

IO

International Organization

Alexander Wendt

Anarchy Is What States Make of It

Markus Fischer

Feudal Europe: Discourse and Practices

James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul

Core and Periphery in the Post-Cold War Era

William R. Thompson and Lawrence Vescera

Growth Waves, Systemic Openness, and Protectionism

Geoffrey Garrett

The European Community's Internal Market

Sponsored by the World Peace Foundation
Edited at the University of Southern California
Published quarterly by The MIT Press

EDITORIAL BOARD

Peter Katzenstein, Chairperson

Vinod K. Aggarwal
David A. Baldwin
Robert Bates
Thomas J. Biersteker
Barry Buzan
Benjamin J. Cohen
Ellen T. Comisso
Peter F. Cowhey
Jack Donnelly
Peter Gourevitch

Joanne Gowa
Joseph M. Grieco
Ernst Haas
Christer Jönsson
Miles Kahler
Stephen Kobrin
Friedrich V. Kratochwil
David A. Lake
Charles S. Maier
Timothy J. McKeown

Helen V. Milner
Donald J. Puchala
Ronald Rogowski
John Gerard Ruggie
Duncan Snidal
Janice Stein
Beth V. Yarbrough
Oran R. Young
Mark W. Zacher

Editor: John S. Odell

Managing editor: Sharon Keller Maddox

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION invites the submission of manuscripts on all aspects of world politics and international political economy. Abstracts, manuscripts, and footnotes should be double-spaced. Footnotes should be numbered consecutively and placed at the end of the manuscript. Submit three copies (printed on one side of the page only), along with a statement of each author's affiliation, to the Editor, *International Organization, Center for International Studies, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089-0035*. Authors may expect a decision within two months of the Editor's receipt of a manuscript.

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 Southern California, or The MIT Press.

International Organization (ISSN 0020-8183) is published quarterly—Winter, Spring, Summer, and Autumn—by The MIT Press, 55 Hayward Street, Cambridge, MA 02142.

Subscriptions and business correspondence: For inquiries concerning subscriptions, write to MIT Press Journals, 55 Hayward Street, Cambridge, MA 02142, or telephone the Circulation Dept. at (617) 253-2889. Yearly subscription rates for students are \$20; for other individual subscribers, \$30; and for institutions, \$70. Subscribers outside the United States should add \$14 for postage and handling. Canadian subscribers also add 7% GST. To be honored free of charge, claims for missing copies must be made immediately upon receipt of the next published issue. Postmaster: send address changes to *International Organization*, 55 Hayward Street, Cambridge, MA 02142. Second Class postage is paid at Boston, MA, and at additional mailing offices.

Advertising: Please write to Advertising Manager, MIT Press Journals, 55 Hayward Street, Cambridge, MA 02142 USA, or telephone (617) 253-2886.

Rights and permissions: All inquiries concerning rights and permissions should be sent to *International Organization*, MIT Press Journals, 55 Hayward Street, Cambridge, MA 02142.

Permission to photocopy articles for internal or personal use or the internal or personal use of specific clients is granted by the World Peace Foundation and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for libraries and other users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC), provided that the fee of \$3.00 per copy is paid directly to CCC, 27 Congress Street, Salem, MA 01970. The fee code for users of the Transactional Reporting Service is 0020-8183/92 \$3.00. For those organizations that have been granted a photocopy license with CCC, a separate system of payment has been arranged.

© 1992 by the World Peace Foundation and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology
ISSN 0020-8183

∞ This publication is printed on acid-free paper.

Editor's note

John S. Odell

The time has come for a regular change at this journal's helm. Such moments provide occasions for taking stock and for reflecting upon our collective scholarly enterprise more broadly. One might ask the following, for example: What are the most significant problems in our literature today and the most important recent world developments on which scholars could concentrate with profit in the next few years? What new or evolving research programs and questions should get further attention from analysts and publishers? In what directions might *International Organization* evolve?

This note, though not attempting to answer all these questions definitively, will maintain that several especially interesting questions and approaches beckon us today and will show that *IO* remains ready to help disseminate the results, both in its traditional subject areas and by expanding in new directions.

