

AFTERWORD

The commercial in/for international
political sociology*Anna Leander***Introduction**

In my contribution to the transversal reflections concluding this *Routledge Handbook of International Political Sociology*, I wish to dwell on the place of the commercial in International Political Sociology (IPS)¹ and use this reflection to make a commercial of sorts for IPS. This reflection began as a concern with the commercializing (or perhaps commodifying or neoliberalizing) of just about everything.² Even sleep – that “uncompromising interruption of the theft of time from us by capitalism” – is transformed by a 24/7 obsession of a “world disenchanted in its eradication of shadows and obscurity and of alternative temporalities” (Crary 2013: 10 and 19). We will therefore soon be able to discuss most topics adding the qualifier ‘Inc.’ as titles such as ‘Democracy Inc.’ (Wolin 2008), ‘Lifeworld Inc.’ (Thrift 2011) or ‘Militainment Inc.’ (Stahl 2009) remind us. Or perhaps we will *not* be able to discuss commercializing of everything.

The Inc. qualifier is increasingly pertinent also for education, universities and knowledge. Scholars, including those of IPS, no longer work with problems but on projects expected to be interesting enough for users to finance, or that can at least be argued to have an ‘impact’ (Bastow et al. 2014). Their knowledge is ‘managed’ through ‘markets for ideas’ (Mirowski 2011). Their production is ranked, evaluated and steered by a strata of *knowledgocrats* in charge of keeping them accountable to a range of standards (Schrag 2010; Braidotti 2013: chap. 4). Universities are turning into ‘factories of knowledge’ as creativity and innovation move out and away to ‘creative industries’, think tanks or private research institutions that purport to be better at producing relevant knowledge (Nowotny 2000; Raunig 2013). This development of an ‘Academia Inc.’ is triggering protests and manifestos to generate awareness that “other forms of science are possible” (Stengers 2013). In the process, however, it may also be making it more difficult to question and explore the politics of the qualifier Inc. (including in academia itself) and hence to create credible images of those other possible sciences. There is a clear tension between the urgency of exploring the commercial and the thorough penetration of commercial logics into all governance logics.

In this chapter, I address the significance of this tension for IPS. I wish to do so first by underscoring the relevance of the commercial for the *fields*, *themes* and *methods* of IPS as covered in this handbook. The point I wish to bring out is that the commercial is indeed a transversal issue, as I draw on the chapters in this handbook to underline. Second, I wish to take this argument

further by suggesting that an IPS is uncommonly well suited to address the omnipresent commercial, to explore the politics of its pervasive presence. The reason is its main characteristics that are helpfully highlighted in this handbook; an IPS is counter-disciplinary, problem oriented and methodologically open. These traits make it possible to draw on IPS to explore the politics of the commercial without falling into the trap of an unwarranted nostalgia for an academia bygone. Hence, and perhaps rather paradoxically, although there is no chapter in this handbook covering the place of the commercial specifically, my commercial for an IPS focuses on its potential for doing precisely this. I will conclude this transversal reflection by insisting on the significance of embracing this potential in its plurality, and of resisting the temptation to fence off *IPS* turfs, policing specific versions of the *IPS* brand. In other words, I wish to make an argument against the temptation of disciplining IPS in order to turn it into a more conventional academic endeavour.

The commercial in international political sociology

The commercial is omnipresent in IPS. This is true also of the fields, themes and methodologies covered by the contributions to this volume. Perhaps, indeed, the reason there is no chapter specifically dedicated to anything like the commercial or neoliberal is that it irreverently insists on making appearances in all the chapters, irrespective of their main focus. This section gives some examples of this. It also points in the direction of some of the reasons this omnipresence may work as an obstacle for explicitly engaging with the politics this omnipresence is generating.

