

International/Global Political Sociology

Dirk Nabers and Frank A. Stengel

Summary

International Political Sociology (IPS) emerged as a subfield of International Relations (IR) in the early 2000s. IPS itself may be understood as constituted by a field of tension between the concepts of “the International,” “the Political,” and “the Social.” Against this background, the centrality of anarchy and sovereignty as the fundamental structuring principles of international politics are increasingly called into question. While IPS remains an exciting, creative and important endeavor, researchers are also exploring paths toward what might be called a Global Political Sociology (GPS). Although IPS has become more global in orientation, more sociological with respect to sources, and more political in its stance, three ongoing shifts need to be made in order to transform IPS into GPS: first, insights from disciplines foreign to IR—both Western and non-Western—need to be employed in order to illustrate that specific localities have implications for the global as a whole; second, the continued engagement with causal theorizing must be replaced with contingency and undecidability as the fundamental constituting features of the political; and third, if the international that has been the nucleus of IR activities for decades, but impedes our understanding of politics instead of stimulating it, then alternative ways of theorizing global politics must be explored.

Keywords

International Political Sociology, Global Political Sociology, sociological theory, poststructuralism, feminism, postcolonialism, the political

Introduction

Since the beginning of the 2000s, International Political Sociology (IPS) has emerged as one of the most vibrant fields of study in International Relations (IR). Based on the realization that traditional IR was too narrow with respect to its (meta-) theoretical outlook, its understanding of the discipline's subject matter, and geographical focus, critics have argued that IR needs to pay much more attention to world politics as a social activity, bringing in insights from sociology. With the foundation of a section of the International Studies Association (ISA) in 2001 and its own flagship journal in 2006, IPS has become an established subfield of IR.¹ This article takes stock of IPS's achievements since the establishment of the section and journal, asking to what extent IPS has succeeded in formulating new perspectives on the international, the political, and the social and where room for further development can be identified.

A handful of articles and journal editorials have been published in the early 21st century that explore the notion of IPS either explicitly (Berling, 2015; Bigo & Madsen, 2011; Bigo & Walker, 2007a, 2007b; Huysmans & Nogueira, 2012, 2016; Kessler, 2009, 2012; van der Ree, 2014) or implicitly (Albert, 2016; Albert, Buzan, & Zürn, 2013; Brenner & Elden, 2009; Leander, 2011; Nabers, 2015). Other researchers have brought together edited volumes with a vast heterogeneity of IPS perspectives (Basaran, Bigo, Guittet, & Walker, 2016b; Guillaume & Bilgin, 2017b). While IPS has been an extremely successful endeavor, most of all by providing a much-needed institutional home for non-traditional IR research, the field still falls somewhat

¹ The section was founded by Didier Bigo and Martin Heisler in 2001, the journal by Bigo and R. B. J. Walker in 2006 (Bigo, 2016; Huysmans & Nogueira, 2016). In this article "IPS" is used as an abbreviation for the field, while *IPS* in italics refers to the journal.

short of the (admittedly ambitious) program outlined by leading IPS scholars (Bigo & Walker, 2007a, 2007b; Huysmans & Nogueira 2012; Lisle, Squire, & Doty, 2017).

There are three primary areas in which there is room for IPS to improve. First, IPS still has to make good on its promise of becoming a truly global field of research. Despite its powerful critique of mainstream IR, much IPS scholarship is still oriented toward the two founding categories of IR, sovereignty and anarchy, thereby limiting theoretical innovation to a certain degree. Jens Bartelson has thus called for a shift “from the international to the global.” IPS scholars need to “gauge what is at stake in the politics of globality” (Bartelson, 2018, p. 34). Moreover, in spite of prominent critiques of Eurocentrism voiced from within IPS (Bilgin, 2009; Ansems de Vries, Coleman, Rosenow, Tazzioli, & Vázquez, 2017; Grovogui, 2009; Moshirzadeh, 2009; Rojas, 2016; Seth, 2009, 2013; Thakur, 2015), much of IPS, like sociology (Alatas & Sinha, 2017; Bhambra, 2007a, 2007b, 2016; Bhambra & de Sousa Santos, 2017; Go, 2016), retains a focus on “the West,” both in terms of cases studied and thinkers drawn on.

Second, IPS’s incorporation of sociological theory has remained selective, in at least two respects. To begin with, IR research that draws on sociological or social theory tends to favor a limited number of theorists (particularly the French theorists Michel Foucault, Bruno Latour, Luc Boltanski, and Pierre Bourdieu, and the German Niklas Luhmann). In addition, at least at times IR scholars’ reading of certain theoretical approaches has been partial, or even misleading (on the example of Max Weber, see Morcillo Laiz & Schlichte, 2016a). Overall, IPS has been rather selective in its import from the so-called “canon” of sociological theory (which itself is far from unproblematic, see Connell, 1997).

Third, while scholarship within IPS directs attention to alternative conceptions of politics (e.g., de Goede & Sullivan, 2016; Lisle, 2006, 2016), much research in the field still proceeds without an explicit theoretical conception of the political. Drawing on the work of Ernesto Laclau, but

also tying in with feminist notions of politics, it becomes possible to formulate a broad conceptualization of the political as referring to power struggles over the production of the social, instead of a more narrow understanding of politics as a separate realm or site (the state). Having said that, our criticism of IPS has to be qualified at least in four respects. First, IPS as a field is highly heterogeneous, and its boundaries—in particular with related fields, such as IR feminism, for instance—are blurry. Thus, any attempt to define the boundaries of the field is bound to fail and to attract (justified) criticism, given many IPS scholars’ suspicion toward any unavoidably political and exclusionary boundary-drawing practices (see Aalberts, 2018). This unavoidably hampers any attempt to make claims about the field as a whole. Second, while the focus here is on IPS, the above-mentioned critique certainly is not limited to it. In fact, IPS is arguably among the most self-reflective fields within IR. Thus, third, almost all of the above-mentioned points have been formulated from within IPS, and many of them contributed to the emergence of the field in the first place. What is presented here is not so much criticism of IPS, but rather a discussion of points IPS scholars themselves have raised in regards to IR that unavoidably also apply to at least some of the scholarship done within the field itself. For example, the field is still in the process of working through the critique raised by feminist, de- and postcolonial perspectives, and how to escape the grip of andro- and Eurocentrism (Ansems de Vries et al., 2017; Çapan & Zarakol, 2018; Muppidi, 2018; Rojas, 2016; True & Hewitt, 2018). Fourth, current developments within the field suggest that a shift toward what could be called a “second generation” of IPS is under way.² The assumption of

² While there is no strict dividing line between the first and second generations, what we call the “first generation” was dominated by the work of Bigo and Walker and was later consolidated by the work of Jef Huysmans and João Pontes Nogueira as editors of the IPS journal.

editorial responsibilities for IPS by Debbie Lisle, Vickie Squire, and Roxanne Doty in 2017 marks somewhat of a maturation of second-generation IPS, characterized by a vigorous push forward of an agenda that focuses on the very conduct of IPS research, a renewed support for dialogue between IR and sociology, and a reinvigoration of a postfoundational stance toward theorizing the global (Lisle et al., 2017).

The remainder of this article is divided into three sections: an overview of the field, focusing on its historical development and different theoretical approaches and methodologies employed, as well as substantive topics; a (highly sympathetic) insider's critique of the project, discussing to what extent IPS has reached the goals it has set itself; and, based on this critical evaluation, a brief outline agenda for further development of the field. For lack of a better term, this vision of the future field has been dubbed Global Political Sociology (GPS) (following, among others, Kessler, 2012), to denote the (continued) need to move beyond "the international" and the still overbearing focus on Western theory. The conclusion summarizes what has been achieved and where to go next.