These research opportunities and needs arise from developments both in research itself and in the world. Surely few eras of modern history have been more stimulating than the present for studying international economic and political relations. The last half-decade has introduced startling changes while simultaneously pushing some familiar trends further along. In the economic system, many markets and regions continue to become gradually more integrated with the rest of the world, while new barriers, concentrations of market power, and conflicts develop as well. Novel technologies and industry strategies change the issues facing governments. Continuing degradation of the natural environment, the other side of the economic coin, is drawing greater international attention, including bilateral and multilateral negotiations. Mean-

This note is a personal statement and not the expression of a decision made by the *IO* Board of Editors. I have, however, benefited from specific suggestions given by a multitude of board members and other thoughtful experts: David Baldwin, Robert Bates, Henry Bienen, Barry Buzan, Neta Crawford, Jack Donnelly, Jeffrey Frieden, Robert Friedheim, John Garofano, Alexander George, Peter Gourevitch, Joanne Gowa, Joseph Grieco, Ernst Haas, John Ikenberry, Robert Jarvis, Miles Kahler, Peter Katzenstein, Robert Keohane, Jonathan Kirshner, Stephen Krasner, Sean Lynn-Jones, Charles Maier, James Morrow, Joseph Nye, Ronald Rogowski, Richard Rose, James Rosenau, John Ruggie, Bruce Russett, David Singer, Susan Strange, Christine Sylvester, Thomas Willett, Beth Yarbrough, and Mark Zacher. Naturally, not all these scholars would agree with all aspects of this note or of one another's views. I bear sole responsibility.

International Organization 46, 2, Spring 1992

© 1992 by the World Peace Foundation and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology

while, macroeconomic coordination continues to elude the major financial states, and commercial competition sparks other governmental conflicts. Most striking has been the worldwide unprecedented trend away from central planning, state ownership, and regulation and toward liberal domestic and foreign economic policies. These policies have included renewed efforts to strengthen regional organizations and policy coordination in Europe, North America, and several regions of the developing world.

Even more dramatic have been the other historic transformations in the international political and security system. The cold war has ended in much of the world, the Warsaw Pact alliance has gone out of business, governments have dismantled some nuclear weapons, and parties to regional conflicts in several far-flung areas have converged toward settlements. New brutal wars have also erupted, and the United Nations has multiplied its peacekeeping activities like never before. While market forces encourage political integration in many areas, resurgent nationalism seems to be pushing simultaneously in the opposite direction in other areas. The retreat of the Communist party movement and the Communist state has become almost total, and democracies have also replaced other authoritarian states (at least formally). While Japan has continued to increase its economic power, Germany has reunited itself. Most spectacularly of all, a nuclear superpower has broken apart before our eyes. Soviet troops have lowered their red flag for the last time, and mapmakers are rushing to redraw the world. Sovereignty itself dominates the front page. One must return to 1945, 1919, and 1815 to find comparable eras of change.

International Organization's general approach

IO aims ultimately to contribute to a better understanding of this perplexing world. Toward that end, our standing objective is simply to publish promptly some of the most important scholarly papers on international political and economic affairs written in English anywhere while maintaining the highest standards of quality and fairness. The journal should be open to diversity and criticism and flexible enough to accommodate to lasting trends. It should add something as well, at least marginally, by framing needed debates, giving impulse to promising new research programs, and occasionally reviewing the accumulating work of more established programs. While *IO* concentrates on basic research, it welcomes such studies that draw practical conclusions relevant for policy problems and studies designed to address current problems through use of relevant theoretical and historical bodies of literature.

Both good “normal science” and fundamental criticism and innovation are crucial. Undervaluing what Thomas Kuhn called “normal science” may be responsible for one of the general problems in our field or at least in political science: susceptibility to fads. Broad ideas are introduced and pursued for a time, and then they seem to fade from popularity as sentiment moves toward other broad new ideas, before careful research has clearly established whether the former deserve to be displaced or incorporated. To be sure, particular

methodological techniques are also sometimes pushed beyond the point of diminishing returns. While few would celebrate the trivial, we do seek creative works that help discriminate among our many theory fragments in ways that contribute to the long-term cumulation of knowledge.

