

International Political Sociology

Transversal lines

Edited by

**Tugba Basaran, Didier Bigo,
Emmanuel-Pierre Guittet and
R. B. J. Walker**



Routledge Studies in International Political Sociology

INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY

Transversal lines

*Edited by Tugba Basaran, Didier Bigo,
Emmanuel-Pierre Guittet and R. B. J. Walker*

First published 2017
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2017 selection and editorial material, Tugba Basaran, Didier Bigo, Emmanuel-Pierre Guittet & R. B. J. Walker; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Tugba Basaran, Didier Bigo, Emmanuel-Pierre Guittet & R. B. J. Walker to be identified as authors of the editorial material, and of the individual authors as authors of their contributions, has been asserted by them in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Names: Basaran, Tugba, editor of compilation.

Title: International political sociology : transversal lines / edited by Tugba Basaran, Didier Bigo, Emmanuel-Pierre Guittet & R.B.J. Walker.

Other titles: International political sociology (Routledge : 2017)

Description: Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY : Routledge, 2017. | Series:

Routledge studies in international political sociology | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016019186 | ISBN 9781138910706 (hardback) | ISBN 9781138910713 (pbk.) | ISBN 9781315693293 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: International relations--Social aspects. | Political sociology.

Classification: LCC JZ1251 .I579 2017 | DDC 306.2--dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2016019186>

ISBN: 978-1-138-91070-6 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-138-91071-3 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-69329-3 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by Taylor & Francis Books

CONTRIBUTORS

John Agnew is Distinguished Professor of Geography at UCLA (USA). He is the author, co-author and co-editor of, among other titles, *Hegemony: The New Shape of Global Power* (Temple University Press, 2005), *Berlusconi's Italy: Mapping Contemporary Italian Politics* (Temple University Press, 2008), *Globalization and Sovereignty* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2009) and the *Sage Handbook of Geographical Knowledge* (2011). He is the editor-in-chief of *Territory, Politics, Governance*.

Mathias Albert is Professor of Political Science at Bielefeld University, where he is also one of the Directors of the Institute for World Society Studies. He has published numerous articles and books, many of them at the interstices of international relations and sociology. His latest books include: *Bringing Sociology to International Relations. World Politics as Differentiation Theory* (co-editor with Barry Buzan and Michael Zürn, Cambridge University Press, 2013), and *A Theory of World Politics* (Cambridge University Press, 2016). Mathias is also active in youth research, his latest book on this subject being *Jugend 2015. 17. Shell Jugendstudie* (with Klaus Hurrelmann, Gudrun Quenzel and TNS Infratest Sozialforschung, Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer).

Claudia Aradau is Reader in International Politics in the Department of War Studies, King's College London. Her research has developed a critical political analysis of security practices. Among her publications are *Politics of Catastrophe: Genealogies of the Unknown* (with Rens van Munster, Routledge, 2011) and *Critical Security Methods: New Frameworks for Analysis* (co-edited with Jef Huysmans, Andrew Neal and Nadine Voelkner, Routledge, 2015). Her current work pursues a critical exploration of security assemblages and the politics of (non)knowledge, with particular emphasis on anticipatory practices and digital devices.

Tugba Basaran received a PhD in International Studies from the University of Cambridge, and subsequently held the position of Assistant Professor in Politics and International Relations at the University of Kent. Basaran is author of *Security, Law and Borders: At the Limits of Liberties* (Routledge, 2011). She is an associate researcher at the Centre d'Etudes sur les Conflits, Liberté et Sécurité, on the editorial board of *Cultures & Conflits* and is currently a visiting scholar at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton (USA). See <https://www.tugbabasaran.wordpress.com>.

Didier Bigo is Professor of International Relations at King's College London Department of War Studies and Research Professor of International Relations at Sciences Po (Paris). He is also director of the Centre d'Etudes sur les Conflits, Liberté et Sécurité and editor of *Cultures & Conflits* as well as founder and previous co-editor with Rob Walker of the ISA journal *International Political Sociology*. His works focus on political anthropology and sociology of transnational forms of power. He has written extensively about critical approaches to security in Europe, the relation between internal and external security, the sociology of conflicts, terrorism, antiterrorism, and practices of surveillance. Personal website: www.didierbigo.com

Philippe Bonditti is an Associate Professor of International Relations at the European School of Politics (Catholic University in Lille, France), and a research associate at the Institute of International Relations, Pontificia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (Brazil) and LabTop/Paris 8 (France). His research explores the contemporary mutations of political modernity based on a Foucauldian-inspired archaeology-genealogy of 'terrorism' and 'antiterrorism'. His most recent publications appeared in the journals *Etudes internationales* and *Critique internationale* as well as in several edited volumes.

