

Cambridge
C
Studies in
S
International
i
Relations
r

*Social Theory
of International
Politics*

Alexander Wendt

Social Theory of International Politics

Drawing upon philosophy and social theory, *Social Theory of International Politics* develops a theory of the international system as a social construction. Alexander Wendt clarifies the central claims of the constructivist approach, presenting a structural and idealist worldview which contrasts with the individualism and materialism which underpins much mainstream international relations theory. He builds a cultural theory of international politics, which takes whether states view each other as enemies, rivals, or friends as a fundamental determinant. Wendt characterizes these roles as “cultures of anarchy,” described as Hobbesian, Lockean, and Kantian respectively. These cultures are shared ideas which help shape state interests and capabilities, and generate tendencies in the international system. The book describes four factors which can drive structural change from one culture to another – interdependence, common fate, homogenization, and self-restraint – and examines the effects of capitalism and democracy in the emergence of a Kantian culture in the West.

ALEXANDER WENDT is an Associate Professor at the University of Chicago. He has previously taught at Yale University and Dartmouth College. He is the author of several articles in leading journals on international relations theory.

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: 67

Social Theory of International Politics

Editorial Board

Steve Smith (*Managing editor*)

Thomas Biersteker Chris Brown Alex Danchev

Rosemary Foot Joseph Grieco G. John Ikenberry

Margot Light Andrew Linklater Michael Nicholson

Caroline Thomas Roger Tooze

Cambridge Studies in International Relations is a joint initiative of Cambridge University Press and the British International Studies Association (BISA). The series will include a wide range of material, from undergraduate textbooks and surveys to research-based monographs and collaborative volumes. The aim of the series is to publish the best new scholarship in International Studies from Europe, North America, and the rest of the world.

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

- 67 *Alexander Wendt*
Social theory of international politics
- 66 *Thomas Risse, Stephen C. Ropp and Kathryn Sikkink (eds)*
The power of human rights
International norms and domestic change
- 65 *Daniel W. Drezner*
The sanctions paradox
Economic statecraft and international relations
- 64 *Viva Ona Bartkus*
The dynamic of secession
- 63 *John A. Vasquez*
The power of power politics
From classical realism to neotraditionalism
- 62 *Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett (eds.)*
Security communities
- 61 *Charles Jones*
E. H. Carr and international relations
A duty to lie
- 60 *Jeffrey W. Knopf*
Domestic society and international cooperation
The impact of protest on US arms control policy
- 59 *Nicholas Greenwood Onuf*
The republican legacy in international thought
- 58 *Daniel S. Geller and J. David Singer*
Nations at war
A scientific study of international conflict
- 57 *Randall D. Germain*
The international organization of credit
States and global finance in the world economy
- 56 *N. Piers Ludlow*
Dealing with Britain
The Six and the first UK application to the EEC

Series list continues after index

Social Theory of International Politics

Alexander Wendt



PUBLISHED BY CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS (VIRTUAL PUBLISHING)
FOR AND ON BEHALF OF THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Cambridge University Press 1999

This edition © Cambridge University Press (Virtual Publishing) 2003

First published in printed format 1999

A catalogue record for the original printed book is available
from the British Library and from the Library of Congress

Original ISBN 0 521 46557 5 hardback

Original ISBN 0 521 46960 0 paperback

ISBN 0 511 02166 6 virtual (eBooks.com Edition)

For Bud Duvall

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>page</i> xiii
1 Four sociologies of international politics	1
Part I Social theory	
2 Scientific realism and social kinds	47
3 “Ideas all the way down?”: on the constitution of power and interest	92
4 Structure, agency, and culture	139
Part II International politics	
5 The state and the problem of corporate agency	193
6 Three cultures of anarchy	246
7 Process and structural change	313
8 Conclusion	370
<i>Bibliography</i>	379
<i>Index</i>	420

