‘Greatly Exaggerated’: The Death of EU Studies-New Regionalism Dialogue? A Reply to Jørgensen and Valbjørn

Ben Rosamond and Alex Warleigh-Lack

Abstract

In a recent piece in this journal Jørgensen and Valbjørn (2012) develop a typology of intellectual dialogue across fields that yields rather negative conclusions about the prospects for sustainable dialogue between ‘European studies’ and the ‘new regionalism’. This response explains why we dispute this pessimistic conclusion. First, we argue that while their derivation of models of dialogue is impressive, it is nonetheless incomplete. Using Jørgensen and Valbjørn’s premises, we derive a ‘market’ mode of dialogue that represents a challenge to their assumption that dialogue will tend towards hierarchy. Second, we accept that there are important ‘sociology of knowledge’ impediments to effective dialogue within political science and International Relations, but maintain that Jørgensen and Valbjørn fail to work through the question of ‘dialogue between whom?’ We argue that methodological division is the most significant impediment to dialogue, but maintain that within-methodology dialogue is more than viable in the case under scrutiny in this debate. Third, having established these general parameters of disagreement, we move to a number of more particular criticisms of the assumptions made by Jørgensen and Valbjørn about our own calls for dialogue between scholars in these two fields.

Keywords

European studies, new regionalism, dialogue, sociology of knowledge

Introduction

It is generally presumed that scholars should talk to one another. At a most basic level, the very idea of knowledge and its advancement is indivisible from the process of dialogue about that knowledge. One test of whether we know something resides in our ability to converse with others who also know about that ‘thing’, but whose understanding or interpretation of the ‘thing’ in question might vary from ours. This is one reason why academics cluster into disciplines and subfields – to engage in dialogue about ‘things’ of mutual interest. Of course, in such context the rules of dialogue are usually specified, or if not specified, they are tacitly understood. Disciplines and subfields generate discourses about ‘things’, and to be a participant in a subfield is to become part of that discourse. From a Kuhnian point of view this arrangement has well known advantages (Kuhn, 1970). The downside is that disciplines

become isolated from one another, and subfields become self-contained silos (Lake, 2011). This is why conversations between subfields and across disciplines are thought to be a good idea, and why calls for inter- and intra-disciplinary dialogue are so often heard (Klein, 1996). Most of those who appeal for such things realize that dialogue is not likely to be straightforward, but very few have thought seriously about what dialogue actually means, and indeed that it may mean very different things. Therefore, readers of this journal and the scholarly community more generally should be extremely grateful to Knud Erik Jørgensen and Morten Valbjørn (2012) for providing such a useful typology of dialogue, and for developing such a thoughtfully-provocative argument about the pathologies of dialogue in a domain of inquiry, regional integration studies, where calls for dialogue have been especially prominent.

Jørgensen and Valbjørn's typology emerges from the identification of four ideal types of dialogue: hierarchical, reflexive, transformative and Eristic. These ideal types are derived from alternative understandings of the purpose, procedure and product of dialogue. The typology is then investigated in relation to the dialogues between two fields of study: 'European studies' and 'new regionalism'. The search for instances of dialogue that come close to fitting the ideal types in the typology demonstrates very clearly that it is rather easier to find examples of hierarchical dialogue than any other type. The problem with the hierarchical mode, as laid out by Jørgensen and Valbjørn, is that it always involves an asymmetrical master-servant relationship, where one dialogue partner draws much more from the engagement than the other (see also Balkin, 1996). Dialogue in hierarchical mode is reminiscent of how neorealist International Relations scholars view international cooperation: as a process that yields relative rather than absolute gains (Grieco, Powell and Snidal, 1993). Hierarchical dialogue is thus inherently unstable as both parties have significant exit incentives. The 'master' field leaves when it has attracted what it needs from the junior partner; the junior 'servant' partner gains little from dialogue, so why bother?

The argument is taken a decisive step further by Jørgensen and Valbjørn who (sensibly) do not get drawn into simply calling for more dialogue to be more like the 'reflexive' and 'transformative' modes. Instead they take sociology of knowledge questions seriously, and speculate that their empirical finding (that dialogue tends towards hierarchy) occurs for reasons that are related to disciplinary tendencies in political science. This part of the argument is condensed into a single paragraph (2012: 19), so the precise point being made is a little hard to divine. But it seems that Jørgensen and Valbjørn are pointing to two related

