Colombo Plan, Military Organizations (SEATO and The Five Power Defence Arrangement), Asian-African Organizations (Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee, and the Afro-Asian Rural Reconstruction Organization), Asian Productivity Organization, Asian-Oceanic Postal Union, Asian Parliamentarians Union, Asian and Pacific Council, Asian Development Bank and Related Organizations, Association of Southeast Asian Nations, Organizations of The Ministerial Conference for the Economic Development of Southeast Asia, Educational Organizations, and Commodity Producers Organizations (Asian Coconut Community, etc.). The documents in each chapter are preceded by a brief note on the origin, organization and evolution of organizations covered. The value of the compendium is enhanced by the inclusion of a selected bibliography in each chapter.

We may not agree with the editor's optimism about removing misunderstandings about these organizations or view these as "potential building blocks toward a united Asia," but there is no doubt that the compendium under review is the first comprehensive reference work on Asian regional organizations, and, perhaps, will remain so for a long time. Students of Asian affairs, journalists, and diplomats will find these volumes a source of handy reference material as well as of brief introduction on nearly all non-UN agencies. The usefulness of this set could have been enhanced if the editor had offered a bit more annotation on the context and diplomatic background of some of the Declarations and communiques of organizations such as SEATO, ASEAN, and ASPAC. But perhaps this is expecting too much from a work of this kind.

L. P. SINGH

Concordia University, Montreal

International Systems: A Behavioral Approach. Edited by Michael Haas. (New York: Chandler, 1974. Pp. xii, 433. \$14.00.)

After Singer's Quantitative International Politics (New York: Free Press, 1968) and Russett's Peace, War, and Numbers (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1972) this book is the third to deal explicitly and extensively with the behavioral and scientific approach to the study of international politics. Yet its aim is different from that of its predecessors. While Singer and Russett presented an overview of the results of empirical research in international relations, Michael Haas's intention is rather to provide a synthesis of theoretical propositions based upon findings of three decades of behavioral research in the field. Continuing the explorations in the territory of quantitative international politics, Haas draws the first "map" of the new discipline. In particular he wants to demonstrate that the use of scientific methods has indeed produced substantive knowledge about international relations; that the behavioral approach provides both a solid base for future research and some answers to policy relevant questions. Haas is hence less concerned than Singer and Russett with problems of measurement and data analysis. In fact, methodological issues are only slightly touched upon in Haas's introduction on scope and methods of international relations and practically absent from the other contributions. Rather, the emphasis is clearly placed on theoretical problems, and Haas's final chapter constitutes a plea for development of new theories of international politics.

Haas's intention to survey the kind of substantive propositions that quantitative international politics has already produced is, I think, certainly sound. Some might argue that such an effort is premature given the youthfulness of the discipline. An inventory of propositions, however, is useful both for the scholar wanting to build his research on past efforts and to the student interested in evaluating the achievements of behavioral perspectives in international politics. Haas's collection of articles is potentially a valuable reference and textbook.

Is Haas's ambitious program realized in this book? International Systems presents a whole array of interesting subject areas, some of which have only recently been brought to the attention of the behavioral researcher. This is particularly the case for the problems of foreign policy calculation (chapter 3 by Lloyd Jensen), international nonalignment (chapter 5 by Nazli Choucri), international statecraft (chapter 6 by Werner Levi), international law (chapter 10 by Irvin White), and international administration (chapter 11 by Haas). Jensen tries to assess how nations evaluate their moves at the international level and what determines these evaluations. He stresses the importance of power maximization and illustrates it by studying the motives behind ratifications or nonratifications of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. In chapter 5 Choucri selects several nonaligned countries to present the attitudinal and perceptual components of nonalignment, emphasizing the influence of the cold war. Her conclusions are based upon content analysis of speeches by these nations' leaders as well as on investigations of the countries' voting behavior in the

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. University of Basel Library, on 10 Jul 2017 at 15:03:11, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms.https://doi.org/10.1017/S000305540026927

United Nations and their trade patterns. In chapter 6 Levi examines the principal tools of statecraft in foreign policy which, in his eyes, are diplomacy, propaganda, and pressure. He points out relationships among these three and considers the increasing weight of propaganda and pressure. In chapter 10 White assesses the impact of the international legel system, especially the International Court of Justice. Haas, in chapter 11, deals with the questions of implementing policies and decisions of international organizations, pointing out bureaucratic problems arising from inefficiency, infighting, and poor relations with the recipients of the programs.