Analytical Table of Contents

Acknowledgements *page* xiii

1 Four sociologies of international politics	1
The states systemic project	7
State-centrism	8
Systems theory	10
Neorealism and its critics	15
A map of structural theorizing	22
Four sociologies	23
Locating international theories	29
Three interpretations	33
Epistemology and the via media	38
Plan of the book	40
2 Scientific realism and social kinds	47
Scientific realism and theories of reference	51
World independence	52
Mature theories refer to the world	53
Theories provide knowledge of unobservables	60
The ultimate argument for realism	64
The problem of social kinds	67
On causation and constitution	77
Causal theorizing	79
Constitutive theorizing	83
Toward a sociology of questions in international theory	88
Conclusion	90

3 “Ideas all the way down?”: on the constitution of power and interest	92
The constitution of power by interest	96
Waltz’s explicit model: anarchy and the distribution of power	98
Waltz’s implicit model: the distribution of interests	103
Toward a rump materialism I	109
The constitution of interests by ideas	113
The rationalist model of man	116
Beyond the rationalist model	119
Toward a rump materialism II	130
Conclusion	135
4 Structure, agency, and culture	139
Two levels of structure	145
Micro-structure	147
Macro-structure	150
Culture as common and collective knowledge	157
Two effects of structure	165
Causal effects	167
Constitutive effects	171
Toward a synthetic view	178
Culture as a self-fulfilling prophecy	184
Conclusion	189
5 The state and the problem of corporate agency	193
The essential state	198
The state as referent object	199
Defining the state	201
“States are people too”	215
On the ontological status of the state	215
The structure of state agency	218
Identities and interests	224
The national interest	233
Are states “Realists”? A note on self-interest	238
Conclusion	243
6 Three cultures of anarchy	246
Structure and roles under anarchy	251
The Hobbesian culture	259

Analytical Table of Contents

Enmity	260
The logic of Hobbesian anarchy	264
Three degrees of internalization	266
The Lockean culture	279
Rivalry	279
The logic of Lockean anarchy	283
Internalization and the Foucault effect	285
The Kantian culture	297
Friendship	298
The logic of Kantian anarchy	299
Internalization	302
Beyond the anarchy problematique?	307
Conclusion	308
7 Process and structural change	313
Two logics of identity formation	318
Natural selection	321
Cultural selection	324
Collective identity and structural change	336
Master variables	343
Interdependence	344
Common fate	349
Homogeneity	353
Self-restraint	357
Discussion	363
Conclusion	366
Conclusion	370
<i>Bibliography</i>	379
<i>Index</i>	420

Acknowledgements

In this book I develop a theory of the international system as a social construction. Since the term is used in many ways, the first half of the book is a conceptual analysis of what I mean by “social construction.” The issues here are philosophical and may be unfamiliar to some students of international politics. However, I have tried throughout to be as clear as possible, keeping in mind a comment James Caporaso made about my first publication in 1987, that “there is nothing so profound here that it cannot be said in ordinary language.” I cannot really say that what follows is “ordinary language,” but his plea for clarity has become for me an important demand of this kind of work. The other half of the book is a theory of international politics based on that philosophical analysis. Juxtaposed to the Realisms that tend to dominate at least North American IR scholarship, this theory is a kind of Idealism, a Structural Idealism, although I refer to it only as a constructivist approach to international politics. As such, the book might be seen overall as a work of applied social theory. While not reducible to social theory, many debates in IR have a social theory aspect. My hope is that even when the arguments below prove problematic, the contours of those issues will have been brought into sharper relief.

I approach this material as a political scientist, which is to say that I have little formal training in social theory, the primary analytical tool of this study. To address this problem I have read broadly but without much guidance, in mostly contemporary philosophy and sociology. To credit these sources I have followed a generous citation policy, even if specialists – in IR and social theory alike – will still find much that is missing. By the same token, however, it was not possible here to properly address all of that scholarship. The bibliography should be

Acknowledgements

seen as a resource for further reading rather than as a measure of what I have seriously engaged.

Over the long course of writing this book I have acquired a number of significant debts.

The book is descended from a dissertation done at the University of Minnesota, was mostly written at Yale University, and then completed at Dartmouth College. I am grateful for the time and support provided by all of these institutions. Among many esteemed colleagues I have benefitted especially from the advice and role models of David Lumsdaine, Ian Shapiro, and Rogers Smith.

The most sustained debt is to my classmates in the “Minnesota School” of constructivism, and especially Mike Barnett, Mark Laffey, Rhona Leibel, and Jutta Weldes. Although their thicker constructivisms should not be identified with the thin one on offer below, this book is in a real sense a joint product of our conversations over the past 15 years.

