

Book Reviews

Sue Branford and Jan Rocha, *Cutting the Wire: The Story of the Landless Movement in Brazil*, Latin American Bureau (available through Kumarian Press), London, 2002, 305 pp., notes, index, £14.99

Published online: 18 October 2006

The Brazilian Landless Movement (MST) is widely regarded as one of the most organized and dynamic social movements in Brazil and Latin America today. From its modest roots in southern Brazil, the MST has expanded into a movement with a national presence. Today, the MST has approximately two million members farming on 5,000 land reform settlements; 500 production, commercialization, and service associations; 96 food processing plants; a national network of 1,800 nursery, primary, and secondary schools; and, via its strategy of occupying idle agricultural land, the MST has conquered over 7 million hectares of land. During the 1990s, the MST built rural–urban alliances and increasingly situated the struggle for land within the larger fight against neoliberalism.

What explains the rise, national consolidation, organizational capacity, and dynamism of the MST? Branford and Rocha's book, *Cutting the Wire*, offers insights into these issues and provides a captivating account of the MST's political praxis since its inception. The authors draw on scores of interviews with MST members, government officials, religious leaders, and academics to tell the story of the movement.

The book contains fourteen chapters, which are grouped into four parts. Part one details the historic roots of the MST in southern Brazil; its official founding in 1984; and, the gradual northward expansion and consolidation into a national movement. The authors, weaving together secondary material with oral testimonies, provide a rich description of the MST's victories, set backs, and difficulties. For example, the successful 1,000-day resistance at Encruzilhada Natalino encampment is explained as an epic victory in MST history for resisting the power of the state government, agrarian elites, and a military siege.

The chapters in part two analyze land occupations, agricultural production on land reform settlements, and the MST's focus on education. The land occupation is the "organizational matrix of the movement" (p. 66). Land occupations do not only result in the spatial conquest of territory, they also diffuse a counter-hegemonic

vision among members, many of whom come to see the struggle for land as an integral part of a larger “popular project” of social change. The authors vividly describe (pp. 68–88) a typical land occupation which entails the identification of an unproductive estate; the recruitment of landless families; logistics such as transport; and, finally, the very act of “cutting the wire,” after which the landless enter the vast estate, erect their black plastic tents, and force government to enter into negotiations to settle the families. Land reform settlements are established after formal transfer of land to landless families. This stage represents numerous difficulties for the settlers who encounter poor infrastructure and endless delays in receiving credit. The authors show that, instead of waiting patiently, the MST members occupy public buildings and block highways to force government to meet their demands. The educational arena is regarded as just as important as occupying land. The MST utilizes Paulo Freire’s pedagogy of consciousness raising in the literacy programs and schools that it runs for 150,000 children across Brazil. An 18-year-old militant explains the transformative potential of the MST’s philosophy of praxis: “With its schools, books and practice, the Movement teaches us to see the world” (p. 109).

In part three, the authors assess the challenges facing the MST: growing violence; the globalization of Brazilian agriculture; and, the neoliberal agenda and the backlash against the MST unleashed by the Cardoso administration. Violence and oppressive social relations have long been a feature of the Brazilian countryside. A full chapter is devoted to the Eldorado dos Carajas massacre of April 1996 when 19 MST members were killed and 69 wounded by military police while on a peaceful march protesting unmet government promises. The discussion of the globalization of agriculture raises the challenges that growing corporate control over agricultural production and distribution pose for the MST’s project of promoting sustainable family farming. During the mid-1990s, the MST experienced rapid growth, achieved numerous conquests, and increasingly challenged the government’s neoliberal agenda. The Cardoso government responded by utilizing the judiciary, intelligence agencies, and the media to vilify, criminalize, and repress the MST and its strategy of occupying idle farms.

Finally, the book evaluates how the MST meets these challenges by analyzing the gradual adoption of agro-ecological farming. In a chapter titled “From a ‘Culture of Resistance’ to a ‘Culture of Liberation,’” the authors describe the personal transformation of MST members after entering the movement. The book concludes by analyzing the MST in historical perspective and comparing it with early utopian peasant movements in Britain, America, and Brazil. This analysis would have been better placed in the introductory chapter.