Stephan Davidshofer is a lecturer at the Université de Genève in the Department of Political Science and International Relations. He previously worked as a senior researcher at the Peace Research Institute in Oslo (Norway) and was a teaching fellow at Sciences Po (Paris). He researches the transformation of security practices in Europe, with a focus on foreign policy, security and development as well as internal security. He serves on the editorial board of the journal *Cultures & Conflits* and is a founding member of the c.a.s.e. collective. His current project 'Bound to Cooperate? Mapping Swiss Security in a Changing Global Landscape' (Swiss National Science Foundation, in collaboration with ETH Zurich) examines the relations between Swiss security actors and their European and international counterparts.

Mitchell Dean is Professor of Public Governance at Copenhagen Business School. He has held Chairs of Sociology at the University of Newcastle and Macquarie University. His books include *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society* (Sage, 2010, second edition), and *State Phobia and Civil Society: The Political Legacy of*

Michel Foucault (with Kaspar Villadsen, Stanford University Press, 2016). He also edited, with Barry Hindess, *Governing Australia* (Cambridge University Press, 1998), the first national work of governmentality studies. The present paper expands upon his *The Signature of Power* (Sage, 2013). He works between political and historical sociology and contemporary political and social theory.

Elsbeth Guild is a Jean Monnet Professor ad personam in law at the Radboud University, Nijmegen (Netherlands) and at Queen Mary University of London. She is also a senior research fellow at the Brussels-based think tank, the Centre for European Policy Studies. She is an internationally acknowledged expert in European free movement of persons, immigration and asylum law. She practiced law in the UK for more than ten years before moving into academic life. She retains her affiliation as a partner at the London law firm Kingsley Napley. Her monograph, *Security and Migration in the 21st Century* (Polity Press, 2009), brings together much of her work over the past ten years – examining from a socio-legal perspective the changing dynamic of migration and security. Elspeth has published widely in her field and is respected for her contribution to the academic and policy debates across the world. In 2008 Elspeth was awarded a Doctorate honoris causa by Lund University (Sweden) in recognition of her academic and policy activities in the field of European immigration and asylum law.

Emmanuel-Pierre Guittet is lecturer in Political Violence, Terrorism and Security Studies at the University of Manchester and holds the 2015–16 International Chair in Criminology at the Université Libre de Bruxelles (Belgium). He is associate researcher at the International Centre for Comparative Criminology and at the Canada Research Chair in Security, Identity and Technology (University of Montreal). He is also a member of the Centre d'Etudes sur les Conflits, Liberté et Sécurité and of the Critical Approach to Security in Europe network (c.a.s.e. collective). He is co-editor of the Manchester University Press book series *New Approaches to Conflict and Security Analysis* and of the *International Political Sociology* Routledge book series.

Christine Helliwell is Reader in Anthropology at the Australian National University in Canberra. She has published widely in the area of social/cultural and feminist theory; much of her work is concerned with the inappropriateness of Western analytic categories for the study of non-Western peoples. She has carried out extensive ethnographic research in Indonesian Borneo; her ethnography of Gerai, '*Never Stand Alone*': *A Study of Borneo Sociality*, appeared in 2001. Apart from her work (some with Barry Hindess) on Western discourses of otherness, she is currently researching Dayak representations of World War II, focusing particularly on representations of Allied and Japanese soldiers.

Barry Hindess is Emeritus Professor of Politics at the Australian National University in Canberra. After working as a sociologist in Britain for the greater part of

his academic career, he switched disciplines shortly after moving to Australia in 1987. He has edited (with Mitchell Dean) *Governing Australia: Studies in Contemporary Rationalities of Government* (Cambridge University Press, 1999), and authored *Pre-capitalist Modes of Production* (with Paul Hirst, Routledge, 1975), *Discourses of Power* (Blackwell, 1996) and (often with Christine Helliwell) papers on liberalism, imperialism and Western perceptions of non-Western peoples.