For most of the book’s writing my graduate students at Yale were my primary intellectual community and reality check, particularly the “third year class” of Janice Bially, Steve Brooks, Ian Cooper, Ian Hurd, and Roland Paris. Many of the formulations below, and many more that failed, were first tried on them.

I am especially grateful to the following individuals.

My parents, Hans and Martha, who constructed me to write such a book.

Charles Green, of Macalester College, who first showed me the value of taking a philosophical approach to politics.

David Sylvan, who taught me about constitution and told me to read Mead; the book would have been better had I read Simmel as well.

Steve Smith, of Aberystwyth, who first suggested I write the book, gave me a venue to publish it, and provided invaluable support throughout the process.

Nina Tannenwald, who when my enthusiasm waned impressed upon me the need to keep going.

Mike Barnett (again), whose unflagging humor and regular phone calls helped keep me in perspective.

Mlada Bukovansky, who talked me through the first draft and gave me a life in the second. Whatever dialectical elements there are below – and there are not enough – are due to her.

Acknowledgements

Jennifer Mitzen, who gave the book its finish. The trust I had in her critical eye made it possible to let the book go.

Most of those named above also provided comments on one or more chapters. Many other people provided helpful and sometimes extensive input as well. They include Badredine Arfi, Tom Banchoff, David Dessler, Marty Finnemore, Rod Hall, Martin Hollis, Pat Jackson, Ron Jepperson, Peter Katzenstein, Bob Keohane, Jeff Legro, Andy Moravcsik, Bill McSweeney, Himadeep Muppidi, Henry Nau, Brad Westerfield, and probably others, to whom I can only apologize for the state of my records. Finally, there are the many now anonymous individuals at the numerous seminars where this material has been presented, who asked questions that forced me to think harder. The book is much better for all of this help.

The book is dedicated to Raymond (Bud) Duvall, dissertation advisor and father of the Minnesota School. He cannot be blamed for all of what follows, but without him the book would not have been written.

No science can be more secure than the unconscious metaphysics which tacitly it presupposes.

Alfred North Whitehead

1 Four sociologies of international politics

In recent academic scholarship it has become commonplace to see international politics described as “socially constructed.” Drawing on a variety of social theories – critical theory, postmodernism, feminist theory, historical institutionalism, sociological institutionalism, symbolic interactionism, structuration theory, and the like – students of international politics have increasingly accepted two basic tenets of “constructivism”:¹ (1) that the structures of human association are determined primarily by shared ideas rather than material forces, and (2) that the identities and interests of purposive actors are constructed by these shared ideas rather than given by nature. The first represents an “idealist” approach to social life, and in its emphasis on the sharing of ideas it is also “social” in a way which the opposing “materialist” view’s emphasis on biology, technology, or the environment, is not. The second is a “holist” or “structuralist” approach because of its emphasis on the emergent powers of social structures, which opposes the “individualist” view that social structures are reducible to individuals. Constructivism could therefore be seen as a kind of “structural idealism.”

As the list above suggests there are many forms of constructivism. In this book I defend one form and use it to theorize about the international system. The version of constructivism that I defend is a moderate one that draws especially on structurationist and symbolic interactionist sociology. As such it concedes important points to materialist and individualist perspectives and endorses a scientific approach to social inquiry. For these reasons it may be rejected by more radical constructivists for not going far enough; indeed it is a

¹ A term first used in International Relations scholarship by Nicholas Onuf (1989).

thin constructivism. It goes much farther than most mainstream International Relations (IR)² scholars today, however, who sometimes dismiss any talk of social construction as “postmodernism.” Between these extremes I hope to find a philosophically principled middle way. I then show that this makes a difference for thinking about international politics.

