



# EUI WORKING PAPERS

ROBERT SCHUMAN CENTRE

Theory Synthesis in IR  
Problems & Possibilities

PATRICK A. MC CARTHY  
and  
ARIS ALEXOPOULOS

EUI Working Paper RSC No. 95/14

European University Institute, Florence

WP  
321  
.02094  
EUR

EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE



3 0001 0021 9338 3

The Robert Schuman Centre was set up by the High Council of the EUI in 1993 to carry out disciplinary and interdisciplinary research in the areas of European integration and public policy in Europe. While developing its own research projects, the Centre works in close relation with the four departments of the Institute and supports the specialized working groups organized by the researchers (International Relations, Environment, Interest Groups, Gender).

**EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE, FLORENCE**

**ROBERT SCHUMAN CENTRE**

**Theory Synthesis in IR  
Problems & Possibilities**

**PATRICK A. MC CARTHY  
and  
ARIS ALEXOPOULOS**

WP  
321.0209  
4 EUR

**EUI Working Paper RSC No. 95/14**

**BADIA FIESOLANA, SAN DOMENICO (FI)**



**All rights reserved.**  
**No part of this paper may be reproduced in any form**  
**without permission of the authors.**

**© Patrick A. Mc Carthy & Aris Alexopoulos**  
**Printed in Italy in September 1995**  
**European University Institute**  
**Badia Fiesolana**  
**I – 50016 San Domenico (FI)**  
**Italy**



# Theory Synthesis in IR

## Problems & Possibilities

PATRICK A. MC CARTHY & ARIS ALEXOPOULOS<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Political & Social Sciences, European University Institute, Badia Fiesolana, Via dei Roccettini 9, 50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI), Italia  
[Fax: +39-(0)55-599887; E-mails: mccarthy@datacomm.iue.it / alexopou@datacomm.iue.it].

An earlier version of this paper was presented in the workshop "Theory Synthesis in IR; Problems & Possibilities" organised by the Schuman Centre Working Group on International Relations and held at the European University Institute (EUI) on March 27, 1995. For their helpful comments on the earlier draft, we are grateful to Robert Keohane, Andrew Moravcsik, Anne-Marie Slaughter, Ole Wæver, Susan Strange, Alec Stone and to the members of the EUI Working Group on International Relations.



## 1. Introduction

The main purpose of this paper is to draw attention to a contemporary phenomenon in the discipline of International Relations (IR) and to initiate discussion and debate regarding it. The phenomenon is "theory synthesis," a term that we will use throughout this essay to describe the contemporary trend in IR towards transcending what may be described as traditional boundaries in IR theory.

Since about the end of the 1980s, a new dynamic has emerged in IR by which certain scholars attempt to integrate elements of distinct theories of international relations within common research programmes. Although the results of these efforts have been the subject of much debate in the field, little attention has been paid to the theoretical and methodological issues that underlie the process of synthesis. This paper aims to act as a catalyst for debate on exactly these issues. Having characterised the tendency towards theory synthesis as a contemporary phenomenon in certain areas of IR, we seek to pose some initial questions and make some initial statements concerning this process. Our aim is to stimulate debate on a broad range of issues relating to theory synthesis in IR and to initiate a critical evaluation of the problems and possibilities that this process uncovers for the development of the discipline of International Relations.

The paper is divided into three sections. We begin by indicating and briefly outlining two important sources of theory synthesis in contemporary IR to be found in the work of Robert Keohane and Andrew Moravcsik. We illustrate how, and to what ends, both scholars seek to contribute to the development of the discipline of IR in general, and to their own research-projects in particular, by integrating traditionally distinct theories into broad common research programmes. In the second section, we briefly look to the history of science for guidance on the question of theory synthesis and address the general questions of theory-commensurability, -competition and -appraisal. Finally, in the third section, we return to the phenomenon of theory synthesis in IR and, in light of the insights provided by the first two sections, critically assess the synthesising efforts of both Moravcsik and Keohane.

## 2. What Synthesis?

The history of the discipline of International Relations has been characterised by "great debates" between contending theoretical approaches to understanding world politics. Although descriptions of these debates have become essential IR



textbook material, it would be misleading to contend that there is perfect agreement as to the content, chronology, or even the number of "great debates" that have actually taken place.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, the discipline of IR has long resembled a playing-field on which "contending theories of International Relations" (Dougherty & Pfaltzgraff, 1990) or competing "perspectives on world politics" (Little & Smith, 1991) have vied with one another for predominance.

Since the end of the Cold War, the situation has changed somewhat. Whatever confidence scholars of IR had amassed over previous years in their ability to understand the operation of the international system has been unceremoniously undermined. No "traditional" approach to IR has been spared the painful experience of having its failings articulated (Gaddis, 1993). Most seriously hit has been IR's claim to predictive power, however implicitly and covertly it was expressed. An impressive amount recent work has been dedicated to re-appraising the discipline of IR from the inside in light of its obvious and significant failure to foresee the huge turning-point in world politics which was the end of the Cold War and the decomposition of the Soviet Union (Allan, 1992; Bowker & Brown, 1992).

This increase in uncertainty in IR has coincided with another important debate which considers the next stage of international relations and poses the pertinent question; "Quo Vadis International Relations" (Lapid, 1989). A central concern of this debate is to consider the reactions of the IR academic community to "theoretical pluralism;" the proliferation of myriad approaches to understanding international politics without an ordering hierarchy of dominance between theories. This vision of the future of IR theory departs significantly from the tradition of "great debates" that has characterised the discipline's genealogy. But it remains a vision. It remains to be seen whether, after the body-blow delivered by the end of the Cold War, the discipline of IR will revert definitively to its familiar pattern of great debates between relatively dominant research programmes, whether it will submit to theoretical pluralism, thereby substituting relatively ordered theoretical debate with something closer to intellectual anarchy, or whether it will assume a completely different mantle that will set the discipline of IR on an alternative road to development.

<sup>1</sup> Some standard historical accounts of the history of the discipline of I.R. can be found, among other places, in Little (1980, 1984), Smith (1985), Banks (1984), Hoffmann (1977) and Hollis & Smith (1991). An interesting alternative account, to which this essay will refer below, is provided by Wæver (1994).

First indications, however, suggest that the traditional structure of the "great debate" in IR is fast metamorphosing (Wæver, 1994) and that a new form of scholarly behaviour—characterised by trans-theoretical innovation—is beginning to take hold in the discipline. Many paradigms seem to have been struck by a fervent desire to communicate with one another and to take seriously the criticisms levelled against them by other paradigms. Neoliberal institutionalists have maintained a constructive debate with neorealists (Baldwin, 1993) and even the group of paradigms labelled "rationalist" have opened a dialogue with those labelled "reflectivist" (Keohane, 1988) to which the latter have not been completely opposed (Wæver, 1994). At first sight, this would seem to be a positive development, since IR has long been the target of hefty criticism due to the inability or unwillingness (the distinction is important) of its constituent paradigms to engage in constructive debate. However, one of the main aims of this paper is to look beyond first impressions and to examine the significance that increased dialogue between paradigms has for the development of IR theory.

The new openness referred to above does not stop with simple dialogue. There has also been an palpable tendency in recent times to transcend dialogue and to attempt to take the criticisms of opposing paradigms so seriously as to incorporate them into one's own paradigm's explanation of international politics. In other words, there has been a definite tendency towards theory-integration or theory-synthesis in IR which has taken at least two main forms;

- (1) the attempted synthesis of two formerly distinct paradigms that have come, by a process of dialogue and debate, to occupy common ground on important theoretical assumptions; and
- (2) the attempted synthesis of two formerly distinct "levels of analysis" in order to better explain international relations.

