

SELECTED REVIEW EXCERPTS OF T.V. PAUL'S BOOKS

1. *The Tradition of Non-use of Nuclear Weapons* Stanford University Press, 2009

1. "These two books [another book is also reviewed] are dedicated to the proposition that things that do not happen can be as important as things that do... Paul considers why those that chose to acquire them [nuclear weapons] have not used them... It is useful to be reminded of the instances in which the weapons might have been used, especially during the early years of the Cold War, before the tradition of non-use was established. There might be questions about some of Paul's interpretations, but his basic analysis is carefully phrased and well judged."

Lawrence Freedman, *Foreign Affairs*, September/October 2009: 151-52.

2. "Paul has produced an excellent book. The central argument that a tradition of non-use has restrained the use of nuclear weapons is well-developed and largely convincing. Although the extent of this influence is, of course, debatable, Paul succeeds in exploring the historical influence and broader implications of the tradition. This book therefore makes an important contribution to the growing body of literature considering the non-use of nuclear weapons."

David James Gill, *International Affairs*, 85, 4 (2009), 863-69.

3. "The most important fact about the Bomb, at least in my view, is that it hasn't been used on a battlefield since 1945. For this, among other things, we owe Ike a large debt of gratitude. T.V. Paul has written an outstanding book that covers this ground and much more: *The Tradition of Non-Use of Nuclear Weapons*. I would highly recommend this book."

Michael Krepon, *ArmscontrolWonk.com*, June 6, 2009.

4. T.V. Paul has provided a solid, useful explanation of the major sources of that tradition and of the threats to its continuation. Both academics and policy makers would do well to pay attention to his work."

Linton F. Brooks, *Nonproliferation Review*, 16(3), November 2009: 521-25.

5. Paul's 'riveting' and 'masterly' book traverses the world of theory and policy with equal ease and is illustrative of how innovative theorizing can shed new light on real world issues in greater depth, offer a richer analysis of even much debated issues. This book deserves to be taken seriously by both policy makers and academics as it is one of the most original and significant contributions to our understanding of nuclear weapons to have come out in recent times."

Harsh V. Pant, *RUSI Journal*, January 2010.

6. "A good book is clearly written, methodically laid out, carefully researched, appropriately nuanced, and has interesting and important things to say. On these

dimensions, T.V. Paul has written a very good book indeed... *The Tradition of Non-Use of Nuclear Weapons* clearly has a great deal to offer to a variety of audiences. It speaks to an obviously important issue; it nicely balances theory and history; and it corrects a number of important misconceptions. Moreover, it accomplishes all this remarkably efficiently- in just over 200 pages of text.”

David Welch, *H-Diplo Book Review Forum*, December 2009.

7. The strength of this book is two-fold: it develops a two-step political-historical argument to account for non-use, and examines non-use in a wide range of cases, many of them non-Western...It is accessible to policymakers due to its length and style and can only have the effect of reinforcing the tradition on non-use to the extent that those in power come away impressed by its logic and lessons and behave more responsibly in a crisis.”

Richard Ned Lebow, *H-Diplo Book Review Forum*, December 2009.

8. This book is an excellent resource for students, scholars, and the policy community. It is well written and accessible, and appropriate for course use for advanced undergraduates and graduate students. Scholars studying deterrence, the military role of nuclear weapons, and proliferation would all find the author’s analysis of use. Finally, policymakers concerned with defense policy and nuclear proliferation would be well advised to take heed of the interaction between the tradition of non-use, nuclear deterrence, and proliferation incentives.

Daniel R. Lake, *International Studies Review* (2009) 11, 781–783.

