

The Academy of Political Science

475 Riverside Drive · Suite 1274 · New York, New York 10115-1274
(212) 870-2500 · FAX: (212) 870-2202 · aps@psqonline.org · <http://www.psqonline.org>

POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY

Volume 125 · Number 3 · Fall 2010

No part of this article may be copied, downloaded, stored, further transmitted, transferred, distributed, altered, or otherwise used, in any form or by any means, except:

- one stored electronic and one paper copy of any article solely for your personal, non-commercial use, or
- with prior written permission of The Academy of Political Science.

Political Science Quarterly is published by The Academy of Political Science. Contact the Academy for further permission regarding the use of this work.

Political Science Quarterly

Copyright © 2010 by The Academy of Political Science. All rights reserved.

blinkers too often short-circuit deliberation. Thus, presidential centrism may be a myth; but we would be better off if it were reality.

ANDREW RUDALEVIGE
Dickinson College

Hierarchy in International Relations by *David A. Lake. Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press, 2009. 232 pp. \$39.95.*

In a theoretically rich study, David Lake challenges the long-prevailing academic notion that the international system is characterized by anarchy. Many existing studies are predicated on the notion that states are sovereign, answer to no higher authority, and are therefore entirely reliant on self-help. Lake points out that the world is, in fact, marked by hierarchy, where weaker states submit to rules created by more-powerful states. This hierarchical relationship is based on a mutual give and take. Dominant states provide essential services such as security and order. The legitimacy deriving from the provision of such functions is essential to maintaining the hierarchy. Of course, the leading powers also benefit from the relationship. In a way, therefore, hierarchy in the international system is a form of interdependence. This is certainly a novel and thought-provoking idea.

Lake develops his argument by elaborating upon a relational concept of authority. He contends that the right to rule, even in the international system, is based on a social contract between the ruler and the ruled. Sovereignty and hierarchy should not be viewed as absolute and indivisible concepts. Sovereignty is a bundle of rights that can be divided among different levels of governance and various rulers. Hierarchy varies according to the levels of authority enjoyed by the ruler. When there are relatively few actions that the dominant state can legitimately command, the level of hierarchy is low. When the leading power determines a large number of actions, hierarchy is at a high level.

In a valuable methodological and theoretical contribution, Lake applies his argument to a comprehensive study of U.S. hierarchy in the international system. He develops a richly detailed and carefully developed set of indicators of security and economic hierarchy. The study points out, for example, that subordinate states spend significantly less on defense as a proportion of gross domestic product than do non-subordinate states. Dominant states are also more likely to come to the assistance of their subordinates in the event of an international crisis. This shows some of the ways in which subordinate states benefit from acceding to a hierarchical system. Lake's argument shows us that the world is not entirely anarchic. In an international system marked by gradations of hierarchy, subordinates benefit from their relationship to dominant powers. Further, hierarchy is not an objective fact, to be measured simply by indicators such as possession of nuclear weapons (p. 178). Perceived legitimacy is also an important component of an authoritative relationship.

This is a timely and meticulously argued study, which provides us a novel prism through which to view the international system. Lake does, however, present an idealized view of the hierarchical system, a system which more-critical observers would view as an empire. Certainly, there are innumerable instances in which U.S. dominance has *not* benefited dominated states. This is an issue that Lake neglects. While hierarchy can be based on voluntary contracts that serve mutual interests, they can also be based on coercive relations that serve only one party. Future research should look more carefully at when and how dominant states rule by coercion rather than consent. Finally, Lake presents a short discussion on how the U.S. hierarchy is impacted by recent developments, such as an increasingly powerful China. Students and scholars of international relations theory should pay greater attention to these dynamics when analyzing changes in relations of domination and subordination.

BIDISHA BISWAS
Western Washington University

Cosmopolitan Communications: Cultural Diversity in a Globalized World by Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart. *New York, Cambridge University Press, 2009. 448 pp. Cloth, \$90.00; paper, \$25.99.*

Popular discourse long has bemoaned the cultural impact of American media on other societies. Where views differ, however, is in the impact itself. In their theoretically grounded, empirically rich work linking media influences to a host of outcome variables, Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart provide a revisionist perspective to such media effects.

Cosmopolitan Communications begins by neatly reviewing contrary schools of thought regarding the influence of American culture. On the one hand, cultural imperialists argue that communications can result in developing societies absorbing American or Western values, attitudes, and beliefs. On the other hand, polarization theorists contend that this same globalization has generated countermovements designed to preserve characteristics indigenous to a particular society. A third camp, situated in between these more extreme views, offers a fusion perspective: through cross-border fertilization, cultures are transformed into new entities that retain their traditions yet borrow from other societies. Is one view more persuasive than the other? The response is not a categorical yes or no. After all, recent events, concerns, and scenarios—ranging from the New World Information Order to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 to the existence of vibrant immigrant communities—speak to the reality of all perspectives. Moreover, systematic investigations of such media effects, which tend to be somewhat reductionist in nature, make it virtually impossible to draw sweeping conclusions.

Norris and Inglehart are careful not to side too much with any single perspective. Indeed, their plethora of examples speaks to their familiarity with these various camps. And at the core of this book is their firewall theory, which