Branford and Rocha are clearly sympathetic to the MST’s cause; however, this has not prevented them from critically evaluating the MST’s failed collective production experiments, openly discussing contentious internal debates, or outlining the views of MST critics. The authors make an important intervention in

analyzing the implications that the globalization of agriculture holds for the MST. Surprisingly, they ignore the challenge that the MST – via the global peasant movement, the Via Campesina – has mounted against WTO negotiations on agricultural liberalization or the important role it plays in the World Social Forum and the anti-corporate globalization movement. Notwithstanding these shortcomings, *Cutting the Wire* is an excellent introduction to the history, politics, and practice of the MST.

Abdurazack Karriem
Cornell University
Ithaca
New York
United States

Julius Court, Ingie Hovland, and John Young (eds.), *Bridging Research and Policy in Development: Evidence and the Change Process*, Intermediate Technology Development Group Publishing, Warwickshire, 2005, 208 pp., bibliography, index, \$27.50 paperback

Finding effective ways for improved linkages between researchers, practitioners, and policy makers is a perennial issue faced by international development agencies, health and non-government sectors alike. *Bridging Research and Policy in Development* takes on this challenge of explaining how research influences policy from the perspective of international development researchers. Moreover, this book offers an innovative way to approach this problem of accounting for the tremendous disparity in the research-practitioner-policy nexus in international development, something akin to trying to predict next week's weather, but in the case of development, the elements are reducing poverty, alleviating suffering, and saving lives.

The authors of this book form an eclectic group comprising a development researcher, postgraduate students, consultants, and practitioners from Britain and Kenya. Together, they generate then test policy theories in development through a series of four case studies. Given the comparatively substantial budgets that go into international development research – estimated at some US\$3 billion from Northern and international sources – it is alarming that a considerable amount of those findings have marginal if not negligible impact in the areas they address. It makes good economic and intellectual sense to better understand how this imbalance occurs in order to refocus the impact of these research endeavours working to eradicate poverty and meet the Millennium Development Goals. The authors offer sensible and insightful pathways through this complex situation.

Researchers in the field of international development may well be at odds to explain how their work impacts, in often unpredictable and circuitous ways, on policy changes and shifts. This volume tackles the difficult question of trying to

explain why and how some ideas in the research-policy networks of international development become adopted and make effective policy, others lay fallow, and some fade into an oblivion that never sees the light of day.

This book's structure comprises three main sections: scene-setting theory and framework chapters; four cases drawn from international development; and a concluding chapter that compares and contrasts the issues raised in the case studies then makes three recommendations directed towards a practical framework for researchers. The authors identify three critical factors that impact research into practice: context, links, and evidence. These aspects interact in highly diverse ways according to the specific political context. While there is little that is new in terms of the various theories used to explain policy development and uptake, their ingenuity lies in the complex and fluid arrangements of these key components – context, evidence, and links – and their appreciation of the socio-cultural dynamics of the international research-policy situation.

The four case studies cover a broad range of contexts and situations. The first case is the 1999 World Bank and IMF policy initiative, the *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper*, which was a marked shift in policy change at an institutionally high level. The second is the Sphere Project, a policy initiative launched in 1996 to strengthen accountability and performance in the work of humanitarian agencies, especially nongovernmental organizations. Moving to a local level, the third case describes how a successful, new, community-based decentralized animal health service delivery in Kenya suffered a 15-year lag before policy makers began to consider adopting policies and legislation to support this initiative. The final case focuses on the policy shift that happened in the United Kingdom's Department for International Development concerning the sustainable livelihood approach, an idea circulating in the 1980s research literature that did not become an underlying policy principle until the mid-1990s.

The authors' findings are of practical value to researchers, international development agencies, public policy makers, and academic departments addressing international development such as sociology, politics, business studies, and anthropology. But even within "developed" contexts, their analytic framework still yields insights for reflection on Western practice and procedures. While all cases make insightful reading into the interplay between contexts and processes, another local case from Asia or South America would have added more international flavor to this important work. Hopefully, such an undertaking will be inspired by others teaching and working in the international field.

The authors conclude by offering three key practical recommendations for researchers wanting to contribute more effectively to evidence-based and pro-poor policy. The first concerns the context of policy makers, their limitations, pressures, ideological assumptions, and status. The second addresses local–international communication processes and how the amount of information is less important than its strategic use in a given context. The final one highlights the importance

of establishing and developing effective connections and networks between researchers and policymakers. It is as much a question of establishing shared meanings and languages as it is shared networks that instigate productive partnerships and connective pathways to policy development. These recommendations are not a recipe book for guaranteed success but are testable key principles and factors that can inform strategies for researchers in the design, dissemination, and evaluation of their work. Moreover, this volume offers a fresh and promising approach to investigate how researchers' findings can achieve greater impact in the crucial area of international development.