Jef Huysmans is Professor of International Politics in the School of Politics and International Relations at Queen Mary University of London. He is also co-editor-in-chief of the ISA journal *International Political Sociology*. He is best known for his work on the politics of insecurity, the securitization of migration, and critical methods. Currently he is working on security and democracy in times of surveillance, the political life of methods, and the political significance of everyday practices. He has published widely in leading journals in international studies, politics, and European studies. He is author of *Security Unbound: Enacting Democratic Limits* (Routledge, 2014), *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration and Asylum in the EU* (Routledge 2006) and *What is Politics?* (Edinburgh University Press, 2005). He edited with Andrew Dobson and Raia Prokhovnik *The Politics of Protection: Sites of Insecurity and Political Agency* (Routledge, 2006); with Patricia Noxolo *Community, Citizenship, and the 'War on Terror': Security and Insecurity* (Palgrave, 2009), with Xavier Guillaume *Citizenship and Security: The Constitution of Political Being* (Routledge, 2013), and with Claudia Aradau, Andrew Neal and Nadine Voelkner *Critical Security Methods: New Frameworks for Analysis* (Routledge, 2014).

Engin Isin is Professor of Politics at The Open University. He is a chief editor of *Citizenship Studies* and author of *Cities Without Citizens* (Black Rose Books, 1992), *Being Political* (University of Minnesota Press, 2002), *Citizens Without Frontiers* (Bloomsbury, 2012) and (with Evelyn Ruppert) *Being Digital Citizens* (Rowman & Littlefield International, 2015).

Julien Jeandesboz is lecturer in International Relations and European Studies at the Université Libre de Bruxelles (Belgium). He previously worked as assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Amsterdam, was a research associate at the Department of War Studies, King's College London and a teaching fellow at Sciences Po (Paris). He serves on the editorial board of the journals *Cultures & Conflits* and *New Perspectives*. His research examines EU security politics, with a focus on border control, surveillance and technology. He recently co-edited a special issue on 'Questioning Security Devices' with Anthony Amicelle and Claudia Aradau in *Security Dialogue* (2015).

Yosef Lapid is Emeritus Professor of Political Science at New Mexico State University. He is co-editor (with Friedrich Kratochwil) of *The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory* (Lynne Rienner, 1995) and co-editor (with Mathias Albert

and David Jacobson) of *Identities, Borders, Orders: Rethinking International Relations Theory* (University of Minnesota Press, 2001).

David Lyon is Professor of Sociology and Director of the Surveillance Studies Centre and of an international and multidisciplinary team research project on Big Data Surveillance at Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario (Canada). His most recent book is *Surveillance after Snowden* (Polity Press, 2015).

Mikael Rask Madsen is Professor of European Law and Integration and Director of iCourts – Centre of Excellence for International Courts, University of Copenhagen (Denmark). His recent books include *La genèse de l'Europe des droits de l'homme* (Presses universitaires de Strasbourg, 2011) and five edited books: *The Authority of International Courts in a Complex World* (co-edited with Karen Alter and Larry Helfer, Oxford University Press, forthcoming 2017), *Law and the Formation of Modern Europe* (co-edited with Chris Thornhill, Cambridge University Press, 2014), *The European Court of Human Rights between Law and Politics* (co-edited with Jonas Christoffersen, Oxford University Press, 2013), *Making Human Rights Intelligible: Towards a Sociology of Human Rights* (co-edited with Gert Verschraegen, Hart, 2013), and *Transnational Power Elites* (co-edited with Niilo Kauppi, Routledge, 2013).

Joao P. Nogueira is Associate Professor of International Relations at the Institute of International Relations, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (Brazil). He is currently co-editor-in-chief (with Jef Huysmans) of the ISA journal *International Political Sociology*. His fields of interest include international political sociology, space and spatiality in world politics, humanitarianism, inequality in world politics; and the role of the BRICS in contemporary international relations.