This handbook begins by looking at the *cognate fields* of an IPS. Among these fields, International Political Economy (Seabrooke and Samman this volume) would appear to be the one most directly and explicitly dealing with the commercial since it focuses on the economy. However, the commercial holds an increasingly core place in all other cognate fields as well, including the most unlikely ones. International Law (and law more generally), for example has traditionally been the field par excellence of the state. The state expanded through the establishment of the legal system. Areas previously otherwise governed were successively subordinated to the authority of (state-generated) law (Bourdieu 2014). Yet, as Aalberts and Werner point out, “law has become a fragmented field with many different regimes, each with their own vocabularies, rules and expertises”. This fragmentation is in part linked to the expansion of the commercial. Companies and markets are ill-regulated by conventional state-based law. One reaction has been an expansion of ‘private regimes’ and contract law; another, the elaboration of a forest of codes of conducts, benchmarks, best practices and standards that are often integrated into hard forms of law (Teubner 2004; Riles 2011; Muir-Watt 2016). With these changes have followed transformations of the definition of the legal experts, of what kind of legal technologies and artefacts are in place, and of how these enact specific forms of politics.

These are momentous political shifts that cry out for serious scholarly exploration, as Aalberts and Werner insist (and as explored in, for example Jasanoff 2012; Kratochwil 2015; Rajkovic et al. 2016). Yet the pervasiveness of the commercial may indeed make the commercial difficult to investigate. In legal studies as elsewhere, the presence of the commercial is prone to generate and support a hierarchy of knowledge in which that which speaks to the concerns of commercial actors is on top. As the commercial is spreading, the category of commercial actor is expanding. Companies and market participants are joined by public administrators enacting new public management. For legal scholarship, it translates as a privileging of investigation geared primarily to promoting more efficient and smoothly operating regulatory systems, which is also anchored and encouraged in funding mechanisms, impact assessments and evaluation practices of legal

research. Hence, a core and recurring concern of legal scholars is the increasing ‘managerialism’ of the field and the related neglect of the harder questions regarding the politics and responsibility of law (Koskenniemi 2011; Kennedy 2016). A similar pervasiveness of the commercial that is likely to hamper investigations of the commercial is also present in other cognate fields of an IPS.

Second, and along similar lines, the *key themes* of IPS as outlined in this volume bear the imprint of the commercial. The commercial is difficult to investigate precisely because of the pervasiveness of the commercial. Not only finance (Tellmann this volume) or development (Hansson and Öjendal this volume), but also citizenship (Nyers this volume), international elites (Kauppi and Madsen this volume), mobility (Adey and Squire this volume), security (Burgess this volume) and gender (Stern this volume) are penetrated by the commercial. To take the last example: the “produced and productive” forms of gender that Stern discusses in her chapter are intertwined with and re-enacting commercial forms of governance. This is obviously the case for the professionals in the private security industry that Stern discusses in her chapter. The gendered identities they are reproducing are imbued with the specific commercial logic that shapes their roles, status and relationships to others, and that in the process fashion their subjectivities (Stern this volume; Eichler 2014). However, similar dynamics are also bound to be at work in far less obvious ways. Keeping to examples pertaining to gender, the ways in which the commercial is intertwined with gendered forms of violence is a case in point. Rape becomes a ‘weapon of war’ in part because of the way it is counted in the demobilization processes with effects for remuneration, employment and status in reintegration processes. The commercial hence becomes part of the practice of resorting to systematic rape in the Democratic Republic of Congo (Eriksson Baaz and Stern 2013). Indeed, more generally political violence, security and surveillance are fashioned by the constant presence of the commercial either in the guise of consultants, contractors and collaborators and or public administrators turned (new public) managers.

The pervasiveness of the commercial may hamper efforts to investigate its significance either as a theme in its own right or as a part of other themes. In a context where research has to be relevant and the users are enmeshed with companies and commercial rationales, the questions that are considered most pressing pertain to the resolution of practical problems. Broader issues of the significance of the commercial for political violence, security or gendered identities, for example, can remain unexamined. To return to the example of the place of the commercial in gendered violence, it is easier to raise questions about how to make the existing measuring, evaluation and payment systems less prone to feed into gendered violence than to focus on imagining systems that follow alternative (non-commercially informed) rationalities. Such research would be relegated to the category ‘issues of general interest’, to be dealt with somewhere else, by someone else; someone not dependent on external, competitive funding. The trouble is that such researchers are a rapidly vanishing species. University research that is not tied to project funding is disappearing. The commercial therefore tends to disappear not only in the hierarchy of knowledges, but also from the key themes, as problem-solving research gains precedence over critical research, to reiterate Cox’s familiar distinction (Cox 1981). This move is reflected in and enshrined through researchers’ instance to distance themselves from the term ‘critical’ by identifying it either with an assumption that it is possible to speak from a privileged position, or with the unveiling conspiracies (for excellent articulations of these positions see respectively Boltanski 2011, 2012). As an alternative, the proposition is to adopt an engaged and dialogical position, something along the lines of what Stengers terms “a Leibnizian ethos” that has as it aims not “to offend established sentiments” but instead to “open them to that which their established identities make them refuse, combat or misrecognize” (Stengers 1995: 25).

