

Discontent, but Also Blind? Understanding the Discipline of International Relations in Greece

Spiros Makris* & Kyriakos Mikelis**

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article entreprend une description des conditions, sous lesquelles l'œuvre scientifique des Relations internationales se produit localement et plus particulièrement en Grèce. La présentation est faite sur la base de quatre catégories: a) la structure institutionnelle, b) le rôle de la société, c) le sens de la science et la relation entre la société et la science et d) le contenu théorique. La reconstitution critique de l'image de soi révèle les tendances de la référence de soi, avec lesquelles le passé intellectuel est approché surtout avec l'optique contemporaine. Des tendances similaires constituent la perception de l'évolution de la discipline comme une lutte entre l'étude du droit international et la politique internationale ou entre le réalisme politique et les conceptions rivales, comme le libéralisme et les approches critiques. Mais cela cache ou sous-estime les mécanismes réels, ou la discipline a vraiment évoluée.

ABSTRACT

This article pursues the brief and systematic description of the conditions under which the scientific work in the name of International Relations has been produced locally, namely in Greece. The narration unfolds on the basis of four sets of factors: a) the institutional structure of I.R., mainly in terms of university structure, b) the role of society, i.e. the so called external elements of science like ideology and foreign policy, c) the science-society relationship and the meaning of science and d) the theoretical content. The critical reconstruction of the self-image demonstrates that presentist tendencies in self-reference (whereby the intellectual past is seen through the perspective of the present) may characterize non Anglo-Saxon communities as well. Such tendency is viewing the development of I.R. mainly as a confrontation between the study of international law and that of international politics or between political realism and its critiques like liberalism or critical approaches. But this hides or downplays the actual mechanisms through which the discipline had indeed been under-developed.

* University of Peloponnese

** University of Piraeus

Introduction

The engagement of scholars of International Relations (I.R.) with the investigation of the characteristics and the exact mechanisms of their discipline's development has met a substantial growth. The respective literature may be said to be a qualitative upgrade with regard to the discipline's self-reflection, since it has recently drawn more systematically and extensively upon epistemology, the history of ideas as well as the history and sociology of science. There have been several themes and methodological concerns within this literature. Special tribute has been granted to the development of the intellectual field and the discipline of I.R. as well as to the degree of correspondence of the scientific work produced locally (nationally or regionally) with the field's universal image and to how such an image has occurred.¹

To this end, several explanatory models or modes of narrative have been forwarded, generalizing the relevant factors and figures.² Those models and consequently the organized I.R. self-reflection have attempted the systematic integration of several parameters, including and/or transgressing space, time, the ideological context and the scientific content. That is, they have included references to the present or to the past, to a specific country/region or to the globe, to science or to international politics and to the social-political reality in general.

So it makes sense to speak of the discipline's development in many respects, one of which is the multi-dimensional reference to specific countries and, in this case, Greece. Although this article pursues the brief but systematic description of the conditions, under which the I.R. scientific work has been produced locally, it focuses critically on how this production has been viewed, since quite a few scholars have expressed their position. In particular, the article is not only a contribution to how the discipline has developed in one more non English-speaking country. It supplements the demonstration of the periphery scholars' dilemmas over the theory-praxis *problématique* through interviews or publication patterns.³ In particular, it aims to such demonstration through the critical reconstruction of the self-image, proving that presentist tendencies in self-reference, whereby the intellectual past is seen through the perspective of the present, may characterize non Anglo-Saxon communities as well.⁴

Indeed several attempts of the analysis of the discipline's development in Greece, written in either Greek or English by scholars either residing in the country or not, have admittedly concentrated on the description of the

institutional framework, of the community's special characteristics and of the relationship between science and politics, usually focusing on the analysis of Greek foreign policy.⁵ Besides the acknowledgment of the substantial institutional growth during the last years, their common ground has been more or less a feeling of displeasure with regard to the field's theoretical status, in the sense that scientific work, which has been produced and communicated locally, has rarely undergone the theory's scrutiny as a means of systematizing the local debates of foreign policy and international politics.

The re-construction lies on both theoretical and empirical reasons and constitutes our central research objective, since the self-image includes inevitably a variety of elements such as ontological and anthropological premises, intellectual and epistemological orientation as well as assumptions over the causes of war. Theoretically, the majority of the local self-reflection has not drawn upon the general self-reflection systematically and has rarely mentioned it with regard to the respective work produced recently. Despite the aforementioned complain that the scientific work produced locally has not been scrutinized thoroughly through theory, the reflection over this work has not undergone comprehensively the second order theory's scrutiny.⁶ At the same time, reasonable and multi-dimensional references seem to occasionally suffer at the empirical level as well, in the sense that certain empirical facts about the country's educational or social reality have been underestimated. For example, there is a common acknowledgment that global (or indeed Anglo-Saxon) disciplinary developments, since the Interwar, were ignored to a certain degree and not kept up with. However, this was not followed consequently by the acknowledgment that the Anglo-Saxon intellectual 'non-connection' should be viewed as something more than the criterion for an *a priori* theoretical evaluation and should be contrasted to Greece's Anglo-Saxon political connection that did exist somehow ambivalently during the Interwar (with regard to Great Britain) and rather more clearly during the early Cold War, when Greece had re-enforced its American diplomatic ties.

