Conceptualizing International Practices

Directions for the Practice Turn in International Relations

Edited by

Alena Drieschova
University of Cambridge

Christian Bueger
University of Copenhagen

Ted Hopf
University of Helsinki

10 Visibility
Practices of Seeing and Overlooking

Jonathan Luke Austin with Anna Leander

Seeing things – *really* seeing them – is difficult. In *On Constructing a Reality*, Heinz von Foerster (2003: 212) provides the neatest physical/physiological example of this (see Figure 10.1) by asking us to

Hold Figure 1 with your right hand, close your left eye and fixate [on the] asterisk of Figure 1 with your right eye. Move the book slowly back and forth along [your] line of vision until at an appropriate distance, from about 12 to 14 inches, [and] the round black spot disappears. Keeping the asterisk well focused, the spot should remain invisible even if the figure is slowly moved parallel to itself.

The blind spot here is produced owing to the absence of photoreceptors at the point on the retina where fibres converge to form the optic nerve. This phenomenon is well known. It is just a mind game, but one with far wider lessons: picking a point of focus, we'll see, always pushes other things to the margins.

Emanuel Adler and Vincent Pouliot (2011a: 3) have led a call within IR that seeks to develop the concept of 'practice' as a conceptual 'focal point' around which empirical and theoretical work of an otherwise eclectic mix can meet. As they suggest, 'the notion of practice … [makes] interparadigmatic conversations possible' (Adler and Pouliot, 2011a: 3). Already, their claim has been amply proven by the vitality of the ongoing work of the International Practice Theory (IPT) programme within IR.[1] However, and in the older terms of Donna Haraway (1988), any focal point – including focusing on one or another set of social practices – is always partial in the perspectives it brings to

[1] For theoretical work see, inter alia, Neumann (2002), Pouliot (2008), Adler and Pouliot (2011b), Bigo (2011), Leander (2011), Bueger (2013), Ringmar (2014), Berling (2015), Kustermans (2016), McCourt (2016). For empirical applications see, inter alia, Pouliot (2010, 2016b), Neumann and Pouliot (2011), Bueger (2013, 2015), Bueger and Bethke (2013), Leander (2013, 2016), Acuto (2014), Adler-Nissen (2014b), Adler-Nissen and Pouliot (2014), Autesserre (2014), Sending et al. (2015), Austin (2016, 2017b).

Figure 10.1 An example of the optical illusion used by Heinz von Foerster in his *On Constructing a Reality*

view. It always has blindspots, things it makes invisible. It is thus that in this intervention, we want to introduce and insist on the importance of tending more carefully to the concept of visibility in practice theorizing as a means to ensure that IPT retains the space for (evolving) interparadigmatic conversations. We will argue that tending to visibility, and in doing so locating blindspots centrally in social scientific inquiry, is necessary to ensure that IPT enhances our capacity to look at the world quite differently, sometimes radically so. This we would contend is a matter of no small importance for scholars of IR, particularly if we connect it to (cultivating) the ability to act differently with/in the world (Austin and Leander, 2021; Austin, 2020b).

This insistence on blindspots may perplex when the very introduction of the study of practices to IR and other disciplines has been intended to extend the array of phenomena that scholars pay attention to. IPT seeks to return to the quotidian and every day, the mundane and seemingly simple. It seeks – indeed – to avoid overlooking the lived experience of the world by challenging the dominance of what Cynthia Enloe (2016: 623) terms 'inattentive' scholarship that refuses to notice and take seriously matters that fall outside established scholarly frames. IPT does so by claiming, ultimately, that world politics is about people doing things, performing the world and the political. Politics is practice. Indeed, as the title of Von Foerster's essay indicates, practices are sets of actions that '*construct*' one particular reality. In evoking the non-representational logic of practicality, IPT has made visible – 'opened our eyes' – to how this occurs sociologically: it has expanded our vision. However, Von Foerster introduced his mind game to remind us that 'perceiving' is also a type of 'doing' (a practice) and thus that 'if I don't see' certain practices then 'I am blind' to the fact that there always exist a multitude of other (possible or extant) realities constituted by similar or different types of (world political) practice.[2]

---

[2] Notably, Von Foerster's claims here foreshadow far more contemporary social theory and its focus on the concepts of 'multiplicity' and/or 'performativity' as constitutive of social realities. See, inter alia, Law (1999), Law and Mol (2001), Mol (2002), Deleuze and Guattari (2004), Bryant (2011).

We argue that 'visibility' is a crucial social and social scientific category that can 'forearm' us against the risks of IPT becoming unnecessarily narrow as a research programme. This risk has already been acknowledged, of course. David M. McCourt (2016), for instance, has recently compared the evolution of IPT to that of Constructivism within IR. As he notes, although IPT has sought to avoid becoming an 'ism', it seems quite true that 'a practice theoretic perspective would view IR itself is a practice: a distinct arena of social competition with its own practical logics' (McCourt, 2016: 482). McCourt's point here is not to critique the goals of IPT but, rather, to highlight the danger of overlooking the gradual emergence and standardization of a particular practice theory-driven way of doing social science, itself made up of innumerable little practices, that dictate what the approach can or cannot appreciate about the world around us. The risk, to repeat ourselves, is thus that blindspots are being introduced into IPT; blindspots that, more significantly, are perpetuated and made permanent through the disciplining effects of disciplinary practices that surround all constraining forms of theorizing (Leander 2020; Kratochwil, Chapter 11).