The first approach to synthesis has been exemplified by some important work by Robert Keohane—leading protagonist of the neoliberal institutionalist school—in his debates with members of the neorealist (Baldwin, 1993) and reflectivist (Keohane, 1988) schools.

In a recent genealogy of the discipline of IR, Ole Wæver (1994) has also dedicated some attention to defining the circumstances under which IR paradigms communicate with one another and the circumstances under which they find it impossible to do so. He has also dealt in a most innovative way with the continuing development of dialogue between "rationalistic" and "reflectivist" approaches to the study of international relations. In this sense, his analysis also falls within the framework of the first approach to theory synthesis in IR.



The second approach, on the other hand, has been chosen by Andrew Moravcsik in the development of his “liberal intergovernmentalist” theory of international relations (Moravcsik, 1993a) which fuses liberal theories of national preference formation with systemic theories of intergovernmental bargaining to articulate a synthesised theory of international politics that transcends the dividing-line between the domestic and international “levels of analysis.”

The following sections will examine in more detail the efforts of these three scholars in pursuing and/or understanding theory synthesis in IR.

## 2.1 *Breaking Down Barriers to Debate?*

One of the most striking examples of attempted theory synthesis is to be found in the current debate between neorealists and neoliberal institutionalists (a collection of contemporary contributions by both sides may be found in Baldwin, 1993). Robert Keohane, at the forefront of the neoliberal institutionalist paradigm, is also the main force behind the synthesising element of the debate that pushes for a recognition on both sides of the closeness of the theoretical assumptions of the two schools. Keohane points out that:

In his response to my criticisms and those of others, Joseph Grieco [of the neorealist school] has interestingly amplified and commented on his earlier arguments, in a way that helps us, in my view, to move toward a more satisfactory synthesis of perspectives (Keohane, 1993:273).

This view may, however, paint too rosy a picture of the future prospects for a “synthesis of perspectives” between neoliberal institutionalism and neorealism both because the two paradigms have not always occupied such close ground as to be within striking-distance of coalition and because the members of the neorealist school seem to be decisively more set against surrendering their final “relative gains” outpost to the onslaught of the neoliberal institutionalists. Grieco himself is significantly less optimistic about the prospects for synthesis both because he recognises the distance that contemporary neoliberal institutionalism has travelled in order to knock at neorealism’s door (Grieco, 1993:118-121) and because he rejects Keohane’s claim that the theoretical assumptions of both paradigms are very similar: “Neoliberal institutionalism is not based on realist theory” (Ibid.:131).

Nevertheless, Keohane envisages the future of debate between the schools as being devoid of “sterile repetition of competing claims” (Keohane, 1993:273).



and prefers rather to concentrate on the formulation, together with neorealism, of a theory of international institutions that will "synthesize elements of realism and liberalism" (Ibid.:293). Indeed, in his articulation of institutionalist theory, Keohane claims to have already created the basis for such a synthesised theory (Ibid.).

Keohane's efforts to encourage dialogue, debate and ultimate synthesis do not limit themselves to the neoliberal intercourse with neorealists, however. They also stretch across the much wider chasm that spans the void between "rational" and "reflective" approaches to the study of international relations. Indeed, it would seem that Keohane (1988) was among the first of the rationalist group to take seriously the criticisms and contending assertions of the more sociologically-inclined reflective group and it was he who, in fact, conferred upon that group the label of "reflective;"—"since all of them emphasize the importance of human reflection for the nature of institutions and ultimately for the character of world politics" (Keohane, 1988:382).

In his treatment of the rationalist-reflective debate, Keohane (1988) underlines the shortcomings of both approaches in understanding world politics in general and institutions in particular. The rationalist approach, he argues, is limited by the difficulty it experiences in sufficiently extending its vision back into history and further by its inability to take account of human consciousness and changes thereof. Reflectivists have been found wanting, Keohane goes on to argue, mainly because they have concentrated exclusively on levelling criticism against rationalistic methods of studying international relations and, as a result, have largely neglected the essential task of developing a coherent research-programme of their own. He concludes, in conciliatory manner, that, although rational approaches need to be developed further in order to improve their historical contextuality and although reflective approaches need to take time out to develop a research-programme that is susceptible to systematic empirical testing, both approaches can and should remain engaged in constructive, competitive debate. Keohane's optimism regarding the prospects of such a debate encourages him to argue that:

Eventually, we may hope for a synthesis between the rationalistic and reflective approaches—a synthesis that will help us to understand both practices and specific institutions and the relationships between them. Such a synthesis, however, will not emerge full-blown, like Athena from the head of Zeus. On the contrary, it will require constructive competition and dialogue between these two research programs—and the theoretically informed investigation of facts (Keohane, 1988:393).

Wæver's (1994) innovative analysis of the development of the discipline of IR, on the other hand, is interesting on at least two levels; first because it deals in depth with the question of debate between IR paradigms and the reasons underlying their (in)commensurability and, second, because it addresses the rationalist-reflectivist debate in a way which complements, and sheds further light upon, Keohane's standpoint outlined above. As such, Wæver's analysis is a useful complement to the consideration of Keohane's synthesising efforts.

Wæver's views on the (in)commensurability of IR paradigms will be referred to in the third section of this paper which will deal more systematically with that topic. For the time being, we are only interested in what he has to say about the rationalist-reflectivist debate and about the prospects for the development of joint research-project encompassing both approaches.

For Wæver (1994), the discipline of IR has perhaps already passed *beyond* its "fourth debate," even though conventional accounts of the history of IR recognise the existence of only three—the realist-utopian clash in the inter-war years, the traditionalist-behaviouralist skirmish of the 1950s and '60s and the more recent attacks on the dominant realist paradigm initiated mainly by institutionalist approaches but also by others. Wæver typifies this third debate in the form of a triangle at who's points lie the paradigms of realism, liberalism and radicalism. While each is connected to the others by a line of debate, the line stretching between realism and liberalism represents, for Wæver, by far the most important vector line along which the most significant debate takes place.

Wæver's "fourth debate" began more recently and is composed of two parts; the "rationalist-reflectivist debate" (debate 4a)—which, as we shall demonstrate later, is also not without an element of synthesis—and the "neo-neo synthesis" (debate 4b). By neo-neo synthesis Wæver means the synthesis of the *neo*-realist and *neo*-liberal institutionalist paradigms into essentially a single rationalistic IR paradigm:

It [the term "neo-neo"] refers first of all to the synthesis between realism and liberalism that became possible, when realism was transformed into neorealism and liberalism into neoliberal institutionalism; it is the synthesis of the two neo-schools that became possible by their very neo-ness (Wæver, 1994:13).

The only remaining point of contention between the two schools that make up the neo-neo synthesis centres upon whether and under what conditions states care about relative gains when considering co-operative activity (cf. Powell, 1993).



According to Wæver, however, this point does not constitute sufficient grounds on which to justify the separation of neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism into distinct IR paradigms and refers to Keohane's (1988) characterisation of the rationalist-reflectivist debate in order to support his contention that neorealists and neoliberal institutionalists are essentially involved in furthering a common research programme.

