IO's Expanding Agenda: 2007–2012

Emanuel Adler and Louis Pauly

As we celebrate *IO*'s seventieth anniversary, we acknowledge how the journal has both reflected and significantly shaped a rapidly evolving field of study. As our predecessors have noted, *IO* started with the study of discrete international organizations and gradually broadened and deepened in both theoretical and empirical terms to encompass comparative politics, political economy, organization theory, security studies, political theory, and world history—all in the cause of advancing and broadening the field of international relations. Early work on interdependence promoted by the journal opened the field to questions not traditionally asked by scholars focused on issues of national security and foreign policy. In a mainly US-centered academic environment, it also opened the door a little to contributors from abroad. During the influential editorships of Bob Keohane and Peter Katzenstein, a prominent subfield of IR still associated with the journal came into its own. International political economy (IPE), especially the American variant prominently signified by liberal institutionalism and increasing methodological rigor, received a very large boost as the journal progressed through the 1980s and 1990s.

It is true that all of our distinguished predecessors shared an interest in IPE questions but the significant impact of those questions on the journal as well as on the rapidly developing subfield of IPE mainly reflected underlying concerns with the traditional questions of IR. Canadians might refer to them as enquiring into the causes and consequences of "peace, order, and good government" at the level of the global system. Thus, despite the dominance of economic themes, articles on security issues, non-economic dilemmas of collective action, and international theory continued to appear regularly in *IO*. It is also true that positivist/rationalist approaches akin to those dominating mainstream economics journals informed a large proportion of articles published in recent decades. However, as Keohane, Katzenstein, and Krasner noted in their fiftieth-anniversary essay, the journal had opened itself over time to a widening array of submissions on the generation and international spread of ideas, some of which pioneered and rendered accessible to a wider audience sociologically informed work, now often associated with the label "constructivism."[1] Perhaps not coincidentally, submissions from outside of the American mainstream and from outside of the United States gradually began to rise as scholars saw the journal as a unique venue for deep interdisciplinary debate in a changing world.

Thus, when we took up the daunting task of editing *IO*, we understood it not only to include the maintenance of *IO*'s prominence but also to continue encouraging an expansion in the collective interests of the field. We thought that mainstream IR had come a long way in advancing fine work employing both economic and sociological approaches, and we wanted to encourage authors across a wider spectrum to consider *IO* as their "home"—the premier venue for the publication of truly novel ideas with the

[1] Keohane, Katzenstein, Krasner 1998.

potential to enrich the field as a whole. Finally, we welcomed submissions that would be both theoretically and empirically illuminating about changes occurring in the global economy, the international security context, the arena for human and gender rights, and the global physical environment.

As our predecessors have pointed out, editors actually have very little discretion. Everything depends upon what comes in the open door. Much of what eventually appears in an academic journal demonstrates the natural time lag between real-time events and rigorous analysis. Not surprisingly, few submissions during our time focused on "big structures and large processes" affecting and being affected by the global financial crisis. The system was in motion and scholars were in "observation" mode. They needed time for deeper analysis. The journal was nevertheless stimulated by a number of articles based on sociological approaches, thus accurately reflecting transformational research that was taking place not only in the US but also around the world. During our time, there was no doubt that the tendency to frame theoretical debates around the established and increasingly rigid theoretical paradigms of the past had almost disappeared. Authors had clearly begun taking as natural the use of a variety of approaches and methods to open the path to better explanations of important developments in both the world and in IR scholarship.

As in earlier periods, a great many of the articles published between 2007 and 2012 have stood the test of time and continue to be widely cited. The credit goes to the authors and reviewers, especially the board reviewers who typically did about a dozen reviews each year for us.

Among the most-cited articles to appear during our watch were:

Busch, Marc L. 2007. Overlapping Institutions, Forum Shopping, and Dispute Settlement in International Trade. *International Organization* 61 (4):735–61.

Goldstein, Judith L., Douglas Rivers, and Michael Tomz. 2007. Institutions in International Relations: Understanding the Effects of the GATT and the WTO on World Trade. *International Organization* 61 (1):37–67.

Hainmueller, Jens, and Michael J. Hiscox. 2007. Educated Preferences: Explaining Attitudes Toward Migration in Europe. *International Organization* 61 (2):399–442.