9. T. V. Paul’s book joins the same political science debate, focusing instead on the “tradition” of non-use of nuclear weapons, which sometimes is described by other analysts as a taboo or a norm. Paul presents a valuable survey of the history of why such weapons have not been used since Nagasaki, arguing that the constructivist political scientists may be exaggerating the role simply of ideas, with the practical considerations of national interest playing a major part in keeping these weapons from being used. One could indeed find a logical parallel in terms of national interests between the continuing mutual-deterrence pattern of “no first use,” in which one side’s weapons are held in check as long as the other side does similarly, and a pattern of no first proliferation, where inherent capabilities to produce nuclear weapons are not employed, as long as the other side does not acquire such weapons.... The author presents an interesting analysis of conflicts where one side had nuclear weapons and the other did not, for example, in the Falklands War between Britain and Argentina. Political scientists may welcome Paul’s book as example of how one can apply alternative theories to concrete policy issues, but someone else will find this book all the more valuable, for the meticulous and nuanced coverage of the nuclear issue, presented in clearly written form.

George Quester, *Parameter: US Army War College Review*: Autumn 2009: 105-109.

10. “Paul has written an interesting and useful book. He highlights the continuing and perhaps increasing dangers of nuclear use and the importance of maintaining the tradition of non-use. This is a debate that has been neglected and Paul puts it firmly back on the agenda both for students of strategic studies and practitioners involved in maintaining international security in a dangerous world.”

John Baylis, *The International History Review* 41, December 2009: 936-37.

11. [In this book] Paul uses his sources intelligently. He cites an impressive array of references to prove his case. In cases where policymakers actually considered the option of using nuclear weapons, Paul traces the points of contention and explains why they decided not to use nuclear weapons after all. He also charts the arguments that were put forward when the decision was taken, thus strengthening his main contention.”

David Tal, *International Journal*, Winter 2009-10: 265-67.

12. “Paul builds on the impressive progress by scholars of deterrence, especially on the crucial concept of reputation. Unlike much of deterrent scholarship, which stresses reputation for credibility, Paul is more concerned with reputation in the form of esteem. Non-use, he argues, is a social norm based on calculation of interest. Like Joseph Nye’s work on soft power, Paul sees states restrained by their need for acceptance or support. Time and again, his scholarship reveals decision-makers pre-occupied not by the anguish of violating a moral taboo, but by fear of antagonizing various audiences, above all other states.”

Aaron Karp, *Contemporary Security Policy*, 31(1) April 2010, 196-202.

13. “Paul’s framework is a timely and important contribution to the nuclear debate that incorporates valuable perspectives from both the rationalist and ideational perspectives. As the issues of arms control, force structure, and disarmament inevitably become mired in political trench warfare, creative and eclectic thinking on nuclear issues will be at a premium. *The Tradition of Non-use of Nuclear Weapons* stands to provide an example of the rigorous scrutiny to which classic paradigms must be subjected in the search for real-world policy solutions.”

Jason Wood, *Joint Forces Quarterly* 58(3), 2010, 112.

From the Back cover of the book:

"The most astonishing event of the twentieth century did not occur: no nuclear weapons used in warfare since the two on Japan in August, 1945. Here is the first thorough history of the evolution of that powerful, completely unpredicted, tradition, with analysis of how to maintain and strengthen it."

—**Thomas Schelling**, Nobel Laureate in Economics and Distinguished University Professor, School of Public Policy, University of Maryland

"This is one of the best books on nuclear policy since George and Smoke's classic, *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy*. It is a major and original contribution to our theoretical understanding and our empirical knowledge of nuclear weapons."

—**John A. Vasquez**, Thomas B. Mackie Scholar in International Relations, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

"An impressive and nuanced assessment, at once wide-ranging and focused."

—**John Mueller**, Professor of political science at Ohio State University and author of the forthcoming *Atomic Obsession*

“T.V. Paul’s fine Study traces the events and debates that have established a powerful tradition of non-use. It sheds light on where we may be going and where we should go.”

--**Robert Jervis**, Adlai E. Stevenson Professor of International Affairs, Columbia University.

“The message of this exhaustively researched book- that the tradition of nuclear non-use needs to be strengthened- should be brought to the attention of policymakers worldwide.”