Anton Mischewski

*The Center for Volunteering
Sydney
Australia*

Daniel C. Levy, *To Export Progress: The Golden Age of University Assistance in the Americas*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 2005, 407 pp, appendixes, notes, references, index, \$45.00

The conventional opinion on aid/assistance is often a negative one and tends to assume a donor driven agenda. The popularity of the dependency approach is suggestive of this trend. From this perspective, international aid is viewed with suspicion; it is assumed that it will fail to produce broader development and involves certain hidden agendas. It is also presumed to involve force and dominance on the part of the donor towards the recipient. In contrast, Daniel C. Levy's work provides a novel attempt to approach the concept of international assistance in general and university assistance in particular from a different angle.

The author has set up a task through this book to swim against the popular current of failures in university assistance from 1960 to 1980, which is seen by both recipients and donors of the time as a "golden age" for universities, assistance, and development. The entire book is an attempt to dispel popular beliefs and to understand the reality of what really occurred during the golden age. The book also works to explore, if there is a change, whether those changes are voluntary on the part of both donors and recipients or whether they are achieved through coercion.

In Chapter 1, titled "Perspectives on Change," the author analyzes different literatures, but draws predominantly from Fred Riggs "prismatic change" to develop criteria for evaluating change. In the following chapter, "Givers and Receivers" the main donors and receivers are identified. Accordingly the chapter looks at principal foundations, bilateral donors, and multilateral donors as well as targeted and non-targeted receivers. The chapter also provides basic data on assistance levels over time and analyzes the distribution by nation.

Chapter 3, “Modernizing the System: Diversification and Expansion,” examines the actual efforts of recipients towards change. This chapter concentrates on system decentralization along with its expansion and diversification and then analyses actual efforts and results. How did donors and their domestic partners pursue their goals, and to what effect? Next, in “Institution Building: Centralizing the University,” the author focuses on institutional building within the system, exploring university centralization as visualized by the donors and investigating the results achieved. This is followed by an exploration of “Academic Work.” Finally, Chapter 6, “Promise and Performance in Exporting Progress” summarizes the findings and evaluates the historic experiences of giving (exporting) and receiving (importing) progress. It makes an assessment of the relationship between the facts discovered and the ideal type of philanthropic change. It then proceeds to evaluate the performance during the golden age of university assistance. It concludes with a brief look beyond the golden age and makes a comparison with the contemporary assistance situation.

This book provides a comprehensive historical understanding of university assistance during the golden age, what transpired and with what consequences. The author tries to make a point that reality is not a clear-cut black and white scenario but rather shades of black, white, and grey. This is visible when he derives the Riggsian concept of prismatic change. Subsequently, the results that are uncovered in the book are of mixed nature and left to readers’ interpretation. The book is useful for education practitioners, policy makers, historians, and political scientists in both the United States and Latin American countries. While the author has gathered useful evidence from specific cases, it is debatable whether or not this can be generalized to Latin America as a whole. The title of the book is also misleading as the author is talking about the philanthropic ideal of change and genuine philanthropy; but the book’s title, “To ‘Export’ Progress . . . ” suggests a trading relationship. University assistance is not trade. It is rather designed for a specific cause, reform and development. Words such as import and export are better suited for trade and commerce rather than philanthropy.

I. N. Rajeev

*Third Sector Research Center
University of Mysore
India*

Deborah Eade and Alan Leather (eds.), *Development NGOs and Labor Unions: Terms of Engagement*, Kumarian Press, Bloomfield, CT, 2005, 406 pp., annotated bibliography, references, index, \$25.95

This is an interesting book because it examines the often uneasy relationship between nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and trade unions. It is a valuable book because to date not much has been written about the subject. The title makes

the book seem dreary and dull, but that is not the case at all. In 22 chapters, contributors write on topics such as the struggle for “no sweat” policies, union and corporate codes of conduct, trade unions and women’s NGOs, organizing home-based workers, and women workers in Central American *maquiladoras*.

