

apparent because the record of actual reforms compared to promised reforms is pretty dismal, as Rolandsen documents.

Documenting even promised reforms is not easy. Rolandsen acknowledges the scarcity and sometimes dubious quality of what records he was able to dig up. There were several major conventions of the SPLM/A during the study period of roughly 1991 to 2004. But minutes were available for only 1994 (the convention on which the book concentrates), and those minutes at times resemble a “propaganda piece” more than an accurate account of debates—if there were debates (181). Rolandsen notes that delegates to the 1994 convention were told to keep their remarks focused on a discussion of the points raised by SPLA leader Garang, and that few delegates who were not SPLA leaders spoke out at all.

Even when reforms were adopted by the conventions, they were seldom implemented. The shallowness of reforms is captured in a comment from the appointed Secretary of Education in the rebel government, who said at a meeting, “I am now standing before you as the whole ministry” (157). Clearly lack of resources limited attempts to build a civilian administration. But lack of intent appears to be just as serious an issue. Rolandsen writes that the “SPLM/A leadership recognizes a need for legitimacy even as it appears unwilling to share power or subject itself to the will of the people or to the SPLM membership at large” (175). He also argues that civil groups and the major ethnic groups must be included in any transition but that mostly they have been left out.

Until the recent Sudan peace accords were signed (leaving the Darfur genocide unsettled), it was difficult for the SPLM/A to share power or gather the resources to do so when it was still at war with the north. The dilemma, of course, is that if it does not eventually share power, it will continue to follow the authoritarian examples of other rebel movements, such as those in Eritrea and, one can argue, Ethiopia. Meanwhile Rolandsen, who curiously seems surprised at the record of the “guerrilla government,” deserves credit for digging up hard-to-find published and unpublished documents, interviewing a range of sources, and giving us a closer look at the gap between the SPLM/A’s reform rhetoric and its performance.

Robert Press
University of Southern Mississippi
Hattiesburg, Mississippi

Helen E. Purkitt and Stephen E. Burgess. *South Africa’s Weapons of Mass Destruction*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005. 322 pp. Appendix. Bibliography. Index. \$24.95. Paper.

Helen Purkitt and Stephen Burgess’s excellent study of South Africa’s development and dismantlement of a weapons of mass destruction program is essential reading for anyone interested in South African politics or

in the broader issues of the proliferation of such weapons. The authors have an ambitious agenda. They lay out in great detail the evolution of South Africa's weapons of mass destruction: nuclear, biological, and chemical. They situate the rise and decline of this program within extenuating political circumstances spanning almost a half-century. And they examine at least three levels of South Africa's security environment: the state, regional, and international. From an international relations perspective, they implicitly borrow from all three of Kenneth Walt's images or levels of analysis, namely, the individual, the state, and the international system.

The politics driving the narrative is clear. The authors emphasize that the trajectory and vicissitudes of South African politics explain much of the logic behind why and how South Africa developed weapons of mass destruction and later discarded them. They use important domestic watersheds, such as Sharpeville (1969), Soweto (1976), and the township disturbances (1984) to demonstrate how insecurity within South Africa shaped its security demands and led to weapons proliferation. Similarly, they earmark the important regional events, such as decolonization in southern Africa, the Angolan civil war, and the insurgency in Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), and examine how they affected South Africa's perceptions of its security dilemma. Finally, the authors have an excellent grasp of how international influences affected the history of South Africa's weapons program.

The volume is less successful in examining the theoretical lessons we can glean from the South African case. The authors offer a collection of important theoretical points without systematically exploring them. They note in the introduction that several theoretical concepts from international relations—neorealist theory, organizational and bureaucratic politics, comparative foreign policy, psychological perspectives—are needed to explain South Africa's weapons of mass destruction program. But these "theories" are used in an anecdotal and ad hoc manner. This, unfortunately, weakens the volume's ability to frame a larger comparative research agenda. For instance, how do we compare Ukraine to South Africa? They have different security dilemmas (neorealism), different bureaucratic legacies and trajectories, and distinct psychological imperatives. Yet both unilaterally disarmed nuclear weapons programs.

Nonetheless, the volume offers important lessons from the South African case that can be applied to the broader context of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The appendix, for example, offers twenty-three policy lessons gleaned from the study. Any scholar—and, more important, any policymaker—would do well to read this list closely. The conclusion includes a sophisticated understanding of the changing security environment punctuated by 9/11. The discussion of transnational security threats, including al-Qaeda, offers some very interesting and creative insights. From this reviewer's perspective, the most interesting analytical and theoretical contribution, albeit underdeveloped, is the volume's

understanding of the growing threat of weapons of mass destruction from nonstate actors. While the book is about a state, South Africa, it is also concerned with the shadowy world of transnational criminal organizations, terrorists, and arms merchants. This is the world that seems to represent the real threat posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and that offers areas of future research worth exploring.

James J. Hentz
Virginia Military Institute
Lexington, Virginia

Goran Hyden. *African Politics in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. viii + 297 pp. References. Index. \$24.99. Paper.

This is a well-developed assessment of important themes in the study of African politics. With one very bold step, Hyden systematically integrates important aspects of the literature on African politics and society into the historically and theoretically rich Eurocentric tradition of state and society, which dominated the field of comparative politics in earlier decades. The themes investigated are compared to the most significant questions raised in classic comparative theory, and Africanist thinkers are compared with nineteenth-century thinkers like Marx, Weber, and Durkheim and more recent analysts like Giddens. While there is a detailed policy discussion, “Quo Vadis Africa,” in the final chapters, the analysis as a whole is developed on a very general, theoretical plane.

So how does this theoretical marriage of the literature on African politics and classic sociological theory fare? For the most part, Hyden finds that theories of European political and social development do not help us understand the character of African politics. He argues that Africa has followed a unique pattern of political and economic development. Unlike the situation in many other parts of the world, power is based in relationships of reciprocity and obligations to kinship groups. The exercise of power may result primarily in the maintenance of important social relations rather than in getting “people to do things they might not have otherwise done.” Africa’s political development is most powerfully rooted in the “economy of affection” and the constraints of the uncaptured peasantry, conditions no other part of the world currently confronts. Equally important is the political movement legacy of modern African nationalism. For Hyden, the colonial state is not the direct antecedent of contemporary politics; the political movements to replace it are. The antithetical relationship of modern African nationalist movements to previous Western authority defined a state, which functioned best with external enemies. Hyden’s portrayal of Africa’s failed development is similar in spirit to current discussions concerning the Middle East as a region of the world that has rejected moder-