The international system is a hard case for constructivism on both the social and construction counts. On the social side, while norms and law govern most domestic politics, self-interest and coercion seem to rule international politics. International law and institutions exist, but the ability of this superstructure to counter the material base of power and interest seems limited. This suggests that the international system is not a very “social” place, and so provides intuitive support for materialism in that domain. On the construction side, while the dependence of individuals on society makes the claim that their identities are constructed by society relatively uncontroversial, the primary actors in international politics, states, are much more autonomous from the social system in which they are embedded. Their foreign policy behavior is often determined primarily by domestic politics, the analogue to individual personality, rather than by the international system (society). Some states, like Albania or Burma, have interacted so little with others that they have been called “autistic.”³ This suggests that the international system does not do much “constructing” of states, and so provides intuitive support for individualism in that domain (assuming states are “individuals”). The underlying problem here is that the social structure of the international system is not very thick or dense, which seems to reduce substantially the scope for constructivist arguments.

Mainstream IR scholarship today largely accepts these individualist and materialist conclusions about the states system. It is dominated by *Theory of International Politics*, Kenneth Waltz’s powerful statement of “Neorealism,” which combines a micro-economic approach to the international system (individualism) with the Classical Realist emphasis on power and interest (materialism).⁴ Waltz’s book helped

² Following Onuf (1989), capital letters denote the academic field, lower case the phenomenon of international relations itself.

³ Buzan (1993: 341).

⁴ Waltz (1979). I will use capital letters to designate theories of international relations in order to distinguish them from social theories.

generate a partially competing theory, "Neoliberalism," stated most systematically by Robert Keohane in *After Hegemony*, which accepted much of Neorealism's individualism but argued that international institutions could dampen, if not entirely displace, the effects of power and interest.⁵ The fact that Neorealists and Neoliberals agree on so much has contributed to progress in their conversation, but has also substantially narrowed it. At times the debate seems to come down to no more than a discussion about the frequency with which states pursue relative rather than absolute gains.⁶

Despite the intuitive plausibility and dominance of materialist and individualist approaches to international politics, there is a long and varied tradition of what, from the standpoint of social theory, might be considered constructivist thinking on the subject. A constructivist worldview underlies the classical international theories of Grotius, Kant, and Hegel, and was briefly dominant in IR between the world wars, in the form of what IR scholars now, often disparagingly, call "Idealism."⁷ In the post-war period important constructivist approaches to international politics were advanced by Karl Deutsch, Ernst Haas, and Hedley Bull.⁸ And constructivist assumptions underlie the phenomenological tradition in the study of foreign policy, starting with the work of Snyder, Bruck, and Sapin, and continuing on with Robert Jervis and Ned Lebow.⁹ In the 1980s ideas from these and other lineages were synthesized into three main streams of constructivist IR theory:¹⁰ a modernist stream associated with John Ruggie and Friedrich Kratochwil,¹¹ a postmodernist stream associated with

⁵ Keohane (1984).

⁶ See, for example, Grieco (1988), Baldwin, ed. (1993), Kegley, ed. (1995), and Schweller and Priess (1997).

⁷ On inter-war idealism see Long and Wilson, eds. (1995).

⁸ Deutsch (1954, 1963), Haas (1964, 1983, 1990), Bull (1977). Less widely cited, Andrews (1975) comes as close as any to anticipating contemporary constructivist IR scholarship. Keohane and Nye's (1977/1989) work on interdependence can also be seen as a precursor.

⁹ Snyder, Bruck, and Sapin (1954), Jervis (1970, 1976, 1978), Lebow (1981).

¹⁰ The work of neo-Gramscians like Robert Cox (1987) and Stephen Gill (1993, ed.) also could be put into this category, although this is complicated by their relationship to Marxism, a "materialist" social theory. Additionally, Hayward Alker deserves special mention. Impossible to classify, his ideas, often circulating in unpublished manuscripts, were an important part of the revival of constructivist thinking about international politics in the 1980s. He has recently published a number of these papers (Alker, 1996).

¹¹ Ruggie (1983a, b), Kratochwil (1989).