Christian Olsson is Associate Professor of International Relations at Université Libre de Bruxelles (Belgium), affiliated to its REPI research unit. His primary research interests include (critical) security studies, the colonial genealogies of contemporary military doctrine, the historical sociology of security practices and the role of private military companies in recent overseas military interventions, especially in Afghanistan and Iraq where he has carried out field-research. His recent work has been published in *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political, Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* and the Elsevier's *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. He is associate editor of *Cultures & Conflicts*.

Francesco Ragazzi is a lecturer in International Relations at Leiden University (Netherlands). He previously worked as a Research Fellow at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) in London. His research interests include critical approaches to diaspora politics, migration, citizenship, and security in international relations. He serves on the editorial board of the journal *Cultures & Conflicts* and is a founding member of the c.a.s.e. collective. His current research explores the effects of security practices on contemporary meanings of community,

with a focus on counter-radicalization. His work appears in *International Political Sociology*, *Political Geography* and *Security Dialogue*, among other journals.

R. B. J. (Rob) Walker is Professor of Political Science and Cultural, Social and Political Thought at the University of Victoria (Canada) and Professor at the Institute of International Relations, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (Brazil). With Didier Bigo he was the founding editor of *International Political Sociology* and he also edits the journal *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*. His most recent book is *Out of Line: Essays on the Politics of Boundaries and the Limits of Modern Politics* (Routledge, 2016).

CONTENTS

<i>List of contributors</i>	ix
-----------------------------	----

Transversal lines: an introduction	1
<i>Tugba Basaran, Didier Bigo, Emmanuel-Pierre Guittet and R. B. J. Walker</i>	

PART I

Lines	11
--------------	-----------

1 Only connect: international, political, sociology	13
<i>R. B. J. Walker</i>	
2 International political sociology: Rethinking the international through dynamics of power	24
<i>Didier Bigo</i>	
3 Continuity, discontinuity and contingency: Insights for international political sociology from political geography	49
<i>John Agnew</i>	
4 IBO, IPS and SIP: Engaging the sociologies of International Relations	68
<i>Mathias Albert and Yosef Lapid</i>	

PART II**Intersections 81**

- 5 Diagrams, dispositifs and the signature of power in the study of the international 83
Mitchell Dean
- 6 Transnational fields and power elites: Reassembling the international with Bourdieu and practice theory 106
Mikael Rask Madsen
- 7 Performing methods: practice and politics 126
Claudia Aradau and Jef Huysmans
- 8 The great map of mankind 145 145
Christine Helliwell and Barry Hindess

PART III**Directions 163**

- 9 Global governance and the politics of inequality: Problematizing controversies in the field of international development 165
João P. Nogueira
- 10 Enacting international citizenship 185
Engin Isin
- 11 Technology and security practices: situating the technological imperative 205
Stephan Davidshofer, Julien Jeandesboz and Francesco Ragazzi
- 12 Violence, war and security knowledge: Between practical theories and theoretical practices 228
Philippe Bonditti and Christian Olsson
- 13 Big data surveillance: Snowden, everyday practices and digital futures 254
David Lyon
- 14 Mobilities, ruptures, transitions 272
Tugba Basaran and Elspeth Guild
- Index* 286

TRANSVERSAL LINES

An introduction

*Tugba Basaran, Didier Bigo, Emmanuel-Pierre Guittet and
R. B. J. Walker*

Speaking about the international, identifying its specificity, has commonly depended on multiple fragmentations: levels of analysis to distinguish the internal from the international, and particular individuals from both; disciplinary boundaries that differentiate international relations from anthropology (confined to localized peoples of marginal interest), and from both sociology and politics (confined to the domestic life of nations and states); distinctions between theoretical and empirical research, between politics and economics, and between scholars willing to face up to political realities and those who prefer to imagine something better. Scholars in other fields encounter related distinctions, but studies of the international always seem to rely on the sharpest of cuts both to identify what the international is and what counts as a legitimate way of studying it.

International political sociology is one (but only one) attempt to avoid these fragmentations. In the most general terms, it seeks to avoid them through an emphasis on transversal lines that cut across conventional planes of scholarship, both theoretically and empirically. Grounded in a critical analysis of the international as a specific object, reassessing the ways in which the international may be identified as a 'problem', and taking advantage of specific methodological strategies, international political sociology has been consciously envisaged as a trans-disciplinary project, one that necessarily resists more familiar appeals to an interdisciplinary discourse aiming to assemble novel forms of disciplinary knowledge so as to reconstitute a different kind of unified social science. On the contrary, international political sociology has sought to build on the possibilities of de-disciplinarizing.