characteristics of conventional/orthodox political science that militate against non-hierarchical dialogue between ‘European studies’ and the ‘new regionalism’. The first is a tendency within political science to favour deductive-universal modes of knowledge production. As long as one dialogue partner enters the conversation with this view of ‘science’, then it will have cast itself as the ‘master’ in the hierarchical relationship. Probably the most egregious example in recent political science, an example that Jørgensen and Valbjørn cite, is the depiction of ‘area studies’ as a subcontracting field that exists primarily to provide deductive models of politics with their data (Bates 1996). The second tendency, which presumably is related to the first but which is more local to the dialogue under scrutiny, is that dominant models of political science bias research against the discussion of regional integration. This is a function of conventional political science’s innate ‘methodological nationalism’ (Jørgensen and Valbjørn 2012: 20-21; see also Beck and Grande, 2007; Chernilo, 2006; Rosamond 2008), which in turn is generative of conceptual normalization around analytical foci that emerged in the context of the political science of the nation-state. These tendencies are both illustrative of power structures in the wider discipline, and it is within the context of these power structures that the possibilities for dialogue must be understood.

We do not, for a minute, dispute this final point. However, we do draw back from Jørgensen and Valbjørn’s overly pessimistic conclusion about the prospects for dialogue between ‘European studies’ and ‘new regionalism’, a dialogue which we have been keen to promote and defend in various ways in our own work (Breslin, Higgott and Rosamond, 2002; Rosamond, 2005; Rosamond, 2008; Warleigh-Lack, 2006; Warleigh-Lack, 2007; Warleigh-Lack and van Lagenhove, 2010; Warleigh-Lack, Robinson and Rosamond, 2011; Warleigh-Lack and Rosamond, 2010). We *do* maintain, however, that reports of the death of such a dialogue are, just as they were for Mark Twain, greatly exaggerated.

To re-state the case for optimism and to suggest that Jørgensen and Valbjørn’s report of the death of ‘European studies’/‘new regionalism’ dialogue is excessively premature, we develop three broad counter-arguments. First, we examine the derivation of Jørgensen and Valbjørn’s ideal types of dialogue, and scrutinize the ‘hierarchy’ mode in particular. We suggest that Jørgensen and Valbjørn develop an interesting and important metaphor of academic fields as producers of tradable goods, but that they use this metaphor to develop only one of several possible modes of dialogue. We suggest instead that their foundational metaphor could yield an interesting ‘market’ variant, and that – under certain conditions – it is possible for this

positive sum/absolute gains ‘market’ mode to prevail over the master-servant/relative gains ‘hierarchy’ mode that they derive and describe. This feeds into and underpins our second counter-argument, which maintains that Jørgensen and Valbjørn have been insufficiently clear on the question of ‘dialogue between whom?’ We develop an argument to suggest that their pessimistic conclusion is most likely to hold where putative dialogue partners embody different views on the necessary and appropriate *conduct of inquiry* (that is to say, where they emerge from different *methodologies*). We are unconvinced that differences over the conduct of inquiry constitute a significant line of cleavage between ‘European studies’ and the ‘new regionalism’. Third, we identify a range of more specific difficulties with Jørgensen and Valbjørn’s depiction of the ‘European studies/new regionalism’ dialogue.

Hierarchy and market

Jørgensen and Valbjørn differentiate their four models of dialogue across three dimensions: purpose, procedure and product. In some ways the dimension of ‘purpose’ sits at the foundation of the other two dimensions. So in the Eristic variant, there is absolutely no intention to use dialogue to alter a field’s identity or its innate confidence in the propriety/superiority of its own project. In contrast, transformative dialogue imagines that dialogue will result in some significant alteration to field’s *modus operandi*. In the case of hierarchical dialogue, the relationship between purpose and product is both clear and interesting. The academic universe is imagined as a trading system where the constituent units (disciplines, fields etc) produce tradable goods, which in turn have the potential to be exchanged. This metaphor relies upon a separation of the constituent unit (discipline/field) from its product (knowledge). Thus the exchange of goods (knowledge) within this system does not have any bearing upon the integrity of the constituent units once dialogue has taken place.

This basic metaphor is very useful. By utilizing the language of international trade, it yields an image of an intellectual division of labour. This makes intuitive sense in a universe of disciplines and subfields, which are premised upon and have perpetuated (for better or worse) an academic division of labour. However, Jørgensen and Valbjørn then make a move that seems to us to be hasty and unwarranted. Their characterization of ‘procedure’ in this model is premised upon only one type of interaction within a universe of tradable goods. They label this model of dialogue ‘hierarchy’, but the hierarchical character of that dialogue emerges not

from ‘purpose’ and ‘product’, but rather from the definition of ‘procedure’. According to Jørgensen and Valbjørn the relationship between units is *necessarily* asymmetrical. Dialogue in a tradable goods system takes on the character of a master-servant relationship. It follows, that the inherent logic of this model of dialogue is one of relative gains, where the incentives to defect are strong, for both dialogue partners. In the case of the dominant dialogue partner, motivations for cooperating through dialogue would seem to be mercantilistic at heart. Dialogue becomes a device for the enrichment of one discipline/field, possibly at the expense of the other.