Richard Ashley and Rob Walker,¹² and a feminist stream associated with Spike Peterson and Ann Tickner.¹³ The differences among and within these three streams are significant, but they share the view that Neorealism and Neoliberalism are “undersocialized” in the sense that they pay insufficient attention to the ways in which the actors in world politics are socially constructed.¹⁴ This common thread has enabled a three-cornered debate with Neorealists and Neoliberals to emerge.¹⁵

The revival of constructivist thinking about international politics was accelerated by the end of the Cold War, which caught scholars on all sides off guard but left orthodoxies looking particularly exposed. Mainstream IR theory simply had difficulty explaining the end of the Cold War,¹⁶ or systemic change more generally. It seemed to many that these difficulties stemmed from IR’s materialist and individualist orientation, such that a more ideational and holistic view of international politics might do better. The resulting wave of constructivist IR theorizing was initially slow to develop a program of empirical research,¹⁷ and epistemological and substantive variations within it continue to encourage a broad but thin pattern of empirical cumulation. But in recent years the quality and depth of empirical work has grown considerably, and this trend shows every sign of continuing.¹⁸ This is crucial for the success of constructivist thinking in IR, since the ability to shed interesting light on concrete problems of world politics must ultimately be the test of a method’s worth. In addition, however, alongside and as a contribution to those empirical efforts it also seems important to clarify what constructivism is, how it differs from its materialist and individualist rivals, and what those differences might mean for theories of international politics.

Building on existing constructivist IR scholarship, in this book I address these issues on two levels: at the level of foundational or second-order questions about what there is and how we can explain

¹² Ashley (1984, 1987), R. Walker (1987, 1993).

¹³ Peterson, ed. (1992), Tickner (1993). ¹⁴ Cf. Wrong (1961).

¹⁵ See Mearsheimer (1994/5), Keohane and Martin (1995), Wendt (1995), and Walt (1998).

¹⁶ For a good overview of recent efforts see Lebow and Risse-Kappen, eds. (1995).

¹⁷ Keohane (1988a).

¹⁸ See, for example, Campbell (1992), Klotz (1995), Price (1995), Biersteker and Weber, eds. (1996), Finnemore (1996a), Katzenstein, ed. (1996), Bukovansky (1997, 1999a, b), Adler and Barnett, eds. (1998), Barnett (1998), Hall (1999), Weldes (1999), and Weldes, *et al.*, eds. (1999), Reus-Smit (1999), and Tannenwald (1999).

or understand it – ontology, epistemology and method; and at the level of substantive, domain-specific, or first-order questions.

Second-order questions are questions of social theory. Social theory is concerned with the fundamental assumptions of social inquiry: the nature of human agency and its relationship to social structures, the role of ideas and material forces in social life, the proper form of social explanations, and so on. Such questions of ontology and epistemology can be asked of any human association, not just international politics, and so our answers do not explain international politics in particular. Yet students of international politics must answer these questions, at least implicitly, since they cannot do their business without making powerful assumptions about what kinds of things are to be found in international life, how they are related, and how they can be known. These assumptions are particularly important because no one can “see” the state or international system. International politics does not present itself directly to the senses, and theories of international politics often are contested on the basis of ontology and epistemology, i.e., what the theorist “sees.” Neorealists see the structure of the international system as a distribution of material capabilities because they approach their subject with a materialist lens; Neoliberals see it as capabilities plus institutions because they have added to the material base an institutional superstructure; and constructivists see it as a distribution of ideas because they have an idealist ontology. In the long run empirical work may help us decide which conceptualization is best, but the “observation” of unobservables is always theory-laden, involving an inherent gap between theory and reality (the “underdetermination of theory by data”). Under these conditions empirical questions will be tightly bound up with ontological and epistemological ones; how we answer “what causes what?” will depend in important part on how we first answer “what is there?” and “how should we study it?” Students of international politics could perhaps ignore these questions if they agreed on their answers, as economists often seem to,¹⁹ but they do not. I suggest below that there are at least four “sociologies” of international politics, each with many adherents. I believe many ostensibly substantive debates about the nature of international politics are in part philosophical debates about these sociologies. In part I of this book I attempt to clarify these second-order debates and advance a constructivist approach.

¹⁹ Though see Glass and Johnson (1988).

