

Another problem concerns the concept of “new” regionalism. One wonders whether this is a catch-all phrase for embracing a wide range of issue areas and institutional forms. The author could have made his framework of analysis more useful by developing a typology of regional groupings and elaborating on the important conceptual distinctions that can be made between functionally-specific (PAFTAD, PBEC, and so forth) versus multipurpose groupings (ASEAN, SAARC), security alliances (SEATO) versus common security forums (ASEAN-PMC), regional trade blocs (EAEG, as originally presented) versus consultative economic forums (APEC).

Furthermore, one may question whether “old” regionalism as conceptualized by the integrationists is really all that old (and obsolete) in view of recent theoretical work by European scholars which has attested to the renewed relevance of neo-functionalism in explaining the EC’s move towards a single market. In a related vein, one is entitled to wonder whether “new” regionalism is really new, given that much of the recent concerns about regionalism have focused on its potential to generate inward-looking and protectionist trading blocs, in contrast to the kind of soft and outward-looking notion envisaged by Palmer.

Finally, while the author seeks to move his analysis beyond the emphasis of “old” regionalism on formal institutions, the case studies in the book focus largely on organizations, their evolution and role. This deprives the reader of an opportunity to test the book’s theoretical framework which stressed the usefulness of the concept of international regimes as an analytical tool for understanding regional co-operation.

Notwithstanding these points, the book makes a significant contribution to the study of an important subject. Its generalizations about the characteristics of Asia-Pacific regionalism are insightful and should be of considerable interest to scholars and policy-makers interested in the future of international relations within the Asia-Pacific.

AMITAV ACHARYA
Centre for International and Strategic Studies
York University, Canada

***New World Disorder: The Leninist Extinction.* By Ken Jowitt. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992. 342 pp.**

New World Disorder: The Leninist Extinction by Professor Ken Jowitt, of the University of California, Berkeley, is primarily a collection of essays

written between 1974 and early 1991. Much of the book deals with rather arcane issues regarding Leninism, a phenomenon which the author believes has become extinct. He discusses these issues in considerable (and sometimes confusing) detail. With the end of the Cold War and the demise of communism in Eastern Europe as a whole, the theoretical issues raised and discussed in the first five chapters of the book have become largely of academic and historical interest. These chapters have also been written in an involved and pedantic style which makes for rather heavy reading.

The latter part of the book deals with more contemporary topics and has been written in a lighter style. It should therefore be of much greater interest to both the general reader and a wider range of academics, specialists and other observers of international affairs. It should be noted, however, that the latter chapters were written well before the abortive coup in the former USSR in August 1991 and the radical turn of events in its aftermath.

Professor Jowitt saw the crisis in the former Soviet Union and Gorbachev's reform efforts as being pregnant with several possible outcomes: a regime ostensibly Leninist or Bolshevik but more Menshevik in substance (similar to Hungary's political evolution at the time); or an ethnically-oriented Soviet regime which could be either benign or dangerously xenophobic (depending on the outcome of the leadership struggle); or a situation "marked for a prolonged period of time by political turbulence and instability, one in which nativists confront Westernizers, Andropovites confront Gorbachevites, 'civics' confront 'ethnics', and neither the party nor terror provides the regime with its political linchpin" (p. 246). The author considered the third scenario to be the most likely outcome.

Interestingly (or rather curiously), Professor Jowitt did not entertain the possibility that the CPSU (the Soviet Communist Party) might collapse as a result of progressive internal weakening caused by infighting and desertions over the issues of political and economic reform. He also did not consider the possibility that the fragile Soviet federation might unravel under growing centrifugal pressures, evident since the late 1980s, particularly in Russia and Ukraine, the two critical federating units. Rather, Professor Jowitt saw the infighting within the CPSU and tensions outside the party as most likely to lead to "the emergence of a strong, not absolute, 'Giollittian' president and presidency". Such a person and office would revitalize the CPSU's role and resolve tensions outside the party without surrendering to xenophobia or ethnic sovereignty (p. 247). He saw the alternative of political chaos as a decisive factor favouring such a scenario.