In our argument, the risk of perpetuating blindspots within IPT reflects the fact that our ability to 'see' the world and its realities is enacted in certain inescapably political fields (Brighenti, 2010) or regimes (Van Winkel, 2005; Heinich, 2012) of visibility that focus our vision on some things rather than others. These fields and regimes of visibility generate power and politics in both obvious and less obvious ways. Basic propaganda is implicated in any regime of visibility, for instance, but so are the many 'great divides' of the social sciences (Bourdieu, 1993; Latour, 1993). In world politics, violence, gender, religion, and culture are all intersected by regimes of visibility that establish dichotomies, hierarchies, blockages, and further 'misrecognitions' of the world (Austin, 2017b; Austin et al., 2019). More than this, visibility involves aesthetic sensibilities. It therefore also always implicates affect. It is a 'double' that combines both perception and affect (Deleuze, 1991). As Andrea Brighenti (2010: 44) puts it, visibility is 'an aspect of social life that enables us to introduce thresholds of relevance and selective attention' linked to this double and, so, 'as a property of subjects, sites, events … rhythms' and – indeed – practices, 'visibility is employed as a means of sorting, classifying and ranking…'. Because of this, 'visibility cannot be reduced to traditional sociological categories such as actor, organisation, system, class, gender, race, and so on, although it meaningfully intersects all of them' (Brighenti, 2010: 38). It is a category in its own right.

Thinking in terms of visibility, we thus suggest, sensitizes us to the politics of practice(s) – theoretical and/or otherwise – in a manner that

locates perception and aesthetics at the core of world politics. In so doing, the concept of visibility might assist in deepening the work of IPT by quite literally extending its field of vision in a manner ensuring that its blindspots are constantly contested, preventing IPT from becoming a disciplining force and instead turning it into the open space of reflection that Adler and Pouliot wished it to be. To advance this argument, we now proceed in four main parts. First, we explore the ways in which visibility is politically crucial to IR by drawing on longstanding and more recent work in social theory that demonstrates the ways in which *who* or *what* is seen or, inversely, remains unseen is essential for establishing both local and world political hierarchies, ranging from formal political hierarchies to hierarchies in observation. Second, we foreground that while this process and the blindspots entailed are inescapable, a cognizance of its politics provides opportunities for practice theory to broaden its view on what constitutes international relations and so to avoid becoming a sclerotic enterprise, which is both normatively and politically essential for its future as a field of study. Third, we anchor this argument in a real-world example. We focus on the import of visibility for the differing ways in which the use of extraordinary rendition (and torture) by the United States and the Syrian Arab Republic have been made (in)visible to both public and social scientific analysis. Fourthly, we draw on this empirical discussion to argue that practices of making seen or unseen are regimes that predefine the focal point of any (scientific or not) mode of observation or analysis. As a result, we suggest, the study of *any other set of practices* is filtered through regimes of visibility, and hence *practices of visibility filter the way we see all practices*. Tending to visibility, blindspots, and practices of seeing and of overlooking is therefore crucial for the IPT research programme. Finally, we turn to the 'broader' consequences of this deepening of the perceptual and affective lenses of IPT for the discipline of IR and beyond.

Enacting Ambiguous Evolving Regimes of Visibility

Politics is visual. Arguably, it has become increasingly so as we communicate ever more through visual media in a world where 'creativity dispositives' are omnipresent (Weber, 2008; Reckwitz, 2012). Who and what is seen or – inversely – remains unseen can thus be seen as essential for the establishment and maintenance of hierarchies, including formal political hierarchies and, more broadly in the terms of Jacques Rancière (2004) for the division of the 'sensible'. To see this, let's begin by going back a little in time. Ethnomethodology has long studied

practices empirically and systematically (Mauss, 1950; Garfinkel, 1967; Liberman, 2013). In one of its classic texts, 'Notes on Police Assessment of Moral Character', Harvey Sacks (1972) describes a problem faced by police officers: inferring the 'goodness' or 'badness' of a person walking down a street or hanging out on a street corner without knowing anything about them. Sacks (1972: 284, emphasis added) describes how police 'treat their beat as a territory of *normal appearances*' based on the idea that 'being noticeable and being deviant seem intimately related'. Spotting criminals thus relies on an 'incongruity procedure' that scans individuals and environments for abnormalities as they are conceived in comparison with the 'normal ecology' of a territory that is 'normative' in the sense of being unnoticeable (Sacks, 1972: 286).

Sacks' description of specialized practices of surveillance are real-world examples of what Rancière (2004) called the 'police order' of society. Rancière's thesis extends Sacks' localized observations and theorizes the presence of a set of largely unconscious or implicit norms and social practices that determine forms of social exclusion and the distribution of power. Norms and practices are repeated and transformed in their repetition (also Schäfer, Chapter 9). Ultimately, these norms and practices are themselves based on the 'distribution of the sensible' which is a means of controlling or ordering what becomes visible or invisible, speakable or unspeakable, and noticeable or not. In this, exclusions and silencings are necessarily implicit. And more than this, if the social order is a police order refusing the possibility of flux and contestation then the social is, to a large degree, an *anti-political* form of order in the sense of both 'translating political controversies into technical objectives' and encouraging a 'non-identification' – a making *in*visible – of certain political issues (Walters, 2009: 116). Anti-political does not here mean *a*political. Quite the contrary: attempting to render certain issues *in*visible (e.g. drone strikes, surveillance data) is often a prompt for their heightened politicization. But the *anti*-political desire seeks to leverage *in*visibility so as to remove certain issues from politics or prevent them from ever arising. It makes them imperceptible and therefore unspeakable. Thus, politics is about vision (however obscured, however partial), and the anti-political is about *attempting* to make-invisible. Following this, a truly politically sensitive IPT must develop a set of methods, practices, and theories that work to make more 'sensible' practices, such as those described by Sacks.

