

sion of Alexander Wendt's now-central *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge University Press, 1999), which appeared after the essay was written. (More generally, despite the February 2002 publication date, the book contains no references to *any* work published later than 1999.) Constructivism's evil twin, post-modern deconstructionism, which tore through international relations in the early 1990s, probably receives more attention (largely negative) in the book than is warranted at present.

The entire work is self-consciously "mainstream" (xiii). Nevertheless, some important theoretical approaches receive almost no attention, notably rational choice (now the most prevalent formal modeling approach in IR) and feminist theory (the focus of one of the largest sub-sections in the ISA). Similarly, while all of the contributors hold named chairs and two are former presidents of the ISA, they represent a relatively narrow generational and geographical niche. There are no contributors from the major graduate schools in the U.S. Northeast, Midwest, or West coast or from outside the United States, and no younger scholars.

In the first essay of the book, Lapid appeals for greater attention to flexible, middle-ground theories. After reading this survey, I am struck by the possibility that we may already have achieved this provided IR is viewed as a collection of middle-range theories specific to various regions and historical circumstances. For example, while structural realism may be an excellent description of the European state system from 1848 to 1945, radical theories could best describe the political situation in most of the Third World during the same time, and constructivism, the behavior of the emerging world powers, United States and Japan. The primary problem with contemporary IR is that all of these approaches claim to be *universal* theories. But to paraphrase Dr. Benjamin Spock, we may know more than we think we know.

Philip A. Schrodt, *University of Kansas*

Global Political Economy: Understanding the International Economic Order. By Robert Gilpin with the assistance of Jean M. Gilpin. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001. Pp. 423. \$65.00 cloth, \$19.95 paper.)

This is an outstanding update of the author's earlier book, *The Political Economy of International Relations* (1987). It is meant to complement Gilpin's more recent work, *The Challenge of Global Capitalism* (2000). In *Global Political Economy*, Gilpin discusses a wide range of theories in the field, combining careful textual analysis with advocacy of his own views. The author's own theoretical stance is one of "state-centric realism." He identifies with authors like Thucydides, Machiavelli, and Hans Morgenthau, but not with what he calls the "systemic realism" of authors like Kenneth Waltz. While he admires and uses the work of contemporary economists, he also carefully differentiates his approach from theirs (chap. 3). Except for a brief acknowledgement of the difficulty of

explaining European integration in state-centric realist terms (chap. 13) and a bit of defensiveness on the continued value of theories of hegemonial stability (chap. 4), Gilpin does a good job of defending his views.

The author does an excellent job of surveying recent work in economics without resorting to jargon. There are outstanding treatments of topics like the continued relevance of Heckscher-Ohlin trade theory, strategic trade, endogenous growth theory, and the new economic geography. The discussion of the globalization of international finance in Chapter 10 emphasizes the need to take into account the “increased interdependence of trade, monetary, and other aspects of the international economy” that results from “movement toward a single, globally integrated market for corporation ownership” (277). Chapter 11 provides a state-of-the-art discussion of the role of multinational corporations in the world economy. Chapter 12 does a fine job of discussing the likely future of theories of the developmental state in light of the Asian crises of the late 1990s. The final chapter lays out three major scenarios for governance of the world economy, informed as always by the author’s realist views.

This book is long and dense. There are few wasted or unnecessary words. It is not easy to read. However, it could be used for graduate seminars or upper division undergraduate courses in international political economy in conjunction with texts that are more empirical or descriptive in their treatment of international political economy.

Global Political Economy is an excellent book. It represents a major and successful updating of *The Political Economy of International Relations*. Any person interested in international political economy can profit from reading it.

Jeffrey Hart, *Indiana University*

The European Commission and the Integration of Europe: Images of Governance.

By Liesbet Hooghe. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Pp. ix, 279. \$65.00 cloth, \$23.00 paper.)

Liesbet Hooghe’s study systematically explores how the top commissioners of Europe differ in their visions and preferences for a European Union. Her study is based on data collected from her personal interviews of 137 top European Commission officials during 1996 and 1997. The opened-ended data from such interviews were supplemented with survey instruments of each respondent, thus offering Hooghe a rich lode from which to build a simplified but accurate interpretation of the motivations lying at the heart of the Commission. Hooghe tests whether such preferences and visions derive from a social or utilitarian context. That is, do values acquired through socialization both within and outside of the Commission shape the Commissioner’s attitudes toward the European Union, or are such views the product of basic pragmatic calculations of cost-benefit analysis of the official’s bureaucratic and political authority and interests?

To do so, she concentrates on four issues that at the time (and for the most