The notion of transversal lines is intended to articulate the distinctive contributions of various forms of knowledge, depending on the specific phenomena, trajectories and problems that are in question. It seeks to identify procedures for thinking about continuities and change in ways that do not ultimately rely upon claims about essentialist or transcendental causalities, or simplify everything into a

form of 'order'. It demands instead that we think about process, change and flows through a continuous reflection on the assumptions enabling claims to knowledge, and provoke discussion with established disciplinary traditions of political sociology, political theory, anthropology, geography, criminology and various strands of the humanities in order to enhance our understanding of the multiple facets and circulations of power and authority.

The development of international political sociology, and the journal *IPS: International Political Sociology*, has been given strong institutional support by the International Studies Association (ISA). This should not be taken to imply that international political sociology is a monolithic movement located within a single discipline; again on the contrary. The scholars who have shaped its contributions so far are more properly understood as members of partially overlapping intellectual and disciplinary communities with a common passion for transversal research projects. A burgeoning number of articles, workshops, and conference papers underline how these scholars engage in debates within and across a variety of disciplines. It is perhaps significant that they sometimes choose to write very long collective articles despite the prevailing conventions of academic publishing. As such, international political sociology is better understood as a *comitium*, an open space that welcomes scholars who are critical of the fragmentations and foundational assumptions of their respective disciplines or sub-disciplines.

International political sociology began by considering the most influential forms of international relations scholarship as both object and subject of critique. How could it be possible to find transversal lines that might resist the entrenched categorisations that seemed to affirm an idealized and even nostalgic view of social and political orders that were clearly under immense stress, not to say falling apart? Specific publications and discussions around the uncertain course of contemporary world politics in the late 1980s and the early 1990s opened up many possibilities. Richard K. Ashley's article elegantly entitled 'Untying the Sovereign State', R. B. J. Walker's book, *One World, Many Worlds*, the collection edited by James Der Derian and Michael J. Shapiro, and the article 'Reading Dissidence/Writing the Discipline' by Ashley and Walker certainly mark significant sites through which the institutionalized discipline of international relations came under forceful questioning from within.¹

Yet, it is also from the outside, and partly in opposition to Anglo-American linguistic hegemony, that a large constituency for international political sociology has developed. For example, the intellectual collaboration between the two romance-language journals *Conflitti Globali* in Italy and *Cultures & Conflits* in France has contributed significantly to the creation of critical space that nurtured the international political sociology project, especially in Europe. These journals have long endeavoured to provide innovative and critical evaluations of the securitization of migration, border control and enhanced technological tools of surveillance, on the one hand, and of the reformulation of war, logic of suspicion and practices of exception, on the other.² With resources from two successive international research projects funded through the European Union's Fifth and Sixth framework

programmes (FP5 ELISE and FP6 CHALLENGE), the partnership between these journals has led to fruitful discussions and publications on the constitutive role played by war and security in national and international politics.

Whether internally or externally, these and other publications were the product of scholars who shared a strong sense of dissatisfaction with not only the achievement of conventional international relations but also, and perhaps more importantly, with the assumptions that shaped the specific forms in which international relations came to be institutionalized. Cracks appeared in this well-oiled institutional machinery, and international political sociology was able to take advantage of a specific moment of uncertainty, indeterminacy and the palpably changing character of contemporary social and political practices, both empirically and analytically.