--**Jeffrey W. Knopf**, Naval Postgraduate School

“T.V. Paul fills a huge gap in the literature on nuclear weapons-why the tradition of nonuse has been so potent and persistent. We can take little comfort, however, in his finding that this tradition could be undone by efforts by nuclear states to develop ‘usable’ low-yield weapons and to deter less than existential threats involving chemical and biological attacks.”

--**William Potter**, Monterey Institute of International Studies.

2. Asymmetric Conflicts: War Initiation by Weaker Powers
Cambridge University Press, 1994

"In highly structured, richly detailed case studies, the author convincingly shows that rational considerations can underlie behavior that does not follow from the logic of deterrence theory. In particular, the historical analysis suggests that weaker challengers, who are expected to be deterred by clear evidence of preponderant power, may think in terms other than victory and defeat; war initiation for partial political gains, even at the risk of limited military loss, is sometimes the only way to effect a change in an unbearable status quo. A major contribution of the study is its careful empirical reconstruction of the often complex and multi-dimensional decision calculus of weaker initiators, providing thereby a highly differentiated context for the evaluation of national security policies. Within this context, the author clarifies not only the behavior of the challenger but also the outlook of the status quo power, which usually fails to realize the limitations and long-term consequences of its deterrent posture. This latter observation is ripe with theoretical and policy implications that deserve the close attention of researchers in the field."

Ben D. Mor, *American Political Science Review*, March 1996:234-36.

"The case studies are well presented and the argument clearly put."

Foreign Affairs, July/August 1995:139.

"A good, methodologically competent piece of work on an interesting topic. It will be respectfully cited in the literature on war initiation and indeed will be required reading in that area."

Michael Nicholson, *International Affairs*, October 1994:763.

"An important contribution to the literature on the causes of war. Students of history and international politics should find the book accessible and provocative. Paul raises an important and timely issue that has received limited attention, and his contribution is certain to spark debate. The book serves as an excellent reminder that conflict processes are often complex and do not lend themselves to easy solutions."

Martin Malin, *Journal of International Affairs*, Winter 1995:653-58.

"Reading this important piece of work was genuinely enjoyable. Paul provides an arresting and original framework that in itself makes an original theoretical contribution to the study of war, deterrence, coercive diplomacy, strategy and alliances. Each individual case study stands by itself as an interesting exposition of the interaction between theory and empiricism. In short, this volume is a significant contribution to the already considerable 'Cambridge Studies in International Relations.'"

Neil Winn, *Millennium*, 23(3), 1995.

"Paul's book studies a familiar question in a fresh light... By bringing together a number of important hypotheses and carefully applying them to a specific set of cases, Paul's work advances our understanding of an issue vital to the study of foreign and security policy." (By

Susan Peterson, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 27(1), Summer 1996:116-17.

3. *Power versus Prudence: Why nations Forgo Nuclear Weapons*

McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000

"This book offers a valuable corrective for any of us who settle for pessimism about the spread of nuclear weapons, for it offers a well-researched and well-written account of why a great number of states have forgone the acquisition of such weapons, even when they have had the physical ability to produce them... The chapters in the book on individual countries will be extremely useful for anyone wanting an update on how these decisions have been made. It reflects the author's careful survey of the literature combined with his own interviews in the field.... This is a book that anyone interested in nuclear weapons questions or interested in international relations theory will want to read."

George Quester, *Political Science Quarterly*, Spring 2001:134-35..

"In *Power versus Prudence* T.V. Paul raises one of the more interesting and neglected questions in security studies, that of nuclear restraints... Paul presents a generally insightful review of the nuclear programs of the states he selected for the study... Each of these three books [review includes two other books) ... take up important questions, advance the existing debate, present clear expositions and adequate empirical background to make the theoretical issues vivid for advanced undergraduates, and offer much to debate -- and with which to disagree -- for scholars of nuclear politics and history."

Fred Chernoff, *American Political Science Review*, September 2001: 760-62.

