

is 'the logical culmination of the political history of the West' (p. 182). In other words, NATO countries are united by shared cultural traits — a common liberal creed — and they are united against the rest. This notion, however, is not just far removed from realist thinking, it would lead to unwelcome consequences.

MATTHIAS DEMBINSKI

*Peace Research Institute Frankfurt, Germany*

- Olav Schram Stokke and Geir Hønneland (eds) *International Cooperation and Arctic Governance: Regime Effectiveness and Northern Region Building*. London and New York: Routledge, 2007. 196 pp. ISBN 0-415-39934-3.

Academic and practical political interest in the Arctic has been growing in the past two decades. New forms of cooperation, programmes, research projects and political institutions have been formed to map, evaluate and address the environmental, social and political conditions and changes that the Arctic is facing. While, in the field of political studies, the formation and development of new Arctic institutions have been studied successfully, the aftermath and questions about the role and possible influences of these institutions have not yet been the focus of research.

*International Cooperation and Arctic Governance: Regime Effectiveness and Northern Region Building*, edited by Olav Schram Stokke and Geir Hønneland, aims to fill the gap in this knowledge. The purpose of the writers is to study and analyse, from different perspectives, the impacts that Arctic institutions might have had. The three Arctic institutions selected for the impact assessment are the Arctic Council, the Barents Euro-Arctic Council (BEAC) and the Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS). Despite their differences as political forums, it is stated (pp. 5-6) that these three institutions share certain common layers of action; international, subnational and transnational. In terms of the broadly understood impact analysis (p. 2), the authors are interested in three 'categories of impact flowing from those institutions' (p. 2), i.e. effectiveness, political mobilization and region building.

The variable perspectives and themes for the impact assessment — questions about indigenous issues, Arctic institutions, pollution, climate change, communicable disease and natural resources — are discussed in different articles. Systematic analysis of the three defined impact categories in every article makes the book delightfully coherent and pleasant to read as an edited book, although it could be questioned whether the impact categories chosen are all suitable for the different topics that the writers are discussing. Effectiveness as 'mitigation or removal of specific problems addressed by a regime' (p. 2) is a broad and complex question in itself, and within many articles it is said to be difficult, even impossible, to measure. To the questions of mobilization and region building, the writers are able to give more specific descriptions of the tendencies and specific answers. The 'whether or not' impact analysis

nevertheless does not make the book and its discussion unnecessary or vague, but more reflective and broad. For the topic in hand, excessive dogmatism or rigidity would have done more harm. As it is, the book inspiringly opens up new viewpoints and invites the reader into discussion.

Selection of the three different Arctic institutions as the focus of the study seems fruitful. The shared similarities of these institutions include distinctions such as can be seen, for example, in the article 'Indigenous Issues' by Elana Wilson and Indira Hønneland in the contexts of analysing the political mobilization of indigenous peoples in Arctic institutions. Although not all institutions are discussed in every article, the combination of Arctic Council, the BEAC and the CBSS is a good example of the varied political forums and contexts of the topics of the book.

As the book is successful in providing basic information about Arctic institutions and raises new themes and viewpoints for discussion, at the same time it is to some extent old-fashionably bound to the strict boundaries of 'different' topics. In the same way as the authors have given coherence and mutual discussion to their texts through the analysis of impact categories, it would have been interesting, perhaps even necessary, to have the themes in themselves overlap and intersect. The questions discussed and studied in and about the Arctic are, in terms of impacts, inevitably interconnected and influenced by each other. In this way, for example, the indigenous issues could have overlapped more strongly with the themes of climate change, natural resources and pollution and conservation.

As a feminist researcher reading the book from the standpoint of gender studies, I was disheartened to notice that gender does not seem to be an issue in the context of the Arctic. For example, the topics of indigenous issues and communicable disease control do not address questions of gender, although the phenomenon and practices discussed are gendered.

Despite the lack of some thematic considerations, the book still redeems its promise to provide essential reading for students with an interest in Arctic affairs. It is a useful reading entity that eminently encapsulates basic information about Arctic institutions with various essential topics in and about the Arctic, evaluating at the same time the impacts of different institutions in the Arctic.

HEIDI SINEVAARA-NISKANEN  
*University of Lapland, Finland*

## Erratum

Berenskoetter, F. (2007) 'Profiling Germany', 42(2): 229-234

DOI: 10.1177/0010836707083399

Page 230, sentence 2 of paragraph 2 should read: 'Meiers begins with a historical overview suggesting that ...'

Page 231, final sentence of paragraph 2 should read: 'As he points out ... if these are in conflict with domestic values, which suggests ...'

Page 231, sentence starting on line 7 of paragraph 3 should read: '... Dalgaard-Nielsen discusses ... out-of-area operations and *Bundewehr* reform, with a focus on the domestic debate.'

SAGE would like to apologise for these errors.