

killing: A very rapid international response could have made a difference.

This is but a small sample of many fascinating and important findings. Straus's study is comprehensive, thorough, and cogently and carefully argued, and it engages stringently with the literature. It is altogether an impressive work that will be compulsory for specialists and invaluable for students. Straus is a former journalist and his writing is a model of clarity and economy; this book will be accessible to most readers. Generally, *The Order of Genocide* supports the emergent theme in genocide studies that war is crucial to causation; in terms of the debate on participation, it supports the position of Christopher Browning (*Ordinary Men*, 1993), rather than Daniel Goldhagen (*Hitler's Willing Executioners*, 1996), emphasizing group pressure rather than racial ideology.

I have two criticisms, one of which is serious. The lesser point is that the title emphasizes the extent to which geno-

cide was produced by the "order" that Rwanda's deep state penetration produced, and to which it mobilized in accordance with given patterns of obedience, while the argument in the end prioritizes *disorder* and insecurity, which are not reflected in the title. The more serious point is that Straus's definition of genocide equates it with killing. This has only minor methodological and analytical consequences in this study, as when he excludes those who looted but did not kill from his category of "perpetrators." But from the point of view of comparative study this is a narrow definition, which would exclude episodes where perpetrators did not simply and unremittingly focus on killing—like the "ethnic cleansing" of Bosnia-Herzegovina that was contemporaneous with Rwanda's genocide—from the scope of genocide studies. It is unfortunate that such an exemplary study should sustain a misleading idea of the field and its concepts.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Feminist Methodologies for International Relations.

Edited by Brooke A. Ackerly, Maria Stern, and Jacqui True. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 316p. \$75.00 cloth, \$29.99 paper. DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707072076

— Mary Caprioli, *University of Minnesota, Duluth*

This volume presents a marvelous account of feminist methodologies. Mainstream scholars might find it all too easy to dismiss when confronted immediately with its refusal to define feminist methodologies and its jabs at quantitative methodologists for presumably assuming their work to be value neutral. Such a dismissal, however, would be a grave mistake. For the book presents a collage of perspectives on feminist methodology. The essays address the questions feminists ask, why they ask such questions, what we learn from these approaches, and how this research contributes to our knowledge. This is not a "how to" book, as you do need to reach your own conclusions—to find your own way methodologically. But this apparent lack of direction is more of an invitation to experiment and to add to our knowledge. And this unrestrained quest for knowledge is precisely the point of feminist methodology as conceived by the authors.

The various chapters relate to one another either by directly addressing the topic of feminist international relations methodology or by offering an example of a feminist methodology. The first section focuses on what feminist methodologies are, mainly in juxtaposition to more typical IR methodologies. The second section is a treasury of feminist research examples that allows the reader to begin to understand what feminist methodologies are. There is an informative chapter by S. Laurel Weldon, who makes a

clear case for feminist standpoint epistemology. Annica Kronsell provides an argument for deconstructing knowledge and for hearing "silence" by focusing on what is not said. And Tami Jacoby offers a self-reflective account of conducting fieldwork—a primer for those about to conduct fieldwork.

Yet, the reader is almost left believing that feminist methodologies can be identified when seen but not defined. Fortunately, the last section, particularly the last two chapters, brings the book back into focus. The chapter by Fiona Robinson, "Methods of Feminist Normative Theory: A Political Ethic of Care for International Relations," highlights some of the norms behind feminist methodologies. And "Studying the Struggles and Wishes of the Age: Feminist Theoretical Methodology and Feminist Theoretical Methods," by Brooke A. Ackerly and Jacqui True, serves as a quite measured summary of the various arguments concerning feminist methodologies as presented in the book. From the last chapter, the reader gains an understanding of how feminist methodologies, with their focus on skeptical scrutiny, exclusionary inquiry, choosing a deliberative moment, and conceptualizing the field as a collective, extend critical IR theory. Readers further realize why feminist methodologies defy rigorous definition.

In spite of these accomplishments, however, the essays are unlikely to convince the uninitiated. The authors make a solid argument concerning the value of feminist methodologies for understanding gendered aspects of the world, but fail to convincingly demonstrate their direct contribution to international relations. The discussion begs a definition of international relations, which is clearly criticized as being far too narrowly construed. Part of the problem here is the way many of the book's chapters situate feminist methodologies in opposition to

international relations scholarship. Ideally, there ought to be space for the kind of work advocated here and that done in the conventionally defined subfields of IR, though, of course, relatively impermeable territorial boundaries often do exist, as the authors J. Ann Tickner, Marysia Zalewski, and Weldon highlight. All should understand, however, that there is equal value in studying state behavior without deconstructing the state, and in deconstructing the state to examine its foundation on gender power structures.