Finally, the *methodologies* of IPS are imbued with the traces of the commercial. In part, one might attribute this to the fact that they have been developed in IPS to help account for the

place of companies, markets and the commercial that are otherwise difficult to see. This is the case for example of methodologies geared to the study of ‘assemblages’ (Abrahamsen, chapter 25 this volume) has used to account for the place of companies and markets in the provision of security. But more than this, the increasing emphasis on applied, readily communicable knowledge has increased the predilection for problem-oriented methods adjusted to specific contexts. The ‘case study’ method is therefore at the core of working, teaching and writing in business schools and consultancy companies with the Harvard Business School case method as a core reference point (Sheen and Gallo 2016). The ambition is to adopt a pragmatic form of knowledge. Rather than being held to the strictures of existing paradigms and methodologies, knowledge should be encouraged to be innovative and inventive, drawing on whatever forms of thought and study prove helpful to solving specific problems. Trans-, inter-, and multidisciplinary therefore hold a pivotal place not only in IPS (Bleiker this volume) but also in business schools. The business case study approach is encroaching on the turf of conventional academia: for example, business schools produce cases to educate their students in sociology (because of its link to business organization), visual theory and aesthetics (because of its link to marketing), history (because of its link to business history) or politics and philosophy (because of the link to corporate social and political responsibility) and so forth. In the process, business schools, consultancy companies and think tanks have contributed to and bolstered the development and weight of methods that bear a striking similarity to the ones covered here under the heading of methodologies of IPS.³

Somewhat paradoxically, however, this surge in methodological innovation, overlapping and intertwining with the methodological trends for commercially produced knowledge, may also be one of the main obstacles to reflecting on and capturing the commercial. There are at least three reasons for this that are mostly linked to the dynamics of commercialized knowledge rather than direct, intended effort by anyone with a stake in the commercial to block research. The first is related to the focus of research: the case study method comes with a predilection for questions about already given problems. This is a tendency that is reinforced in the current context, where priority is given to engagement with users in the technologies for developing, carrying out and evaluating research. Second, current developments also reflect important changes in the temporality of research. The time pressure generated by the need for innovation and topicality stands against the need for slowness in reflection and evidence gathering. Most significantly, it militates against the extremely time-consuming task of reflexively scrutinizing not only the choice of research question, but the way this question is situated in a broader context, and the way the observer’s position in that context has consequences for the observation itself. In other words, it militates against the ‘reflexivity’ (at all levels) that has received so much attention as a methodological virtue in IPS and beyond (e.g. Bourdieu 2001; Hamati-Ataya 2013; for a critique see Lynch 2000). Finally, with commercialization has followed an emphasis on methods as the blanket answer to the overall uncertainty about contradictory and incompatible knowledges. Sound method makes the difference. Data standards, informed consent, and ethical standards have therefore taken on new significance in shaping research endeavours. This is intended to protect the objects of research. However, it does so very unequally. While large companies, governments or intelligence organizations will have a tendency to claim the protection offered, the homeless, governed or victims of drone attacks are less likely to have the means to do so. There is therefore a real risk that a fetishization of fieldwork, a narrow understanding of consent, or rigid (and unethical) notions of ethics will unwittingly hamper research and publication into the commercial. In the process it will generate a bias in knowledge (Czarniawska 2007). It will de facto exempt the powerful from scrutiny. They can and will refuse access, scrutiny and arguments that do not suit them, whereas the less privileged cannot and will not.

It is relatively easy to gain access to a refugee camp. It is less so to gain access those who pushed people to leave their homes.