We cannot see how the (defining) characteristic of hierarchy logically follows from the model’s premises. In other words, we suggest that Jørgensen and Valbjørn’s ideal type becomes infected with an ad hoc claim that does not follow from the formal derivation of the ideal type. At the very least, the tradable goods metaphor and its purpose and product should suggest an alternative ideal type, which we might label ‘market’. In fact, it may suggest a continuity of possibilities between the extremes of ‘hierarchy’ and ‘market’, although here for the sake of simplicity and to help us make our point, we will only focus on the alternative ‘market’ ideal type.

In the market version of dialogue as trade, actor motivations are Ricardian rather than mercantilistic. As is well known, Ricardo (2004 [1817]) developed his theory of comparative advantage in an attempt to justify the practice of free trade. The theory of comparative advantage is a theory of absolute gains as – with the aid of some relatively straightforward arithmetic – Ricardo was able to show how it made sense not only for countries to trade with one another, but also for them to specialize in the production of those goods in which they have a comparative advantage. This has proved to be an enormously important result in the history of political economy, not least because Ricardo was able to provide a rationale for trade in conditions of asymmetry. Even if country A produces goods X and Y more efficiently than country B, distributional benefits will follow for *both* A and B if each specializes in the production of the good (X or Y) in which it has comparative advantage. There is no challenge to the fundamental sovereignty of A and B. The effect of trade, following the principle of comparative advantage, is the positive sum flow of distributional benefits through the whole trading system.

The implications for Jørgensen and Valbjørn’s model of this brief excursion into the history of political economy should be obvious: it is possible to construct a much more positive

version of dialogue out of the metaphor of tradable goods. Partners enter into dialogue because it benefits them to do so, but the market mode of dialogue also requires mutual respect even in situations of asymmetry between the partners. Abuse of dialogue by the more powerful partner (as typified by Jørgensen and Valbjørn's hierarchical model) actually harms the interests of that partner. The advancement of the interests of either dialogue partner relies on a collective understanding that the institution of dialogue delivers absolute gains. It is thus rational for dialogue to be maintained. The market version is distinguished from the reflexive and transformative variant because it still differs along the key axes of purpose and product. The market model is compelling, we think, because it is consistent with a world where specialization is the norm and offers an account of how dialogue can be conducted to the mutual enrichment of specialisms, without posing any existential threat to them.

The market ideal type is not without problems, but its presentation offers a more palatable version of and a more compelling argument for dialogue in a world of academic specialism than Jørgensen and Valbjørn's hierarchical model. Indeed, the articulation of the market model has, we suggest, some very significant *normative power* in so far as it can be added to the repertoire of arguments that advocate dialogue between different units of the political science universe. As it stands, these pro-dialogue arguments tend to take the form of Jørgensen and Valbjørn's reflexive and transformative models. We agree that the sociological realities of specialization often render the reflexive and transformative arguments for dialogue less compelling, not least because potential dialogue partners are not prepared to concede on matters of purpose or product. And this may be why extant dialogue has tended to regress towards the hierarchical and Eristic variants as defined by Jørgensen and Valbjørn.

Dialogue between whom?

Jørgensen and Valbjørn's overall conclusions do not rely exclusively upon discussion that flows from their typology. The tendency to hierarchy which they observe is explained by something else: innate tendencies within the discipline that tend to delegitimize dialogue in the first place and generate incentives for partners to exit dialogue when it occurs. It is important to think about this part of their argument in some detail, because the mere invocation of our fifth idea type – market – would not make a difference if those tendencies were sufficiently strong. In the universe where academic fields provide tradable goods, hierarchy would always trump market if the organizing principles of knowledge production structured behaviour in ways that resembled the procedures of hierarchy as defined by

Jørgensen and Valbjørn. It might, as we have done, be possible to imagine a market ideal type but whether such a model could have any ‘real world’ purchase in the face of these structuring incentives is quite another matter. For the critique that we have outlined so far to have any traction, we need to show that these structuring tendencies do not necessarily disallow market (and by extension, reflexive and transformative) versions of dialogue within the political science academy.

In pursuit of that end we turn our attention to the question of which units are actually supposed to be engaging in dialogue. Throughout their piece, Jørgensen and Valbjørn refer to putative dialogues between entities called ‘European Studies’ and ‘New Regionalism’. More specifically, they cut through some of the definitional problems by focusing ‘deliberately on encounters between four fields of study. European Studies, old and new regionalism, political science and International Relations’ (2012: 5). A key thing to note is that these fields are different types of entity. Political science is a discipline and, depending on taste or inclination, International Relations is either a discipline in its own right or a subfield of political science.¹ ‘European studies’ can mean distinct things: a site for multi-disciplinary reflection on European integration (broadly defined) or a geographic subfield of political science that focuses on the politics of the European Union. Old and new regionalism are usually understood as fields of study that emerge from International Relations and/or one of its chief sub-areas, International Political Economy (IPE). Studies of regionalism are concerned with a substantive puzzle (the dynamics of regional integration) and ideally do not privilege any particular area focus. Of course, each of these is to a greater or lesser extent recognizably constituted via the usual means: professional associations, the formal organization of universities into departments and research institutes, scholarly journals, conferences, book series, and so on. As such, each can be thought of as a potential dialogue partner, despite the facts (a) that the ‘actorness’ (to coin a phrase) of each in this respect is differently constituted and (b) that each operates in a distinct relationship with what might be called the ‘parent discipline’ (and in one case the field is unequivocally the ‘parent discipline’).

What is interesting to us is that Jørgensen and Valbjørn presume that dialogue across and between these four fields are likely to be hamstrung by the disciplinary tendencies they identify later in the paper. To be sure, different subfields within political science can seem to be like non-communicating silos, and US political science in particular has a tendency toward

subfield ‘fetishism’ (Kaufman-Osborn, 2006). But discipline-subfield and subfield-subfield divisions are surely not the major (nor the most significant) source of cleavage in the broad universe of political science. Rather political science is much less divided among exponents of different substantive foci than it is among proponents of different approaches to the *conduct of inquiry*. Writing over two decades ago, Gabriel Almond (1990) identified ideological and methodological divides as the two key axes of division amongst political science. Methodological division, which Almond saw as a matter of a range of positions along a continuum from ‘soft’ (thickly descriptive, philosophical, qualitative) to ‘hard’ (deductive, mathematical, quantitative) political science, has in the interim become significantly politicized within the discipline. The ‘Perestroika’ rebellion that took hold in US political science in the early years of this century was organized around the proposition that quantitative/mathematical orthodoxy had taken hold within the discipline (Monroe, 2005). The upshot, for ‘perestroikans’ was a stifling of the innate pluralism of political science, which, in turn, was turning the discipline into a haven of inward-looking, socially-irrelevant scientism (Flyvbjerg, 2001; Schram and Caterino, 2006).

What Almond was getting at, and what perestroikans have organized around subsequently, is the deep significance of *methodological* divisions within political science, and these are of a different order to distinctions or even cleavages between substantive subfields. Quite often discussion of these divisions is reduced to a discussion of (quantitative versus qualitative) *methods* (Levy, 2007; Pierson, 2007), when – in fact – methodological cleavages are concerned with alternative understandings of ‘the logical structure and procedures of scientific enquiry’ (Sartori, 1970: 1033). In a major recent discussion of the conduct of inquiry in IR, Patrick Jackson (2011) derives four alternative conceptions of inquiry (methodologies) within IR – neopositivism, critical realism, analyticism and reflectivism – which

differ from one another in the way that they seek to warrant particular knowledge-claims, their understanding of causality and causal explanation, and the use to which they put comparison across multiple cases. Researchers working within these methodologies, whatever technical procedures they utilize, only generate meaningful results by conforming their knowledge-producing practices to the requirements of research design entailed by underlying commitments the methodology makes in the realm of philosophical ontology ... (Jackson, 2011: 197-198).

It follows that in terms of dialogue, the most difficult – indeed potentially impossible – conversations are those between rival methodologies rather than those among different subfields. In other words, *within methodology* dialogue is much more straightforward than *between methodology* dialogue. Thus methodological divisions should not be trivialized, and they stand as major impediments to dialogue. However, Jørgensen and Valbjørn’s analysis ends up with extensive pessimism about the potential for dialogue between ‘European Studies’ and the ‘New Regionalism’ as if their major divisions are methodological, when this is clearly not necessarily the case.

Of course, there are methodological arguments for keeping European studies and studies of regional integration separate. For example, the ideographic argument against using generalizable concepts to study regionalism in the developing world (Marchand, Bøås and Shaw, 1999) is an example of a methodological objection to dialogue rooted in a competing (and perhaps incommensurable) ontology. However, scholars of both the EU and regionalism elsewhere can be readily found working within the same methodological traditions. By way of illustration, consider two of Jackson’s methodologies – neopositivism and reflectivism – and assume, as seems reasonable, that exponents of both methodologies exist within the fields of ‘European Studies’ and the ‘New Regionalism’. This yields four stylized positions reflecting combinations of subfield and attitudes to the conduct of inquiry.

Table 1: Possible positions on the conduct of inquiry in European studies-new regionalism dialogue

	Neopositivism	Reflectivism
European Studies	1	2
New Regionalism	3	4

Our simple point is that dialogues 1-4 and 2-3 are not just subfield dialogues, but also cross methodological dialogues. These are as unlikely to be successful in the same way that intra-field, cross methodology dialogues (1-2, 3-4) are constrained by alternative conceptions of how social science should be done. But note that there is nothing in principle to rule out dialogues across subfields where there is methodological affinity. In our scheme these correspond to dialogues 1-3 and 2-4. The drift of Jørgensen and Valbjørn’s paper is to assume that potential dialogues between ‘European Studies’ and the ‘New Regionalism’ fall into type 1-4 and 2-3, whereas we show – via some elementary philosophy of science reasoning – that there is significant space for viable dialogue between the two subfields (1-3 and 2-4).

From the general to the particular

So far the argument here has operated at a general level not only to show difficulties with Jørgensen and Valbjørn's argument, but also to establish a meta-position that establishes the *prima facie* plausibility of successful and sustained dialogue. This claim was reached through two analytical moves. The first move established a mode of dialogue that could be configured to disable the situation where the logic of relative gains disturbs and ultimately destroys any encounter between two fields. The second move took account of the view that under present intellectual conditions in political science, 'within methodology' dialogue between subfields remains perfectly viable.

The foregoing is not merely a critique of an intervention in the debate; it is also an attempt to develop a more elaborate justification in support of the efforts we have undertaken in support of the very dialogue that Jørgensen and Valbjørn's paper suggests is doomed to failure. Since their paper takes issue with a number of points that we have argued together, separately or with others in the past, this section of the article draws together a few observations by way of more particular responses.

First, our aim in the *Journal of Common Market Studies* piece (Warleigh-Lack and Rosamond, 2010) fits Jørgensen and Valbjørn's categories of 'reflexive' and 'transformative' dialogue, hoping for at least the former and aiming perhaps for the latter. It is not intended as an exercise in proving one school of thought or approach superior to the other; in fact, we explicitly argue that the potential for learning is mutual. As such, we can now point out retrospectively that our argument is also compatible with the 'market' mode of dialogue developed above. This much is clear in the body of work we have produced on such matters, including our co-edited book with Nick Robinson (Warleigh-Lack, Robinson and Rosamond 2011) and a piece one of us co-authored with Luk van Langenhove (Warleigh-Lack and Van Langenhove 2010). The latter, in fact, is an introduction to a special issue of the *Journal of European Integration* that the two co-edited, whose sole purpose was to look at the literature and scholarship on several world regions to establish the ways in which this work could usefully add to, reform, or shape work on the EU. Indeed, we explicitly take EU scholars to task for being parochial. We think, then, that it is important not to conflate or confuse two separate arguments, which can be summarized as follows:

- (i) the ‘new’/‘old’ regionalism divide is exaggerated, not least because at least two regions (the EU and ASEAN) have been key instances of both, so the claimed division between scholarly communities is based on shaky epistemological ground;
- (ii) the new regionalist literature contains many insights which EU scholars should take on board because it contains a wider range of empirical and theoretical perspectives than those contained in the EU studies mainstream.

Nor do we argue, either singly or in tandem, that EU studies should abandon its focus on EU *qua* polity as Jørgensen and Valbjørn maintain. Rather, we argue that polityhood can be an outcome of regional integration, as per Björn Hettne’s well-known typology (Hettne 2003). And such a claim is not a stunning new revelation for EU studies scholarship. For example, Leon Lindberg, working alone or in conjunction with Stuart Scheingold, was developing neofunctionalist scholarship from this premise from the early 1960s (see Lindberg, 1963; 1965; Lindberg and Scheingold, 1970). Indeed, part of the value of EU studies work for scholars of other regions – not to mention global governance and international relations – is that it has shown how analysts of transnational politics can and must draw on both IR and comparative politics work, if indeed those distinctions continue to make sense.² Thus, the section of their paper which argues that advocates of dialogue claim that EU studies must be ‘rolled back’ to previous phases in order to facilitate comparison (Jørgensen and Valbjørn, 2012: 11) is inaccurate. This matters because it punctures Jørgensen and Valbjørn’s argument that our work can be construed as an example of ‘hierarchical dialogue’. Instead we agree with other scholars, who point out that each global region will have a different range of suitable comparators according to the issue in question, and in some cases the most suitable comparator may not, in fact, be other regions but rather nation-states or international/global institutions (De Lombaerde, Söderbaum, van Langenhove and Baert 2010). The EU, for instance, has long been many things at once: part-polity, part-international organization and so on (again we can go back quite a long way for this insight, see Puchala, 1971). It can thus be compared with many different kinds of political organization, in different ways and for different purposes; the same is true of many regions, especially when historical context is entered into the mix of factors considered: for example, could NAFTA rulings be compared with pre-*Costa* and *Van Gend* ECJ jurisprudence? (Abbott, 2000; Duina, 2006; Zürn and Wolf, 1999).

Moreover, it is misleading to argue, as Jørgensen and Valbjørn submit (2012: 11), that the ‘governance turn’ literature is not readily applicable outside the EU. This can be demonstrated in two ways. First, work derived from this tendency in EU studies *can* be applied to regions outside Europe. For example, Mark Aspinwall (2010) has shown persuasively that the Europeanization literature can ‘travel’ to NAFTA, and much of the informal governance literature is perfectly applicable to contexts beyond the EU (Blatter, 2001; Christiansen and Piattoni, 2003; Elliott, 2012; Helmke and Levitsky, 2004; Peters, 2006; Stone, 2011). Second, the governance turn in EU studies reflects and is related to a broader shift in the way that politics happens under the conditions of both neoliberalism and globalization; in other words, the very fact that states and civil society actors have turned to regional structures and processes in recent years is part of the shift, or transformation, from ‘government’ to ‘governance’ (Blatter, 2003; Hettne 2003; Hettne and Söderbaum 2008). We will not labour this point because it is now such a feature of so much of the governance literature. If contemporary societies are seeing ‘a change in the nature of the state’ (Treib, Bähr and Falkner, 2007: 1), where the ways in which ‘institutionalized modes of co-ordination through which collectively binding decisions are adopted and implemented’ (Börzel, 2007: 194) has shifted from hierarchical to network or market modes, then one of the primary techniques through which this seems to have been accomplished has been through scalar shifts away from national to regional *loci* of governance. EU studies literature, or at least part of it, has gone a very long way with this claim (see Jachtenfuchs, 2007 for a summary), but there is absolutely nothing in the formulation of our previous sentence to suggest that these could or should be questions that are discussed by European studies scholars in isolation. In addition, there is no reason why a dialogue premised on these questions would default to Jørgensen and Valbjørn’s hierarchical mode. Nor is there any reason why separate sets of regional scholars would necessarily encounter methodological divides in common pursuit of these puzzles.

Conclusions

We have argued against Jørgensen and Valbjørn from two premises. The first is the derivation, using their own basic metaphor, of a positive sum form of dialogue that we have labeled here ‘market’. While an abstraction, we suggest that this mode of dialogue is realizable and is actually consistent with a world where scholarship is organized into specialist fields and disciplines. Second, by thinking carefully about sociology of knowledge questions, we maintain that it is not so much different sub-fields as competing *methodologies*

that will struggle to engage in dialogue. From the point of view of the dialogue under scrutiny in this discussion – European studies and new regionalism – this is a very important point. Jørgensen and Valbjørn's conclusion would only make sense if these two fields were divided on methodology as well as empirical focus. We are certain that this is not the case, and in turn we feel confident of the prospects for the maintenance of 'market' mode dialogue and we would hope that reflexive and transformative forms would also be possible.

Of course, there are obstacles to various kinds of subfield interaction, even without the disciplinary or methodological barriers that systematically prevent dialogue. As they mature, different subfields develop their own conference circuits, journals, guiding puzzles and discourses, which together can – and often do – exercise a centripetal logic. In many ways EU studies is a spectacular example of this phenomenon (Rosamond, 2007). But the question at stake here is less about the tendency of the component parts of a discipline being inward looking because the fact of there being instances of 'European studies'-'new regionalism' dialogue is not disputed. The issue, as we have discussed, is about the viability and equity of such dialogue. Indeed there has been much evidence lately that scholars in the fields of EU studies and new regionalism are willing to reach out to each other, as demonstrated for instance by a range of plenary sessions and keynote addresses at recent UACES Annual Conferences in the UK.

Much of the foregoing has been concerned, quite properly, about the internal drivers of the possibilities for or impediments to dialogue – those factors associated with the conditions of knowledge production that influence the shape, scope and conduct of inquiry. But there are also significant external drivers that have helped and will continue to facilitate dialogue between the two fields. The development of the EU's profile as a global and regional actor has provided a stimulus for research on inter-regionalism as well as comparative study. Moreover, as non-European regions develop, so policy-makers tend to ask questions about what, if anything, can be learned from the EU – a political dialogue which the EU itself has been only too keen to encourage.

We remain grateful to Jørgensen and Valbjørn for raising these important questions and in particular for encouraging us to think deeply about the viability of dialogue between scholars of new regionalism and European studies. Having checked the pulse, however, we are reasonably confident that reports of the death of that dialogue are exaggerated.

Notes

1. Obviously there is considerable cross-national variance with the US providing perhaps the most clear-cut example of IR being formally constituted as a subfield of political science (Kaufman-Osborn, 2006). Even then, there are hopes that a newer IR, less subordinate to the disciplinary oversight of political science, could form in the context of developing interdisciplinary 'global studies' programs in the US (Rosow 2003). The conjoining of IR to political science/political studies generally occurred across the world after both fields had formed, albeit in quite different ways. Thus the degree to which conjoining leads to relations of hierarchy between parent discipline and subfield varies with national context (Guilhot 2008, Schmidt 1998).
2. Thus, it is necessary to distinguish between the claim made in some of our previous work, namely that EU studies has much to contribute to the re-thinking of IR scholarship in an era of global governance (Warleigh-Lack 2007), and the rather different interpretation of this argument put forward by Jørgensen and Valbjørn, namely that EU studies is a prototype of global governance studies.

References

- Abbott, F.M. (2000) 'NAFTA and the legalization of world politics', *International Organization* 54(3): 519-547.
- Almond, G.A. (1990) *A Discipline Divided: Schools and Subfields in Political Science*, Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.
- Balkin, J. M. (1996) 'Interdisciplinarity as Colonization', *Washington and Lee Law Review*, 53 (3), pp. 949-70.
- Bates, R.H. (1996) 'Area studies and the discipline', *APSA-CP: Newsletter of the APSA Organized Section in Comparative Politics* 7(1): 1-2.
- Beck, U. and Grande, E. (2007) *Cosmopolitan Europe*, Cambridge: Polity.

- Blatter, J.K. (2001) 'Debordering the world of states: towards a multi-level system in Europe and multipolarity system in North America? Insights from border regions', *European Journal of International Relations* 7(2), pp. 175-209.
- Blatter, J.K. (2003) 'Beyond hierarchies and networks: institutional logics and change in transboundary spaces', *Governance* 16(4), pp. 503-506.
- Breslin, S., Higgott, R. and Rosamond, B. (2002) 'Regions in Comparative Perspective', in Breslin, S., Hughes, C.W., Phillips, N. and Rosamond, B. (eds) *New Regionalism in the Global Political Economy: Theories and Cases* London: Routledge, pp.1-19
- Börzel, T. (2007) 'European governance: negotiation and competition in the shadow of hierarchy', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 48(2): 191-219.
- Chernilo, D. (2006) 'Social Theory's Methodological Nationalism', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 9(1): 5-22.
- Christiansen, T. and Piattoni, S. (eds) (2003) *Informal Governance in the European Union*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- De Lombaerde, P., Söderbaum, F., Van Langenhove, L. and Baert, F. (2010): 'Problems and Divides in Comparative Regionalism', in F. Laursen (ed) *Comparative Regional Integration: Europe and Beyond* Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 21-39.
- Duina, F. (2006) 'Varieties of regional integration: the EU, NAFTA and Mercusor', *Journal of European Integration* 28(3): 247-275.
- Elliott, L. (2012) 'ASEAN and Environmental Governance: Strategies of Regionalism in Southeast Asia', *Global Environmental Politics* 12(3), pp. 38-57.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001) *Making Social Science Matter*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grieco, J., Powell, R. and Snidal, D. (1993) 'The Relative-Gains Problem for International Cooperation', *American Political Science Review* 87(3), pp. 727-743
- Guilhot, N. (2008) 'The Realist Gambit: Postwar American Political Science and the Birth of IR Theory', *International Political Sociology* 2(4): 281-304.
- Helmke, G. and Levitsky, S. (2004) 'Informal institutions and comparative politics: a research agenda', *Perspectives on Politics* 2(4), pp. 725-740.
- Hettne, B. (2003): 'The New Regionalism Revisited', in F. Söderbaum and T. Shaw (eds) *Theories of New Regionalism: A Reader* Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 22-42
- Hettne, B. and Söderbaum, F (2008): 'The Future of Regionalism: Old Divides, New Frontiers', in A. Cooper, C. Hughes and P De Lombaerde (eds) *Regionalisation and Global Governance: The Taming of Globalisation?* London: Routledge, pp. 61-79.