At the same time, *IO* remains eager to review works posing fresh questions and challenging predominant answers. This journal will continue to air new formulations and basic critiques—probing, for example, whether and how analysis reflects epistemological commitments, nationality, ethnicity, gender, or social position. Articles or research notes responding directly to previous pieces can be one lively means of illuminating broader as well as more specific issues.

Traditional subjects and promising opportunities

Subjects in which we have concentrated continue to merit primary attention. In response to the evolution of research and world events, however, *IO* should also explore selected other topics and approaches more fully than it has done, especially by building on its areas of greatest depth.

General theories of international relations and foreign policy. We continue to seek innovative contributions to general theories of international relations and foreign policy, using a mixture of creative methods ranging from the more precise to the more speculative. Theorists from all schools could explore, among other things, the lasting issues raised by recent world developments in historical perspective. Do these transformations allow us to reaffirm, refine, or reject any major propositions or to imagine better ones? These events are, in fact, raising for fresh scrutiny some of our most fundamental concepts and processes, including capitalism, socialism, democracy, nationalism, international power structure, state formation, legitimate authority, and sovereignty.

With respect to methods of theorizing, *IO* has not emphasized formal modeling. While not all theorizing requires mathematical formulations, deductive work can help uncover logical inconsistencies in other research and contribute interesting general propositions that unify diverse phenomena. *IO* welcomes formal as well as statistical studies that communicate their meanings for international relations effectively to a general readership.

Political economy. The journal has established itself particularly as a leading forum in international political economy. In this primary field, *IO* has specialized in theoretically relevant empirical research, rather than purely abstract or atheoretical studies. Political economy also presents inviting opportunities for specific new investigations. For instance, the international economic policies of nations other than the United States demand much more and better comparative analysis. The behavior of the European Community as a world actor is a surprising lacuna in our literature. Insufficient attention has

been given to the institutional origins of the large and growing volume of intrafirm trade and countertrade. Conversely, the possible contribution of international economic interdependence in inducing domestic institutional revolutions in the former Communist states would be worth exploring. The overlap of environmental and economic policymaking should generate important new propositions.

More generally, political economy still needs wider exploitation of insights that originate in the separate disciplines—economics, history, political science, sociology, and others. Doing multidisciplinary work thoroughly is much more difficult than calling for it, yet the long-term trend is toward more sophisticated familiarity in each discipline with the relevant bodies of literature of the others. (Naturally, this does not end controversy; disputes within disciplines are often as vigorous as those between.) Some analysts, for instance, are intrigued by transaction cost economics and its notion of the firm as a governance structure, a view that blurs traditional distinctions between firms, states, and international organizations. *IO* needs more works by economists addressing the multidisciplinary literature with at least some empirical materials. Our readers would welcome political science and other studies reflecting an even better understanding of economic hypotheses and findings about the specific markets they cover.

War, peace, and security. The stunning conclusion of the cold war is provoking a deep reexamination of security policies and studies by scholars on several continents. In my opinion, this literature's future development is likely to take place in this journal to a greater extent than in the recent past. While *IO* clearly is not a player in technical military debates, our founders were centrally concerned with war and peace, and more recently we have increased the number of articles on security conflicts and alliance politics. Now as war in general remains a real threat but the superpower nuclear balance in particular seems less urgent, security studies are likely to shift their emphasis more toward dimensions in which *IO* has specialized. Many observers have advocated the integration of military force into a broader analysis that examines nonmilitary influences on conflict, such as economic interdependence and industrial rivalry, and also considers nonmilitary processes and institutions for the avoidance and resolution of conflict, such as negotiation and international organization. In addition to these areas, *IO* has suggested ideas on domestic-international interactions that could illuminate security affairs, and in general our readers would prize efforts to strengthen this field theoretically. We welcome rigorous contributions to the conflict and security debate from all sides, not only from alternative perspectives but from more traditional ones as well.