It is nevertheless important to underline that international political sociology is not a new synthesis. It is not a new meta-narrative articulating a nicely homogeneous political sociology of the international. It rather raises a set of uncomfortable questions and proposes an array of alternative ways for thinking about the international. Whatever one assumes is being identified by concepts of an international, the relations it expresses are less likely to be linear or monocausal than transversal: criss-crossing and generating diverse, plural and transnational social and political practices. Consequently, international political sociology is better understood as a project, a collaborative endeavour primarily intended to further dialogue across areas of scholarship that usually proceed in comfortable isolation from one another. It is an invitation to assess the articulation of modern thought and the forms of silencing that some of the divisions between disciplines have created. It is thus also an invitation to re-envision ways of engaging with entrenched boundaries, borders and categories,³ as well as to analyse specific practices, especially their justifications and routines, their effects on the reproduction of particular narratives, and their contributions to the empowerment of particular groups or individuals over others.⁴ It seeks to engage with emerging forms of domination and social (im)mobility, stretch the possibilities of epistemological enquiry, identify transversal lines questioning unitary categories like the social, the political and the international, and learn from dissident scholars who, like ourselves, still work within established disciplines of sociology, anthropology, geography, political theory, international studies, and so on.

Reworking the modern categories expressed by these different disciplines concerned with the international is not simple. A lot is at stake both in these categories and especially in the distinctions between them. Nor is it a radical theoretical exercise for its own sake. It is, in part, a call for applying greater sociological imagination to understanding the various and entrenched divisions of and in many worlds. Perhaps more importantly, it is a plea for reflexive scholarship aiming at countering teleological and dogmatic visions of the world transmitted through the symbolic violence of entrenched categories and distinctions.⁵ It is also in part an attempt to appreciate the historical depth not only of the categories it seeks to rework but also the forces that have shaped the capacity of sociology to speak

about a society, political science to speak about a polity, and international relations scholars to speak about an international.

International political sociology is not trying to localize either politics or the international; rather, it seeks to provoke discussions about relations of power and practices of authorization in ways that do not simply condone or justify established categories and classifications. As such, it does not automatically separate out a global/international level from myriad other levels, such as the national and sub-national, the territorial or extra-territorial, self or other, inside or outside. It is thus an invitation to explore the fissures in the walls that orthodox scholarship erects around the analysis of the international, to analyse the logics of diffraction and disjunction, and to re-engage with longstanding questions about power relations and mechanisms of social change as well as novel forms of heterogeneity, transformation and struggles for power.

In short, international political sociology questions the rationales through which international relations has defined the international, political science has understood politics and sociology has conceptualized society. It also tries to reconnect some branches of humanities by obliging them to confront the tendency of some disciplines to present themselves as sites of autonomous knowledge providing specific technologies of action and power. It thus resists influential ideas of modernisation and expertise predicated on clear demarcations between domains of thought that make it easy to distinguish an inside of society from its outside, or a modernity in the making from its non-modern residues, or a domain of politics that is different from science and *techné*, or a domain of facts that is different from values.

Thus as an exercise in relations, tensions and transversals which destabilise the different versions of the opposition between structure and agency, international political sociology endeavours to avoid some of the tendencies commonly found in political science generally and theorisations of international relations in particular: essentialization and ahistoricism; a false dualism between constructivism and empirical research; and an absolute opposition between the collective and the individual. A sociology of practices, and especially of practices of power and politics, must refuse the core tenets of methodological individualism and methodological nationalism, insisting that individuals and communities exist only in relations and are embedded in processes.⁶ From this stance, thinking processually and relationally is the most appropriate way to understand how fields of forces are organised and evolved. Processes rather than reified things best represent the phenomena that we encounter in the world around us. This impels us to think in terms of movement, trajectories and becoming rather than the fixed and static, the separate and self-contained.⁷ A relational perspective is also processual, insisting that social and political life is not reducible to the intersubjectivity of already pre-constituted entities. It is the relations between agents that permit us to understand their practices and what constitutes and transform their identities.

The present book is prompted by the feeling that it is now time to pause and to take stock of the intellectual dynamics between dissident researchers who are unsatisfied with disciplinary boundaries, the enclosure of knowledge and so on. We

have not tried to compile a catechism or establish a new orthodoxy, but to highlight the diversity of contemporary research and bring together leading scholars from various intellectual and geographical backgrounds so as to encourage much needed transversal conversations.

Outline of the book

The book is divided into three sections: *Lines*, *Intersections* and *Directions*. The first section examines some of the influences that led to the formation of the project of international political sociology, the second explores some key concepts, and the third explores some transversal topics of research within the project.