International Political Sociology

IPS represents a relatively new field of study within and beyond the discipline of IR. It was established in the 2000s, finding its institutional frame through the founding of an International Studies Association (ISA) section in 2001, and its journal in 2006.³ From the start, IPS was conceived as an alternative to more conventional, "mainstream," or traditional

³ The recent foundation of the book series "Routledge Studies in International Political Sociology", edited by Tugba Basaran, Didier Bigo, Emmanuel-Pierre Guittet, and Jef Huysmans, is an additional sign of the increasing institutionalization of the field.

approaches to international studies. Proponents of IPS sought to bring (primarily) sociological approaches into a discipline which had previously been dominated by (American-oriented) political science thinking, led by a widespread positivist orientation, and rather narrowly focused on anarchy, sovereignty, and the state as a unitary, rational actor (Bigo, 2016; Bigo & Walker, 2007a, 2007b; Guzzini, 2017).⁴

IPS was proposed in response to the pressing need to better understand growing and complex global, transnational, and local–global relations that persistently refuse to be categorized into well-established disciplinary strands, and unconditionally defy mono-causality, direct experience, and any form of naturalism or materialism. Political discourses surrounding terrorism and the “war on terror,” the world financial crisis, Brexit, the rise of what is all too rashly dubbed “populism” (see Stengel, MacDonald, & Nabers, 2019), as well as accompanying developments in the United States under Trump, in Turkey under Erdoğan, Russia under Putin, or the Philippines under Duterte (to randomly pick just a few out of a wide variety of cases), have driven home the point that international relations can no longer be narrowly conceived in terms of inter-national geo-political associations and interactions. Nor can they be adequately understood with the mere addition of “non-state actors” and/or “domestic factors” as further “independent” or “intervening” variables in a set of causal factors. In spite of sustained critical efforts to question the conventional approaches to international relations from a number of alternative theories and approaches, the social origins, dimensions, and consequences of global politics at various scales and levels suggest

⁴ This is also reflected in the IPS Section Charter, according to which the section seeks to supplement “traditional” approaches to international studies by directing attention to the “social and cultural dimensions of international studies, broadly conceived”. See the Charter of the IPS Section.

that it is time to break the established disciplinary boundaries. The emergence of IPS as a subdiscipline of IR represents a very welcome development in this respect.

IPS scholarship is marked by three main characteristics. First, IPS has shown an increased interest in bringing in a genuinely sociological perspective on the international (Albert et al., 2013). As a result, IPS has been “consciously envisaged as a trans-disciplinary project” (Basaran, Bigo, Guittet, & Walker, 2016a), which is not necessarily limited to sociology but also seeking to incorporate insights from related fields—like geography, anthropology, or history—and to break up the dominance of political science in the field (this transdisciplinarity is most clearly visible in the contributions to Guillaume & Bilgin, 2017b). Based on the declared aim to foster dialogue between IR, social theory, and sociology (Huysmans & Nogueira, 2012), numerous scholars have applied insights from sociological theory to international phenomena. For example, IPS has featured forums on Michel Foucault, Pierre Bourdieu, Niklas Luhmann, and Bruno Latour,⁵ and individual articles and books have brought the work of numerous other thinkers to bear on various “international” problems, among them sociologists Jean Baudrillard (Malmvig, 2014), Henri Lefebvre (Brenner & Elden, 2009; Davies, 2016), and Zygmunt Bauman (Lyon, 2010), as well as philosophers Giorgio Agamben (Huysmans, 2008), Walter Benjamin (Pusca, 2009), Jacques Derrida (Arfi, 2010; Onuf, 2010; Vaughan-Williams, 2008), Judith Butler (Gregory, 2015; Sjoberg, 2012; Weber, 2010), Jacques Rancière (Shapiro, 2011), and Carl Schmitt (Doty, 2007).

Second, IPS is concerned about traditional IR’s focus on “the international,” narrowly understood as inter-national. Its proponents have criticized the focus on states, sovereignty,

⁵ See the contributions to IPS issues 2(3) and 4(2), both on Foucault; 5(3), on Bourdieu; 3(1), on Luhmann; and 7(3), on Latour.

and anarchy as well as attempts to exclude studies that do not fit into such a constricted understanding of what IR should be about (Bigo & Walker, 2007b). Closely related to this point is the question of how “the international” should be studied. As Bigo and Walker aptly observe, “the discipline encourages the assumption that the problem of the international refers to a realm of reality with clear boundaries about which the discipline can generate substantial claims to knowledge” (Bigo & Walker, 2007b, p. 728). Consequently, one important feature of IPS is the combination of questioning prevailing notions and a theoretical and methodological pluralism, while maintaining a broadly reflexive orientation (Huysmans & Nogueira, 2012). In contrast to Political Sociology as a separate subfield of both political science and sociology, much of which focuses on rather “traditional” subjects such as state–society relations, civil society, party politics, elections, or public opinion (see Amenta, Nash, & Scott, 2012; Botelho, 2014; Janoski, Alford, Hicks, & Schwartz, 2005), the bulk of research in IPS has a distinctly post-positivist or critical outlook. Both the journal and the section have been critical of the founding categories of IR— anarchy and sovereignty — from the outset. While the notion of the international had served as an unquestioned symbol of an IR disciplinary identity since the writings of Hans Morgenthau and Kenneth Waltz, the existence of the sovereign state as its crucial foundational yardstick had more or less been taken for granted by generations of IR scholars. In contrast, IPS was established against efforts to patrol “the boundaries of the international” (Bigo & Walker, 2007a; 2007b, p. 728), that is, to distinguish between appropriate and inappropriate topics for IR. The field was designed to “paint a different picture of the international” (Leander, 2011, p. 294) and has stimulated reflexive scholarship on the difficult notion of the state, generating a sense of reading sociology more thoroughly. As Guzzini has rightly pointed out, the majority of studies in IPS share the theoretical commitment to a relational social ontology and a focus on process (Guzzini, 2017). Not

surprisingly, practices (Bueger, 2014; Bueger & Gadinger, 2015; Nexon & Neumann, 2017; Solomon & Steele, 2017) and discourses (Chandler, 2013; Holland, 2009; Nabers, 2015; Nymalm, 2013; Oke, 2009) are central theoretical concepts in much work within IPS.

In the years after the formal launch of the journal and section, sociological insights were ostentatiously complemented by claims from political theory, aiming to “creatively rework the modern categorical dichotomies of state and society, sovereignty and market, national and international, the social and political, nation and state, global and international, and community and society” (Huysmans & Nogueira, 2012, p. 1). In a strict withdrawal from modernist agendas that tend to categorize the world into binaries and take solid identities (e.g., the state as a monolith) as a point of departure, IPS sought help in what had quite bluntly become labeled postmodernism, poststructuralism, or, over-simplistically, French theory, employing, for instance, the Foucauldian notions of “regimes of truth” and “knowledge formation” (Huysmans & Nogueira, 2012), Jean-Luc Nancy’s concept of an “inoperative community” (Shindo, 2012), as well the array of notions available from Pierre Bourdieu, such as “practices, field, habitus, practice, symbolic power/violence and reflexivity” (Leander, 2011, p. 295, italics in original; also Bigo, 2011). The reference to literatures outside IR has become characteristic of the IPS mode of theorizing the disciplinary limits. Other typical examples include Bülent Diken and Carsten Bagge Laustsen, who draw on Hardt and Negri in their account of an “omni-crisis,” and on Agamben when they argue that “the exception signals the crisis of the distinction and the correspondence between membership and inclusion” (Diken & Laustsen, 2005, pp. 68, 161).⁶ Furthermore, Xavier Guillaume (2011) and others draw on the

⁶ These analyses might be traced back to Carl Schmitt’s *Ausnahmezustand* (“state of exception”), which refers to a temporal interruption of the order of things; see, for example, Marchart (2007, pp. 52–55).

concept of the everyday to better understand the international as a practice and a process, while Michele Acuto (2014) illustrates how Bruno Latour's work on assemblage can be employed in order to better understand the cosmopolitics of the mundane.

A third aspect that characterizes the first almost two decades of IPS theorizing and needs to be briefly mentioned here refers to IPS's commitment to "a more internationalized understanding of what it means to study international problems" (Bigo & Walker, 2007a, p. 2). Above all, this means to question IR's Eurocentric and androcentric view, to include "non-Western" perspectives (a term that itself is far from unproblematic, see Bilgin, 2009) as well as work by non-male scholars. This also includes the demand to work toward the decolonization of the discipline (Shilliam, 2011). Each editorial statement of IPS (Huysmans & Nogueira, 2016), and numerous other articles, have critically engaged Eurocentrism (Bilgin, 2009; Seth, 2013) and/or grappled with the questions of how we could overcome it and what a non-Eurocentric IR could look like (Çapan & Zarakol, 2018; Grovogui, 2009; Rojas, 2016; Seth, 2009).⁷ With its acceptance of articles in non-English languages and its commitment to "stylistic pluralism," the journal has also taken practical steps to break up Western dominance (Huysmans & Nogueira, 2012, p. 2).

Areas for Further Development

Despite IPS undoubtedly being a success story, the field also has significant potential for further development. Thus, while IPS scholars have, much more than their more conventional counterparts in other fields, called for International Relations (IR) to break out from its

⁷ Similar debates exist in sociology (Go, 2013; McLennan, 2003; Wallerstein, 1997).

theoretical and disciplinary limitations, this remains very much a work in progress, including much of the research done in IPS itself. Most notably, because IPS emerged as a field from within the ISA (Guillaume & Bilgin, 2017a), much IPS research unavoidably retains a specific IR focus in its subject matter. This manifests itself mainly through a continued concern with the state and sovereignty, a somewhat selective or limited incorporation of sociological theory, and a narrow conception of the political as a distinct sphere. To be sure, this is not to diminish the exceptional success of IPS scholarship, but only to point out that there is still some potential for future development.

