

Zusammenfassungen in englischer Sprache

Michael Zürn

The Discipline of International Relations in Germany since 1989

pp. 21-46

The introduction to this overview on the state of International Relations theory in Germany outlines the development of the discipline over the past fifteen years. By means of reference to the contributions in this volume, it demonstrates that the field of International Relations has made considerable progress over this period. Theoretical contributions of high quality are today by no means a rarity. Moreover, International Relations has gained substantially in significance within the larger field of social science in Germany. Finally, German IR is no longer purely and passively receptive of its American counterpart.

Peter Mayer

The Epistemology of IR: Observations on the State of the „Third Debate“

pp. 47-97

The chapter addresses IR's „Third Debate“ in which positivists and post-positivists argue about the epistemological foundations of the discipline. It covers three interlocking controversies or problematiques: (i) the „naturalism issue“ referring to the question of whether or not IR should adopt the methodology of natural science; (ii) the „value issue“ revolving around the question of whether IR is (or should be) value-free and whether or not normative theory has an essential place in IR; and (iii) the „foundationalism issue“ centering on the question of whether or not there are sufficiently firm foundations for IR theorists to ground upon their claims about features of the events and processes they study. Finally, the chapter puts forward an hypothesis about why German students of international relations – although intensely involved in the disputes about the relative merits of rationalist and constructivist approaches to IR – showed relatively little interest in the „Third Debate“.

Thomas Risse

Constructivism, Rationalism and Theories of International Relations

pp. 99-132

The controversy between rational choice and constructivist approaches is useful and relevant, as long as it contributes to the development of substantive theories of international politics and to theory-guided empirical research. The essay discusses, first, the constructivist challenge to conventional theories of International Relations based upon the rational choice paradigm. Second, I summarize the current state of the art of constructivist research concentrating on so-called „moderate” constructivism. This part emphasizes especially contributions from the German-speaking International Relations community. Third, the article focuses on the controversy with rationalist approaches to international relations. The aim is to explore concrete examples of theoretical bridge-building between rational choice and moderate social constructivism.

Antje Wiener

The Dialogical Turn: Constructivist Bridges and their Future

pp. 133-159

This contribution raises the question about the value-added of constructivist research for theory building in international relations theory (IR). It characterizes the value-added as the focus on the social that followed constructivists' communications over social ontologies, illustrated with reference to the role of norms in IR. It is argued that following different basic assumptions which range from the conceptualization of norms as constitutive and regulative for behavior, on the one hand, to the mutual construction of norms and social practices, on the other, it is possible to demonstrate that constructivists have settled into two strands. Both are significantly distinct due to their respective transdisciplinary efforts in addressing the social. While one strand – dubbed the „compliance approach“ – follows a neo-Durkheimian structural understanding of social facts, the other – „societal approach“ – works with a Giddensian reflexive understanding of social construction.

Christopher Daase

**War and Political Violence:
Conceptual Innovation and Theoretical Progress**

pp. 161-208

There has been progress in the study of war and political violence over the last fifteen years. In particular, where old orthodoxies were relaxed and where intellectual stimuli were accepted from other approaches, methods, or disciplines, new insights were gained about the concept of war, the causes of political violence, and its consequences. In the field of concept analysis a historical understanding of the concept of war, the development of theoretical typologies, and the reformulation of qualitative and quantitative criteria for the coding of wars have lead to more refined and reflective concepts of war and political violence. In the field of etiology, a number of causal patterns significantly increasing the likelihood of war have been discovered through the combination of inductive and deductive theorizing, the analysis of causal mechanisms and the amalgamation of small-n and large-n case studies. The relatively new research on the effects of war has produced a number of hypotheses about learning in war, the consequences of unconventional warfare on actors and structures of the international system, and the privatization and criminalization of political violence in so called civil war economies. The cross fertilization of these research programs will yield additional insights if the interdisciplinary and multi-methodological discourse can be kept alive.

Harald Müller

Concept, Theories and the Practice of Peace

pp. 209-250

The debate about the meaning of „peace“ has incrementally enlarged the scope of the term to become equivalent with „the good“. In this process, its utility to distinguish between peaceful and non-peaceful situations within and between states was lost. The motivation was not to legitimize social situations of injustice, discrimination or ecological destruction as peaceful. The problem might be solved by distinguishing between *peace* – as a social situation in which physical violence is absent and not considered by organized social groups – and its *causes* – which includes a minimum degree of justice, equality, and sustainability. Recent theoretical approaches such as „democratic peace“ and the concept of civilization have theorized more or less complex causes of peace, trying to combine internal and external conditions of non-violence.