- Jackson, P.T. (2011) *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of Science and its Implications for the Study of World Politics*, Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Jachtenfuchs, M. (2007) 'The European Union as a Polity (II)', in Jørgensen, K.E., Pollack, M.A. and Rosamond, B. (eds) *Handbook of European Union Politics*, London: Sage, pp. 155-173.
- Jørgensen, K.E. and Valbjørn, M. (2012) 'Four dialogues and the funeral of a beautiful relationship: European studies and the new regionalism', *Cooperation and Conflict* 47(1), pp. 3-27.
- Kaufman-Osborn, T. (2006) 'Dividing the domain of political science: on the fetishism of subfields', *Polity* 38(1), pp. 41-71.
- Klein, J.T. (1996) *Crossing Boundaries: Knowledge, Disciplinarity, and Interdisciplinarity in the series on Knowledge: Disciplinarity and Beyond*, Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Kuhn, T. (1970) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Lake, D.A. (2011) 'Why "isms" are Evil: Theory, Epistemology, and Academic Sects as Impediments to Understanding and Progress', *International Studies Quarterly*, 55(2), pp. 465-80.
- Levy, J.S. (2007) 'Qualitative methods and cross method dialogue in political science', *Comparative Political Studies* 40(2), pp. 196-214.
- Lindberg, L.N. (1963) *The Political Dynamics of European Economic Integration*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Lindberg, L.N. (1965) 'Decision-Making and Integration in the European Community', *International Organization* 19(1): 56-80.
- Lindberg, L.N. and Scheingold, S.A. (1970) *Europe's Would-Be Polity: Patterns of Change in the European Community*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Marchand, M.H., Bøås, M. and Shaw, T. (1999) 'The Political Economy of New Regionalisms', *Third World Quarterly* 29(5): 897-910.
- Monroe, K.R. (2005) *Perestroika! The Raucous Rebellion in Political Science*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Peters, B.G. (2006) 'Forms of informality: identifying informal governance in the European Union', *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* 7(1), pp. 125-140.
- Pierson, P. (2007) 'The cost of marginalization: qualitative methods in the study of American politics', *Comparative Political Studies* 40(2), pp. 146-169.

- Puchala, D. J. (1972) 'Of Blind Men, Elephants and International Integration.' *Journal of Common Market Studies* 10: 267-284..
- Ricardo, D. (2004) [1817] *Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*, London: Dover Press.
- Rosamond, B. (2005) 'The Uniting of Europe and the Foundations of EU Studies: Revisiting the Neofunctionalism of Ernst B. Haas', *Journal of European Public Policy* 12(2): 237-254.
- Rosamond, B. (2007) 'European integration and the social science of EU studies: the disciplinary politics of a sub-field', *International Affairs* 83(2): 231-252.
- Rosamond, B. (2008) 'Open political science, methodological nationalism and European Union studies', *Government and Opposition* 43(4): 599-612.
- Rosow, S.J. (2003) 'Toward an Anti-disciplinary Global Studies', *International Studies Perspectives* 4(1), pp. 1-14.
- Sartori, G. (1970) 'Concept misinformation in comparative politics', *American Political Science Review* 64(4): 1033-1053.
- Schmidt, B.C. (1998) *The Political Discourse of Anarchy. A Disciplinary History of International Relations*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Schram, S. and Caterino, B. (2006) *Making Political Science Matter: Debating Knowledge, Research and Method*, New York: NYU Press
- Stone, D. (2011) 'The ASEAN-ISIS Network: Interpretive Communities, Informal Diplomacy and Discourses of Region', *Minerva* 49, pp. 241-262.
- Treib, O., Bähr, H. and Falkner, G. (2007) 'Modes of governance: towards a conceptual clarification', *Journal of European Public Policy* 14(1):.1-20
- Warleigh-Lack, A. (2006) 'Towards a conceptual framework for regionalization: bridging "new regionalism" and "integration theory"', *Review of International Political Economy* 13(5): 750-771.
- Warleigh-Lack, A. (2007) 'The European and the universal', in Jørgensen, K.E., Pollack, M.A. and Rosamond, B. (eds) *Handbook of European Union Politics*, London: Sage, pp.561-575.
- Warleigh-Lack and van Langenhove, L. (2010) 'Introduction. Rethinking EU studies: the contribution of comparative regionalism', *Journal of European Integration* 32(6): 451-462.
- Warleigh-Lack, A., Robinson, N. and Rosamond, B. (eds) *New Regionalism and the European Union: Dialogue, Comparison and New Research Directions*, London: Routledge.
- Warleigh-Lack, A. and Rosamond, B. (2010) 'Across the EU studies – new regionalism Frontier: invitation to a dialogue', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 48(4), pp. 993-1013.

Zürn, M. and Wolf, D. (1999) 'European law and international regimes: the features of law beyond the nation state', *European Law Journal* 5(3): 272-292.

Corresponding author:

Ben Rosamond, Department of Political Science, University of Copenhagen, Øster Farimagsgade 5, 1353 Copenhagen, Denmark
Email: br@ifs.ku.dk

Author biographies

Ben Rosamond is Professor of Political Science and Deputy Director of the Centre for European Politics at the University of Copenhagen. He teaches courses on theorizing European integration, the EU and globalization, international political economy and ideational approaches to political analysis. His current research interests focus on the role of ideas about the economy in European integration and the 'everyday' politics of free movement within the EU.

Alex Warleigh-Lack is Professor of EU Politics and Director of CRonEM at the University of Surrey. He is also Associate Fellow of UNU-CRIS, the United Nations Centre for Comparative Regional Integration Studies in Bruges. His current research focus is on comparative regional integration and the application of green political theory to regional and international politics.