The International and the Global

IPS, if to a lesser extent than conventional IR, needs to continue on its path toward what could be called a global study of the global. This involves two related moves, first from an analysis of the international to a perspective on the global, and second the transformation of IPS itself into a global endeavor.

To begin with, IPS emerged as a field of study from within the (American) ISA, and as such remains closely tied to IR as a discipline. In its most obvious fashion, this manifests itself as a default focus on the study of Western governments and societies, with a strong focus on the United States. Here, IPS needs to continue to broaden its geographical scope. Beyond questions of case selection, and more fundamentally, the move toward a study of the global also means that IPS needs to continue its efforts to rid itself of IR's traditional focus on the international. Proponents of IPS have been vocal in their critique of IR's basic assumptions, including its focus on the state, sovereignty, and anarchy, its Eurocentric bias, and its gendered discourses. Also, numerous studies in IPS have themselves pointed to the need to transcend IR, to reach out to other disciplines and become a truly transdisciplinary endeavor. However,

one could legitimately argue that IPS still remains at least partly trapped within the disciplinary boundaries of IR, as it clearly emphasizes IR as its point of departure. Thus, Basaran et al. (2016a) claim that “International political sociology began by considering the most influential forms of international relations scholarship as both object and subject of critique” and first and foremost focused on the “sites through which the institutionalized discipline of international relations came under forceful questioning from within.” However, it is important in this context to stress again that the need to move beyond a narrow focus on “the international” has been stated by proponents of IPS themselves (Bigo & Walker, 2007b). It is important to emphasize at this point that moving beyond a narrow focus on the international is not intended to downplay the significance of sovereignty and borders within global politics. However, the dominant IR logic of inside and outside, hierarchy and anarchy, negates that “order grows out of disorder, harmony out of conflict, and it does so by means of a sublimation of otherness,” situating “the metaphysical unity of the state in opposition to its outside, its ethical negation” (Bartelson, 1995, pp. 24, 28). For IPS to “replace old and supposedly obsolete accounts of international relations by a global and unified knowledge about world politics explaining global society, along with global economy, global security, and global governance” (Bigo & Walker, 2007a, p. 5), as the “founding fathers”⁸ of IPS as an institutionalized subfield of IR anticipated, IPS needs to develop novel concepts of the social, the political, and the global by synthesizing them into an approach that no longer takes

⁸ It should be noted that while Bigo, Heisler, and Walker christened and institutionalized the field, much of what is now referred to as IPS already existed as “critical” and “post-postivist” approaches in IR. In that sense, the field has many more founding fathers—and, not to forget, mothers, like J. Ann Tickner (1988), Carol Cohn (1987), Cynthia Enloe (2000), and others.

sovereignty and anarchy as its foundational principles. In ethical terms, theorizations that leave the state behind as a core analytical category need to be shifted into new terrains.

For “a political sociology of problems that are identified by the overloaded term international” (Bigo & Walker, 2007a, p. 4) to thrive, it might indeed be time to transcend the term and acknowledge the in principle global implications of every political act. While IPS must be praised for shifting IR’s focus increasingly to the relevance of practices and the study of discourse, as well as for humanizing the disembodied characteristics of concepts like power, system, and institution (Albert & Buzan, 2013), it still needs to leave the familiar terrain of the international and engage in the study of the global more thoroughly. This path was sketched by Jef Huysmans and João Pontes Nogueira when they took over the editorship of the IPS journal in 2012, shifting the focus “from the globe to world, in the plural” (Huysmans & Nogueira, 2012; also Walker, 2010), and was mapped again when in 2017 Debbie Lisle took over as editor and stressed “the plurality of global life-worlds” (Lisle et al., 2017, p. 1) as the journal’s future focus.

From the start, pursuing new critical avenues for IR research has been a core objective of IPS (Bigo & Walker, 2007b), but the field still has a long way to go to acknowledge the global dimensions of politics delineated by work such as Walker’s (in particular Walker, 2010), in which he describes how spatiotemporal boundaries are contingently established and radical political measures implemented. It also needs to recognize the increasing fragility of borders, the non-existence of inside and outside, its mutual constitution, infiltration and undecidability, as depicted by Bigo and Walker (2007b) in their usage of the Möbius ribbon to deconstruct the sovereign authority of the modern state.

One example of what a truly global political sociology could look like is the work by Mathias Albert (2016), who conceptualizes politics as world politics, and sees any form of society as

essentially global in character. An illustration that springs to mind is the global character of domestic migration and urbanization in China, which has crucial implications for global labor and production chains, resource flows, investment, social security, the environment, and climate change. Against this background, international politics (the international) cannot simply be engaged as a mirror image of domestic politics (the national). In the past, notions of legitimate sociopolitical order and authority have commonly been regarded as the normative and empirical benchmark for politics within nation-states. In contrast, the lack of the same benchmark prevails as the characteristic feature of politics between nation-states. What is overlooked in such an account is that the international and the national are mutually implicated in the global. Taken together, they reinforce our basic understanding about where legitimate political authority is present or absent.

In addition, IPS needs to become global with respect to the way it approaches its subject. The fact that much of the critique of IR's Eurocentric bias stems from within the field notwithstanding, the exorcism of Eurocentrism in, and the decolonization of, IPS itself also remains a work in progress. There are two main areas in which IPS (let alone IR more generally) should continue its efforts. First, IPS needs to diversify its theoretical toolkit, including more non-Western thinkers (Acharya & Buzan, 2010). While non-Western sources are indeed often mobilized in IPS for the purpose of a feminist or postcolonial analysis and critique of "Western" practices, Eurocentrism, androcentrism, traditional masculinity, etc. (e.g., Agathangelou & Turcotte, 2010; Nair, 2007; Shepherd, 2010; Weber, 2016; Wibben, 2010), the sociological theory IPS regularly draws on is still largely limited to the Western canon. To be sure, we do not exempt ourselves from this critique, nor is the discipline of sociology itself not plagued by Eurocentrism and androcentrism (Alatas & Sinha, 2017; Bhambra, 2007a, 2007b; Bhambra & de Sousa Santos, 2017). Nevertheless, while there are plenty of references

to Foucault, Bourdieu, and others in IPS, studies that apply, say, Ibn Khaldun, José Rizal, or indigenous thinkers from the Americas to political problems of global character are few in number.

For instance, Rizal's discussion of emancipation could be a valuable source for Welsh-School inspired critical security studies (Alatas, 2017), and early Confucian Classics may be drawn on to recontextualize Western notions of power and agency (Chan, 2009; Hui, 2018). The multifarious indigenous discourses on social relations, power, and leadership can in an equal way help to overcome the dichotomies between human beings and nature, the rational and the irrational, civilization and barbarism, empiricism and construction, dualism and monism, as well as universalism and particularism (Akiwowo, 1999). Building on Neta Crawford's groundbreaking work in bringing indigenous thought into IR, the homogenization of aboriginal people can be replaced by an emphasis on difference, complexity, contradictions within societies, and multifaceted relationships between humans and nature (Crawford, 2007; also Katzenstein, 2010). Acknowledging this complexity and encouraging IPS scholars to engage in anthropological work outside the "West" might eventually generate a better understanding of how the "colonial difference" (Çapan & Zarakol, 2018, pp. 127–129) has in the past prevented theories from travelling from the periphery of social theorizing to its Anglo-American core. Again, this is not to say that IPS as a whole has ignored non-Western theory altogether. This is certainly not the case, as studies drawing on Edward Said (see issue 36(1) of the journal *Millennium*), Ashis Nandy (e.g., Pasha, 2010) or ubuntu philosophers (Ngcoya, 2015) demonstrate. However, IPS would do well to continue its move toward a diversification of its theoretical pool.

The second area on which IPS should focus in order to overcome Eurocentrism is that of theoretical and methodological decolonization (Barkawi, 2016; Shilliam, 2011; Smith, 2013).

That includes the contextualization of Western theory (Alatas & Sinha, 2017), a questioning of implicit Eurocentric bias in allegedly universally applicable concepts, such as modernity (Quijano, 2007; Mignolo, 2007), and the study also of historical and contemporary developments in the West in their global context (Bhabra, 2007a, 2007b, 2016). To pick just two examples, this might include: the interconnection of colonization, racialization, and urbanization and their global implications (Tedesco & Bagelman, 2017; Muppidi, 2018); or the relevance of the sociological concept of performativity for the economic problem of welfare services in the Syrian war and its repercussions for the classic IR concepts of anarchy, sovereignty, and the state (Ciro Martínez & Eng, 2017). Moreover, studies that ostentatiously propose alternative decolonial projects as a way of studying global politics (Rojas, 2016) need to take broader space in IPS and push the critical potential of the field into novel areas.