"This engaging, informed, and thought-provoking volume is a must read for those interested in conflict analysis, security studies, nuclear proliferation issues, and foreign policy studies."

Choice, September 2001: 244.

"At the heart of [Paul's] prudential realism is the fundamental recognition of the security interdependence of states, whether allies or adversaries. Paul skillfully demonstrates that this recognition has underpinned all national choices to forgo nuclear weapons... One of the salutary findings of this impressive work is that the risk of proliferation are the greatest in areas of high conflicts and protracted conflicts."

RUSI Journal, August 2001: 96.

[Paul] highlights some promising areas of study that should be helpful to policymakers."

Orbis, Summer, 2001:466-74.

"A welcome addition to a small but growing literature on one of the most intriguing puzzles in international relations... The theoretical critique is strongly argued, the case narratives are well presented, and the conclusions offer interesting ideas about the nature of nuclear decision-making and the future of nuclear weapons. *Power versus Prudence* will no doubt stimulate established scholars to take up this important topic and encourage younger scholars to do primary research on long-ignored cases of nuclear restraint."

International Studies Review, Fall 2001:177-80.

"Given the central role of nuclear weapons in international security, how can their surprisingly slow spread be explained and how can one account for the fact that 182 countries have formally renounced such armaments by joining the NPT as non nuclear weapons states? T.V. Paul's fine

study goes far toward explaining this phenomenon which he aptly terms “nuclear forbearance.” His work accomplishes much more than this, however, because he embeds this analysis within the heated debate between realist and liberal international s theorists and offers a satisfying synthesis – “prudential realism” – which draws from both camps.”

Leonard S. Specter, *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, Fall 2002:725-27.

“This book would fit nicely in a graduate or undergraduate course on international relations theory.”

Political Studies, August 2002:646.

From the Back cover of the book:

“An able, nuanced, and richly informed analysis of a much under-considered puzzle: why, despite decades of predictions to the contrary, have so few countries chosen to acquire nuclear weapons?”

John Mueller, professor of political science at Ohio State University, and author of *Retreat from Doomsday: The Obsolescence of Major War, and Quiet Cataclysm: Reflections on the Recent Transformation of World Politics*.

"*Power versus Prudence* makes a valuable and timely contribution to the debates surrounding nuclear proliferation and arms control. The work is cogent, original, and theoretically sound. Paul succeeds brilliantly at proving his initial hypotheses."

Albert Legault, Institut Québécois des hautes études internationales, Université Laval.

"A significant contribution to the field. The author makes a convincing case. This is a refreshing approach to an issue that has been previously explored by scholars but not in this manner. Paul argues his point persuasively."

David Haglund, Centre for International Relations, Queen's University

4. *India in the World Order: Searching for Major Power Status*

Cambridge University Press, 2003

“This book can be highly recommended both to undergraduate students of south Asian politics and international relations and to postgraduate students needing a book to set the context for this debate, which is surely one of the most crucial to international security in the early twenty-first century.”

International Affairs, July 2003: 933-34.

“Much scholarship on Indian foreign policy has been historical, descriptive, hortatory or, polemical. Consequently, the book under review represents an important departure. Nayar and Paul, to their considerable credit, have written an explicitly theoretical study of India’s quest for great power status. .. The strength of the book lies in its explicit engagement with a well-established corpus of theoretical literature in international relations.”

Sumit Ganguly, *Survival*, Autumn 2003: 241.

“A Substantial and Authoritative Review.”

Journal of Strategic Studies, 27(1) March 2004:189.

“Adopting largely an international system level analysis, the two distinguished scholars teaching at McGill University, Montreal, have provided a cogent and an in-depth analysis of the role played by India and the attempts made by major powers, the U.S. in the beginning and China at a later period, to circumscribe India’s role. The book has not only contemporary relevance; it also dwells upon theories of power transition, balance of power, containment, deterrence and role of nuclear weapons in foreign policy.”

The Hindu, Book Review, July 29, 2003.

