Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," *International Organization*, 52, no. 4 (Autumn 1998): 887-917.

-the three main points:
    -first, the "turn" of ideational thinking is not new, but a return to some of the traditional concerns of IR
    -second, norms evolve in a "life cycle" where "different behavioral logics dominate different segments of the life cycle"
    -third, norms cannot be separated from rationality   [888-889]

-the operational definition of a norm: "a standard of appropriate behavior for actors with a given identity"  [891]
    -two categories of norms (similar to distinction in philosophy lit. on rules; see Rawls, Nozick):
        -*regulative* norms order/constrain behaviour
        -*constitutive* norms create identity/interests

-Finnemore and Sikkink have two cases they study: women's suffrage and laws of war

-norm life cycle: a three-stage process
    -first stage is *norm emergence*
    -second stage is the broad acceptance of the norm (in Sunstein's terms, a "norm cascade")
    -final stage involves internalization of the norm   [895]

*-Norm Emergence* [Stage One]
    -in most studies on norm origins, the various factors stressed include human agency, indeterminacy, and chance
    -two elements are common for successful norms
        -*norm entrepreneurs*        [896-899]
            -these are agents with a strong desire to see a norm realized
        -*organizational platforms*  [899-901]
            -norm entrepreneurs at the intl. level need an organizational platform to promote norms
            -if they work through an existing institution, the structure of that institution affects how the norm is transmitted
            -one very important factor: expertise/knowledge ['epistemic communities']
            -norm entrepreneurs, whatever their agenda, need to convince states to endorse their norms
            -in most cases, emergent norms need to be institutionalized in international law
        -*tipping/threshold points*  [901]
            -after norm entrepreneurs have persuaded a 'critical mass' of decisionmakers to adopt new norms, the norm reaches a threshold/tipping point
            -much scholarship still needs to be done to clarify this issue [identifying the threshold, etc.]

*-Norm Cascades* [Stage Two]     [902-904]
    -after the tipping point, the norm becomes less of a domestic and more of an international phenomenon
    -the process, F&K argue, is international *socialization*
        -three possible motivations for responding to this international 'peer pressure'
            -the first is *legitimacy*: obviously, international legitimacy matters to state, but there is also a domestic effect: domestic legitimacy is affected by one's international legitimacy [a 'pariah' state internationally has, according to F&K, less legitimacy domestically]
            -the other two motivations are *conformity* and *esteem*: states conform in order to prove that they belong to the state system (or a subset thereof, like 'liberal' states or 'European' states); esteem is related to the idea that states want not only others to think highly of themselves but that they want to think highly of themselves

*-Internalization* [Stage Three]   [904-905]
    -the last stage is when norms become so widely accepted that they are unreflective; thus, internalized norms are extremely powerful but also hard to discern (b/c no one has to question or even discuss them)
        -