

## Abstracts

*Julia Grauvogel/Hana Attia*

### **How Do International Sanctions End? Towards a Process-Oriented, Relational and Signaling Perspective**

*zib*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 5-33

Research on sanctions has hitherto focused on the implementation and effectiveness, whereas their termination has received little attention. The traditional model, which looks at sanctions in terms of rational, inter-state bargaining, focuses on how cost-benefit calculations affect the removal of sanctions. Yet, this research insufficiently captures the back and forth between easing sanctions, stagnation and renewed intensification. It also fails to account for the multifaceted social relations between senders, targets and third actors as well as the signaling dimension of ending sanctions. To help fill these gaps, the paper proposes a process-oriented and relational understanding that also recognizes how sanctions termination conveys the – potentially contested – message of ending the visible disapproval of the target. Case studies on Zimbabwe and Iran illustrate how such an approach sheds light at different logics of action that shape processes of sanctions termination and thereby contributes to a more holistic understanding of sanctions in general.

**Keywords:** sanctions termination, processes, relations, signals, Zimbabwe, Iran

*Witold Mucha/Christina Pesch*

### **What Kind of Knowledge Do We Produce? Analyzing German Academic Journals on the State of Peace and Conflict Research**

*zib*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 34-66

A recursive look at article titles of German journals dealing with peace and conflict research suggests that authors primarily focus on issues of war, terror, as well as state failure and less on peace-related subjects. To examine whether this is a legitimate guess is one of three purposes of this article. The article aims to analyse the state of the German academic debate on peace and conflict studies between 2012 and 2017 on the basis of the journals *Sicherheit und Frieden (S+F)*, *Friedens-Warte (FW)*, *Zeitschrift für internationale Beziehungen (zib)*, and *Zeitschrift für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung (ZeFKo)*. The comparative analysis is based on the three questions: A) Which methodological approaches are employed to examine which regions? B) In which relation are peace-related and conflict-related issues examined based on which topics? C) To what extent do authors pursue a normative claim?

Empirically based, the study responds to the debate initiated by the zib in 2012 on the question of the relationship between IR and peace and conflict research.

**Keywords:** peace, conflict, research, knowledge, knowledge production

*Leonie Holthaus*

**Pierre Bourdieu and the Options of Critique in Practice Theory**

zib, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 67-87

Practice theorists have exhaustively debated the sociology of Pierre Bourdieu. In this article, I introduce the debate against the background of the longer reception of Bourdieu before I defend a non-structuralist interpretation of his work and a new, methodological argument. With regard to the reception of Bourdieu, I focus on a central discontinuity, as evident in critical constructivists and practice theorists' different readings of Bourdieu, and the increasing popularity of structuralist interpretations of Bourdieu. Through a competing discussion of his key concepts, I reject the structuralist critique. Afterwards, I add to existing, Bourdieu-inspired pleas for interpretative, inductive, and historical methodologies, a debate on the challenge of finding the right balance between the use of experience-near and experience-distant academic knowledge. I close with a plea for critical, but not too distant approaches in practice theory.

**Keywords:** Bourdieu, practice theory, critique, democracy promotion, methodology

*Matthias Dembinski/Dirk Peters*

**Dissociation as a Peace Strategy? Outline of a Research Programme**

zib, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 88-105

Established liberal peace strategies intend to create peace through evermore exchange, ever denser institutions and an ever closer alignment of states and their interests and identities. Against the backdrop of the current crisis of these strategies, exemplified by the British departure from the EU, this article develops the contours of a research programme that focuses on the dissociation of states from established institutional orders. Such processes of dissociation are accompanied by rising tensions between departing and remaining states. Hence, the primary purpose of this research programme is to analyse and understand dissociation dynamics and to explore whether and how dissociation could be organized in ways that create fewer tensions.

**Keywords:** liberal peace strategies, international institutions, institutional crisis, dissociation, plural peace

*Justin Rosenberg*

**International Relations and the Consequences of Multiplicity**

zib, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 107-122

This paper takes up two contemporary (but longstanding) concerns about the discipline of IR: that IR does not bring a distinctive approach of its own to social analysis, and must, therefore, import ideas from other fields while generating no big ideas of its own; and that, due to this shortfall, IR is condemned to a fragmentation which is now resulting in what some have described as ‘the end of IR theory’. The paper responds to this in three steps. First, it argues that this gloomy situation ultimately results from Realism’s negative definition of the international as political anarchy. Second, it shows how a positive redefinition in terms of societal multiplicity provides IR with a distinctive mode of analysis that is full of consequences for all the human disciplines. And finally, it suggests that multiplicity also opens up a new common ground for international theory itself, providing both a more optimistic reinterpretation of IR’s apparent fragmentation and a constructive agenda for the further development of IR as a discipline in its own right.

**Keywords:** multiplicity, IR theory, disciplinarity, anarchy

*Anja P. Jakobi*

**International Relations – A Discipline, Sub-Discipline or a Vanity Project? A Reply to Justin Rosenberg**

zib, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 123-131

This reply to Justin Rosenberg proceeds in three steps: First, I question the analysis of International Relations (IR) in Rosenberg’s article. While the relation of IR and political science knows tensions, there exist more commonalities than acknowledged in the original article, for instance with regard to shared perspectives, research interests and methods. Second, I question the seemingly existent exceptionalism of IR by reflecting on what constitutes a discipline, and by showing parallels to political science that remain unmentioned in Rosenberg’s article. Finally, I question whether IR’s relevance can be enhanced by following Rosenberg’s idea of multiplicity. Rather, I argue, relevance should be questioned and pursued by relying on other criteria, for instance, the added value of IR perspectives for those within and beyond the IR community.

**Keywords:** international relations, theory, discipline, assessment, purpose

Mathias Albert

**On Attempts to Escape: Consequences and Limits of Multiplicity**

*zib*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 132-141

This article deals with Rosenberg's argument in three steps that follow the structure of his contribution: In a first step, it deals with the issue of IR's status as a discipline, respectively the accusation of a missing determination of a disciplinary core, the latter with the result of an alleged – compared to other disciplines lack of an export of theory beyond IR's boundaries. Although the present contribution shares the core of this diagnosis, it does not share some of its basic assumptions about the characterisation of disciplinarity in general, and some specific disciplines in particular. It also does not share its designation of multiplicity as a common substantive bond. A second step then turns exactly to the elaboration of this common bond of multiplicity. Understood as one among many possible perspectives on historical processes of globalisation, multiplicity indeed opens a pathway for dealing with a range of questions improperly neglected in IR. However, on the basis of an unquestioned, classical notion of society-cum-community, it reproduces the methodological (inter-)nationalism inherent in a large part of IR. In a third step, this leads to a diagnosis that shares much of the criticism about a fraying of the subject but reacts to that with the task of an orientation towards praxis rather than an appeal for unity.

**Keywords:** disciplinarity, multiplicity, IR theory, historical sociology, methodological (inter-)nationalism

*Antje Wiener*

**Multiplicity as the Unique Selling Point of International Relations: Rosenberg's Call for a Debate on a New, Sustainable IR Theory**

*zib*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 142-153

This article addresses Justin Rosenberg's proposal to enhance the visibility of International Relations (IR) as a field in its own right based on a focus on the concept of multiplicity. The contribution welcomes this proposal. Against this backdrop, it discusses central conceptual aspects with a view to the realisation of the project critically. In detail, the article proceeds in three sections, addressing first the definition of multiplicity as a concept which not only reflects the plural constitution of global order but also enables critical reflection of this order, second, the disposition to inner-disciplinary dialogue as a key vehicle for the new foundation of IR theory, and finally third, the question of the definition of agency in relation with internationality. In due acknowledgement of Rosenberg's rather more narrowly conceived concept of 'internationality', this article suggests embedding the concept more sustain-

ably with reference to the wider spectrum of IR theories, including especially recent theories.

**Keywords:** multiplicity, internationality, IR theory, global IR, gender