Our narration unfolds on the basis of the relevant sets of factors set out by O. Wæver, upon four following sections: a) 'institutional framework', b) 'sociology', c) 'epistemology' and d) 'historiography'. These sections correspond accordingly to: a) the institutional structure of I.R., mainly in terms of university structure, b) the role of society, i.e. the so called external elements of science like ideology and foreign policy, c) the science-society relationship and the meaning of science and d) the theoretical content.⁷

1. Institutional framework

At present time, the I.R. subject matter is researched and taught in quite a few university departments mainly in the name of international studies or international economic studies as well as regional studies, let aside courses offered in departments of economics, political science and law (see Table 2). The quite sized and somewhat diversified institutional framework can be compared to the early Cold War's monopoly of I.R. subjects by international law chairs in departments of Law and in Panteios School.⁸ The chairs were assigned to international law (public and private) and sometimes included the addition of diplomatic history, although the latter was more or less disregarded especially by historians. Its non-autonomous position was affirmed by the lack of a separate chair of diplomatic history, especially in the Faculties of Arts, where history was taught. Diplomatic history was included sometimes in the scientific work of other chairs like the history of foreign nations and political history, but this was not done systematically. So the present self-reflection's reference to the dominance of the I.R. subject matter by the study of international law and diplomatic history may be right but also misleading, if it is taken to mean that historians were actually engaged heavily in diplomatic history, which was not the case.

The present situation is the result of two factors. The first factor is the change of the basic academic unit (from the Faculty to the Department) and the abolition of the chair institution with a law passed in 1982. Implementing the newly introduced organizational structure, the departments of law and politics verified and indeed claimed the investigation of subjects related to international politics, through the establishment of departmental sections dedicated to what was termed international studies. The second factor is the 1990s' university enlargement (increase in number of departments), with an emphasis to regional studies and international economic relations.

This variety embeds various epistemological choices which are affirmed by the diversification of sections or specialties.⁹ In that sense, regional studies, especially with regard to the countries of the East, provide an interesting example. While a historical-linguistic emphasis could be expected, regional studies have only been partially subject to the framework of political science or international studies, probably in a lesser degree or later than in Anglo-Saxon states and mainly the U.S. Moreover, the study of law had indeed tended to absorb and exhaust political science and I.R. After all, when sections of international studies were introduced in the three law departments, only one out of the latter (that of the Aristotelian University of

Thessaloniki) included explicitly international relations and diplomatic history as subjects researched by the respective sector. The continuation of the study of international law in law departments and even in departments of political science is still part of the picture and in any case no innovation of the Greek case. Most importantly, the study of international organization and international institutions was - and for some it may continue to be - a supplement to the study of international law, while has not been pursued exclusively in the framework of political science or (international) political economy. To be sure, the recent growth of departments or sections of international and European studies in economic universities or departments has tended to qualify this situation.

Although quite recently there has been an expressed concern in the existing self-reflection over the margin and the potential for a broad social/political perspective of the I.R. subject matter, the establishment of research institutes, emphasizing international politics/foreign policy, took place in the late 1980s. It did not precede but followed research centers which had been founded just or quite before, emphasizing regional studies or international law although an older center, which focused on the latter, included the term I.R. in its title (see Table 3). The name of the professional association of international studies in the 1980s as the Hellenic Association of International Law and International Relations is equally indicative, since this term and the addition of two separate strands have been preferred in rather few countries.¹⁰ The Greek choice may be said to originate from the need for the attribution of respect to the oldest and quite sized strand.

Understanding this as the dominance of a certain (the legal) perspective of reality is part of what has happened but would mistakenly be thought that it exhausts it. If it did, in the sense that the proponents of the legal approach wanted and pursued successfully the inexistence of others, then how could a small number of respective books and the existence of various journals dealing somehow diversely with international politics, before the 1990s and the 2000s, be explained?¹¹ However, such journals have usually been proven rather short-lived, demonstrating that the scientific communication was existent and, yet, rather incomplete.

2. Sociology

The current self-reflection's sociological common ground is the connection of the development of political science and international studies with the

degree of Greek political life's rational organization. Acknowledging the short and general character of the description which follows and hoping that it does justice to this image, as it has evolved inside I.R. locally, we perceive that I.R. was the victim of authoritarianism and the variance of the degree of democracy at several levels; that is, inside Greek society and state (which was enhanced by legal formalism) as well as inside science (which was enhanced by the rigid university structure system) and most importantly with regard to international political reality itself in light of the perceived and actual dependence and vulnerability of the Greek state. The discipline's salvation from the restricted development or the virtual inexistence (with the exception of the study of international law) was aggravated moreover by the dominance of ideologies, like nationalism or cosmopolitanism/ internationalism, over science. In contrast to the rather embryonic development of social and political sciences locally, the political restoration after the fall of the Junta in 1974 signals some kind of cure. In the case of I.R., this was enhanced by the perceived need and potential for renowned scientific contributions to deal with both science's, and Greek foreign policy's, stalemate (the latter especially with regard to the Cyprus issue) as well as opportunities and challenges like Greece's entrance to the E.E.C. In other words, special challenges for foreign policy have led to the increase of the respective demand for I.R. and some kind of alternate discourse with supposedly greater theoretical and epistemological width, more so since scholars were able to claim that foreign policy and international politics had not been taken seriously or systematically enough.

While such a description may be similar to other states' descriptions, an element should be noted, which is compatible with this image but has been either omitted or mentioned rather marginally in the I.R. self-reflection.¹² The Greek state became independent in the first half of the 19th century with different state frontiers than the present ones due to subsequent enlargements. Political life in Greece had been characterized since then, and for quite a long time, by rather intense scientific and political/ideological debates over political dilemmas such as the geographic expansion of the Greek state, the existence of significant parts of the Greek nation living outside the Greek state, the relationship of antiquity with modern Hellenism, the relations of Greeks living inside the state with those living outside and finally the debate on West-East. Given the general dispute over the adoption of western standards *per se*, the result was an ideas-centered social research until the mid-Cold War as well as a rather incohesive, non-systematic and

incomprehensive discussion of those standards. The latter was enhanced by the fact that Greece became an independent state which seceded from the Ottoman Empire, so it could draw from various administrative or educational systems and not from a specific one, as would have probably been the case if it belonged to another Empire like the British one.

