
Taylor uses new archive sources to reinterpret this history, making the most of the Irish Military Archives collection, which is now online and useful for its perspective on the IRA. Meanwhile, he uses Irish Grants Committee files to represent the “voice of the victims” (252). Taking regard of these new sources, he argues that the intimidation of veterans occurred for other reasons than just war service and was geographically focused, and, moreover, that the British Government overall fulfilled its obligations to the Irish former servicemen. In relation to the new Irish Free State’s interaction with former servicemen, the new Irish parliament, Dáil Éireann, established in 1927 a committee to investigate complaints of former servicemen and concluded that their concerns were “common to all members of society.” Similarly, a report in 1936 by the British Ministry for Pensions determined that there was no “discrimination against ex-servicemen.” Taylor concludes that the widely used term ex-servicemen suggests a homogeneity that did not exist in Ireland, as these men distributed through all classes and were part of the social fabric of their local communities.

Only a small number of Irish veterans joined ex-servicemen societies, and most shied away from the British Legion due to its imperial connotations. It is true that there were public clashes in relation to World War I remembrance ceremonies, held on November 11 each year to mark the end of the war. These ceremonies emphasized the links with Britain and attracted a media spotlight. He suggests that it was not previous services to the British government that divided Irish society in 1920s and 1930s, but rather the split in families and communities over the Irish Civil War (1922–23). Taylor feels it suited loyalists and republicans alike to portray former servicemen as marginalized group in the twentieth century, but in the end they were neither heroes nor traitors.
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This edited volume is designed to explore the connection between international relations theory and the Northern Ireland peace process, and it features the work of many key scholars of this area. Its intention is to engage with and establish scholarship of a largely neglected field, as, although the link between international relations and Northern Ireland has been made before, previous work has mostly focused on British-Irish intergovernmental relations during the “Troubles” and leading up to the Good Friday (Belfast) Agreement of 1998. The book includes twelve chapters covering a diverse range of areas within this topic, from gender and human rights to the European Union and external engagement, among many others. This review seeks to provide an informative overview of these contributions.

In chapter 1, Paul Dixon uses constructivist realism to critique idealist and conservative realist interpretations of the Northern Ireland peace process. Dixon makes some compelling arguments, in particular that the wishful thinking of idealism leaves the approach ill-equipped.
to explain the politics of peace processes. His argument that the elite-led character of the consociational Good Friday Agreement is responsible for continued divisions in Northern Ireland is, however, less compelling, as only a model that recognized and accommodated the political elites of unionism and nationalism had the potential to achieve lasting conflict management. In chapter 2, Andrew Oswiak uses an issue-based approach and selectorate theory to demonstrate the role of issues, leaders, and regimes in bringing about the Good Friday Agreement. He is correct that much peacebuilding remains to be done, particularly on contentious issues such as parades. This perspective is supported by the collapse of the Northern Ireland Assembly in January 2017 and the status of the Irish language being a major contributing factor in the failure to reestablish power sharing.

In chapter 3, Carolyn Gallaher emphasizes the need for disarmament, demobilization, and reintegation for lasting conflict management. She is obviously correct in saying that violence remains present in Northern Ireland in the form of dissident republican groups and others, but perhaps does not give enough credit to the Good Friday Agreement for the significant reduction in violence that it has achieved. P. J. McLoughlin (chapter 4) analyzes the importance of ideas and agency in the peace process. In focusing on the role played by the former Social Democratic and Labour Party leader John Hume, McLoughlin provides a comprehensive overview of Hume’s efforts to internationalize the peace process by engaging with the Irish government, the United States, and Europe. In analyzing the role of licit and illicit transnational networks, Devashree Gupta, in chapter 5, emphasizes links between the Provisional Irish Republican Army and Irish Americans during the “Troubles,” for example.

In exploring connections between gender, international relations, and Northern Ireland, Maire Braniff and Sophie Whiting (chapter 6) identify an underdeveloped area of the peace process, noting that issues considered to be “normal” in societies that are not divided by conflict, such as the pursuit of gender equality, have been sidelined in Northern Ireland by the need for conflict management. In chapter 7, Maria Power explores the link between human rights and the Catholic Church in Northern Ireland in the 1980s. Given the significance of religion in the region, it is not surprising that the church was influential in promoting human rights, although it is important to recognize its limitations as an actor. Chapter 8 by Mary Murphy examines the particularly current issue in Northern Irish—and wider British—politics of the European Union, with a focus on the ramifications of Brexit. Her observation that the joint EU membership of the United Kingdom and Ireland was influential in achieving the Good Friday Agreement is very salient, due to the possible implications that the exit of Great Britain from the European Union could have on the cross-border bodies established by the Agreement, such as the North-South Ministerial Council and the British-Irish Council.