The other element of Wæver's fourth debate (debate 4a) emerges as a direct consequence of the neo-neo synthesis. The former poles of realism and liberalism having coalesced, the main line of debate changed its course to run between the new "rationalistic" coalition on the one hand, and the "radical" pole—which came to be characterised by reflectivist theorising—on the other.<sup>2</sup>

Wæver argues that IR has perhaps passed beyond the fourth debate since much has developed since the rationalist-reflectivist debate became the main one in IR. First of all, boundaries have developed within both paradigms, dividing each in two. In the rationalist paradigm, the "boundary of boredom" divides rational-choice approaches from institutionalist approaches. In the reflectivist school, the "boundary of negativity" divides deconstructivist from constructivist approaches. Both rational-choice and deconstructivism have been isolated on the extremes of their respective paradigms while a dialogue has emerged between institutionalist and constructivist approaches—i.e., the contemporary rationalist-reflectivist debate. And even this debate displays signs of accommodation. Wæver states that;

we have seen the neo-neo synthesis which strives for a classical shared methodology, and even among the theories that do not vie for such close merger, there is a changed attitude. The trend of the last decade has exactly been for all the more dominant theories also to establish more self-knowledge and a better understanding of their limits, inner logic and their couplings to other kinds of theory (Wæver, 1994:21).

<sup>2</sup> Wæver (1994) does not, however, offer a satisfactory explanation of the composition of the "radical" pole of his triangular typology during the transition from the third to the fourth debate. The question remains open as to how reflectivism should have overcome Marxism to become the dominant "radical" paradigm in the fourth debate.



## 2.2 *Transcending Levels of Analysis?*

In assessing the limits of his proposed common realist/institutionalist research-project, Keohane contributes to clearing the ground for what may be described as an even more ambitious attempt at theory synthesis; one that would transcend the traditional division between the domestic and the international "levels of analysis." In this regard, both Keohane and Grieco admit that;

even such a synthesized theory at the systemic level [i.e., the neorealist/neoliberal institutionalist synthesis] will be inadequate. ...systemic theory cannot provide a complete explanation of state action. [...] Without a theory of interests, which requires analysis of domestic politics, no theory of international relations can be fully adequate. Systemic theory is worthwhile, but it can only take us part of the way; and we should be careful to avoid retreating behind it: a major task... is to link domestic politics with international relations in a theoretically meaningful and analytically rigorous way (Keohane, 1993:294).

The work of Andrew Moravcsik attempts exactly what Keohane and Grieco suggest; a synthesis of domestic politics with international relations. However, there is an important distinction to be drawn between the type of synthesis attempted by Keohane and that attempted by Moravcsik. Rather than striving for the removal of final obstacles to the merger of two formerly distinct research programmes that have subsequently come to occupy common ground on central theoretical assumptions, Moravcsik seeks the merger of two traditionally separated "levels of analysis" of international relations; the "domestic politics" level and the "systemic" level. In other words, he seeks the synthesis mainly of Waltz's (1958) second and third images although he suggests that a more complete understanding of international politics would also need to incorporate the psychological elements of Waltz's first image. Moravcsik states that we are challenged;

to revisit the level-of-analysis problem, throwing into relief the many instances in which the levels collapse into one another. ...we need to move toward more complex synthesis of domestic and international explanations. The resulting framework may permit a more systematic integration of domestic ("second-image") and individual ("first-image") influences on foreign policy into systemic theory [third image] (Moravcsik, 1993b:33).

Moravcsik has pursued this synthesis by developing what he terms a "liberal intergovernmentalist" approach to studying international relations (Moravcsik,

1993a) which combines “liberal”<sup>3</sup> theories of national preference formation with essentially realist theories of intergovernmental bargaining. For Moravcsik, the statesman, or Chief of Government (COG), is the focal-point of international politics. S/he must constantly juggle in order to maintain a equilibrium between the demands and opportunities of international politics on the one hand and of domestic politics on the other in order to maximise the opportunities offered by both. The COG, therefore, occupies the space between the domestic and the international arenas and mediates as best s/he can the opportunities and restraints that emanate from each, often playing one off against the other in order to improve an international bargaining position or to expand domestic support.

This approach departs radically from the traditional IR approach which formally denied the commensurability of the two levels of analysis and, in granting pre-eminence to systemic explanations, referred to domestic politics only to explain anomalies left over after a systemic analysis had been completed and had been found to be relatively weak on explanatory power. These anomalies, or this “residual variance,” argued the traditional approach, could be legitimately explained by reference to domestic politics since three assumptions of the systemic approach—the assumption of rationality, the assumption of consistent mobilisation capacity and the assumption of stable state preferences—were often too strict to generate accurate results from specific case-studies (Moravcsik, 1993b). Thus, only in cases where residual variance was evident—i.e., when predictions generated by systemic theory did not fit perfectly with observed events, did the traditional approach tolerate a fleeting reference to domestic politics in order to clear up the mess.

Moravcsik’s approach, he argues, goes beyond the “residual variance” approach insofar as it does not give *a priori* preference to either domestic or international explanations:

...the decision to begin with systemic, as opposed to domestic, theory is essentially arbitrary. Systemic theories are not inherently more parsimonious, nor more powerful, nor more precise than their domestic counterparts. [...] ...the converse may be more true: domestic politics provides the analytical basis for analyzing international factors. In the absence of a compelling theoretical argument or clear empirical evidence from studies that assess domestic and international explanations on an equal

<sup>3</sup> For an interesting criticism of the “liberal” nature of Moravcsik’s and Keohane’s theories, see Long (1994).



basis, the grant of priority to systemic theories simply introduces an unwarranted bias into the body of empirical research conducted in international relations (Moravcsik, 1993b:14).

Also, it is essentially a theory of international bargaining that shows how the domestic and systemic levels are closely inter-linked through the COG, who's "double-edged" strategies seek the best outcomes by playing one level off against the other. In this way, Moravcsik's theory does not simply seek to append the existing body of knowledge on domestic preference formation to the existing body of knowledge on intergovernmental bargaining. It does not proceed by first isolating and specifying a particular set of national preferences and then explaining how this domestic preference-base constrains intergovernmental negotiators. Rather, it seeks to show how "complex patterns of interdependence do not simply constrain statesmen, ...but also create new possibilities for creative statecraft" (Moravcsik, 1993b:16). In other words, the synthesis that Moravcsik is after is not of the "additive" kind, but of the "interactive" kind. He seeks to show that the integration of domestic and systemic explanations of international relations yields more powerful explanations by *simultaneously* accounting for domestic preference formation and intergovernmental bargaining and by underlining the interdependence and the interaction of both processes (Moravcsik, 1993b:15, 17).



### 3. Synthesis from a History of Science Perspective

So far we have identified the practice of theory synthesis as a phenomenon of contemporary IR and have briefly underlined the significance of this practice to the work of two contemporary IR scholars, Robert Keohane and Andrew Moravcsik. Before advancing to a critical appraisal of the synthesising efforts of both Keohane and Moravcsik, however, we will turn for guidance to the history of science.

Our reading of epistemology is not a normative approach about the way that social scientists “ought” to appraise theories and carry out research. Actually, there is a whole branch of science—the methodology of science—that provides criteria and algorithms of doing science. As leading figures of this branch one may name K. Popper, T. Kuhn, I. Lakatos and P. Feyerabend. What we attempt here is to address the business of theory-synthesis from the perspective that sees science as a historical and social product. We agree with Kuhn that science is not a timeless individual logical product but rather a social activity. From this standpoint, we hope to shed some additional light on central questions surrounding the development of science and on the role played by theory synthesis and competition in that development.

