

# 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](mailto: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.

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

posits that cosmopolitan communications—reflected in “the channels that increasingly bind people living in diverse communities and nation-states together” (p. 8)—have individual-level effects that are moderated by several factors. Macro-level factors (or firewalls) include the level of media freedom that exists in a particular nation-state, the external barriers to trade integration, levels of poverty, and access to communication technologies. Coupled with individual-level firewalls, such as how much citizens learn from the media, these factors condition the extent to which cultural exports (primarily from the global North) can undermine cultural diversity.

Particularly impressive about *Cosmopolitan Communications* is the authors’ array of criterion variables. Recognizing how other scholars have conceptualized and operationalized media impact, Norris and Inglehart focus on several key consequences of such media content—the extent to which citizens hold nationalistic identities and trust outsiders; their attitudes regarding individual success as well as conservative economic attitudes; social and moral values related to sexuality, religion, gender, and family; and citizens’ level of civic engagement. Research on each of these criterion values can fill volumes, and Norris and Inglehart adroitly distill the work of key players to present an easily digestible account of the extant literature. Naturally, their focus is driven by their working with secondary data from the World Values Surveys. The authors link these data to indices constructed from a plethora of other sources, including the Freedom House, the World Bank, and the United Nations Development Programme.

As with any undertaking that involves extensive comparisons over space and time, *Cosmopolitan Communications* does not allow for detailed contrasts to be made—nor should readers expect them. The book’s argument simply is not designed with any particular country in mind, although the authors have included numerous rich examples that serve to illustrate a particular point. Readers, however, should anticipate skillful theoretical and analytical meshing of levels of analysis. Norris and Inglehart easily succeed on this front. Despite the spate of data on which their argument rests, the authors provide sufficient caveats to their research that allow future researchers to follow up in specific research areas. Norris and Inglehart are to be commended not only for integrating arguments from a number of disciplines, but also for returning to the very serious normative concerns and practical implications related to cultural diversity around the globe.

PATRICIA MOY  
*University of Washington*

**The Dynamics of Two-Party Politics: Party Structures and the Management of Competition** by Alan Ware. *New York, Oxford University Press, 2009. 176 pp. \$60.00.*

Alan Ware turns the focus on two often-overlooked factors in prevailing models of party systems: the agency of the party leaders and the structure