



WZB

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin
für Sozialforschung



Karl Deutsch Colloquium in Prague 2012

The Institute of International Relations Prague (IIR), Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB) and Charles University in Prague with the support of German-Czech Future Fund and Embassy of the United States Prague

Day 1

Venue: Vlastenecký sál, Carolinum (Charles University's Formal Halls)

Conference chair *Petr Drulák* of the Institute of International Relations opened the conference by speaking briefly about the life of Karl Deutsch and noting that the 100th anniversary of his birth in Prague is celebrated this year. Deutsch, whom Drulák described as one of the founders of the discipline of International Relations, was a Czechoslovak citizen who studied law at Czech Charles University in Prague after having to leave studies at the German university in Prague for harbouring anti-Nazi views. In 1938 he moved to the USA where he settled permanently, maintaining links whenever possible (the iron curtain of course descended in 1945) with Czechoslovakia until his death in 1992.

Pavel Šturma of the Charles University Faculty of Law noted the aptness of the conference taking place in the Carolinum halls, as it was from there that Deutsch graduated in 1938. He said that Deutsch's life almost sums up the 20th century, with

his links to three nations: USA, Germany and of course Czechoslovakia. He described Deutsch's early life and more particularly his educational parcours in Charles University, followed by his move to the USA and Harvard, where he received his second Ph.D. in 1942. He then broached some of what could be described as Deutsch's 'pet topics': pressing International Relations issues such as armament and disarmament of course feature here, but Šturma said that perhaps most notable was his research on the European integration process. Indeed, Deutsch would be particularly influential and helpful today in tackling some of Europe's current problems, he finished.

Michal Kubát of the Charles University Faculty of Social Sciences remarked that Deutsch was an interesting and important figure for social sciences. He also noted that he was one of the few Western social scientists to be published in Czechoslovakia (in 1971). Since 1991, Deutsch has been a key figure Czech for political scientists, he concluded.

The Ambassador of the United States of America to the Czech Republic **H.E. Norman Eisen** praised Deutsch's influence in social, political and economic modelling, as well as his ground-breaking promotion of quantitative studies. He also commented on his opposition to fascism in Europe and noted how Deutsch, his fellow alumnus of Harvard, was one of the many brilliant minds who found refuge in the US at this time. Indeed, Deutsch would spend more than half of his life as a resident of the USA.

H.E. Detlef Lingemann, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany to the Czech Republic, again noted Deutsch's opposition to Nazism and praised his realization - even as a student - that Hitler's policies were evil. He noted his work on European integration theory. Deutsch, he said, was one of those few who would answer in the affirmative when questioned whether a mish-mash such as Europe could ever become unified. Another of Deutsch's key thoughts was that the government should always be at the service of the people, something we should remember in today's fast-paced and rapidly-changing globalized world.

Michael Zürn of the Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB) described the founding of his organization in the mid-1970s, and the fact that its development owed much to the contribution of Deutsch after he took over the helm in 1977. He praised Deutsch's combination and application of high methodological standards to substantive and important issues.

KARL DEUTSCH IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA, THE UNITED STATES AND GERMANY

The chair *Otto Pick* (Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences) began by speaking of his own time in England during the 1970s, where Deutsch's research and thought didn't find the resonance as it perhaps should have at the time. He went on to describe the background of Deutsch in Central Europe; seeing how nationalism could be such a destructive force in such a region was perhaps a factor in his lifelong promotion of European integration. He saw such a project as possible because of his belief that *group cohesion* is more important than *linguistic cohesion*. Overall, Central Europe formed Karl Deutsch, said Pick; the turmoil of life in this part of the world, the changes in borders, languages and nation-states. His escape in 1938 was due primarily to the fact that he was one of the few Prague Jews that perhaps saw what was to come in the late 1930s; many other Prague Jews were oblivious to the threat posed by Hitler and Nazism.

Richard Ned Lebow of Dartmouth College was a student of Karl Deutsch and knew him very well at Yale. Lebow's presentation focussed mainly on Deutsch as a person and as a personality. The various anecdotes delivered by Lebow about Deutsch's life in the USA highlighted the latter's innate sense of righteousness and his opposition to fascism, as well as his humour and his dedication to family and to life outside work; Deutsch was not all-consumed by his studies, said Lebow.

Andrei S. Markovits of the University of Michigan spent 17 years working with Deutsch and he again told anecdotes about his character - curious, never condescending, sometimes absentminded, an "ideas person". He always had time for everybody, even undergraduate students, said Markovits. He also referred to him as a socialist soul and a social democrat at heart. Going on to mention how Deutsch's analogies were always very visual - referring to angles, reflections, geometry, numbers etc - Markovits suggested that this perhaps stemmed from his beginnings in the study of optometry.