The following analysis takes the method of synthesis to its logical conclusion. It addresses the important questions of theory selection and appraisal and compares the processes of synthesis and competition. It is meant to provide a spring-board from which we can ultimately offer some evaluative remarks about the utility of theory synthesis in IR in the concluding part of the paper.

In order to better examine the context of theory synthesis in the field of IR, we will exploit the history of science by focusing our efforts on trying to answer the following key questions;

- (1) What criteria may be employed in order to ascertain the validity of a theory (which theory should I accept)?
- (2) How is the researcher to decide on a theoretical paradigm in which to work (which theories should I work on)?

Question (1) fits into the endless debate within scientific communities about theory appraisal and selection. Is there a “proper” way to compare and rank theories? What does “good” theory mean? What is the merit of appraising theories? To deal with these kinds of questions we need to examine more closely the debate about the nature and the development of scientific knowledge.

Here we identify two traditions of doing science. The first is the positivist tradition, which is based on the assumption that science consists of the cumulation of logically constructed knowledge about reality. The second is the school of thought based on the assumption that knowledge is more of a social phenomenon and never a logical product.

The key difference between the above traditions clearly derives from the way in which they understand the character of theoretical knowledge. Here is the Achilles' heel even of modern rationalism's method of appraising rival theories; i.e. using falsification methods to test theories against data sets. In fact scientists invariably describe and explain phenomena in terms of a specific theory which they have invented or constructed. But formally speaking, an endless number of theories can be constructed to be consistent with a particular body of data. Logically, the notion of a single correct or best-supported theory does not hold. Therefore even working within the well-defined positivist framework there is no safe logical way of picking the theory-winner out of a field of competing theories.

Kuhn's (1970) work repeatedly reminds the scientific community of the limits of autonomous individual reason in carrying out science. The same reminder is provided by the successive waves of hermeneuticists, structuralists, post-empiricists, deconstructivists and other "invaders."<sup>4</sup> The conventional wisdom that theorising in the social sciences has an individual logic as an external variable has been seriously undermined.

It seems convincing that a dominant *research project*—in lakatosian terminology—or *paradigm*—in kuhnian terminology—is never accepted purely as a result of logical considerations. Always there is evidence that supports it and evidence that calls it into question; there are always arguments for and against it. According to the Kuhnian theory of scientific development, the key prerequisite for the adoption of a paradigm is the absence of any "compelling logical justification." Kuhn asserts that knowledge is a public possession and must have a general form for all its users which can be obtained through communication, interaction and cooperation. Clearly, knowledge is a collective creation founded upon the evaluations we make together in social situations, according to custom and precedent and in relation to our communal ends. However, the above definition of knowledge should not be understood in the sense that custom must replace reason in our thinking but rather that reasoning itself must not be seen as a timeless activity fixed upon a social system of values, means and ends.

<sup>4</sup> See the chapters on Feyerabend, Poulatzas, Habermas, Foucault, and Lacan in Skinner (1985).



Having clarified in this way the concept of scientific knowledge, an answer to question (1) seems impossible. If we define theories as systems of statements, just as most rationalist epistemologists currently do, and accept the social definition of knowledge, the comparative evaluation of competing theories crashes on the intractable problem of the Kuhnian "incommensurability of scientific theories" (Kuhn, 1970). Reasonable men in social sciences disagree on three main points. First, they disagree on what counts as a problem and what counts as a solution to a problem. Thus, attempts at synthesis on a problem-solving base will be hampered by incommensurability. Second, they disagree on what is naturally given and what needs explanation. Hence, attempts at synthesis on the explanatory level will face the same obstacles. Third, they disagree on the degree of refutation needed in order to lead scientists to the conclusion that a theory is bankrupt.

Although incommensurability seems a valid argument, especially for the social sciences, it is a static approach of doing science in which individual reasoning is still the motto. If science is a social activity, the comparison and appraisal of competing theories is fundamental in order for scientists to promote their theories. Through comparison, they communicate with rival theories; they "learn" about them. In this way they can better organise their own arguments in order to make their own theories "better." Moreover, through comparison, they can increase the persuasive power of their research projects for both their members and the weak or indecisive members of rival groups. In other words since theory synthesis is not a timeless, neutral activity, theory appraisal and communication is a fundamental element of this process.

The output of this process is, again, not the logical domination of one framework over the rest, nor their logical synthesis. In the Popperian and Kuhnian scientific worlds, stable periods are characterised not by a system of theoretical pluralism but by a system in which one theory is predominant over the rest. Mature science is dominant and there is no space for "bad" science. Theory proliferation exists only in times of crisis—the stage during which newer theories compete to succeed the bankrupt, old, normal theory.

Reading through the history of the social sciences, it is very difficult to identify periods of normal science during which one theory dominated. We can see that proliferation not only immediately precedes revolutions but that it exists all the time. The state of affairs corresponds more with Feyerabend's (1974:211-212) view that science cannot be understood as a temporal succession of normal periods and periods of proliferation but rather as their juxtaposition. There are theories that become relatively but never absolutely dominant and this position depends on the role of sociological factors like authority, education, hierarchy, and



reference groups instead of on some isolated individual rationality that is supposed to monitor experience without bias or preconceptions (Kuhn, 1974).

Ultimately, all we can say is that there is no answer to question (1); "which theory should I accept?" The pronoun "I" is dominant in our answer. It depends on where "you" stand; it depends on what "you" want to ask; it depends on why "you" ask; it depends on how "you" ask; and, finally, it depends on who "you" ask. Does this mean that the acceptance of a theory is something personal? Well, personal "yes," but subjective "no." The decision is personal insofar as it contributes to the general appraisal of a research programme made by the epistemic community but it is not the judgement itself. Theory appraisal and selection by the epistemic community is a social product that can be identified and evaluated as a "social logical" phenomenon and not as a "neutral logical" construction. In social science, theory selection never led the discipline into a period of absolute domination by one research paradigm.

The fact that social science is characterised by the co-existence of many competing research projects leads us to the second key-question. The "victorious" research project has to be announced by the historian of social science but in the meantime the researcher has to choose a project on which to work.

The question of *choosing* a research-project is fundamentally different from question (1). Neither historians nor philosophers of science, nor interested observers of the scientific scene, would ask themselves question (2). It would be asked only by a working scientist, and only in connection with theories within his own field. As we argued earlier in answer to question (1), the scientific community decides, through its communication channels, the ranking of "good" research projects. These theories are already completed intellectual constructions when the community comes to appraise them. Things become different for the community when the time comes to advise a researcher to participate in one or another rival research project. Considering the non value-free nature of social science, and considering that researchers have only weak theoretical criteria with which to work, any channelling of research towards "the one and the best" research project would lead to monopolisation of the field, with catastrophic consequences for scientific progress. Let's examine this argument more carefully.

Because of the fact that the social sciences are in a "pre-mature stage" of development and that many competing paradigms exist, the scientific community does not have the privilege of *ex post* appraisal of its theories and the *ex ante* advising of its members. But even if one does not accept the role of the scientific community in the Kuhnian sense, one cannot overcome the problem posed by the fact that theories are dynamic by nature and, as such, nobody can freeze them.