We can begin developing the necessary tools for appreciating the importance of visibility for IPT by turning to two social theorists – Nathalie Heinich (1991, 2001, 2012) and Andrea Mubi Brighenti (2007, 2008, 2010) – who have both worked to re-theorize practices by placing

visibility at the core of their thinking. Heinich (2012), to get us started, discusses how a certain 'visibility-capital' (*capital de visibilité*) defines the status of visibility, generally, and plays a specifically central (and historically evolving) role in the morphologies of politics, economics, art, and beyond. It has, for example, taken on a specific contemporary form in the cultivation of celebrities. Celebrity is about 'being known' and being known because one is seen. For Heinich (2012: 66), the mass reproduction of images and the asymmetries in the distribution of who or what is seen in these images has produced a new social category and, in turn, a new social class or 'elite' who gain positive or negative social capital from their relative social (in)visibility.

Importantly, however, Heinich does not connect the (in)visibility of any individual person to their ontological status as a particular kind of person or, that is, to any 'essence' they may possess or to their social status. Instead, she insists that (in)visibility is linked to their place in a visual economy, where it is their image that matters and that comes to take on a place and standing of its own. As she underlines, 'the "star" is not at the origin of the multiplication of their own images (at their base, they are nothing but a person possessing certain talents), but it is instead the images themselves that create the "star"' (Heinich, 2012: 21). Heinich's words here move towards attributing 'worth' or 'value' to (artistic or otherwise) images and objects in and of themselves (c.f. Gielen, 2005). In this regard, she places great importance on the medium of visibility. For her, aesthetic objects must be attributed a certain form of 'agency', a position much work on images and visibility shares (Mitchell, 2005; Latour, 2010; Austin, 2019; Bertram, 2019). The image itself does 'work' in her account: *it is the images themselves that create the 'star'*. To understand how this occurs, Heinich insists that we grapple seriously with issues of perception and affect as they are mediated through objects and aesthetic practices in ways that exceed reason, logic, intention, or interest, or indeed – and as demonstrated by Hansen (1997, 2000) – actually *produce* reason, logic, intention or interests. Heinich's account is particularly pertinent for international practices as she insists on the place of visibility in power and hierarchies. Her focus on visibility as a form of social capital produced both through social inequalities and also the autonomous affects of particular media and objects of representation thus allows us to make quite direct connections to the enactment of practices, power, and politics in realms central to world politics.

Consider images of violence. The fact that such images tend to provoke shock and/or horror to one degree or another – whatever happens afterwards and however much we may become desensitized – reveals these

objects not only to be subject merely to a judgement of taste but also to possess an autonomous aesthetic involving both perception and affect. When we observe images of violence they do things to us, whether we want them to or not. However, such objects are unequally distributed in terms of their visibility-capital vis-à-vis distinctly positioned actors (see the example given later). And it is here the political enters. Many societal hierarchies – those based on race, gender, class, and so on – are generated in an affective economy of visibility, constituted by certain practices of making seen or unseen, and affecting how world political practices are perceived. These practices mobilize 'implicit schemata, patterns and selection criteria, [and] culturally acquired competencies' (Reckwitz, 2014: 26). Thus, an execution by the militant group Daesh is seen very differently from an extra-judicial drone strike by the United States. The politics of this are clear. Regimes of visibility are crucially important to making this politics possible: what we see, and how we see it, matters to how we perceive the world.

If Heinich's focus is on visibility as a social category that places the aesthetics of objects at the centre of practice theorizing, then Brighenti's work is especially useful for attending to some specificities of the deployment of visibility in world political practices and specifying the nature of invisibility capital. Brighenti lays out 'three different types of visibility schemes' that allow us to nuance our understanding: a 'social' type, which is an 'enabling resource, linked to recognition', a 'media-type … whereby subjects are isolated from their original context and projected into a different one endowed with its own logic and rules', and, finally, a 'control-type' that 'transforms visibility into a strategic resource for regulation (as in Foucault's surveillance model) or selectivity and stratification (as in Deleuze's society of control model), or both (as in Haggerty and Ericson's surveillant assemblage)' (Brighenti, 2007: 339). Later, Brighenti (2010: 45–50) systematizes these categories in terms of visibility as *recognition*, *control*, and *spectacle*, and conceptualizes an array of practices of making seen (visible) and unseen (invisible) which together form a *field* of visibility. Importantly, Brighenti distinguishes clearly between the 'visual' and the 'visible' by noting how the visible is always *inter-visible*: it is about the crossing of gazes between the observer and the observed (whether these are human or not) and the ways in which the regime of visibility affecting the former interacts with her perception of the latter in order to alter it, positively or negatively (Brighenti, 2010: 44). Taken together, he provides a nuanced toolkit grasping the ambiguous and variable, relationships between politics, power, and the visible, and converting it into a social-scientific category. As he writes:

The relationship between power and visibility is complex: power does not rest univocally either with visibility or with invisibility. In the moral domain, a fundamental tension between recognition and control has emerged. Both practices are connected to visibility. In other words, visibility is not correlated in any straightforward way to recognition and control, or to any specific moral value. As such, it does not constitute anything inherently liberating, nor, conversely, does it necessarily imply oppression. But, in the end, isn't this open range of possibilities what we expect from a sufficiently general descriptive and interpretive social scientific category? (Brighenti, 2007: 340)

Brighenti's final words here are what makes his work particularly useful for IPT, where a set of complex and intersecting practices are often analysed in their chaotic and contradictory deployments, necessitating theoretical and conceptual flexibility in our analysis. Rarely will a single practice or set of practices univocally support or disrupt power relations in one way or another. Instead, the status of practice tends to be both ambiguous and evolving. This is also the case vis-à-vis the visibility of practice. Thinking in terms of visibility is important then to unpack the densely contradictory 'hinterlands' (Law, 2004), 'mangles' (Pickering, 1995) or 'shadows' (Nordstrom, 2004) of practice in a way that nourishes the depth of analysis occurring within IPT.

