

Governance in World Affairs by Oran R. Young. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1999. Xvi, 244pp., notes, index, acronyms and abbreviations. ISBN 0-8014-8623-8 (pb.) \$16.95 US. Reviewed by Monica Tennberg.

In *Governance in World Affairs* Oran Young aims to present a comprehensive account of the current theory of international regimes in international environmental politics. In that sense, it is a welcome addition to some other regime studies such as Hasenclever et al., *Theories of International Regimes* (1997) and Oran Young (ed.) *Global Governance: Drawing Insights from the Environmental Experience* (1997). This book returns to some of the themes that Young has written about earlier, such as the development of understanding of the ontological status of regimes, explaining the phenomenon of cooperation in international life without supranational authority, and understanding broader consequences of regimes in international society. Here, he generalizes the findings of many case studies ranging from Arctic experiences to global climate negotiations.

Young focuses on the problem of categorising regimes according to the different tasks they involve, analysing problem structures in international regimes and on the one of evaluating the effectiveness of regimes. *Governance in World Affairs* also highlights the Arctic experiences of cooperation, in particular of the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS), the Arctic Council and the Barents Euro-Arctic Cooperation. The arctic environmental protection regime has often been dismissed because it is not a regulatory or procedural cooperative arrangement. Nevertheless, that cooperation has spawned a set of programmatic activities that have proven significant in generative terms. This generative quality is seen in the increasing level of knowledge on the state of the Arctic environment and the emergence of the Arctic region as a political space in its own right. Another potential in Arctic cooperation is nesting; that is the initiation of collectively supported activities designed to stimulate learning about relevant problems as well as the collaborative projects to solve them for example in the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP) and Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) programmes of the AEPS.

Since the Arctic has been a region of increasing cooperation, which is seen in the development of forms of cooperation engaging many actors and interest groups, the Arctic cooperation is presented as an example of "clustered regimes." According to Young, "institutional clustering occurs when those engaged in the formation or operation of governance systems for specific issues find it attractive to knit several of these arrangements together into institutional packages, even when there is no compelling functional need to nest the individual components into a common and more generic framework." In the Arctic Council, clustering is based on the reason for achieving economies of scale. It seems successful, according to Young, since it makes

the creation of new images or visions possible instead of narrow functional approaches to a certain limited set of environmental questions. In the case of cooperation in the Barents region, a significant effect of clustering has been the propagation of the image of a politically appealing grouping of actors and issues where none had previously existed.

In the sense that the book is presented as a comprehensive account of regime studies, some aspects of regimes are not fully discussed. The first question is who are the actors in regimes. The author asks whether we are witnessing the emergence of a global civil society alongside international society? Are there an increasing number of actors other than states actively participating in international cooperation, including interest groups, professional associations, and corporations? He defines two types of regimes: international regimes and transnational regimes. The former are cooperative arrangements between states and the latter are those that include many participants. However, Young recognises that such categories are useful only for analytical purposes—real world regimes “a mix of international regimes in which non-state actors play significant roles and transnational regimes in which states have important roles to play.” The core of the issue here is the changing character of international life—the status of states as sovereign actors is changing. This is seen in the rise of the role of other actors. In the case of the Arctic, the development of the relationship between states and indigenous peoples’ organisations is interesting. The writer recognises that the resistance of some governments to the idea of the Canadian initiated Arctic Council with a multilevel representation hindered the establishment of the Council for a couple of years.

Instead of classifying regimes, one should ask, how is collaboration in a regime constructed? The writer has, in an earlier book on regime theory, noted that “regimes are human artifacts” meaning that sometimes to understand a particular regime and its development it is more important to know which representatives of delegations sit at the same tables during the coffee break in the negotiations than to know all the fine theories and categorisations of regime properties that we have. This point seems to be less important to Young when writing this book. The writer says very little about the dynamics of everyday activities of regime creation and maintenance: the dynamics of regime formation are covered in only two pages of the book. In that sense, *Polar Politics: Creating International Environmental Regimes* (1993) edited by Oran Young and Gail Osherenko is more enlightening in that it focusses on the different factors in the creation of a regime: power, knowledge and interest, as well as such ubiquitous ones as leadership and context. The dynamics of creating a problem structure for a particular regime formed by different actors and types of interaction within an emerging regime cannot be separated, I don’t think, from an analysis of the effectiveness of the regime itself.