Living in a real world of incomplete knowledge, even within the positivist tradition, there is no way of choosing with absolute certainty the optimal research project, not to mention choosing a common research agenda for the social sciences. Because of this, isn't some theoretical competition desirable? As Kuhn himself put it;

if a decision must be made under circumstances in which even the most deliberate and considered judgement may be wrong, it may be vitally important that different individuals decide in different ways. How else could the group as a whole hedge its bets?" (Kuhn, 1970:186)

Let us now turn to the comparative appraisal of research programs in progress. There are two methods by which one might proceed. The first is to ask which research programme has performed best so far, excluding all considerations of their future performance. However, this method of choosing presupposes that research programmes may be assessed in light of one another, an assumption that may be misfounded. The second method is to try to guess which of these rival programs is going to perform best in the future. When doing so, it is worthwhile keeping in mind that there is no guarantee that a bad project will not become a good one in the future. Popper actually held that contradictions further intellectual progress only so long as we are determined not to put up with them to and work to remove them (Popper, 1963:316-17). Lakatos insisted that a stagnant or degenerate research programme may always "stage a comeback" (Lakatos, 1978:113).

Therefore, the answer to the question (2) is that there is no way of safely suggesting a research project as the most promising to a researcher. Instead of centralising the process of carrying out research, it is better for the academic community to work to safeguard the maximum competition amongst rival research projects, and to defend its institutions against any cartelisation of social science.

#### 4. Problems & Possibilities

In light of these considerations, how does the development of the discipline of International Relations look today? Has competition or cooperation characterised IR debate over the past number of years? Which of the two trends is likely to become dominant in the coming years?

It is plausible to argue that debate within the discipline of IR has undergone a transformation in the last number of years. There has been a move away from



the “great debate” tradition that characterised the discipline’s history up, perhaps, until the end of the 1970s or maybe even later. Instead, IR paradigms have begun to take a different view of one another insofar as they have begun to engage in synthesising activity to an unprecedented degree. Although this tendency has not manifested itself across the entire range of IR paradigms, it is especially evident in the work of both Keohane and Moravcsik; but is not exclusively limited to their work.<sup>5</sup> It is a tendency that is, no doubt, central to understanding the evolution of IR theory today since its influence can be felt at the heart of the discipline; i.e., it permeates the debate between neorealists and neoliberal institutionalists, the debate between rationalists and reflectivists, and the liberal intergovernmentalist attempt to integrate theories of domestic preference formation and intergovernmental bargaining.

The final part of this essay will address the problems and the possibilities that go hand in hand with this synthesising tendency and will pose some questions regarding the significance of theory synthesis to the development of IR theory.

The fact that important scholarship in the field of international relations has tended in recent years to concentrate on integrating traditionally diverse theories into common research programmes should not deter us from questioning this development. Why has there been a “run” on synthesis in the past ten years? What are the conditions that have made it possible to attempt to integrate theories? What problems, obvious and not so obvious, does this attempt face and what are its chances of success? What does this tendency tell us about the present state of the discipline of IR? These are the big questions, all of which are closely bound up with one another, that the following analysis will attempt to address.

Steve Smith (1994) has some interesting things to say about theory synthesis in the context of Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) and his comments are especially pertinent to our present discussion of the development of IR theory. His consideration of the topic seems to stem from a revulsion against what he terms a “pick and mix” approach to employing theories of international relations (Smith, 1994:15). By this he means the approach of drawing on distinct bodies of theory in order to explain and better understand certain sub-sets of international behaviour. He argues that debate in IR has been stifled largely because each paradigm has stuck to explaining what it can explain best. Thus, a kind of

<sup>5</sup> Wæver (1994b:257; 1994a:13), for example, has pointed to other attempts at theory synthesis in the work of John Ruggie and Barry Buzan.



“academic division of labour” has been instigated within IR with the unfortunate result that:

The three paradigms do not so much debate, or stand in opposition to one another, as offer accounts of parts of the subject whilst not treading on one another's territory. In this light the debate is very conservative since it defends each paradigm against competition; it is defensive as well, ending up with a version of ‘we speak different languages’ or ‘we see the world differently’ (Smith, 1994:6).

From this standpoint, Smith goes on to question the efficacy of the “pick and mix” approach. He correctly points out that this practice gives the impression that the theories being used to explain different types of activity can actually be combined in order to provide more powerful explanations of broader arenas of international political behaviour. He argues, however, that this impression is misleading since it gives us the erroneous impression that our partial theories are, in fact, compatible with one another and may be combined to produce “better” theory.

His objections to this assumption may be condensed as follows into one general argument. Because of the fact that the “world views” of each of the different FPA paradigms may be widely divergent, it may be difficult, if not in fact impossible, to find a neutral set of data with which to test rival paradigms against one another. This may be the case because each approach may not accept the ontological assumptions of the others and, therefore, there may be no way of reaching agreement on what actually constitutes the subject of study.

Smith uses the agent-structure division to support his assertion about the possible incommensurability of partial theories used in FPA. His argument is essentially that if FPA theories take different stances on the agent-structure question, they cannot be combined into a single, coherent theoretical framework that better explains the formulation of foreign policy. Three reasons preclude the possibility of this synthesis.

First, there is a methodological stumbling-block; it is impossible to assess the relative explanatory leverage of agency and structure in a particular situation since no neutral vantage-point exists from which to assess their relative explanatory leverage. Second, there is an epistemological stumbling-block. Since agency and structure approaches do not share a common epistemology, it is impossible to arrive at a common understanding of what is to be regarded as knowledge in a given situation. As Walter Carlsnaes put it in his summary of Smith's second objection to theory synthesis in FPA:

Since inside [agent] accounts refer to agents' intentions and definitions of the situation, whereas outside [structure] accounts eschew all such reference to agential self-understanding in favour of strictly causal explanations of behaviour, it is simply not possible to blend what essentially are two mutually exclusive epistemologies (Carlsnaes, 1994:278).

The third stumbling-block is ontological. In essence, this argument states that agency and structure cannot both be ontologically prior. In other words, the influence of individuals *and* social structures cannot both be given primacy in explaining foreign policy behaviour.

Smith's arguments are strongly based on those of Kuhn, who held that because there *are* no facts independent of our theories about them, there is no one way of viewing, classifying and explaining the world that would satisfy all rational people:

Rival theories can of course be compared, but not against an objective scale. In the end they are simply incommensurable, with the result that their exponents may be said... to be living and working in different worlds (Kuhn, 1970:134-5).

The arguments of Smith and Kuhn, coupled with the points raised concerning the philosophy of science in the second part of this essay, provide an ideal starting point from which to begin a discussion of the problems facing theory synthesis in IR.

A central problem inherent in theory synthesis would seem to be the problem of *compatibility*. But is it necessary to concur with the view that two theories cannot be combined in a common framework if their ontological and/or epistemological assumptions are not the same? With this question in mind, let us briefly examine the development of contemporary IR theory.

In this regard, Wæver's (1994) account of the development of IR theory and its increasing tendency towards dialogue, compatibility and synthesis paints a far from harmonious, if not inconsistent, picture. Particularly puzzling is the sometimes clear, sometimes blurred, but always problematic distinction he draws between the ontological/epistemological incommensurability of theories and the "division of labour" approach to theorising (which is, by the way, comparable to Smith's "pick and mix" metaphor). For the sake of clear comparison, we will focus on the IR's third debate on the one hand, and on that which has occurred subsequent to this debate on the other: Wæver argues that IR's "third debate" was characterised by a lack of dialogue borne of the incommensurability of the



dominant paradigms. With reference to the realist and institutionalist paradigms, he states that:

The two paradigms had different strengths, there were things better explained by the one, and others better dealt with by the other. And more importantly: there was no way to prove one or the other right. Realists and pluralists (interdependence people) saw different realities. If they went out to 'test' their theories, they would test them against different material, for they each sorted the world according to different concepts... [...] ...the emerging self-perception in and of the discipline was that competing theories had emerged which each contained its own confirming stories, data and preferred issues (Wæver, 1994a:2).

