

strategic interests still appeared inextricably bound to notions of its east European sphere of influence. And if we 'forget', there is a wealth of competent scholarly literature to which we can return, as well as an increasing abundance of documents, memoirs, and other primary sources to enhance our understanding and permit us to critically re-evaluate earlier judgements.

Indeed, two chapters reproduced here are available elsewhere, and the most interesting part of the book is the piece on civil society, published in *Soviet Studies* in 1990. Generally, however, not much is distinctive. The individual chapters have not been re-woven to provide a unifying theme, they are not well documented, and they are somewhat repetitive. The author's criticism of Western scholarship as excessively pre-occupied with elites and power at the highest levels (Chapter 2) ignores the wealth of approaches to communist studies. In particular, many of those utilising a political economy perspective long ago dealt effectively with points she makes about the nature of the communist system and its internal logic. Moreover, her judgements (1996) about the contemporary situation appear rather superficial and as 'short-termist' as those she criticises.

FRANCES MILLARD  
University of Essex

Michael J. Green, *Arming Japan: Defense Production, Alliance Politics, and the Postwar Search for Autonomy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 206 pp., US\$16.50, ISBN 0 231 10285 2.

*Arming Japan* by Michael J. Green examines the development of Japan's defence production sector since the second world war. At the centre of this historical analysis lies the problem of *kokusanka* (or 'national productionisation') of defence production. The most notable theme that emerges from this book is the failure of Japan to develop *kokusanka* during this period. The second constant theme is the inextricable and pervasive presence of the US–Japan alliance in the world of Japanese defence production.

The push for *kokusanka*, according to Green, is a form of technonationalism, which promotes national technological development and resists dependence as a threat to sovereignty. Green attributes the failure of this push to two chief causes. First, rapid world technological advancement has significantly increased the technological costs of purely indigenous defence production. Second, political costs to the US relationship, which result from any push towards greater *kokusanka*, have constantly undermined pro-*kokusanka* forces within the Japanese bureaucracy.

This book is important for three reasons. Most significantly, Green's book provides an excellent historical overview of Japan's defence development since the 1950s. For those wishing to know more about the Japanese defence sector and the development of the defence-related bureaucracies, this book provides an in-depth analysis from the birth of *kokusanka* with the F-86 to the FSX failure, and beyond. Neither the value nor the difficulty of putting together such a comprehensive historical analysis should be underestimated. The extent of the bibliography, which uses both English and Japanese-language resources, is indicative of the comprehensive nature of this book.

In addition to its historical value, the book examines some important questions in security studies. It provides some interesting explanations as to how globalisation, or complex interdependence, has affected Japan's defence industry. In this case, it appears to have altered Japan's attitude towards defence autonomy from maintaining technological independence to increasing influence within the US alliance, thus enabling Japan to reduce the risks and costs of its high-tech projects. Not that this process has been without risks; the constant danger for the Japanese has been the balance between entrapment within, and abandonment from, its alliance with the USA.

Third, for students of Japanese foreign policy and Japan's international relations, this book provides a fascinating insight into the nuts-and-bolts of Japan's international role and its relationship with the USA. Green does not limit the book to technical discussions, although acronyms and abbreviations take over at times. *Arming Japan* also provides a fascinating insight into the bureaucratic politics that have influenced the defence sector, from the Policy Affairs Research Council to the defence *zoku* (clique) in the Liberal Democratic Party. Again, for students of US–Japan relations, Green's research is invaluable.

In addition to the aforementioned important aspects of *Arming Japan*, the conclusions drawn by Green, as to how the USA should act towards Japan in the increasingly uncertain multi-polar Asia-Pacific, would provide for some interesting debate. Green's prescriptions for an improved

relationship that will last well beyond the cold war illustrate the extent to which the tentacles of the alliance have become entrenched in the economic, political and security spheres of Japan and the USA.

H.D.P. ENVALL

*University of Melbourne*

Jill Krause and Neil Renwick (eds), *Identities in International Relations* (London: Macmillan, 1996), 220 pp., \$42.95, ISBN 0 333 69384 1.

This edited volume aims to look at international politics in a different and more radical way than mainstream work in the field. Its central theme is the way in which identity is changing the shape of international relations. The authors try to assess the challenge of identity to the orthodoxy of the discipline, which has traditionally emphasised the role of the state. These authors seek to go beyond the constrictive boundaries of their perspective, an approach which makes a great deal of sense in an era when the state has been undergoing enormous redefinition. The book brings together a range of writers in international relations, focusing on such topics as the Nicaraguan Revolution, gender and colonialism and sub-Saharan identities. However, there is a major problem in that only about half the chapters address the central theme.

Chris Farrands' chapter deals with the way identity is linked to social change and social cohesion. How does our individual psychological make-up link with the study of international relations? At one point the author asserts that 'nationalism, nationality, ethnicity and race among others, have been understood in a long-standing literature as a central focus in International Relations' (p. 19). Where? I think this statement is patently untrue. If anything, this has been the focus of history, sociology and comparative politics, but not the field of international relations. It is only recently that the latter has started to take an interest in these interdisciplinary issues. Much more within the IR debate is Gillian Youngs' perspective on the inside/outside divide which looks at the changing nature of time/space relationships, and what this means for identity and its movement away from state-bound definitions and boundaries. The best chapter in the book is by Jan Aart Scholte who deals with civilisation and collective identities. It is the best written, tying in traditional work on IR with the new global processes shaping the way we think about our identity. Richard Davies' chapter on how the discipline would benefit from studying ethnicity is good, but it does not go much beyond describing the voluminous comparative politics/ethnic studies literature already in existence. Moreover, while the chapters on the Middle East, Nicaragua and sub-Saharan identities are well written and interesting, they do almost nothing to place the material in the context of the book. In these chapters there is almost no reference to IR theory or critical readings in IR theory which might elucidate something about identity. There is almost no discussion of postmodernist views. Identity, the way it is located and the way it changes is central to the postmodernist case. Yet in these chapters, I can find very little analysis relating the case studies to the central theme of the book.

Neil Renwick tries much harder in his chapter 'Re-reading Europe's Identities' to come to grips with the central theme, using postmodern literature and work as his guide. What this book shows, however, is that international relations itself exhibits a crisis of identity and appears to be reaching out to disciplines such as history, comparative politics and political theory for answers. A great deal of the book actually focuses on re-examining concepts and ideas that have been covered in other disciplines; only a few chapters really fulfil the mandate of the book. In the conclusion, for instance, the editors argue that 'these studies have illuminated the way in which established ways of understanding identity in international relations are inherently distorted in their suppression or exclusion of the complexities of ethnicity, gender, race, relation and ethno-centricism' (p. 213). This might be true, but the book does this by referring to other literature where identity has been covered; postmodernism, history and political theory among others, without really relating it to any old, or in fact new, theory of international relations. The book is a partial success which contains some interesting ideas; however, the assertion that it is a 'radically new approach to the understanding and explanation of International Relations' is radically overstated in my opinion.

KENNETH CHRISTIE

*University of Bergen*