The commercial is seeping into and being embraced by the fields, themes and methodologies of IPS. At the same time, its pervasive presence may well make it more difficult to observe precisely the commercial and its role. As argued with reference to the field of law, its presence in cognate fields of IPS may result in the privileging of a specific form of knowledge, geared to focusing on questions of efficiency and to sustaining university hierarchies reflecting this prioritization. Similarly, with reference to its place in the themes of IPS, the commercial may lend primacy to problem solving as opposed to critically formulated themes. And finally, the place of the commercial in shaping methodologies may well result in a bias against research unwelcome to the powerful. These cautionary 'mays' outlined with reference to IPS of course have a more general bearing. They are pertinent to knowledge production more generally with far reaching consequences for their work. As Wolin puts it:

Scientists have become "incorporated" either as entrepreneurs or as employees in research divisions of corporations and government bureaucracies ... [this] has destroyed the iconic status it [science] enjoyed for more than three centuries, leaving scientists and their findings more vulnerable to political and corporate manipulation and attacks by religious and economic archaists.

(Wolin 2008: 126)

In the next section, I wish to highlight the possibilities left open by the 'may' and also to outline why an IPS has an important role to play in preventing the move from our cautionary 'mays' to the affirmative 'does'; this is where my reflections turn into a commercial for the capacity (and responsibility) of IPS to engage the question of the place of the commercial in IPS, but arguably also beyond.

A commercial for international political sociology

Drawing attention to the commercial in IPS is not the same as reflecting on its implications for IPS. Indeed, there is all reason to caution against the tendency to assume that the commercial is inherently evil (Callon et al. 2009: 237). There is even less reason to assume that the commercial is the worst possible alternative. As is well established in IPS and beyond, scholarly knowledge, including in its more progressive incarnations, has had a disturbing propensity to *re-produce*⁴ knowledge forms consolidating hierarchies of gender, race and class with very disturbing consequences (Bourdieu 1989; Haraway 1997; Hobson 2012, among very many). There is therefore little reason to be nostalgic for a purportedly pure conventional academia, where theory reigned unsullied by lowly commercial (and worldly) concerns. Such a place has never existed. However, this in no way implies that we should somehow unquestioningly embrace the transformation and change entailed by the move to Academia Inc. On the contrary, questioning its implications is of essence. In the remainder of this reflection I wish to do this by underlining that three characteristics of an IPS as a scholarly endeavour: its counter-disciplinarity, its situated problem-oriented approach and its methodological openness give it the capacity to engage the questions arising around the commercial. Furthermore, since with power comes responsibility, it has the responsibility to do so.

In her contribution to this volume, Lisle argues that "there is something very exciting about the uncontainability of this research [focused on visibility]; that is, scholars are more interested in tracing how power moves through chains of connection and multiplicity than they are in

obeying familiar disciplinary categories". This observation is valid not only for research on visibility, but for work in IPS more generally. IPS indeed has developed as a "counterdisciplinary" place (Koskenniemi 2012), that is a place where questions can be (and are) raised while taking into account the practical implications of theoretical (disciplinary) framings. It is a place where problems are framed against (or counter to) the disciplines rather than within them. Another way of conceiving of the 'cognate fields' of IPS, covered in the first section of this handbook, is therefore as the disciplines counter which issues are most commonly raised. In opening for this kind of counterdisciplinary work, IPS arguably offers a space for thinking that is of essence not only for investigating the place of the commercial, but also for political research more generally. Politics is brought out by pointing to contentions and contestation. It is therefore difficult to see how research that is content with faithfully reproducing questions, repeating theoretical concepts, or reiterating forms of reasoning as they are articulated in existing theories and approaches, could indeed do more than restate and reinforce the already known. This is of course especially true when it comes to researching issues and problems arising as a consequence of these questions, concepts or styles of reasoning. As argued earlier, one of the core concerns with the escalation of the commercial is precisely the way it is transforming the relationship between research and practice, including making this relationship more difficult to scrutinize.

From this perspective then, a form of counter-disciplinarity is arguably necessary for investigating and intervening in what is indeed a "politics of becoming" (Connolly 2011; Braidotti 2013). The fact that an IPS is 'derivative' of 'cognate disciplines', rather than an academic discipline in its own right, may therefore be a strength and not a weakness. Rather than a sign of a theoretical underdevelopment in need of remediation, it may be the *sine qua non* for investigating the significance of the commercial. Its strength is precisely that it offers the possibility of circumventing the hindrance imposed by paradigms on understanding (Hirschman 1970). Recognizing, accepting and embracing the specificity of the counter-disciplinary approach therefore appears important not only for the consolidation of an IPS but for realizing the potential of the field – including when it comes to exploring the place of the commercial.