If the need for the state's geographic expansion and (since the 1920s) the preservation of its bigger borders could be seen as a starting point for the tradition of *Realpolitik*,¹³ the former was nevertheless counterbalanced by a rather peculiar role of the state. The tribute of the legal science to the state did not lead to the reasonable expansion of the respective discourse. Nor did so the nation-centric view of historical studies, since the basic unit of historiography was not the 'state' but the 'nation', the history of which was approached more in idealistic terms rather than materialistic or a combination. Indeed, political realism as a distinct intellectual tradition was quite under-developed. This anti-materialism is demonstrated in the critique against Marxist approaches like dependence theory. Nowadays this may be attributed too readily, albeit latently, to Greece's American diplomatic connection, missing the fact that such tradition existed in I.R. of another country - Japan in the Cold War - despite such a connection.¹⁴ Ironically, the acceptance of Marxism as well as of Critical Theory in the social sciences and in the field of history, after the political restoration, coincided more or less with the political scientists' engagement with international politics in terms of power, interest and international system. It may well be that the former focused on the research and even so critique of nationalism as a phenomenon, however it was missed that the development of political realism was not self-evident. Indeed, there were instances when analysis tended to be characterized by a rather strong confusion and mix-up of nationalism and cosmopolitanism as ideologies to be searched even so criticized and of I.R. political realism and liberalism as distinct scientific approaches or intellectual traditions.

Generally it can be claimed that the field's challenges and opportunities for the last decades, with regard to the degree of local political development, have been acknowledged by I.R. scholars themselves. On the other hand, the endeavor to determine them exactly has had the danger of overestimating or underestimating the historical weight of various factors, including the oversight of the social and intellectual context of ideas about interests and power. More so, it is endangered by the reproduction of a mentality of the type 'let's now do business as usual', as demonstrated in the section to follow.

3. Epistemology

The common ground of the references to epistemology in Greek I.R. textbooks and texts, about the discipline's development in the country, is the acknowledgment of both a rather difficult paradigmatic embodiment and the status of ordeal for the local community, due to the usual a-theoretical character of the analysis especially in scientific work produced in the native language. This common ground includes the influence of the last decades' political developments to the development of renowned discourse, which would be less normative or ideas-centered than before. Its scientific standards would be upgraded along with both the enhancement of empirical research and with theoretical embodiment, i.e. the explicit and broader location of research and teaching in various and yet clear enough standards. At the same time, the correspondence with the field's universal image remains an important criterion for the local evaluation. However, the allocation of subjects in selective departments in the first two years of study, where obligatory courses are the majority and make comparisons easier, demonstrates a certain divergence in the scientific training even at the beginning of the courses (see Table 4). There seems to be agreed that courses of economy, Europe, history, I.R. theory, methodology and politics should be offered. While a range of subjects is recognized, the focus to a subject may vary among departments, which decide themselves about the curriculum through their general assembly.

The call for the upgraded scientific standards as well as the acquaintance with game theory, quantitative methods or the systemic approaches of I.R. could be considered indicative of a broad positivism which nevertheless did not evolve into a systematic and comprehensive epistemological position. For example, it was not an I.R. expert but a political scientist who noticed the lack of systematic use of statistics in the political sciences.¹⁵ However, and in contrast to other scientific fields in the country, like sociology or political science, the acquaintance with Marxism and post-positivism specifically in I.R. has turned to be rather delayed.¹⁶ It should be noted that up to roughly the 1980s the doctoral training of social sciences' scholars had taken place more in Continental Europe rather than the Anglo-Saxon countries, least of all Great Britain. This has changed. Scholars who have been trained especially in Great Britain, at a time when I.R. (post)positivism was discussed intensely and explicitly, have pursued or might pursue an academic career in the country. This could mean that a respective discussion (whether dialogue or monologue) might strengthen up.

Overall, the construction of scientific identity includes the call for being scientific, more so in the sense that empirical reality should be searched through an epistemological variety, which is relevant to the institutional diversification. Apart from this call, the scientific identity is also based upon the faith to the field's function as a national/state science, in the sense of the contribution to the current policy debates. This contribution has been regarded as the confrontation between scientific discourse and the occasionally 'dangerous' public discourse, supposing a certain relationship between the appropriateness of the scientific framework and the effectiveness of foreign policy. It is important to note that the actual content of this image has varied, while theoretical inquiries have been highly thoughtful of the possible connection of hegemonism with particular theoretical approaches such as either political realism or liberalism.¹⁷

For example, one strand relates to the critique of the approach of security issues as national issues, which includes the critique against political realism and the *problématique* of power and the balance of power. Such a critique has been pursued by both historians and I.R. scholars.¹⁸ Another strand, which may be seen as a response to rather intense attacks against political realism since the 1990s, relates to the necessity of keeping up to the traditional paradigm of I.R. as a means for insuring the acceptance and application of rules that should guide the function of the local scientific community. Here, the application of the traditional paradigm is used for an epistemological evaluation of ontologically cosmopolitan approaches, which seem to conflate scientific critique with ideological one. Although this kind of analysis does not refer explicitly to the scientific ethos *ala* Merton, it actually uses it for the local evaluation, while at the same time it treats ontology extensively in communitarian terms.¹⁹