As regards Deutsch's legacy, Markovits said that he was the most cited and unquestionably the leading political scientist of the 1960s. One of the reasons he was so successful in the US (and less so in Europe) was the popularity of quantitative social science in America. However, in the past decades he has fallen out of favour somewhat as a result of modernizing forces and ideas. However, even though Deutsch is no longer taught as much in university and as part of Ph.D. programs etc. All of what is taught today, however is coloured in some way by his pioneering work.

Tom Cusack of the WZB said that he knew Deutsch from the time he spent studying at the University of Michigan. He spoke of Deutsch's interest in technological advancement, and whether this advancement was effective or beneficial to human, cultural and societal development. Indeed, living at a time when technology was highly primitive compared with today's world, Deutsch would have relished some of the latest inventions of the 21st century. Cusack went on to discuss Deutsch's academic orientation as a liberal rather than a realist, and somebody who did extensive research in the theory of the balance of power, which coloured much of the research which Cusack himself would conduct much later.

Various issues were broached following the opening of the conference to **questions from the floor**. Responding to a question about Deutsch's decision to stay in the US after 1945, rather than return to Europe, Markovits said that statistically most émigrés don't return; thus there was nothing hugely strange about his decision. The fact that he was working with esteemed colleagues in both Harvard and MIT, had a great fellowship at the former and the marriage of his daughter must have also played a part in the decision. The fact that Czechoslovakia had become Communist also essentially precluded a return, at least to Prague. Pick said that it is important to make the distinction between exiles (who return home when possible) and émigrés (who leave for good).

Various questions also focussed on Deutsch's methodological and statistical approach to social science. As regards Deutsch's role in the intellectual debates in the USA in the 1960s, Lebow said that as a committed pluralist Deutsch always respected both sides of such debates. This would only change if or when the status of pluralism itself was the subject of the debate. He was never part of those who scorned people on the other side of the debating table. Similarly, as regards having doubts about his methodological processes based on scientific material, Cusack said that even when projects didn't work out so well, Deutsch remained pragmatic and never lost his optimism regarding these methods. Markovits seconded this, stating that he never lost his optimism about the "larger project".

In conclusion, a majority of the panel agreed that Deutsch would have been delighted by the open and essentially united Europe which exists today, two decades after the fall of Communism and indeed Deutsch's death.

Day 2

Venue: The Institute of International Relations, Prague

THE CONTINUING RELEVANCE OF DEUTSCHE'S INTELLECTUAL HERITAGE FOR CURRENT SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH I

Michael Zürn of WZB, who chaired this panel, opened by highlighting several aspects of his own research which he said would not be possible without the pioneering work of Deutsch. One of these is the issue of globalization as an independent variable for political process; for example changes in society that affect political processes. This idea of de-nationalization comes directly from Deutsch, he said. This term 'de-nationalisation' furthermore fits many scenarios much better than the term 'globalization' (which implies an end-point).

Although the world has changed vastly since the 1960s, "Deutschian" theories still hold relevance. For example the increase in cross-border transactions from the 1980s onwards have in part vindicated his ideas, as have especially cultural imports and exports etc. Also, the *common production* of goods across borders, eg climate change which is commonly produced at a denationalized or global level, can be traced back to the work of Deutsch. Other examples are the Internet and international crime.

Antje Wiener (Hamburg University) opened her contribution by describing what she is currently working on - what she termed 'global constitutionalism' as well as global norms. She described her scepticism about the emergence of global governance and indeed even her scepticism regarding Europeanization. She made the point that European elites, for example, do not physically travel across borders as much as we think; modern communication is mainly virtual. These *stationary* elites largely counteract the belief of a shift towards a global community.

Deutsch's 'layercake' model, which holds that elites are generally the first to live out changes in societal norms (before they filter down to other strands of society), guided much of her research. However, her question was more about the level of harmonization of the thoughts of European elites from different states. Does any assimilation actually exist at the elite level in the first place? She said that after interviews with various elites – asking questions about Schengen, an EU constitution etc – she found that there remain large divergences of opinion between London and Berlin for example, but that a relatively harmonized attitude towards Europe emerged from Brussels.

Michal Parížek, representing WZB as well as Charles University Faculty of Social Sciences discussed his study of the relationship between the design and functioning of institutions. Some of the problems which he discovered were that institutions are designed by the actors that use them, and thus are designed in their image; politicians use institutions if and when it suits them, for example when a convergence of interests arises; and that behavioural changes are almost impossible to predict and thus actors cannot possibly say what their interests may be down the line.