Thus Wæver characterises the third debate by reference to its dominant "form;" incommensurability (p. 8) and finds support for this state of the discipline in the philosophy of science of Thomas Kuhn, who argued that:

Each 'paradigm' constructs its own basic concepts/units and question—and thereby its data, criteria and not least its stories about paradigmatic experiments or similar scientific events. Paradigms are incommensurable, because they each generate their criteria of judgement and their own 'language' (Wæver, 1994a:2).

Although Wæver concentrates exclusively on the incommensurable nature of this "third debate" and uses this point to distinguish the latter from the debate that followed it, there can be little doubt that some theoretical "division of labour" was also evident in the third debate and even in Wæver's own analysis of that debate. Not only did contending paradigms tend to refer to their mutual ontological/epistemological incompatibility and thereby eschew criticism of one another, some issues, to paraphrase Wæver himself, were better explained by one theory, and some were better explained by another. This situation is typical, however, of a theoretical division of labour. Even during the third debate, therefore, theoretical incommensurability and theoretical division of labour existed side by side. Not only did IR paradigms concentrate their attention on different aspects of international relations, the realities they observed within their respective areas of concentration were essentially incommensurable.

In contrast to the proposed dominance of theoretical incommensurability in the third debate, Wæver posits a different dominant characteristic of the "fourth debate"—"the mode of relating schools in the 1990s is not incommensurability



but a kind of 'division of labour'" (Wæver, 1994a:21). Following this analysis, the dominant IR theories of the 1990s have undergone a deep-reaching reappraisal of themselves. They have become more aware of their limits, their inner logic and their relationships with other theories and have come to an implicit understanding that each of them occupies an relatively dominant position in different areas of international relations. In this way, contending IR paradigms have more or less decided to carve up the study of international relations among themselves.

It is with explicit reference to this "division of labour" phenomenon that Wæver explains the unprecedented move towards accommodation and synthesis that has been evident in recent work in IR. However, this aspect of Wæver's analysis is just as problematic as his analysis of the dynamics of IR's "third debate" in that, this time, he focuses exclusively on the supposed theoretical "division of labour" but omits a consideration of incommensurability; either because he believes that such incommensurability no longer exists or has least been sufficiently diluted by a largely successful attempt to discover an inter-paradigmatic common language which has provided for not only improved communication between those paradigms lying close to one another on his scale, but also for the development of research programmes common to contiguous paradigms.

At this point we are reminded of Smith's objections—outlined above—to the assumption that 'if theories offer the researcher a pick and mix option, they are automatically commensurate with one another.' One of the central problems with the assertion that theory synthesis is happening, or can happen, in IR, therefore, is that it must take account of the compatibility of theories that "seem" to explain different parts of the same reality. Wæver's analysis of the fourth debate is, therefore, as incomplete as his analysis of the third debate since, instead of allocating equal attention in each case to the issues of commensurability and division of labour, he concentrates the majority of his attention in the former case on theoretical incommensurability and in the latter case on theoretical division of labour. It is much more plausible to argue that the history of IR has not been divided into clear cut periods of theoretical "incommensurability" and theoretical "division of labour," as Wæver would have us believe. Rather, it seems obvious that both elements have been present at all stages of IR's development and both are still present now. Therefore, in assessing the possibilities for theory synthesis in contemporary IR, we would be ill-advised to accept the rather simplistic view that current theories offer us a plethora of specialised tools with which to examine different parts of a common international reality. In other words, we should not accept unquestioningly the assertion that contemporary theories of IR "partly

explain the same object" nor should we readily buy into the argument that these theories "can be treated as *complementary* sources of negative predictions" (Wæver, 1994a:21; emphasis added). By following this line, we would be falling into the "pick and mix trap of assumed commensurability" against which Smith has warned.

When analysing the current state of IR and especially when analysing contemporary attempts to synthesise theories therein, we should not lose sight of the dual problems of commensurability *and* division of labour. The latter may imply the former but the implication is misleading.

The synthesising project of Robert Keohane, briefly outlined in the first part of this essay, focuses mainly on overcoming the traditional division of labour between realists and institutionalists—the latter traditionally focusing on conflictual, the former on co-operative international relations. It does so by attempting to engage both paradigms in a research project that would "explore the extent, strength, and content of international institutions, examining *how*, not merely whether, they make a difference" (Keohane, 1993:273). This synthesising attempt takes place, however, against a background assumption that realism and institutionalism are ontologically and epistemologically commensurable. But it is the problem of theoretical commensurability, and not that of theoretical division of labour, that provides the ultimate obstacle to the complete fusion of the two approaches. The question of whether states care about relative-gains is essentially a question of ontology. As long as this ontological incompatibility exists, it is questionable whether the so-called neo-neo synthesis can be completed. However, the problem may be overcome by rephrasing the question and by asking instead "under what conditions do states care about relative gains?" This is by far a more productive question and holds out much hope of a synthesis of perspectives between the neorealist and neoliberal institutionalist schools—assuming, of course, that both sides of the debate can agree upon the fact that states do, under certain conditions, care about relative gains.

The research-project of Andrew Moravcsik, on the other hand, approaches the issues of commensurability and division of labour from a completely different and more problematic standpoint. In contrast to Keohane's synthesis, Moravcsik is not attempting to integrate two bodies of theory that have transcended, through a process of competitive debate, the division of labour that once existed between them. Domestic and systemic accounts of how states conduct their relations with other states differ fundamentally from one another. A division of labour, in the sense of concentration on different aspects of international relations, still exists



between domestic and systemic approaches to the study of international relations, as the “residual variance” approach, outlined above, demonstrates.

Nor is Moravcsik attempting to integrate two sets of theories that have, over time, come to accept common ontological and epistemological assumptions. In fact, nothing could be further from the truth. Domestic approaches to explaining international relations focus mainly on the conscious role that actors play in the formulation of the foreign-policy of states and on the influence of agency on the nature of the international system. Systemic approaches, on the other hand, focus attention on the constraints imposed upon states by the distribution of capabilities in the international system and in doing so not only assert that these constraints are the main determining factor of international behaviour, but also largely ignore the role of agency in the determination of foreign-policy.

Moravcsik’s approach, therefore, faces difficulty on the fronts of both commensurability and division of labour, mainly because his synthesising efforts are much more ambitious than those of Keohane. He attempts to bypass the issue of commensurability by making the COG the centre of international relations; the focal-point that simultaneously appeases in two directions at once and simultaneously takes advantage of the opportunities provided by each level for increasing leverage in the other. The COG is Moravcsik’s answer to incommensurability, since s/he occupies the perfect position from which to analyse both the domestic and the international “levels.”

Furthermore, agency is given priority over structure in Moravcsik’s analysis, which is only to be expected considering we are dealing with a *liberalist* intergovernmentalist approach in which the COG (an agent) plays a preponderant role in shaping the relations between states.

Thus, the main criticism that may be levelled against Moravcsik’s approach to integrating domestic and international theories is that his approach does not actually transcend levels of analysis by incorporating domestic and systemic accounts of international relations, as Keohane (1993) hoped could be achieved. Rather, it simply subsumes the systemic under considerations of enlarged agency.