This epistemological variety need not necessarily be seen as a weakness. However, at the end of the day the importance of the sharp marking and probably exclusion of a piece of analysis (as well as scholars for that matter) as nationalist or hard-liner and utopian or no expert lies not in the fact that such marking exists but in its function to the communication of sub-fields in a meta-level.²⁰ Moreover, having identified the rather troubled relationship between science and politics, i.e. the fact that a somewhat problematic political situation has compromised the position of science, I.R. scholars seem to agree that being a realist, in the sense of evoking the empirical element, is an important future of students' training. Then again, what about the danger of falling to the epistemic fallacy and about the

differences of what exactly means to be a realist in philosophical terms?²¹ It is fair to argue that they have not been commonly acknowledged and that the theory/empirical research relationship seems to be rather downplayed in both textbooks and research articles. Put in other words and with all due respect to emerging exceptions, the field has been original in a negative sense, with regard to Anglophone literature, since the latter has reflected extensively, comprehensively and much earlier on the theory/empirical research relationship in terms of scientific progress and not just in terms of contribution to foreign policy-making. The corollary of this is the scholars' inability (or delay at best) to tackle seriously with the fact that the field's scholarly character had been undermined by its dependence from daily politics, since its social and disciplinary legitimacy and funding were thought to rely heavily on the field's policy-making relevance.

4. Historiography

The near monopoly of the I.R. subject matter by the chairs of international law does not necessarily mean that a history of ideas about diplomacy and international politics would be exhausted in the study of international law. This monopoly, which is commonly recognized in the local self-reflection, means the discipline's restricted development as such but not that of the scientific work *per se*. The Interwar provides many examples. One relevant example is a geopolitical *problématique*, including imperialism, expressed by sociologists or economists in particular. The current self-reflection ignores it completely when it makes reference to the infamous legal dominance of international studies before the mid-1970s. A second example is the work of scientists or intellectuals, who usually had turned quickly to politics, focusing on international organization.²² However it was usually of elitist nature or written in a foreign language and in any case it was often left out of university audiences.²³

Nevertheless this discourse was characterized by the lack of a specific and wide core of ideas. Moreover it would be neglected during the Cold War. The work of the early Cold-War was less broad and it emphasized more in terms of society of states than balance of power or related themes. In that sense, the public and even so scientific tendency of viewing politics in terms of power and interest as a pathology has had its impact to the analysis of diplomacy as well. It is highly indicative that, despite the generally strong connection of Greek international law scholars with French scholarship or at least French-

speaking one (since Greek international law experts tended to contribute in French), *polémologie* was virtually ignored by both law experts and historians. However it was addressed by a sociologist as a subject in a rather comprehensive manner.²⁴ At the same time, heavy criticism against the legalistic line of thought came in the name not of political science or I.R. but of economics, in view Greece's entrance prospects to the EEC. These mean not that I.R. scholars have been wrong, with regard to their complaint that international politics had not been dealt seriously and systematically enough, but that at least during both the Interwar and the early Cold War the sovereignty/anarchy *problématique* had actually been addressed and discussed.

On the other hand, the political restoration in the mid-1970s has been followed shortly after by the presentation of theoretical perspectives at textbooks in a rather neutral manner. The field's thematic enlargement during the next two decades was based more to the establishment of I.R. sub-fields and the evocation of subject-matters *per se* rather than to the growth of empirical research as a response and feedback to theory. With regard to research and analysis that may be of policy relevance, there was a change at least in the sense that the reality of international politics consists definitely - although not exclusively - of terms of dependence and political pressure.²⁵ This was not irrelevant to the fact that Marxist political and scientific discourse was more or less legitimized. So terms like power and interests could be used more easily, although what to make of them might have not been the same for every analyst. Moreover, the development of a Marxist analysis of international affairs may be attributed more to social scientists in general than I.R. scholars.

At the end of the day, state-centricity on the whole may have been questioned more than actually undermined. But it was only since the 1990s when explicit and extensive reference was made to the antagonistic character of the international system²⁶ and attention was given to the combination of systemic theory for the explanation of the restrictions of state behavior with the theory of internal structure for the analysis of state choice.²⁷ During the last years, this approach has been regarded as a value-neutral description of political reality in the name of the intellectual tradition of Thucydides' work, following the growing tendency of investigating the ancient Greek tradition over interstate relations.²⁸ These did not precede but actually followed both the quite sized and still increasing literature over Europeanization, due to Greece's membership to the E.E.C./E.U., and a liberal-like line of reasoning. Since the mid-1970s, there has always been a research concern linked to the

pluralist systemic approach, the theory of interdependence and nowadays the investigation of the possible consequences for sovereignty in view of globalization.²⁹ The Annan plan is an example where the anarchy/sovereignty *problématique* was recently discussed, with regard to a serious foreign policy issue. On the one hand, there was the argument that its acceptance was necessary due to severe negative consequences that its rejection implied. On the other hand, a serious argument was made against it because its acceptance by Greece and Cyprus would mean the actual demise of the latter's sovereignty.³⁰

This thematic variety has been seen by the recent self-reflection as a dispute that may focus on both (Greek) foreign policy and the conceptualization of world politics but relates to current and global theoretical debates. One could argue that the objects of critique have been both a kind of not a realist enough realism (or not realism at all) and a not realistic enough realism. However the linkage to the global debates has been rather deductive. That is, it seems that references to them have actually been made in order to rather legitimize preference to one approach or the other, with usually little interest in viewing them comprehensively for the purpose of furthering answers or reformulations of the meta-theoretical questions that have arisen globally. Here lies the irony that the field has been related to the real world, with regard to its dependence to policy relevance, but at the same time it had remained unrelated to it in certain respects, since its apparent polyphony is an achievement of the last years and an extensive analysis of international anarchy explicitly in the name of political realism delayed, making its appearance essentially after the end of the Cold War.