The Non-Intentional Aesthetic Politics of Visibility and Perception

A few clarifications are now in order. It is important to stress that, of course, when discussing visibility, the use of phrases such as 'making seen' or 'making unseen' can be read in terms of deliberate agency and intentionality; intimating classical understandings of the use of propaganda to purposefully make things seen or unseen. Such manipulations of visibility obviously abound. So do the preparatory efforts to pave way for them, for example by making 'scenes' (Walters, Chapter 6). However, they are far from all we are referring to. Indeed, it is likely that deliberate manipulations of visibility are only a minor part of sustaining a regime of (in)visibility. Consider, for example, the case of racial minorities and – again – their targeting by police. This form of visibility occurs largely because of biases that are firmly held within the minds of police agents and which correlate visibility based on 'looks' – and the deviation of particular 'looks' from a 'normal' standard – as indicating a propensity to carry out crime. There is no intentionality here in the *form* that visibility takes (skin pigment), but, instead, a regime of visibility exists based on dynamics of power and subordination that have evolved over centuries, produced originally through both intentional and non-intentional means. More than this, certain

practices work to reproduce regimes of (in)visibility *indirectly*, peripherally, or collaterally to their primary purpose. When wealthy parents dress their children in more expensive clothes than their less-wealthy peers, the goal of these parents is not necessarily to carry out a practice (fashionable dressing) in order to reproduce racial and class hierarchies that feed into a set of regimes of (in)visibility perpetuating political inequality. This process occurs independently of the goal of the originally enacted practice.

For a fuller example, consider the cases described by medical anthropologists who have studied interactions between local and foreign visiting doctors at relatively impoverished hospitals found mostly outside Europe and North America. In one such hospital in Malawi, Wendland (2012: 113) describes how:

One late afternoon I followed sounds of commotion to a bay in the labour ward where a pregnant woman lay convulsing in a prolonged seizure … It was hot, and the air felt thick with the smells of blood, bleach, and amniotic fluid … Handwritten notices taped to the walls reminded staff how to resuscitate newborns, clean equipment, and manage haemorrhages. On the hallway floor, cardboard boxes made makeshift containers for 'sharps' – the blades and needles that pose particular dangers in southern African hospitals … In one of the labour bays, the midwife stood holding the seizing woman's head to one side, ensuring that she could breathe. Two sweating Dutch medical students flanked her, struggling to draw up medication to stop the seizure. The bay was littered with discarded syringes and medicine vials … Meanwhile labouring women in the other bays cried out: 'Asista, adokotala, thandizani' [sister, doctor, help me]. One of the students looked up, met my eye, and said quietly, 'Welcome to hell'.

What is visible in this case are seemingly chaotic and 'make-do' practices through which doctors at an impoverished hospital treat patients: with cardboard boxes for needles, handwritten notes, and blood disinfected with bleach but not immediately wiped away. These practices are described as 'hell' by foreign doctors. They are the elements of an image of dysfunction, non-professionalism, and essentially a 'lesser' form of medical care. By contrast, local doctors took notice of the foreign doctors' 'white coats [that] bulged with stethoscopes, penlights, pocket medical guides, and other accoutrements' (Wendland, 2012: 112). Those foreign bodies are adorned with material objects that *suggest* the presence of 'better' practices elsewhere, based on an assumption of greater expertise and the fact of greater material capacity: 'the wretchedness of clinical practice in Malawi depended on a contrast with medicine … elsewhere' (Wendland, 2012: 112).

At the same time, many of the practices that become visible in this example, which seem to be dirty and inadequate, can be 'seen' in quite a different light as representing a remarkable capacity to 'make do' and

keep saving lives without the prosthetic aids of advanced technologies. An ability to make do, moreover, that foreign doctors often lacked: visiting doctors 'could rarely feel an enlarged spleen with their hands or confirm profound anemia without a hematocrit by examining a patient's nail beds and mucous membranes. Accustomed to following protocols in which one diagnostic or therapeutic step led to the next, visitors had little capacity to improvise when the required materials were not available'. (Wendland, 2012: 114) The comparative advantage of the practices being carried out by local doctors is made *in*visible through a regime that privileges signs of material cleanliness and abundance (white coats, technologies, etc.) as signals of professionalism. Importantly, however, the emergence of this way of seeing things is not deliberate. Many of the practices that create the impression of 'danger' or 'hell' are entirely necessary and quite effective in this context but they produce aesthetic and affective responses. Likewise, few suggest that doctors in more wealthy states should do away with their advanced medical tools. These are medical practices that those doctors in Malawi themselves would desire. But placed in contrast with their own practices they intensify the perception of the 'wretchedness of clinical practice in Malawi' nonetheless.

This example also captures a second key element of our discussion: the aesthetic aspects of regimes of visibility. The Dutch doctor's remark – 'Welcome to hell' – represents a visceral response to an environment in which dirt and blood pervade. If we were to take a snapshot of this hospital, then the reader would likely feel much the same. We all react to what is visible and sensible through the aesthetic qualities of what is perceived, with aesthetics referring here – and hereafter – to a broad conception of the judgements of sentiments and taste that are evoked whenever we perceive something (Austin, 2019). Necessarily, we are also thus concerned here with thinking visibility in terms of a *political* aesthetics, 'by connecting an idea of … [the aesthetic] with a cultural diagnosis of, and political commitment to, the historical situation of human practices' (Garcia, 2014: 274). As seen earlier, regimes of visibility alter the affective quality of the aesthetics of particular scenes quite notably. For foreign doctors, this 'hell' could be contrasted to a cleaner, neater, more efficient, and more attractive foreign alternative, while local doctors saw *beyond* this also to the unique efficacy of their own practices of making do. In one case, the aesthetics of the scene led to an overlooking of what else could be seen there and in the other not because – to be sure – regimes of visibility are translated, altered, and adapted based on the social, political, and corporeal positionality of the observer.