Following two steps can lead to the research of institutions as cybernetic systems, an endeavour loosely inspired by Deutsch. Firstly, explained Parížek, a focus should be placed on information – institutions are *a priori* set up to facilitate the transmission of information. Secondly, an effort needs to be made to move up a level from just studying institutions and focus on the *regime* and the system functions as a whole; ie study institutions as political systems in themselves. More concretely, in terms of information, institutions fulfil key technical roles (is there enough dissemination of information, enough meetings between elites and key figures, is there adequate explanation and translation of varying discourses?), and regarding the political issues, are adequate measures in place to punish actors who oppose the long-term viability of institutions through individual action?

Tomáš Váňa of Charles University of Social Science outlined several reasons why he believes Deutsch has not become an object of mainstream discourse: one error in Deutsch's communication theory was that it neglected the fact that systems are composed of humans with free will – consistent homeostatic processes aren't assured; another error is the trust which Deutsch's theory places in the rational decision-making process taking place in systems – experience shows that optimal decisions are not always made. However, by adapting the theory and taking into account various developments such as the availability of new technology to the masses as well as new media of communication such as internet, Skype, etc, the obstacles to a Deutsch-inspired research are not insurmountable and the conditions for the operationalization of his communication theory are now more favourable than they were half a century ago.

THE CONTINUING RELEVANCE OF DEUTSCHE'S INTELLECTUAL HERITAGE FOR CURRENT SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH II

Otto Pick began by talking about the practical application of foreign policy. As a diplomat Pick is primarily interested in what he labelled "the real world" and Deutsch, he said, has had a marginal impact in this world. When it comes to putting out the bush fires of conflict theory rarely enters into account. That said, several of Deutsch's ideas

are worthy of consideration. His major contribution, according to Pick, was his thesis about social communication, which has added relevance following the events of the Arab Spring.

Talking about the development of NATO, where he worked in the 1960s, Pick noted how *realpolitik* is much more important than a sense of community; thus he has difficulty with Deutsch's idea of a security community. Pick also noted his difficulty with reconciling quantitative measures and the science side of social science with real world decision-making. Nonetheless he finished on a positive note by praising Deutsch's ideas on (de-)nationalization and social communication's effect on this.

Ondřej Ditrych of the Institute of International Relations spoke about Deutsch's concept of security community and its continuing relevance. He began by giving an overview of the concept as developed by Deutsch in 1957's *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area*, which outlined a security community as a political community which eliminates war and the expectation of war within its boundaries. However, despite this innovative research, the study of such communities failed to generate a substantive research agenda until forty years later, with the publication of *Security Communities* (1998) by Adler and Barnett. Ditrych offered a criticism of this project, however, pointing to its excessive theoretical complexity and methodological superficiality. He concluded by offering a way forward based on this criticism in the research of security community, namely a rigorous and honest methodological approach, taking seriously Deutsch's challenge of the realist paradigm of security and pushing it ever further, and expand the research's scope to include processes of disintegration of security communities. An object of such research at hand is the security community in Europe

Jan Růžička of Aberystwyth University based most of his contribution on the intellectual trajectory of Deutsch's career. He mentioned the difference between his trajectory as opposed to other European émigrés such as Morgenthau, despite coming from a similar background. He speculated that perhaps the fact that Deutsche was *Central European* whereas Morgenthau for example was *German*. He went on to mention the fact that there is a clear recognition of Deutsch's contribution to International political theory, but one that sets him clearly on the 'scientist' side. Even the fact that he is often disparaged for his quantitative approach, the fact that people often set themselves against what he theorized is a testament to his ground-breaking study.

Theresa Kuhn of the University of Oxford described her research, based on Eurobarometer surveys, as being primarily interested in the transformation of

transactions into loyalties. Deutsch's theorizing about this is inspiring, she noted, although while we have seen a huge increase in transactions we have not yet seen the development of EU support nor an EU identity across nations.

The reasons for this and thus the three main challenges to Deutsch's theory are that: transnational interactions are highly stratified across society - elites are the ones communicating and the ones travelling across borders, and the preconceived pro-EU attitude among the educated elite does not seem to filter down to other parts of society; secondly, not all forms of transactions are positive or long-term, nor are they always supported by the EU; and thirdly, there exist externalities to such transactions, for example the global influence of EU interactions, and also 'cross-one-border' transactions which may foster a transnational identity but not necessarily a European one.

In conclusion, Kuhn said that transnationalism is an elite phenomenon - it is a small group of people that actually partake in this and it is they who benefit from and develop a pro-EU attitude.

As a concluding remark, chair of the panel Stefano Guzzini (DIIS) said that several 'Deutchs' emerged throughout the duration of the colloquium. Firstly, there was the social democrat Deutsch with the strong commitment to peace; secondly, there was the encyclopediac Deutsch, who understands history but also is up-to-date with new technology; and thirdly, the statistical and quantitative Deutsch who had a fascination with figures, statistics and data.

Petr Drulák concluded the conference by proposing three more versions of Deutsch which had emerged from the conference: the conceptual innovator, the method man, and above all the humble man of integrity.