Chapter 9 by Katy Hayward and Eoin Magennis and chapter 10 by Sandra Buchanan analyze the respective roles of the private sector and external investment in the Northern Ireland peace process. Hayward’s observation that the private sector is reluctant to involve itself in the region due to the risks associated with doing so is compelling; however, many would argue that this involvement is an integral aspect of “normalization.” Similarly, Buchanan argues that external investment is necessary in Northern Ireland but is being hampered by political instability. The aforementioned collapse of the Assembly and continued activity of dissident republicans and others supports this concern. In chapter 11, Timothy White explores the role of cooperation theory in achieving the Good Friday Agreement and beyond. Whilst the mutual benefits of cooperation are fundamental to facilitating intergroup elite-level engagement in all peace processes, they have been particularly useful in Northern Ireland, where a lasting settlement needed to be sold to unionists and nationalists as providing benefits to both communities. Finally, in chapter 12, Cillian McGrattan examines the need for responsibility, justice, and reconciliation in post-Agreement Northern Ireland. He is correct in his observation that many issues that fall within this remit, including symbolism and the aforementioned status of the Irish language, were not included in the Good Friday Agreement, and
the ramifications of this are now being realized in developments such as the collapse of the Assembly.

Overall, this book offers a highly useful insight into the link between international relations theory and the Northern Ireland peace process. Some connections between the two are more tenuous than others, with many being framed within the context of the United Kingdom and Ireland, and others making a wider international link. Ultimately, this volume fills a gap in a field that has been largely neglected and will be of interest to scholars and students of the Northern Ireland conflict, divided societies, and theories of International Relations.
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Liverpool and Manchester came to prominence during the first industrial revolution. Liverpool was the point of importation for slave-produced American cotton, and Manchester was where most of the world’s trade in cotton cloth was conducted. Much has been written about the economic, social, cultural, and political history that flowed from this preeminence. However, the later history of these two cities, especially during the first half of the twentieth century, has been less well served. Many assume that stagnation and squalor accompanied the underlying economic decline of these once-powerful commercial and industrial centers. Charlotte Wildman’s *Urban Redevelopment and Modernity in Liverpool and Manchester, 1918–1939* offers a welcome corrective to this common perception. It makes a notable contribution to a growing literature that highlights civic “boosterism” and planned urban renewal during the interwar years rather than focusing exclusively on a story of post-1945 “reconstruction.” Moreover, Wildman extends the territory covered by this insight through the imaginative connection of housing and infrastructural improvements with the gendered cultures of consumerism and religion.

Wildman organizes the book into three parts. The first, “Civic Culture,” demonstrates how the two cities attempted to deal diversely but imaginatively with an inheritance of decaying housing stock. Between them they rehoused large numbers in publicly financed, purpose-built estates of suburban houses, of which Wythenshawe Garden City, outside Manchester, is the most notable, and nationally significant, example. With regard to Liverpool, Wildman gives due credit to the influence of the University of Liverpool School of Architecture and the dominating figure of Sir Charles Reilly in the development of urban modernism, as well as to Liverpool’s long-serving city architect, Sir Lancelot Keay. Surprisingly, however, Wildman makes no mention of the intriguing fact that Liverpool, unlike most other English cities, also built several modernist high-rise blocks between the wars (see Matthew Whitfield, “Lancelot Keay and Liverpool’s Multi-Storey Housing of the 1930s,” in E. Harwood and A. Powers, eds., *Housing the Twentieth Century Nation* [2009]).

Wildman rightly emphasizes how civic authorities understood the need for transport improvements to cope with the automobile age (including the opening of the Mersey Tunnel) and the extent of investment in public transport as the corporation motorbus gradually replaced the corporation electric tram. Equally, she recounts how both cities’ concern for planning involved prestige architectural projects such as Manchester Central Library and Town Hall Extension. Such buildings represented the desire for an impressive civic center at the