Although Professor Jowitt's scenarios and predictions diverged fundamentally from developments in the former Soviet Union since August 1991,

his final chapter "A World Without Leninism" contains some interesting, even if poignantly pessimistic, observations concerning the implications and impact of the end of Leninism on world order. He is particularly concerned about the danger of widespread territorial disintegration resulting directly and indirectly from the collapse of the Soviet empire. The Leninist extinction, he emphasizes, already "threatens some and will challenge many other territorial boundaries" in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, the Balkans, Western Europe and Asia, where there is considerable potential for civic/ethnic identity issues to resurface. Similarly, other issues which do not "respect" existing territorial boundaries, such as religious fundamentalism (not just the more familiar Islamic type) will gain momentum and become more dominant sources of political tension and conflicts, both in the internal and international arenas.

In sum, Professor Jowitt's analysis of the likely consequences of the Leninist extinction is that "we face a period of global, regional, and national turmoil over boundaries and identities" (p. 328). He ends his discourse by lamenting America's limited capacities for dynamism and far-sightedness in the foreign policy field. He believes that the United States cannot sustain its "absolutist" position in international relations, "if for no other reason (and there are other reasons) than it can't afford it" (p. 330). Professor Jowitt, however, fails to discuss any alternative approaches that could help preserve world order in the face of growing challenges to it, which he is evidently aware of. He simply worries, for example, that success in Kuwait will "reinforce the absolutist assumption by the United States of global responsibility for unchanged territorial boundaries" (p. 330). Similarly, in a dismissive style, he criticizes the United States' decision to seek economic integration with Mexico rather than with Western Europe. Professor Jowitt also does not discuss issues such as collective security and the United Nations' role, which have gained considerable prominence after the end of the Cold War and the unsettling experience of the Gulf crisis. It is only natural for the reader to expect some discussions of these burning issues when picking up a book that bears the catchy title, *New World Disorder*.

Implicit in the author's concluding remarks is the notion that the United States is losing its stature as the world's principal power-centre to Western Europe, which enjoys better prospects of regaining such a stature in the twenty-first century. On the whole, Professor Jowitt has been far more rigorous and erudite in his discussion of ideological issues concerning Leninism and its extinction than in his treatment of current affairs. On balance, the book promises more than it actually offers. Yet, the author's pessimism seems more realistic than those wilfully optimistic about developments in a world without Leninism. For example, Francis Fukuyama's

belief in the historical victory of liberalism in his *End of History* is no match for Professor Jowitt's more mature and erudite understanding of history and historical processes.

NAZIR KAMAL
The Straits Times
Singapore

***Gorbachev and Southeast Asia.* By Leszek Buszynski.** London: Routledge, 1992.

A large number of studies have appeared, especially since the mid-1980s, on the Soviet Union and Southeast Asia. For the most part, they deal with general Soviet foreign policy means and tactics, or the perceptions and attitudes of various Southeast Asian leaders towards the Soviet Union.

The very nature of the Soviet political system rendered it difficult to carry out systematic and detailed study of the decision-making process in order to understand the aims and values, and to gain insight into political bargaining among the various institutions. The beginnings of the era of *perestroika* and *glasnost* ushered in a new mode of political behaviour within the Soviet Union, making it more fruitful for scholars to understand the interplay between domestic and foreign policy.

Leszek Buszynski has addressed the "transformation of foreign policy upon the basis of domestic political change". Though written before the demise of the Soviet Union in December 1991, the author incorporates the tremendous changes unleashed in the preceding two years, and thus presents the inevitability of replacing "Soviet foreign policy" with the strong Gorbachev legacy, and the contending policies of the various republics as they grappled with the rising sense of nationalism and power struggle.

Buszynski, a Senior Research Fellow at the Australian National University, is in a unique position to study Gorbachev and Southeast Asia. He has the advantage of being familiar with both the Russian environment and the Southeast Asian context. The current book is his second on the Soviet Union and the region, the earlier one being *Soviet Foreign Policy and Southeast Asia* (1986) in which he explored the evolving Soviet-Southeast Asian relationship, with emphasis on the Brezhnev period. He has also published several other studies on related topics.