

---

DOI: 10.1355/ae26-3j

---

***Routledge Handbook of International Political Economy: IPE as a Global Conversation.* Edited by Mark Blyth.** Abingdon: Routledge, 2009. Pp. 377.

---

While the discipline of International Political Economy (IPE) has been in existence for almost forty years, it is characterized by considerable diversity with regard to approaches, methodology, and focus. IPE is, often in the United States, portrayed as a sub-discipline of international relations that has a specific methodological approach and way of framing questions. In other parts of the world, such as the United Kingdom and Australia, IPE is characterized by significantly greater diversity as regards methods and disciplinary boundaries. In Asia, Europe, and Latin America, IPE is approached in yet other ways.

To date, most overviews of IPE have approached the discipline from a specific standpoint, usually determined by the author's training and membership of a particular intellectual "lineage". The approach taken by this book is rather different. Its starting point is that IPE, as a discipline, has multiple traditions. These traditions vary across countries, but also within them, as a given country may house several approaches. Through inviting a range of scholars from around the world to put forward their views on how they perceive IPE, this book aims to celebrate its diversity through mapping the discipline's different approaches and intellectual traditions.

The introduction by Mark Blyth sets out the rationale behind the book, provides an overview of each of its sections, and draws out key themes and differences. The following eighteen chapters are grouped into four sections, each dedicated to exploring how IPE is approached in a given region and what implications this has for the discipline as a whole.

The first section deals with IPE as it is practised in North America. The first chapter by Cohen looks at the historical context within which IPE emerged in the United States, and explores how

different schools of thought have influenced the discipline's methodological and thematic focus. Subsequent chapters by Kirshner, Cooley, and Abdelal look at different U.S.-based IPE traditions such as realist political economy, rationalist theories of institutions, and constructivism. The final chapter by Germain looks at IPE as it is practised in Canada, which has been particularly influenced by the work of Robert Cox.

The second section analyses IPE in Britain. The first chapter by Clift and Rosamund traces the intellectual lineage of IPE in the country, putting forward an explanation of how and why it differs from its U.S. counterpart. In the following chapters: Cameron and Palan look at the role of reflexive theory in IPE; Langley explores the influence of Susan Strange and particularly her exploration of power; and Cerny looks at the structural approach and how it could be used to bring the British and U.S. schools closer together.

The third section looks at IPE in Asia. The first chapter by Arrighi is an analysis of China, its development model, and the implications of its rise for the world order. The second chapter by Bello is a discussion of the East Asian developmental state framework and its utility in exploring domestic political issues often missed by Western IPE. The chapter by Cheung looks at the international and subnational dimensions of economic development in East Asia and its theoretical ramifications for state-centric IPE. The last chapter by Sharman looks at how IPE has developed as a discipline in Australia and how it relates to its U.S., British, and Asian counterparts.

The final section brings together essays on IPE in other countries and regions as well as by experts in cognate fields. The first chapter by Jabko looks at why, despite a long tradition of political economy, IPE did not really develop in France. The subsequent chapter by Palma explores why, notwithstanding Latin America's contribution to structuralism and dependency theory, the region undertakes little IPE research today. Campbell analyses what contribution the discipline of sociology makes to IPE, and Oliver explores the relationship between economic history and IPE. Hobson and Seabrooke round out

---

this section with a discussion of what they term “everyday” international political economy — namely the reflexive relationship between non-elite actors and the global economy.

This Handbook is very ambitious in its scope, and succeeds admirably in carrying it off. For a discipline that is as jargon-prone as IPE, the book is, for the most part, very accessible. It is also very well-structured and presented, something many edited works are not.

Recasting this overview as a “conversation” between different traditions is a new and welcomed approach. In addition, this has the additional merit of mapping the genealogy of the discipline, which has been influenced by geography, intellectual traditions, as well as specific individuals. Thus, the Handbook is very useful for understanding why IPE in the United States means something quite different from what it does in, say, Australia. This “genealogical” approach is certainly new and very helpful to students as well as those more familiar with the discipline.

That said, the book would have benefited from discussions on one or more of the following issues:

As with the chapter on China, this book would have benefited from a discussion on India. In addition to the country’s growing economic and political clout and the ensuing implications for a “multi-polar” world, India has long been studied by IPE scholars with important theoretical implications. The work of C. Raja Mohan on India’s nuclear capabilities and its relations with the United States, and Francine Frankel on Indo-Chinese relations are cases in point. In addition, work by Atul Kohli and Ronald Herring has linked India to the “developmental” state debate, and Joseph Grieco, a leading Realist, studied pre-liberalization India’s attempt to carve an “autonomous” role for itself in the world economy.

