intra-South trade have increased since 1995, North–South trade has declined. An increased inclusiveness of developing countries and a fairer decision-making process in the WTO have not corrected 'the global trading system['s]… deficiencies vis-a-vis the developing countries' (p. 13).

Kim presents a rich, multifaceted examination of the international trading system and successfully accomplishes her aim of finding evidence to support those who fear the WTO (and globalisation more generally) does more harm than good. And she does so by presenting context alongside hard outcomes: the importance of sequencing presented in Section 1 complements the later statistical analysis, and vice versa. Though some may find the two sections too starkly divided, Kim's decision to separate them thus means each has a stand-alone value, increasing the book's worth and potential readership. In 'Consequences', the differentiation of WTO members by timing of entry means there is little focus on the institutional impact of the emerging powers. An analysis of these changing power dynamics – evidenced by WTO coalitions on agriculture such as the G20 and G33 – could have highlighted how developing countries are responding to the institutional power divide Kim identifies and would have been an added bonus to what is already an in-depth analysis. As the future of the DDA remains uncertain, *Power and the Governance of Global Trade* provides an opportunity for reflection on the trade regime's history and its recent distributional consequences. Scholars, students and policymakers alike will benefit from this clearly written, thorough analysis of a complex and sometimes controversial regime, and its mixed-methods approach will hopefully inspire others to follow suit.

Helen Coskeran

Helen Coskeran is a PhD candidate in the Department of Politics and International Studies at the University of Cambridge, UK.

Jonathan Nitzan and Shimshon Bichler, *Capital as Power: A Study of Order and Creorder* (London and New York: Routledge, 2009, 464 pp., $39.95 pbk; $140.00 hbk).

Amidst the social sciences scholarship that is dominated by either neoclassical economics or Marxist views, *Capital as Power* presents a thought-provoking and erudite argumentation of an alternative understanding of the nature of capital. Asserting that orthodox perspectives of capitalism are inadequate, Jonathan Nitzan and Shimshon Bichler impressively historicise and argue against both liberal and Marxist conceptions of capital as an innate 'economic' or 'market-created' entity that can be calculated in terms of 'utils' or sheer 'abstract labour'. In the most radical argumentative fashion, the authors offer a heterodox view by averring the fictitious ontological nature of capital which cannot be empirically detected, quantified or measured. Moreover, they contend that the economics-inspired conception of capital is inherently misleading, that is, solely conceiving capital as the ultimate derivative of the production–consumption nexus. Alternatively, capital must be broadly situated within the more complex, multifaceted and highly contested dynamics of power – or politics, to be more precise. Neither an empirical entity nor a

social bond inherent in material things, capital is indeed a '*symbolic representation of power*' (p. 7).

This volume is divided into five substantive parts. With the aim of historicising the notion of capital within the broader history of ideas in political economy, Part 1 discusses extensively that the erroneous economistic understanding of capital can be found in the problematic bifurcation between politics and economics, and within economics itself, the infamous and convoluted distinction between nominal and real. Part 2, meanwhile, concentrates on the misguided conceptions of capital from both the Marxist and liberal viewpoints. In this section, the authors maintain that neoclassical economics fundamentally runs in a fallacious circular reasoning. This means that in the aim of explaining capital productivity, liberals have to turn to the quantity of capital whose logical ontogenesis is completely dependent on describing also the quantity of profit. In contrast, Marxists remain evasive by merely centring upon their parochially oriented thesis that capital accumulation is just a mere offshoot of the exploitation of workers. Part 3 further explores the faultiness of capital conceived within the theoretical purviews of production and equipment, instead of the intricate subtleties of capitalisation and finance. Conclusively, Part 4 introduces a heterodox theory of capital accumulation, and Part 5 justifies the authors' concept of capital as power.