Two chapters stand out. The first is “Never the Twain Shall Meet? Women’s Organizations and Labor Unions in the Maquila Industry in Central America.” The authors outline the dreadful working conditions faced by those toiling in *maquilas* (assembly plants) which manufacture clothing and other goods for large multinationals such as the Gap, Liz Claiborne, and Sears. By 1999, there were more than 325,000 maquila jobs in Central America; 65–95% of employees were women (p. 183). On average, they are 23 years old and nearly 70% are single mothers (p. 183). Working conditions are abysmal and include long hours, low pay, sexual harassment, unsanitary conditions, mandatory overtime – often not paid at a higher rate of pay, and sexist behavior toward pregnant women (p. 184). Women are closely monitored at their workstations; they have no free access to toilet breaks.

The women authors of this chapter, Prieto and Quinteros, believe it is possible though they admit “it will not be easy,” to unite women’s organizations and unions in efforts to improve the situation in the *maquilas*. According to the authors, the problem is that traditional union struggles often result in workers losing their jobs. Put simply, women (and men) are fired for trying to organize a union, or for striking. According to a study done by the International Labor Organization, workers’ names are put on a blacklist which effectively prevents them from getting another job in the *maquilas* (p. 186). So it comes as little surprise that less than 0.5% of *maquila* workers belong to unions (p. 186).

The *maquila* women are desperately poor and desperately disadvantaged. Prieto and Quinteros believe the gender perspective is missing from traditional union struggles. They point out that women typically occupy worse jobs than men do, and that women’s work is historically and economically of less importance (p. 191). Men see unions through a masculine lens as a way to access leadership and power, while women prefer to be part of a social movement in which they can share interests based on identity, nationality, and gender (p. 192). Another point of departure between unions and NGOs is that the former are generally formal, hierarchical types of institutions, led by men, while the latter operate more informally and reject an authoritarian model (p. 193).

Prieto and Quinteros lay out other problems well: labor issues are usually the preserve of trade unions, but in these highly oppressive circumstances, what can unions do to help these women workers? The authors think it is more useful for women in the *maquilas* to join women’s organizations and work with NGOs that engineer different strategies to fight the brutal working conditions (p. 187). However, faced with the increased popularity of women’s organizations, unions question their legitimacy, insisting that it is unions which have the experience and power to effect change (p. 190).

A second fascinating chapter is “Working at the Intersection: A Story from Australia” by Ken Davis who points out that War on Want, the British NGO, was

the first to call on governments to donate 1% of GDP to development programs overseas (p. 139). Davis also shows that there has been a great divide between support for left-wing versus centrist causes among Australian NGOs and unions (pp. 154–155). For example, the Australian Council of Trade Unions created APHEDA, an NGO which gives “human development assistance on behalf of the Australian organized working class” (p. 156). The organization supports Palestinian human rights, other national liberation struggles, and rights for women and refugees (p. 156). APHEDA found itself an outlier in the NGO community of Europe and North America, which tends to favor “safer” or less controversial projects (p. 156). APHEDA chose not to join Australia’s burgeoning NGO umbrella group, the Council of Overseas Aid, as it was too conservative and refused to support the African National Congress and Palestinian groups (p. 157).

By 2000, APHEDA renamed itself Union Aid Abroad, but there were growing criticisms of its role as a union-backed NGO. On the one hand, Australian unions, like Canadian unions, seek to organize workers to keep wages high and ensure job security. These unions tend to support strictly apolitical aid, such as sponsoring a child through a charitable agency, or sending computers or tools to the developing world (p. 158). Union Aid Abroad broke out of this mould by supporting those involved in national liberation struggles against imperialism. In 2002, a right-wing think-tank in Australia accused Union Aid Abroad of “partnering terrorist movements” (p. 161). So it seems that if union-NGO organizations try to seriously change or undermine the powerful, they might be discounted or worse, linked to terrorism. With changes in government – from Labour to successive Conservative administrations in Australia – it has become more and more difficult for Union Aid Abroad to get funding, especially since its work is not based on the charity model of NGOs which is now favored by the government (p. 158).

There are 20 more chapters in this book, some more riveting than others. That said, the book is well worth reading. A nice addition to the book is its annotated bibliography of books, journals, and websites about trade union and civil society organizations worldwide.

Judy Haiven

*Saint Mary's University
Halifax
Nova Scotia
Canada*

Michael M. Gunter, Jr., *Building the Next Ark: How NGOs Work to Protect Biodiversity*, University Press of New England, Hanover and Oxford, 2004, 252 pp., appendices, bibliography, notes, index, \$26.00

At a time when external criticisms of environmental NGOs have triggered self-scrutiny in the environmental movement, Michael M. Gunter, Jr.’s discussion of NGO conservation strategies is a welcome contribution. Written with the

scrutiny of a political scientist and the heart of an environmentalist, this book is thick with description of the strategies undertaken by environmental NGOs – their effectiveness and constraints. It aims to explain how different externally-aimed strategies and internally-manifested organizational structures impact the effectiveness of transnational biodiversity protection and, based on this analysis, offers prescriptions on how NGOs can become more effective.