The Social and Sociology

The second point of critique is concerned with IPS's concept of the social and IPS's reality as a transdisciplinary endeavor, drawing in particular on sociology and social theory. While central figures in IPS emphasize the need to move beyond the narrow confines of IR toward IPS as a transdisciplinary undertaking, it remains to some extent still located within the traditional frame that IR provides. IPS is a broad tent, and deliberately so, but the consequence is that it has become (or been from the start?) somewhat of a catch-all term for any research that is not positivist yet remains sociological. While the existence of a forum and label for such approaches without doubt is to be welcomed, IPS defines itself through delineation from "traditional" IR. As Huysmans and Nogueira have aptly observed, IPS is best understood not as a coherent school but as a "signifier that connects people sharing a disposition toward traversing familiar, institutionalized repertoires of analysis" (Huysmans & Nogueira, 2016, p.

299). From the perspective of Essex School discourse theory (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001), which constitutes but one example of a comprehensive ontology of the social, one could argue that IPS is a hegemonic project, and its success depends in part at least on the emptiness of the signifier “IPS,” as this allows various subjects with diverse theoretical, methodological, and other preferences to identify with it.

Providing an institutional home to non-mainstream IR research is an important achievement. However, it also has a downside, namely that the specifically sociological in IPS sometimes gets lost. For instance, the *International Studies Encyclopedia* (Denemark, 2010) includes two chapters with IPS in the title—Alejandro Colás’s (2010) chapter on “The International Political Sociology of Empire,” and Luis Lobo-Guerrero’s (2010) on “The International Political Sociology of Risk”—neither of which actually defines what IPS is and what distinguishes it from other approaches. Moreover, the incorporation of approaches from sociology has been largely limited to a few select theories. While Bourdieu, Foucault, Habermas (e.g., Deitelhoff & Müller, 2005; Risse, 2000), Luhmann, Latour, and perhaps lately Boltanski by now feature prominently in IR, other sociological classics have largely been neglected. Similarly, Guillaume and Bilgin (2017a) have observed that a specific understanding of what IPS is or should be tends to prevail in both IPS and IR, one that is marked in particular by the works of Foucault and Bourdieu. For instance, studies that draw on Emile Durkheim, Norbert Elias (but see Linklater, 2004), Nancy Fraser, Karl Mannheim, Talcott Parsons, Georg Simmel (but see Kessler, 2016), Herbert Marcuse, Alfred Schütz, or Ferdinand Tönnies, to name just a few, are still rare.⁹ Yet, it is here that questions of social transformation (Elias, Marx), solidarity

⁹ However, it should be noted that Oliver Kessler (2016) has begun exploring what Simmel has to say about IR, and Barry Hindess (2009) critically discusses Comte in his piece on the use of world society as a concept.

(Durkheim), holistic development (Durkheim, Weber, Elias, Parsons), the everyday (Schütz, Goffman), or the anthropological foundations of human behavior (Weber, Marcuse) could be further studied in their global dimensions.

Thus, Bigo and Walker's statement, formulated years ago, still applies (if to a lesser extent that it did originally): "The influences of Durkheim, Marx, and Weber, for example, are not difficult to identify among many of the classic texts of international relations theory, but discussion of the importance of such influences remains relatively muted" (Bigo & Walker, 2007a, p. 2). Their critique of the oversimplification of theoretical approaches has not become obsolete, either. And finally, Walker's argument that "there is hardly a theoretical orientation in the modern human sciences that has not been chastised for its conservative bias, for its neglect of structural change and its consequent reification of the status quo" (Walker, 1993, p. 113), made in the early 1990s, also remains pertinent to IPS theorizing (see Nabers, 2015). Even the reception of Max Weber, often cited in IR, has been partial and often based on misunderstandings of his core concepts (Morcillo Laiz & Schlichte, 2016a; see also Morcillo Laiz & Schlichte, 2016b) or focused primarily on certain aspects, like his work on ideal-types or his notion of science (e.g., Jackson, 2010). Equally, Marx's reception has been so selective that David Chandler (2010, p. 205) muses about his apparently being so "indigestible that he has been a constant mystery to the discipline." To be sure, this is not to say that IPS as a whole does not draw on sociological theory. That would be a gross misrepresentation of the field. Rather, the point is that there is significant potential in sociological theory that remains untapped. Moreover, with the exception of the Routledge Handbook on International Political Sociology (Guillaume & Bilgin, 2017a), in which a wide assortment of themes and methods are presented, transdisciplinarity beyond sociology and social theory remains limited.

The Political

A third point concerns the notion of politics and the political prevalent in the majority of IPS scholarship. Much research in IR conceives of politics as a separate realm of social activity, an understanding that some consider too narrow for IPS as a whole. The tradition in IR to differentiate the political from other domains of the social is connected with Hans Morgenthau's early theoretical efforts (Morgenthau & Thompson, 1985; for a prioritization of the political, see Walker, 2010), which have been utilized by IPS scholars to demonstrate that the rich tradition of classical realism resonates with contemporary postcolonial approaches that critique the imperial logic of liberalism (Abraham, 2017). Outside IR, this differentiation was prominently introduced by Carl Schmitt, on whom Morgenthau draws to isolate the political from other domains of the social, such as the juridical and the economic sphere. Politics is in this context often reduced to its organizing principles, to the process and form of politics, thus to a pre-given and predetermined form. To employ Heideggerian vocabulary, it points to the ontic dimension of society, to the always only temporarily fruitful effort of lashing and thereby grounding society, by codifying principles, norms, rules, institutions, etc.

Similarly, some studies in IPS treat the political as a separate sphere, including approaches that otherwise have much to commend them. For instance, Albert (2016, p. 1) "takes politics to be a functionally differentiated realm of modern society," and Kessler (2009, 2012), in his attempt to develop the notion of Global Political Sociology (GPS), describes world society as temporally differentiated systems, with the political system being functionally differentiated from other systems, like the legal and economic systems. While the Luhmann-inspired systems approach does indeed offer an escape from the too-narrow focus on the inter-state system (Kessler, 2012), treating politics—or, rather, the "political subsystem" (Luhmann, 1982, p.

132)—as a separate realm might at times risk the marginalization, if unintended, of politics outside the spheres of the political system. In contrast, one might argue, echoing feminist critiques of the public/private dichotomy (see Peterson, 2000), that our understanding of the political should not be limited to seeing it as a distinct realm. Although the concept of world society, as understood by Luhmann, Albert, and Kessler, among others, unveils the fundamental flaw of the anarchy–sovereignty distinction by showing that social processes are irreducible to inter-national flows, thus moving IPS closer to GPS, it may be more productive to shift attention to the political institution of every social subjectivity. This prompts a broader understanding of the political as constitutive of the social; that is, the political establishes the fundamental principles on which a society rests and converges. Similar to feminist approaches, this is to understand the political as referring to the process of the “radical institution” (Laclau, 1994, p. 4, italics in original) of social relations, the process by which the social as such (norms, values, cultures, etc.) is produced in power-laden struggles, independent of the specific site in which these struggles take place.

To avoid any misunderstandings, the aim is not to exclude a Luhmann-inspired GPS but only to say that acknowledging the political constitution of the social might be a fruitful theoretical alternative. To some extent, this means to live with a theoretical tension between different understandings of politics and the political within GPS as it is envisioned. Still, conceptual pluralism has two key strengths. First, it avoids any boundary-patrol exercises distinguishing valid understandings of the global/political/social from invalid ones (Bigo and Walker, 2007b). Such calls could only ever be formulated out of an over-estimation of one’s own epistemological footing. Put simply, no one knows whose conception of the political corresponds to reality (presuming for a second that that we follow ontological realism), and both perspectives might lead to valuable insights. Moreover, it is questionable to what extent

a Global Political Sociology worthy of its name can do without Luhmann. Second, the tension might be more semantic than substantive. For this conception of the political constitution of the social would also include the functional differentiation of society into subsystems. That is, it would conceive of the “political subsystem” itself as a sedimented discursive practice, the contingent result of past discursive struggles. This is not necessarily incompatible with a systems-theoretical approach. After all, Luhmann himself was quite clear that the emergence of the political subsystem as a separate realm of activity is the result of a process of functional differentiation that distinguishes modern societies from others rather than an essential feature of any society ever (Luhmann, 1982, 2000).