Detlef F. Sprinz

International Regimes and Institutions

pp. 251-273

Research on international regimes and institutions over the past two decades can be divided into three main phases. In the first phase, theory-based research focused on the conditions of the creation of international regimes, followed by a second phase on the implementation of and compliance with international regimes. The final third phase returned to the key question whether regimes matter. Research in this phase is supported by recent developments on measurement tools for regime effectiveness and is complemented by research on the design of international institutions. The most recent developments further develop current streams of research (regime interaction and regime effectiveness) and also focus on responses to the legitimacy deficit in international relations by way of including non-state actors in the analysis. The chapter concludes that the German contribution to research on international regimes has been pronounced and visible on a world-wide scale.

Joachim Betz

**(German) Contributions to Development Theories
since the End of the East-West-Conflict**

pp. 275-311

The development debate in Germany after 1990 was characterized by some kind of stocktaking of former grand theories, leading to the survival of dependency theories in the guise of debates around the new world order and globalization. However, an intellectual convergence is visible with respect to a new development strategy, which draws its inspiration from a refashioned Washington consensus enriched by participatory, institutional and social concerns. This has much to do with a missing alternative to a more or less forced integration of developing countries into the world economy. The German debate is characterized by an emphasis on either the dichotomy of general assumptions on the Third World or by taking refuge in a debate on postfordism, the new world order and globalization on one side and by conducting microstudies without theoretical ambition on the other side. From this perhaps harsh criticism some new fields of research interest have to be exempted, in particular those on crisis prevention and peace consolidation in ethnic conflicts, on democratic transition and consolidation in developing countries, and, more recently, on international terrorism. In these fields the German debate has produced quite a few original and empirically rich contributions.

Sebastian Harnisch

Theory-Oriented Foreign Policy Analysis in an Era of Change

pp. 313-360

The article advances the argument that theory development in the study of foreign policy can be better understood in generational terms rather than in paradigmatic terms where one paradigm supplants a competing one. The generational metaphor suggests that the demise of the Cold War and the interpretive turn in the social sciences have shaped a „new generation” of foreign policy analysis while leaving traditional theoretical families (more or less) intact. As constructivists and other post-positivist foreign policy analysts both mix with and supplement rationalistic approaches the polarized debates of the past were transformed into a multifaceted theoretical discourse in the 1990s that undermines earlier notions of a cohesive subdiscipline of foreign policy analysis. In conclusion, the article holds that this diversity of approaches is useful because it reinvigorates debate between students of foreign policy and explores alleys to reintegrate the field into political science at large.

Martin List and Bernhard Zangl

Juridification in International Politics

pp. 361-399

The contribution gives an overview of political science research in international juridification or legalization with a special emphasis on the contributions made so far by the German IR community. International legalization is reconstructed in four historical steps. The first step consists in mutual recognition as equals under public international law by the early modern European states. It is followed by step two, the enlargement of this recognition by applying it to non-European states as well. The third step consists in the transition from the public international law of co-existence to that of cooperation, i.e. the increasing legalization of ever more issue areas. The fourth and so far final step supports these legalization processes by applying ever more binding procedures. Differing approaches to analyzing this fourth step of international legalization are presented: the adjudication perspective stressing increased involvement of courts and court-like third party mechanisms; the legitimacy perspective emphasizing legitimate norm-creation processes; the management perspective taking particular note of dialogue-based implementation of law and the enforcement perspective seeing legalization as sanctioned law-enforcement. By way of conclusion, some hints at further desirable research on international legalization are given.

Frank Schimmelfennig

**International Socialization: From an „Exhausted“
to a Productive Research Program?**

pp. 401-427

After it had declined together with functionalist integration theory, international socialization has again become a central research issue in IR due to the rise of the constructivist research program and growing interest in processes of norm-guided change in international relations. The chapter examines the roots of the „new” research on international socialization as well as conceptual and theoretical issues it currently faces. It discusses problems of definition, distinction, and causal analysis and it distinguishes mechanisms of socialization and the conditions under which they operate and are successful. It then presents results of two German research projects on the democratic and human rights socialization of „Southern” and „Eastern” countries. It concludes that German research on international socialization is well integrated internationally, competitive, and innovative. However, it would benefit from a closer connection with general research on the domestic effects of international institutions.

