

right-wing populist ideology that narrowed the United States' ideological distance from Duterte's Philippines.

Despite these and other quibbles, *Frenemies* stands out amidst an increasingly crowded IR literature on alliances because Haas's ideational theory deftly fills a large explanatory gap left by the realist theories that have dominated that literature to date. It thereby merits a prominent place on the bookshelves and syllabi of international security scholars.

The Grand Design: The Evolution of the International Peace Architecture. By Oliver P. Richmond. Oxford: Oxford

University Press, 2022. 320p. \$74.00 cloth.

doi:10.1017/S1537592723002189

— Alexander D. Barder, *Florida International University*
abarder@fiu.edu

Oliver P. Richmond's *The Grand Design: The Evolution of the International Peace Architecture* is a timely and sophisticated examination of the historical and theoretical processes for the establishment of a peaceful international order. The study of modern international relations has long addressed questions pertaining to the breakdown of international order, hegemonic conflicts, and the attempt to reestablish a more resilient political order that can, more or less, adjudicate interstate disputes without resorting to cataclysmic violence. The book is certainly timely because of a sense that hegemonic conflicts have returned to contemporary international politics and that, in the twenty-first century, the proliferation of digital technologies, climate change, and reactionary politics entail a constellation of events that radically call into question the durability of a liberal international order.

Richmond approaches the questions of peacemaking or peace building in a remarkably compelling way. First, he lays out for his readers a conceptual vocabulary for drawing attention to historical continuities across centuries. In fact, Richmond does not frame the question of peace within a preconceived notion of political order; rather, he deploys the concept of an international peace architecture (IPA) as a "partially planned, partially fortuitous, partially resisted or blocked, intergenerational set of practices (e.g., military intervention, humanitarianism, peacekeeping, mediation, social movements, etc.) aimed at ending war" (p. 9). The IPA need not be internally coherent nor free of contradiction; it may—in fact, often—reflect forms of political hierarchies that are predicated on ubiquitous forms of violence and determinative of who counts and who is recognized as a political agent. Richmond also uses terms such as layers, stages, and sediments to render intelligible the imbrications of the IPA with the "historical dynamics of war, and to their geopolitical, institutional, constitutional and civil peace responses" (p. 11). Second, Richmond recognizes the historical and conceptual Eurocentrism that has been at work for centuries in defining the very meaning of

what counts as a peaceful order. And yet, political contestation by the "subaltern"—whether civil society activists or claims from the peripheries of the global system—must figure in a larger story about the evolution of the IPA and its potential future.

The historical story Richmond tells is rich in nuance and detail. It is organized according to five stages or layers, with speculation about a future sixth. The story begins with the period roughly between Westphalia (1648) and the emergence of the modern state-system to the Concert System in 1815 (Stage/Layer 1). As is well known, the language of the balance of power, European diplomacy, and the emergence of an imperial system of hierarchies figure as references for international peace. The decline and collapse of this order beginning in the late nineteenth century reframed what was necessary for international peace: international institutions such as the League of Nations and the United Nations, designed to limit sovereign prerogative (Stage/Layer 2). In contrast, Stage/Layer 3 emerges with a broadly Marxist critique of capitalism and liberalism to advance a framework of political and economic rights that became the catalyst for decolonization, nonaligned movements, and struggles for forms of global social democracy. Stage/Layer 4 continues this pluralization of international peace with a focus on a cosmopolitan project of human rights, social development, and security. By the 2000s, Stage/Layer 5 represents a reactionary project focused on neoliberal state-building and American neo-imperial missions across the world. As Richmond writes, "Stage five rested on a rejection of the connection between peace, justice, and social legitimacy, instead foregrounding the geopolitical needs of hegemonic states in the global North and their interests in capital" (p. 147).

Of key interest then is what comprises Stage/Layer 6 (our current moment), which is still in its infancy. Given the failure of the muscular American-centric attempt to redefine peace through forceful democratization and neoliberal state-building, Richmond argues that there are contradictory forces at work here. On the one hand, there are significant initiatives to return to a Stage/Layer 4 program of expansion of rights and civil society in the wake of a legitimacy crisis associated with the previous stage, including issues pertaining to sustainable development and the UN's Sustaining Peace Agenda. On the other, as Richmond correctly points out, an evolving nexus of "state, capital, and technology" creates the conditions of a ubiquitous surveillance society that challenges traditional conceptions of rights and autonomy. Digital governmentality is an emergent mode of governing that increasingly asserts forms of extractive capital with disciplinary techniques. What this implies for the IPA in the future is a crucial problem because it renders the meaning and nature of global peace increasingly ambiguous.

