

國際關係理論反思性、 反思現實主義理論之研究*

莫 大 華

(國防大學政治學系教授)

摘 要

本文主旨在探索國際關係理論本身存在的理論反思性，包括反思性較強的批判性國際關係理論、後現代主義、建構主義等理論，以及反思性較弱的現實主義與自由主義等理論，尤其是現實主義反思中出現的反思現實主義（reflexive realism），特別是其對於國際關係學界忽略的現實主義之政治—倫理面向及理論化過程的反思，以及其理論內涵與特色；進而其引發國際關係理論研究未來發展的可能性。本文首先分析國際關係理論的理論反思性及其核心元素，以及非主流各理論的反思性。其次，分析反思現實主義或烏托邦現實主義的理論內涵，包括其政治—倫理面向及理論化過程的反思，以理解反思現實主義的理論反思性。最後，提出反思現實主義引發國際關係理論研究未來發展的可能性。

關鍵詞：理論反思性、反思性、反思主義、反思現實主義、烏托邦現實主義

* * *

壹、前 言

從 1980 年代起，國際關係學者運用後實證主義反思主流理論（現實主義）的理論化過程，進入了後實證主義後設理論重建國際關係理論的時代，致使理論反思性（reflexivity）問題已經成為顯著的問題，第三次大辯論也就進入反思的（國際關係）理論化之時代。① Yosef Lapid 在 1989 年曾指出，多年來在西方社會科學中，國際關係

* 本文曾經發表於中華民國國際關係學會 2012 年會暨第 5 屆學術研討會（台中市：國立中興大學，2012 年 12 月 26 日），感謝與會者提供評論意見；本文曾接受國科會研究案（NSC101-2410-H606-009）的研究經費補助，特此致謝。

註① Yosef Lapid, “The Third Debate: On the Prospects of International Theory in a Post-Positive Era,” *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 3 (1989), pp. 235-254; Mark Neufeld, “The Reflexivity and International Relations Theory,” *Millennium*, Vol. 22, No. 1 (1993), p. 53.

學科的自我反思是最少的。^② Mark Neufeld 在 1991 年就將之稱為「反思轉向」(reflexive turn)，並展望國際關係理論發展出反思性的趨勢，雖尚不足以發展出真正的「反思轉向」，但此趨勢的增長是真實且顯著的。^③甚至意圖打破第三次大辯論的知識論停滯，並且超越實證主義。^④這股反思轉向的趨勢歷經 20 年後，不僅衝擊後實證主義的國際關係理論（主要是建構主義），出現反思主義 (reflectivism) 與理性主義的大辯論，也衝擊到實證主義的國際關係主流理論（現實主義），而出現反思的國際關係理論 (reflexive International Relations Theory)。其中，反思的現實主義 (reflexive realism) 更是此反思轉向中最為顯著的發展之一，它不僅代表著現實主義的內部自我反思，也代表著激進的後實證主義（批判理論、後現代主義與女性主義等）與現實主義的和解。^⑤國際關係主流理論的現實主義歷經第三次大辯論的後實證主義批判之後，何以出現這樣的和解呢？是現實主義學者本身的反思呢？或是後實證主義學者的反思呢？或是國際關係理論發展過程中，即是存在著理論的反思性 (theoretical reflexivity) 呢？國際關係學者不時會反思理論的系絡與內容，重新呈現學者所誤解與忽略的面向。

簡言之，即是為了增強客觀性的科學 (the science of objectivity) 之目的，如何客觀化國際關係理論學者呢？^⑥尤其是歷經第三次大辯論批判，遭受質疑「現在還有人是現實主義者嗎？」(Is Anybody Still a Realist?)^⑦或是「過去有任何人曾經是現實主義者嗎？」(Was Anybody Ever a Realist?)^⑧或是深陷「持續的困境」^⑨的現實主義學者，例如 Edward Carr、Hans Morgenthau、Kenneth Waltz、Raymond Aron 等人，無論是在揭露國際關係學界對於這些學者的誤解、誤認、曲解或忽略的理論化過程與倫理政治面向，或是以經驗研究重新補充現實主義理論的解釋力，無論其是否自稱是反思的現實主義，這樣的反思現實主義正方興未艾地擴散在國際關係著名期刊，以及專書出版之中，殊值研究與分析。

註② Yosef Lapid, *op. cit.*, pp. 249-250.

註③ Mark Neufeld, "The Reflexive Turn and International Relations Theory," *CISS Working Paper*, No. 4 (1991), York University.

註④ Wayne S. Cox and Claire Turenne Sjolander, "Critical Reflections on International Relations," in Claire Turenne Sjolander and Wayne S. Cox, eds., *Beyond Positivism: Critical Reflections on International Relations* (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1994), pp. 1-10.

註⑤ 參閱 Ian Hall, "The Triumph of Anti-Liberalism? Reconciling Radicalism to Realism in International Relations Theory," *Political Studies Review*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (2011), pp. 42-52.

註⑥ Matthew Eagleton-Pierce, "Advancing a Reflexive International Relations," *Millennium*, Vol. 39, No. 3 (2011), p. 806.

註⑦ Jeffery W. Lergo and Andrew Moravcsik, "Is Anybody Still a Realist?," *International Security*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (1999), pp. 5-55;

註⑧ Peter D. Feaver et al., "Correspondence: Brother Can You Spare a Paradigm (or, Was Anybody Ever a Realist?)," *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (2000), pp. 165-193.

註⑨ Stefano Guzzini, "The Enduring Dilemmas of Realism in International Relations," *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (2004), pp. 533-568.

本文主旨在探索國際關係理論本身存在的理論反思性，包括反思性較強的批判性國際關係理論、後現代主義、建構主義等理論，以及反思性較弱的現實主義與自由主義等理論，尤其是現實主義反思中出現的反思現實主義，特別是其對於國際關係學界忽略的現實主義之政治—倫理面向及理論化過程的反思，以及其理論內涵與特色；進而其引發國際關係理論研究未來發展的可能性。本文首先分析國際關係理論的理論反思性及其核心元素，以及非主流各理論的反思性。其次，分析反思現實主義與烏托邦現實主義的理論內涵，包括其政治—倫理面向及理論化過程的反思，以理解反思現實主義的理論反思性。最後，提出反思現實主義引發國際關係理論研究未來發展的可能性。

貳、國際關係理論反思性及非主流各理論學派的反思性

國際關係理論對於其本身的發展常是藉由大辯論史（history of great debates）或學科知識史（intellectual history or historiography）的方式呈現，無論是辯論的各方或是新理論的出現，都代表著國際關係理論學者對於既有理論的反思，也包括對本身的理論進行自我反思。這呈現出國際關係理論本身具有的反思性，尤其是國際關係學者嘗試藉由反思社會學的反思觀點，自我反思其理論化或整體國際關係理論化的過程。

一、國際關係理論的理論反思性

在第三次大辯論中，後實證主義增強了國際關係理論的反思性，這是其對國際關係理論發展的貢獻之一。然而，必須體認到後實證主義主要還是複製或引進其他社會科學學科的理論與觀點，反思性則是主要引自反思社會學（reflexive sociology）的觀點，特別是 Pierre Bourdieu 的著作，藉以反思國際關係既有的關鍵概念（如主權、權力、戰略等）及研究方向（如文化轉向與實踐）。¹⁰但仍促使國際關係學者使用不同的

註¹⁰ 例如 Pierre Bourdieu, translated by Matthew Adamson, *In Other Words: Essays Toward a Reflexive Sociology* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990); Pierre Bourdieu 著，陳逸淳譯，所述之言：布赫迪厄反思社會學文集（台北：麥田出版，2012年）；Pierre Bourdieu and Loic Waquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Pierre Bourdieu, *Science of Science and Reflexivity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004)。有關 Bourdieu 對國際關係理論反思的影響，參閱 Rebecca Adler-Nissen, ed., *Bourdieu in International Relations: Rethinking Key Concepts in IR* (London: Routledge, 2012); Inanna Hamati-Ataya, "IR Theory as International Practice/Agency: A Clinical-Cynical Bourdieusian Perspective," *Millennium*, Vol. 40, No. 3 (2012), pp. 625-646; Didier Bigo, "Pierre Bourdieu and International Relation: Power of Practices, Practices of Power," *International Political Sociology*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (2011), pp. 225-258; Didier Bigo and R. B. J. Walker, "Political Sociology and the Problem of the International," *Millennium*, Vol. 35, No. 3 (2007), pp. 725-739; Peter Jackson, "Pierre Bourdieu, the 'Culture Turn' and the Practice of International History," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 34, No. 1 (2008), pp. 155-181.

詞彙指涉反思性，例如反思的 (reflective or reflexive)、^⑪反思 (reflection or reflexion)^⑫或自我反思的 (self-reflective or self-reflexive)^⑬或自我反思性 (self-reflection or self-reflexivity)^⑭或自我意識地反思的 (self-consciously reflective or self-consciously reflexive)^⑮或反思論者 (reflexivist or reflectivist) 或反思主義 (reflectivism or reflexivism)^⑯等，這些詞彙都顯示出國際關係學者積極重新檢視國際關係理論本身或理論化過程。縱使學者在使用這些詞彙時，所指涉的範圍與意涵有所差異，甚至是含混地使用或是交互使用。^⑰

但這樣的理論反思性包含了三項核心元素：(一) 對於理論化基礎前提的自我認知 (self-awareness)；(二) 體認理論典範與常態科學傳統所維持的固有政治規範 (political-normative) 面向或內容，以及 (三) 肯定在缺乏中立的觀察語言或客觀標準下，有可能合理地評斷爭辯中的理論典範之優點。換言之，反思性是一種後設理論立場，涉及 (一) 承認事實與價值構想的相互關係，也承認特定 (知識) 社群的社會議程與政治議程；(二) 開放參與合理的對話評鑑爭辯中各理論典範的優點。^⑱然而這也

註⑪ Emanuel Adler and Peter M. Haas, "Conclusion: Epistemic Communities, World Order, and the Creation of a Reflective Research Program," *International Organization*, Vol. 46, No. 1 (1992), pp. 367-390; Inanna Hamati-Ataya, "Knowing and Judging in International Theory: Realism and the Reflexive Challenge," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 4 (2010), pp. 1079-1101.

註⑫ Inanna Hamati-Ataya, "Reflexivity in International Relations Theory: Prospects for an Interdisciplinary Research Programme," Paper presented at International Studies Association Annual Convention, Montreal Canada, March 16-19, 2011.

註⑬ Ted Hopf, "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory," *International Security*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (1998), pp. 171-200; Brooke Ackerly and Jacqui True, "Reflexivity in Practice: Power and Ethics in Feminist Research on International Relations," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (2008), pp. 693-707.

註⑭ Piki Ish-Shalom, "Theorization, Harm, and the Democratic Imperative: Lessons from the Politicization of the Democratic-Peace Thesis," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (2008), pp. 680-692; Jennifer Sterling-Folker and Rosemary E. Shinko, "Discourses of Power: Traversing the Realist-Postmodern Divide," *Millennium*, Vol. 33, No. 1 (2005), pp. 637-664.

註⑮ J. Ann Ticker and Andrei P. Tsygankov, "Responsible Scholarship in International Relations: A Symposium," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (2008), pp. 661-666; Georgio Shani, "Toward a Western IR: The Umma, Khalsa Panth and Critical International Relations Theory," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (2008), pp. 722-734.

註⑯ Robert O. Keohane, "International Institutions: Two Approaches," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 4 (1988), pp. 379-396; Inanna Hamati-Ataya, "The 'Problem of Values' and International Relations Scholarship: From Applied Reflexivity to Reflexivism," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (2011), pp. 259-287.

註⑰ Inanna Hamati-Ataya, "Reflectivity, Reflexivity, Reflexivism: IR's 'Reflexive Turn'-and Beyond," *European Journal of International Relations*, Online First, May 30, 2012, pp. 1-26. 但本研究無意區分 reflective 與 reflexive 或 reflectivity 與 reflexivity 之間的差別，但由於 reflect 在字義上，仍有反射的意思，如鏡子反射，故仍舊偏好 reflexive，較易表達出自我反思的意涵。

註⑱ Mark Neufeld, "Reflexivity and International Relations Theory," in Claire Turenne Sjolander and Wayne S. Cox, eds., *Beyond Positivism: Critical Reflections on International Relations* (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1994), pp. 13-18.

涉及一項根本的問題，就是理論本身如何受到國際體系的文化特質、規範特質與物質特質，以及國際關係理論者在國際體系的地位所影響？¹⁹但學者也逐漸關注有關反思性如何產生經驗知識的議題，例如權力、倫理、女性主義、公民社會與國際貿易等議題，²⁰甚至為此議題提出研究指導綱領。²¹另外，有些國際關係學者強調「自傳反思性」(autobiographical reflexivity)，鼓勵國際關係學者以「自我民族誌」(autoethnography)為研究方法，敘述自身的學術生涯與著作作為反思的對象，藉以系絡化其理論觀點，探索學者的理論化過程中的相關內外因素。²²這些都展現出國際關係理論的反思轉向仍是方興未艾，持續引起各理論學派學者的關注。

無論是何種的反思性，皆是基於理論學者本身自我對於其理論或理論學派或整體理論傳承所進行的系絡思考理論化之過程，而非只是思考理論的主張與應用而已。當然，必須強調後者也是一種反思，只是必較重視理論本身而已，而非重視理論本身的系絡化，但仍有助於國際關係理論的發展。

二、國際關係各非主流理論本身的自我反思

國際關係理論的各學派學者對於其學派亦進行自我反思，甚至整個國際關係理論的發展，而顯現其學派的特色與要點。就非主流理論學派而言，批判性國際關係理論(Critical International Relations Theory)、國際關係後現代主義理論與建構主義理論是主要的學派，也是反思性較為顯著與受關注的學派。

(一) 批判性國際關係理論(Critical International Relations Theory)

批判性國際關係理論首先將反思性引進國際關係理論之中，²³也是較可能完全反思的國際關係理論之一(另一個是後現代主義理論)，尤其是 Robert Cox 的理論。²⁴也包

註¹⁹ Inanna Hamati-Ataya, "Knowing and Judging in International Theory: Realism and the Reflexive Challenge," pp. 1100-1101.

註²⁰ Stefano Guzzini, "The Concept of Power: A Constructivist Analysis," *Millennium*, Vol. 33, No. 3 (2005), pp. 495-521; Brooke Ackerly and Jacqui True, "Reflexivity in Practice: Power and Ethics in Feminist Research on International Relations," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (2008), pp. 693-707; Cecelia Lynch, "Reflexivity in Research on Civil Society: Constructivist Perspectives," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (2008), pp. 708-721; Matthew Eagleton-Pierce, "Advancing a Reflexive International Relations," *Millennium*, Vol. 39, No. 3 (2011), pp. 805-823.

註²¹ Inanna Hamati-Ataya, "The 'Problem of Values' and International Relations Scholarship: From Applied Reflexivity to Reflexivism," pp. 259-287.

註²² Matthew Eagleton-Pierce, "Advancing a Reflexive International Relations," *Millennium*, Vol. 39, No. 3 (2011), pp. 805-823; Naeem Inayatullah, ed., *Autobiographical International Relations: I, IR* (London: Routledge, 2010); Ronald Bleiker and Morgan Brigg, "Introduction to the RIS Forum on Autoethnography and International Relations," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (2010), pp. 777-778.

註²³ Mark Hoffman, "Critical Theory and the Inter-Paradigm Debate," *Millennium*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (1987), pp. 231-249.

註²⁴ Mark Neufeld, "Reflexivity and International Relations Theory," in Claire Turenne Sjolander and Wayne S. Cox, eds., *Beyond Positivism: Critical Reflections on International Relations* (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1994), pp. 28-32.

括 Ted Hopf 與 Stefano Guzzini 所稱的批判性建構主義學者 (critical Constructivists)，是較有反思性的建構主義。^⑤當然，這主要是因為這些理論都援用了批判理論的觀點，而使其具有反思性。批判性國際關係理論以德國法蘭克福學派 (Frankfurt School) 的批判理論結合法國社會學者 Pierre Bourdieu 的反思社會學 (reflexive sociology)，發展其強調反思性的國際關係理論，直到此時，最能顯示其反思性的著作，莫過於 2007 年出版的 *Critical International Relations Theory After 25 Years* 一書，以及 2009 年出版的 *Critical Theorists and International Relations*，前者由不同理論學派的學者分別反思批判性國際關係理論，首先反思其發展 25 年之後，是否依然批判呢？^⑥進而反思哪有甚麼是依然批判的呢？^⑦是否總是為西方國家白人及西方帝國主義呢？^⑧以及其是否完成原先的理論承諾呢？^⑨後者則是引介 32 位對國際關係理論有影響的批判理論學者，藉以反思批判性國際關係理論引述的不同學者，重新打開國際關係理論的既定假定。^⑩

總之，批判性國際關係理論仍然堅持其理論反思性，使其能不時地批判與反思國際關係理論與實務，以及自我批判與自我反思，仍是重視與強調反思性的國際關係理論。事實上，也是因為批判性國際關係理論對於既有的主流國際關係理論 (現實主義與自由主義) 的批判而帶動國際關係理論的反思轉向，展現了國際關係理論研究與發展的多元性與豐富性。

(二) 國際關係後現代主義理論

Anthony Burke 曾言，國際關係後現代主義理論的發展端賴三項事情：第一，自我批判回顧其過去，並回應倫理、政治及知識等新挑戰的能力；第二，與其他批判理論及傳統理論建設性接觸的能力；第三，與意圖平息它的各種政治理論及實踐形式之間鬥爭的結果。^⑪這正呈現出後現代主義理論的自我反思性，也顯示出理論反思性攸關著

註⑤ Ted Hopf, "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory," pp. 171~200; Stefano Guzzini, "A Reconstruction of Constructivism in International Relations," *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (2000), pp. 147~150.

註⑥ Nicholas Rengger and Ben Thirkell-White, "Still Critical after All These Years? The Past, Present and Future of Critical Theory in International Relations," in Nicholas Rengger and Ben Thirkell-White, eds., *Critical International Relations Theory After 25 Years* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 3~24.

註⑦ Friedrich Kratochwil, "Looking Back from Somewhere: Reflections on What Remains 'Critical' in Critical Theory," in Nicholas Rengger and Ben Thirkell-White, eds., *Critical International Relations Theory After 25 Years*, pp. 25~45.

註⑧ John M. Hobson, "Is Critical Theory Always for the White West and for Western Imperialism? Beyond Westphalian Toward a Post-Racist Critical IR," in Nicholas Rengger and Ben Thirkell-White, eds., *Critical International Relations Theory After 25 Years*, pp. 91~116.

註⑨ Craig N. Murphy, "The Promise of Critical IR, Partially Kept," in Nicholas Rengger and Ben Thirkell-White, eds., *Critical International Relations Theory After 25 Years*, pp. 117~133.

註⑩ Jenny Edkins and Nick Vaughan-Williams, eds., *Critical Theorists and International Relations* (London: Routledge, 2009).

註⑪ Anthony Burke, "Postmodernism," in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 369~373.

後現代主義理論的未來發展。後現代主義學者堅持所有關於世界政治的理論化，都是從某種觀點進行理論化，以及堅持天啓的客觀性 (apocalyptic objectivity) 是不能維持的。其揭示要反思當代以原型現實主義者 Machiavelli 追求現實政治實踐正當化的標準詮釋，展示了外交論述的偉大文本及其社會系絡與外交實踐正當與否之間的連結，以及探索當代的戰略/安全論述在提供合理化現實主義實踐及限制非傳統的安全概念化上的關鍵角色，藉由這些增強了有目的之理論 (theory for something) 的反思洞察力。^⑳ 尤其後現代主義理論質疑任何的絕對真理或大敘述 (grand narrative) 或後設論述 (meta discourse)，是異議的思想，不時反思既有政治秩序與論述，尤其是背後的權力關係，特別是顛覆的 (subversive) 後現代主義更是意圖顛覆國際政治理論與實踐。^㉑ 甚至後現代主義學者在努力建立和平時，仍自我反思其鑲嵌在此和平結構中自己的道德架構。^㉒

後現代主義與批判性國際關係理論一樣，由於其理論本身就具備反思性的基礎，在批判與質疑國際關係既有理論與實踐之際，也保持自我批判與質疑的立場維持其理論的反思性。例如後現代主義運用流行文化 (popular culture)，諸如電影、電視影集、小說、戲劇) 作為國際關係理論的讀本，藉由檢視流行文化而能提供更好的洞察，因為在流行文化內，形塑了道德性、產生與轉變了認同體，以及建構與改變了有效的類比與敘述。^㉓ 批判與反思各國際關係理論背後的相互文本作用及權力論述實務，藉以顯示其反基礎的知識論立場。誠如 Jim George 所說，如何可能思考與行動超越正統 (理論)。^㉔ 簡言之，後現代主義的反思性在於顛覆或質疑國際關係主流理論的權力與知識之關係，這也是其與批判性國際關係理論最大的差異所在。

(三) 建構主義理論

建構主義如同是一個反思的後設理論，反思性是建構主義的核心成分，但也是被忽略的成分，^㉕ 或許是因為建構主義也是屬於批判性國際關係理論家族的一員。^㉖ 但建

註 ⑳ Mark Neufeld, *The Restructuring of International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 61.

註 ㉑ James Der Derian and Michael J. Shapiro, eds., *International/Intertextual Relations: Postmodern Readings of World Politics* (New York: Lexington, 1989); D. S. L. Jarvis, *International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism: Defending the Discipline* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2000).

註 ㉒ Rosemary E. Shinko, "Agonistic Peace: A Postmodern Reading," *Millennium*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (2008), pp. 473-491.

註 ㉓ Iver B. Neumann and Daniel H. Nexon, "Introduction," in Daniel H. Nexon and Iver B. Neumann, eds., *Harry Potter and International Relations* (Lanham, Md: Rowman and Littlefield, 2006), p. 6.

註 ㉔ Jim George, "Australia's Global Perspectives in the 1990s: A Case of Old Realist Wine in New (Neoliberal) Bottles," in R. Lever and D. Cox, eds., *Middling, Meddling, Muddling: Issues in Australia Foreign Policy* (St. Leonards: Allen & Unwin, 1997), pp. 12-43.

註 ㉕ Stefano Guzzini, "A Reconstruction of Constructivism in International Relations," pp. 147-150.

註 ㉖ Richard Price and Christian Reus-Smit, "Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism," *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (1998), p. 260.

構主義是可以在反思的現代性 (reflexive modernity) 之系絡內理解的，^③建構主義的反思性並不及批判性國際關係理論，除非是其中的批判性建構主義。批判性建構主義源自批判理論的觀點，他們自我意識地體認到其參與到其所觀察的社會實體的再造、構成與固定的過程，他們知道觀察者與被觀察者是不可能分開。^④他們強調自我與社會的反思性，即是行為者與結構之間的相互構成。^⑤構成式的理論化過程增強了批判性自我反思或反思性的集體能力，這也開啓自我意識地思考未來方向的可能性。^⑥相對於批判性建構主義，現代建構主義 (如 Alexander Wendt) 就刻意忽視反思性，例如 Petr Drulak 就指出 Wendt 從原先以反思性作為結構變遷的來源，到後來改以因果性作為來源。^⑦

最能顯現建構主義反思的著作，當屬 Nik Hynek 和 Andrea Teti 反思建構主義的理論發展歷史，發現建構主義藉由「正常化」(normalization) 過程逐漸接近主流理論 (新效用主義或理性主義)，消除了其原有的理論與實踐之批判潛能。此正常化過程始於建構主義學者二元分類建構主義，主要是傳統 (conventional) 建構主義與批判性建構主義，在建構主義與後現代主義及後結構主義之間樹立起圍牆，並自許建立主流理論與後現代主義之間的橋梁，消除了建構主義與主流理論原有的本體論差異，而使主流理論豁免了來自後現代主義與後結構主義的批判，尤其是實用建構主義 (pragmatist constructivism) 藉由將建構主義置於社會科學的共識內，而間接中立化 (neutralization) 了建構主義的激進潛能，現實建構主義 (realist constructivism) 則是直接中立化此激進潛能，這涉及到建構主義缺乏反思其自己的本體論承諾、知識論承諾與方法論承諾及政治承諾。^⑧

上述三種國際關係理論的反思性是較為強烈的，因為正是其以反思性質疑與批判國際關係主流理論的現實主義與自由主義，甚至就國際政治的反思行動而言，兩者皆是不適當的理論。^⑨真是如此嗎？現實主義與自由主義沒有自我反思性嗎？當然不是，即使在反思性的程度上不及上述的理論，自由主義與現實主義學者依然就其理論題出自我反思，尤其是現實主義出現反思現實主義與烏托邦現實主義的主張，更顯示其自我反思性的潛力。

註 ③ Stefano Guzzini, "A Reconstruction of Constructivism in International Relations," p. 153.

註 ④ Ted Hopf, "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory," p. 185.

註 ⑤ Ibid., p. 182.

註 ⑥ Alexander Wendt, *The Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 375.

註 ⑦ Petr Drulak, "Reflexivity and Structural Change," in Stefano Guzzini and Anna Leander, eds., *Constructivism and International Relations: Alexander Wendt and His Critics* (New York: Routledge, 2006), pp. 140~159.

註 ⑧ Nik Hynek and Andrea Teti, "Saving Identity from Postmodernism? The Normalization of Constructivism in International Relations," *Contemporary Political Theory*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (2010), pp. 171~199.

註 ⑨ Jeffrey Berejikian and John S. Dryzek, "Reflexive Action in International Politics," *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (2000), pp. 193~216.

參、反思現實主義與烏托邦現實主義的理論內涵

國際關係主流理論（現實主義與自由主義）遭受非主流理論的反思與批判，尤其現實主義更是各方批判的對象，其內部也衍生出許多分流，例如攻守勢現實主義、新古典現實主義、權變現實主義（contingent realism），^④這是在傳統與創新之間的思考，^⑤似乎也可算是理論修正或反思。但不同於攻勢現實主義、守勢現實主義、新古典現實主義及權變現實主義堅持現實主義的國際體系權力結構論，反思現實主義則是重新探討傳統現實主義的哲學基礎與人文基礎，以及其實踐的議題，尤其是政治行動的倫理架構，例如人道（humanity）的本質與倫理行為的大同主義（cosmopolitan）標準。^⑥即是恢復傳統現實主義原有的（國家）行為主體性、慎重（prudence）原則，並且承認（結構）限制，以提供國際政治務實的倫理觀點。^⑦反思現實主義所指的反思是一種知識論的立場，認為傳統現實主義的著作必須以詳細說明其歷史或相互主觀的系絡予以系絡化。^⑧例如 Vibeke Schou Tjalve 就以美國清教徒倫理的遺緒，反思傳統現實主義學者 Reinhold Niebuhr 及 Hans Morgenthau 的現實主義倫理觀點。^⑨Ty Solomn 更是反思 Morgenthau 基於人性而來的傳統現實主義理論，發現權力與愛（love）兩個概念是 Morgenthau 用以克服人類境況（condition）的孤獨。^⑩Inanna Hamati-Ataya 則是反思 Morton Kaplan、Hans Morgenthau 及 Kenneth Waltz 三位現實主義學者的理論化過程，比較三者的差同。^⑪甚至也反思古典現實主義 Hobbes 的政治、倫理與道德的面向，以及其在現實主義傳統的角色與如何被後續學者詮釋。^⑫

註④ John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2001); Sean M. Lynn-Jones, "Offense-Defense Theory and Its Critics," *Security Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (1995), pp. 660-691; Steven E. Lobell, et al., eds., *Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Charles L. Glaser, "Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help," *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (Winter 1994-1995), pp. 50-90.

註⑤ Annette Freyberg-Inan, Ewan Harrison, and Patrick James, eds., *Rethinking Realism in International Relations: Between Tradition and Innovation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009).

註⑥ Andrew R. Hom and Brent J. Steele, "Open Horizons: The Temporal Visions of Reflexive Realism," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (2010), pp. 271-272.

註⑦ Brent J. Steele, "'Eavesdropping on Honored Ghosts': From Classical to Reflexive Realism," *Journal of International Relations and Development*, Vol. 10, No. 3 (2007), p. 273.

註⑧ Ibid., p. 275.

註⑨ Vibeke Schou Tjalve, *Realist Strategies of Republican Peace: Niebuhr, Morgenthau, and the Politics of Patriotic Dissent* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008).

註⑩ Ty Solomon, "Human Nature and the Limits of the Self: Hans Morgenthau on Love and Power," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 14, No. 2 (2012), pp. 201-224.

註⑪ Inanna Hamati-Ataya, "Knowing and Judging in International Relations Theory: Realism and the Reflexive Challenge," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 4 (2010), pp. 1079-1101.

註⑫ Raia Prokhovnik and Gabriella Slomp, eds., *International Political Theory after Hobbes: Analysis, Interpretation and Orientation* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

總之，反思的現實主義鼓勵學者（例如 Michael C. Williams、Brent J. Steele、Inanna Hamati-Ataya 等）重新客觀化與系絡化傳統現實主義者的著作，甚至也包括新現實主義學者與古典現實主義學者。其中以 Hans Morgenthau 是較多學者反思的對象，藉由學者重新客觀化與系絡化下，他已經出現不同以往傳統現實主義的非道德論者（amoralist）面貌，^⑤反而成爲是亞里斯多德派（Aristotelian）、^⑥聖奧古斯丁派（St. Augustinian）、^⑦尼采派（Nietzschean）^⑧或韋伯派（Weberian）及舒密特派（Schmittian）^⑨的道德論者，修斯提底斯派（Thucydidean）的悲劇者，^⑩或是具有激進基礎的烏托邦現實主義者，^⑪甚至其理論化是在尼采派的極端質疑與韋伯派的理想類型之間來回，^⑫以及他雖不是後現代主義論者，但在尼采與韋伯的影響下，卻具有後現代主義的思考，^⑬或是批判的實存主義者。^⑭甚至也強調理念（ideas）在構成行動與政治判斷及倫理判斷上的角色。^⑮無論是以往的誤解、忽視或是扭曲，這樣的 Morgenthau 已不是學界所認知的面貌，也就顯示出傳統現實主義仍有其道德、倫理與規範的意涵。

不僅是 Morgenthau，國際關係學者也重新反思傳統現實主義學者 Edward H.

註⑤ Michael C. Williams, eds., *Realism Reconsidered: The Legacy of Hans J. Morgenthau in International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

註⑥ Anthony F. Lang, Jr., "Morgenthau, Agency and Aristotle," in Michael C. Williams, eds., *Realism Reconsidered*, pp. 18-41.

註⑦ Alastair J. H. Murray, *Reconstructing Realism: Between Power Politics and Cosmopolitan Ethics* (Keele: Keele University Press, 1997).

註⑧ Christoph Frei, *Hans J. Morgenthau: An Intellectual Biography* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2001).

註⑨ Hans-Karl Pichler, "The Godfathers of 'Truth': Max Weber and Carl Schmitt in Morgenthau's Theory of Power Politics," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (1998), pp. 185-200; Chris Brown, "The Twilight of International Mortality? Hans J. Morgenthau and Carl Schmitt on the End of the Jus Publicum Europaeum," in Michael C. Williams, eds., *Realism Reconsidered*, pp. 42-61; William E. Scheuerman, "Carl Schmitt and Hans Morgenthau: Realism and Beyond," in Michael C. Williams, eds., *Realism Reconsidered*, pp. 62-92.

註⑩ Richard N. Lebow, *Tragic Vision of Politics: Ethics, Interests and Orders* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 216-256.

註⑪ William E. Scheuerman, *Morgenthau* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

註⑫ Sean Molly, *The Hidden History of Realism: A Genealogy of Power Politics* (New York: Palgrave, 2006), p. 76.

註⑬ Mihaela Neacsu, *Hans J. Morgenthau's Theory of International Relations: Disenchantment and Re-enchantment* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 3.

註⑭ William E. Scheuerman, "A Theoretical Missed Opportunity? Hans J. Morgenthau as Critical Realist," in Duncan S. A. Bell, ed., *Political Thought and International Relations: Variations on a Realist Theme* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 41-62.

註⑮ Michael C. Williams, "Why Ideas Matter in International Relations: Hans Morgenthau, Classical Realism, and the Moral Construction of Power Politics," *International Organization*, Vol. 58, No. 4 (2004), pp. 633-665.

Carr，也是出現不同於學者所認知的面貌。^⑥他不同於 Morgenthau 等美國的現實主義學者，他是一位親近馬列主義的激進人士，喜好政治政策、社會政策及外交政策的激進改革，並且引用 Karl Mannheim 社會建構論的知識社會學，^⑦以及思想史模式與辯證法作為其理論化的方法，^⑧但他是為了保守的目的而採取激進主義，^⑨甚至他是具備批判理論的左派現實主義，^⑩以權力與控制的邏輯探索現代性（modernity）的黑暗面，並以重新引發抵抗宰制的排斥（dominant exclusion）之能力，探索現代性的其他面，其政治社群觀點與馬克思、Michel Foucault 及 Jean-Jacques Rousseau 的著作接近。^⑪他的國際政治道德哲學是現實主義與烏托邦主義辯證而來，國際政治倫理是不固定的。^⑫他主要是批判西方自由社會的先驗理性與經驗主義，在這方面，Sean Molloy 認為 Carr 是堅守經驗主義而反對先驗理性，Timothy Dunne 認為是反對經驗主義與先驗理性，^⑬這涉及到他的現實主義是否具有後實證主義的色彩，值得深入探討。甚至 Carr 的傳統現實主義比新現實主義更能解釋歐洲聯盟整合的歷史變遷，可以補強新現實主義及整合理論。^⑭總之，這樣的 Carr 與學界的認知是截然不同的，也是顯現出傳統現實主義學者的多重面貌，並非學界既定的只重權力而忽略道德、重經驗而忽視（先驗）理性之面貌。

除了反思傳統現實主義學者外，國際關係學者也反思新現實主義學者 Kenneth Waltz 的道德倫理架構與理論化過程。Ole Weaver 以科學哲學檢視 Waltz 的著作，認為 Waltz 並不是實證論者或經驗論者，而是巴柏論者（Popperian）、實用主義論者與科學

註⑥ Michael Cox, ed., *E. H. Carr: A Critical Appraisal* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000).

註⑦ Charles A. Jones, *E. H. Carr and International Relations: A Duty to Lie* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

註⑧ Randall Germain, "Carr and the Historical Mode of thought," in Michael Cox, *E. H. Carr: A Critical Appraisal*, pp. 123~136; Timothy Dunne, *Inventing International Society: A History of the English School* (New York: Macmillan, 1998), pp. 23~46; Timothy Dunne, "Theories as Weapons: E. H. Carr and International Relations," in Michael Cox, *E. H. Carr: A Critical Appraisal*, pp. 217~233; Charles Jones, "Carr, Mannheim, and a Post-positivist Science of International Relations," *Political Studies*, Vol. 45, No. 2 (1997), pp. 232~246; Sean Molloy, "Dialectics and Transformations: Exploring the International Theory of E. H. Carr," *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (2003), pp. 279~306.

註⑨ Peter Wilson, "Radicalism for a Conservative Purpose: the Peculiar Realism of E. H. Carr," *Millennium*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (2001), pp. 123~136.

註⑩ Andrew Linklater, "Nationalism and the Future of Sovereign Nations," in Michael Cox, ed., *E. H. Carr: A Critical Appraisal*, p. 239.

註⑪ Andrew Linklater, "The Transformation of the Political Community: E. H. Carr, Critical Theory, and International Relations," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (1997), p. 338; pp. 324~325.

註⑫ Sean Molloy, "Hans Morgenthau vs. E. H. Carr: Conflicting Conceptions of Ethical Realism," in Duncan Bell, ed., *Political Thought and International Relations: Variations on a Realist Theme* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 86~88.

註⑬ Sean Molloy, "Dialectics and Transformations," p. 281; Timothy Dunne, "Theories as Weapons," p. 281.

註⑭ Daniel Kenealy and Konstantinos Kostagiannis, "Realist Visions of European Union: E. H. Carr and Integration," *Millennium*, Vol. 41, No. 2 (2013), pp. 221~246.

實存論者，而且少有將 Waltz 歸類為科學實存論者，他更是激進的反經驗論者。^⑤學者發現 Waltz 也強調國內政治的影響，特別重視維護民主的外交決策。^⑥這是學界所忽略的面向，甚至檢視其 *Man, State, and War* 著作的政治系絡與社會系絡，發現其結構現實主義有助於美國自由主義在冷戰期間及結束之後說明美國參與國際體系，以及國際體系的兩極動態已經增強了自由主義自己慣常的兩極特性。^⑦學者也就現實主義學者遭致最大的批評，即是未能預測冷戰結束，針對 Morgenthau、Raymond Aron 及 Waltz 的思想提出比較，尤其是對意識形態的差異觀點。^⑧另外，學者忽視 Waltz 理論中有關的國家社會化觀點，誤以為這是建構主義的獨占觀點，因而批評新現實主義的解釋力。Cameron G. Thies 遂以角色理論論述物質因素制約了國家社會化，而非建構主義所強調的理念因素與物質因素相互的作用，因為國家社會化是藉由國家選擇的角色類型傳遞了國際無政府結構的限制及國家在國際體系結構的能力分布於國家互動的層次。換言之，國家在國際體系結構的物質能力重重地制約了國家選擇的角色及其社會化活動。^⑨

除了反思現實主義的出現之外，從 1990 年代初期起，後實證主義學者在其著作中已經擁抱、吸納及發展了現實主義的元素，甚至自稱「烏托邦現實主義者」(utopia realism) 或「解放的現實主義」(emancipatory realism)。^⑩甚至 Paul Howe 認為 Edward Carr 雖然批判烏托邦主義，但其現實主義仍具有烏托邦現實主義的色彩。^⑪事實上，烏托邦現實主義有其源自英國輝格黨 (Whig) 的現實主義傳統。^⑫Ken Booth 認為國際體系已不再是戰爭體系，國家的重要性漸失，全球公民社會與全球共同社群是指日可待，應該恢復烏托邦主義在國際政治理論與實踐的角色與聲譽，^⑬以建立一個互惠責任的世界社群。^⑭然而，Shannon Brincat 則是指出 Booth 烏托邦現實主義的限制，認為烏托邦主義不應成為未來美好社會的藍圖，而是應該作為一個批判的想像 (a

註⑤ Ole Weaver, "Waltz's Theory of Theory," *International Relations*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (2009), pp. 203~204, 217.

註⑥ Michael C. Williams "Waltz, Realism and Democracy," *International Relations*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (2009), pp. 328~340.

註⑦ Michael Foley, "Bring to Realism to American Liberalism: Kenneth Waltz and the Process of a Cold War Adjustment," *International Relations*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (2009), pp. 313~327.

註⑧ Marco Cesa, "Realist Visions of the End of the Cold War: Morgenthau, Aron, and Waltz," *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, Vol. 11, No. 2 (2009), pp. 177~191.

註⑨ Cameron G. Thies, "State Socialization and Structural Realism," *Security Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 4 (2010), pp. 689~717.

註⑩ Ken Booth, "Security in Anarchy: Utopia Realism in Theory and Practice," *International Affairs*, Vol. 67, No. 3 (1991), pp. 527~545; Michael Nicholson, "Realism and Utopianism Revisited," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 5 (1998), pp. 65~82; Ken Booth, *Theory of World Security* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 87~91.

註⑪ Paul Howe, "The Utopian Realism of E. H. Carr," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (1994), pp. 277~297.

註⑫ Cameron G. Thies, "Progress, History and Identity in International Relations Theory: The Case of Idealist-Realist Debate," *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (2002), pp. 147~185.

註⑬ Ken Booth, "Security in Anarchy: Utopia Realism in Theory and Practice," pp. 527~545.

註⑭ Ken Booth, *Theory of World Security*, pp. 124~125.

critical imaginary)，是揭露既有真實中的分歧之啓示性裝置 (heuristic device)，以及世界政治進步變遷的理想動力。^⑥

然而，不同於這樣的方式，有些學者則是以後現代主義的文本閱讀方法，事實上，批判性國際關係理論學者 Richard A. Ashley 早就使用此雙重閱讀方法呈現新現實主義的貧困之處，尤其是將既有的國際秩序視為是自然的秩序，沒有揭露其限制，而忽視國際政治實踐 (實務) 的重要性，他嘗試「恢復被消音的現實主義」(recovering a silenced realism)，即是被新現實主義所消音的古典現實主義。^⑦但在目前的反思轉向中，Chris Brown 運用雙重閱讀 (double reading) 或症候式閱讀 (symptomatic reading)，並以系絡的方式重新建構 Waltz 的著作，將文本視為是言說行動 (speech-acts)，不僅探求作者所言，也探求其所行。所謂症候式閱讀是指排除只是閱讀文本的表面內容，而是要重新建構文本以填補已經被指出的差距與沉默，藉以脫離作者對於文本詮釋的控制權，使文本能開放地接受任何的挑戰。在這樣的閱讀方式下，Waltz 的人性 (human nature) 觀已經是不同於傳統現實主義者，而是與當代演化心理學 (evolutionary psychology) 的觀點相容，一位現代的傳統現實主義者。^⑧

烏托邦現實主義似乎也成爲另一種反思現實主義，但兩種卻是呈現不同的觀點，前者是從後實證主義的知識論觀點，後者則是實證主義的知識論立場；前者代表著是後實證 (現代) 主義與現實主義的和解，後者代表著是現實主義重新發現其原有的政治倫理面向。當然，這並不意味著兩者之間是沒有辦法對話的，而是意味著兩者都認爲現實主義的權力面向本身所具有的倫理道德目的。

肆、反思現實主義的特性

在略述國際關係各理論的反思性之後，本文提及相較於攻守勢現實主義、新古典現實主義及權變現實主義，反思現實主義是現實主義中反思性最強的，因此，有必要深入探討反思現實主義的特性，以理解其與其他現實主義反思的差異。根據 Brent J. Steele 的說法，第一，反思現實主義學者主張以歷史系絡或相互主觀系絡，既系絡化反思現實主義學者，也系絡化自我反思。第二，反思現實主義的關鍵元素是質疑 (skepticism)，質疑社會行動與政治秩序的建構、穩定與正當的政治權威之條件，以及廣泛政治挑戰的各種不同、特定與歷史偶然的解決方案之結果，並鼓勵行爲者自我反思其所追求的價值觀與利益，以及促進負責任的自我與政治秩序。第三，反思現實主義是倫理立場，行爲者的道德目標是與社群的歷史及價值觀相連，自我意識價值與

註 ⑥ Shannon Brincat, "Reclaiming the Utopian Imaginary in IR Theory," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 3 (2009), pp. 581-609.

註 ⑦ Richard A. Ashley, "The Poverty of Neo-Realism," *International Organization*, Vol. 38, No. 2 (1984), pp. 225-286.

註 ⑧ Chris Brown, "Structural Realism, Classical Realism and Human Nature," *International Relations*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (2009), pp. 257-270.

事實之間的相互關係，社會科學與生俱來的主觀性質及強烈的政治性質。⁸⁸ Steele 進而定義反思現實主義是嘗試恢復古典現實主義的行為者主體性 (agency)、慎思明辨 (prudence) 及承認自由 (freedom) 的限制及可能性等原則，這是提供國際政治務實倫理觀點 (a practical-ethical view) 的一部分。⁸⁹ 所謂慎思明辨是要事先判斷行動可能導致的結果，例如國家有確保國家利益之權力及責任，要事先判斷使用或不使用權力或武力的導致結果；所謂行為者主體性是指國家承認慎思明辨其執行國家利益之戰略 (statecraft)，即是國家受到國家目的認知的驅使及內在反思，藉由外在的社會互動關係而實現國家目的；承認自由的限制與可能性是指國家實現國家利益或目的之能力。⁹⁰ 簡言之，反思現實主義的國家是有倫理道德的權力及責任的行為者。甚至在時間性 (temporality) 或歷史觀上，反思現實主義不同於現實主義、自由主義與建構主義的循環史 (時間) 觀、線性進步史 (時間) 觀，它是超越的、開放的史 (時間) 觀。⁹¹ 換言之，反思現實主義是以開放的時空觀點重新系絡化現實主義理論，開拓多元可能的反思現實主義，特別是在其政治倫理的主張，意圖重新將政治倫理引入國際關係研究，重塑國際關係應有的倫理道德基礎。更重要的是，學者藉由系絡化現實主義而能自我反思此道德倫理基礎。

誠如上述所及，反思現實主義重新反思國際關係學界所忽略的現實主義之政治倫理面向，例如務實的倫理 (practical ethics)、⁹² 奠基於權力與道德的國際體系可以成功地提供國際體系和平與正義、⁹³ 權力與人性、⁹⁴ 乃至大同主義的倫理 (cosmopolitan ethics) ⁹⁵ 等，意圖將現實主義帶回其原有的政治倫理意涵，而非國際關係學界所誤解的權力政治面向。特別是 Michael Williams 將反思現實主義與後實證主義 (後現代主義與後結構主義) 結合，以批判國際體系的二極結構而建立反映責任倫理的國家利益。⁹⁶ 這與上述的烏托邦現實主義實有相同的狀況，皆使兩者在現實主義的政治倫理面向更加混淆了，實有必要予以釐清與分析。簡言之，現實主義的政治倫理面向與權力面向之間的關係，是否是手段與目的鏈 (chain of mean-end) 的關係，而非孰重孰輕的相對關係。反思現實主義甚至也引起政治哲學重返國際關係理論研究，以政治哲學探究國

註⁸⁸ Brent J. Steele, "‘Eavesdropping on Honored Ghosts’: From Classical to Reflexive Realism," pp. 275–277.

註⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 273.

註⁹⁰ Ibid., pp. 278–282.

註⁹¹ Andrew R. Hom and Brent J. Steele, "Open Horizons: The Temporal Visions of Reflexive Realism," pp. 271–300.

註⁹² Brent J. Steele, "‘Eavesdropping on Honored Ghosts’: From Classical to Reflexive Realism," pp. 272–300.

註⁹³ Anthony D. Lang, *Agency and Ethics: The Politics of Military Intervention* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2002), p. 6.

註⁹⁴ Ulrik Enemark Petersen, "Breathing Nietzsche’s Air: New Reflections on Morgenthau’s Concepts of Power and Human Nature," *Alternatives*, Vol. 24, No. 1 (1999), pp. 83–118.

註⁹⁵ Alastair J. H. Murray, *Reconstructing Realism: Between Power Politics and Cosmopolitan Ethics* (Keele: Keele University Press, 1997).

註⁹⁶ Michael C. Williams, *The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 128–168.

際關係理論而重新概念化「國際政治」，發展強調兩者結合的「國際政治哲學」(International Political Theory)。某種程度上，就是國際關係理論研究中常使用的「國際思想」(international thoughts)，其探索國際關係所涉及的基本理念與信仰，所攸關的價值觀，以及語言與論述。⁹⁷例如探究國際關係各理論的政治哲學先驅者思想，包括當前各理論所忽略的知識系絡及政治系絡、思想史的常與變，以展示政治哲學對國際關係研究的潛在豐富性。⁹⁸進而對於國際關係實務能提供政治倫理或道德的規範，這也是反思現實主義意圖重新揭露現實主義所具有的倫理面向，使國際關係能有倫理道德基礎，而非權力相爭的狀態。

總之，反思現實主義所意圖的知識目的是要以系絡化重新揭露現實主義的倫理面向，藉以質疑既有的秩序而自我反思，進而提出倫理道德訴求，重新展現國際關係或國際社會的倫理道德基礎。甚至是企圖扭轉國際關係理論學者對於現實主義的誤解，重新回歸現實主義原有的面貌，這正是反思現實主義的反思性之所在。

伍、反思現實主義引發國際關係理論研究未來發展的可能性

反思現實主義截然不同於國際關係所熟悉的現實主義理論內容，誠如 G. John Ikenberry 就認為這是大多數現實主義學者不會承認的現實主義類型，也缺乏明確的經驗命題，是細微差別且隱晦不明的現實主義，無法解釋真實的世界。⁹⁹這似乎是一針見血的批判，直指了反思現實主義的弱點或致命之處。如同其他強調反思的國際關係理論一樣，反思難以具體落實在經驗之上，多是人類思維的作用而已。國際關係學者是否承認反思現實主義呢？就反思現實主義而言，即使守勢現實主義、攻勢現實主義、古典現實主義或新古典現實主義仍是屬於現實主義的反思性，但現實主義理論內部的差異並非關注的焦點，而是注重在反思現實主義與烏托邦現實主義的出現。反思現實主義是在反思現實主義理論的哪些面向？使其得以自許為反思現實主義呢？又是如何反思呢？其強調的政治倫理面向又是有何關聯？烏托邦現實主義又與反思現實主義有何差別？後現代主義與現實主義的和解是理論綜合或混淆？難道一定要現實主義者反思的現實主義才是反思現實主義嗎？是否兩者也能用多元的觀點看待反思主義呢？

如何界定反思現實主義？其有何特性使其不同於其他的現實主義反思？這些特性又如何能在反思的過程中呈現呢？重新檢視現實主義學者的理論化過程，以及重新系絡化原有的政治倫理面向能否顯示其理論反思性？其政治倫理面向所涉及的範圍呢？其

註⁹⁷ Robert Jackson, *Classical and Modern Thought on International Relations* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), p. 1.

註⁹⁸ Beate Jahn, ed., *Classical Theory in International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

註⁹⁹ G. John Ikenberry, "Political and Legal: The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 85, No. 1 (2006), p. 145.

與當前的規範的國際關係理論 (normative international relations theory) 又有何差異呢？甚至其是否只是現實主義與自由主義結合而成的自由現實主義 (Liberal-Realism) 而已？或是其能否使現實主義因應既有的批判與質疑呢？

反思現實主義出現之後，國際關係學者又是如何看待這樣的現實主義呢？尤其這樣的現實主義已經超越學界所認知的現實主義，現實主義者是否會承認其是現實主義嗎？其所遭致的批評又是如何？有無獲致讚美呢？其對現實主義的發展有何貢獻及影響？或是否其將會使現實主義轉為是政治思想而非國際關係理論？或是藉由倫理道德與權力政治的交互運用而使現實主義更能落實在實務之上？在此方面，Anthony Long 就以 1918 年英美軍事干預俄羅斯、1956 年英、法以色列軍事干預埃及和 1992~93 年美國及聯合國軍事干預索馬利亞為例，說明此三場軍事干預的失敗並非無道德或非道德的權力政治所致，而是過多的規範性政治 (normative politics)，也就是將軍事干預賦予過多的倫理規範，藉以說明 Edward Carr、Rienhold Niebuhr、George Kennan 及 Hans Morgenthau 等現實主義學者強調政治與道德的觀點，國際政治只有建立在權力及道德的基礎，才能提供和平與正義。^⑩ Brent J. Steele 以美國軍事干預伊拉克為例，呈現出美國在穩定權力平衡的區域安全秩序與推動民主之間的困境，造成美國外交政策的失敗，透過 Niebuhr、Morgenthau 的觀點及 Anthony Long、Michael Williams 及 Richard Ned Lebow 的著作，反制共和黨新保守主義 (neoonervatism) 對現實主義的諷刺及醜化，為當代世界政治恢復古典現實主義的務實倫理，並探討反思主義的理論意涵及未來發展。^⑪

簡言之，反思現實主義學者藉由重新閱讀現實主義學者的著作，引述以往所忽略、忽視或扭曲的原有倫理道德觀點，藉由國際關係實務個案而恢復現實主義的實貌，即是重視權力政治與倫理道德的相互運用。也就是說，反思現實主義是重新包裝 (re-packing) 或重新詮釋特定傳統現實主義學者的觀點，藉以反思國際關係學者對現實主義既有的錯誤認知或誤解，進而對於國際政治實務提出務實的倫理原則。

上述種種問題都攸關著反思現實主義能否發展成為現實主義內部的分流，並為國際關係學者所接受。同樣地，反思現實主義也促使學者思考國際關係理論的反思性，即使國際關係理論的第三次大辯論中，後實證主義 (批判理論、後現代主義與建構主義等) 國際關係學者引用 (知識) 社會學的反思性作為批判實證主義 (現實主義與自由主義) 的工具，帶動所謂的反思轉向。即使同為主流理論的自由主義也會有自我反思，不同於現實主義所遭受的批判而出現反思的現實主義或是重新反思現實主義，同是主流理論的自由主義卻是較少的反思性，只有少數的學者對自由主義提出反思，甚至認為自由主義正面臨危機。^⑫例如 Daniel Deudney 和 G. John Ikenberry 呼籲要有「更

註^⑩ Anthony F. Long, *Agency and Ethics: The Politics of Military Intervention* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2002).

註^⑪ Brent J. Steele, "Eavesdropping on Honored Ghosts," pp. 272~300.

註^⑫ Ronnie D. Lipschutz, "What Comes after Liberalism? More Liberalism!" *Millennium*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (2010), pp. 545~551; Marjo Koivisto and Tim Dunne, "Crisis, What Crisis? Liberal Order Building and World Order Convention," *Millennium*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (2010), pp. 615~640.

為自我意識且堅定的自由治國之術」，^⑩並且陸續提出 2.0 版的自由主義與 3.0 版的自由制度主義，但仍是以美國霸權作為自由國際秩序的核心組織原則。^⑪Cynthia Weber 就認為自我意識與堅定是相矛盾的，無法達成這樣的自由主義。^⑫Brian C. Rathbun 更是反思國際關係自由主義 (Liberalism) 與自由派 (Liberals) 之差異，由於自由主義的核心元素並不一致，難以界定自由派學者，所以幾乎所有的人都是自由派學者，若是如此，那自由主義能有甚麼意義呢？^⑬於是自由主義學者嘗試反思自我與他人之間關係的自主性 (autonomy)，以此作為抵抗主權權力。^⑭

或許是因為在與現實主義同為理性主義的主流理論中，自由主義較少遭致其他理論 (批判性國際關係理論、後現代主義、女性主義) 的批判與質疑，而且這些批判與質疑的國際關係理論本身常是具備了自由主義的色彩。自由主義的反思性或反思的自由主義常是學者忽略的面向，自由主義學者本身也較不關注此面向。但隨著反思現實主義的興起，自由主義的反思也會逐漸成為另一股國際關係理論反思的潮流。

即使如此，但 (知識) 社會學的反思性原義為何？除了 Pierre Bourdieu 之外，是否還有其他的社會學者呢？當國際關係理論探討反思性時，何以出現諸多不同的名詞指涉反思性呢？其意涵是否也有差異呢？是否意味著反思性是指自我反思或自我批判或自我意識本身理論的限制？或是反思其他理論的限制也屬於反思性呢？若是前者才是真正的反思性，又要如何界定學者的理論學派呢？不同的理論學派學者就不能反思其他學派嗎？是否應該就其反思的理論內容為依據呢？或是反思性能否代表著國際關係理論的進步性呢？這些問題連帶著也就促使或迫使國際關係學者必須自我反思有關國際關係理論反思的議題了，而且這也是一個難有定論的議題。例如 Inanna Hamati-Ataya 就嘗試以反思主義探討國際關係理論所涉及到的「價值觀問題」(problem of values)，意圖超越單純地運用反思性而能有系統的理解反思性的社會認知實務 (social-cognitive practice)，尤其是在知識論上的爭論。^⑮另外，Patrick Jackson 的 *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations* 一書引起的國際關係理論科學性與反思性的爭論，也說明了理論反思性對國際關係理論的衝擊。*Millennium* 期刊曾在 2013 年的第 41 卷第 2 期就此書為論壇主題邀請學者撰文討論，不同理論學派學者分別提出不同的批評觀點，呈現出科學研究與反思研究的爭論。其中，Christine Sylvester 就以女性主

註⑩ Daniel Deudney and G. John Ikenberry, "The Nature and Sources of Liberal World Order," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 2 (1999), pp. 179-196.

註⑪ G. John Ikenberry, "Liberal Institutionalism 3.0: America and the Dilemma of Liberal World Order," *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (2009), pp. 71-87; G. John Ikenberry, "The Liberal International Order and Its Discontents," *Millennium*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (2010), pp. 509-521.

註⑫ Cynthia Weber, "After Liberalism," *Millennium*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (2010), pp. 553-560.

註⑬ Brian C. Rathbun, "Is Anybody Not an (International Relations) Liberal?" *Security Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (2010), pp. 2-25.

註⑭ Rosemary E. Shinko, "Ethics after Liberalism: Why (Autonomous) Bodies Matter," *Millennium*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (2010), pp. 723-745.

註⑮ Inanna Hamati-Ataya, "The 'Problem of Values' and International Relations Scholarship: From Applied Reflexivity to Reflexivism," pp. 259-287.

義的觀點提出女性主義的反思性，認為反思性的研究不僅要將經驗與狀況納入說明，也要反思形塑現在（the present）的歷史力量與因素。^⑩

國際關係理論中，批判理論、後現代主義與建構主義是較具反思性的理論，然而，這些理論身為邊緣理論或最受爭議的理論，其理論反思性又呈現出怎樣的內容呢？在國際關係理論的知識傳統系絡內，其反思性究竟又獲得怎樣的地位呢？是否這樣的反思性能作為現實主義反思的參考呢？相同理論學派內的不同類型觀點是否其反思性有所差異呢？不同類型觀點是否也就是呈現該理論學派的反思性呢？如何能駕簡馭繁地呈現各主要理論的反思性，而不必要深入探究其內部的差異呢？或是理論反思性決定了相同理論學派的不同類型觀點呢？

凡此種種，都說明了反思現實主義引發了國際關係理論研究更多的未來可能性，即使它仍是在發展之中，並且遭致嚴厲批判，例如 Daniel J. Levine 就嚴格批評反思現實主義學者 Michael C. Williams and Richard Ned Lebow 對於 Morgenthau 著作的閱讀是選擇性地，^⑪但國際關係理論研究的豐富性與多樣性也在反思現實主義的發展過程中展露無遺。

陸、結 論

對於國際關係學者而言，歷經多次的國際關係理論大辯論之後，尤其是在後設理論的爭論之下，國際關係理論的反思性已不再是缺乏了，尤其是在第三次國際關係理論大辯論中，反思性的議題引起各理論自我反思本身的理論化過程，甚至所謂第四次大辯論的理性主義與反思主義的辯論，實際就是理性與反思性的辯論，即是行為者是基於理性或反思性的爭論。誠如 Christian Bueger 所言，無疑地，國際關係學科並不缺反思性，而是似乎在幾場大辯論與許多的轉向之後，國際關係已經到了（反思性）智識過多。其理由是因為許多關注的問題在邏輯上是無法解決的，並且關於反思性的辯論變得有情感了；以及因為此辯論是學術的，無關學者的社會生活或被研究的客體。^⑫簡言之，國際關係理論反思性的研究仍無所定論。

然而，對於國際關係理論研究的國內學者而言，國際關係理論的反思性或反思轉向則是剛開始受到關注，無論國內學者本身是偏好何種理論學派，關切這樣的議題實屬必要。尤其是對於現實主義的反思方面，例如石之瑜曾經以知識脈絡的觀點反思現實主義的主要代表人物，指出他們對於理性、現實與道德的看法並不一致，不能歸為

註⑩ Christine Sylvester, "The Elusive Arts of Reflexivity in the 'Science' of International Relations," *Millennium*, Vol. 41, No. 2 (2013), pp. 309-325.

註⑪ Daniel J. Levine, "Why Hans Morgenthau Was Not A Critical Theorist (and Why Contemporary IR Realists Should Care)," *International Relations*, Vol. 27, No. 1 (2013), pp. 95-118.

註⑫ Christian Bueger, "From Epistemology to Practice: A Sociology of Science for International Relations," <<http://bueger.info/documents/Bueger%202010%20-%20From%20Epistemology%20to%20Practice.pdf>>. 檢索日期：2011年12月9日。

同一脈絡。⑩鄭端耀也是以脈絡的觀點，檢視作為現實主義反思的攻勢現實主義、守勢現實主義與新古典現實主義理論之產生、內容與爭辯，認為這三者調和了新現實主義所遭致的批判，尤其新古典現實主義是現實主義內的中間道路。⑪明居正反思古典現實主義的核心概念（人性、自然狀態、主權、國家、國家利益與權力平衡），提出其理論貢獻與不足之處。⑫包宗和則是反思結構現實主義的論點與辯述，認同其對國際政治理論的貢獻。⑬鄭端耀甚至以搶救權力平衡理論為名，就國際關係現實主義學者的三種搶救途徑（國際體系、權力與制衡策略）進行分析、評估與評論，認為權力平衡理論的轉型與再生是重要的議題，權力平衡理論從既定的單一理論而朝向多元理論轉型，但這將失去其理論的嚴謹性，喪失其理論特色與內涵。⑭雖然國內學者並未認識到反思的現實主義之興起，但也理解到國際關係現實主義學者反思現實主義理論的發展，所不同的是反思的現實主義所強調的政治—倫理面向，以及重新客觀化現實主義學者的理論，這是目前國內尚未重視到的議題，頗值得學者投入研究。

因為反思現實主義重新反思與系絡化現實主義理論，不僅使國際關係學者重新閱讀原典探索原先忽略或誤解的觀點之外，更使學者能理解國際關係理論本身的反思性，進而自我反思所研究的理論之理論化與系絡化，以確實理解研究的理論及自我。國內的國際關係理論研究學者若能關注反思現實主義，或許就更能掌握此學科的發展，以及無論其偏好或被歸類於何種理論，若能自我反思自己理論研究的本身，豈不快哉。

* * *

（收件：2013年5月6日，接受：2013年10月25日）

-
- 註⑩ 石之瑜，「現實主義國際政治學的知識脈絡」，*問題與研究*，第39卷第7期（2000年），頁37~53。
- 註⑪ 鄭端耀，「國際關係攻勢與守勢現實主義理論爭辯之評析」，*問題與研究*，第42卷第2期（2003年），頁1~21；鄭端耀，「國際關係新古典現實主義理論」，*問題與研究*，第44卷第1期（2005年），頁115~140。
- 註⑫ 明居正，「古典現實主義之反思」，收於包宗和主編，*國際關係理論*（台北：五南圖書，2011年），頁27~48。
- 註⑬ 包宗和，「結構現實主義的論點、辯述與反思」，收於包宗和主編，*國際關係理論*，頁49~68。
- 註⑭ 鄭端耀，「搶救權力平衡理論」，收於包宗和主編，*國際關係理論*，頁69~83。

Reflexivity and Reflexive Realism in International Relations Theories

Tahua Mo

Department of Political Science
National Defense University

Abstract

This article explores theoretical reflexivities of international relations theories, including the stronger reflexivity of the critical international relations theory, postmodernism, constructivism, and the weaker reflexivity of realism and liberalism. In particular, the reflection of realism has brought out “reflective realism” which reveals the political-ethical aspects and theorization, as well as contents and characters of realism. This article also explores possible contributions of reflective realism to international relations theories. First, this article analyzes the central elements of theoretical reflexivity, and the reflexivity of alternative international relations theories. Second, the article details the contents of reflective and utopia realism, including those reflected by political-ethical aspects and theorization. Finally, the article discusses future potentials of reflexive realism.

Keywords: Theoretical Reflexivity, Reflexivity, Reflectivism, Reflective Realism, Utopia Realism

參考文獻

- 包宗和，「結構現實主義的論點、辯述與反思」，收於包宗和主編，*國際關係理論*（台北：五南圖書，2011年），頁49~68。
- 石之瑜，「現實主義國際政治學的知識脈絡」，*問題與研究*，第39卷第7期（2000年），頁37~53。
- 明居正，「古典現實主義之反思」，收於包宗和主編，*國際關係理論*（台北：五南圖書，2011年），頁27~48。
- 陳逸淳譯，*所述之言：布赫迪厄反思社會學文集*（台北：麥田出版，20012）。
- 鄭端耀，「國際關係攻勢與守勢現實主義理論爭辯之評析」，*問題與研究*，第42卷第2期（2003年），頁1~21。
- 鄭端耀，「國際關係新古典現實主義理論」，*問題與研究*，第44卷第1期（2005年），頁115~140。
- 鄭端耀，「搶救權力平衡理論」，收於包宗和主編，*國際關係理論*（台北：五南圖書，2011年），頁69~83。
- Ackerly, Brooke and Jacqui True, "Reflexivity in Practice: Power and Ethics in Feminist Research on International Relations," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (2008), pp. 693~707.
- Adler, Emanuel and Peter M. Haas, "Conclusion: Epistemic Communities, World Order, and the Creation of a Reflective Research Program," *International Organization*, Vol. 46, No. 1 (1992), pp. 367~390.
- Adler-Nissen, Rebecca, ed., *Bourdieu in International Relations: Rethinking Key Concepts in IR* (London: Routledge, 2012).
- Ashley, Richard A., "The Poverty of Neo-Realism," *International Organization*, Vol. 38, No. 2 (1984), pp. 225~286.
- Berejikian, Jeffrey and John S. Dryzek, "Reflexive Action in International Politics," *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (2000), pp. 193~216.
- Bigo, Didier and R. B. J. Walker, "Political Sociology and the Problem of the International," *Millennium*, Vol. 35, No. 3 (2007), pp. 725~739.
- Bigo, Didier, "Pierre Bourdieu and International Relation: Power of Practices, Practices of Power," *International Political Sociology*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (2011), pp. 225~258.
- Bleiker, Ronald and Morgan Brigg, "Introduction to the RIS Forum on Autoethnography and International Relations," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (2010), pp. 777~778.
- Booth, Ken, "Security in Anarchy: Utopia Realism in Theory and Practice," *International Affairs*, Vol. 67, No. 3 (1991), pp. 527~545.
- Booth, Ken, *Theory of World Security* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp.

87~91.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Loic Waquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Bourdieu, Pierre, *Science of Science and Reflexivity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

Bourdieu, Pierre, translated by Matthew Adamson, *In Other Words: Essays Toward a Reflexive Sociology* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990).

Brincat, Shannon, "Reclaiming the Utopian Imaginary in IR Theory," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 3 (2009), pp. 581~609.

Brown, Chris, "Structural Realism, Classical Realism and Human Nature," *International Relations*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (2009), pp. 257~270.

Brown, Chris, "The Twilight of International Mortality? Hans J. Morgenthau and Carl Schmitt on the End of the Jus Publicum Europaeum," in Michael C. Williams, eds., *Realism Reconsidered*, pp. 42~61.

Bueger, Christian, "From Epistemology to Practice: A Sociology of Science for International Relations," <<http://bueger.info/documents/Bueger%202010%20-%20From%20Epistemology%20to%20Practice.pdf>>. 檢索日期：2011年12月9日。

Burke, Antony, "Postmodernism," in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 359~377.

Cesa, Marco, "Realist Visions of the End of the Cold War: Morgenthau, Aron, and Waltz," *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, Vol. 11, No. 2 (2009), pp. 177~191.

Cox, Michael, ed., *E. H. Carr: A Critical Appraisal* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000).

Cox, Wayne S. and Claire Turenne Sjolander, "Critical Reflections on International Relations," in Claire Turenne Sjolander and Wayne S. Cox, eds., *Beyond Positivism: Critical Reflections on International Relations* (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1994), pp. 1~10.

Der Derian, James and Michael J. Shapiro, eds., *International/Intertextual Relations: Postmodern Readings of World Politics* (New York: Lexington, 1989).

Deudney, Daniel and G. John Ikenberry, "The Nature and Sources of Liberal World Order," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 2 (1999), pp. 179~196.

Drulak, Petr, "Reflexivity and Structural Change," in Stefano Guzzini and Anna Leander, eds., *Constructivism and International Relations: Alexander Wendt and His Critics* (New York: Routledge, 2006), pp. 140~159.

Dunne, Timothy, *Inventing International Society: A History of the English School* (New York: Macmillan, 1998), pp. 23~46.

- Dunne, Timothy, "Theories as Weapons: E. H. Carr and International Relations," in Michael Cox, *E. H. Carr: A Critical Appraisal*, pp. 217~233.
- Eagleton-Pierce, Matthew, "Advancing a Reflexive International Relations," *Millennium*, Vol. 39, No. 3 (2011), pp. 805~823.
- Edkins, Jenny and Nick Vaughan-Williams, eds., *Critical Theorists and International Relations* (London: Routledge, 2009).
- Feaver, Peter D. et al., "Correspondence: Brother Can You Spare a Paradigm (Or, Was Anybody Ever a Realist?)," *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (2000), pp. 165~193.
- Foley, Michael, "Bring to Realism to American Liberalism: Kenneth Waltz and the Process of a Cold War Adjustment," *International Relations*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (2009), pp. 313~327.
- Frei, Christoph, *Hans J. Morgenthau: An Intellectual Biography* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2001).
- Freyberg-Inan, Annette, Ewan Harrison, and Patrick James, eds., *Rethinking Realism in International Relations: Between Tradition and Innovation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009).
- George, Jim, "Australia's Global Perspectives in the 1990s: A Case of Old Realist Wine in New (Neoliberal) Bottles," in R. Lever and D. Cox, eds., *Middling, Meddling, Muddling: Issues in Australia Foreign Policy* (St. Leonards: Allen & Unwin, 1997), pp. 12~43.
- Germain, Randall, "Carr and the Historical Mode of thought," in Michael Cox, *E. H. Carr: A Critical Appraisal*, pp. 123~136.
- Glaser, Charles L., "Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help," *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (Winter 1994-1995), pp. 50~90.
- Guzzini, Stefano, "A Reconstruction of Constructivism in International Relations," *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (2000), pp. 147~182.
- Guzzini, Stefano, "The Enduring Dilemmas of Realism in International Relations," *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (2004), pp. 533~568.
- Guzzini, Stefano, "The Concept of Power: A Constructivist Analysis," *Millennium*, Vol. 33, No. 3 (2005), pp. 495~521.
- Hall, Ian, "The Triumph of Anti-Liberalism? Reconciling Radicalism to Realism in International Relations Theory," *Political Studies Review*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (2011), pp. 42~52.
- Hamati-Ataya, Inanna, "Knowing and Judging in International Theory: Realism and the Reflexive Challenge," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 4 (2010), pp. 1079~1101.
- Hamati-Ataya, Inanna, "Reflexivity in International Relations Theory: Prospects for an Interdisciplinary Research Programme," Paper presented at International Studies

- Association Annual Convention, Montreal Canada, March 16-19, 2011.
- Hamati-Ataya, Inanna, "The 'Problem of Values' and International Relations Scholarship: From Applied Reflexivity to Reflexivism," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (2011), pp. 259~287.
- Hamati-Ataya, Inanna, "IR Theory as International Practice/Agency: A Clinical-Cynical Bourdieusian Perspective," *Millennium*, Vol. 40, No. 3 (2012), pp. 625~646.
- Hamati-Ataya, Inanna, "Reflectivity, Reflexivity, Reflexivism: IR's 'Reflexive Turn'-and Beyond," *European Journal of International Relations*, Online First, May 30, 2012, pp. 1~26.
- Hobson, John M., "Is Critical Theory Always for the White West and for Western Imperialism? Beyond Westphalian Toward a Post-Racist Critical IR," in Nicholas Rengger and Ben Thirkell-White, eds., *Critical International Relations Theory After 25 Years* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 91~116.
- Hoffman, Mark, "Critical Theory and the Inter-Paradigm Debate," *Millennium*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (1987), pp. 231~249.
- Hom, Andrew R. and Brent J. Steele, "Open Horizons: The Temporal Visions of Reflexive Realism," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (2010), pp. 271~300.
- Hopf, Ted, "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory," *International Security*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (1998), pp. 171~200.
- Howe, Paul, "The Utopian Realism of E. H. Carr," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (1994), pp. 277~297.
- Hynek, Nik and Andrea Teti, "Saving Identity from Postmodernism? The Normalization of Constructivism in International Relations," *Contemporary Political Theory*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (2010), pp. 171~199.
- Ikenberry, G. John, "Political and Legal: The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 85, No. 1 (2006), p. 145.
- Ikenberry, G. John, "Liberal Institutionalism 3.0: America and the Dilemma of Liberal World Order," *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (2009), pp. 71~87.
- Ikenberry, G. John, "The Liberal International Order and Its Discontents," *Millennium*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (2010), pp. 509~521.
- Inayatullah, Naeem, ed., *Autobiographical International Relations: I, IR* (London: Routledge, 2010).
- Ish-Shalom, Piki, "Theorization, Harm, and the Democratic Imperative: Lessons from the Politicization of the Democratic-Peace Thesis," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (2008), pp. 680~692.
- Jackson, Peter, "Pierre Bourdieu, the 'Culture Turn' and the Practice of International History," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 34, No. 1 (2008), pp. 155~181.

- Jackson, Robert, *Classical and Modern Thought on International Relations* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).
- Jahn, Beate, ed., *Classical Theory in International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
- Jarvis, D. S. L., *International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism: Defending the Discipline* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2000).
- Jones, Charles A., *E. H. Carr and International Relations: A Duty to Lie* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- Jones, Charles, "Carr, Mannheim, and a Post-positivist Science of International Relations," *Political Studies*, Vol. 45, No. 2 (1997), pp. 232~246.
- Kenealy, Daniel and Konstantinos Kostagiannis, "Realist Visions of European Union: E. H. Carr and Integration," *Millennium*, Vol. 41, No. 2 (2013), pp. 221~246.
- Keohane, Robert O., "International Institutions: Two Approaches," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 4 (1988), pp. 379~396.
- Koivisto, Marjo and Tim Dunne, "Crisis, What Crisis? Liberal Order Building and World Order Convention," *Millennium*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (2010), pp. 615~640.
- Kratochwil, Friedrich, "Looking Back from Somewhere: Reflections on What Remains 'Critical' in Critical Theory," in Nicholas Rengger and Ben Thirkell-White, eds., *Critical International Relations Theory After 25 Years* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 25~45..
- Lang, Anthony D., *Agency and Ethics: The Politics of Military Intervention* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2002).
- Lang, Anthony F. Jr., "Morgenthau, Agency and Aristotle," in Michael C. Williams, eds., *Realism Reconsidered*, pp. 18~41.
- Lapid, Yosef, "The Third Debate: On the Prospects of International Theory in a Post-Positive Era," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 3 (1989), pp. 235~254.
- Lebow, Richard N., *Tragic Vision of Politics: Ethics, Interests and Orders* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 216~256.
- Lergo, Jeffery W. and Andrew Moravcsik, "Is Anybody Still a Realist?," *International Security*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (1999), pp. 5~55.
- Levine, Daniel J. "Why Hans Morgenthau Was Not A Critical Theorist (and Why Contemporary IR Realists Should Care)," *International Relations*, Vol. 27, No. 1 (2013), pp. 95~118.
- Linklater, Andrew, "Nationalism and the Future of Sovereign Nations," in Michael Cox, ed., *E. H. Carr: A Critical Appraisal*, p. 239.
- Linklater, Andrew, "The Transformation of the Political Community: E. H. Carr, Critical Theory, and International Relations," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 3

- (1997), pp. 321~338.
- Lipschutz, Ronnie D., "What Comes after Liberalism? More Liberalism!," *Millennium*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (2010), pp. 545~551.
- Lobell, Steven E. et al., eds., *Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- Long, Anthony F., *Agency and Ethics: The Politics of Military Intervention* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2002).
- Lynch, Cecelia, "Reflexivity in Research on Civil Society: Constructivist Perspectives," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (2008), pp. 708~721.
- Lynn-Jones, Sean M., "Offense-Defense Theory and Its Critics," *Security Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (1995), pp. 660~691.
- Mearsheimer, John J., *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2001).
- Molloy, Sean, "Dialectics and Transformations: Exploring the International Theory of E. H. Carr," *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (2003), pp. 279~306.
- Molloy, Sean, "Hans Morgenthau vs. E. H. Carr: Conflicting Conceptions of Ethical Realism," in Duncan Bell, ed., *Political Thought and International Relations: Variations on a Realist Theme* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 83~104.
- Molly, Sean, *The Hidden History of Realism: A Genealogy of Power Politics* (New York: Palgrave, 2006).
- Murphy, Craig N., "The Promise of Critical IR, Partially Kept," in Nicholas Rengger and Ben Thirkell-White, eds., *Critical International Relations Theory After 25 Years* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 117~133.
- Murray, Alastair J. H., *Reconstructing Realism: Between Power Politics and Cosmopolitan Ethics* (Keele: Keele University Press, 1997).
- Neacsu, Mihaela, *Hans J. Morgenthau's Theory of International Relations: Disenchantment and Re-enchantment* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).
- Neufeld, Mark, "The Reflexive Turn and International Relations Theory," CISS Working Paper, No. 4 (1991), York University.
- Neufeld, Mark, "The Reflexivity and International Relations Theory," *Millennium*, Vol. 22, No. 1 (1993), pp. 53~76.
- Neufeld, Mark, "Reflexivity and International Relations Theory," in Claire Turenne Sjolander and Wayne S. Cox, eds., *Beyond Positivism: Critical Reflections on International Relations* (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1994), pp. 11~35.
- Neufeld, Mark, *The Restructuring of International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

- Neumann, Iver B. and Daniel H. Nexon, "Introduction," in Daniel H. Nexon and Iver B. Neumann, eds., *Harry Potter and International Relations* (Lanham, Md: Rowman and Littlefield, 2006), p. 1~23.
- Nicholson, Michael, "Realism and Utopianism Revisited," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 5 (1998), pp. 65~82.
- Petersen, Ulrik Enemark, "Breathing Nietzsche's Air: New Reflections on Morgenthau's Concepts of Power and Human Nature," *Alternatives*, Vol. 24, No. 1 (1999), pp. 83~118.
- Pichler, Hans-Karl, "The Godfathers of 'Truth': Max Weber and Carl Schmitt in Morgenthau's Theory of Power Politics," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (1998), pp. 185~200.
- Price, Richard and Christian Reus-Smit, "Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism," *European Jour of International Relations*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (1998), pp. 259~294.
- Prokhovnik, Raia and Gabriella Slomp, eds., *International Political Theory after Hobbes: Analysis, Interpretation and Orientation* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).
- Rathbun, Brian C., "Is Anybody Not an (International Relations) Liberal?" *Security Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (2010), pp. 2~25.
- Rengger, Nicholas, and Ben Thirkell-White, "Still Critical after All These Years? The Past, Present and Future of Critical Theory in International Relations," in Nicholas Rengger and Ben Thirkell-White, eds., *Critical International Relations Theory After 25 Years* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 3~24.
- Scheuerman, William E., "A Theoretical Missed Opportunity? Hans J. Morgenthau as Critical Realist," in Duncan S. A. Bell, ed., *Political Thought and International Relations: Variations on a Realist Theme* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 41~62.
- Scheuerman, William E., "Carl Schmitt and Hans Morgenthau: Realism and Beyond," in Michael C. Williams, eds., *Realism Reconsidered*, pp. 62~92.
- Scheuerman, William E., *Morgenthau* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- Shani, Georgio, "Toward a Western IR: The Umma, Khalsa Panth and Critical International Relations Theory," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (2008), pp. 722~734.
- Shinko, Rosemary E., "Agonistic Peace: A Postmodern Reading," *Millennium*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (2008), pp. 473~491.
- Shinko, Rosemary E., "Ethics after Liberalism: Why (Autonomous) Bodies Matter," *Millennium*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (2010), pp. 723~745.
- Solomon, Ty, "Human Nature and the Limits of the Self: Hans Morgenthau on Love and Power," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 14, No. 2 (2012), pp. 201~224.

- Steele, Brent J., "Eavesdropping on Honored Ghosts': From Classical to Reflexive Realism," *Journal of International Relations and Development*, Vol. 10, No. 3 (2007), pp. 272~300.
- Sterling-Folker, Jennifer and Rosemary E. Shinko, "Discourses of Power: Traversing the Realist-Postmodern Divide," *Millennium*, Vol. 33, No. 1 (2005), pp. 637~664.
- Sylvester, Christine, "The Elusive Arts of Reflexivity in the 'Science' of International Relations," *Millennium*, Vol. 41, No. 2 (2013), pp. 309~325.
- Thies, Cameron G., "Progress, History and Identity in International Relations Theory: The Case of Idealist-Realist Debate," *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (2002), pp. 147~185.
- Thies, Cameron G., "State Socialization and Structural Realism," *Security Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 4 (2010), pp. 689~717.
- Ticker, J. Ann and Andrei P. Tsygankov, "Responsible Scholarship in International Relations: A Symposium," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (2008), pp. 661~666.
- Tjalve, Vibeke Schou, *Realist Strategies of Republican Peace: Niebuhr, Morgenthau, and the Politics of Patriotic Dissent* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008).
- Weaver, Ole, "Waltz's Theory of Theory," *International Relations*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (2009), pp. 201~222.
- Weber, Cynthia, "After Liberalism," *Millennium*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (2010), pp. 553~560.
- Wendt, Alexander, *The Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Williams, Michael C., "Waltz, Realism and Democracy," *International Relations*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (2009), pp. 328~340.
- Williams, Michael C., "Why Ideas Matter in International Relations: Hans Morgenthau, Classical Realism, and the Moral Construction of Power Politics," *International Organization*, Vol. 58, No. 4 (2004), pp. 633~666.
- Williams, Michael C., eds., *Realism Reconsidered: The Legacy of Hans J. Morgenthau in International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
- Williams, Michael C., *The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 128~168.
- Wilson, Peter, "Radicalism for a Conservative Purpose: the Peculiar Realism of E. H. Carr," *Millennium*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (2001), pp. 123~136.