

within the IMF takes place. They also stress the importance of economic ideas in the decision-making process and explain how competing ideas have developed over time. However, when it comes to the question of how the IMF has adapted to the recent challenges of financial globalization, the answer provided by the book remains partial. The strong emphasis on the IMF's interpretations of the different crises without a more thorough examination of the actual policy outcomes makes it difficult for the study to illustrate the patterns of adaptation convincingly.

Despite the above criticisms, the analysis remains a valuable empirical study that, first of all, tells us a good deal about deliberation processes within the IMF. The constructivist approach demonstrates the crucial impact of economic ideas, traces their paths within the IMF and offers a more nuanced perspective than the traditional portrayal of the IMF as a mere vassal of the United States. The work also contributes to the principal-agent debate by showing how agents within the IMF itself impact decision-making processes. The main strength of the book lies in its qualitative research methodology and notably its insightful interviews with high-profile IMF officials. In sum, Moschella's volume is accessible, suited for a wide range of readers and succeeds in re-invigorating the debate about the IMF among political economists.

Benedikt Erforth © 2012
University of Trento

Notes on contributor

Benedikt Erforth (MSc, University of Edinburgh) is a doctoral candidate at the School of International Studies, University of Trento, Italy. His research interests include European external affairs, French foreign policy, the conceptualization of power, and bridge-building between realist and constructivist theories.

Maxwell T Boykoff, *Who speaks for the climate: making sense of media reporting on climate change*, Cambridge, United Kingdom, Cambridge University Press, 2011, ISBN13 9780521115841 (hbk), ISBN13: 9780521133050 (pbk), 240 pp

Why is it that major newspapers in the United States (US) and Europe keep printing opinion-editorial articles arguing that the risks of climate change are overstated? Often such articles are signed by 'scientists' of reputable schools in the US or Europe. Invariably, these statements get a response from other scientists pointing out that the arguments are incorrect and long refuted, lamenting about the media that keep printing pieces that suggest that the science of climate change is not settled. In fact, this is a case where scientists argue from their own logic and criticize another logic: that of the media. It is the well-institutionalized peer-review-based scientific reasoning versus the 'medialogic' of making news, of pitting protagonists against antagonists, of seeing exposing alleged conflict as a journalistic success.

Climate change is an issue with very high political and social stakes. To err on the one side may be costly; to err on the other side would be disastrous. Here it is

not climate science that determines how to conceive of the issue. Looking at climate change as a political phenomenon, one realizes that 'more knowledge' is not going to help society take the right turn. While the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has been criticized for various procedural fallacies, it remains a remarkably effective science-for-policy institution. In 20 years of its existence, it has created a global consensus on the most important facts. Without the IPCC, there would be no agreement on the idea of a 'two-degree target'—the goal of limiting the rise of the global mean temperature to 2°C above pre-industrial levels. Politically the issue is not a lack of knowledge. As John Vidal, quoted by Boykoff, puts it, the perennial question is: 'We know what to do: why don't we do it?' (152). Well, because it is not so easy to create this 'we' in the first place.

In *Who speaks for the climate?* Maxwell T Boykoff seeks to make 'sense of media reporting on climate change', as the subtitle reads. Boykoff comes up with a very insightful analysis of the media coverage of climate change in the past decades, with various empirical analyses in the now (easy and hence) popular method of quantitative discourse analysis. More attention on the role of the media in the climate change debate is in order. Undoubtedly there is a lot of 'media-derived authority' at play, as Susan Herbst once called it (Herbst 2003). Given that fact, it is important to invest academic energy in trying to understand the way in which the media are part of the climate debate.

Not all is exactly new in Boykoff's book. That the media should handle climate change much more 'in the context of climate science' and that 'balance is bias' as it results in overemphasizing outlier views on anthropogenic climate change are messages that have been put forward by Boykoff and others several times before already. That raises the question of what audience Boykoff had in mind when writing the book. The pitch is not entirely clear.

Boykoff discusses far more than media theory alone and links it to the very insightful science and technology studies (STS) literature. On the one hand he seeks to understand the role of the media in terms of the ways in which climate change is framed, but the STS reading comes out in findings that suggest that media representations are not simply to be read in terms of direct political influence but 'stitch together' climate science, governance and daily life.

The insight that we do have a rather fragmented media field is key to understanding climate change discourse. There is no singular 'public sphere'; new social media have only added to the possibilities to find sources that help support views one already holds. Boykoff argues that scientists should improve their media performance. But how to do this? Should they stick to the slightly boring neutral and contextual way of arguing? Or should they dare to experiment with other 'genres'? The phenomenon of celebrity scientists (like Richard Dawkins or Oliver Sachs) suggests that this enhances the range of influence scientists can have. As the lead singer of U2, Bono, is quoted saying: 'celebrity is a bit silly but it is a currency of a kind' (19). Deservedly, Boykoff also refers to statements of the late Stephen Schneider many times. If one wants to know how to communicate climate science, it would be advisable to read Schneiders statements and to watch his speeches on the internet next to reading Boykoff's book.¹

¹ See for example, <<http://www.skepticalscience.com/science-and-distortion-stephen-schneider.html>>.

Boykoff shows sympathy for the journalist who needs 'to focus and contextualize a story with tight deadlines' (75). He pleads for a more educational role for journalism, but is realistic enough to see that more 'climate literacy' is not going to curb the trend on its own. In the end Boykoff argues for a more collaborative effort of scientists and journalists. That is a nice idea, but the different logics of science and journalism that he has presented seem a fundamental stumbling block. Arguably, our best bet is on 'public intellectuals' who know their science but are willing to mediate between science, society and politics. And that is an art form in itself.

References

Herbst, Susan (2003) 'Political authority in a mediated age', *Theory and Society*, 32, 481–503

Maarten Hajer © 2012

University of Amsterdam and Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency

Bart Strengers © 2012

Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency

Notes on contributors

Maarten Hajer (DPhil, University of Oxford) is Professor of Public Policy at the University of Amsterdam and Director of Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL). His research interests cover environmental politics, transnational policy discourses, deliberative democracy, media politics and new forms of governance. He is the author of more than ten books, including *The politics of environmental discourse* (1995), *Living with nature* (1999), *Deliberative policy analysis* (2003) and *Authoritative governance* (2009).

Bart Strengers (MA, Delft Technical University) is Climate Researcher at PBL. He is currently working on an assessment of sceptical arguments in the global climate debate.

Eric W Cox, *Why enduring rivalries do—or don't—end*, Boulder, Colorado, Lynne Rienner, First Forum Press, 2010, ISBN10 1935049240, ISBN13 9781935049241 (hbk), x + 221 pp

Within the discipline of international relations, the emerging subfield focusing on international rivalries is becoming an important branch of study. Rather than concentrating on rare events such as wars, this research programme seeks to understand the dynamics of what many scholars perceive to be the most dangerous dyads: enduring rivals. Because the foreign policy goals of rival states are incompatible in the long run, strategic or enduring rivalries become complex militarized conflicts in which hatred prevails and cooperation is rare. These militarized disputes not only comprise a large proportion of conflict, but also have the capacity to destabilize the international system as a whole.