The space required to elucidate the possibilities of theory synthesis in IR is much smaller than that required above to outline only some of the problems of the synthesising approach, mainly because it is easier to outline problems than to enumerate possibilities. Therefore, this section is composed mainly of general statements about the possible advantages and disadvantages of integrating theories and of some open questions that we would like to see addressed by IR scholars.

Those directly involved in the practice of synthesising theories would argue that theory synthesis is desirable only if it leads to the development of “better”

theory. In order to achieve this aim, they would argue, a worthwhile synthesising project must fulfil a number of important criteria. First, it must succeed in integrating within a common theoretical framework two formerly distinct, or even incommensurable, theories. Second, the resulting theory must be at once more accurate—in the sense of its ability to generate predictions—and more general than both of the theories that went into making it. Third, each of the component theories must constitute “limiting cases” of the new synthesised theory; in other words, each of the old theories must constitute an approximation of the new theory when the new theory is limited to the domain where the old theories were successful (Cartwright, 1991). If these criteria cannot be fulfilled by a synthesising project, then that project is not worthwhile since it does not provide us with “improved” theory and we would be better off sticking to the admittedly partial theories with which we began our synthesising efforts.

The general question that remains to be answered is as follows: Does theory synthesis, in the way it has been outlined here, provide a path forward for IR? Should the discipline of IR give priority to establishing common research programmes between distinct research paradigms with the ultimate aim of integrating their insights into common research frameworks? In other words, should priority be given to emptying the tools of different theoretical boxes into larger synthesised boxes or should we be content with sticking to the division of labour approach to the study of international relations by which we may choose from the large number of tool-boxes at our disposal depending on what type of international behaviour we are examining?

The answer to this question should take into consideration the discussion outlined in part three of this paper concerning the difficulties of theory-appraisal and selection on the one hand and the long-term benefits of competition between research paradigms on the other. If theory synthesis provides a useful path forward for the discipline of IR, what will be the mechanisms that will decide which theories become integrated in which broad research programmes? Is it desirable to strive for and openly support the process of theory synthesis or is it more advisable to foster a competitive theoretical environment in which contending theories of international relations defend themselves in entrenched positions from one another’s onslaughts?

As this paper has pointed out, both trends have existed in IR throughout its entire history and their interaction has to a large extent determined the development of the discipline. Again today, IR finds itself at a particular stage of this interaction in which synthesising tendencies seem to have gained the upper hand over competitive inter-paradigm competition. While the current trend of theory synthesis in IR may reflect a certain maturity of some IR paradigms and a



certain consolidation of their research over the past number of years, it is imperative for the future development of the discipline that we remain disposed to alternative approaches to studying international relations that foster competition rather than co-operation between paradigms. Consolidation and synthesis may be productive and may underline progress that has been achieved but, as this paper has pointed out, these trends are fraught with difficulties. Competition, on the other hand, constitutes the tension that maintains the discipline in a healthy state by ensuring paradigmatic diversity.

## References

- ALLAN, P. (1992). "The End of the Cold War: The End of International Relations Theory?" In Allan, P. & Goldmann, K. (eds.), *The End of the Cold War; Evaluating Theories of International Relations*. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Martinus Nijhoff.
- BALDWIN, D. A. (ed.), (1993). *Neorealism and Neoliberalism; The Contemporary Debate*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- BANKS, M. (1984). "The Evolution of International Relations Theory." In M. Banks (ed.), *Conflict in World Society*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf Books.
- BOWKER, M. & BROWN, R. (1992). *From Cold War to Collapse: Theory and World Politics in the 1980s*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CARLSNAES, W. (1994). "In Lieu of a Conclusion: Compatibility and the Agency-Structure Issue in Foreign Policy Analysis." In W. Carlsnaes & S. Smith (eds.), *European Foreign Policy; The EC and Changing Perspectives in Europe*. London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi: Sage.
- CARTWRIGHT, N. (1991). "Can Wholism Reconcile the Inaccuracy of Theory with the Accuracy of Prediction." *SYNTHESE*. 89(1): 3-13.
- DOUGHERTY, J. E. & PFALTZGRAFF, R. L. JR. (1990). *Contending Theories of International Relations; A Comprehensive Survey*. Third Edition. New York: Harper Collins.
- FEYERABEND, P.K. (1975). *Against Method*. London: NLB.
- \_\_\_\_ (1974). "Consolations for the Specialists." In Lakatos, I. & Musgrave, A. (eds.), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- GADDIS, J.L. (1993). "International-Relations Theory and the End of the Cold-War." *International Security*. 17(3): 5-58.
- GRIECO, J. M. (1993). "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism." in Baldwin, D. A. (ed.), *Neorealism and Neoliberalism; The Contemporary Debate*. New York: Columbia University Press.



KEOHANE, R. O. (1993). "Institutionalist Theory and the Realist Challenge After the Cold War." in Baldwin, D. A. (ed.), *Neorealism and Neoliberalism; The Contemporary Debate*. New York: Columbia University Press.

\_\_\_\_ (1988). "International Institutions: Two Approaches." *International Studies Quarterly*. 32(4): 379-396.

KUHN, T.S. (1974). "Logic of Discovery or Psychology of Research." In I. Lakatos & A. Musgrave (eds.), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. London: Cambridge University Press.

\_\_\_\_ (1974a). "Reflections on my Critics." In I. Lakatos & A. Musgrave (eds.), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. London: Cambridge University Press.

\_\_\_\_ (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Second Edition. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

LAKATOS, I. & MUSGRAVE, A. (eds.), (1974). *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. London: Cambridge University Press.

LAKATOS, I. (1978). "The Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes." In *Philosophical Papers*. Vol. 1, London: Cambridge University Press.

LAPID, Y. (1989). "Quo Vadis International Relations? Further Reflections on the 'Next Stage' of International Theory." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. 18(1): 77-88.

LITTLE, R. (1984). "Teaching International Relations; Working With Paradigms." *Interstate: A Journal of International Relations*. 13-10.

\_\_\_\_ (1980). "The Evolution of International Relations as a Social Science." In R. Kent & G. Neilsson (eds.), *The Study and Teaching of International Relations*. London: Francis Pinter.

LITTLE, R. & SMITH, M. ((eds.)), (1991). *Perspectives on World Politics*. Second Edition. London/New York: Routledge.

LONG, D. *The Harvard School of International Theory: A Case for Closure*. Paper presented at the British International Studies Association Annual Meeting, University of York, York, 19-21 December, 1994.:

- MORAVCSIK, A. (1994). "Why the European Community Strengthens the State: Domestic Politics and International Cooperation." *Harvard University Centre for European Studies, Working Paper Series #52*.
- \_\_\_\_ (1993a). "Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach." *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 31(4): 473-524.
- \_\_\_\_ (1993b). "Integrating International and Domestic Theories of International Bargaining." In P.B. Evans, H.K. Jacobson & R.D. Putnam (eds.), *Double-Edged Diplomacy: International Bargaining and Domestic Politics*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.
- POPPER, K. R. (1963). *Conjectures and Refutations*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- POWELL, R. (1993). "Absolute and Relative Gains in International Relations Theory." In D.A. Baldwin (ed.), *Neorealism and Neoliberalism; The Contemporary Debate*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- SKINNER, Q. (ed.), (1985). *The Return of Grand Theory in the Human Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SMITH, S. (1994). "Foreign Policy Theory and the New Europe." In Carlsnaes, W. & Smith, S. (eds.), *European Foreign Policy: The EC and Changing Perspectives in Europe*. London: Sage. Series: Sage Modern Politics Series. Vol. 34.
- \_\_\_\_ (1990). "International Relations." A. Leftwich (ed.), *New Developments in Political Science; an International Review of Achievements and Prospects*. Aldershot: Elgar.
- \_\_\_\_ (1989). "Paradigm Dominance in International Relations: The Development of International Relations as a Social Science." In C. Dyer & L. Mangasarian (eds.), *The Study of International Relations; The State of the Art*. Macmillan.
- \_\_\_\_ (1985). "The Development of International Relations Theory." *Teaching Politics*. 14(1): 103-123.
- WÆVER, O. (1994). "The Rise and Fall of the Inter-Paradigm Debate." *Copenhagen Centre for Peace & Conflict Research, Working Papers 13/1994*.