Social theories are not theories of international politics. Clarifying the differences and relative virtues of constructivist, materialist, and individualist ontologies ultimately may help us better explain international politics, but the contribution is indirect. A more direct role is played by substantive theory, which is the second concern of this book. Such first-order theorizing is domain-specific. It involves choosing a social system (family, Congress, international system), identifying the relevant actors and how they are structured, and developing propositions about what is going on. Substantive theory is based on social theory but cannot be “read off” of it. In part II of the book I outline a substantive, first-order theory of international politics. The theory starts from many of the same premises as Waltz’s, which means that some of the same criticisms commonly directed at his work will have equal force here. But the basic thrust and conclusions of my argument are at odds with Neorealism, in part because of different ontological or second-order commitments. Materialist and individualist commitments lead Waltz to conclude that anarchy makes international politics a necessarily conflictual, “self-help” world. Idealist and holist commitments lead me to the view that “anarchy is what states make of it.”²⁰ Neither theory follows directly from its ontology, but ontologies contribute significantly to their differences.

Even with respect to substantive theorizing, however, the level of abstraction and generality in this book are high. Readers looking for detailed propositions about the international system, let alone empirical tests, will be disappointed. The book is about the *ontology* of the states system, and so is more about international *theory* than about international politics as such. The central question is: given a similar substantive concern as Waltz, i.e., states systemic theory and explanation, but a different ontology, what is the resulting theory of international politics? In that sense, this is a case study in social theory or applied philosophy. After laying out a social constructivist ontology, I build a theory of “international” politics. This is not the only theory that follows from that ontology, but my primary goal in building it is to show that the different ontological starting point has substantive import for how we explain the real world. In most places that import is merely to reinforce or provide ontological foundations for what at least some segment of the IR community already knew. On the

²⁰ Wendt (1992).

substantive level IR scholars will find much that is familiar below. But in some places it suggests a rethinking of important substantive issues, and in a few cases, I hope, new lines of inquiry.

In sum, the title of this book contains a double reference: the book is about “social theory” in general and, more specifically, about a more “social” theory of international politics than Neorealism or Neoliberalism. This chapter makes two passes through these issues, emphasizing international and social theory respectively. In the first section I discuss the state-centric IR theory project, offer a diagnosis of what is currently wrong with it, and summarize my own approach. In a sense, this section presents the puzzle that animates the argument of the book overall. In the second section I begin to develop the conceptual tools that allow us to rethink the ontology of the international system. I draw a “map” of the four sociologies involved in the debate over social construction (individualism, holism, materialism, and idealism), locate major lines of international theory on it, and address three interpretations of what the debate is about (methodology, ontology, and empirics). The chapter concludes with an overview of the book as a whole.

The states systemic project

Constructivism is not a theory of international politics.²¹ Constructivist sensibilities encourage us to look at how actors are socially constructed, but they do not tell us which actors to study or where they are constructed. Before we can be a constructivist about anything we have to choose “units” and “levels” of analysis, or “agents” and the “structures” in which they are embedded.²²

The discipline of International Relations requires that these choices have some kind of “international” dimension, but beyond that it does not dictate units or levels of analysis. The “states systemic project” reflects one set of choices within a broader field of possibilities. Its units are states, as opposed to non-state actors like individuals,

²¹ I have been unclear about this in my previous work (e.g., 1992, 1994). I now wish to draw a sharper distinction between constructivism and the theory of international politics that I sketch in this book. One can accept constructivism without embracing that theory.

²² On levels of analysis see Singer (1961), Moul (1973), and Onuf (1995). In much of IR scholarship units and levels of analysis are conflated. I follow Moul (1973: 512) in distinguishing them, and map them onto agents and structures respectively.

sample content of Social Theory of International Politics (Cambridge Studies in International Relations)

- [Financial Times Europe \(05 May 2016\) for free](#)
- [Food Network \(March 2014\) online](#)
- [download Paradise Lost \(HarperPerennial Classics\) online](#)
- [read **Buddha: A Very Short Introduction \(Very Short Introductions\) pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub**](#)

- <http://jaythebody.com/freebooks/Financial-Times-Europe--05-May-2016-.pdf>
- <http://cambridgebrass.com/?freebooks/A-Conspiracy-of-Alchemists--The-Chronicles-of-Light-and-Shadow--Book-1-.pdf>
- <http://xn--d1aboelcb1f.xn--p1ai/lib/Paradise-Lost--HarperPerennial-Classics-.pdf>
- <http://xn--d1aboelcb1f.xn--p1ai/lib/The-Authentic-Heart--An-Eightfold-Path-to-Midlife-Love.pdf>