Since social relations attain their meaning through political acts of delimiting them from what they are not, it is possible to advance a critical angle on the subject matter of social scientific research, emphasizing the normative aspect inherent to knowledge produced by theorizing and analyzing social relations. For instance, in her book *The International Political Sociology of Security*, Trine Villumsen Berling (2015), by situating herself within the IR practice turn and explicitly drawing on Bourdieu’s sociology, illustrates how the interaction between the scientific community and the practice of European security policy brings new actors, such as think tanks, into the focus of international politics. What she calls “theory-type agency” elucidates how theory can be employed in social struggles, and it is precisely at this juncture where there is potential for future research, that is, in investigating the dynamics of “hegemonic struggles” in the study of global politics.

Moreover, both the politics of the everyday and the domain of marginalized discourses, formerly treated as existing outside the sphere of “hard” global politics, fall into the realm of the political. In second-generation IPS work, examples can be drawn from the scrutiny of popular culture, which may shed further light on how ontological security is routinely

produced (e.g., Innes, 2017) as well as on how geopolitical “truths” are subliminally articulated through allegedly innocent sources such as comics (Shim, 2017), and finally on how purportedly historical truths can be deconstructed by employing alternative historical sources such as film (Philpott, 2017). In contrast, erecting solid, objective and therefore unquestionable epistemological foundations necessarily implies the exclusion of alternatives. Arguments can be obtained from Husserl’s and Heidegger’s phenomenological discussions, and stretch into Derrida’s and Lévinas’s philosophy of the ethical Other. IPS as critical theory needs to inquire into structurally veiled power relations and offer alternatives to the established order. However, IPS must also unveil the intricacies of the notion of “critique,” if it presupposes some standard or foundation from which this critique is formulated. Most significantly, therefore, IPS must address the artificial and belying view of social order as a fixed state of affairs that is dominant in positivist social sciences. In Foucault’s tradition, normalization and reification are principal constitutive elements of “disciplinary power” (also Edkins, 1999, ch. 3; Foucault, 1977). Discipline, according to Foucault, generates a new form of individuality for subjects, which enables them to achieve their tasks within society. Foucault-inspired research in IR has, for example, pointed to the opaqueness of procedures in global anti-terror campaigns, in which medieval practices of truth construction are sometimes transferred into today’s hegemonic practices of the “war on terror” (Lang, 2008).

It is in dissecting the ubiquitous form of Foucauldian power that IPS can perhaps add the most value. And here is also where the further development of a normative theory, of ontological and epistemological questions, in IPS might start. To this end, theories that take the “political constitution of society” (Laclau, 1996; Nabers, 2015) further into the realm of the global must continuously be enriched. The precedence that the political takes in GPS reminds us of the impossibility of final grounding, but it also emphasizes the imperative of striving toward the

aim of completion. Societal principles, the ontic contents of a society, are politically produced by society for itself. These principles are contingent, and any pretense of final closure must be witnessed with caution, for it is ideology that is veiled in the mantle of purported objectivity. Society will inescapably remain incomplete; otherwise politics would lose its substance and direction.

Linking the political constitution of society with a critical reworking of the nexus between the international and the global, new questions may be formulated, for instance: “How might the narratives of nationhood be retold, the founding moments of a state reconstituted, or its fundamental documents reinterpreted?” If there is no beyond of the political, counternarratives against reifications of ethnic and indigenous subjects may be continuously formulated, and diachronic accounts of colonial histories and narratives of nationhood may be strengthened.

Toward a Global Political Sociology

As noted in the previous sections, IPS in its current state opens up a number of paths for further refinement. IPS’s future trajectory should therefore be toward what, following Kessler (2012), may be called a Global Political Sociology (GPS). Although it shifts the focus to the global and the political constitution of the social, GPS must not be misunderstood as a replacement for IPS, as many of the issues described here have also been on the agenda of IPS. Rather, IPS should transcend its current state and transform itself into GPS. While building on the existing scholarship in this emerging subfield, GPS would be marked by three features: (a) it would be inspired by genuine sociological, anthropological, philosophical, and neighboring perspectives in the humanities; (b) it would rest on an understanding of the social as politically

constituted; and (c) it would conceptualize the social as fundamentally global, in that it is spatially dispersed and temporarily contingent.

First, while in this sense IPS takes IR as a point of departure, GPS pursues an alternative path: it employs insights from disciplines foreign to IR—both Western and non-Western—illustrating that specific localities have implications for the global as a whole. GPS will therefore go beyond merely adding “the social” to IR, bringing IR to sociology, or expanding “the social” to “the global.” In this way, GPS will shift the focus not only by starting outside of IR to analyze problems with global implications, but also by bringing issues that are commonly seen as of no concern to IR into the study of global politics. This perspective does not necessarily go beyond what some authors in IPS have called for. However, it clearly privileges world society over the society of states. Systems theory in general (Helmig & Kessler, 2007; Kessler, 2012) and Albert’s (2016) work provide good examples for a transdisciplinarity situated beyond IR, sociology, and other neighboring disciplines in the humanities and social sciences. While this strand of work argues that world society is entirely constituted through communication, GPS can further explore how subjectivities, truths, and power structures are constituted through what we call the political. Examples for such work might also include the combination of Western with non-Western thought, as exhibited, for instance, by Brian Mello in his combination of Michel Foucault with Frantz Fanon to illustrate how ISIS articulates itself publicly as an “anticolonial revolutionary regime” (Mello, 2018, p. 142).

The second fundamental feature of a global political sociology is its twisting of the hierarchical prioritization of the social over the political in Western thought. GPS stresses contingency instead of causality, for it is precisely the moment of contingency and undecidability that has been labeled the moment of the political (Marchart, 2007; Nabers, 2015). Especially in the

francophone and hispanophone world, the nexus between the two words has led to an extensive renovation of political theory and political philosophy. Names like Alain Badiou, Ernesto Laclau, Claude Lefort, Chantal Mouffe, and Jean-Luc Nancy are prominent in these developments. In contrast to the conception of the political as a separate realm, the political—as it is understood here—brings in an ontological dimension. What is highlighted by the above-mentioned thinkers is that society cannot be conceived of having any ultimate foundation outside the (discursive) practices that constantly (re-)produce and transform it. Seen this way, society is contingent, always in flux, never fully fixed or finished; it is subject to, and a temporary outcome of, on-going political struggles. This is what the “political constitution of society” refers to. This is an ontological feature of all societies, which plays out in specific, context-dependent political struggles at the ontic level. It is the political in which subjectivity is differentially instituted, and any foundations, on which global politics is enacted, are produced entirely within the political. Politics, then, circumscribes “a practice of creation, reproduction and transformation of social relations,” which occurs within the sphere of the political horizon (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985, p. 153). Therefore, to speak of ontology in this context is to refer to the construction of a specific social or—more precisely—political ontology. The political is no longer treated as a subsystem of the social but becomes fundamentally constitutive of every social relationship.

The third feature of GPS would be a new understanding of the global. GPS complements IPS’s perspective with a genuinely global standpoint. While “the international” is not completely redundant, it is too limiting and contains a number of normative and ontological biases. Indeed, the “national” and “the international” themselves are particular sociohistorical phenomena that can be investigated within the GPS framework, rather than being taken as natural and apolitically pre-given. It is thus the normative aspect of addressing the

international–global distinction as “a clash between distinct worldviews, each with different ideological implications for how we should approach the world thus construed” (Bartelson, 2018, pp. 33–34). In adopting a global perspective, as well as leaving room for a non-Western perspective, GPS will transcend “the international” as hegemonically understood in IR (Gasper, 2005). It should be clear in all work bearing this new label that it is not (only) the state that exercises power; rather, state power and the exercise of power by human agents are both enacted by the hegemonic structures in which they operate. This picks up on Foucault’s claim that “political theory has never ceased to be obsessed with the person of the sovereign,” and supports his call for a reorientation:

What we need, however, is a political philosophy that isn’t erected around the problem of sovereignty, nor therefore around the problems of law and prohibition. We need to cut off the King’s head: in political theory that has still to be done. (Foucault, 1980, p. 121)

GPS thus calls into question the very idea of monopolized power. Instead, power is permanently contested by other centers of power, and hegemony occurs through the production of subjectivity by certain articulatory practices. From this perspective, the state has no subjectivity apart from the practices it performs, and these practices involve the interaction with many—domestic, transnational, international, and global—actors. As second-generation IPS work has attempted to lay bare, this also applies to all forms of citizenship, which gain new meanings through the transnational circulation of people, which disrupts and eventually dislocates “unmoored traditional or statist notions of citizenship” (Finn, Opatowski, & Momani, 2018, p. 293).