The counter-disciplinary approach is linked to a situated understanding of problems and issues of investigation. Indeed, unlike many conventional academics, scholars dedicated to an IPS do not shy away from the situatedness of the problems they investigate, which Spelman (1988) so well captures when she describes it through an analogy with the unease of a man at the seashore who is getting increasingly disturbed by the diversity of the pebbles that he had initially thought were all alike. Rather, the expectation they start with is that problems are situated in time and space, with the implication that the questions sometimes heralded as the basics of sound method: 'What is *this* a case of? becomes the wrong question to ask. The implication of taking situatedness seriously is that it becomes impossible to assume that problems are necessarily cases of something else (Haraway 1988). It becomes necessary to drop "the double faced, self-identical god of transcendent cultures of no culture, on the one hand, and of subjects and objects exempt from the permanent finitude of engaged interpretation on the other", as Haraway puts it (1997: 37). This attachment to the situatedness of questioning, and hence multiplicity of questions, runs through most chapters in this volume.⁵

One case in point is Burgess's contribution to this volume that has the appearance of a list of security issues on the IPS (journal) horizon (six issues including the privatization of security) but especially beyond it (sixteen issues excluding mention of neoliberalism, markets or political economy). This listing invites further adding on an extension, as do listing practices more generally (de Goede and Sullivan 2016; Weber 2016). Reading the list we begin pondering what other problems we might have connected to the ones in the chapter and how we might take the chapter beyond its own current boundaries, framing and limits. This invitation, or more precisely this

positive encouragement, of situated questioning is important if the always risky and uncertain enterprise of exploring uncharted terrain is to have a chance of success. Indeed, the necessarily inefficient, clumsy and time-consuming process of asking, thinking through and answering questions that have not already been answered is only going to be engaged if such efforts are rewarded in their own right, that is if there is a willingness to recognize that creativity thrives not in the sterile purity of discipline, but nurtured by the often confusing and contradictory worlds of the *metis*⁶ (Whitehead 1933; Stengers 2002). Indeed, precisely because an IPS offers a space where such research is possible, it also provides the basic precondition for investigating the commercial, namely a space where the commercial can be investigated as a specific, situated problem.

The possibility offered by an IPS for exploring the commercial in situated counter-disciplinary fashion would be of limited use if it did not also offer an understanding of method that made it possible to translate this effectively into specific analytical strategies (Bourdieu et al. 1991; Åkerström-Andersen 2003). This requires a decisive departure from the conventional conception of methods, which treats methods much as cookbooks providing recipes for how and what to look at. Instead it requires an approach to methods which functions more as an open dictionary, a Wikipedia of sorts, from which innovative ways of dealing with problems can be gleaned and new ones added; an approach to methods that encourages inventiveness and imagination rather than rules and restrictions. Of course, the virtues of such an approach to method have been underlined many times in a wide variety of contexts. Gadamer (1990 [1960]) devoted his *magnum opus* to showing its importance for understanding “Truth”. Bourdieu created his own journal to make sure that it could be practiced in sociology (Bourdieu 1975). Whitehead has become a reference point in areas ranging from the philosophy of science to media studies, due to his propensity to defend imagination and the adventure of ideas (Whitehead 1933; Stengers 2002; Hansen 2015). Barbara Czarniawska helpfully underlines its importance also in the time-pressured world of contemporary organizational studies and beyond (Czarniawska 2007).

This ambition to reclaim methods in a way that allows for more imagination and experimentation is also palpable in the flow of work related to methods in IPS (e.g. Salter and Mutlu 2012; Shapiro 2012; Aradau and Huysmans 2014). One area where this has been particularly perceptible is in the methodological reflections surrounding ways of accounting for materiality (de Goede, Schouten and Mayer in this volume). Experimenting with methods integrating materiality has helped us move forward in our understanding of the ‘little analytics’ through which governance in the age of big data is exercised (Amoore and Piotukh 2015; also Johns 2016). The interest of an IPS in this type of methodologically imaginative research provides the resources necessary to investigate the commercial, not least because it encourages and points the way to the routes that may make it possible to circumvent and resist the ‘methodological’ requirements and standards that often work to consolidate the power of the already powerful.

