immediate goals of seeking to redress such egregious political and developmental imbalances to understand that suicide bombers undertake a ‘knowing sacrifice’ intimately connected to their religious beliefs and aspirations.

The final chapter is concerned with articulating the overall argument of the book with clarity and verve: Islamic radicals may resort to violence and suicide bombings because power to change the world in the ways they would like is not available from any other means. This is not to suggest that such violence will necessarily ‘change the world’ in desired directions but to highlight that violence is the result of frustration at the iniquities of the world.

After reading this book, I was impressed by the author’s depth and breadth of knowledge of a topic that is notoriously complex. Studded with interviews with leading figures from Islamist groups, including Hamas, Hizbullah and Islamic Jihad, Milton-Edwards draws out the whys and wherefores of Islamic violence and its devastating effects not just on the West but on Muslim communities, which are already beset in many cases by conflict and the politics of state-directed tyranny.

JEFFREY HAYNES
London Metropolitan University


The causes of interstate intervention have long been a matter of inquiry. The scholarly literature has flourished with examples of multilateral and unilateral intervention, ranging from the general to the particular (see *The Journal of Conflict Resolution, The Journal of Conflict Management and Peace Science*, etc.). Apart from the international context itself, much, inevitably, depends on the nature of the state in question – on its ethnic/national composition, the strength and capacities of its domestic institutions, its economy, its geo-strategic position and its conceptions of itself. Ethnically motivated intervention into intrastate ethnic conflict has arguably not received due attention, as Carment, James and Taydas point out in their new study. *Who Intervenes*? seeks to offer a palpable new theory of the relationship between ethnic and interstate conflict. The key question is why do some ethnic conflicts lead to interstate war while others do not?

The answer, according to *Who Intervenes*?, is that the likelihood and character of interstate intervention depend upon the interplay of two factors limiting the strategies of decision-makers of any potentially intervening state: ethnic composition and institutional constraint of the intervening states. The former refers to the ethnic arrangements within their and the target state, such as number, size, and relationship of groups, and, the latter to the decision-makers’ preferences for non-violent outcomes, which depend on the institutionalised political order in their own state and any resulting institutional constraints they may be under. The interaction effects of these two factors are assessed in the light of two enabling conditions: transnational ethnic affinities and intrastate ethnic cleavage. On the bases of the two factors and the two enabling conditions the framework identifies four types of states that are likely to use force. The typology ranges from an ethnically dominant state with low institutional...
constraints to an ethnically diverse state with high institutional constraints, the former being the most likely intervener.

Over five chapters, which comprise the main part of the book, the framework is tested against five case studies of interstate conflict – the Indo-Sri Lankan crisis, Somali irredentism, Thai Malay separatism, the break-up of Yugoslavia and its immediate aftermath, and the Cyprus question. These are examined in broad strokes and are used to evidence the typology proposed by the framework. The study’s conclusion and policy advice is that policies which encourage institutional reform and support ethnic diversity can be expected to reduce the likelihood and even the perceived need for intervention.

The challenge of understanding individual cases of intervention and, what are more often than not, fairly complex motives for state action is, however, somewhat overwhelming for what is inherently a limited framework. The study is aimed at developing a theoretical framework of analysis for interstate ethnic crisis for any ethnic conflict that includes a potential intervener. Yet, although it goes some way to dealing with ‘ethnic’ elements like ‘ethnic leaders’, it does not give due attention to the other, arguably more general but none the less significant factors, such as geopolitical, strategic and cultural considerations.

Thus the break-up of Yugoslavia is explained, on the one hand, through the role of an ethnic leader, while, on the other, the complex role of ethnicity, in terms of its interplay with international and domestic shocks, is not dealt with (S. Woodward (1995) Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution after the Cold War, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution). In a similar vain, the point of Cyprus’s relative size, location and lack of sufficient military deterrent, for example, while not the subject of this study, must go some way towards explaining Turkey’s intervention in 1974 and are thus dearly missed; as is discussion of Turkey’s or Greece’s political culture, in particular Turkey’s powerful military elite.

Within the limits set by the caveats implied above, the study does contribute to our understanding by identifying and typifying the interplay of two factors in interstate ethnic conflict. The authors build on the work of Robert Putnam on two-level games, but their new theory, which considers domestic institutional constraints, affect and ethnic interests, seems to neglect important elements of the domestic and the wider international game which do not only coexist but interact with the ethnic ones. While these issues are mentioned in the case studies, albeit briefly, they are not incorporated into the framework. Thus, regrettably, one is left with an impression that the rigor of the case-studies was sacrificed for the framework. The study certainly gives intellectual food for thought yet, as to the validity of the proposed theory, this reviewer is left unconvinced.

MLADEN TOSIC
University of Cambridge


Deriving from a workshop at the University of Texas, Austin, in 2003, this volume offers many insights into the changed political significance of ethnicity since the