

are weighed against a full-scale war. The point has some merit, but wars may be unintentional. Indeed, a leader's preferences over a spectacle relative to war are defined in terms of the leader's expectations of resistance from the target.

I find this distinction to be problematic because it relies on the expectation of the target's behavior. And, arguably, leaders who choose diversion may find themselves in a war due to mistaken expectations. The Falklands War, which is examined in the book, is a good example; the Argentine leadership is thought to have miscalculated the response of Great Britain. Oakes considers this possibility of unintentional war and incorporates it nicely into her argument. Specifically, she hypothesizes that states with low policy (i.e., pauper states) resources are more likely to find themselves embroiled in interstate war than states with high policy resources (princely states). However, she does not adequately test this hypothesis. When assessing the probability of diversion, she examines 177 countries over a 22-year period (i.e., country-years, or monads). Rather than an examination of only monads, a dyadic analysis examining conflict initiation and reciprocation would have been more appropriate for assessing whether targets of diversion are likely to retaliate against pauper states. Given her criticism of the previous literature's failure to account for alternatives to diversion, I also expected Oakes to empirically examine the policy choices she identifies using a multinomial model in which the dependent variable includes nominal categories consisting of each of the policy alternatives. Such a strategy would allow for the direct comparison of the alternatives under various conditions identified by her argument.

Oakes's choice of case studies is remarkable. Her first case is the frequently examined Falkland's War, which she deftly analyzes in comparison to the numerous other explanations of the conflict. The next case study in the book examines James Buchanan's choice to launch a military expedition into Mormon-controlled Utah during 1857–58. This case seems an odd choice at first glance. But as the author points out, Utah under territorial governor Brigham Young was essentially a state within a state. Finally, she explores a number of other cases in which no military action was taken in response to domestic unrest. Taken together, these case studies provide an account of the theoretical mechanisms identified by Oakes in her argument.

Overall, *Diversionary War* is a nice contribution to research on the linkages between domestic and international politics. Although I tend to doubt that leaders explicitly consider using force abroad in response to problems at home, Oakes's arguments and evidence are provocative enough to make me reconsider my previous position.

Borders Among Activists: International NGOs in the United States, France, and Britain. By Sarah S. Stroup. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012. 264p. \$39.95.
doi:10.1017/S1537592714000735

— Sarah Wilson Sokhey, *University of Colorado Boulder*

In *Borders Among Activists: International NGOs in the United States, France, and Britain*, Sarah S. Stroup examines how the behavior of international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) differs based on the country in which they were founded. She argues that four domestic factors—the regulatory environment, political opportunities, material resources, and social networks—influence their strategies for fundraising, professionalization, advocacy, and government relations; she demonstrates how these domestic factors influence the behavior of humanitarian and human rights INGOs in the United States, France, and Britain. The book is organized around case studies of humanitarian INGOs in each country, including CARE (US), Oxfam (Britain), and Médecins Sans Frontières (France), and of human rights INGOs in each as well, including Human Rights Watch (US), Amnesty International (Britain), and the Federation Internationale des ligues des Droits de L'Homme (FIDH). By using “mini-cases” of other INGOs, she argues that the dynamics of these main cases are not unique, but reflect national trends.

Stroup's work contributes a better understanding of how domestic influences matter in a globalized era—even for organizations that operate internationally. Her findings are bolstered by extensive interviews with individuals working in these organizations, and by detailed accounts of their operations. The implication of the argument extends beyond INGOs: Any organization that operates internationally including corporations, interest groups, and possibly even subsets of organizations like the European Union, should be influenced by its country of origin.

While interesting, the book's findings raise several issues which are not fully addressed, involving the interplay of domestic and international pressures, the connections between domestic influences, and the role of policy diffusion. These issues reflect broader challenges in the study of international civil society and political economy. Scholars should think more seriously about how to identify when and why global or domestic factors matter, about the consequences of domestic factors, and about the role played by policy diffusion (an influence that links local and international pressures). How does Stroup address these questions? I discuss each in turn.

Domestic or International Pressures. On the one hand, Stroup's finding is not surprising in its noting that international charities behave differently based on the country of origin. Few scholars or policymakers would argue with this contention. Rather, it would be surprising to find that national origin *did not* play an important role in the behavior of charities. In fact, a growing body of

research in political economy shows that the influence of international institutions is often limited, and that domestic institutions play a more important role, even in a highly globalized era. (see, e.g., James Vreeland's *The IMF and Economic Development*, 2003).