Philipp Genschel

Globalization as a Problem, as a Solution, and as a Part of the Landscape

pp. 429-464

There are basically three stories about the globalization-welfare state nexus. The first story argues that globalization is the cause of the chronic crisis of the welfare state (globalization theory). The second maintains that whatever the cause of the welfare state crisis, globalization is not part of it (globalization skeptics). The third story holds that globalization, far from causing the welfare state’s troubles, is a consequence of these troubles and part of their solution (revisionism). The paper reviews each of these stories and traces their intellectual origins.

Christoph Scherrer

International Political Economy from a Critical Perspective

pp. 465-494

The article discusses new theoretical developments within the tradition of Marxist political economy. Recent research inspired by the French regulation school and Neo-Gramscian approaches to international relations moves beyond traditional concepts of structural determination by taking contingency seriously. The global governance debate illustrates the remaining difference between mainstream constructivist approaches on the one hand and these post-Marxist plus some gender theoretical approaches on the other.

Markus Jachtenfuchs

Governance Beyond the State

pp. 495-518

Besides the prevailing cooperation paradigm, a governance paradigm has emerged in international relations, most notably during the last decade. At least potentially, the governance paradigm offers an overarching perspective that is able to analyze governance within states as well as governance beyond the state. The article is divided into five parts. It offers a sociology of knowledge perspective on the roots of the debate (1) as well as a phenomenology of governance beyond the state (2). Then it discusses theoretical insights and potential linkages to other debates (3) and the German peculiarities within this debate (4). In conclusion it provides an assessment of the potential and the risk of the governance approach.

Andreas Nölke

**Intra- and interdisciplinary Networking:
Transcending Government-Centrism?**

pp. 519-554

Looking back upon German IR research we may identify a repeated dialectic development between government-centrism (thesis) and transnationalism (antithesis). The article documents, explains and assesses the most recent trend towards transnationalism within German IR, including the issue of a possible synthesis. Since the latest shift towards transnationalism has been more pronounced in Germany compared to other IR communities, the article also reflects upon some specific characteristics of the German discipline. Here we may observe that the transnational shift coincides with a number of contemporary developments that may be summarized under headings such as German reunification, the revitalization of the European project and accelerating globalization.

Correspondingly, a transnational approach appears to be quite plausible. Furthermore, this conceptual reorientation is supported by a relatively small degree of separation between IR and other subdisciplines of Political Science in Germany. However, German IR suffers from a lower degree of inter-disciplinary cooperation within a joint „International Studies” approach if compared with the dominating Anglo-Saxon community.

Mathias Albert

**Debordering and International Relations:
The Dual Transformation of a Subject Matter and its Discipline**
pp. 555-576

The article argues that the interrelated debordering of the discipline of International Relations and its subject provides an opportunity to constitute a „science of the global”. It first illustrates the debordering of international relations in the sense of a declining structuring power of the Westphalian model and discusses a number of debates and approaches which reflect this debordering within IR. Against this background it sketches the contours of a project to reorient the discipline as a „science of the global” which takes serious a distancing from „methodological nationalism”.

Klaus Dieter Wolf and Gunther Hellmann

The Future of International Relations in Germany
pp. 577-603

In this concluding chapter the authors apply three perspectives in order to identify key strengths as well as shortcomings in German International Relations, and to sketch some avenues for future research. A synopsis of the different contributions culminates in a profile of German IR which is compared in a second step with alternative profiles resulting from the new *Handbook of International Relations* and a recently published state of the art volume of the *American Political Science Association*. Finally, the response to the original call for papers is revisited in order to appraise the present state and the prospects of German IR. The authors suggest that the comparative advantage of German IR should be utilized for transferring questions of legitimacy and justice from the state level to the level of global governance and for approaching the classical research on security issues from a broader perspective which leaves state-centrism behind. (Self-)critical remarks are addressed to the lack of historiographical interest and towards a possible tendency to neglect classical research topics in favour of more fashionable ones.