

flora. However, over the past 16 years or so, Gaborone has sought to remove them, relocating many to 'resettlement camps', where hunting and gathering is impossible and where the Basarwa have, like indigenous First People elsewhere in the world, become dependent on government handouts and alcohol – worsening their position at the bottom of the Botswanan social ladder.

The government has claimed that the 55,000 pula (\$8,200) per month needed to supply services to the Basarwa in the Reserve was 'too expensive' to continue. This is rather ironic, not to say dubious, bearing in mind that the country had a budget *surplus* of 2.58 billion pula in the financial year 2000/2001!

In addition, the government has refused offers of financial assistance from international organisations on this matter. For the Basarwa this is of extreme importance as a significant number of them receive rations and earn some income through government-sponsored projects. Many Basarwa live below the official Poverty Datum Line (PDL) and are officially classed as destitute. Social, economic and indeed racial barriers prevent the Basarwa from having decent access to services and employment. Unfortunately, in Botswana the prevailing attitude, as Saugestad points out, is that the Basarwa are an inconvenience that need to be 'developed'. Indeed, the government rationale for removing the Basarwa from the CKGR is so that better services can be provided to them.

Part of the problem facing the Basarwa is that the government refuses to accept the indigenous status of the people. Indeed, when the Year of the Indigenous was announced by the United Nations, Gaborone refused to celebrate the Basarwa on the (false) grounds that 'we are all indigenous to Botswana'. This stand springs from a combination of two attitudes. One is the historically negative posture felt by the dominant Tswana towards the Basarwa, and the second is the expressed wish to be a 'non-racial' republic as advocated by the first president, Seretse Khama, and maintained by subsequent heads of state. The claim, excellently detailed by Saugestad, by organised Basarwa to be the 'First People of the Kalahari' was thus at once a claim to indigenous status *and* a challenge to the *status quo* and the years of neglect and oppression felt by the Basarwa in Botswana.

As the book points out, the very idea of indigenous is a conceptual tool that permits the analysis of a broad spectrum of social problems be analysed with greater sensitivity and greater linkage to actually lived experiences. Saugestad builds on her work with indigenous people in both Norway (the Sami) and New Zealand (the Maori) to produce an excellent study of the plight of the Basarwa in Botswana and their struggle for recognition and dignity. The book is warmly recommended for all those interested in indigenous peoples, in African political economy and in Botswana.

IAN TAYLOR

*Department of Political and Administrative Studies,  
University of Botswana*

**Globalization and Governance** edited by Aseem Prakash and Jeffrey A. Hart. New York: Routledge, 2000. Pp.xiv + 338. £19.99 (paperback). ISBN 0 415 24249 5

This edited volume is the second in the *RIPE Series in Global Political Economy*. It explores the nature and impact of globalisation from the perspective of International Political Economy (IPE).

This is an excellent collection of essays. Its strength is the theoretical rigor and the state-of-the-art theoretical frameworks the authors employ. Therefore, it is an up-to-date

compendium of IPE, or at least one slice of the sub-discipline. As the title indicates, the essays look at how the process of globalization creates the need for new forms of governance, or how governance stimulates globalisation (Lake, p.42). Globalization is first problematized as the dependent variable; then as an independent variable leading to new forms of governance. The volume offers a wide array of theoretical constructs to connect globalisation to governance.

The volume also purports to present 'competing perspectives, the new institutionalist and constructivist - ' (p.1), and in the process bridge different research traditions. This would be a more important and more original contribution to international relations theory, but it does not happen. First, the new institutionalist - constructivist dichotomy is a false one. In fact, new institutionalism and social constructivism are closely related, and building bridge between the two is traversing a rather narrow ravine.

Second, the editors relate that there is a continental divide between the new institutionalist and constructivist, respectively, America and Europe (Preface). But Alexander Wendt (Ph.D. University of Minnesota, then Yale, Dartmouth and University of Chicago) has done as much to spread the social constructivist gospel as any scholar. Friedrich Kratochwil, now editor of the *European Journal of International Relations*, which is representative of the influence of constructivism in Europe, made his name in the United States (Ph.D. Princeton, then to Columbia and the University of Pennsylvania). There is more, and although social constructivism owes an intellectual debt to the 'British School', it is also part of mainstream IR theory in America.

