

Contents

1 Sociological Theory and Law	1
2 Institution and Reflection—the Weakness of Sociology of Law and the Semantics of Interdisciplinarity	21
2.1 The Institutional Weakness of the Sociology of Law in Germany	23
2.1.1 Professorships	24
2.1.2 Academic Teaching	28
2.1.3 Research Institutes and Funding Programs	29
2.1.4 Scientific Self-organization	33
2.1.5 Policy Advice	34
2.1.6 Journal for Sociology of Law (Zeitschrift Für Rechtssoziologie)	35
2.2 Polyphonic Discourses: “Interdisciplinarity” as Semantics of Reflexive Theory	37
2.2.1 The Perspective of Sociology of Science	38
2.2.2 Discourse Theoretical Perspective	42
2.3 Discourses of Interdisciplinarity	46
2.4 Reflection Theoretical Models	51
2.4.1 Communication Breakdown	52
2.4.2 Temporalization	53
2.4.3 Level Change	53
2.4.4 Indifference	54
2.4.5 Factual Hierarchy	55

2.4.6	Responsiveness	56
2.5	Conclusions: The Research Program of an Empirical Analysis of Reflection-Theoretical Discourse Configurations ...	57
3	The Founding Myth of Interdisciplinarity and the Asymmetry of Reflective Theory	61
3.1	The Concept of Society in Private Law Science—Interdisciplinarity in the Reflection of Law	64
3.1.1	Representation	66
3.1.2	Social Purpose	67
3.1.3	Autonomy of the Normative	70
3.1.4	Interdisciplinary Models: Indifference and Objective Hierarchy	71
3.1.5	Interim Result: Normative and Empirical Science	81
3.2	Autonomy and Relevance: Sociology of Law and the Unsolved Problems of Interdisciplinarity in Early Sociology	82
3.2.1	Autonomy of Sociology and Substantive Hierarchy—Marx, Durkheim, Tönnies	83
3.2.2	Double Autonomy and Responsiveness as a Challenge—First Traces in Weber and Geiger	89
3.3	Early Sociology of Law as an Essentially Contested Concept ...	101
4	Responsive Interdisciplinarity—new Beginnings and Unrealized Opportunities	105
4.1	Responsiveness as a Program: The “Transcendental Theory” of Sociology and the Sociology of Law in Helmut Schelsky	109
4.2	Responsiveness or Reception: The Ambivalence of the Theory of Reflection in Niklas Luhmann	117
4.2.1	A Sociological Theory Motivated by Law	119
4.2.2	“Sociology with More Law”? Hidden Reflection-Theoretical Approaches Around 1970	123
4.2.3	Reflection-Theoretical Practice Discourse as a Blank Space	138
4.2.4	Consolidation of the Autonomy Perspective in the Model of Reception	149
4.2.5	“... Not the Last Word Spoken”—Open End and Programmatic Ambivalence	151

4.2.6	Object-Theoretical Conclusion: “Law as a Social System”	153
4.2.7	Seven Clues for Responsiveness	156
4.3	Conclusion: Sociological Theory Takes Law Seriously—And Withdraws	164
5	Asymmetric Reflection Theories: Sociology’s Farewell to Law	167
5.1	Trilemma of Reflective Theory—The Silence of Systems Theory	171
5.1.1	Discourse of Legal Autonomy—Legal Fact Research and Enlightening Auxiliary Science	175
5.1.2	Discourse of Social Policy—Committed Social-Engineering Sociology of Law	180
5.1.3	Discourse of Sociological Autonomy	191
5.1.4	Reflection-Theoretical Blockade—Ways Out of the Trilemma?	195
5.2	Sociology and Law: The Disinterest of Other Sociological Theories	199
5.2.1	Normative Integration of Society—Talcott Parsons	199
5.2.2	Conditio Humana—Social Anthropology and Microsociology	202
5.2.3	Disciplinary Power Dispositifs—Michel Foucault	203
5.2.4	The “Juridical Field” as a Battlefield—Pierre Bourdieu	207
5.2.5	Law and Critique—Jürgen Habermas	212
5.2.6	Interim Conclusion—The Gap in Reflective Theory	220
5.3	Failure of the Sociology of Law—Reflection-Theoretical Interpretations	221
5.3.1	Reflective Theoretical Prelude—Individual Voices	222
5.3.2	Application Research	225
5.3.3	Interdisciplinarity—Unfinished Debates on Reflective Theory	228
5.4	After the Turning Point: Responsiveness as a Task	235
6	Potentials of a Responsive Sociology of Law	239
6.1	Global Discourses and New Perspectives	240
6.1.1	Sociology of Law as Engaged Science—Reform Policy Qua Social Engineering	242
6.1.2	“New Pragmatism”	244

6.1.3	Sociology of Law as Theory and Critique—New Approaches	248
6.2	New Sociological Jurisprudence: Traces of Responsive Reflection Theory	259
6.2.1	Responsive Legal Dogmatics	260
6.2.2	Reflexive Law and Societal Steering	268
6.2.3	Crisis Dynamics and Critique	275
6.3	Symmetrical Interdisciplinarity	283
6.3.1	Structures of a Responsive Theory of Reflection	283
6.3.2	Letting the Environment Have a Say—The Need for Professionalization of (Legal) Sociology	286
6.3.3	From Reflective Theory to Object Theory	295
References		303