In addition to these newer areas of research, more traditional subjects appear: socialization in international relations both by individuals and countries (chapter 2 by Michael Haas), alliances with an emphasis on the theory of public goods (chapter 4 by John D. Sullivan), and communication and integration (chapters 7 by W. Philips and 8 by Haas). International decision making (chapter 9 by Louis Kriesberg), deterrence (chapter 12 by John Raser), and conflict resolution (chapter 13 by Haas) also represent classic research topics.

One important area is absent, namely conflict and war studies. These are only occasionally treated within the chapters on socialization, alliances, deterrence, and conflict resolution. Omission of an explicit contribution on conflict and war is all the more regrettable because this aspect of international relations has the longest research tradition as well as one of the richest theoretical contents. Indeed, conflict research, particularly arms race models, has provided international relations. Without mention of this important subfield, has Haas fully achieved his goal of presenting the substantive results of behavioral research in international politics?

Neglect of war and conflict analysis is symptomatic of a general weakness of the book. A basic characteristic of wars and conflicts is their longitudinal aspect. Very well emphasized by some of the contributions in Russett's *Peace, War, and Numbers,* the dynamic dimension is often lacking in *International Systems.* Rather, the results of behavioral research are presented here as bivariate or multivariate propositions in the static if-then mode. But the relationships elucidated by these statements are rarely integrated into coherent dynamic schemes.

The conception that different behavior characterizes different moments in the evolution of a process is certainly present in Haas's article on

socialization and in the contributions by Jensen, Choucri, and Sullivan - and these four are perhaps the best chapters in the book. But somehow the connections between these developmental stages is missing and no conceptualization of the dynamics of international behavior appears. For instance, the momentum gathered by an agreement like the nonproliferation treaty is in itself an important element of foreign policy calculations: some states will join only when many other states have already ratified. Had Hensen considered these kinds of feedback mechanisms, his article would have gained in structure and clarity. Similarly, in Choucri's contribution on nonalignment, one would have liked to see evaluatons of the effect of the disappearance of cold war issues on the international system. Didn't the recent energy crisis show that the nonaligned bloc gained some momentum? Raser's article on deterrence also lacks a dynamic perspective. Raser does not provide any clear representation of the mechanisms by which the nuclear balance of terror evolves over time. He does not discuss the problem of its stability in relation to technology. Also, linkages between deterrence theory and behavioral models of arms-races like Richardson's are missing.

These weaknesses lead to a relative absence of rigor in the elaboration of the theoretical constructions surrounding the propositions presented in International Systems. Its value as a textbook is therefore reduced because familiarity with the issues is necessary to understand and evaluate the various arguments and propositions. This lack of clarity is reflected paradoxically in the last chapter by Haas. In my eyes, a theory is a formally consistent body of propositions, rich in substantive content, and largely empirically verified. What Haas calls theories are to me no more than broad frameworks without specific substantive content or with one so general that it becomes trivial. This is especially true for what he calls genetic, field, and equilibrium theory.

Despite these last harsh criticisms, I think that *International Systems* has some inherent virtues in presenting the scholar and the student with a broad overview of the knowledge accumulated by the behavioral approach. Its coverage of relatively new domains is particularly valuable. I have suggested some areas that could be improved upon, realizing full well that *la critique est aisée, l'art est difficile.*

URS LUTERBACHER

University of Geneva