Security Communities. **Edited by Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. 462pp.

Security Communities is the most recent example of what might be called the growing "back to the future" trend in international relations (IR) theory: the determination on the part of some scholars to rummage on the dustier shelves of international relations and sociology in search of fresh ways to think about and explain contemporary global politics.

Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett's 462 page volume has as its central task the "resuscitation" of the concept of security communities, pioneered by Karl Deutsch and his colleagues in the 1950s (p. 5). Deutsch's attention to the processes of communication, "we-feeling" and shared identity has always made his work a likely source of inspiration for sociologically-inclined IR scholarship. But *Security Communities* should not be mistaken for old wine in new bottles. By blending Deutsch's insights with ideas from constructivist international relations theory, Adler and Barnett advance a novel and highly flexible analytical framework not only capable of considering the conditions under which pacific communities might emerge, but also providing "an alternative look at regional interactions and their relationship to security practices" (p. 6).

In two elegantly written introductory chapters, the editors present a framework for critically examining community formation in international politics. Without claiming that there is a single pathway to the development of a security community, they offer "one conceptualization of the mechanisms and conditions by which security communities develop" (p. 49). This approach falls into three distinct phases: nascent, ascendant, and mature security communities, with the last most closely corresponding with Deutsch's use of the term. Mature security communities can be further distinguished between "tight" and "loose" groupings of states, depending on the degree of supranationalism evident.

Adler and Barnett eschew Deutsch's fixation with "transactions" as an indicator of regional integration, instead relying on constructivist claims about the role of norms and socialization in collective identity formation. While stressing the importance of power and threats among several conditions that can "trigger" security communities, they devote equal space to the inter-subjective structure of international life, the shared meanings that can facilitate social learning, and the development of mutual trust and identity.

The core of the book comprises eight case studies which view a range of regional and state security practices through the revised Deutschian lens. While Deutsch's original preoccupation was with the

North Atlantic, *Security Communities* is happily less Eurocentric. Apart from the essays on Western Europe and the OSCE, the book includes chapters on the Persian Gulf states, South America, U.S.–Canadian and U.S.–Mexican relations, among others. Of perhaps greatest interest to the readers of this journal, however, may be Amitav Acharya's analysis of ASEAN, and Richard Higgott and Kim Richard Nossal's co-authored essay on Australia.

One of the great strengths of Adler and Barnett's approach is that it regards a security community as an ongoing evolutionary process rather than simply an end-point. This opens the way for the consideration of regions (such as the Southern Cone and ASEAN) that may be developing dependably pacific inter-state relations, but which do not yet exhibit all the requisite qualities for a security community spelled out by Deutsch. Furthermore, as Higgott and Nossal's chapter illustrates, the flexibility of the approach means that it can even be used to explore how a single state, in their case Australia, has consciously sought to relocate itself *vis-à-vis* its neighbours.

Their study begins with the reminder that physical propinquity is not a necessary condition for the building of a security community. Australia has always had to deal with the insecurity inherent in the "tyranny of distance" that has historically separated it from its chosen protectors in London and Washington. But few countries have been as racked by the tensions between history and geography as Australia. Higgott and Nossal paint a vivid picture of the country's search for its strategic identity, torn between its traditional security ties to the West and a growing desire to "be at home" in the Asia-Pacific.

The authors trace the source of the tension in Australian security policy to its post-war beginnings: the "we-feeling" that held the ANZUS alliance together also confirmed the "otherness" of Australia's Asian neighbours. Their history of the ANZUS dispute might be a little off the mark (New Zealanders may be surprised to learn that the 1984 Labour government's anti-nuclear policy was "largely in response" to the bombing of the Greenpeace ship *Rainbow Warrior*), but Higgott and Nossal ably capture the growing Australian sense of frustration with U.S. trade policy in the 1980s and the spirit of republican nationalism that led the Hawke and Keating governments to assiduously pursue their "push into Asia."