Conclusion: on the symbolic economy of the IPS ‘brand’

This transversal reflection has contributed to the construction of an IPS brand, just as does this handbook in its entirety and similar endeavours (e.g. Basaran et al. 2016 and Gofas et al. 2017). These branding exercises inevitably engender and are part of the symbolic economy of the brands they create. Who owns the brand? Who can legitimately use it to market their own research? Whose status as a researcher should the proceeds from the brand raise? And what research/researcher should *not* be entitled to any of the benefits attached to the IPS brand? Because there is a stake in the brand, these questions will arise, just as they would in relation to any academic brand. With them come also efforts to control and discipline, to draw lines between the insiders

and the outsiders; to expel intruders, traitors and aspirants who are not faithful to the canon. In view of the argument just made, it should come as no surprise that I spend my last lines cautioning against these (perhaps inevitable?)⁷ efforts to discipline an IPS through a policing of the discipline. Indeed, the fate of international political economy is instructive in this respect. What started out as a resolutely open, undisciplined discipline has become increasingly “boring” (Cohen 2010) as scholars have relied on ever more narrow and exclusive approaches, doing their best to exclude alternatives in the process (Contexto Internacional 2015). The interesting and important questions formerly dealt with in IPE are consequently raised elsewhere, under other brand names.

In this reflection I have pointed to how and why IPS has an important role to play in tackling one of the main contemporary challenges; the commercialization of most things, including IPS. In the process I have repeatedly insisted that an IPS is important precisely as a counter-discipline, open to situated (multiple) questions and imaginative methodologies. Needless to say, these characteristics will be lost if it is policed into becoming a conventional academic discipline. I therefore insist on the importance of preserving the characteristics that I have just placed at the core of my own commercial for IPS, and hence my take on the *IPS* brand. Certainly, when it comes to investigating the place of the commercial, the stakes in preserving IPS as a space of such investigation are high. There is an unsettling familiarity in the description Bourdieu offers of the context that made Heidegger and most of his contemporaries passively submit to, feed into and reinforce

the effects of economic and political events [that] are felt through the mediation of the crisis specific to the university defined by the influx of students and the absence of employment, the appearance of a university proletariat condemned to teach under university level or to living at the margins of the university . . . the declining socio-economic status of the professors . . . demands from the State and big industry for more practical teaching . . . and the critique from the political parties.

(Bourdieu 1988: 21, my translation)

The current IPS brand offers both an invitation to avoid relating in a similar fashion to the current commercialization in IPS (and beyond), and a space from which an alternative stance can be constructed. As such, this brand is worth working with. However, were that to change, the invitation to be cancelled and the space closed, then scholars of IPS will hopefully do as their IPE peers did: continue to raise their issues elsewhere and perhaps even invent a novel brand to signal their collective efforts.

Notes

- 1 Precisely because the competition surrounding the authority to define ‘international political sociology’ is core to my argument, I have opted for using the acronym IPS contrary to the editors and most contributors to this volume, who see it as referring only to the ISA section and the journal.
- 2 The commercial in other words is a shorthand denoting the (complex contextually articulated) neoliberal governmental rationality of steering conducts through (quasi)markets. Commercializing refers to the spread of this rationality to activities and spheres that were not previously governed through it. For more precise discussions of this spread, ‘that no one denies’ of the ‘competition principle’ to all areas and its relationship to the state and public policy, see respectively Rosa (2013) and Dean (2012).
- 3 For IPS scholars unfamiliar with the business school world, I would recommend looking up ‘critical management studies’ (<http://aom.org/Divisions-and-Interest-Groups/Critical-Management-Studies/Critical-Management-Studies.aspx>) or visit the EGOS website (www.egosnet.org). They will certainly find the themes debated and methodologies invoked surprisingly familiar.

- 4 Emphasis can be placed either on 're-' or 'produce', hence the odd 're-produce'.
- 5 Some have opted for introducing one approach, their own, to a question no doubt because it makes it possible to say something more in depth about this one approach more than because of a conviction that this is indeed the only IPS approach. See for example Sending (this volume), who suggests that IPS approaches to global governance are informed primarily by Foucault.
- 6 A metis is a person of mixed race but also the Titan goddess of wisdom, skill and craft, and mother to Athena.
- 7 Notes 2 and 3 in the introduction to this volume are an indication of the sensitivity already surrounding the acronym IPS. This perhaps is just the confirmation of the fact that there is indeed a symbolic economy of intellectual fields that makes it difficult to imagine that fields could remain open and unpoliced (Bourdieu 1984; Collins 2000). Suggesting such a possibility, in fact, probably does more to harm than help the kind of investigation advocated here.

