

Debat

Hans-Henrik Holm og Georg Sørensen har fremsendt nedenstående kommentarer til Heikki Patomäki's anmeldelse af deres bog i *Politica*, 28. årg., 1996, nr. 1, pp. 99-102.

Heikki Patomäki has offered a number of opinions on *Whose World Order?* which seriously misrepresent the content of the book. For lack of space, we cannot correct all the wrongs; our focus is on the main items:

1. The causal chain played out in the book seeks to identify the combined effect of the end of the Cold War and uneven globalization when „filtered through“ different types of societal structures and different geographical regions“ (p. 1). This requires us to do substantial conceptual work on the core concepts of the analysis; it requires reflections as how to concretely execute the analysis in very different environments. And we found that it required rethinking of some of the core concepts of the discipline of International Relations, including such concepts as sovereignty and the state. Instead of reporting on this work, Patomäki chooses to make the odd statements that there are almost no „explicit causal hypotheses“ and also a great lack of discussion of „methodological problems“ in the book.

2. We argue the existence of pre-modern, quasi-states in Sub-Saharan Africa. Patomäki believes that African states are modern, with substantial capabilities. In this he is at odds, not only with us, but with a whole field of research studying quasi-states and failed states. The distinction between different main types of state is a distinction based on ideal types (p. 203). Concrete, empirical cases fit the types more or less. Patomäki has

not understood this when he claims that the distinction is, empirically, „less than clear“. In addition, Patomäki's focus on state types misrepresents the core content of the book which is about regional variation. Our summary of main types of statehood function as a tentative hypothesis, set forth after more than 200 pages of analysis.

3. Core chapters of the book contain analyses by people who have spent several decades of their lives conducting systematic, empirical research on their respective regions: Osvaldo Sunkel on Latin America, Takashi Inoguchi on East Asia, Gowher Rizwi on South Asia, Claude Ake on Africa. Each of these authors has written a number of books on the topics they address in our volume. When they refer to such work, however, they must listen to the serious charge by Patomäki: these chapters contain no „systematical empirical work“ and is based on „second-hand sources“, a truly bizarre assessment since the assertions of the authors are their own, based on their individual research! We respectfully urge H. Patomäki to rethink the complicated relationship between specific types of sources and systematic empirical work.

4. In several cases, Patomäki attempts to make it appear as if the editors are in strong disagreement with their own authors: „Claude Ake is closer to the truth“ than we are; Zürn analyses „complexities of the EU“ that we have missed. We must say that any rumors about such

Debat

Hans-Henrik Holm og Georg Sørensen har fremsendt nedenstående kommentarer til Heikki Patomäki's anmeldelse af deres bog i *Politica*, 28. årg., 1996, nr. 1, pp. 99-102.

Heikki Patomäki has offered a number of opinions on *Whose World Order?* which seriously misrepresent the content of the book. For lack of space, we cannot correct all the wrongs; our focus is on the main items:

1. The causal chain played out in the book seeks to identify the combined effect of the end of the Cold War and uneven globalization when „filtered through“ different types of societal structures and different geographical regions“ (p. 1). This requires us to do substantial conceptual work on the core concepts of the analysis; it requires reflections as how to concretely execute the analysis in very different environments. And we found that it required rethinking of some of the core concepts of the discipline of International Relations, including such concepts as sovereignty and the state. Instead of reporting on this work, Patomäki chooses to make the odd statements that there are almost no „explicit causal hypotheses“ and also a great lack of discussion of „methodological problems“ in the book.

2. We argue the existence of pre-modern, quasi-states in Sub-Saharan Africa. Patomäki believes that African states are modern, with substantial capabilities. In this he is at odds, not only with us, but with a whole field of research studying quasi-states and failed states. The distinction between different main types of state is a distinction based on ideal types (p. 203). Concrete, empirical cases fit the types more or less. Patomäki has

not understood this when he claims that the distinction is, empirically, „less than clear“. In addition, Patomäki's focus on state types misrepresents the core content of the book which is about regional variation. Our summary of main types of statehood function as a tentative hypothesis, set forth after more than 200 pages of analysis.

3. Core chapters of the book contain analyses by people who have spent several decades of their lives conducting systematic, empirical research on their respective regions: Osvaldo Sunkel on Latin America, Takashi Inoguchi on East Asia, Gowher Rizwi on South Asia, Claude Ake on Africa. Each of these authors has written a number of books on the topics they address in our volume. When they refer to such work, however, they must listen to the serious charge by Patomäki: these chapters contain no „systematical empirical work“ and is based on „second-hand sources“, a truly bizarre assessment since the assertions of the authors are their own, based on their individual research! We respectfully urge H. Patomäki to rethink the complicated relationship between specific types of sources and systematic empirical work.

4. In several cases, Patomäki attempts to make it appear as if the editors are in strong disagreement with their own authors: „Claude Ake is closer to the truth“ than we are; Zürn analyses „complexities of the EU“ that we have missed. We must say that any rumors about such

disagreement are strongly exaggerated. G.A. Raymond had the following to say about the volume's coherence in his APSR-review, „By focusing on common questions, the volume avoids the problem of disjointed contributions that plagues many edited books. What is more, it offers the reader fascinating insights into how observers from other cultures perceive the structure and functioning of the current international system.“

5. Patomäki thinks it is a book of „short“ chapters. The average chapter length in the book is 9,800 words. We are delighted that we have succeeded in reaching such a level of readability that chapters of that length can be considered short. Patomäki also complains that the language of the book is „common-sensical“. That is very true; we happen to consider that a virtue.

Our book has obviously been unable to meet Patomäki's criteria for excellence. What are they? Patomäki is surprisingly clear about the standards that an excellent book must meet in his opinion: it must be (a) inaccessible, filled with non-common sensical language; (b) highly focused on „underlying theoretical assumptions“; (c) disliked and not enjoyed by managing editors; and (d) published by a state-run or -subsidised publishing house. These are surely innovative demands.

Hans-Henrik Holm, Georg Sørensen
Ref.

Raymond, Gregory A. (1995), „Whose World Order? Uneven Globalization and the End of the Cold War“, *American Political Science Review*, 89:4, December, pp. 1074-1075.

Heikki Patomäki har givet nedenstående svar på Hans-Henrik Holm og Georg Sørensens kommentar.

In my book review, I said that „there are many nice chapters as well as at least some illuminating insights to our changing globe“. I added that „for many pragmatic and teaching purposes this book may be just right and there are [also] interesting non-Eurocentric insights into the processes of globalization and the end of the Cold War“. I also devoted a considerable number of words to explaining and assessing the editors' attempt to take some steps towards developing a theory of their own. The editors themselves discussed this „theory“ only in three pages (pp.202-204) at the very end of the book. But since I considered it to be somewhat original and noteworthy and aiming at

some generalisations, I thought it would be worthwhile going into some detail.

I also did not question the authority of the contributors in their own fields as such. On the contrary, I highly value some of the works by these authors that I happen to be familiar with. Upon closer examination, I also have to admit that authors such as Inoguchi, Sunkel and Zürn base their chapters extensively on their own former research and often also on relevant documents and other sources. But in this respect, the book is very uneven. For instance, the documentation in chapters 2, 5 and 6 is very poor. Sometimes the usage of references is also mis-