Institutions. The journal continues to specialize in the analysis of international institutions, following the direction indicated in our first editorial note published in 1947. Institutional studies are not separate from the economic and security issue-areas; indeed, they are one way to tie diverse issues together. The

recent renewed energy behind European regional integration and the heightened profile of the United Nations during the Persian Gulf War and other conflicts will probably generate new works. This journal does not, however, seek to protect an orthodoxy of its own on this topic. For instance, an article in the spring 1991 issue recounted the excesses, failures, and costs of international organizations. Undoubtedly, this will not be the last word in this debate. More basic work is needed, for example, to document the multiple effects of international organizations—on state policies, markets, and conflicts—in part by more frequent systematic comparisons across institutions.

Negotiation. Recently, we have also published several studies of negotiation, but *IO* has not contributed as much as it might on this central process found in economic, security, and political arenas. Bargaining analysis need not be limited to interactions concerning multilateral rules or institutions, of course. States and firms often bargain bilaterally, and in fact some of those attempts probably have much more direct effects on markets and politics than many multilateral ones have. *IO* could usefully publish more studies of conflict resolution generally, whether quantitative or nonquantitative in method.

Policy ideas. Another expanding and promising research program of recent years has investigated the sources and effects of policy ideas, knowledge, epistemic communities, norms, and learning. A series of recent *IO* articles and notably the special winter 1992 issue illustrate this perspective. It, too, needs rigorous specification and fuller comparative empirical investigation, but if its implications prove valid, all the issue-areas discussed earlier could be affected.

Two levels. The journal's tradition does concentrate on things international, understood to mean cross-border interactions and institutions. This is not to exclude comparative studies that also feature properties of domestic markets or politics. Indeed, one research theme appearing in our pages has been designed precisely to merge insights about the international and domestic realms. This enterprise also has potential for unifying otherwise diverse economic, environmental, and political-security issue-areas. In this connection, we may soon see a serious reconsideration not only of nationalism as a force in world affairs but also of systemic conditions that dampen or stimulate nationalist expressions. *IO* normally does not publish studies in which neither the main causes nor the main effects are international—in contrast to *World Politics*, for example.

Also cutting across these issues are two final considerations. Since all topics benefit from historical depth, more studies by historians interested in these questions would enrich this journal. So, too, would more works by scholars based outside the United States. *IO* remains eager for submissions from a truly international community of scholars, either contributing to research enterprises that dominate our pages or identifying our parochialisms and demonstrating how North Americans could profit from other perspectives.

These brief thoughts have been meant to affirm and to stimulate but not to cover everything. They should not be read as indirect discouragement of any topic omitted; other thinkers, too, will generate many and better creative ideas. In any case, scholars will do what they find most interesting, regardless of editors' musings, and their priorities will shift again with time. Throughout, the contents of *IO* will be determined above all by the works submitted independently and by peer reviewers' judgments. As always, we aim to review each submission impartially and disseminate the best work available to us.

Procedures

Our review process is "anonymous, thorough, and prompt," as Peter Katzenstein wrote in 1981. Our policy is to provide an editorial decision with careful written comments within two months of submission. We keep our backlog limited, speeding the appearance of manuscripts accepted.

IO seeks proposals for innovative special issues to be designed and edited by guest editors. By these means, we hope to focus particular attention on promising perspectives and important subjects. Influential special issues may take a variety of forms. The journal's office can provide suggested guidelines in writing. Proposals are evaluated by the Board of Editors annually and should reach the editor in final form not later than 30 June.

In addition to whole special issues, we consider publication of symposia, sets of two to five articles on the same topic. Manuscripts submitted together as a possible symposium are all reviewed by the same referees, applying the journal's usual criteria. If any of the manuscripts is rejected, this does not jeopardize publication of the others. The address of the new editorial office is shown on the inside front cover.

