

IO

International Organization

International Organization at Fifty: Exploration and Contestation in the Study of World Politics

Editors: Peter J. Katzenstein
Robert O. Keohane
Stephen D. Krasner

Contributors: Barry Eichengreen
Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink
Geoffrey Garrett
Robert Jervis
Miles Kahler
Peter J. Katzenstein, Robert O. Keohane, and
Stephen D. Krasner
James G. March and Johan P. Olsen
Lisa L. Martin and Beth Simmons
Michael Mastanduno
Helen V. Milner
John Gerard Ruggie
Ole Wæver

IO

Edited at the University of California, San Diego
Published quarterly by The MIT Press
Founded in 1947 by the World Peace Foundation

Peter Gourevitch *Editors*

David A. Lake

Stephan Haggard *Review Editors*

Jack Snyder

Lynne L. Bush *Managing Editor*

Janice Stein *Editorial Board Chair*

Helen V. Milner *Editorial Board*

John Odell

Robert Powell

J. David Richardson

Thomas Risse

Volker Rittberger

Ronald Rogowski

Frances Rosenbluth

Kathryn Sikkink

Beth Simmons

Anne-Marie Slaughter

Arthur Stein

Janice Stein

Beth V. Yarbrough

Mark W. Zacher

Robert Bates
Benjamin J. Cohen
John A. C. Conybeare
Matthew Evangelista
James Fearon
Albert Fishlow
Geoffrey Garrett
Peter Gourevitch
Joanne Gowa
Stephan Haggard
Christer Jönsson
Miles Kahler
Peter Katzenstein
Stephen D. Krasner
David A. Lake
Charles Lipson
Lisa Martin

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION invites the submission of original manuscripts on all aspects of world politics and international political economy. Authors should follow the guidelines published annually in the Winter issue. Guidelines also may be found on the World Wide Web at <http://mitpress.mit.edu/IO>.

Address for submissions:

Lynne Bush

Managing Editor

International Organization

IR/PS

University of California, San Diego

9500 Gilman Drive

La Jolla, CA 92093-0519

Statements and opinions expressed in *International Organization* are the responsibility of the authors alone and do not imply the endorsement of the Board of Editors, the Board of Trustees of the World Peace Foundation, the University of California, or The MIT Press.

For abstracting listing and price information, please refer to the back of this issue.

Periodicals postage is paid at Boston, Mass., and at additional mailing offices.

© 1998 by The IO Foundation and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology ISSN 0020-8183

Ⓢ This publication is printed on acid-free paper.

***International Organization at Fifty: Exploration and
Contestation in the Study of World Politics***

edited by

Peter J. Katzenstein

Robert O. Keohane

Stephen D. Krasner

A special issue of *International Organization*

In Memoriam

SUSAN STRANGE

(1923–1998)

Vigorous, insightful pioneer on international political economy. Author of “The Management of Surplus Capacity: Or How Does Theory Stand Up to Protectionism 1970s Style?” (International Organization, Summer 1979), “Cave! Hic Dragones: A Critique of Regime Analysis” (International Organization, Spring 1982), “Protectionism And World Politics” (International Organization, Spring 1985), and “The Persistent Myth Of Lost Hegemony” (International Organization, Autumn 1987).

**Member, Board of Editors,
International Organization,
1977–1982**

International Organization

Volume 52, Number 4, Autumn 1998

Preface: *International Organization* at Its Golden Anniversary xv
Peter J. Katzenstein, Robert O. Keohane, and Stephen D. Krasner

American and European Perspectives

International Organization and the Study of World Politics 645
Peter J. Katzenstein, Robert O. Keohane, and Stephen D. Krasner

The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations 687
Ole Wæver

Rationalist Approaches

Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions 729
Lisa L. Martin and Beth Simmons

Rationalizing Politics: The Emerging Synthesis of International, American, and Comparative Politics 759
Helen V. Milner

Global Markets and National Politics: Collision Course or Virtuous Circle? 787
Geoffrey Garrett

Economics and Security in Statecraft and Scholarship 825
Michael Mastanduno

Constructivist Approaches

What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-Utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge 855
John Gerard Ruggie

International Norm Dynamics and Political Change 887
Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink

Juxtaposing Rationalism and Constructivism

Rationality in International Relations *Miles Kahler* 919

The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Orders
James G. March and Johan P. Olsen 943

Critical Commentaries

Realism in the Study of World Politics *Robert Jervis* 971

Dental Hygiene and Nuclear War: How International Relations
Looks from Economics *Barry Eichengreen* 993

Contributors

Barry Eichengreen is John L. Simpson Professor of Economics and Political Science at the University of California, Berkeley.