In the first sections of the book, Gunter evaluates various bodies of International Relations theory and how they relate to the role NGOs play in conservation. Next, he lays out the theoretical and empirical argument that NGOs are the most uniquely suited institutions to address the obstacles of conservation. Drawing on scholars Peter Haas, Robert Keohane, Marc Levy, Oran Young, and Donald Wells, Gunter creates four indicators of organizational effectiveness, which emphasize the NGO's role in issue definition, mobilizing support, explaining the issue in strategic policymaking bodies, and implementing solutions. With these four indicators of effectiveness in mind, Gunter then evaluates seven strategies of environmental NGOs. With succinct summaries of diverse theories of political science and their practical applications, this section of the book is pertinent not only to those interested in environmental causes, but also those who study the effectiveness of transnational NGOs.

The bulk of the book is dedicated to in-depth analysis of the strategies employed by eleven U.S.-based NGOs working on transnational biodiversity issues. Gunter evaluates both “mainstream” (i.e., lobbying, litigation, research, property acquisition, and monitoring) and “participatory” (i.e., grassroots networking, community education) strategies in light of three major tensions in conservation: domestic versus international interests; ecological versus economic impact; and short- versus long-term costs and benefits. The book proffers and supports the common notion that environmental success can only occur when these seeming dichotomies in actuality are linked closely to each other. Going beyond merely supporting this common notion of linkages, this book explains how each strategy fosters and/or hinders these linkages.

While many studies of NGOs examine either internal organizational traits or external strategy impacts, *Building the Next Ark* valiantly attempts to tie internal organizational structure with organizational effectiveness. Examining five basic characteristics of organizational structure (i.e., general demographics, decision-making style, partnerships, targeted constituency, and strategic concentration), Gunter explains which trends of organizational structure in NGOs foster or impede conservation success. Unique to this study is the discussion of how high staff turnover both positively and negatively impact the NGO's greatest currency: expertise. Also of note is the discussion on decision-making. While previous research addresses the impact of centralized versus decentralized NGOs, and the transparency of decision-making, Gunter includes in his analysis the characteristic of “imagination.” Defined as the ability of an NGO to incorporate both “a multitude of perspectives in its decision-making process” (p. 49) and “a diverse set

of tactics within its cache of strategic initiatives" (p. 145), the term is reminiscent of James Scott's term "*metis*" in *Seeing Like a State*, through its emphasis on problem- and location- appropriate solutions. While the terms differ in the organizations to which they refer (government versus nongovernmental organizations), both terms illustrate the link between successful initiatives and the organization's ability to tailor its toolbox to each issue and community.

The greatest weakness of *Building the Next Ark* is the confusion it creates between the terms "participation" and "partnerships." According to this work, participation is a type of strategy with a limited definition: grassroots networking and community education. While these are two approaches to participatory conservation, both of these assume work done towards a goal predetermined by the NGO, ignoring the growing number of conservation organizations who are seeking direction of their efforts from the communities in which they work. While this book intends to study international NGOs and their attempts to protect biodiversity, the discussion of participation seems to address the issue of mobilizing previously disinterested Americans on biodiversity issues. This analysis would benefit from an examination of a broader array of participatory approaches used transnationally. While the discussion of "partnerships" mentions the importance of cooperating with other organizations, and the term "targeted constituency" addresses the location of an organization's members, oftentimes the constituency most consulted in conservation is not represented by any NGO. This book would be strengthened by a discussion of the strategies NGOs use to engage this unrepresented constituency. More generally, while this analysis identifies and evaluates seven popularly used strategies in biodiversity conservation, one looks forward to future efforts to examine the potential of emerging strategies in conservation.

An important effort at chronicling environmental strategy, locating it within organizational and International Relations theory, and prescribing improvements to transnational NGO efforts, this book appeals to both academics and practitioners alike. Members of the environmental field will benefit from this book's intermingling of the empirical and theoretical to create a new understanding of how NGOs operate to protect the world's biodiversity. Scholars of transnational NGOs will benefit from its rich treatment of the classic transnational issue of biodiversity protection. Practitioners in transnational NGOs should be eager to apply the lessons of this sector in their own work.