Nonetheless, it is worth noting that the aesthetic dimension of visibility does go beyond this: the point here is *not* at all that local doctors in the case cited are not dissatisfied and themselves even disturbed by what they

objectively 'see' in their hospital. They are affected by the 'hell' of medical treatment in Malawi to the same – most probably greater – extent as their foreign colleagues, and they desire – as such – the same resources as those colleagues. The aesthetics of visibility, in this sense, cannot be argued with. It may therefore stymie the efforts of certain disenfranchised groups to get their Others to look beyond what they see at first glance and gain a broader optic on the scenes they are coming to encounter. A fundamental tension exists, therefore, in which practitioners or observers have an inherent capacity to 'look at things differently' (i.e. interpret practice differently) but are caught nonetheless in webs of affect, mediated through visibility, that render this process difficult or even undesirable. There is no easy resolution to this tension. Nonetheless, the effects of regimes of (in)visibility must – first and foremost – be considered politically. Once we sensitize ourselves to how our impressions of world political practice are mediated through visibility, aesthetics, and affect, we gain the capacity to think politics differently as well as of reflecting more realistically on the import of sensual perceptions for political agency. The result is that it becomes possible to see a consideration of visibility as holding positive normative capacities, where awareness of its effects can lead to political change at both individual and institutional levels.

As the example given here demonstrates, the concept of visibility can serve a positive (political) role for IPT. Considering visibility forces us to acknowledge how the world becomes 'multiple' in its apprehension in often unintended ways. Practices of making (in)visible, in short, always fashion how other practices are perceived. Employing visibility in our analyses of international practices thus works as a mode of sensitization provoking an awareness of what was taken for granted, went unsaid, and passed unseen in world politics. More than this, we have seen how the concept forces us to acknowledge the place of aesthetics and affect in the political practices we observe and such an acknowledgement will often call radically into question assumptions of the 'reasoned' or 'rational' nature of practices by articulating a less scholastic view of world political practices and therefore perhaps also a more strongly objective one (Crone, 2014; Leander, 2017; Austin, 2020a).

One of the attractions of practice approaches is that they lead us away from the 'hyperintellectualization' of scholars who commit the fallacy of assuming that *their* categories and forms of reasoning are shared by and guide the observed (Reckwitz, 2002: 258). In contrast, the aesthetic and affective dimensions of practice matter actually as much for the classical realms of world politics: diplomacy, military cooperation, international organizations, global governance, European integration, international law, and so on, as it does for the realm of the political world outside the borders of these classical realms and in practices of

theorizing. Theorists, statesmen, people, and things are engaged in often non-intentionally producing an aesthetic politics of visibility. Indeed, we want to stress the import of recognizing this fundamental 'symmetry' of practices in IPT and thus of extending the study of practices generally, as well as tending to practices of seeing and overlooking also to more marginalized and disenfranchised actants, whether they are humans such as torturers and terrorists, activists, artists, doctors, and shamans, or things such as digital infrastructures, border fences, and facial recognition software. And while shifting our vision in these ways will often be deeply uncomfortable, it is of fundamental political import. It will help us see the fissures and fractures from which potentials for political change may arise (Austin, 2017b; Leander, 2017).

Seeing and Overlooking Practices of Torture

In order to flesh out this discussion, we now draw on an extended example of the importance of visibility for IPT. To begin, we would like to ask the reader to consider Figures 10.2, 10.3, and 10.4. Each of these depicts the process by which prisoners were 'rendered' from a point of capture to a

Figure 10.2 Post-9/11 rendition of captured prisoners by the United States from Afghanistan to Guantanamo Bay

Figure 10.3 Post-9/11 rendition of captured prisoners by the United States from Afghanistan to Guantanamo Bay

detention facility, where they were typically tortured, by either the United States (post-2001) or the Syrian state (post-2011). You may already be familiar with Figures 10.2 and 10.3, which show the early stages of the (extraordinary) rendition of prisoners from Afghanistan that began in 2002. Prisoners are bound to the floor by mesh cables, wear heavy-duty earmuffs, and in other pictures are seen to be masked with surgical-looking equipment such that they can neither see nor hear. They are then hooded. The goal is total sensory deprivation. An American flag is hung in the background. Soldiers can be seen either standing in the foreground, not interacting with the prisoners, or sitting, with their legs crossed over each other. These men seem – more than anything – quite relaxed with what is going on: nonchalant, calm, unwinding; taking it easy.

Figure 10.4 will be unfamiliar and is quite hard to make out: pixelated lumps and colours splotched with blackness. It comes from a video filmed in Syria, the content being clearer when watched. The lumps making up the picture are bodies, bent over and bowed forward. Their hands are tied behind their backs and their faces are blindfolded. But this means of achieving the state of being blindfolded is entirely improvised: the T-shirt of each prisoner is pulled forward above their eyes. If this is unclear,

Figure 10.4 Post-2011 'rendition' of prisoners by the Syrian Arab Republic during the Syrian civil war

try it. If you are wearing one, pull your T-shirt upwards from its seam at your waist and over your head. You will see that you *can* still see. The fabric stretches out and becomes porous. It does not possess the capacity to block sight entirely. Hence, prisoners must also bow down. If you are wearing a buttoned shirt then this procedure will not work: the buttons will either not hold or will leave gaps in your vision. In this case, the video demonstrates an alternative solution: the crafting of a blindfold from a piece of cloth, probably torn from your shirt itself. In either case, the per-meable properties of cloth like this means that prisoners need to remain bowed to be truly blindfolded. Prisoners can still hear, however: there are no earmuffs in these images. Instead, a soldier can be seen traversing over the backs of the tightly squeezed together prisoners and whipping them to enforce their bowed position and prevent them from talking to each other. He shouts and screams and falls as the aircraft moves from side to side. This soldier does not seem at all relaxed.