Thus, this volume does not bridge different research traditions. From an ontological, epistemological, and even methodological perspective, they are part of the same genus, if different families. The terms of the debate (in the volume), in fact, poisons the well. Governance is defined as a way of providing 'collective action'; globalisation is defined largely in terms of its economic effects, and the focus of the volume is on the country level. This does not mean they do not offer insights, because they do. Michael McGinnis, for instance, explains that there are different levels of governance organisation that compete to provide collective goods (p.74). This helps us map important changes in international politics. None the less, most are grounded in rationalist research traditions. Peter Haas' and Wayne Sandholtz's fine (constructivist) contributions certainly focus on non-material forces for change, but are nonetheless firmly grounded in the same tradition as the new-institutionalists (David Lake and Michael McGinnis). Other than the notable exception of Ian Douglas's contribution, there is no challenge to mainstream IPE, and little representative of 'reflectivism'.

The introduction does argue that 'Even an actor oriented neoinstitutionalist approach has to take structural factors into consideration' (p.xiii), but this is not the way constructivism explores the agent-structure dynamic. Neo-realists understand the impact of structure on actors, and the 'two-level game' literature [Evans, Jacobson and Putnam, 1993] understands that the two levels interact. Structures and agents reconstitute each other through dynamic process of interaction over time. Sandholtz in his discussion of the 'evolution of rules' does use this definition (p.80), although the structure of his argument is similar to Robert Keohane and Joseph's Nye's classic argument on transnationalism and international organizations politics [1974].

This volume does capture the dynamic changes in international politics that operate at the interstices of globalisation and governance. The world is more complex (Cerny) and political power more challenging to locate, and localise. As Kobrin argues, the new world order somewhat resembles Medieval rule. There are no weak chapters; each explores an important dimension of change within the globalisation process that is forcing changes in

both domestic and global governance. And for an edited volume, the separate essays cohere nicely; the authors actually relate their arguments to their co-contributors.

JAMES J. HENTZ

*Department of International Studies and Political Science,  
Virginia Military Institute*

#### REFERENCES

- Evans, P., Jacobson, H. and R. Putnam (eds.), 1993, *Double-Edged Diplomacy*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.  
Keohane, R. and J. Nye, 1974, 'Transgovernmental Relations and International Organizations', *World Politics*, Vol.27, No.1, pp.39-63.

**Africa's Challenge to International Relations Theory** edited by Kevin C. Dunn and Timothy M. Shaw. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001. Pp.xv + 242. \$65 (hardback). ISBN 0 333 91828 2

This collection poses a direct challenge to the provincialism of mainstream International Relations (IR) scholarship. Its ambitious objective, as stated in the introductory chapter by Kevin Dunn, is to 'problematize both existing IR theory and theorizing in general'. In so doing, the authors draw on African examples to demand 'a better IR'. Individual essays address core IR theories such as realism, liberalism, structuralism and post-modern approaches (with constructivism conspicuous in its absence), and engage key concepts like the state, nation, sovereignty, identity, power, anarchy, diplomacy, and the international/domestic dichotomy. By organising around these central tenets of IR, most authors succeed in engaging the discipline on its own terms without conceding too much to its often-irrelevant debates.

For a book composed largely of conference papers (a majority from the 1999 International Studies Association Conference), there is a surprising coherence across chapters, even if the quality is at times uneven. Coherence is not unity, however, and the book encompasses divergent approaches. For instance, the authors disagree over such basic themes as the 'state of the state' in Africa and how stateness shapes the continent's international relations. With the volume's stated commitment to plural discourses, however, these incongruities can be read as a strength rather than a weakness, the more so given the extent to which the essays 'talk' to one another in frequent cross-references.

Recognising that everyone brings their own interests to a book, several of the chapters stand out in our reading. Co-editor Kevin Dunn makes an important contribution to resolving inconsistencies between the way the state is approached in IR and African studies. Much of IR's irrelevance to Africa derives from the fact that the state, even while it is the starting-point of so much IR theory, is treated as an ahistorical given at the centre of all politics.

African studies, on the other hand, is preoccupied with the state, as seen in Africanists' penchant for inserting adjectives such as 'failed', 'weak', 'shadow', 'quasi' (etc.) in front of the word 'state'. The state, argues Dunn, needs to be conceptually unpacked as a discursive invention shaped by its historicity and context. 'What is needed is an approach that examines *which* discourses are being constructed and employed, by *whom*, to *what ends*, and to *what effects*' (p.61). Here, the penetration, even

