

verantwortlich zu machen wären, mag man hingegen trefflich streiten. So ist es schlicht unerträglich, dass Morris nicht davor zurückschreckt, Arabern ganz grundsätzlich einen Hang zu Gesetzlosigkeit und Kriminalität zu attestieren. Ähnlich kritisch wird man auch seine Betrachtungen zum möglichen Fortgang der israelisch-palästinensischen Beziehungen hinterfragen dürfen. Da Israelis und Palästinenser sich als unfähig erwiesen hätten, die Zweistaatenlösung umzusetzen, müsse man nun nach anderen Optionen Ausschau halten. Und so sieht auch Morris in einer stärkeren Einbindung Jordaniens – namentlich in einem jordanisch-palästinensischen Staat – den einzigen Ausweg aus der derzeitigen Situation. Dass weder die Palästinenser noch die jordanische Regierung an einem solchen Modell ernsthaftes Interesse haben dürften, scheint den Autor nicht weiter zu stören.

Insgesamt richtet Morris seinen Fokus als Historiker zu sehr auf die Evolution der Ein- und Zweistaatenlösung. Diese Passagen sind langatmig und zum Teil recht konfus. Wer mit Blick auf den Untertitel des Buches (»Resolving the Israel/Palastine Conflict«) hingegen ausführlichere Stellungnahmen zum Thema Streitbeilegung erwartet, muss mit den letzten sechs Seiten seines 200-Seiten-Essays vorliebnehmen. Erst hier wendet sich Morris der weiteren Entwicklung zu und kommt, wie angedeutet, zu fragwürdigen Ergebnissen. Lesenswert ist das Buch im Prinzip nur, weil es die Enttäuschung, die nach den Ereignissen der vergangenen Jahre in Israel offenbar Einzug gehalten hat, so deutlich macht. Nach der Lektüre des Buches fällt die Antwort auf die Frage, warum sich Netanyahu und Lieberman mit dem Bekenntnis zu einem palästinensischen Staat so schwer tun, jedenfalls etwas leichter. Vielleicht liegt es ja daran, dass sie von den Wählern kein Mandat dafür erhalten haben.

*Tim Maschuw,
Bonn*

ANDRE UFER:

Rethinking Good Governance in Developing Economies: Institutions, Governance and Development in Thailand

Baden-Baden 2008

Nomos, 201 pp.

The central question that this book seeks to address is whether good governance reform is an appropriate tool to bring about socio-economic development in the developing world. The author's answer to this question is unequivocal. In his view, there is a fundamental mismatch between the underlying ideology of good governance theory and the real-life institutional requirements of the development process in different developing countries.

Essentially, Ufer criticizes good governance theory for its one-size-fits-all approach. In his view, it is wrong to assume that the liberal concepts that are at the basis of good governance thinking can be applied to all developing countries indiscriminately. As transformation is a process that starts out from socio-political settings as diverse as the countries that they are emerged in, universal concepts are doomed to failure. What Ufer suggests is a fundamental shift of the theory: rather than focusing on which set of institutions are most likely to provide the right set of goods to ensure competitive markets, he proposes looking at what he calls »the transformation capacity« of states. This capacity he defines as the ability to push through transformation and make it both economically and politically sustainable.

Though even in this perspective, democracy and competitive markets continue to be the overriding aim of development, they are not seen as appropriate means towards these ends when it comes to countries in the initial stages of the transformation and industrialization processes.

In a nutshell, Ufer's key message is that social and political structures and how they are being transformed matter. To prove his case, he analyzes the development process of Thailand. He demonstrates that in Thailand, the specific combination of a certain social structure on the one hand (i.e. a class hierarchy with a powerful military and economic elite) and particular policies on the other hand (i.e. the employment of rents), was conducive to economic growth. However, Ufer also shows how in the course of accelerating development, this structure of governance ended up bringing about its own demise: with the advent of democratization, rural capital changed the original balance of power challenging traditional elites as well as conventional ways of how wealth and power were distributed. As this shift of balance coincided with the advance of a free market economy, it weakened the grip of the state. Finding Thailand at this crossroads, Ufer suggests as a remedy that both the political and institutional capacities of the state be reinforced to send the country on the path to a stable democracy and economic development.

Now it seems that this book offers the best of both worlds by combining a fundamental challenge to the theory of good governance with a case study illustrating why and how this theory ought to be reconceptualized. A learned and well-structured discussion of the main concepts of good governance gives an insight into their shortcomings while also providing solutions for their improvement.

What will shake the foundations of good governance theory is the author's assertion that in the case of Thailand, this improvement lies primarily in enhancing the capacity of the state to create, distribute and monitor growth enhancing rents. Rather than conceiving of rents as distorting the free play of market forces, they are seen as a necessary factor in bringing about democratic as well as economic development.

Ufer no doubt deserves credit for having questioned the good governance orthodoxy in development theory by asserting that political and social structures matter. This allows for a more comprehensive perspective on both the theory in general and the development process of Thailand in particular. In addition, it replenishes good governance theory with a much needed diversification that takes account of the country-specific institutional needs of development.

Though it is to be expected that this book will have an impact on the ongoing debate on good governance theory, it remains to be seen whether it has the potential to rock its core. Should Ufer's analysis prove correct with regards to Thailand, it would nevertheless have to be applied to other comparable countries to be substantiated further. As according to Ufer's argument, growth-enhancing institutions differ from country to country, understanding the Thai case does not necessarily help in identifying relevant structures in other countries. In fact, this may be the central weakness of the analysis. The validity of Ufer's argument will only be established beyond doubt once it has been applied successfully to other countries. It remains to be seen whether others will follow in Ufer's lead to buttress his findings.

All in all, it can be said that Ufer's analysis stands on its own feet. And given the current and ongoing political crisis of the Thai political system which exposes the weakness of political institutions, it has certainly been worth the effort to look at how political structures need to be transformed in order to bring about a full-fledged democracy as well as sustainable growth patterns.

*Cilia Ebert-Libeskind,
Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Berlin*

JULIE E. MEHAN:

Cyberwar, Cyberterror, Cybercrime. A Guide to the Role of Standards in an Environment of Change and Danger

Ely 2008

IT Governance Publishing, 268 S.

Sicherheitsfragen im Cyberspace haben in den vergangenen zwei Jahren – besonders in den letzten Monaten – in der öffentlichen Wahrnehmung an Bedeutung gewonnen. Bezogen auf Deutschland wird dies nicht zuletzt deutlich durch die intensive Debatte um die Einführung des Internetfilters im Juni 2009, die vor allem von Seiten der Zivilgesellschaft heftig kritisiert wurde, und gegen die derzeit eine Klage beim Bundesverfassungsgericht angestrebt wird. Protest manifestierte sich auch in einer Online-Petition, mit 134 015 Unterschriften, die größte, die es in Deutschland bisher gegeben hat. Während die Diskussion um Kriminalitätsprävention versus Einschränkung von Freiheitsrechten noch anhält und auf