

dimensions to light and thereby to advance debate on the direction of the discipline.

The volume is divided into eight sections. Following Reus-Smit and Snidal's introduction, Part II, 'Imagining the Discipline', contains four chapters setting out contrasting views on what the empirical focus of the discipline should be. Part III, the lengthiest section, contains essays on the major theoretical perspectives in IR. The structure of this section highlights the editors' innovative approach. In keeping with Reus-Smit and Snidal's conviction that the normative dimensions of IR theorizing have been unduly neglected, each chapter describing a dominant approach to IR is followed by a chapter that addresses the normative underpinnings and commitments of that approach. The chapter on 'Realism', for example, is followed by an essay on 'The Ethics of Realism'. Part IV sets out the principal methodological approaches of the discipline. Part V considers the interaction between IR and various 'subfields': international political economy; strategic studies; foreign-policy decision-making; international ethics; and international law. Part VI, 'The Scholar and the Policy-Maker', contains two essays reflecting on the relationship between theory and practice; Part VII has two essays on cultural diversity in IR theory. The final section, 'Old and New', comprises five very different chapters considering the state of the discipline as it stands, and how it should approach the future.

The *Handbook* caters to a variety of audiences. Those seeking capsule introductions to the dominant approaches to IR will find high-quality contributions in Part III. Those looking for critical engagement will find much to grapple with in the chapters that present the ethics of those approaches. The chapters on methodology will be of interest to social scientists more generally. There is inevitable overlap and repetition between various chapters, but in general the structure of the volume is attractive.

The substantive approaches covered in Part III are realism; Marxism; neoliberal institutionalism; new liberalism; the English School; constructivism; critical theory; postmodernism; and feminism. The editors have chosen to solicit different authors to

Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal (eds). ***The Oxford Handbook of International Relations***, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. Pp. 800. \$150.00. ISBN: 9780199219322.

The establishment of International Relations (IR) as a discrete field of inquiry led to a rupture with legal and historical discourses. What followed was an almost unchallenged focus on explanatory and predictive analysis, and ethical questions were laid aside. The *Oxford Handbook of International Relations* is driven by the editors' conviction that the segregation of the empirical from the normative is untenable: both aspects permeate IR theories. The volume is more than a survey of the dominant approaches to the study of IR; it seeks to bring the tensions between empirical and normative

present the empirical and normative faces of each IR theory. This decision pays off well; what is lost in continuity is, on the whole, made up for in insight drawn from outside approaches and fresh perspectives. The ‘ethics’ chapters are often highly critical of the approach under discussion. The attention to normative questions draws out similarities across various theories but also highlights the underlying methodological differences, which are further explored in Part IV.

For a volume explicitly concerned with the normative dimension of international relations, it is perhaps surprising that there is not more attention devoted to international law. There are two contributions by international lawyers. Gerry Simpson, in a chapter on ‘The Ethics of the New Liberalism’, offers a persuasive critique of new liberal approaches to international relations and international law. Simpson argues that new liberalism’s normative content remains opaque, suppressed in favour of description of the putative new world order of transnational networks (at 262–263). Michael Byers provides an insightful chapter on the way in which IR theory has demonstrated a progressively serious engagement with issues of international law. He suggests that the IR approach perhaps most amenable to international law, constructivism, often fails to take into account the impact of power on normative understandings, and that its engagement with international law requires ‘broadening, deepening, and a degree of disillusioning’ (at 624). In grasping the nature of international law-making, Byers proposes an ‘eclectic’ approach that rejects hermetic theorizing in favour of borrowing across IR theories and between disciplines.