“In *India in the World Order*, B.R. Nayar and T.V. Paul go beyond historical and single case approaches by employing international relations theory, in particular realism. They address the issue of how middle powers, such as India attempt to gain entry into the great power system in the face of resistance from long-lasting great powers. The theoretical framework and comparison of India with other powers contribute to a stimulating study in international relations and comparative foreign policy.”

Stephen F. Burgess, *Contemporary Security Policy*, 24(2), April 2003:184-86.

An “important” study “documenting India’s great leap forward.”

M. Ehasan Ahrari, *Security Dialogue*, 35(2), 2004:207-15.

“This work will be especially interesting to those who want to explain Indian behavior on nuclear issues and on the non-proliferation regime and have found the traditional theoretical divides (neorealist, institutionalist, constructivist) unsatisfactory.”

Seema Gahlaut, *Perspectives on Politics*, December 2005:941-42.

5. *Absolute Weapon Revisited: Nuclear Arms and the Emerging International Order*

University of Michigan Press, 1998 & 2000

“Although there are dozens of recent books and think-tank studies of the multi-faceted nuclear weapons issue, the scope, depth, and quality of the papers in this volume are its marks of distinction. Strongly recommended for libraries and collections specializing in international security, war and peace studies, military and defense issues, and arms control.”

Choice, October 1998

“A major contribution to the ongoing debate on whether the acquisition of non-conventional weapons is more or less conducive to the outbreak of war.”

American Political Science Review, September 1999

“One of the most stimulating collection of writings on nuclear affairs published in recent times and can be recommended to students.”

International Affairs, July 1999

“A commendable contribution to the literature on the nuclear arms race, and is recommended for those interested in proliferation issues and international relations.”

Millennium, vol. 28(1), 1999

“The volume succeeds in offering a contemporary perspective on the issues raised by Brodie and his collaborators in 1946...” and “has worth a place in any library concerned with nuclear weapons and international security.”

Canadian Journal of Political Science, December 1999.

“The debates [in the book] is a valuable stimulus to thought about the vital issues relating to the future of nuclear weapons, the prospects for nuclear disarmament and for the proliferation of nuclear weapons.... Without doubt an essential read for all interested in how international politics are likely to develop in the twenty-first century.”

Journal of Strategic Studies, June 2000.

From the back cover of the book

“The Cold war, the Soviet Union, and bipolarity have all disappeared, but nuclear weapons have not. Indeed the stimulating essays in the *Absolute Weapon Revisited* make clear that they may loom larger than they did before. I doubt if we have the final answers for either scholarship or for policy, but by combining the basic ideas articulated by Bernard Brodie and his colleagues over 50 years ago with the subsequent history, these authors have greatly clarified the important questions.”

Robert Jervis, Columbia University.

“Bernard Brodie’s *Absolute Weapon*, published in 1946, was the first serious attempt to make sense of the nuclear age. Since then the Cold war has been and gone without the actual use of

nuclear weapons. This timely and serious volume returns to the main issues raised by Brodie in the light of this experience. The authors by no means all agree, but their debate illuminates the vital issues relating to the past and future role of nuclear deterrence and the prospects for disarmament and the continuing spread of these deadly weapons.”

Lawrence Freedman, Kings College, London.

6. International Order and the Future of World Politics

Cambridge University Press, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002 (twice), 2003

“The arguments are compelling and the overall effect is impressive.”

*John Owen, University of Virginia, **Choice**, 37(7), March 2000: 1368*

“This ambitious volume provides extensive, well organized sample of current thinking on international relations.”

Naval War College Review, Autumn 2000.

7. The Nation-State in Question

Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003

“This impressive volume brings together political scientists and sociologists to assess what effects globalization has had on the state. Simplistic early views of globalization held that increasing openness and interdependence, together with the benign post-cold war security environment, would rob states of their historical role and capacities while fueling the rise of supranational actors such as the European Union and sub-national actors such as nongovernmental organizations. The essays here are part of a later wave of more balanced scholarship that moderate such breathless, often hysterical conclusions. The contributors show that states are not likely to disappear or lose much significance anytime soon.”