These images depict military practitioners carrying out what seems a quite different set of activities. In one there is beating and whipping, and in the other there is mere infrastructure: a process of transporting prison-ers. In one set of images, we see brutal human practices and in the other

seated soldiers watching numbly as their 'cargo' is transported from site to site. That is what we can *see*. Nonetheless, many of their *possible* 'intervisibilities' with ourselves as viewers and wider publics, or a host of even more invisible actants, are often overlooked (Brighenti, 2007: 326). When we describe the images, as we have here, we do not express exactly what we see or could be seeing. A certain regime or field of visibility and our position and relation to this regime and field will fashion the tone and tenor of each description and the seeing it renders. So will our sense of aesthetics and our affective sensibilities that are deeply embedded within our corporeality as acting human subjects. These fields and the aesthetic and affective sensibilities associated with them may be somehow ingrained in human practice at its broadest level (Garcia, 2014; Austin, 2017a).

Whether or not they are, the (in)visibilities they engender are ultimately indeterminate. They are modulated also by the personal history, experiences, and sensibilities of each observer. The consequent ambiguous, non-intentional, and aesthetic practices of seeing and overlooking will appear self-evident to us all and are therefore unlikely to provoke much reflection. For the same reason, their enactment cannot be better discerned from an observing individual sitting outside this practice than from someone inside it. Insider informants will not be telling stories about them or translating vernacular visibility to the kinds of visibility outside observers may be more accustomed to. Precisely because of this resistance to observation, regimes of (in)visibility are prone to be re-enacted and reproduced. Precisely for this reason, it matters that IPT attends to them more carefully.

The regimes of (in)visibility through which we understand these images are all the more likely to be reproduced in our practices of seeing and observing because they are closely intertwined not only with 'seeing' but also 'sensing' more broadly. As Laura Marks (2004) argues, it is important to recognize that images are haptic rather than just optic. The separation between the image and the observer that an optic understanding of images rests on breaks down if one begins to think of images as 'grabbing' the observer and in turn being 'grabbed' by the observing gaze. On this account images are also sensuous: you can feel them physically, touch them, smell them. Regimes of (in)visibility are therefore reproduced not only through vision but also through the broader 'bodily unconscious' of us all, the core of our experiential engagement with the world, the point where 'the eye and the body of the observer merge, and in doing so merge with what they observe' (Taussig, 2009: 86).

What, then, are the regimes of (in)visibility these two sets of images are likely to re-enact and reproduce? In what ways are most people, including ourselves, likely to look at them? First, although the

practices these images hint at – torture and killing – are subject to great controversy in both cases, we would not expect to find any symmetry in their descriptions; neither within each set of images nor between the two sets but, rather, the re-enactment of dominant points of view. The practices carried out by the United States in the first set of images have variously been defended as justified by the threats of global terror or alternatively been critically related back to a critique of the discourse of sovereign exceptionalism during 'states of emergency' leading to the systemic production of bare life and/or more simply to a condemnation of the leaders of the Bush regime and/or the CIA as having made possible or 'ordered' rendition. In either case, this renders the 'cogs in the machine' – the relaxed-looking soldiers – relatively invisible as violence workers. They are, after all, transporting men for torture. They are, however, visible as professionals without qualifiers. They do not beat or whip. They are simply 'carrying out their duty' while following all the relevant rules and regulations. Inversely, the bodies of the men being transported are transformed beyond seeing into monstrous cyborgs. They are wrapped in hoods and earmuffs. Things to be shunned and feared. Things it's most comfortable not to look at.

In the case of the second set of images, our eyes immediately focus upon the man who (in the video) is jumping and whipping bodies. This figure becomes a perpetrator of war crimes entangled with the leadership of the Syrian state, which is considered, in the end, a 'pro-torture' regime in and of itself, leading to a corruption of all limits of moral restraint. He is not a professional. He is not even a violence worker: he is a criminal seen in his criminality. By contrast, we can see more of the men he is harming: while they appear as lumps, we can still 'see' their screams and moans, and the patterns on their T-shirts: reflective of their personalities or their interests or their favourite football team. We see the tortured as humans, for the moment at least, and the torturer as inhuman: a precise inversion of the first image. Here, the affective power of visibility is brought to bear upon the viewer. And while much of this has to do with the biases and prejudices of world politics against the non-Euro-American world, it is important to recall that when white soldiers come to torture brown bodies in a closer manner to that being depicted in Figure 10.3, the temptation of any Euro-American observer is typically to sever direct links between these figures and their own identity, or that of the nation-state they belonged to. For example, for many, the perpetrators in Abu Ghraib were aberrant figures, non-reflective of the values of the democratic United States. These figures risked puncturing the dominant regime of visibility presenting the 'Civilized West' in one way and the 'Barbaric Arabs/Muslims' in another.