References

- Åkerström-Andersen, Niels (2003). *Discursive Analytical Strategies: Understanding Foucault, Koselleck, Laclau, Luhmann*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Amoore, Louise and Piotukh, Volha (2015). Life Beyond Big Data: Governing with Little Analytics. *Economy and Society*, 44(3): 341–366.
- Aradau, Claudia and Huysmans, Jef (2014). Critical Methods in International Relations: The Politics of Techniques, Devices and Acts. *European Journal of International Relations*, 20(3): 596–619.
- Basaran, Tugba, Bigo, Didier, Guitet, Emmanuel-Pierre and Walker, R.B.J. (eds.) (2016). *International Political Sociology: Transversal Lines*. London: Routledge.
- Bastow, Simon, Dunleavy, Patrick and Tinkler, Jane (2014). *The Impact of the Social Sciences. How Academics and Their Research Makes a Difference*. Los Angeles et al.: Sage.
- Boltanski, Luc (2011). *On Critique*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Boltanski, Luc (2012). *Enigmes et Complot: Une Enquête à Propos d'Enquêtes*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1975). Présentation. *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, 1(1): 1–3.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1984). *Homo Academicus*. Paris: les éditions de minuit.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1988). *L'Ontologie politique de Martin Heidegger*. Paris: Les édition de minuit.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1989). *La noblesse d'Etat*. Paris: les éditions de minuit.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (2001). *Science de la science et réflexivité. Cours du Collège de France 2000–2001*. Paris: Raisons d'agir.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (2014). *On the State. Lectures at the College de France 1989–1992*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, Jean-Claude Chamboredon, Jean-Claude, Jean-Claude Passeron, Jean-Claude, and Beate Kraus, Beate (1991). *The Craft of Sociology: Epistemological Preliminaries* (original edition. 1968). Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.
- Braidotti, Rosi (2013). *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Callon, Michel, Pierre Lascombes, Pierre, and Yannick Barthe, Yannick (2009). *Acting in an Uncertain World: An Essay on Technical Democracy*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Cohen, Benjamin J. (2010). 'Are IPE Journals Becoming Boring?', *International Studies Quarterly*, 54(3): 887–891.
- Collins, Randall (2000). *The Sociology of Philosophies: A Global Theory of Intellectual Change*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Connolly, William E. (2011). *A World of Becoming*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Contexto Internacional (2015). 'Special Issue on IPE as a *Global Dialogue*', 37(3): 839–1080 (available at <http://goo.gl/dGy3el>).
- Cox, Robert W. (1981). 'Social Forces and World Order: Beyond International Relations Theory', *Millennium Journal of International Studies*, 10(2): 126–155.
- Crary, Jonathan (2013). *24/7 Late Capitalism and the Ends of Sleep*. London: Verso.
- Czarniawska, Barbara (2007). *Shadowing and other Techniques for Doing Fieldwork in Modern Societies*. Copenhagen: CBS Press.
- Dean, Mitchell (2012). 'Rethinking Neoliberalism', *Journal of Sociology*, 5(2): 150–163.
- de Goede, Marieke, and Gavin Sullivan, Gavin (2016). 'The Politics of Security Lists', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 34(1): 67–88.
- Eichler, Maya (ed.) (2014). *Gender and Private Security in Global Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Eriksson Baaz, Maria, and Maria Stern, Maria (2013). *Sexual Violence as a Weapon of War?: Perceptions, Prescriptions, Problems in the Congo and Beyond*. London: Zed Books.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg (1990 [1960]). *Wahrheit und Methode. Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.
- Gofas, Andreas, Nicholas Onuf, Nicholas, and Innana Hamati-Ataya, Innana, (eds.) (2017). *The SAGE Handbook of the History, Philosophy and Sociology of International Relations*. London: Sage.
- Hamati-Ataya, Innana (2013). 'Reflectivity, Reflexivity, Reflexivism: IR's 'Reflexive Turn' – and Beyond', *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(4): 669–694.
- Hansen, Mark B.N. (2015). *Feed Forward: On the Future of Twenty First Century Media*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Haraway, Donna (1988). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of the Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14: 575–599.