Foreign Affairs, March April 2004, 157.

“The volume is required reading for students of the state and is recommended for its nuanced and perceptive examination of major aspects of the different functions and relationships of states in a period of development and change,”

George Sorensen, *Cooperation and Conflict*, 39(2) 2004, 215-17.

“A systematic engagement with the historical and conceptual development of nation-states is the major lacunae of the mainstream literature on globalization and the decline of the nation-state of the last ten or so years. In their different ways, the 14 essays included in the *Nation-State in Question* try to fill that gap, addressing the challenges nation-States currently face by keeping an eye on both the historical continuities and discontinuities of these challenges. Organized around a plurality of theoretical and methodological perspectives, the collection’s unifying theme is no doubt the importance of nation-states within a context of globalization. This, apart from the merit of its individual contributions, is a major reason to welcome the publication of this fine edited collection.”

Contemporary Sociology, 33(5), 2004:577-78.

“This is really an outstanding collection of essays from a diverse range of scholars, each of whom attempts to answer the vexing question of the role of the state in the contemporary era.... A rich assortment of tables and figures help to illustrate the various points made by the contributors.”

Critical Sociology, 30(1), April, 2004, 172-73.

“The Nation-State in Question is a collection that will be a boon to many courses across a wide range of academic disciplines, and that it will give any thoughtful observer of the contemporary global scene much to ponder.”

International Studies Review, 6 (2004), 483-85.

This volume offers a “complex and nuanced perspective” on the state of the nation-state. “I can only recommend the *Nation-State in Question* to anybody who is interested in the nature of the state, the ways it relates to society, the factors that are causing it to change, and the direction it may take in the future.”

Martin van Creveld, *Perspectives on Politics*, (APSA) March 2005: 206-7.

“This book belongs to a third wave of writing that seriously tries to understand and measure the changes that states are experiencing, without committing itself in advance to sensationalist conclusions. The chapters... are empirically grounded, historically informed and balanced in their conclusions. There is a wealth of material in this collection. It is well-edited, with the chapters making references to each other and an effective introduction and conclusion by the editors. The case studies always reach out to broader debates and issues. It can be recommended as stimulating set of readings for those interested in the debates on globalization and state transformation.”

Michael Keating, (European University Institute, Florence),
Canadian Journal of Political Science, 37(3), September 2004:757-58.

“The Nation-State in Question presents a collection of essays that forcefully critique the view that the nation-state can no longer exercise the kind of power it once did. The evidence suggests that the retreat has really been a restructuring.”

Alex Gourevitch, *Journal of International Affairs* 58(1), Fall 2004:255-60.

“The book brings together a very capable group of scholars from the fields of international relations and comparative politics....The principal contribution of the volume, which deserves a wide readership, lies in the combination of theoretical insight and in-depth analysis of policy areas.”

Malte Pehl, *Journal of Peace Research*, 42(5), 2005:647.

“*The Nation-State in Question* is an important addition to a growing literature critical of the view that unrelenting globalization has begun to limit state authority across a series of domains and might ultimately lead to the withering away to the state. The contributors to the book are unanimous in their view that the state has been the central organizational expression of modernity, and will continue be the dominant form of political organization for the foreseeable future.”

Richard Ned Lebow, *International History Review*, 27(2), June 2005:459-63.

“The *Nation State in Question* is an excellent book that I would recommend to all students of contemporary politics. In particular, I would like to see students of globalization read this collection. The volume is a tonic for those weary of the hyper-globalist thesis, which has become more mantra than empirical fact (with onerous political consequences). The state is not dead, national legislatures do wield power, and capital does not trump politics at every turn.”

Paul Hamilton, *International Journal*, 60(4) Autumn 2005: 1168-70.