Tending to (in)visibility can help us look at these images differently and reflect on some of their usually overlooked aspects. For example, it may help us draw attention to the socio-material *agencements* that 'French Pragmatists' have made central to practice theoretical toolkits. It may help us see the practical work being undertaken by the mundane 'missing masses' of materiality (Bénatouïl, 1999; Baert and Da Silva, 2010; Bueger and Gadinger, 2015). In Figures 10.2 and 10.3, much of the 'work' undertaken to restrain and ensure the sensory deprivation of the prisoners is achieved by material objects: hoods, cables, earmuffs, and shackles. These objects allow the soldiers to rest and relax on the plane. Their work in ensuring sensory deprivation is the result of decades of 'congealed labour' carried out by the United States, and incorporating scientists, psychologists, and doctors, to discover the most 'effective' way to carry out these practices (McCoy, 2012; Austin, 2016). The political significance of this becomes clear, however, when we apply the same analysis to Figure 10.4, and allow it to reinstate a form of symmetry. Here, the Syrian soldier is attempting to enforce precisely the same practice as his American colleague: sensory deprivation by removing sight and sound from the prisoners transported. But he lacks the 'congealed labour' gifted to these latter violence workers and so must rely on improvised material props as well as be constantly vigilant that the prisoners do not raise their backs: hence the shouting and beating of the prisoners. This is why he is not relaxed, but also why his involvement in rendition would likely be 'judged' more seriously when made visible than that of his American counterparts: it is *he* who is acting to disappear these men, unlike those American soldiers who watch passively as one set of missing masses go about creating another. Nonetheless, stripped of the regimes of (in-)visibility through which they are typically observed and normatively or politically evaluated, the practices depicted in each of these videos are identical.

There are two issues here. First, the difficulty of perceiving the role of those material 'missing masses' in enabling and structuring the visibility of practice. A difficulty – simply – of 'seeing' what is happening. Second, the ways in which we as viewers and the men on screen as actors are distinctly affectively proximate or distant from the reassuringly regulated, legal, and 'clean' system of violence depicted in Figure 10.2. Dramatics of the case aside, not much is different here from our earlier discussion of hospitals. But consider nonetheless Edmund Clark and Crofton Black's (2016) reflections on their own attempts to put together the story of rendition through photographs, redacted documents, and legal documents:

In piecing together evidence of rendition, our account includes *locations where nothing happened and people who never existed*. A flight crew, enjoying a rest and recuperation stop in Palma de Mallorca, travelled under *false names with no addresses* other than anonymous PO boxes. A plane filed a flight plan for Helsinki but *never arrived there*, going instead to Lithuania, then recorded its onward destination as Portugal while travelling to Cairo. A company registered in Panama and Washington DC gave power of attorney to a man whose address turned out to be a student dormitory where *no one of that name was known…* [emphasis added]

As they note, all these little misdirections are 'masks, obscuring by design and revealing by accident' (Clark and Black, 2016). Hiding behind these masks not only lay a torture regime that was arguably as 'brutal' as that ongoing in Syria today – albeit at a smaller scale – but also much 'cleaner' in its visibilities: luxury jets, holding companies, redacted text, and relaxed soldiers. The power to work with visibility in these ways – to engage successfully in the 'management of gazes' (Brighenti, 2010: 51) – is intimately related to our ability to perceive what practices are, how they emerge, and what they mean. This is related to William Walters' description in Chapter 6 of practices of secrecy, and how they are implicated in regimes of (in)visibility, but it also goes further. Our gazes are managed not only by active, intentional efforts to make-invisible, but also by material objects, those missing masses, that we find very difficult to recognize as being crucial to the enactment of practices, and perhaps most importantly by the affective and aesthetic qualities of the field and regimes of visibility shaping our engagement with images of violence. Ultimately, what becomes clear in examples like this is the import of tending to (in)visibility. It stands at the heart of our ability to observe and theorize practices and hence also of our ability to engage them politically.

Contesting and Shifting Focal Points in Practice Theorizing

To conclude, we can now enunciate two key points that are always interconnected when considering visibility. First, there exist *practices of making seen and making unseen which together form a regime of (in-)visibility*. These practices are materially embedded, technologically mediated, and – today – often digitally and algorithmically structured. They work through affect and emotion as much as through language and reflection. (In)visibility as a mode of analysis is thus distinct from 'discourse'. Of course, both speak to conditions of enunciation within a social sphere. But visibility is distinct in ways in which it does not privilege the ideational or the semiotic but integrates materiality, affect,

aesthetics, circulation, and beyond. Second, these practices of making seen or unseen form regimes that predefine the focal points of any (academic/scientific or otherwise) mode of observation or analysis. As a result, and for IPT specifically, the study of any other set of practices is filtered through these regimes of visibility, and hence *practices of visibility shape the way we see all practices*. All practices – torture and terrorism, diplomacy and negotiation, kissing and sex, bombing and shooting, writing and reading – are made (in)visible by these ontologically prior practices of making seen and unseen. These practices are, in one sense, ontologically prior to any other practice: they always structure how we see or participate in any other practice. In doing so, regimes of (in)visibility are fundamentally about power, politics, and order. Indeed, appreciating this fact allows us to suggest that many world political hierarchies are produced by practices of making seen and unseen and that IPT therefore needs to be far more attentive to them, lest it contribute to conservatively reproducing the status quo (Austin, 2017b). Combining the ontological sensibilities of IPT with a sensitizing understanding of visibility opens up the possibility of politicizing practice theorizing more thoroughly than has previously been achieved.