Similarly, this work would have benefited from a discussion on the practice in, and implications of, IPE in the Muslim World as well as Sub-Saharan Africa. Events in both regions have had important theoretical implications for the discipline. Indeed, IPE as a discipline was established against the backdrop of the 1973 oil

crisis. The work of influential scholars also comes to mind. Samir Amin, the Franco-Egyptian dependency theorist, wrote extensively on international economic relations between the “centre” and “periphery”, as well as political and economic issues concerning both the Arab world and West Africa. IPE work in the Middle East continues today through the work of scholars such as Abbas Alnasrawi and Bahgat Korany. Similarly, IPE work focusing on Sub-Saharan Africa by the likes of Francois-Xavier Verschave, Philippe Le Billon, and Paul Collier has studied issues such as neo-colonialism, the resource curse, and the political economy of conflict.

In addition, while economic geography issues are dealt with in Yeung’s chapter, I would argue that the discipline’s contribution to IPE merits a specific chapter. Work by Ron Martin, Nigel Thrift, Ash Amin, and Peter Dicken has been very influential in recent IPE work. Thrift’s founding role in the journal *Review of International Political Economy* as well as the ubiquitous references to Dicken’s *Global Shift* in much contemporary IPE work (including this book) are testament to this. Furthermore, the work of the likes of AnnaLee Saxenian, Michael Storper, and Allen J. Scott on the social and political dimensions underpinning the success of sub-national territories in the international economy would be of benefit to IPE scholars, as they try to cope theoretically with the “decentering” effects of globalization on the nation-state.

Lastly, the absence of a concluding chapter was a pity for several reasons. The book is cast as a “conversation” between different branches of the discipline, respecting their individual traditions, strengths, and shortcomings. Beyond appreciating this diversity, it is relevant to ask what can be learned as a result of the exercise and if there are any rules that should underpin future “conversations”. Furthermore, it would be pertinent to highlight the challenges that the discipline itself needs to face, as the chapters written by Campbell, Oliver, and Yeung raise important methodological questions.

But, in sum, the points raised above are forgivable. By transcending the standard

---

formulas of presenting and discussing IPE, this book constitutes a welcome breath of fresh air and makes a substantial contribution to the discipline through mapping many of its intellectual lineages. Along with Gilpin's 1987 and 2001 works, and an edited tome such as Goddard, Cronin, and Dash (2002), this book should form the cornerstone of any IPE collection.

FRANCIS E. HUTCHINSON  
*Governance and Public Sector  
Management Consultant*

DOI: 10.1355/ae26-3k

---

***Indonesia Betrayed: How Development Fails.* By Elizabeth Culler Collins.** Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2007. Pp. 265.

---

While "Indonesia Betrayed" was how President Suharto described an unsuccessful coup attempt by the Communist Party in 1966, Elizabeth Collins' book *Indonesia Betrayed: How Development Fails* uses this expression to describe Suharto's long-term impact on the Indonesian economy and society. This book provides factual evidence that Suharto, the leader of the New Order regime, may have betrayed Indonesia far worse than the Communist Party through his debt-led growth development policy and authoritarian style of government. The purpose of the book, however, is to do more than just analyse the history of development in Indonesia. It adequately describes the causes, expectations, and results of the so-called *reformasi* (Reformation) movement in Indonesia. Collins, a professor of Southeast Asian studies at Ohio University, analyses issues from the perspective of the most marginalized Indonesians and comes to the conclusion that development was unsuccessful in bringing long-lasting prosperity to the country.

Suharto, the second president of Indonesia, tried to implement development as the country's main economic strategy; he even called himself "The Father of Development". Studying the origin of

Suharto's New Order development policy, Collins describes that as a strong anti-Communist policy, Suharto converted the political and economic orientation of Indonesia from that of a communist country to a more Westernized society based on capitalism. His main economic policies were based on the World Bank and IMF development ideals of industrialization and liberalization, and the attainment of high economic growth financed by external debt. However, she shows that in practice, the corrupt Suharto and his cronies were the largest beneficiaries of this external funding. Soon after, the need to repay the debt drove the regime to exploit Indonesia's natural resources and tropical forest. Collins also explores how this economic policy was done simultaneously with repressive politics. For three decades, the New Order created artificial harmony and maintained political stability by oppressing opposition through minimizing the number of political parties; depoliticizing students, peasantry and urban workforce organizations; and centralizing local governments. Collins also describes how the government was able to violently suppress protesting indigenous communities deprived of their long-standing access to forests and other resources through both military force and the Mafia. However, this policy led NGOs and student groups to begin the pro-democratic movement against Suharto's development policy in the 1970s.

Collins shows how the problems of huge external debt were hidden during a sustained period of economic growth, two decades prior to the 1997 Asian crisis. In the wake of widespread rioting following a massive price hike caused by drastic depreciation during the crisis, the *reformasi* movement, led by students and worker groups, overthrew Suharto's presidency. This pro-democratic movement led the Indonesian public to believe that a democratic government and a more equal distribution of power and wealth would arise.

This book also describes the consequences of the debt-based development policy brought about by Suharto's regime. One of the main problems Collins identifies is the export-oriented policy required by the World Bank and the IMF to ensure