ROBERT NALBANDOV:
Foreign Interventions in Ethnic Conflicts

Farnham 2009

Ashgate Publishing, 206 p.

What makes some foreign interventions in ethnic conflicts more successful than others? This is the question Robert Nalbandov raises, analyzing the success and the failure of foreign interventions in intra-state ethnic conflicts, not using the traditional approach of determining whether the outcome was the establishment of durable peace in a target country, but rather on the basis of the real fulfillment of unique third party goals and objectives, thereby creating a new goal-oriented approach. Nalbandov argues that our history and development are conducted – and thus our contemporary world order is shaped – in the form of a constant struggle for existence, power and resources in inter- and intra-state conflicts. This pessimistic background on which Nalbandov's work draws places his research within a realistic tradition.

After providing a broad and detailed context of theories on third-party interventions – which is also a good overview of the recent research in the field of international security and conflict resolution – Nalbandov presents a technical and detailed quantitative analysis of foreign interventions in ethnic conflicts since World War II. In an attempt to define the causal factors that contribute to or impede the success of interventions, Nalbandov extends this rather theoretical background through four informative and interesting case studies before reaching his conclusion.

Nalbandov contends that the end of the Cold War and the simultaneous dissolution of a relatively stable and clearly situated world structure resulted, on the one hand, in a new era of democratization within the international system, but also encouraged the proliferation of severe ethnic clashes both within and between state territories. Although such conflicts existed before and during the Cold War, Nalbandov argues that these divisions remained relatively clearly arranged and tightly controlled within the context of the two ideological superpowers. Globalization and the emerging multi-polar international system meant that wars between states became more and more costly and less likely to reveal a clear winner – as we can see in Iraq and Afghanistan. As a result, intra-state conflicts have emerged as the more dominant form of conflict, or at least have gained greater international attention.

According to Nalbandov, »Ethnicity and nationalism became (again) key distinguishing features of groups representing country populations« in a more globalized world without a stable order. While this may be true, it is not necessarily a new or recent development. Ethnicity and nationalism have been key driving forces in conflicts during the past century, and were also a dominant influence in several hegemonic or ideological conflicts. Nowadays, such ethnic conflicts, espe-

cially in Africa and the Caucasus, are reemerging in the context of the new multipolar global paradigm to reveal the fragile heritage of those nations' colonial past. Nalbandov's in-depth studies of the interventions in Chad, Georgia, Somalia and Rwanda are cited as examples of this phenomenon. He uses these cases to show how the ethnic security dilemma and the problem of credible commitment illustrate his theories on international security.

Nalbandov explains that intra-state conflicts have severe consequences, not just for the individual nations involved, but often also for the whole geographic region, due to the extremes of instability and violence involved in such conflicts. As a result, uninvolved third-party states are often compelled to intervene (unilaterally or multilaterally) due to specific interests or concerns not directly associated with the intra-state conflict itself. These choices can be either rational and based on positive cost-and-benefit calculation, or simply based on moral commitments. In either case, »Third party interventions can mitigate or aggravate intrastate security due to support of either belligerent or due to neutrality, bound to a common good of a larger regional and or international community of states.«

Nalbandov maintains that the reasons for foreign interventions are broad and complex, ranging from idealistic considerations (such as seeking stabilization, prevention of genocide and providing aid) to Realpolitik. This often means that intervening states support a preferred group or secure a certain sphere of influence rather than pursue a more even-handed approach. So far, this is not necessarily new, but Nalbandov explains that the analysis of the specific motives and interests that a third-party pursues is most important for establishing the measure of success for a given intervention.

Nalbandov criticizes approaches that base the success or failure of interventions on the duration of post-conflict peace (Doyle and Sambanis use two years, Regan at least six months). He says that the real intentions of actors and interveners are not taken into account by these peace-centric theories. According to Nalbandov, the motives of the actors involved in interventions are so diverse that success cannot truly be measured. Nalbandov criticizes the assumption that all interventions are peace-driven and peace-making is the aim of the parties involved. Thus, his goal-oriented approach to measuring success has several advantages, even though the question is often hard to answer: first, what interests and objectives is the third party pursuing and second, is it possible to transform these variables into a theory? The question of what makes some interventions more successful than others is therefore a highly technical one, which Nalbandov tries to operationalize.

Nalbandov's volume certainly represents a new and fresh approach to determining the success of interventions within the field of conflict resolution and international security. His extensive dataset of interventions and his detailed analysis of the conflict cases he lists are not necessarily comprehensive (and not meant as such), but they do add new input beyond the traditional peace-centered

domain of conflict resolution. Nalbandov provides a solid theoretical foundation for his analysis of foreign interventions in ethnic conflicts. He also provides a rough framework for measuring whether such unilateral and multilateral interventions have been successful or not. However, while Nalbandov's methods certainly provide an important and interesting alternative viewpoint, it seems doubtful that his conclusions are solid enough to serve as a guide to predicting the outcomes of such complex circumstances.

Alexander Boettcher,
Jena

MARC STEARS:
Demanding Democracy. American Radicals in Search of a New Politics

Princeton/NJ 2010

Princeton University Press, 256 S.

Marc Stears' spannendes, kluges und engagiertes Buch »Demanding Democracy« beschäftigt sich mit einem zentralen Problem jeder progressiv-emanzipatorischen Politik: der Umsetzung demokratischer Ideale in einer nicht-idealen Welt. Dabei geht es um das immer wieder neu auszutarierende Verhältnis von Gesellschaftsanalyse und politischen Zielvorstellungen sowie den Mitteln ihrer Durchsetzung. Radikale Demokraten sahen sich immer wieder mit einem Bündel von Fragen konfrontiert, deren Beantwortung nach wie vor eine wesentliche Herausforderung darstellt: Wie soll die ideale Demokratie aussehen? Wo und wie weicht die Gegenwart von diesem Ideal ab? Wie muss man agieren, um dem Ideal näher zu kommen? Stears identifiziert mit Blick auf die US-amerikanische Geschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts eine »radical tradition«, die sich aus dem »Progressive Movement« der Jahrhundertwende, den gewerkschaftlichen Kämpfen um industrielle Demokratie in der Zwischenkriegszeit, dem neuen Liberalismus der fünfziger, der Bürgerrechtsbewegung der sechziger sowie der Neuen Linken der siebziger Jahre zusammensetzt.

Das »Progressive Movement«, dem sich Marc Stears bereits früher in einer lesenswerten Studie (Progressives, Pluralists, and the Problems of the State. Ideologies of Reform in the United States and Britain, 1906–1926, Oxford University Press 2006) gewidmet hat, setzte mit einer Kritik der kaum zu durchdringenden oligarchischen Parteimaschinerie, der wenig transparenten lokalen Exekutivkörperschaften und der schwachen Rolle der Zentralregierung ein. Diese seien, so argumentierten wichtige Vertreter wie Herbert Croly, Walter Lippman oder Walter Weyl, für eine andere Zeit gemacht worden und gegenwärtigen Realitäten nicht mehr angemessen. Es bedürfe daher einer grundlegenden Reform – einer Demokratie für die urbanisierte und industrialisierte Gesellschaft des 20. Jahr-