Conclusions

The critical reconstruction of the local self-reflection in Greece demonstrates that there is something more at stake in the local self-reflection of periphery scholars than perceived. Observing how the locals have observed themselves includes also how they have not observed themselves. That is, what they don't say and see in their pursuit and expression of scientific identity is equally important with what they say and see. But the point is not to blame wrong to the concentration on the description of the institutional framework, of the community's special characteristics and of the relationship between science and politics as well as to the acknowledgment of the substantial institutional growth and the feeling of displeasure about the field's

theoretical status. It is that the construction of the self-image should be viewed not as the *a priori* solution to the problem of enhanced paradigmatic embodiment but as part of the problem, due to the a-historical nature of the feeling of discontentment with regard to the field's theoretical status and local development, i.e. the fact that references to the social and intellectual past have not been made systematically and comprehensively.

For example, the perceived dominance of the legal perspective of reality is indeed part of what has happened, however without exhausting it. It is equally important what historians did also and -to be exact- what they didn't do. That is, they were not engaged heavily in diplomatic history. Although they are forgotten today by the current I.R., the ones who indeed studied international politics are some Interwar writers, whose socio-economic thought included it. Although they did not built up a discipline, they formed a forgotten discourse with distinct references to geopolitics or international organization. In that line of thought, the state was the point of reference instead of the nation. But this was the exception and not the rule, while at the same time the continental political thought was not negotiated in its entirety. The distinction between the nation and the state may seem trivial but it bears serious ontological assumptions. The nation-centric idealist discourse of the past does not fit ready-made criticisms against either typical political realism or typical liberalism, exactly because it has been an animal of its own. This animal has been criticized, in the efforts to legitimize some kind of a renowned discourse, but even as a subject of critique it was not taken seriously enough. It may be accepted that there was something wrong with scientific endeavors in the past, but they have been taken more as a given and less as a complex construction.

Consequently, the present days reference -even so emphasis- to the global theoretical trends misses the ontological bases of the past discourse. The tendency of viewing the development of I.R. mainly as a confrontation between the study of international law and that of international politics or between political realism and its critiques, like liberalism or critical approaches, is a presentist move that hides the actual mechanisms through which the discipline had indeed been under-developed, enabling the reproduction of an -indeed diverse- mentality of the type 'let's now do business as usual'. In that way, the projection of the field's status to state failure or weakness is restricted to state's power with regard to foreign policy and not expanded also to the internal dimension, i.e. the impact to the social sciences as well the scientific communication. So, while I.R. theory is evoked rightly as a means and

criterion for the systematization and comprehensiveness of analysis and research, there still remains the difficulty of understanding 'theory' as more than the criterion for an *a priori* scientific evaluation, like as a product with specific spatial-temporal context.

Contrary to what has been happening in the past, the establishment of I.R. in peripheral countries is less an issue. However, systematic progress as well as inter-disciplinary communication are still an issue, for good reason too, since the commission of vast resources in international studies doesn't ensure automatically scientific progress. Dealing seriously with the local self-reflection is part of negotiating this issue. To be sure, at the end of the day the analysis of the peripheral scholar will have to teach the rest something about foreign policy and international/global politics. But, at the same time, it may teach also about his/her country as well as science produced there. The lessons are out there, as long as one is looking for them.

TABLE 1

Explanatory Models of the Development of I.R. in a Specific Spatial-Temporal Context

Models	Levels
Wæver, 1998: 694-696	A) state and society: A.1) ideology and tradition of political thought A.2) cultural-intellectual style and educational culture A.3) state characteristics and the state-society relationship A.4) foreign policy (the role and behavior of the state in the international arena) B) social science: B.1) social interests B.2) the development of basic principles guiding the field's discursive organization C) intellectual activity within I.R. C.1) social and intellectual structure in terms of paradigmatic stability, hierarchy e.t.c. C.2) intellectual content and theoretical traditions
Drulák, Druláková, 2000: 256-257	A) institutional framework B) produced work C) biography of scientists/researchers
Lucarelli, Menotti, 2002: 114-116	A) characteristics of national literature: A.1) themes and substantial issues A.2) degree of abstraction A.3) dominant approaches/schools of thought A.4) communication patterns between local scholars and the international I.R. community B) academic and cultural context of intellectual production

<p>Breitenbauch, Wivel, 2004: 416-420</p>	<p>A) national traditions and conditions of social science (internal to both the state and science)</p> <p>B) foreign policy and geopolitics (external to both the state and science)</p> <p>C) political culture (internal to the state and external to science)</p> <p>D) global theoretical trends (internal to science and external to state)</p>
---	---

TABLE 2
Departments with a Focus on the International Dimension

University	Department	case A	case B	case C	case D	remarks
University of Athens	Political Science and Public Administration	+	*			
University of Athens	Turkish Studies and Modern Asian Studies				+(2)	Foundation 2004
University of Athens	Slavic Studies					Foundation 2007
Athens University of Economics and Business	International European Economic Studies			*(2)		Foundation 1989
Panteion University	International European Studies	+(3)	*(2)	*(1)	*(1)	Foundation 1997 from split of the Department of Political Science and International Studies
University of Piraeus	International European Studies		+(2)	+		Foundation 2000
University of Macedonia	International European Economic and Political Studies		+	+		Foundation 1990, as Dep. of International European Economic Studies. Renamed in 1993
University of Macedonia	Balkan, Slavic and Eastern Studies				+(3)	Foundation 1996
Democritus University of Thrace	International Economic Relations and Development	+(2)		*(3)		Foundation 1999. Two more sections exist