The Grand Design is an ambitious book. It covers a span of five centuries of political thought and action in a coherent

narrative. And yet, despite Richmond's attempt to call into question the enduring Eurocentrism of what constitutes IR's historical conceptualization of peace and the place of subaltern forms of contestation, there is little in terms of more contemporary non-Western contributions to the theorization of a future peaceful global order. With the potential emergence of a multipolar political order, for example, what are the voices in the BRICS that redefine the parameters of peaceful coexistence beyond liberal ideas? In what ways, do multilateral institutions reflect a different form of political praxis (i.e., the peacemaking by China in the Middle East, for example) that genuinely points to an emergent non-Western architecture?

Theoretically, IR scholars—particularly social constructivists—would also wonder whether the deployment of such a vocabulary of architecture, layers, sediments, and stages gives additional theoretical salience than the more traditional focus on the historical evolution of political order. Can we not account for the processes of contestation, crises, collapse, and reconstitution as a larger struggle of the constitutive and regulative rules of what constituted the legitimate global political order? Here the inchoate deployment of a Deleuzian ontology that appears in Richmond's book—the term “rhizome” appears multiple times—may have been an interesting way to reframe notions of sustainable peace by taking account of the role of nonhuman agents and the role of climate change. Indeed, this may lead to a view of the book's title as being unfortunate in its assumptions that the evolution of the IPA is, strictly speaking, a design of the mind and human agency.

Notwithstanding these minor issues, Richmond's book is a compelling examination of the larger questions of global order and the historical, political, and intellectual evolution of peace thinking since early modernity. His work will certainly frame the conversation in the field for many years to come.

The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: A New Interpretive Approach. By Andrew Erueti.

Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022. 240p. \$99.00 cloth.
doi:10.1017/S1537592723002141

— Sheryl Lightfoot , University of British Columbia
sheryl.lightfoot@ubc.ca

In Indigenous politics circles, a grand debate has been raging for a decade and a half about the role, meaning and effects of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (“the Declaration”) in theory and practice. Some scholars and Indigenous rights activists argue strongly for its normative value based on its origins in grassroots Indigenous rights movements of the 1960s and 1970, which transformed it into a global human rights consensus document. Meanwhile, other scholars and Indigenous rights activists view the history of UN

negotiations over the Declaration and its connection to the liberal international human rights regime as so profoundly problematic that it cannot be normatively salvaged in any meaningful way.

The simple truth is that state recognition and respect for Indigenous rights were grossly insufficient before and continued so after the passage of the Declaration, and the pervasive neoliberal, capitalist model has done significant damage to Indigenous Peoples around the world. The need to restore and revitalize Indigenous languages, cultures, governance, and ways of life is dire, and coupled with the urgent need to protect Indigenous lands and waters in a time of great global change, this debate is not merely an intellectual one but is also a deeply existential one. It is often emotionally charged, sometimes producing critiques with very sharp edges.

Andrew Erueti's book, *The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: A New Interpretive Approach*, brilliantly offers a pathway through this grand debate, revealing a political history of the Declaration that is at once explanatory of the debate itself while also offering a “mixed-model” interpretation that significantly sharpens both its meaning and effects. Erueti analyzes how, using this mixed-model approach, the same Declaration can and does serve the diverse needs of Indigenous Peoples worldwide. His timely intervention encourages them to come back together in global solidarity.

Indigenous rights and politics scholars such as James Anaya, Claire Charters, Dalee Sambo Dorough, Brenda Gunn, Joshua Nichols, and this reviewer ground their work in the notion that the Declaration is a useful, appropriate, and potentially powerful tool as a specific articulation of Indigenous Peoples' rights within universal human rights as articulated in the core human rights treaties. Grounding Indigenous rights within the human rights language also enhances the legibility and credibility of the Declaration with state actors. It provides Indigenous Peoples with an international-level tool for Indigenous rights advocacy in national, regional, and global contexts.

Although some scholars have addressed the grassroots, and often quite radical, origins of the Declaration and its roots in community-based gatherings before the first international Indigenous meeting in Geneva in 1977 (which eventually gave birth to the UN Working Group that produced the draft declaration), none has considered the complex Indigenous political history of the UN negotiations as Erueti has done here. Erueti finds that the globalization of the international Indigenous rights movement was a critical juncture in its political history, creating a fundamental tension between the Global North and Global South that threatened to undermine its grassroots, more radical origins (the “decolonization model”) in favor of a “human rights model.”

This is the argument of the Declaration's harshest scholarly critics, who view it as having become so watered down