The merits of such ‘eclectic’ theorizing are discussed by Peter Katzenstein and Rudra Sil in the opening chapter of Part III. That such a modest call for collaboration across competing IR approaches is needed at all says a great deal about the fervour of the theoretical disputes that have divided the discipline. As a number of contributors point out, there remains a considerable divide often along geographical lines, with US and European approaches fundamentally at odds, particularly in terms

of their methodological assumptions. It is thus not surprising that chapters devoted to empirical and scientific modes of analysis, such as rational choice, quantitative methods, and psychological approaches, are all contributed by academics at US universities; chapters on ‘sociological approaches’ and ‘historical methods’ are provided by European scholars. The lack of cultural diversity in IR theory is taken up in Part VII and by Phillip Darby in Chapter 5. However, this concern for diversity is not reflected in the choice of contributors: while there are a number of chapters by scholars in Australia, Canada and New Zealand, it is surprising that there is only one contribution from continental Europe (and Friedrich Kratochwil, who contributes the chapter on sociological methodology, has in fact spent much of his career in the United States) and no contributions from scholars from institutions in the Global South.

Whether the *Handbook* has achieved its objective of advancing the debate on the future of the discipline is best left to IR specialists. But it can be warmly recommended to international lawyers seeking to enter the world of IR theory for the first time, and to those familiar with the literature who seek a reference work of depth and sophistication.

## Individual Contributions

### Part I Introduction

*Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal*,  
Between utopia and reality: the practical  
discourses of international relations;

### Part II Imagining the discipline

*David A. Lake*, The state and international  
relations;

*Michael Barnett and Kathryn Sikkink*, From  
international relations to global society;

*Robert Cox*, The point is not just to explain  
the world but to change it;

*Phillip Darby*, A disabling discipline;

### Part III Major theoretical perspectives

*Peter Katzenstein and Rudra Sil*, Eclectic  
theorizing in the study and practice of  
international relations;

*William C. Wohlforth*, Realism;

*Jack Donnelly*, The ethics of realism;

*Benno Teschke*, Marxism;

*Nicholas Rengger*, The ethics of Marxism;

*Arthur A. Stein*, Neoliberal institutionalism;

*James L. Richardson*, The ethics of neoliberal institutionalism;

*Andrew Moravcsik*, The new liberalism;

*Gerry Simpson*, The ethics of the new liberalism;

*Tim Dunne*, The English School;

*Molly Cochran*, The ethics of the English School;

*Ian Hurd*, Constructivism;

*Richard Price*, The ethics of constructivism;

*Richard Shapcott*, Critical theory;

*Robyn Eckersley*, The ethics of critical theory;

*Anthony Burke*, Postmodernism;

*Peter Lawler*, The ethics of postmodernism;

*Sandra Whitworth*, Feminism;

*Jacqui True*, The ethics of feminism;

Part IV The question of method

*Andrew H. Kydd*, Methodological individualism and rational choice;

*Friedrich Kratochwil*, Sociological approaches;

*James Goldgeier and Philip Tetlock*,

Psychological approaches;

*Edward D. Mansfield and Jon C. Pevehouse*, Quantitative approaches;

*Andrew Bennett and Colin Elman*, Case study methods;

*Joel Quirk*, Historical methods;

Part V Bridging the subfield boundaries

*John Ravenhill*, International political economy;

*Robert Ayson*, Strategic studies;

*Douglas T. Stuart*, Foreign policy decision-making;

*Terry Nardin*, International ethics;

*Michael Byers*, International law;

Part VI The scholar and the policy-maker

*Henry R. Nau*, Scholarship and policy-making: who speaks truth to whom?;

*Joseph S. Nye, Jr.*, International relations: the relevance of theory to practice;

Part VII The question of diversity

*David L. Blaney and Naem Inayatullah*, International relations from below;

*Richard Little*: International relations theory from a former hegemon;

Part VIII Old and new

*Janice Bially Mattern*, The concept of power and the (un)discipline of international relations;

*Toni Erskine*, Locating responsibility: the problem of moral agency in international relations;

*Robert O. Keohane*, Big questions in the study of world politics;

*Richard Rosecrance*, The failure of static and the need for dynamic approaches to international relations;

*Steve Smith*, Six wishes for a more relevant discipline of international relations.

*James Upcher*

*DPhil Candidate in Law, Merton College, Oxford*  
Email: james.upcher@merton.ox.ac.uk

doi: 10.1093/ejil/chp111