

disagreement are strongly exaggerated. G.A. Raymond had the following to say about the volume's coherence in his APSR-review, „By focusing on common questions, the volume avoids the problem of disjointed contributions that plagues many edited books. What is more, it offers the reader fascinating insights into how observers from other cultures perceive the structure and functioning of the current international system.“

5. Patomäki thinks it is a book of „short“ chapters. The average chapter length in the book is 9,800 words. We are delighted that we have succeeded in reaching such a level of readability that chapters of that length can be considered short. Patomäki also complains that the language of the book is „common-sensical“. That is very true; we happen to consider that a virtue.

Our book has obviously been unable to meet Patomäki's criteria for excellence. What are they? Patomäki is surprisingly clear about the standards that an excellent book must meet in his opinion: it must be (a) inaccessible, filled with non-common sensical language; (b) highly focused on „underlying theoretical assumptions“; (c) disliked and not enjoyed by managing editors; and (d) published by a state-run or -subsidised publishing house. These are surely innovative demands.

Hans-Henrik Holm, Georg Sørensen
Ref.

Raymond, Gregory A. (1995), „Whose World Order? Uneven Globalization and the End of the Cold War“, *American Political Science Review*, 89:4, December, pp. 1074-1075.

Heikki Patomäki har givet nedenstående svar på Hans-Henrik Holm og Georg Sørensens kommentar.

In my book review, I said that „there are many nice chapters as well as at least some illuminating insights to our changing globe“. I added that „for many pragmatic and teaching purposes this book may be just right and there are [also] interesting non-Eurocentric insights into the processes of globalization and the end of the Cold War“. I also devoted a considerable number of words to explaining and assessing the editors' attempt to take some steps towards developing a theory of their own. The editors themselves discussed this „theory“ only in three pages (pp.202-204) at the very end of the book. But since I considered it to be somewhat original and noteworthy and aiming at

some generalisations, I thought it would be worthwhile going into some detail.

I also did not question the authority of the contributors in their own fields as such. On the contrary, I highly value some of the works by these authors that I happen to be familiar with. Upon closer examination, I also have to admit that authors such as Inoguchi, Sunkel and Zürn base their chapters extensively on their own former research and often also on relevant documents and other sources. But in this respect, the book is very uneven. For instance, the documentation in chapters 2, 5 and 6 is very poor. Sometimes the usage of references is also mis-

leading. For instance, on p.3 the editors tell us that Hedley Bull thought that the Cold War world is bipolar, even though Bull himself talks about a „complex or multiple balance among three or four powers“ (see pp. 112 ff. in his *Anarchical Society*). But anyway, I did not intend to imply that there is no scholarly work in this volume.

Nonetheless, I stick to my judgment that this book is *mostly* a collection of interpretative but non-reflective and non-explanatory descriptions of the post-Cold War situations in the different parts of the world, with an emphasis on the theme of globalization. Of course, it is impossible to say a lot about Russia, South Asia, Africa, Latin America or whatever in 12-25 pages. However, with few exceptions, the authors do not reflectively compare different possible interpretations or pose explicit causal hypotheses. There is also

very little discussion about underlying conceptual issues. And although I agree with many of their opinions, very often the authors simply state their opinions - for instance about Bush's „New World Order“ or Fukuyama - as self-evident truths apparently with no need for in-depth discussions. And because none of the authors have done any systematic empirical research *for this book*, the often illuminating and interesting new details and insights that empirical research can sometimes give are also missing.

As said, the book is very good for many purposes, particularly for teaching students and edifying policy makers and journalists. By raising some important questions, it may well serve the interests of the research community as well. It only fell short of some of my criteria for good research, which include reflectivity, accuracy, depth and originality.