On the other, Stroup's finding challenges the contention that INGOs are converging upon a single model of behavior because of international pressures (at least in some facets). However, the evidence in the book establishes that national origin matters, but does not disprove the idea that globalization has important effects. The pressures of globalization—including norms about charities' behaviors—are likely to still matter. Stroup herself notes that pressures like international law, organization, and humanitarian norms are shaping efforts to create a single model of best practices for INGOs (pp. 73–75). In focusing on domestic factors, Stroup's findings give little insight into how domestic contexts differently channel international pressures. Research on the effects of international pressures has long suggested that the same global pressures influence domestic actors differently (i.e., Peter Gourevith, *Politics in Hard Times: Comparative Responses to International Economic Crises*, 1986). Globalization likely does influence INGO behavior, but this does not mean we should expect convergence on the same practices, as Stroup suggests.

As such, it is not entirely clear why Stroup concludes at the end of chapter 1 that it is “unlikely that all three [INGOs in the United States, Britain, and France] will converge upon a single model of civil society” (p. 70). Although they are undeniably distinct in their strategies, the differences in organizations like CARE, Oxfam, and Médecins Sans Frontières may be more accurately characterized as differences in degree, not kind. For example, all seek private donations, even if they do so to varying degrees (due to whether or not they receive significant government support). And, these organizations often respond to the same disasters; the book's opening vignette about the Haitian earthquake in 2010 describes the involvement of CARE, Oxfam, and Médecins Sans Frontières. The book does not really directly compare the similarities between these organizations.

Domestic Influences. What is the connection between the domestic factors described by Stroup? The regulatory environment for INGOs today is shaped by material resources, political opportunities, and social networks. Stroup treats regulatory environments as more or less fixed. However, regulatory environments change over time based on the interaction of these domestic factors. Establishing how the effects of national origin possibly changes over time would lend more insights into the relative impact of domestic and international pressures.

Relatedly, at certain points the argument about domestic influences is somewhat circular. For instance, Stroup

argues that domestic factors like the regulatory environment (such as tax laws) and political opportunities influence INGOs strategies in government relations. It would be hard to imagine, however, how domestic political opportunities *would not* influence an INGO's relations with the government, almost by definition. In the United States, INGOs like CARE and Human Rights Watch enjoy significant support from the government, and therefore have much closer relations with government officials (particularly in comparison to their French counterparts). In this regard, Stroup's case studies function better as descriptions of how INGOs differ, rather than as a causal explanation for why they differ.

Diffusion. The effects of diffusion are critical, as they represent one means by which globalization might produce convergence on a single model of INGO behavior. Stroup identifies several diffusion pressures—ones that are coercive, mimetic, normative (p. 17)—but fails to mention other possible mechanisms by which policy diffusion may operate. Research on diffusion suggests that competition is also an important means by which policies (or behaviors) might spread. (See, e.g., Craig Volden and Charles R. Shipan, “The Mechanisms of Policy Diffusion,” *American Journal of Political Science* 52(4) [Oct. 2008]: 840–857). INGOs might learn from each other, although Stroup argues that INGOs fail to learn from each other's best practices. Stroup does not consider that INGOs might compete in the charity arena, and seek to distinguish themselves from other organizations by behaving differently. In this competition scenario, diffusion may work by actually producing different behaviors.

Despite in some ways raising more questions than answers, Stroup's book is a very worthwhile read and engages a rich and interesting area of research. *Borders Among Activists* is an important contribution to the literature—its highlighting of how international activism retains a distinctly domestic flavor will inspire future research. To gain a more complete understanding of the interplay between international civil society and globalization, future work must build on Stroup's efforts, considering the impact of domestic and international factors in tandem, rather than focusing on one to the near exclusion of the other.

The Challenge of Grand Strategy: The Great Powers and the Broken Balance between the World Wars.

Edited by Jeffrey W. Taliaferro, Norrin M. Ripsman, and Steven E. Lobell. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012. 360p. \$99.00 cloth, \$34.99 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592714000747

— Austin Long, *Columbia University*

Pity the leaders of great powers who are burdened with the challenge of grand strategy. Grand strategy is a tricky