Democritus University of Thrace	Language, Literature and Culture of Black Sea Countries				+(4)	Foundation 2000
University of the Aegean	Mediterranean Studies		+		+	Foundation 1997. There is another division with regard to archaeology
University of Western Macedonia	Balkan Studies					Foundation 1999 in the Aristotle's University of Thessalonica. Transferred in 2004
University of Peloponnesus	Political Science and International Relations					Foundation 2003. Accepted students for the first time in the academic year 2007-2008

The table includes the departments specialized in 'International Studies' (including Regional and International Economic Studies. It excludes the departments of Language and Literature with regard to western countries, the program of European Culture at the Hellenic Open University and the Departments of Law which have a section of international studies (Universities of Athens, Thessalonica and Thrace)

-case A: section of international and/or European Studies or International Relations

-case B: speciality in International Studies/Relations

-case C: speciality in International Economic Studies/Relations

-case D: speciality in regional studies

In columns B, C and D the mark '+' denotes the officially recognized and institutionalized speciality, while the mark '*' denotes a speciality which is not institutionalized officially.

TABLE 3

Research Institutes-Professional Associations of International Studies

Before the 1980s	-Hellenic Institute of International and Foreign Law -Institute of International Public Law and International Relations -Institute of Balkan Studies (IMXA) -Hellenic Mediterranean Center of Arabic Islamic Studies
Early 1980s	-Hellenic Society of International Law and International Relations -Hellenic Center of European Studies and Research -Foundation of Mediterranean Studies -Center of international European Economic Law
Late 1980s	-Hellenic Institute of Defense and Foreign Policy (ELIAMEP. Later the term 'defense' was replaced by the term 'European') -Hellenic Institute of International Strategic Studies -Hellenic Center of European Studies -Institute of International Relations -Hellenic University Union of European Studies
The 1990s and onwards	-Defence Analyses Institute -Institute of international Economic Relations *Institute of Democracy Constantin Karamanlis *Institute of Strategic and Development Studies

The table is indicative but not exhaustive. The duration and viability of the above is not uniform. The mark '*' indicates institutes connected to a political party and a broader interest in politics, including a special interest in international relations.

TABLE 4

Distribution of Subjects in Curricula in Selected Departments,
in the First two Years

Department of International Relations →	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Subject ↓							
Foreign languages		4		8	4	4	
Computers		2			2		2
Mathematics-Statistics-Econometrics		5			3		4
Methodology	2	1	1	1	2		
Greek politics/history	1			1	1	3	
Sociology	2						
Politics	5	1/2	2	2	3		
Economy	1	6	2	2	4	1	11
Law	2	1	1	2			1
International + European Law		1	2	3	1	1	1
International Relations, Strategic Studies	1	1/2	5	5	3	1	
History International European + Diplomatic	1	1	4	2	2		1
International + European Organization	1	1	1	4	1	1	
International Economic Relations- International Political Economy		1	2	2	1		
Archaeology						3	
Linguistics						4	
History (regional historical studies)						4	
Selective	4		4		1	8	4
	20	24	24	32	28	30	24

List of Departments:

1. Department of Political Science and Public Administration of the University of Athens
2. Department of International European Economic Studies of the Athens University of Economics and Business
3. Department of International European Studies of the Panteion University
4. Department of International European Studies of the University of Piraeus
5. Department of International European Economic and Political Studies of the University of Macedonia
6. Department of Mediterranean Studies of the Aegean University
7. Department of International Economic Studies of the Democritus University of Thrace

Source: The Departments' websites (electronic visit: Spring 2007). The subjects include those with credits and they are recorded as described in the websites. These departments are the ones which were considered equivalent by a ministerial decision (no 2, 3, 4, 5, 7) plus one with a division of International Relations and Organizations (no 6) plus one with a section of International and European Studies (no 1).

REFERENCES

* The authors wish to express their thanks to the article's reviewer for rigid and thoughtful remarks and suggestions which have helped the former with the elaboration of the essay's argument.

1. E.g. Bell, D. "International Relations. The Dawn of a Historiographical Turn?" *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, Vol. 3 (2001), No. 1, pp. 115-126, Crawford, R. & Jarvis, D. (eds.) *International Relations: Still an American Social Science? Towards Diversity in International Thought*, New York: State University of New York Press, 2001, Jørgensen, K.E. "Towards A Six-Continents Social Science: International Relations" *Journal of International Relations and Development*, Vol. 6 (2003), No. 4, pp. 330-343, Friedrichs, J. *European Approaches to International Relations Theory: A House With Many Mansions* London: Routledge, 2004, Jørgensen, K.E. & Knudsen, T. (eds.) *International Relations in Europe. Traditions, Perspectives and Destinations*, London: Routledge, 2006.
2. E.g. Wæver, O. "The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations" *International Organization*, Vol. 52 (1998), No. 4, pp. 687-727: pp. 694-696, Drulák, P. & Druláková, R. "International Relations in the Czech Republic: A Review of the Discipline" *Journal of International Relations and Development*, Vol. 3 (2001), No. 3, pp. 256-282: pp. 256-257, Lucarelli, S. & Menotti, R. (2002) "No Constructivists' Land: International Relations in Italy in the 1990s" *Journal of International Relations and Development*, Vol. 5 (2002), No. 2, pp. 114-142: pp. 114-116, Breitenbauch, H. O. & Wivel, A. "Understanding National I.R. Disciplines Outside the United States: Political Culture and the Construction of International Relations in Denmark" *Journal of International Relations and Development*, Vol. 7 (2004), No. 4, pp. 414-443: pp. 416-420. See Table 1. Extensive reference to the theoretical content has been pursued in the internal history of ideas (Dunne, T. *Inventing International Society: A History of the English School*, Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1998), the critical internal discursive history (Schmidt, B. *The Political Discourse of Anarchy. A Disciplinary History of International Relations*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998) or the history of ideas that includes references to the interplay between the discipline and its subject matter (Guzzini, S. *Realism in International Relations and International Political Economy. The Continuing Story of a Death Foretold*, London: Routledge, 1998). To be sure, there have been previous endeavours of understanding the theoretical content and scientific communication (Holsti, K. *The Dividing Discipline. Hegemony and Diversity in International Theory*, London: Allen and Unwin, 1985).