- \_\_\_\_\_. (1994a). "Resisting the Temptation of Post Foreign Policy Analysis." In W. Carlsnaes & S. Smith (eds.), *European Foreign Policy; The EC and Changing Perspectives in Europe*. London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi: Sage.
- WALTZ, K. N. (1959). *Man, the State and War*. New York and London: Columbia University Press.



# **EUI WORKING PAPERS**

**EUI Working Papers are published and distributed by the  
European University Institute, Florence**

**Copies can be obtained free of charge  
– depending on the availability of stocks – from:**

**The Publications Officer  
European University Institute  
Badia Fiesolana  
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)  
Italy**

**Please use order form overleaf**



## Publications of the European University Institute

To                    The Publications Officer  
                      European University Institute  
                      Badia Fiesolana  
                      I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI) – Italy  
                      Telefax No: +39/55/573728  
                      E-mail: [publish@datacomm.iue.it](mailto:publish@datacomm.iue.it)

From                Name .....

                      Address .....

                      .....

                      .....

                      .....

                      .....

- ☐ Please send me a complete list of EUI Working Papers
- ☐ Please send me a complete list of EUI book publications
- ☐ Please send me the EUI brochure Academic Year 1996/97

Please send me the following EUI Working Paper(s):

No, Author .....

Title: .....

No, Author .....

Title: .....

No, Author .....

Title: .....

No, Author .....

Title: .....

Date .....

Signature .....

## Working Papers of the Robert Schuman Centre

### RSC No. 94/1

Fritz W. SCHARPF

Community and Autonomy Multilevel  
Policy-Making in the European Union

### RSC No. 94/2

Paul McALEAVEY

The Political Logic of the European  
Community Structural Funds Budget:  
Lobbying Efforts by Declining Industrial  
Regions

### RSC No. 94/3

Toshihiro HORIUCHI

Japanese Public Policy for Cooperative  
Supply of Credit Guarantee to Small Firms -  
Its Evolution Since the Post War and Banks'  
Commitment

### RSC No. 94/4

Thomas CHRISTIANSEN

European Integration Between Political  
Science and International Relations Theory:  
The End of Sovereignty \*

### RSC No. 94/5

Stefaan DE RYNCK

The Europeanization of Regional  
Development Policies in the Flemish Region

### RSC No. 94/6

Enrique ALBEROLA ILA

Convergence Bands: A Proposal to Reform  
the EMS in the Transition to a Common  
Currency

### RSC No. 94/7

Rosalyn HIGGINS

The EC and the New United Nations

### RSC No. 94/8

Sidney TARROW

Social Movements in Europe: Movement  
Society or Europeanization of Conflict?

### RSC No. 94/9

Vojin DIMITRIJEVIC

The 1974 Constitution as a Factor in the  
Collapse of Yugoslavia or as a Sign of  
Decaying Totalitarianism

### RSC No. 94/10

Susan STRANGE

European Business in Japan: A Policy  
Crossroads?

### RSC No. 94/11

Milica UVALIC

Privatization in Disintegrating East European  
States: The Case of Former Yugoslavia

### RSC No. 94/12

Alberto CHILOSI

Property and Management Privatization in  
Eastern European Transition: Economic  
Consequences of Alternative Privatization  
Processes

### RSC No. 94/13

Richard SINNOTT

Integration Theory, Subsidiarity and the  
Internationalisation of Issues: The  
Implications for Legitimacy \*

### RSC No. 94/14

Simon JOHNSON/Heidi KROLL

Complementarities, Managers and Mass  
Privatization Programs after Communism

### RSC No. 94/15

Renzo DAVIDDI

Privatization in the Transition to a Market  
Economy

### RSC No. 94/16

Alberto BACCINI

Industrial Organization and the Financing of  
Small Firms: The Case of MagneTek

### RSC No. 94/17

Jonathan GOLUB

The Pivotal Role of British Sovereignty in  
EC Environmental Policy

### RSC No. 94/18

Peter Viggo JAKOBSEN

Multilateralism Matters but How?  
The Impact of Multilateralism on Great  
Power Policy Towards the Break-up of  
Yugoslavia



**RSC No. 94/19**

Andrea BOSCO

A 'Federator' for Europe: Altiero Spinelli  
and the Constituent Role of the European  
Parliament

**RSC No. 94/20**

Johnny LAURSEN

Blueprints of Nordic Integration. Dynamics  
and Institutions in Nordic Cooperation,  
1945-72

\* \* \*

**RSC No. 95/1**

Giandomenico MAJONE

Mutual Trust, Credible Commitments and  
the Evolution of Rules for a Single  
European Market

**RSC No. 95/2**

Ute COLLIER

Electricity Privatisation and Environmental  
Policy in the UK: Some Lessons for the  
Rest of Europe

**RSC No. 95/3**

Giuliana GEMELLI

American Influence on European  
Management Education: The Role of the  
Ford Foundation

**RSC No. 95/4**

Renaud DEHOUSSE

Institutional Reform in the European  
Community: Are there Alternatives to the  
Majoritarian Avenue?

**RSC No. 95/5**

Vivien A. SCHMIDT

The New World Order, Incorporated:  
The Rise of Business and the Decline of the  
Nation-State

**RSC No. 95/6**

Liesbet HOOOGHE

Subnational Mobilisation in the European  
Union

**RSC No. 95/7**

Gary MARKS/Liesbet HOOOGHE/Kermit  
BLANK

European Integration and the State

**RSC No. 95/8**

Sonia LUCARELLI

The International Community and the  
Yugoslav Crisis: A Chronology of Events

**RSC No. 95/9**

A Constitution for the European Union?

Proceedings of a Conference, 12-13 May 1994,  
Organized by the Robert Schuman Centre with the  
Patronage of the European Parliament

**RSC No. 95/10**

Martin RHODES

'Subversive Liberalism': Market Integration,  
Globalisation and the European Welfare  
State

**RSC No. 95/11**

Joseph H.H. WEILER/ Ulrich HALTERN/  
Franz MAYER

European Democracy and its Critique -  
Five Uneasy Pieces

**RSC No. 95/12**

Richard ROSE/Christian HAERPFER

Democracy and Enlarging the European  
Union Eastward

**RSC No. 95/13**

Donatella DELLA PORTA

Social Movements and the State: Thoughts  
on the Policing of Protest

**RSC No. 95/14**

Patrick A. MC CARTHY/Aris

ALEXOPOULOS

Theory Synthesis in IR - Problems &  
Possibilities

















