

onto the stage of this drama by creating economic disturbances that adversely affect citizens' daily lives – tend to amplify this negative effect.

Regime type also matters. The government of Peru under Fujimori was less amenable to (and perhaps less vulnerable to) protest activity than the democratic regimes that preceded and succeeded it. In fact, faced with economic disturbances it came down even harder, speeding up privatization and concluding it more quickly, whereas in India, this period was lengthened when protests occurred. In India, as well, rule by a right-wing party, the BJP tended to go together with faster implementation of privatization.

The fresh analysis that Uba has presented concerning the *impact* of protest actions against encroaching global capitalism, considered here in the sphere of state enterprise privatizations, is useful and timely for many reasons. State leaders wishing to assess the likely consequences of a decision to privatize can more fully game the likely situation starting with the variables that Uba has isolated. Union managers can similarly calculate the likely benefits and costs of future protests. Better-informed deal-making is a possible result. Better understanding of the processes involved certainly follows.

**Möller, Ulrika, 2007. *The Prospects of Security Cooperation: A Matter of Relative Gains or Recognition?* Göteborg Studies in Politics 105. Göteborg: Statsvetenskapliga institutionen.**

---

IAN CLARK<sup>1</sup>

---

This doctoral thesis had its public disputation on 21 September and was approved. I was the Opponent for this occasion.

The work employs a specific case in order to explore a more general theoretical argument. The specific case is that of India in the negotiations for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in 1996, and it asks why India's stand changed from that of initial support to final repudiation. From this basis, the author asks the general question why states defect from the possibility of cooperation, and most of the work is a sustained contribution to this theoretical position.

It has some elements of major originality. The book starts from a sense of dissatisfaction with the present state of the IR theoretical literature on state defection. It insists that, despite the claims of neoliberalism and constructivism, there is no serious alternative to structural realism as an explanation of state defection. Whenever defection from cooperation occurs, all theories seem to vindicate structural realism, and so the author seeks to develop a theoretical position which represents a genuine alternative. It starts with some elements taken from the realist perspective, and injects into this a novel constructivist

---

1 Ian Clark är professor vid Department of International Politics, Aberystwyth University.

argument about the social dimension of security seeking. This results in a position that may, according to the author, be viewed as realist constructivism.

What are its main features? To begin with, the argument shares the features of structural realism insofar as it starts with anarchy and security seeking. However, the security seeking in which states engage is not the traditional conception of physical survival, and state agents are not primarily concerned by uncertainty about the intentions of other states. What they *are* concerned by is uncertainty about their own social role (since anarchy does not assign social roles), and uncertainty about whether their preferred role will be recognised by other agents. It is this notion of social roles that becomes central to the unfolding analysis.

How do states know which role they seek to perform, and which they wish others to recognise? According to the author, this results from a 'dominant national narrative', rooted in culture and recent historical experience. In the case of India, this is illustrated by India's deep commitment to playing a leading role in nuclear disarmament, and also in traditions of non-violence in India's formation. This also has to be reconciled with India's strong opposition to the NPT as discriminatory. This is clearly a complex notion, and questions

can be asked about any such attempt to 'reify' a single dominant national narrative. Nonetheless, the author sets out a rigorous and precise set of methodologies for 'process tracing' the case study to the more general theoretical arguments.

This is a rich piece of work. On balance, its major contribution is to the development of IR theory. It offers a nuanced reading of the constructivist literature, and succeeds in developing an original position of its own. It will be up to each reader to determine how well the project succeeds over all. Some may doubt whether it ends by offering the genuine alternative to structural realism that it sought at the outset, but instead refines some of its premises. Others may have reservations about the reliability of 'dominant national narratives' as a robust social-scientific concept. Others again may wonder whether we can so sharply distinguish between the security aspects of role performance, and more traditional versions of national security. Whatever the assessment, this is a bold attempt to contribute to a complex field, and the author should be congratulated for her daring in entering into it, and for making a worthwhile contribution to understanding this important aspect of state behaviour.