3. See respectively Mathews, J. "Composing Identities: Literacy Dilemmas of Periphery Scholars Negotiating the Theory/Policy Gap in International Relations" Paper delivered at the 45th I.S.A. Convention, Montreal Quebec, Canada, 17-20/03/2004. PDF File / I.S.A. Archive: <http://www.isanet.org/archive.html> & Aydınli, E. & Mathews, J. "Are the Core and Periphery Irreconcilable? The Curious World of Publishing in Contemporary International Relations" *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 1 (2000), No. 3, pp. 289-903.
4. For a description and critique of such tendencies in I.R. historiography, see Schmidt, *op. cit.*: pp. 16-21.
5. E.g. Constantinides, S. "Greek Foreign Policy: Theoretical Orientations and Praxis" *Hellenic Studies/Études helléniques*, vol. 4 (1996), no 1, 43-61, Constantinides, S. (Editor) *Greek Foreign Policy: Theoretical Orientations and Praxis*, *Hellenic Studies/Études helléniques* (1997), Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 5-15 (Introduction), Conostas, D. "Greek Foreign Policy and the Community of International Relations Scholars" *Hellenic Studies/Études helléniques*, vol. 5 (1997), no 2, 29-48, Couloumbis, T. "Greek Foreign Policy Since 1974: Theory and Praxis" *Hellenic Studies/Études helléniques*, vol. 5 (1997), no 2, 49-63, Ifestos, P. "Fetishist Internationalism: Jousting With Unreality in Greece" *Hellenic Studies/Études helléniques*, vol. 5 (1997), no 2, 65-94, Stavridis, S. "Assessing the Views of Academics in Greece on the Europeanization of Greek Foreign Policy: A Critical Appraisal and a Research Agenda Proposal" LSE-Hellenic Observatory. Online Working Paper 11, 2003: www.lse.ac.uk/collections/hellenicObservatory/pdf/Stavridis-11.pdf, Tsakonas, P. "Theory and Practice in Greek Foreign Policy" *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, vol. 5 (2005), no 3, 427-437. Those specific references have been written in English. Apart from other contributions in Greek [e.g. Varvarousis, P. "The Science of International Relations in Greece. Development and Prospects" *International Politics and International Law*, Vol. 21-22 (1993), 325-352, Greco, V. "Schools of Thought and Greek Foreign Policy" Athens: ELIAMEP/occasional paper no 2002/2 (in Greek) & Tziambiris, A. "International Relations in Greece: Convergence, Influence and Prospects" in Couloumbis Th., Dokos Th., Kintis A. (eds.) (2003) *Review of Foreign Policy 2002-2003*, Athens: Papazisis, 2003, pp. 267-278 (in Greek). The study of foreign policy in Greece was discussed at a panel of a conference held in 1995 by the Institute of International Studies and the Hellenic Society of International Law and International Relations. Those contributions were published in the I.I.S. Yearbook 1996.
6. The term 'second order theory' refers to theory about theory or in other words meta-theory, which is inherent in every scientific and theoretical framework/approach.
7. It can reasonably be argued that a more appropriate framework to Greece's particularities could have been elaborated. But this raises the issue; Is Greece really a peculiar/particular case? If so, why this particularity couldn't and

shouldn't be shown by general explanatory modes, especially if the latter reflect the consensus among I.R. scholars, needless to say epistemologists, that particularities may be at place but their analysis should be systematic, i.e. multi-dimensional? No matter the differences of what constitutes the respective dimensions, why shouldn't a model guide the respective research? Doesn't it ensure that particularities are not taken a given or described in a rather *ad hoc* manner but examined thoroughly? Theoretically speaking, why would the Greek case need an analytical model only for itself? Why should the case study precede and not follow the explanatory model? To be sure, the research outcome could provide valuable feedback. Indeed, in this case, particularities are demonstrated through the model, since certain blind spots are detected. At the same time, a critical reconstruction is achieved, by juxtaposing various narratives of both international politics and the discipline.