Keohane, Robert O., Stephen Macedo, and Andrew Moravcsik. 2009. Democracy-Enhancing Multilateralism. *International Organization* 63 (1):1–31.

Morrison, Kevin M. 2009. Oil, Nontax Revenue, and the Redistributional Foundations of Regime Stability. *International Organization* 63 (1):107–38.

Tomz, Michael. 2007. Domestic Audience Costs in International Relations: An Experimental Approach. *International Organization* 61 (4):821–40.

Weeks, Jessica L. 2008. Autocratic Audience Costs: Regime Type and Signaling Resolve. *International Organization* 62 (1):35–64.

We are very happy to have accepted these and many other excellent articles across the growing field of IR, a number of which later evolved into books. We've decided here, however, to highlight two groups of articles from our period as editors.

First, under the category "greatest hits," we list three articles that helped integrate the sociological approach into IR's mainstream and three articles with other approaches that also left a strong mark on the field. Second, under the category "worth more attention," we list five articles that deserve a wider readership.

Greatest Hits

Sociological Approaches

> Vincent Pouliot. 2008. The Logic of Practicality: A Theory of Practice in Security Communities. *International Organization* 62 (2):257–88.

Having now become one of the most cited articles since 2007, Pouliot's seminal article contributed to an emerging research program on the primacy of practices in, or what he calls "the logic of practicality" of, world politics. Relying on the recent "turn to practice" in social theory, Pouliot argued that while it is complementary with the other logics of social action, such as instrumental rationality, rules-driven, and communication-driven behavior, the "logic of practicality" is ontologically prior to other logics because it is located at the intersection of structure and agency. Moreover, the other logics have a bias toward the notion of "representational knowledge," namely, that agents "think about" something.

This notion is inconsistent with practice scholarship's strong findings that agents "think from" something—that what agents do is based on background or inarticulate knowledge, which makes actions appear "commonsensical." To show the relevance of practice theory, Pouliot built on Pierre Bourdieu and "his conceptual triad of habitus, field, and practical sense" to develop a theory of practice of security communities. Accordingly, "peace exists in and through practice when security officials' practical sense makes diplomacy the self-evident way to solving interstate disputes."[2] He also discussed the methodological implications of such theory, thus showing how it can be applied empirically.

> Jörg Friedrichs and Friedrich Kratochwil. 2009. On Acting and Knowing: How Pragmatism Can Advance International Relations Research and Methodology. *International Organization* 63 (4):701–31.

Before becoming editors of *IO*, one of us had a conversation with a positivist member of the *IO* board in which we agreed that positivist epistemology is flawed. However, s/he said, "I will stick to positivism until someone can show me a better alternative." In this article, Friedrichs and Kratochwil aim to provide such an alternative. After pointing out the problems associated with positivist epistemology in the social sciences and discussing how pragmatism had become an explicit subject in the IR agenda, they suggest a pragmatist research strategy that juxtaposes standard methodology, theory synthesis, analytic eclecticism, and abduction. In particular, they argue that abduction represents a concrete example of how pragmatism suggests pursuing social scientific

[2] Pouliot 2008, 257.

research. To illustrate the approach, they apply it to the analysis of European state preferences on regional integration. It is possible that this widely cited article did not entirely persuade our good friend on the *IO* board, but by presenting a social scientific alternative to positivism, it plays a useful role in the pages of *IO* and will stand the test of time.

> Richard Price. 2008. Moral Limit and Possibility in World Politics. *International Organization* 62 (2):191–220.

Of those that came in for review, Price wrote one of the best articles that speak to the question of ethics. We saw in it an opportunity not only to begin a dialogue among mainstream constructivists and critical theorists, who are best known for discussing such questions directly in the IR field, but also more generally the opportunity to enlarge the scope of the *IO* agenda. Two outstanding referees agreed.

Profound questions of political theory whose answers may partly be founded in empirical research belong in the journal. This article tries to show how and why constructivism, which has already addressed the scientific implications of normative change, may also be most adequate to address ethical questions. Most suggestive, however, was the more general notion that IR scholars can address ethical issues by combining analytical and normative IR theory. By proposing a roadmap to address ethical questions, this article continues to stimulate an important debate on whether and how IR theorists should address ethical issues and assess evidence of "progress" in global affairs.