Martha Finnemore is Associate Professor of Political Science and International Affairs at George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

Geoffrey Garrett is Professor of Political Science at Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

Robert Jervis is Adlai E. Stevenson Professor of International Politics, Columbia University, New York, New York.

Miles Kahler is Rohr Professor of Pacific International Relations at the Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies, University of California, San Diego.

Peter J. Katzenstein is Walter S. Carpenter, Jr. Professor of International Studies at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

Robert O. Keohane is James B. Duke Professor of Political Science at Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

Stephen D. Krasner is Graham H. Stuart Professor of International Relations and Senior Fellow in the Institute for International Studies at Stanford University, Stanford, California.

James G. March is Professor Emeritus of Management, Political Science, Sociology, and Education at Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Lisa L. Martin is Professor of Government at Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Michael Mastanduno is Professor of Government and Director of the John Sloan Dickey Center for International Understanding at Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire.

Helen V. Milner is Professor of Political Science at Columbia University, New York, New York.

Johan P. Olsen is Director of a research programme on the Europeanization of the nation state financed by the Norwegian Research Council and Adjunct Professor of Political Science at the University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.

John Gerard Ruggie currently serves as chief adviser for strategic planning to United Nations Secretary-General **Kofi Annan**, at the rank of Assistant Secretary-General. He is on leave as Burgess Professor of Political Science and International Affairs at Columbia University, where he was Dean of the School of International and Public Affairs from 1991–96.

Kathryn Sikkink is Professor of Political Science at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Beth Simmons is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Berkeley.

Ole Wæver is Senior Research Fellow at the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute in Denmark.

Abstracts

International Organization and the Study of World Politics

by Peter J. Katzenstein, Robert O. Keohane, and Stephen D. Krasner

A distinct subfield of international relations, IPE, has emerged over the last thirty years, largely in the pages of *International Organization*. IPE began with the study of international political economy, but over time its boundaries have been set more by a series of theoretical debates than by subject matter. These debates have been organized around points of contestation between specific research programs, reflecting fundamental differences among the generic theoretical orientations in which these research programs are embedded. The fate of specific research programs has depended on their ability to specify cause and effect relationships and to operationalize relevant variables. Scholarship in IPE has become more sophisticated both methodologically and theoretically, and many of its insights have been incorporated into policy discussions. Past points of contestation, including those between realism and its liberal challengers and between various conceptions of domestic structure and international relations, help us to understand recent debates between rationalism and constructivism.

The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations

by Ole Wæver

The international relations (IR) discipline is dominated by the American research community. Data about publication patterns in leading journals document this situation as well as a variance in theoretical orientations. IR is conducted differently in different places. The main patterns are explained through a sociology of science model that emphasizes the different nineteenth-century histories of the state, the early format of social science, and the institutionalized delineation among the different social sciences. The internal social and intellectual structure of American IR is two-tiered, with relatively independent subfields and a top layer defined by access to the leading journals (on which IR, in contrast to some social sciences, has a high consensus). The famous successive “great debates” serve an important function by letting lead theorists focus and structure the whole discipline. IR in France, Germany, and the United Kingdom has historically been structured differently, often with power vested more locally. American IR now moves in a direction that undermines its global hegemony. The widespread turn to rational choice privileges a reintegration (and status-wise rehabilitation) with the rest of political science over attention to IR practices elsewhere. This rationalistic turn is alien to Europeans, both because their IR is generally closer to sociology, philosophy, and anthropology, and because the liberal ontological premises of rational choice are less fitting to European societies. Simultaneously, European IR is beginning to break the local power bastions

and establish independent research communities at a national or, increasingly, a European level. As American IR turns from global hegemony to national professionalization, IR becomes more pluralistic.

Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions

by Lisa L. Martin and Beth Simmons

Studies of international institutions, organizations, and regimes have consistently appeared in the pages of *International Organization*. We review the theoretical and empirical work on international institutions and identify promising directions for the institutionalist research program. Early studies of international institutions were rich with empirical insights and often influenced by theoretical developments in other fields of political science, but lacking an overarching analytical framework they failed to produce a coherent body of scholarship. Current efforts to reinvigorate the study of international institutions draw on a new body of theory about domestic institutions. We argue that the assumptions of this new approach to institutions are more appropriate to international studies than those of earlier attempts to transfer theories across levels of analysis. We suggest that the most productive questions for future research will focus on specifying alternative mechanisms by which institutions can influence outcomes and identify particular sets of questions within this agenda that are especially promising.

Rationalizing Politics: The Emerging Synthesis Among International, American, and Comparative Politics

by Helen V. Milner

International relations has often been treated as a separate discipline distinct from the other major fields in political science, namely American and comparative politics. A main reason for this distinction has been the claim that politics in the international system is radically different from politics domestically. The degree of divergence between international relations (IR) and the rest of political science has waxed and waned over the years; however, in the past decade it seems to have lessened. This process has occurred mainly in the “rationalist research paradigm,” and there it has both substantive and methodological components. Scholars in this paradigm have increasingly appreciated that politics in the international realm is not so different from that internal to states, and vice versa. This rationalist institutionalist research agenda thus challenges two of the main assumptions in IR theory. Moreover, scholars across the three fields now tend to employ the same methods. The last decade has seen increasing cross-fertilization of the fields around the importance of institutional analysis. Such analysis implies a particular concern with the mechanisms of collective choice in situations of strategic interaction. Some of the new tools in American and comparative politics allow the complex, strategic interactions among domestic and international agents to be understood in a more systematic and cumulative way.

Global Markets and National Politics: Collision Course or Virtuous Circle?

by Geoffrey Garrett

Increasing exposure to trade, foreign direct investment, and liquid capital mobility have not prompted a pervasive policy race to the neoliberal bottom among the OECD countries. One reason is that there are strong political incentives for governments to cushion the dislocations and risk generated by openness. Moreover, countries with large and expanding public economies (when balanced with increased revenues, even from capital taxes) have not suffered from capital flight or higher interest rates. This is because the modern welfare state, comprising

income transfer programs and publicly provided social services, generates economically important collective goods that are undersupplied by markets and that actors are interested in productivity value. These range from the accumulation of human and physical capital to social stability under conditions of high market uncertainty to popular support for the market economy itself. As a result, arguments about the demise of national autonomy in the global economy are considerably overdrawn.

Economics and Security in Statecraft and Scholarship

by Michael Mastanduno

This article traces and explains how U.S. policy officials and IR scholars have conceived of the relationship between economics and security over the past half-century. During the interwar years, economics and security were integrated in both scholarship and statecraft. During the Cold War, scholars treated the two issues as separate areas of inquiry. U.S. policymakers integrated economics and security during the early Cold War, but by the 1970s the two components of U.S. foreign policy had drifted apart. After the Cold War, a renewed emphasis has emerged in both U.S. statecraft and IR scholarship on the integration of economics and security. Three factors explain these patterns: (1) the international distribution of material capabilities, (2) perceptions of the strategic environment, and (3) perceptions of the position of the United States in international economic competition.

What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-Utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge

By John Gerard Ruggie

Social constructivism in international relations has come into its own during the past decade, not only as a metatheoretical critique of currently dominant neo-utilitarian approaches (neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism) but increasingly in the form of detailed empirical findings and theoretical insights. Constructivism addresses many of the same issues addressed by neo-utilitarianism, though from a different vantage and, therefore, with different effect. It also concerns itself with issues that neo-utilitarianism treats by assumption, discounts, ignores, or simply cannot apprehend within its characteristic ontology and/or epistemology. The constructivist project has sought to open up the relatively narrow theoretical confines of conventional approaches—by pushing them back to problematize the interests and identities of actors; deeper to incorporate the intersubjective bases of social action and social order; and into the dimensions of space and time to establish international structure as contingent practice, constraining social action but also being (re)created and, therefore, potentially transformed by it.