A second critique—which might be too easily, and unfortunately, dismissed as a question unique to those who accept dominant IR thinking—is the volume’s lack of criteria for evaluating feminist methodologies. It contains a wealth of information regarding how to determine whether or not a methodology is feminist but not how to judge the rigor of such research. This is no small concern. Imagine having to review a manuscript employing a feminist methodology. Assuming all else equal, three referees would likely offer different accounts of the methodological concerns. Even three reviewers identified as feminist methodologists would likely leave an editor unclear with respect to the manuscript’s methodological rigor. Feminist methodologies, as noted in the book, are not necessarily replicable and, according to Carol Cohn, often focus on “understanding” rather than “validity.” In her chapter “Motives and Methods: Using Multi-sited Ethnography to Study U.S. National Security Discourses,” Cohn writes: “I was not trying to prove a point or test a hypothesis, but to see what was there and think about it” (p. 104). She continues: “[There is not] one, true, accurate understanding to which any one of us has privileged access. . . . Each of us will bring different insights to understanding and interpreting that complexity, if we ‘listen to the material.’” (p. 105). There exists a fine line between requiring narrow criteria for IR methodology and erasing criteria of epistemic validity altogether. And it is not clear that this volume always navigates this line carefully.

Ultimately, the essays paint a broad-stroke picture of feminist IR methodologies, approaches, and concerns. The essays make clear that feminist concerns are not limited to international relations scholarship narrowly construed, but rather extend to questions of military policy (as discussed by Cohn and Kronsell) and national security more generally (as explored by Jacoby and Maria Stern). Indeed, the volume makes clear that feminist methodologies blur almost all conventional disciplinary boundaries (see, for example, Christine Sylvester’s argument for art criticism to be accepted as a valid IR methodology).

This edited volume is instructive in illuminating feminist methodologies and in highlighting the insights gained from them, and in many ways it provides useful cultural insights into the orientations and practices of feminist IR scholars. It tackles a difficult topic and should serve as a catalyst for further debate. Ackerly, Stern, and True make

a sizable contribution in providing insight into feminist methodologies and concerns and encouraging the reader to assess her own biases; to question “knowledge,” discipline boundaries, and definitions; to identify assumptions and exclusions; and to recognize the necessity of including gender in research—it is tempting to include the phrase “where relevant,” though the authors do make a solid argument that gender is always relevant.

Scare Tactics: The Politics of International Rivalry.

By Michael P. Colaresi. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2005.

232p. \$34.95.

DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707072088

— Brandon Valeriano, *University of Illinois at Chicago*

The emerging research program of international rivalries is an important branch of study within the international relations subfield. Rather than focus on rare events such as war, this research program seeks to understand the dynamics at work for what many scholars perceive to be the most dangerous pairs of interstate enemies in the system. Those enemies are historical rivals, typically coded as strategic or enduring rivals. In a rivalry, hatred is endemic and cooperation may be rare. These actors clearly are of a different sort than the rest of the system and need to be studied in their historical context.

While much work has been done to account for who the rivals are and why they might be important, little work has been done to explain how rivalries emerge, escalate, and terminate. It is from this research gap that Michael Colaresi’s book emerges. It is an important work that covers the domestic and international causes of escalation and de-escalation of rival states. Little work has been done at this point to connect domestic political motivations with rivalry dynamics. Colaresi does an excellent job of moving between the levels of domestic and international action to present a coherent theory of international action.

The author’s theory of dynamic two-level pressures centers on a very simple combination of internal domestic pressures and a state’s future expectations. The first pressure is termed rivalry outbidding. If a pair of states is confronted with a public and a set of elites who wish to continue and escalate a rivalry, there is little opportunity for a conflict to be resolved even in the context of a democratic system. Leaders who seek to terminate an external threat may not retain their grip on power if they rid a state of their important external enemies that may be critical for internal support (see, for example, Siad Barre in Ethiopia and his support from Ogaden clansmen). Even democracies are not immune to this effect in that opposing elites may use the peaceful inclinations of a leader to signal their overall weakness in dealing with a threatening actor and thereafter remove the actor from office in the next election (see, for example, Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan).