

Bevölkerung sowohl in den Niedriglohnländern als auch die von Lohnarbeit abhängigen Klassen und Schichten in den Metropolen. Zum Schutz dieser Menschen vor den negativen Folgen der kapitalistischen Globalisierung sei deshalb der Aufbau bzw. die weitere Ausgestaltung von Sozialsystemen notwendig.

Im letzten Drittel seiner Broschüre befasst sich Loheide mit der Opposition gegen die Globalisierung. Im 19. Jahrhundert hätte sie zur Hervorhebung der Interessen des eigenen Landes gegenüber anderen Staaten, zu Protektionismus (ab 1880) und schließlich zu zwei Weltkriegen geführt, in denen nationale Wirtschafts- sowie politische Interessen mit militärischer Gewalt durchgesetzt wurden. Eine derartige Entwicklung sei zwar bei List, der von „Erziehungszölen“ sprach, die eine Volkswirtschaft nur so lange vor der Weltwirtschaft schützen sollten, bis das Land das Niveau der technisch und ökonomisch fortgeschrittenen Staaten erreicht habe, nicht angelegt gewesen, aber die Rechte habe sich auf ihn berufen. Auch in der Gegenwart gäbe es parallel zur verstärkten Globalisierung eine Zunahme nationalistischer Strömungen, die vorgeben, Schäden infolge weltwirtschaftlicher Turbulenzen könnten nur durch Rückbesinnung auf die Interessen der eigenen Nation und deren rücksichtslose Durchsetzung begegnet werden. Vor dieser Art der Globalisierungskritik, die schon einmal rechte Regierungen an die Macht gebracht habe, warnt Loheide nachdrücklich. Als Gegenmaßnahme empfiehlt er leistungsfähige Sozialsysteme zu entwickeln bzw. zu erhalten. „So würden sich die Spannungen zwischen den Völkern, Nationen und Regionen automatisch reduzieren und das zumindest im Vergleich

mit der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts friedliche Zusammenwachsen der Welt könnte weitergehen“ (S. 93).

Die Publikation gibt einen klar gegliederten, gut lesbaren Überblick über die Globalisierungsprozesse in den vergangenen anderthalb Jahrhunderten, der mit den Erkenntnissen der wirtschaftshistorischen Forschung übereinstimmt. In Zusammenhang mit der relativ ausführlichen Behandlung der Frage durch Loheide, ob es von der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis heute einen, durch die Weltkriege nur unterbrochenen oder zwei, sich in ihrer Qualität unterscheidende Globalisierungsprozesse gegeben habe, unterschätzt Loheide m. E. jedoch die 1929 einsetzende Weltwirtschaftskrise, die, wie auch aus Tabelle I (S. 63) ersichtlich, wesentlich zur damaligen De-Globalisierung beitrug. Das ist insofern auch für die Gegenwart von Bedeutung, als die Möglichkeit einer weiteren tiefen Weltwirtschaftskrise besteht, die eine erneute Flucht in die Nationalwirtschaften begünstigen und den Rechten zusätzlichen Auftrieb geben könnte. Zumindest hätte Loheide auf diese Möglichkeit hinweisen sollen.

Darren J. O'Byrne / Alexander Hensby: *Theorizing Global Studies*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011, 237 S.

Rezensiert von
Tayyibe Zeynep Armagan, Wien

The frequency with which the word “globalization” is present in today’s discourse

does not indicate a universal agreement on what, precisely, the term means. Rather, individuals of varying disciplines and academic backgrounds employ the “buzz” word as an empty rhetorical tactic, glossing over its ambiguity in the hope that its mere application will lend credence to their argument. It is such usage of the term, as well as its inadequacy to explain the many complex dynamics associated with it, that Darren J. O’Byrne and Alexander Hensby are concerned with in their new volume titled *Theorizing Global Studies*. As O’Byrne and Hensby would agree, for several reasons, the term has exhausted its utility. First, as the authors also point out, the task of defining globalization and clarifying the subject matter of global studies, a fairly new interdisciplinary field, still remains. Furthermore, the field seems to lack a systematic theory of its own. In the light of such deficiencies, a lot of responsibility is left to academics. In fact, O’Byrne and Hensby’s book can be considered as an attempt to address these deficiencies and further develop the field of global studies. Here, it is important to mention that the authors have been careful enough to move away from what they refer to as “the unhelpful and almost labyrinthine study of globalization” (p. 3) to that of global studies. While this field is broad and its borders are often difficult to determine, O’Byrne and Hensby have selected eight models: globalization, liberalization, polarization, Americanization, McDonaldization, creolization, transnationalization and balkanization which they discuss in the following eight chapters of the volume. These models are theories of global change that are referred to within the field of global studies. The authors acknowledge that

similarities as well as differences can be spotted among them. However, they nevertheless do a good job in differentiating the theories from each other and legitimizing their choices for this specific list of theories over other possible ones.

The narration of these models helps resolve the aforementioned problem of defining globalization and determining the contents of global studies. Not only do O’Byrne and Hensby provide a simple definition of globalization in their introduction, they also have a chapter expanding on this definition. In this chapter, the readers are introduced to the idea of globalization “as a process of becoming global” (p. 10). They are also introduced with the problematic of measuring “globality” and important terms of global studies such as “interconnectedness.” Nonetheless, it is essential to understand that O’Byrne and Hensby’s concept of globalization can only be understood in relation to the other theories. The same goes for other concepts such as Americanization and McDonaldization. Although these two concepts may seem to refer to the same phenomenon, the authors show the distinct logic behind these two models. Furthermore, as if to preemptively undermine criticism that may come on that ground, the authors clearly state that these eight models are ideal-types which may not be always consistent with real life situations. This seems plausible as the book is a theoretical one.

Secondly, the narration of these models paves the way for the second problem, that of theorization. However, readers should not expect a conclusive, standardized theory of globalization. In fact, attention must be paid to the present progressive tense in the title (i.e. theorizing) as it indicates that

the production of global studies theory is a continual process. In other words, the book is not for those who are seeking a fixed, clear-cut answer. This is made clear by the authors as well: “[...] but the task of theorizing global studies is far from complete” (p. 208). Rather, in its effort to help define the contents of the field, the book can be seen as one of the first steps in this long and difficult task. On a slightly different note, the book’s importance for the field of global studies must be emphasized. By distinguishing global studies from international relations, sociology, anthropology and history and by making global studies its subject matter; the authors have also indirectly put forth a defense for global studies to exist on its own right. This is significant for the newly emerging field which is contested from time to time by defenders of classical disciplinary borders. Up to this point, this review has focused on contextual issues, but indeed the structure and style warrant mention as well. Firstly, the well-knit structure of the book is exceptional; references to previous and forthcoming chapters are made throughout the text and thus a textual integrity is maintained at all times. Secondly, in addition to the general introduction and conclusion, each chapter consists of its own introduction and conclusion. This enhances the coherency of the text. The charts and biography boxes used throughout the book also serve a similar purpose in addition to further acquainting the reader with the field. What is apparent in the authors’ style is the frequent use of exemplification whether in the form of metaphors or actual events. These help readers to get a grip on the theories and easily remember them. What might draw the reader’s atten-

tion even more in the style is the sense of objectivity apparent through the authors’ presentation of both sides of the issue in almost all cases. Indeed, O’Byrne and Hensby have been careful to address the potential questions and criticisms on each model.

Before concluding, a remark must be made on the conclusion of the authors, where they claim to “pull some themes together” (p. 9). Firstly, one would expect to see some broader explanation on the issue of theorizing global studies. Acknowledging the fact that coming up with a theory of global studies is a difficult task, it is hard to see why the authors refrained from giving suggestions on what can be done in this regard. Where else, if not in the conclusion, could such suggestions be made? Secondly, the authors have selected three questions to address each model with. Although the first two of these make sense in relation to the rest of the book, the last on human rights remains unexplored and weak. After all, little has been said about human rights throughout the book and this last endeavor seems irrelevant. Perhaps this could be strengthened in further editions.

As a whole the book makes a great source for both undergraduate and graduate students of social sciences, and in particular international relations, political science, sociology and, of course global studies. Indeed, beginners or anyone interested in the field are sure to benefit from this encyclopedic source.