All in all, GPS follows the example set by IPS scholars like Walker, who direct attention to the crucial argument that “as a structure of inclusions and exclusions, the modern international

must itself have a constitutive outside” (Walker, 2010, p. 10). This claim is a fundamental imperative for theorizing global politics. If the issue is what lies beyond a conceptual or discursive limit like the one set by the nation-state, then the answer can only be that it is just one more difference in a system of infinite differences. Then again, the limit between internal and external structure, between “Self” and “Other,” would become impossible to identify, and it becomes clear that mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion are purely artificial and can only be grasped in their global properties. In other words, if the international that has been the nucleus of IR activities for decades impedes our understanding of politics instead of stimulating it (Leander, 2011, p. 296), then alternative ways of theorizing global politics must be explored.

That said, new perspectives on the ethical can be put forward by GPS. Ethics must no longer be understood as pre-given and essentialized or standardized codes of conduct, but as a result of the many and varicolored practices arising from within the political. In a postfoundational and post-positivist orientation that IPS has increasingly espoused in its second decade of scholarly productivity (Lisle et al., 2017, pp. 3–4), the ontological/political horizon never predetermines the actual ontic instantiation of a normative order, but again accentuates its contingency and temporality. Contingency is directly related to the questioning of exclusionary practices that go hand in hand with the erection of seemingly eternal foundations. The ethical rests on “the relationship between what is and what ought to be (between ontology and ethics)” (Laclau, 2000, p. 81; Pin-Fat, 2010, p. 4). This fragile relationship can, however, never be entirely reconciled. As Maja Zehfuss contends: “Law represents the element of calculation. Justice, however, requires the experience of *aporia* . . .” (Zehfuss, 2002, p. 230; more broadly Zehfuss, 2018). Due to the incomplete nature of world society, moral standards must be developed that can do without the illusion of some

predetermined normative foundation, without universalism, and without some hidden human essences that merely need to be discovered. A way out may be found on the basis of accepting a notion of “justice as recognition,” which would “include external recognition of the identity, or identities, constituting any individual or group” (Shapcott, 2001, p. 10).

This also means that, in terms of methods and methodological orientations, GPS wants to be explicitly nonconventional in nature (see the broad overview in Guillaume & Bilgin, 2017b, part III). The concepts of representation and correspondence, which claim that scientific theories refer to an objectively portrayable world that exists independently of our minds, are renounced as logically inconsistent. Method has to be open, nonmechanistic, and first and foremost designed to facilitate and quasi-improve the process of reading and understanding global social complexity. In the Cartesian perspective, method often appears as mechanistically calculated to generate a precise and indubitable picture of the world. A universal method would be able to ascertain precise and fixed foundations and overcome the Cartesian anxiety. Method, understood as universally applicable, does not fit with GPS. Instead, societal totality, universality, essentialism, and final grounding are constantly interrogated. Method and postfoundationalism go hand in hand in this perspective, as feminist and postcolonial scholars have repeatedly maintained by challenging the heterosexual, Western, and neo-colonial attributes of the Cartesian subject. The materiality of the body is replaced by the materiality of gendered discourse in these perspectives; unquestioned foundations, which have produced dichotomous gender constructions over millennia, are substituted by radical performativity. Method, from this stance, is designed as postempiricist, for the search for empirical foundations, which are somehow situated outside of the historically contingent conceptual grid, is seen as futile. The logical consequence of this argument is that the ontological or political level cannot be retrieved in a direct manner, and

no method can be appropriate to capture a ground that is essentially absent. It is only after two decades of IPS scholarship that questions of feminist methodologies have started to become a prominent focus of discussions in the IPS journal, with Linda Åhäll (2018) advancing a feminist methodological approach combining affect and discourse, and Joanna Tidy (2018) aptly elucidating how gendered and racialized coding constitutes specific articulations of masculinity and femininity. It is at this juncture that the connection between the political and global once again comes to the fore, which leads Jacqui True and Sarah Hewitt (2018, p. 90) to conclude that “feminist scholars shift the focus of IR from inter-state relations toward relational agents embedded in gendered and racialised hierarchies.”

In conclusion, a number of questions follow from the insights formulated in this article, that need to be addressed in future research within the field of GPS. What are the main debates in and around global political sociology? How can discourses of nationhood, sovereignty and subjectivity be alternatively recapped from a global perspective? How can counternarratives against reifications of indigenous subjects, as well as the strengthening of diachronic accounts of colonial and national histories, be constructed? How can a modernist agenda that tends to classify the world into binaries be transcended? How can the tensions between cosmopolitanism and communitarianism, universalism and particularism, legitimacy and legislation, humanity and citizenship, inclusion and exclusion, openness and closure be conceptualized from a global perspective? How do people articulate and/or transcend their space, culture, and identity? When and how does the everyday life of people matter on a transnational or global scale? How are order, security, prosperity, equality, and justice being negotiated and/or contested across communal, regional, cultural, racial, class, and national boundaries? How do people, information, market, capital, land, and the state interact under

the conditions of globalization and fragmentation? How do such interactions shape and/or challenge power relations and governance?

Acknowledgements

This paper has profited from discussions with participants in an MA course on “Global Political Sociology” that one of the authors (Stengel) taught at Kiel University in the summer term of 2017.

Further Reading

Balzacq, T., & Baele, S. J. (2017). The third debate and postpositivism. In R. Marlin-Bennett (Ed.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

D’Aoust, A.-M. (2017). IR as a social science/IR as an American social science. In R. Marlin-Bennett (Ed.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

References

Aalberts, T. (2018). International relations and the challenges of interdisciplinarity. In A. Gofas, I. Hamati-Ataya, & N. Onuf (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of the history, philosophy and sociology of international relations* (pp. 311–325). London, U.K.: Sage.

Abraham, K. J. (2017). Making machines: Unlikely resonances between realist and postcolonial thought. *International Political Sociology*, 11(3), 221–238.

Acharya, A., & Buzan, B. (Eds.). (2010). *Non-Western international relations theory: Perspectives on and beyond Asia*. London, U.K.: Routledge.

Acuto, M. (2014). Everyday international relations: Garbage, grand designs, and mundane matters. *International Political Sociology*, 8(4), 345–362.

Agathangelou, A. M., & Turcotte, H. M. (2010). Postcolonial theories and challenges to “first world-ism.” In L. J. Shepherd (Ed.), *Gender matters in global politics* (pp. 44–53). London, U.K.: Routledge.

- Åhäll, L. (2018). Affect as Methodology: Feminism and the Politics of Emotion. *International Political Sociology*, 12(1), 36–52.
- Akiwowo, A. (1999). Indigenous sociologies: Extending the scope of the argument. *International Sociology*, 14(2), 115–138.
- Alatas, S. F. (2017). José Rizal (1861–1896). In S. F. Alatas & V. Sinha (Eds.), *Sociological theory beyond the canon* (pp. 143–170). London, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Alatas, S. F., & Sinha, V. (Eds.). (2017). *Sociological theory beyond the canon*. London, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Albert, M. (2016). *A theory of world politics*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Albert, M., & Buzan, B. (2013). International relations theory and the “social whole”: Encounters and gaps between IR and sociology. *International Political Sociology*, 7(2), 117–135.
- Albert, M., Buzan, B., & Zürn, M. (2013). *Bringing sociology to international relations: World politics as differentiation theory*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Amenta, E., Nash, K., & Scott, A. (Eds.). (2012). *The Wiley-Blackwell companion to political sociology*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ansems de Vries, L., Coleman, L. M., Rosenow, D., Tazzioli, M., & Vázquez, R. (2017). Collective discussion: Fracturing politics (or, how to avoid the tacit reproduction of modern/colonial ontologies in critical thought). *International Political Sociology*, 11(1), 90–108.
- Arfi, B. (2010). “Euro-Islam”: Going beyond the aporiatic politics of othering. *International Political Sociology*, 4(3), 236–252.
- Barkawi, T. (2016). Decolonising war. *European Journal of International Security*, 1(2), 199–214.
- Bartelson, J. (1995). *A genealogy of sovereignty*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Bartelson, J. (2018). From the international to the global? In A. Gofas, I. Hamati-Ataya, & N. Onuf (Eds.). *The Sage handbook of the history, philosophy and sociology of international relations* (pp. 33–45). London, U.K.: Sage.
- Basaran, T., Bigo, D., Guittet, E.-P., & Walker, R. B. J. (2016a). Transversal lines: An introduction. In T. Basaran, D. Bigo, E.-P. Guittet, & R. B. J. Walker (Eds.), *International political sociology: Transversal lines* (pp. 1–9). London, U.K.: Routledge.

