Japanese Journal of Political Science 14 (2) 277–281 © Cambridge University Press 2013

Reviews

Michael N. Barnett, *The International Humanitarian Order*, Routledge, 2010
doi:10.1017/S1468109913000078

According to Michael Barnett, the international humanitarian order includes 'norms, informal institutions, laws, and discourses that legitimate and compel various kinds of interventions with the explicit goal of preserving and protecting life' (p. 1). It goes beyond humanitarianism because it involves 'the self-conscious and explicit attempt by states and non-state actors to create international mechanisms' (p. 2). Such an order has a long history but has expanded significantly and rapidly after the Cold War. *The International Humanitarian Order* is a collection of Barnett's articles on international order, peacekeeping, peacebuilding, and humanitarianism, published between 1995 and 2006. Barnett admits that he wrote these articles without noticing the existence of the international humanitarian order as such; as a distinguished scholar with the experience also at the US Mission to the United Nations, he himself was a part of the development of this emerging order. This collection enables us not only to understand how the international humanitarian order developed, but also to examine how contemporary intellectuals and practitioners discern it and how their understanding and practices add a new significance to the order. More crucially, this volume offers a cautious and critical observation on the international humanitarian order, highlighting not only its promising transcendent aspect but also its 'dark side' caused by the presence of power and politics.

The expansion of the international humanitarian order was impacted by a significant change, after the Cold War, in the meaning of international peace and security and the way to maintain international stability. Chapter 2 illustrates that the security dialogue came to explore a liberal order centred around multilateralism and institutions. The UN, as 'a forum for collective legitimation', was expected to contribute to such an order by articulating and transmitting norms of states, which promote states cooperation (chapter 4). New understanding of international order not only increased the role of the UN but also altered its activities. Chapter 3 points out that there was a renewed understanding of the relationship between domestic and international order, that empirical sovereignty and the domestic characteristic of states, rather than juridical sovereignty and territorial integrity, matter to international order. This emerging view significantly changed the UN's peacekeeping missions which came to include the restoration of civil order and stability.

The 'cognitive shift' in the understanding of sovereignty has also transformed the meaning and practice of humanitarianism, the significance and impact of which are analyzed in depth

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109913000078 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in chapter 9. The transformation of humanitarianism that Barnett identifies is two fold. First is the politicization of the purpose of humanitarianism. A change in international understanding of international peace and security, as well as in the normative and legal environment, endorsed humanitarian agencies not only to provide relief to victims of disasters but also to take action to eliminate the root causes of conflict that place those victims at risk. Accordingly, they came to engage in promoting human rights, economic development and democracy, which signifies 'the transformation of local structure'. This goes beyond the traditional understanding of apolitical humanitarianism: 'any actions that aspire to restructure underlying social relations are inherently political' (p. 174). Indeed, humanitarian agencies came to embrace the goal to create stable, effective, and legitimate states. This expanded humanitarianism has become a shared agenda with states, whom humanitarian agencies once distanced themselves from but now increasingly came to collaborate with. Second is the institutionalization of humanitarian organizations, which was promoted by the expansion of humanitarian activities and the actors involved. As humanitarianism became an acknowledged 'field', those working in the field came to be pressured to secure effectiveness and legitimacy. The bureaucratization of humanitarian organizations was a response to this emerging challenge.

Barnett is concerned that these trends 'left organizations more vulnerable to external control' (pp. 186–7) and, accordingly, violated the humanitarian principles of impartiality, independence and neutrality that guarantee an apolitical 'humanitarian' space. Moreover, there are serious downsides. In chapters 5 and 7, he examines the UNHCR's (UN High Commissioner for Refugees) shifting mandate to be actively involved in refugee-providing countries to bring relief to internally displaced peoples and eliminate the root causes of refugee flows. It also came to promote repatriation policy. These shifts were promoted not merely by humanitarian imperatives but also by states' pressure to deter and contain the flow of people. This 'sovereignty-led humanitarianism', Barnett argues, has a danger to compromise the UNHCR's traditional protection mission and risk refugee rights; the result is the disassociation from the very people they are supposed to protect. The 'indifference' to the suffering of people is also generated through the institutionalization, especially bureaucratization, of international organizations, along which the organizations' own survival and needs came higher in policy agendas. Asking 'how the decision [by the Security Council] not to halt the genocide [in Rwanda] came to be understood and defined as ethical and moral' (p. 122), Barnett points out in chapter 6 that there was the desire to protect the UN's reputation and future, which could be further damaged by sending unprotected peacekeepers: this is 'a testimony to the dominance of the interest of the organization over those of the individual' (p. 124). These 'unrecognized features of international organizations' indeed illustrate the 'dark side' of expanded humanitarianism.