In the first part, R. B. J. Walker, Didier Bigo, John Agnew, Mathias Albert and Yosef Lapid reflect on international political sociology's moment of emergence and how certain transversal intellectual dynamics within and outside the international relations discipline provide a fertile soil for the international political sociology project today. They analyse the differentiation between the way the international relations discipline inspired largely by political science and international political sociology approach the problem of the international, as well as some of the main discussions emerging from trans-disciplinary debates.

Rob Walker considers what is at stake in the concepts of a social, a political and an international in order to insist that what may appear to be debates about contemporary academic disciplines speak to a much longer history. Critiques of international relations theory were always about much more than the limited horizons of specific forms of institutionalized knowledge. Reading the move towards process, practice, relationality and politicization as the appropriate response to the reification of structural forms in states, nations and disciplines, he simultaneously reminds us about the continuing appeal of principles guiding progressive accounts of what it means to speak about humanity in general and politically qualified citizenships in particular. Paradoxically, the stress on careful analyses of social practice quickly exposes the need for careful analysis of principles and concepts that seem to work precisely because of their apparent abstraction from social or political practices. In his contribution, Didier Bigo shows that the lines of politicization are not ontologically bounded by either the spatiality of the interstate system or the temporality of a global order in the near future. He emphasizes how thinking in terms of immanence and change leads to a different framing of the problem of the international today. Insisting on the logic of practices, he proposes to explore the lengthening of the chains of interdependence linking the practices of the different actors, and the types of dynamics that result from the proliferation of boundaries. Once relations and process are highlighted, it becomes easier to understand how centrifugal and centripetal dynamics organize practices of politicization internationally. John Agnew then comes back to his own earlier critique of the conceptualization of territory and sovereignty within the discipline of international relations⁸ and shows how rethinking spaces and places far from the ordering of contiguity allows us to understand contingencies, discontinuities and the

continuities they produce. Finally, Mathias Albert and Yosef Lapid reconsider the significance of thinking in terms of relations and process instead of substance and essentialist categories. Their contribution is informed by the Identity, Border and Order initiative, another attempt to disturb the dominant ontology of stability and continuity in international relations. They consider that two different paths have been opened for conceiving a political sociology that avoids methodological nationalism and essentialist accounts of a national society. If the international political sociology project insisting on tensions and disruptions is one possibility, rethinking in more global terms through a sociology of international politics is an alternative that cannot be marginalized.

All these authors insist on the need to examine specific practices, relations between actors, temporal processes, the diversity of places, the multiplicity of ways in which people congregate, and so on, rather than simply presume continuity, territory and the centralization of power and authority. They encourage attention to places where lines become boundaries, how they crisscross, cut, intersect and destroy the continuity of other lines, and organize a pattern of traces left by multiple dynamics of human activity. The painting by Kandinsky reproduced on the cover of this volume may be suggestive in this respect.

The second theme is the exploration of the key intersections or nodes permitting explorations of these lines, at the core of which lies a series of heated discussions about power and authority, practices and governmentality, performativity and reflexivity. Quite clearly, Foucault's theory of disciplinary power and Bourdieu's sociology of power, with a particular emphasis on forms of domination, have played a productive role in the development of the international political sociology project. In his contribution, Mitchell Dean discusses Foucault's notion of *dispositif* and his understanding of power. Dean suggests that to engage with and to use the notion of power goes with the need to recognize its signature, that is, to understand how power operates and to analyse the forms it takes. In his view, a revised analytics of power involves a fourfold programme of research in which the study of *dispositifs* is connected to a genealogy of order, an archeology of glory and an analytics of sovereignty. In his contribution Mikael Rask Madsen looks at the importance of Pierre Bourdieu's work when it comes to the study of the international and highlights the post-Bourdieuian trend within international political sociology. Perceptively, he reminds his reader that such apparatuses do not provide any empirical or theoretical shortcuts for understanding transnational fields and their effects on reconfigurations of power. Methodologically decisive here is the way reflexivity operates through the 'double historicization' of both the object and the academic construction of the object by the researcher. In their chapter, Claudia Aradau and Jef Huysmans frame the messiness of many worlds and their multiple coexisting rationales in a different way. For them, any method is performative and helps to produce plural realities; these multiple realities can be partially connected, but resist reduction. Therefore, against methods that aspire to be universal they insist that methods depend on places and the politics of places, and show how this understanding of performative practice modifies our common understanding of