8. The latter has been based in Athens and now bears the name 'Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences'.
9. The section is the organizational unit within the department and the specialty is the official division of the curriculum. The degree includes reference to the student's specialty.
10. For example, the affiliate associations of the World International Studies Committee, as shown in its website (http://www.wiscnetwork.org/about_wisc.php), have used usually but not exclusively the term 'international relations' or 'international studies'. A search in the internet, with search term 'Association of International Law and International Relations', has shown that such associations have existed in Greece, Spain and Romania. It is noted that our neutral description of institutional growth and variety (which is an indisputable fact), embedding epistemological choices, need not necessarily mean the lack of personal or subjective preferences and the insignificance of inter-personal relations. On the contrary, the fact that the title of the professional I.R. organization has not followed the usual universal path demonstrates exactly that such choices have been at least partially subject to preferences of a rather personal nature.
11. Here, the reader should take under consideration the science studies' regard of scientific journals not as an epiphenomenon but as a criterion for science's maturity.
12. This is less the case with the self-reflection of the political sciences and history.
13. Although national claims did not stop and Greek populations still continued to live outside Greece, it was indeed then that the majority of Greeks lived in Greece, whose borders were almost like its present borders.
14. Inoguchi, T. & Bacon, P. "The Study of International Relations in Japan: Towards a More International Discipline" *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, Vol. 1 (2001), No. 1, pp. 1-20: p. 12.

15. Sotiropoulos, D. (2003) "New Challenges for the Study of Greek Politics" Keynote Speech, delivered at the Hellenic Observatory's Conference on Current Social Science Research on Greece. Draft submitted for Inclusion in the Website of the Hellenic Observatory, LSE, July, 2003: <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/hellenicObservatory/pdf/KeynoteSpeech.pdf>: p. 18. To be sure, the achievement of a comprehensive epistemological position is a broader problem of I.R. or any scientific field for that matter. However, the point here is that the departure (or at least serious discussion about it) from traditional methods of law and diplomatic history as its supplement, with regard to the disciplinary study of international politics since the 1980s, led to a rather empiricist scientific stance rather than a strictly behaviourist one.
16. This point applies less to historians and political scientists engaged with the study of international politics, who have used post-positivist or Marxist tools and meta-theoretical bases since quite a few years, and more to I.R. scholars, although certainly some of them would be content with such use by other scholars especially as a critique against political realism.
17. Concern about this connection with regard to realism has been expressed in the work of A. Heraclides [e.g. Heraclides, A. *International Society and Theories of International Relations. A Critical Investigation*, Athens: Sideris, 2000 (in Greek): p. 110], while concern about this connection with regard to liberalism has been expressed in the work of P. Ifestos [e.g. Ifestos, P. "Cosmo-theoretic Difference and the Claims for Political Sovereignty" Athens: Piotita, 2001 (in Greek): p. 223].
18. E.g. Heraclides, A. *Greece and the 'Danger from the East' Stalemate and Breakthrough* Athens: Polis, 2001 (in Greek). In terms of (meta)theoretical content this played a role in the split of the Department of Political Science and International Studies of Panteion University to two departments: a) Political Science and History and b) International & European Studies.
19. Ifestos, P. *International Relations as an Object of Scientific Study in Greece and Abroad. Course, Object, Content and Knowledge Base*, Athens: Piotita, 2003 (in Greek).
20. For this and the importance of the handling of high task uncertainty, see Waever, *op. cit.*, pp. 717-719.
21. For a critique of the epistemic fallacy, i.e. the transposing of epistemological arguments into ontological ones, see Wight, C. *Agents, Structures and International Relations. Politics as Ontology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006: p.

In the field of science studies, epistemic fallacy constitutes a major issue and has also been defined as the attempt to derive an ontology from an epistemology, to seek empirical solutions to ontological questions or finally to analyse, define and reduce statements about being to statements about knowledge.

22. Indeed some of them, like A. Papanastasiou and P. Kanellopoulos, became prime minister.
23. For example, the Ph.D. thesis of the famous politician P. Papaligouras under the title ‘Théorie de la Société Internationale’ (Papaligouras, P. “Théorie de la Société Internationale” Zurich: Les Editions Polygraphiques, 1941, vol. 1, was indeed neglected by international law scholars, needless to say historians. It was only a couple of years ago that a book was written about it by E. Cheila: Cheila, E. *International Society. Past and Current Approaches. The Contribution of P. Papaligouras*, Athens: Herodotus, 2001 (in Greek).
24. It was P. Stamatiades. He taught in Panteios School in the 1960s but not for long.
25. Such books were written by both D. Conostas and Th. Couloumbis.
26. Ifestos, P. *War and its Causes. The Many Faces of Hegemonism and Terrorism* Athens: Piotita, 2002 (in Greek).
27. E.g. Platias, A. “High Politics in Small Countries” in Ifestos P. (ed.) *Cosmos Yearbook 1995. The Hellenic Review of International Relations*, Athens: Institute of International Relations, 1996, pp. 155-168.
28. Platias, A. *International Relations and Strategy in Thucydides*, Athens: Estia, 1999 (in Greek).
29. For example, the latter have been discussed by several contributors to the volumes Canellopoulos, A. & Fragonicolopoulos, Ch. (eds.) *The Present and the Future of Greek Foreign Politics*, Athens: Sideris, 1995 (in Greek) and Tsinisizelis, M. & Ifantis, K. (eds.) *Current Problems of International Relations. State Sovereignty: Threats and Challenges*, Athens: Sideris, 2000 (in Greek). J. Kinnas was an older contributor to the systems approach.
30. This point has been raised especially by Ifestos. See Ifestos, P. “Power and Law in International Politics: Greek Foreign Policy 1974-2004” in Arvanitopoulos, K. & Koppa, M. (eds.) *30 Years of Greek Foreign Policy 1974-2004*, Athens: Livanis, 2005 (in Greek), pp. 163-216 and esp. pp. 186 & 198-201 as well as special files in his website: <http://www.ifestos.edu.gr>. Moreover, positive attitude towards the plan usually construed the plan’s rejection only in terms of sentimentalism, ignoring that this rejection was also based on the logic of consequences concerning sovereignty.