In these articles, Barnett maintains a critical stance towards the international humanitarian order, which, seemingly an ethical field, inherently entails the power imbalance between the deliverer and the recipient. What he emphasizes is the importance of the ways in which we acknowledge and understand the presence of power and politics in the international humanitarian order. Here, Barnett introduces, in conclusion, the concept of paternalism, which includes care for the needs of others, as well as interference in and control of the lives of those being cared. If power and politics exist in every social relation, paternalism, Barnett argues, is defensible as it forces those engaged in humanitarian activities to constantly question themselves, whether they are truly doing good for others. This exercise requires ethical analysis on unintended consequence and ones' own intention, which may cause difficulties and anxiety to humanitarian

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109913000078 Published online by Cambridge University Press

agencies who act on the ground they know best the needs of others, as well as to scholars who claim to seek value-neutral knowledge. Indeed, it is the very intention of Barnett to shake their stance in order to make 'a space for genuinely emancipatory action'.

Barnett does not deny the international humanitarian order as such; he sees 'transcendentalism' in this order, that is 'an expansion of the willingness of humans to incorporate the suffering and welfare of others into their everyday decision' (p. 210), as an evidence of international progress. However, such progress can be pushed forwards only through continuous self-reflective attitudes by those who practice and research humanitarianism. This volume provides us a vital opportunity to think and rethink ethically about how we understand and practice humanitarian activities, how we place ourselves in this 'living humanitarianism', and how we face our own moral duties in international relations.

Madoka Futamura
United Nations University

J. Calvitt Clarke III, *Alliance of the Colored Peoples: Ethiopia and Japan before World War II*, Oxford, UK: James Currey for the International African Institute, 2011, 198 pp. (hb 978-1-84701-043-8)
doi:10.1017/S146810991300008X

Only a truly dedicated historian with the passion and patience for minute details, including those details which are found scattered in space and time, could write such a book. By organizing and interpreting such details, J. Calvitt Clarke III has rendered outstanding service to those of us who, for personal or professional reasons, are interested in Japan's relations with Ethiopia. While Ethiopia had had longstanding, and at times intimate, diplomatic relations with the United States *after* World War II, Ethio-Japanese relations had been eventful *before* World War II. But there was a gaping hole about the latter in the scholarship until now. This book is the first and fullest account of Ethio-Japanese relations before World War II.

Clarke III starts out with the discourse about the notion of 'the yellow peril', the genealogy of the idea, and moves on to the history of Japan's 'colonial' ambitions in Africa and how, among other things, Europe's changing attitudes towards Japan crushed those ambitions from the outset. What follows is a general discussion of the dilemmas of modernization Ethiopia had faced and how it generally resolved them as illustrated by the struggle that ensued between Ethiopia's 'Japanizers' and 'traditionalists' in the 1920s and 1930s. The author then casts the major characters in Ethiopia who were to play a central role in the debates about whether Japan could serve as a model for Ethiopia's modernization, drawing in passing a useful comparison, including in the appendix, between the constitution of Meiji Japan (1889) and Ethiopia's first constitution (1931). Clarke III finds a 'close' resemblance between the two. It is remarkable to discover in this book that Ethiopia's approach to modernization resembled that of Japan to some extent. Both Ethiopia and Japan showed readiness to adapt different systems of organization and thought from abroad in their respective efforts to modernize their societies. Both countries put emphasis on the positive role of education in social transformation. We also learn that although Emperor Haile Selassie was committed to Ethiopia's modernization, he was unwilling to devolve power as Emperor Meiji had done in Japan. Haile Selassie sought to perpetrate himself as 'absolute

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109913000078 Published online by Cambridge University Press