This book offers a great service to the scholarship of political economy, most especially on its determined revival of the almost-forgotten 'Cambridge Controversy' on the ontological nature of capital (see p. 79). Amidst contemporary social sciences that are hegemonically shaped by neoclassical theories, Nitzan and Bichler make a compelling case for why capital should not be conceived in purely 'materialist' terms, but instead in terms of multi-faced dynamics of power relations magnified at the global level, as seen in today's version of capitalism. The quintessential strength of this volume is its extensive historicisation of the major problems that haunt political economy, followed by a clear presentation of key paradigms in understanding capital; before eventually presenting their ambitious goal of reintroducing power dynamics as the ultimate working principle behind capital and its accompanying processes. One of the most notable arguments advanced is the notion of capitalists as 'absentee owners of power' wherein there is a marked 'separation of ownership from production' (pp. 230–1). I suspect that the sort of capitalist exploitation first exposed by Marx has been further advanced by the authors by highlighting further the highly deplorable 'ontological distance' between the capitalist and the sphere of production through which the severity of exploitation emanates from – although it should be noted that Nitzan and Bichler do not explicitly aim for this.

Despite the commendable goals of the authors in defying the enormity of power posed by the 'academic churches' of neoclassical economics and Marxism, there are apparently some inadequacies to the study of power and capital than Nitzan and Bichler claim. Firstly, they contend that globalisation can be epitomised as 'capitalization of power on a global scale' (p. 350). This may sound purely reductionist, from a holistic globalisation studies perspective, considering that there are other equally important modalities of power (e.g. culture, military, diplomacy, etc.) that operate at the global scale which may be considered as wholly distinct from sheer 'capitalisation'. Secondly, the authors' ontology of the state as a sheer 'mode of power' appears to be unconvincing, since their argumentation is completely dismissive of a very active and rich scholarship on the theories

of the state; most especially on state–society relations. It seems that their ontology of the state was merely created in order to fit within their ambitious doctrine of 'capital as power' conceived as the irrepressible force of global politics. State–society dynamics are much more intricate than what they seem to be in the context of this book's characterisation. Nevertheless, these points should not hinder people from reading this book, as I suspect that this work will be an eventual classic in political economy for its deeply impressive challenge to the orthodoxy of the discipline, as well as its remarkable survey of the state of the scholarship on capital.

Salvador Santino F. Regilme, Jr

Salvador Santino F. Regilme, Jr is a PhD candidate in Political Science and North American Studies at the Graduate School of North American Studies, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany.

Bert Swart, Alexander Zahar and Göran Sluiter (eds), *The Legacy of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011, 584 pp., £95.00 hbk).

Considering the imminent closure of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and other ad hoc or temporary international tribunals, this book is without a doubt a timely contribution to the literature on the ICTY. Dedicated to the memory of the late Bert Swart, the third co-editor who originally proposed the idea of the book, *The Legacy of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia* seems an important collection of essays laudably attempting to capture the key developments, achievements and debates regarding the tribunal. The aim of the volume is to propose a series of critical reflections on selected topics of international criminal procedure and substantive law in light of the upcoming closure and legacy of the tribunal.

The book is divided into five parts: 'A Distant Court' (I), 'Process and Rights: Three Views' (II), 'Battlefields' (III), 'Improvisation and Discovery' (IV) and 'Legacy in Bricks and Mortar' (V). This review will focus on the role of the ICTY as an ad hoc tribunal and international organisation which is particularly interesting from an International Relations perspective, hence Parts I and V are discussed in more detail below. A reader with a purely legal perspective might well benefit particularly from detailed discussions of procedural and jurisprudential developments. Indeed, Part II presents three different perspectives on the ICTY's procedural system and legacy (Chapters 3–5) while Part III exposes several contentious issues of procedural and substantive law, ranging inter alia from the crime of persecution and complicity in genocide, to regulation of defence counsel and proportional sentencing (Chapters 6–11). In Part IV several improvisations and discoveries at the ICTY are explored, for example, the right to self-representation, command responsibility and 'special agreements' between Conflicting Parties (Chapters 12–16). The overall organisation of the book, however, is not immediately persuasive. Indeed, some developments based on improvisation and discovery (Part IV) may explicitly touch on process and rights (Part II) and have become the ground for the existence of battlefields (Part III). The