Cristina M. Balboa

*School of Forestry and Environmental Studies
Yale University
New Haven
United States*

Soma Hewa and Darwin Stapleton (eds.), *Globalization, Philanthropy and Civil Society: Toward a New Political Culture in the Twenty-First Century*, Springer, New York, 2005, 227 pp., bibliography, index, \$89.95

To edit a volume is the academic equivalent of herding cats, only harder. Volumes that consist of conference papers face the most daunting challenges of all. Disparate contributions resist even the most dedicated editors' efforts to achieve focus, coherence, and a sense of accumulation across papers. It should come as no surprise, therefore, that this volume, based on papers presented at a conference held at the Rockefeller Archive Center, achieves these aims imperfectly, at best. Though it contains chapters that are, overall, very strong, and add usefully to our knowledge of how philanthropy and civil society are shaping and being shaped by processes of globalization, the whole of this volume adds up to less than the sum of its parts.

The volume opens with two historical overviews of globalization from historians, and includes a third overview chapter – oddly positioned near the end of the volume – by an anthropologist. While these chapters are all effective on their own terms, they made few links between the study of globalization and the other core themes of the volume, such that questions about the intersection of philanthropy, civil society, and globalization are sparsely developed. At the same time, the various approaches to the study of globalization that are presented in these opening chapters were not well integrated into other contributions. Opportunities for exchange across disciplinary and other boundaries were not fully exploited.

Following an editors' introduction that accords too much weight to philanthropy in shaping the modern world, the volume is divided into sections on history and globalization, philanthropy and globalization during the Cold War, philanthropic foundations and civil society in a globalized world, and the globalization of culture and technology. Authors include a number of highly accomplished researchers in the field, as well as noted scholars from outside the field who reflect broadly on the themes at hand.

The central questions addressed in the volume are summarized in a thoughtful chapter on Canada's experience by Brock, Brook, and Elliott. Are "global forces . . . changing the way . . . organizations practice philanthropy?" Has globalization produced an "homogenizing effect on philanthropic organizations . . .? How have the forces of globalization affected the relationship between civil society and the state?" (p. 153). Not surprisingly, answers vary. Along some dimensions, the globalization of civil society has intensified significantly, as suggested in the chapter by Anheier and Daly, and that by Salamon. Yet in others, NGOs and civil society more broadly remain tightly linked to domestic contexts, whether among European foundations or Canadian civil society organizations.

Domestic constraints seem even more prominent with respect to philanthropy. It is certainly the case that leading American foundations were active

internationally during the Cold War (and beyond), as we see in two rich and insightful chapters by Gary Hess on American foundations in India during the Cold War and Victoria Bestor on the activities of the Rockefeller Foundation in Japan. Yet as Frumkin's chapter on the international work of American foundations makes clear, there is an important difference between globalization, on one hand, and the international activities of U.S. foundations that are tightly linked to American foreign policy, on the other. In all three of these chapters, the focus remains America-outward. They do not explore as fully the implications for philanthropy of an international system that has become significantly more pluralistic, more open to flows that move outside of, underneath, and around national states, and of foundations' agendas that are less tightly linked to the policy ambitions of national governments than in the past.

What the volume does well is to present a number of high quality case studies concerning the international experiences of American philanthropy during the Cold War in South and East Asia. These are presented alongside useful state-of-the-field surveys that review the status of international philanthropy in the U.S., foundation composition, activities, and roles in Europe and, in one of the volume's strongest chapters, explore the impact of globalization on NGOs in Canada. A final chapter on the globalization of debates around social risk and biotechnology is also useful in underscoring the role of civil society in moving issues onto policy agendas around the world.

If some of the disconnects that mark this volume reflect its origins in a set of conference papers, they can also be read as a reflection on the state of research in this important area. Seen in this light, all is not well in the field of global philanthropy and civil society research. The volume reinforces the impression of a field that is reliant on a relatively small cohort of researchers, in which the demand for publications outpaces supply, yet where leading concerns have become sufficiently well-defined to make it harder than it should be for scholars outside the field, even those who work on related issues, to engage it in a productive fashion. In this context, where a great deal of strong scholarship is evident, it is innovation, cumulation, and the circulation of ideas across boundaries that suffer. More globalization of scholarship and a new intellectual, rather than political, culture, may be needed to address these concerns.

Steven Heydemann

*Center for Democracy and the Third Sector
Georgetown University
Washington, DC
United States*