- Basaran, T., Bigo, D., Guittet, E.-P., & Walker, R. B. J. (Eds.). (2016b). *International political sociology: Transversal lines*. London, U.K.: Routledge.
- Berling, T. V. (2015). *The international political sociology of security: Rethinking theory and practice*. London, U.K.: Routledge.
- Bhambra, G. K. (2007a). *Rethinking modernity: Postcolonialism and the sociological imagination*. Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bhambra, G. K. (2007b). Sociology and postcolonialism: Another “missing” revolution? *Sociology*, 41(5), 871–884.
- Bhambra, G. K. (2016). Postcolonial reflections on sociology. *Sociology*, 50(5), 960–966.
- Bhambra, G. K., & de Sousa Santos, B. (2017). Introduction: Global challenges for sociology. *Sociology*, 51(1), 3–10.
- Bigo, D. (2011). Pierre Bourdieu and international relations: Power of practices, practices of power. *International Political Sociology*, 5(3), 225–258.
- Bigo, D. (2016). Interview with Didier Bigo. SciencesPo.
- Bigo, D., & Madsen, M. R. (2011). Introduction to symposium “A different reading of the international”: Pierre Bourdieu and international studies. *International Political Sociology*, 5(3), 219–224.
- Bigo, D., & Walker, R. B. J. (2007a). International, political, sociology. *International Political Sociology*, 1(1), 1–5.
- Bigo, D., & Walker, R. B. J. (2007b). Political sociology and the problem of the international. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 35(3), 725–739.
- Bilgin, P. (2009). The International Political “Sociology of a not so international discipline.” *International Political Sociology*, 3(3), 338–342.
- Botelho, A. (2014). Political sociology: State–society relations. *Current Sociology*, 62(6), 868–885.
- Brenner, N., & Elden, S. (2009). Henri Lefebvre on state, space, territory. *International Political Sociology*, 3(4), 353–377.
- Bueger, C. (2014). Pathways to practice: Praxiography and international politics. *European Political Science Review*, 6(3), 383–406.

- Bueger, C., & Gadinger, F. (2015). The play of international practice. *International Studies Quarterly*, 59(3), 449–460.
- Çapan, Z. G., & Zarakol, A. (2018). Between East and West: Travelling theories, travelling imaginations. In A. Gofas, I. Hamati-Ataya, & N. Onuf (Eds.). *The Sage handbook of the history, philosophy and sociology of international relations* (pp. 122–133). London, U.K.: Sage.
- Chan, S. (2009). A Chinese political sociology in our times. *International Political Sociology*, 3(3), 332–334.
- Chandler, D. (2010). Forget Foucault, forget Foucault, forget Foucault . . . *International Political Sociology*, 4(2), 205–207.
- Chandler, D. (2013). Resilience and the autotelic subject: Toward a critique of the societalization of security. *International Political Sociology*, 7(2), 210–226.
- Ciro Martínez, J., & Eng, B. (2017). Struggling to perform the state: The politics of bread in the Syrian civil war. *International Political Sociology*, 11(2), 130–147.
- Cohn, C. (1987). Sex and death in the rational world of defense intellectuals. *Signs*, 12(4), 687–718.
- Colás, A. (2010). The international political sociology of empire. In R. A. Denmark (Ed.), *The international studies encyclopedia* (pp. 4399–4417). Chichester, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Connell, R. W. (1997). Why is classical theory classical? *American Journal of Sociology*, 102(6), 1511–1557.
- Crawford, N. C. (2007). The long peace among Iroquois nations. In K. A. Raaflaub (Ed.), *War and peace in the ancient world* (pp. 348–368). Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell.
- Davies, M. (2016). Everyday life as critique: Revisiting the everyday in IPE with Henri Lefebvre and postcolonialism. *International Political Sociology*, 10(1), 22–38.
- de Goede, M., & Sullivan, G. (2016). The politics of security lists. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 34(1), 67–88.
- Deitelhoff, N., & Müller, H. (2005). Theoretical paradise—empirically lost? Arguing with Habermas. *Review of International Studies*, 31(1), 167–179.
- Denmark, R. A. (Ed.). (2010). *The international studies encyclopedia* (Vols. 1–12). Chichester, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Diken, B., & Laustsen, C. B. (2005). *The culture of exception: Sociology facing the camp*. London, U.K.: Routledge.

- Doty, R. L. (2007). States of exception on the Mexico–U.S. border: Security, “decisions,” and civilian border patrols. *International Political Sociology*, 1(2), 113–137.
- Edkins, J. (1999). *Poststructuralism & international relations: Bringing the political back in*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Enloe, C. (2000). *Bananas, beaches and bases: Making feminist sense of international politics* (updated ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Finn, M., Opatowski, M., & Momani, B. (2018). Transnational citizenship capacity-building: Moving the conversation in new directions. *International Political Sociology*, 12(3), 291–305.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. London, U.K.: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*. New York, NY: Pantheon.
- Gaspar, D. (2005). Beyond the international relations framework: An essay in descriptive global ethics. *Journal of Global Ethics*, 1(1), 5–23.
- Go, J. (2013). For a postcolonial sociology. *Theory and Society*, 42(1), 25–55.
- Go, J. (2016). *Postcolonial thought and social theory*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Gregory, T. (2015). Drones, targeted killings, and the limitations of international law. *International Political Sociology*, 9(3), 197–212.
- Grovogui, S. N. (2009). Counterpoints and the imaginaries behind them. *International Political Sociology*, 3(1), 327–331.
- Guillaume, X. (2011). The international as an everyday practice. *International Political Sociology*, 5(4), 446–462.
- Guillaume, X., & Bilgin, P. (2017a). Introduction. In X. Guillaume & P. Bilgin (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of international political sociology* (pp. 1–14). London, U.K.: Routledge.
- Guillaume, X., & Bilgin, P. (Eds.). (2017b). *Routledge handbook of international political sociology*. London, U.K.: Routledge.
- Guzzini, S. (2017). International political sociology, or: The social ontology and power politics of process. In X. Guillaume & P. Bilgin (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of international political sociology* (pp. 368–377). London, U.K.: Routledge.

- Helmig, J., & Kessler, O. (2007). Space, boundaries, and the problem of order: A view from systems theory. *International Political Sociology*, 1(3), 240–256.
- Hindess, B. (2009). How useful is the concept of global society? *International Political Sociology*, 3(1), 122–125.
- Holland, J. (2009). From September 11th, 2001 to 9–11: From void to crisis. *International Political Sociology*, 3(3), 275–292.
- Hui, V. T. (2018). Confucian pacifism or Confucian confusion? In A. Gofas, I. Hamati-Ataya, & N. Onuf (Eds.). *The Sage handbook of the history, philosophy and sociology of international relations* (pp. 148–161). London, U.K.: Sage.
- Huysmans, J. (2008). The jargon of exception—on Schmitt, Agamben and the absence of political society. *International Political Sociology*, 2(2), 165–183.
- Huysmans, J., & Nogueira, J. P. (2012). International political sociology: Opening spaces, stretching lines. *International Political Sociology*, 6(1), 1–3.
- Huysmans, J., & Nogueira, J. P. (2016). Ten years of IPS: Fracturing IR. *International Political Sociology*, 10(4), 299–319.
- Innes, A. J. (2017). Everyday ontological security: Emotion and migration in British soaps. *International Political Sociology*, 11(4), 380–397.
- Jackson, P. T. (2010). *The conduct of inquiry in international relations: Philosophy of science and its implications for the study of world politics*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Janoski, T., Alford, R. R., Hicks, A. M., & Schwartz, M. A. (Eds.). (2005). *The handbook of political sociology: States, civil societies, and globalization*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Katzenstein, P. J. (2010). “Walls” between “those people”? Contrasting perspectives on world politics. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8(1), 11–25.
- Kessler, O. (2009). Toward a sociology of the international? International relations between anarchy and world society. *International Political Sociology*, 3(1), 87–108.
- Kessler, O. (2012). World society, social differentiation and time. *International Political Sociology*, 6(1), 77–94.