The resulting strategic schizophrenia that wants Australia to be a part "of Asia" while also defending against it, says something about the limitations inherent in an élite-driven redefinition of national identity. In their introduction, Adler and Barnett stress the importance of "creative and far-sighted political elites" (p. 43) in building community, but the Australian case seems a powerful reminder that in

a democracy at least, you also need to take the people along with you. Higgott and Nossal conclude that an Australian–Southeast Asian security community will continue to remain out of reach, if only because at the grass-roots level, there has not been any change in identity. "Australia's neighbours in Asia and most ordinary Australians... continue to be unwilling to embrace that sense of 'we-feeling'... so important for the development of community" (p. 288).

Unlike Australia's relations with its near neighbours, Southeast Asia has been able to develop a sense of collective identity. This is despite the fact that ASEAN, as Acharya notes, does not at first look much like a traditional security community. Illiberal, extraordinarily diverse, and with a low level of intra-regional transactions, ASEAN's creation challenged many of the key assumptions of Deutsch's work. How then can we explain the fact that its members have not gone to war since its formation in 1967? Acharya's conclusion, informed by the work of Benedict Anderson as well as Deutsch, is that ASEAN is an "imagined regional community". Its collective identity has been forged through a "highly deliberate process of elite socialisation involving the creation of norms, principles, and symbols aimed at the management of diversity and the development of substantive regional cooperation" (p. 207). These include a shared ideology of developmentalism, the practice of multilateralism, and a regional code of conduct (the "ASEAN way"). Shared values are important in community building, Acharya argues, but they need not be liberal-democratic values.

This extension of the security community model to the developing world, liberating it from its traditional focus on liberal polities, is particularly welcome. But ASEAN's leaders should temper any self-congratulation by noting that Acharya only considers ASEAN to be a nascent security community (what he has called a "security regime" elsewhere) and even this limited sense of community has been sorely tested by the recent economic and political crises in the region. Similarly, if Guadalupe Gonzalez and Stephen Haggard's analysis of the U.S.–Mexico relationship in the volume has any wider application, it suggests that without more democratization, it may be difficult for ASEAN to achieve "deeper regionalism" and greater levels of trust between its members.

Despite the diversity of the case-studies under consideration, *Security Communities* is a coherent and extremely well-argued volume. It is not without its flaws, however: the authors offer little by way of explanation for how "loose" security communities evolve into more complex "tight" institutions like the European Union. Nor do they offer any discussion of the conditions under which security communities might break down, something that would have been especially

timely, given the conflict in the former Yugoslavia, until relatively recently an amalgamated security community of sorts. Students of Asia-Pacific security will also bemoan the absence of a U.S.–Japan case study — surely one of the more important and interesting contemporary examples of a security community? But no single volume can cover everything and as the editors note in their concluding chapter, this book only represents the first step towards a constructivist research programme on security communities. As such, it lays down solid foundations for others to build upon.

Security Communities is a timely and thoughtful piece of work which will be of interest to scholars not just of security studies, but also of regionalism, institution-building and IR theory. It marks another important step in the building of an empirically grounded constructivist challenge to the neo-realist/neo-liberal dominance of security studies and regionalism. Students of Asia-Pacific security will surely have much to offer the research programme that eventually emerges.

<div align="right">

DAVID CAPIE
Department of Political Science
York University
Toronto, Canada

</div>

Vietnam: The Incomplete Transformation. **By Peter Wolff.** German Development Institute Book Series No.12. Berlin, London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1999. 137pp.

These days, a likely consensus among Vietnam watchers would be that nothing much is going on in the country by way of economic reforms. The international media also deliver a similar message about policy inertia. Some ten years after impressing the world with an initial zeal for market reforms, the socialist regime in Hanoi shows signs of losing its ideological nerves and is finding ways to cling on to the state's costly and inefficient domination over the economy. Policy vacillation, administrative red-tape, and corruption at many levels of the bureaucracy have made foreign investors tire of Vietnam. Many have pulled out and the euphoria over Vietnam as Asia's most likely new tiger economy is over. Vietnam's political élite has not yet found a way out of this dilemma. This is the "incomplete transformation" in the title of Wolff's book.

What went wrong? Wolff's book sets out to answer this fascinating and important question. His explication of the stalled reforms is