Other Approaches

> Emilie M. Hafner-Burton. 2008. Sticks and Stones: Naming and Shaming the Human Rights Enforcement Problem. *International Organization* 62 (4):689–716.

A pioneering effort to differentiate, estimate, and assess the consequences of common strategies for encouraging compliance with global norms, this article puts the spotlight on the unintended consequences of campaigns to promote human rights. The objective remains worthy, but the real world of politics needs to be taken into account when novel policies are designed. For a new generation of IR scholars, the article provides an example of how rigorous scholarly work can have serious policy implications.

> Emilie M. Hafner-Burton, Miles Kahler, and Alexander H. Montgomery. 2009. Network Analysis for International Relations. *International Organization* 63 (3):559–92.

This insightful essay takes seriously the challenge of rendering the concept of networks useful and measurable in the field of IR. It investigates "network structures" which it sees as "emergent properties of persistent patterns of relations among agents that can

define, enable, and constrain those agents."[3] "Network power," in turn, is understood to be observable along three different pathways: access, brokerage, and exit. The essay set the stage for deeper analysis of networks ranging from transnational advocacy networks to terrorist networks as their impact of the system continued rapidly to expand.

> Jonathan Mercer. 2010. Emotional Beliefs. *International Organization* 64 (1):1–31.

This paper is a path-breaking piece that taps into new research in psychology and the neurosciences. Cognition and emotion constitute beliefs, and rationality can only be understood as resting on this foundation. Mercer takes this now well-supported argument a step further and shows how emotional commitments can have predictable effects and implications for policy. "How one fights terrorism," for example, "changes if one views credibility as an emotional belief."[4]

Worth More Attention

> James A. Caporaso and Sidney Tarrow. 2009. Polanyi in Brussels: Supranational Institutions and the Transnational Embedding of Markets. *International Organization* 63 (4):593–620.

Comparative politics and international relations again meet between the covers of *IO*. This article traces the effects of supranational legal decisions on the fabric of integrating markets and transnationalizing societies.

> Séverine Autesserre. 2009. Hobbes in the Congo: Frames, Local Violence, and International Intervention. *International Organization* 63 (2):249–80.

Peace-building efforts often fail. This stimulating research demonstrates convincingly that the way well-intentioned external actors discursively frame the underlying issues can be the source of the problem.

> Christian Reus Smit. 2011. Struggles for Individual Rights and the Expansion of the International System. *International Organization* 65 (2):207–42.

Reus-Smit shows here that during the last five centuries, revolutionary ideas on individual rights were at the root of the demand for sovereignty and the delegitimation of empires. He argues quite elegantly that they lay behind the ensuing expansion of international systems and the evolution of international order. His article proposes a

[3] Hafner-Burton, Kahler, and Montgomery 2009, 559.
[4] Mercer 2010, 1.

novel theory about the social nature of international systems and how international orders transform.

> Jordan Branch. 2011. Mapping the Sovereign State: Technology, Authority, and Systemic Change. *International Organization* 65 (1):1–36.

Going beyond the path opened by John Ruggie in the pages of *IO*, Branch's article demonstrates that representational practices of map-making changed how actors thought about space, authority, and organization, thus preceding and shaping the creation of sovereign states and their practices.

> Michael Barnett. 2011. Evolution Without Progress? Humanitarianism in a World of Hurt. *International Organization* 63 (4):621–63.

Drawing from evolutionary social science and organizational theory, Barnett explores the question of whether normative evolution can be consistent with moral progress. With a focus on the evolution of humanitarian practices, Barnett shows that the powerful forces that drive moral improvement tend to reinforce power inequalities and domination. Normative evolution, therefore, seems to be inconsistent with moral progress. Humanitarian practitioners' reflexive and learning capacity may be able to help transform "evolution without progress."

References

Hafner-Burton, Emilie M., Miles Kahler, and Alexander H. Montgomery. 2009. Network Analysis for International Relations. *International Organization* 63 (3):559–92.

Katzenstein, Peter J., Robert O. Keohane, and Stephen D. Krasner. 1998. Preface: *International Organization* at Its Golden Anniversary. *International Organization* 52 (4):xv-xviii.

Mercer, Jonathan. 2010. Emotional Beliefs. *International Organization* 64 (1):1–31.

Pouliot, Vincent. 2008. The Logic of Practicality: A Theory of Practice in Security Communities. *International Organization* 62 (2):257–88.