From the back cover

"Well written and well organized, this book reflects sound scholarship. I applaud the initiative of the editors to assemble such an eclectic collection that will be highly useful for those wishing to cross disciplinary boundaries. Moreover, the essays tend to avoid the disciplinary jargon that often limits a readership to a narrow academic audience."

Bruce Cronin, University of Wisconsin, author of *Community Under Anarchy*

"Each of the chapters is soundly written and the volume as a whole brings together some outstanding, well recognized scholars to undertake an ambitious, wide-ranging enterprise."

Hendrik Spruyt, Arizona State University, author of *The Sovereign State and Its Competitors*

8. *Balance of Power: Theory and Practice in the 21st Century*

Stanford University Press, 2004

“Balance of power is among the more controversial and therefore enduring concepts in international relations. The editors and contributors to this collection, prolific academicians in the field of international relations and security studies, focus on an important question: what is the relevance of balance of power theory and policies in the post-Cold War Era? ... The introduction, setting out the questions to be addressed by the contributors, and the conclusion, summing up the essays, lend the volume unusual coherence. ... These well-documented essays are recommended to those interested in international relations study as well as regional security policies. *Summing up: Highly Recommended.*

Choice, Vol. 42(11), July 2005

“The book offers a wealth of analytical gems and fruitful avenues for future international relations scholarship. The pairing of the theoretical enterprise with the subsystem regional implications is innovative, and the concluding chapter to the volume does an admirable job of tying together some of the disparate themes. The book is a valuable addition to the literature and worth examining for advanced international relations courses.”

Patricia A. Weitsman, *Perspectives on Politics*, December 2005: 953-54.

“Many social scientists will find this volume a most welcome addition to the ongoing debates in the field of international relations, political science and social theory in general.”

Eric Mielants, *Contemporary Sociology*, 35(1), 2005:63-64.

“The balance of power is one of the oldest and most enduring concepts of international relations. It is surprising that since the end of the Cold War, the dynamics of power balancing have been all but absent: the great powers have not formed counterbalancing coalitions to guard against U.S. predominance and unlikely to anytime soon. This book which brings together leading international security experts to assess the current status of the balance of power theory, confirms the peculiarity of today’s international system.”

G. John Ikenberry, *Foreign Affairs* 84(1), 2005: 180.

“My initial impression of this book was that balance of power as we knew it is no longer relevant, but there are new versions developing. My more lasting opinion, however, is that it is about much more. Within a few days, I had recommended it to three colleagues, each working in different fields. The book seemed to relate to just about anything I was reading: realist theory, terrorism, political economy, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, democratic development. It had burrowed into my mind, and had me thinking about my research, my teaching, and current international politics. It is one of those books.

“Balance of power is dead: long live balance of power! Read this book. You will find yourself recommending it to colleagues as well.”

George A. MacLean, *International Journal*, Winter 2005/06.

"The edited volume by Paul, Wirtz, and Fortmann certainly does not resolve the many puzzles that Balance-of-Power theory is grappling with. But it points out some very important findings,

underlining how vibrant and stimulating the debate is among scholars who assume that Balance of Power will keep playing an important part in analyzing International Relations in the 21st century. Moreover, it makes clear that it is not a degenerating research program, but rather progressive and likely to make important contributions in the future. The message is clear: it is high time to refocus on Balance-of-Power theory.”

Politische Vierteljahresschrift April 2006 (Translated from German)

“This book is a good example of how to produce an edited volume. It has a clear topic around which it builds a set of research questions. The cumulative effect is a comprehensive analysis of the current position and relevance of balance of power in international relations. This volume is an insightful revision of balance of power politics and poses challenging questions for researchers in international relations... This volume is highly recommended for both scholars and students of international relations.”

Ismene Gizelis, *Journal of Peace Research* Vol. 44(2), March 2007:252.