International Norm Dynamics and Political Change

by Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink

Norms have never been absent from the study of international politics, but the sweeping “ideational turn” in the 1980s and 1990s brought them back as a central theoretical concern in the field. Much theorizing about norms has focused on how they create social structure, standards of appropriateness, and stability in international politics. Recent empirical research on norms, in contrast, has examined their role in creating political change, but change processes have been less well-theorized. We induce from this research a variety of theoretical arguments and testable hypotheses about the role of norms in political change. We argue that norms evolve in a three-stage “life cycle” of emergence, “norm cascades,” and internalization, and that each stage is governed by different motives, mechanisms, and behavioral logics. We also

highlight the rational and strategic nature of many social construction processes and argue that theoretical progress will only be made by placing attention on the connections between norms and rationality rather than by opposing the two.

Rationality in International Relations

by Miles Kahler

Rationalist models have faced four persistent sets of critics as the research program of international relations has evolved. Under neorealism's structural constraints of international competition and selection, agents' rationality may appear superfluous. Psychological critics have presented neither a single theoretical alternative to rational choice nor contingent hypotheses that specify when psychological distortions of rational decision making are most likely. Both rational choice and psychological approaches must construct models of action for social entities that aggregate individuals. The rationality and individualism of beliefs is questioned by theorists who stress culture, identity, and norms as independent sources of action. Careful stipulation of scope, acknowledgment of methodological shortcomings, and precise definition of differences can serve to bridge the theoretical divide between rational choice models and their critics. Problem-centered research provides a level playing field on which theoretical competition can be established.

The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Orders

by James G. March and Johan P. Olsen

The history of international political orders is written in terms of continuity and change in domestic and international political relations. As a step toward understanding such continuity and change, we explore some ideas drawn from an institutional perspective. An institutional perspective is characterized in terms of two grand issues that divide students of international relations and other organized systems. The first issue concerns the basic logic of action by which human behavior is shaped. On the one side are those who see action as driven by a logic of anticipated consequences and prior preferences. On the other side are those who see action as driven by a logic of appropriateness and a sense of identity. The second issue concerns the efficiency of history. On the one side are those who see history as efficient in the sense that it follows a course leading to a unique equilibrium dictated by exogenously determined interests, identities, and resources. On the other side are those who see history as inefficient in the sense that it follows a meandering, path-dependent course distinguished by multiple equilibria and endogenous transformations of interests, identities, and resources. We argue that the tendency of students of international political order to emphasize efficient histories and consequential bases for action leads them to underestimate the significance of rule- and identity-based action and inefficient histories. We illustrate such an institutional perspective by considering some features of the coevolution of politics and institutions, particularly the ways in which engagement in political activities affects the definition and elaboration of political identities and the development of competence in politics and the capabilities of political institutions.

Realism in the Study of World Politics

by Robert Jervis

The popularity of alternative approaches to international politics cannot be explained entirely by their scholarly virtues. Among the other factors at work are fashions and normative and political preferences. *This in part explains the increasing role of rationalism and constructivism.* Important as they are, these approaches are necessarily less complete than liberalism, Marxism, and realism. Indeed, they fit better with the latter than is often realized. Realism,

then, continues to play a major role in IR scholarship. It can elucidate the conditions and strategies that are conducive to cooperation and can account for significant international change, including a greatly decreased tolerance for force among developed countries, which appears to be currently the case. But neither it nor other approaches have as yet proved to be reliable guides to this new world.

Dental Hygiene and Nuclear War: How International Relations Looks from Economics

by Barry Eichengreen

This article adopts economics as a perspective from which to view recent research in international relations. The most telling difference between international relations and economics, it argues, is in the connection between theory and empirical work. The strength of economics is the complementary and mutually supporting character of theoretical and empirical work. In international relations, in contrast, the connections between theory and empirics are looser. As a consequence, research in international relations has not converged to a core of common theoretical assumptions and an arsenal of commonly accepted empirical techniques.