- Kessler, O. (2016). The Contingency of Constructivism: On Norms, the Social, and the Third. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 45(1), 43-63.
- Laclau, E. (1994). Introduction. In E. Laclau (Ed.), *The making of political identities* (pp. 1–10). London, U.K.: Verso.
- Laclau, E. (2000). Identity and hegemony: The role of universality in the constitution of political logics. In J. Butler, E. Laclau, & S. Žižek (Eds.), *Contingency, hegemony, universality: Contemporary dialogues on the Left* (pp. 44–89). London, U.K.: Verso.
- Laclau, E. (Ed.). (1996). *Emancipation(s)*. London, U.K.: Verso.
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics* (1st ed.). London, U.K.: Verso.
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2001). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics* (2nd ed.). London, U.K.: Verso.
- Lang, A. F. (2008). Evil, agency, and punishment. In R. Jeffery (Ed.), *Confronting evil in international relations* (pp. 89–114). Basingstoke, U.K.: Springer.
- Leander, A. (2011). The promises, problems, and potentials of a Bourdieu-inspired staging of international relations. *International Political Sociology*, 5(3), 294–313.
- Linklater, A. (2004). Norbert Elias, the “civilizing process” and the sociology of international relations. *International Politics*, 41, 3–35.
- Lisle, D. (2006). *The global politics of contemporary travel writing*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Lisle, D. (2016). *Holidays in the danger zone: Entanglements of war and peace*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lisle, D., Squire, V., & Doty, R. (2017). Editorial: International political sociology; critical and collective adventures. *International Political Sociology*, 11(1), 1–4.
- Lobo-Guerrero, L. (2010). The international political sociology of risk. In R. A. Denmark (Ed.), *The international studies encyclopedia: Vol. 7* (pp. 4418–4436). Chichester, U.K.: Blackwell.
- Luhmann, N. (1982). The world society as a social system. *International Journal of General Systems*, 8(3), 131–138.
- Luhmann, N. (2000). *Die Politik der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Suhrkamp.

- Lyon, D. (2010). Liquid surveillance: The contribution of Zygmunt Bauman to surveillance studies. *International Political Sociology*, 4(4), 325–338.
- Malmvig, H. (2014). Free us from power: Governmentality, counter-conduct, and simulation in European democracy and reform promotion in the Arab World. *International Political Sociology*, 8(3), 293–310.
- Marchart, O. (2007). *Post-Foundational political thought: Political difference in Nancy, Lefort, Badiou and Laclau*. Edinburgh, U.K.: Edinburgh University Press.
- McLennan, G. (2003). Sociology, Eurocentrism and postcolonial theory. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 6(1), 69–86.
- Mello, B. (2018). The Islamic State: Violence and ideology in a postcolonial revolutionary regime. *International Political Sociology*, 12(2), 139–155.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2007). Delinking: The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of decoloniality. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2–3), 449–514.
- Morcillo Laiz, Á., & Schlichte, K. (2016a). Another Weber: state, associations and domination in international relations. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 29(4), 1448–1466.
- Morcillo Laiz, Á., & Schlichte, K. (2016b). Rationality and international domination: Revisiting Max Weber. *International Political Sociology*, 10(2), 168–184.
- Morgenthau, H. J., & Thompson, K. W. (1985). *Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace* (6th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Moshirzadeh, H. (2009). A “hegemonic discipline” in an “anti-hegemonic” country. *International Political Sociology*, 3(3), 342–346.
- Muppidi, H. (2018). Coloring the global: Race, colonialism and internationalism. In A. Gofas, I. Hamati-Ataya, & N. Onuf (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of the history, philosophy and sociology of international relations* (pp. 46–59). London, U.K.: Sage.
- Nabers, D. (2015). *A poststructuralist discourse theory of global politics*. Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nair, S. (2007). Edward W. Said and international relations: Introduction. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 36(1), 77–82.
- Nexon, D. H., & Neumann, I. B. (2017). Hegemonic-order theory: A field-theoretic account. *European Journal of International Relations*, 24(3), 662–686.

- Ngcoya, M. (2015). Ubuntu: Toward an emancipatory cosmopolitanism? *International Political Sociology*, 9(3), 248–262.
- Nymalm, N. (2013). The end of the “liberal theory of history”? Dissecting the US Congress’ discourse on China’s currency policy. *International Political Sociology*, 7(4), 388–405.
- Oke, N. (2009). Globalizing time and space: Temporal and spatial considerations in discourses of globalization. *International Political Sociology*, 3(3), 310–326.
- Onuf, N. (2010). Old mistakes: Bourdieu, Derrida, and the “force of law.” *International Political Sociology*, 4(3), 315–318.
- Pasha, M. K. (2010). Disciplining Foucault. *International Political Sociology*, 4(2), 213–215.
- Peterson, V. S. (2000). Rereading public and private: The dichotomy that is not one. *SAIS Review*, 20(2), 11–30.
- Philpott, S. (2017). Performing mass murder: Constructing the perpetrator in documentary film. *International Political Sociology*, 11(3), 257–272.
- Pin-Fat, V. (2010). *Universality, ethics and international relations: A grammatical reading*. London, U.K.: Routledge.
- Pusca, A. (2009). Walter Benjamin, a methodological contribution. *International Political Sociology*, 3(2), 238–254.
- Quijano, A. (2007). Coloniality and modernity/rationality. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2–3), 168–178.
- Risse, T. (2000). “Let’s argue!”: Communicative action in world politics. *International Organization*, 54(1), 1–39.
- Rojas, C. (2016). Contesting the colonial logics of the international: Toward a relational politics for the pluriverse. *International Political Sociology*, 10(4), 369–382.
- Seth, S. (2009). Historical sociology and postcolonial theory: Two strategies for challenging Eurocentrism. *International Political Sociology*, 3(3), 334–338.
- Seth, S. (2013). “Once was blind but now can see”: Modernity and the social sciences. *International Political Sociology*, 7(2), 136–151.
- Shapcott, R. (2001). *Justice, community and dialogue in international relations*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

- Shapiro, M. J. (2011). The presence of war: "Here and elsewhere." *International Political Sociology*, 5(2), 109–125.
- Shepherd, L. J. (2010). Feminist security studies. In R. A. Denmark (Ed.), *The international studies encyclopedia: Vol. 4* (pp. 2181–2201). Chichester, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Shilliam, R. (2011). Decolonising the grounds of ethical inquiry: A dialogue between Kant, Foucault and Glissant. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 39(3), 649–665.
- Shim, D. (2017). Sketching geopolitics: Comics and the case of the Cheonan sinking. *International Political Sociology*, 11(4), 398–417.
- Shindo, R. (2012). Rethinking community: Translation space as a departure from political community. *International Political Sociology*, 6(2), 149–164.
- Sjoberg, L. (2012). Toward trans-gendering international relations? *International Political Sociology*, 6(4), 337–354.
- Smith, L. T. (2013). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London, U.K.: Zed Books.
- Solomon, T., & Steele, B. J. (2017). Micro-moves in international relations theory. *European Journal of International Relations*, 23(2), 267–291.
- Stengel, F. A., MacDonald, D. B., & Nabers, D. (2019). Introduction: Analyzing the nexus between populism and international relations. In F. A. Stengel, D. B. MacDonald, & D. Nabers (Eds.), *Populism and world politics: Exploring inter- and transnational dimensions*. Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sylvester, C. (2012). The elusive arts of reflexivity in the "sciences" of international relations. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 41(2), 309–325.
- Tedesco, D., & Bagelman, J. (2017). The "missing" politics of whiteness and rightful presence in the settler colonial city. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 45(3), 380–402.
- Thakur, V. (2015). Africa and the theoretical peace in IR. *International Political Sociology*, 9(3), 213–229.
- Tickner, J. A. (1988). Hans Morgenthau's principles of political realism: A feminist reformulation. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 17(3), 429–440.
- Tidy, J. (2018). Fatherhood, gender, and interventions in the geopolitical: Analyzing paternal peace, masculinities, and war. *International Political Sociology*, 12(1), 2–18.

- True, J., & Hewitt, S. (2018). International relations and the gendered international. In A. Gofas, I. Hamati-Ataya, & N. Onuf (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of the history, philosophy and sociology of international relations* (pp. 90–105). London, U.K.: Sage.
- van der Ree, G. (2014). Saving the discipline: Plurality, social capital, and the sociology of IR theorizing. *International Political Sociology*, 8(2), 218–233.
- Vaughan-Williams, N. (2008). Borders, territory, law. *International Political Sociology*, 2(4), 322–338.
- Walker, R. B. J. (1993). *Inside/outside: International relations as political theory*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Walker, R. B. J. (2010). *After the globe, before the world*. London, U.K.: Routledge.
- Wallerstein, I. (1997). Eurocentrism and its avatars: The dilemmas of social science. *Sociological Bulletin*, 46(1), 21–39.
- Weber, C. (2010). Citizenship, security, humanity. *International Political Sociology*, 4(1), 80–85.
- Weber, C. (2016). *Queer international relations: Sovereignty, sexuality and the will to knowledge*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Wibben, A. T. R. (2010). *Feminist security studies: A narrative approach*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zehfuss, M. (2002). *Constructivism in international relations: The politics of reality*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Zehfuss, M. (2018). *War and the politics of ethics*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.