The *IO* Board of Editors plays a vigorous central role. Its hardworking members perform the majority of peer reviews, and they meet annually to assess the journal as a whole. At the same time, the bylaws require turnover on the board, which elects its successors by secret ballot. Thus, for instance, only five members listed in this issue—fewer than 20 percent—were members ten years ago. In addition, the editor seeks reviews from scholars not on the board whenever additional expertise or perspective is needed.

The board and I would appreciate assessments and suggestions from any reader. I am most grateful to Professor Stephen Krasner for his leadership during the past five years and to the board for the honor of succeeding him. The view from the helm, in sum, is an array of fascinating intellectual challenges; let us work to ensure that scholarship realizes some of its opportunities for progress.

International Organization

Volume 46, Number 2, Spring 1992

Articles

- Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics *Alexander Wendt* 391
- Feudal Europe, 800–1300: communal discourse and conflictual practices *Markus Fischer* 427
- A tale of two worlds: core and periphery in the post–cold war era *James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul* 467
- Growth waves, systemic openness, and protectionism *William R. Thompson and Lawrence Vescera* 493
- International cooperation and institutional choice: the European Community’s internal market *Geoffrey Garrett* 533

International Organization gratefully acknowledges the assistance of the following additional reviewers during 1991:

Emanuel Adler
Marie Anchordoguy
William Ascher
Michael Barnett
Bruce Bueno de Mesquita
Valerie Bunce
Alan Cafruny
David Cameron
James Caporaso
John A. C. Conybeare
Bruce Cumings
David Dessler
Dennis Encarnation
Matthew Evangelista
Peter Evans
Jeffrey Frieden
Giulio Gallarotti
Geoffrey Garrett
Judith Goldstein
Peter Haas
Stephan Haggard
Leah Haus
Jeffrey Herbst
Raymond Hopkins
G. John Ikenberry
Harold K. Jacobson
Bruce W. Jentleson
Robert Jervis
Ethan B. Kapstein
Robert Kudrle

Charles A. Kupchan
Peter Lange
Fred Lawson
Jack Levy
Charles Lipson
Lisa Martin
Michael Mastanduno
Chung-in Moon
Theodore H. Moran
Andrew Moravcsik
Joseph Nye
John S. Odell
John R. Oneal
T. J. Pempel
M. J. Peterson
James Lee Ray
Simon Reich
J. David Richardson
Richard Rosecrance
James Rosenau
Herman Schwartz
Kenneth Sharpe
Arthur Stein
William Thompson
Stephen Walt
Michael Webb
Steve Weber
Alexander Wendt
Wing Thye Woo
David B. Yoffie

Contributors

Markus Fischer is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Political Science at the University of Chicago.

Geoffrey Garrett is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Stanford University and a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California.

James M. Goldgeier is Assistant Professor of Government at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

Michael McFaul is a Visiting Research Fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford, California.

William R. Thompson is Professor of Political Science and Director of the Center for the Study of International Relations at Indiana University, Bloomington.

Lawrence Vescera is a Ph.D. candidate at the Center for Politics and Policy, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California.

Alexander Wendt is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

Abstracts

Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics

by Alexander Wendt

The claim that international institutions can transform state interests is central to neoliberal challenges to the realist assumption that “process” (interaction and learning among states) cannot fundamentally affect system “structure” (anarchy and the distribution of capabilities). Systematic development of this claim, however, has been hampered by the neoliberals’ commitment to rational choice theory, which treats interests as exogenously given and thus offers only a weak form of institutional analysis. A growing body of international relations scholarship points to ways in which the identities and interests of states are socially constructed by knowledgeable practice. This article builds a bridge between this scholarship and neoliberalism by developing a theory of identity- and interest-formation in support of the neoliberal claim that international institutions can transform state interests. Its substantive focus is the realist view that anarchies are necessarily self-help systems, which justifies disinterest in processes of identity- and interest-formation. Self-help is a function not of anarchy but of process and, as such, is itself an institution that determines the meaning of anarchy and the distribution of power for state action. The article concludes with an examination of how this institution can be transformed by practices of sovereignty, by an evolution of cooperation, and by critical strategic practice.