From the Back Cover

“The realist theory of balance of power has always had to contend with its opposite, the economic theory of collective goods. Under the first, states would oppose an expansionist power, siding with the weaker side. Under the second, states would free-ride, waiting for someone else to oppose the aggressor. These essays are the very first to address this contradiction. The authors find that states rarely use hard balancing techniques, but content themselves with ‘soft balancing’ or even non-action. This is a new and provocative synthesis which alters, realist theory and is a must-read for students and practitioners alike.”

Richard Rosecrance, University of California, Los Angeles

“This collection of studies written by leading experts in the field offers a careful, thorough and very wide ranging assessment of balance of power theory in today’s international politics. The caliber of the research is outstanding.”

Patrick Morgan, University of California, Irvine

9. *The India-Pakistan Conflict: An Enduring Rivalry*

(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

“This excellent volume, which brings together International Relations theorists and specialists in Comparative Politics, aims to address the protracted conflict and lay bare its roots. The result is a fine example of a pioneering work that frames our understanding of the rivalry between India and Pakistan within the appropriate theoretical approaches to the study of embedded conflicts. At the same time, it manages to tease out the domestic configurations in both countries that have shaped this particular conflict.”

Farzana Shaikh, *International Affairs* (London), 82:3, 2006:609-10.

“*The India-Pakistan Conflict* offers excellent cases for graduate and specialist study of nuclear deterrence and international relations theory because the [contributors] debate their conceptual arguments clearly.”

Robert S. Anderson, *Pacific Affairs* 79(2), Summer 2006:291-97.

“This book manages to move beyond much of the existing literature precisely because it seeks to marry key conceptual and theoretical debates to the India-Pakistan case....The challenge of building confidence and a sustainable peace between India and Pakistan remains, but meanwhile T.V. Paul and his colleagues have made a useful contribution to analyzing some of the drivers that have underpinned their decades-long rivalry.

Alexander Evans, *RUSI Journal*, February 2007: 75-76.

“The book makes an excellent handbook on the nature and genesis of the India-Pakistan conflict by 11 eminent scholars.”

Brigadier A.R. Siddiqui, *The Dawn* (Karachi), March 18, 2007.

“This volume deliberately crosses disciplinary lines, bringing together the insights of a diverse set of comparativists and international relations specialists. The result is a rich compendium of discussions that conveys the multi-dimensional complexity of the Indo-Pakistani conflict....The book makes an important contribution in bringing together a range of scholars in both international relation and comparative politics, whose diverse viewpoints and expertise illuminate the spectrum of factors underlying conflict in South Asia.”

S. Paul Kapur, *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 18(12) 2006: 966-67.

“The Indian subcontinent remains a chronically under-studied area of the world in US academic circles. This inattention is curious, since both Pakistan and India are emerging as critical partners in US policy, both states possess nuclear weapons, and the entire region is an enormous generator if violent religious and ethno-nationalist non-state actors. *The India-Pakistan Conflict: An Enduring Rivalry* make[s] important contributions to current scholarship.... Overall, this volume is an extremely useful contribution to both theoretical literature and regional analysis.”

Timothy Hoyt, *India Review*, 6(2), April-June 2007: 116-31.

“Paul’s edited book is a contribution to the political complexity of the enduring rivalry between India and Pakistan. It is particularly useful to those individuals who seek peace and stability in

the subcontinent and adjacent regions. It deserves to be read, studied and pondered, and its proposals tried... His introduction is especially useful, providing a succinct history. The summary on power asymmetry gives fresh insight into the protracted nature of the conflict. Durable peace will require drastic changes in the complex political situation..."

Garth N. Jones, *Journal of Third World Studies*, Fall 2007.

"The volume offers the first cogent application of a range of international relations and comparative theories to the India-Pakistan case. It offers the bridge between theory and case studies that instructors look for in assigning readings. As the most disputatious dyad in the world, the India-Pakistan rivalry is also a real-world challenge that both international relations and comparative politics scholars will increasingly ponder.

Sunil Dasgupta, George Washington University, *Journal of Strategic Studies*,
March 2008, 330-33.