- Haraway, Donna (1997). *Witness@Second_Millennium.FemaleMan©_Meets_OncomouseTM*. New York: Routledge.
- Hirschman, Albert O. (1970). The Search for Paradigms as a Hindrance to Understanding. *World Politics*, 22(3): 329–343.
- Hobson, John (2012). *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics. Western International Theory, 1760–2010*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jasanoff, Sheila (2012). *Science and Public Reason*. New York: Routledge.
- Johns, Fleur (2016). Global Governance through the Pairing of List and Algorithm. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 34(1): 126–149.
- Kennedy, David (2016). *A World of Struggle: How Power, Law, and Expertise Shape Global Political Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Koskenniemi, Martti (2011). "What Is International Law For? (chapter 10)". In Martti Koskenniemi (ed.), *The Politics of International Law*. Portland and Oxford: Hart, pp. 240–267.
- Koskenniemi, Martti (2012). Law, Teleology and International Relations: An Essay in Counterdisciplinarity. *International Relations*, 26(1): 3–34.
- Kratochwil, Friedrich (2015). *The Status of Law in World Society: Meditations on the Role and Rule of Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leander, Anna (2008). Securing Sovereignty by Governing Security through Markets. In Rebecca Adler-Nissen and Thomas Gammeltoft-Hansen (eds.), *Sovereignty Games: Instrumentalising State Sovereignty in Europe and Beyond*. London: Palgrave, pp. 151–170.
- Lynch, Michael (2000). Against Reflexivity as an Academic Virtue and Source of Privileged Knowledge. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 17(3): 26–54.
- Mirowski, Philip (2011). *Science-Mart: Privatizing American Science*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Muir-Watt, Horatia (ed.) (2016). *Private International Law and Public Law*. Edward Elgar.
- Nowotny, Helga (2000). Transgressive Competence: The Narrative of Expertise. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 3(1): 5–21.
- Rajkovic, Nik, Aalberts, Tanja and Gammeltoft-Hansen, Thomas (eds.) (2016). *The Power of Legality: Practices of International Law and their Politics*. London et al.: Routledge.
- Raunig, Gerald (2013). *Factories of Knowledge, Industries of Creativity*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.
- Riles, Annelise (2011). *Collateral Knowledge: Legal Reasoning in the Global Financial Markets*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rosa, Hartmut (2013). *Weltbeziehungen im Zeitalter der Beschleunigung*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Salter, Mark and Mutlu Can (eds.) (2012). *Research Methods in Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Schrag, Zachary M. (2010). *Ethical Imperialism: Institutional Review Boards and the Social Sciences, 1965–2009*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Shapiro, Michael J. (2012). *Studies in Trans-Disciplinary Method: After the Aesthetic Turn*. London: Routledge.
- Sheen, Raymond and Amy (with) Gallo (2016). *HBR Guide to Building Your Business Case*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.
- Spelman, Elizabeth V. (1988). *Inessential Woman. Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Stahl, Roger (2009). *Militainment, Inc.: War, Media, and Popular Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Stengers, Isabelle (1995). *L'invention des sciences modernes [original edition 1993]*. Paris: Flammarion.
- Stengers, Isabelle (2002). *Penser avec Whithead: Une Libre et Sauvage Creation*. Paris: Seuil.

- Stengers, Isabelle (2013). *Une autre science est possible: Manifeste pour ralentissement des sciences*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Teubner, Gunther (2004). "Global Private Regimes: Neo-spontaneous Law and Dual Constitution of Autonomous Sectors in World Society". In Karl-Heinz Ladeur (ed.), *Globalization and Public Governance*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 71–88.
- Thrift, Nigel (2011). Lifeworld Inc. – and What to Do About It. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 29(1): 5–26.
- Weber, Jutta (2016). Keep Adding. On Kill Lists, Drone Warfare and the Politics of Databases. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 34(1): 107–125.
- Whitehead, Alfred North (1933). *Adventures of Ideas*. New York: Free Press.
- Wolin, Sheldon S. (2008). *Democracy Incorporated: Managed Democracy and the Specter of Inverted Totalitarianism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.