Feudal Europe, 800–1300: communal discourse and conflictual practices

by Markus Fischer

The application of critical theory to international relations has resulted in a most significant theoretical challenge to the neorealist paradigm. To gain empirical validation as well, critical theorists have suggested that the distinct character of the medieval system supports their argument that international politics is subject to fundamental change. Assuming that medieval discourse consisted of communal norms, critical theorists would expect the behavior of medieval actors to be correspondingly cooperative. If true, medieval politics would have differed fundamentally from the conflictual politics of modern states. In examining the discourse and practices of medieval actors, this article probes the historical record of the central period of the Middle Ages, the feudal age, which lasted from about A.D. 800 to 1300. While it confirms the communal and cooperative character of feudal discourse, it finds that the actual practices of feudal

actors stood in stark contrast to the norms they professed, notwithstanding some adherence on the level of formal appearances. In essence, like modern states, feudal actors had to arm themselves to remain independent, sought to conquer one another, concluded alliances, formed spheres of influence, and resolved their conflicts by force. The results of the investigation cast grave doubts on the twin arguments of critical theorists that discourse shapes practice and that the international system undergoes fundamental change. Conversely, the results support the neorealist view that international politics is permanently conflictual because of the structural constraint that arises from the enduring absence of central authority. Moreover, the finding that the logic of power politics held among feudal knights and their retainers suggests that neorealism could expand its analytic scope to the individual level.

A tale of two worlds: core and periphery in the post-cold war era by James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul

Many structural realists have argued that a future multipolar international system will be less stable than the bipolar system of the cold war era. This article suggests that arguments based on the stability of a bipolar or multipolar system are misplaced. Focusing instead on democracy, economic interdependence, and technology as factors making war or peace more likely, the article argues that the future will best be described as a tale of two worlds. In the core states, the growth of shared norms concerning democracy and markets will not only make balance-of-power politics among the great powers a thing of the past but will also make nuclear weapons less important for maintaining stability than they were during the cold war. In the peripheral states, however, the absence of absolute deterrents to war as well as an absence of shared norms about democracy and markets will make old-style balance-of-power politics the norm. A new research agenda is needed to consider the relations within the liberal core and the realist periphery as well as between these two worlds.

Growth waves, systemic openness, and protectionism by William R. Thompson and Lawrence Vescera

Analysts have argued that systemic openness and protectionism can be explained in terms of hegemonic stability, ideas, surplus capacity, business cycles, or shifts in elite orientation. None of these approaches, however, develops an appreciation for the fundamental politicoeconomic processes that would allow the different emphases to be related to one another. This article offers a potentially integrative approach focusing on technological leadership and on recurring growth waves, which are characterized in alternating pattern by the ascent of system leaders and the subsequent successful attempt of technological followers to catch up. It argues that while protectionism is generally more likely to occur during wave downturns, it is more intense in the catch-up wave than in the ascent wave, since competition for leadership succession is more intense and the gap between leaders and followers is narrower during the catch-up period. To illustrate the applicability of this perspective, the article examines historical evidence on growth in trade, gross domestic product, industrial production, and the ratio of customs revenues to imports.

International cooperation and institutional choice: the European Community's internal market

by Geoffrey Garrett

The decision of the European Community (EC) members to complete their internal market is an important instance of international cooperation. The economic objective is to remove a wide array of nontariff barriers to trade that elsewhere have proved intractable. The institutional structures established to reach this goal heavily constrain the autonomy of sovereign states and cannot be explained by traditional theories of international cooperation that focus on the efficiency of solutions to collective action problems. Many forms of trade liberalization would have represented Pareto improvements for the EC. The specific choices made, such as the reform of decision making by the Council of Ministers, the EC Commission, and the European Parliament, reflected the relative bargaining power of the various member states. This bargaining power was influenced by asymmetries in economic dependence, differences in time horizons, and differences in domestic constraints on national governments. Specifically, the choices reflected the preferences of France and especially Germany, which can be expected to benefit considerably from the economic outcomes generated by the institutional structures of the internal market.