This politicization takes place across the five fault lines fracturing IPT according to Alena Drieschova and Christian Bueger in Chapter 1. Enacting ambiguous evolving regimes of (in)visibility is at the same time stabilizing existing power-relations *and* an opportunity for counter-practices transforming them. Similarly, on the one hand regimes of (in)visibility are materially inscribed, embodied, reflecting 'unintentional aesthetic' sensemaking. On the other, they form part of consciousness and rationality. The 'strategies' of the American and Syrian torturers we describe are material *and* conscious. Third, and still along similar lines, in our account the everyday and the aggregate are connected. The interactions we describe between local and visiting doctors in the Malawi hospital are both mundane quotidian interactions *and* enactments of different aggregate regimes of (in)visibility and of the visceral reactions associated with them. Fourth, in our discussion power and communities are not opposed to each other. Rather, the regimes of (in)visibility we discuss are core to upholding both power *and* communities, where power is crucial in the making of communities and communities in the making of power. Along these lines, the images of white torturers in Abu Ghraib disturbed both community and power by 'puncturing' the regime of (in)visibility upholding the distinction between the Civilized West and the Barbaric Muslims and the order within each community. Fifth and finally, we conceive of practice theory as being about practice *and* theory. We have provided an argument

that is both about regimes of (in)visibility (theory) and about the doings of US/Syrian tortures and of foreign and local doctors in Malawian hospitals (practice). More generally, the kind of practice theorizing we discuss flattens the distinction between theory and practice, treating theorizing as a specific kind of practice. As we point out, also theorizing is contextual, embodied, affective, aesthetic, and messy in its enactment of regimes of (in)visibility and inescapably dirty as it enacts the politics associated with them.

Beyond that capacity to politicize IPT in a manner transgressing the binaries that keep haunting theoretical work in IR and beyond, thinking the study of practice through the lens of (in)visibility also expands our awareness of the repertoire of practices relevant to practice thinking by 'opening up' previously black-boxed sets of practices concerned with questions of power, its construction, and its projection. Take, for instance, the concept of *soft power*. Generally, this refers to the capacity to gain influence not through blunt power-projection but via the capacity to be 'attractive' to potential allies or adversaries. As Nye argues in his work on this subject, it is the 'attractiveness of a country's culture', the 'friendly and attractive' nature of its 'policing', its dedication to 'attractive causes such as economic aid or peacemaking' or 'attractive' ideology that ensures influence (Nye, 2004: X, 5, 9, 10, 6). In the end: 'soft power is attractive power' (Nye, 2004: 6). Notably, at no point does Nye suggest what actually makes something attractive per se. Seen through the lens of visibility, however, it becomes clear that whatever is deemed globally 'attractive' is not seen as such solely due to a reasoned or logical debate over contents (e.g. a sober look at the advantages of democratic institutions). Instead, attractiveness is fashioned by regimes of (in)visibility in which aesthetic and affective qualities are central. Cultivating such an attractive aesthetics requires a carefully constructed and contingently arrived at regime of (in)visibility that draws focus to that which attracts and distracts from that which does not. Soft power, in this sense, is nothing but the expression of a specific regime of visibility, and a capacity to manipulate it; to make seen and unseen and to shift the quality of the seeing.

Examples like these demonstrate why (in)visibility is something that the state and other centres of power attempt to control to such a high degree. Indeed, and to come to a conclusion, consider Rancière's (1998: 28) reflection on the 'visibility and invisibility of repression' in reference to the 1961 massacre in Paris by police of peaceful Algerian and French-Algerian demonstrators. Rancière notes how the 'police cleared the public space and, thanks to a news blackout, made its own operations invisible':

For us, this meant that something had been done in our country and in our name, and that it was taken away from us … At the time, it was impossible even to count the victims. A phrase used by Sartre in his preface to *Les Damnes de la terre* helps us to understand, *a contrario*, the meaning of that twofold disappearance: '*The blinding sun of torture* has now reached its zenith, and it is lighting up the whole country'. Now, the truth is that *this blinding sun never lit up anything*. Marked and tortured bodies do not light up anything. We know that now, now that images from Bosnia, Rwanda and elsewhere show us much more than we were shown in those days (Rancière, 1998: 28).

What we perceive in the world is always controlled, both directly and indirectly, intentionally and non-intentionally, through practices of making seen and unseen, filtered through the affective, aesthetic, and material. For France to retain its image as a democratic and – indeed – 'enlightened' state required it blot out the 'blinding sun' of its torture that Sartre hoped would revolutionize society. The United States, we have seen, has sought much the same in its similar machinations. And the same battle is occurring in the summer of 2020. In this regard, the abstraction of the 'police' as a core symbol of state power should never be taken to be represented 'primarily [as] a strong-arm repressive force' but, rather, as a 'form of intervention which prescribes what can be seen and what cannot be seen' (Rancière, 1998: 28). And it is this power that practice theory must reckon with.

References

Abbott, A. (1995). Things of boundaries, *Social Research*, 62(4), 857–82.
  (2005). The Historicity of Individuals, *Social Science History*, 29(1), 1–13.
Abbott, K., J. F. Green and R. O. Keohane. (2016). Organizational Ecology and Institutional Change in Global Governance, *International Organization*, 70(2), 247–77.
Abrahamsen, R. and M. C. Williams. (2011). *Security beyond the State: Private Security in International Politics*, Cambridge University Press.
Acharya, A. (2004). How Ideas Spread: Whose Norms Matter? Norm Localization and Institutional Change in Asian Regionalism, *International Organization*, 58(2), 239–75.
Acuto, M. (2014). Everyday International Relations: Garbage, Grand Designs, and Mundane Matters, *International Political Sociology*, 8(4), 345–62.
Acuto, M. and S. Curtis, eds. (2013). *Reassembling International Theory: Assemblage Thinking and International Relations*, Palgrave Macmillan.
Adams, M. (2006). Hybridizing Habitus and Reflexivity: Towards an Understanding of Contemporary Identity? *Sociology*, 40(3), 511–28.
Adler, E. (1991). Cognitive Evolution: A Dynamic Approach for the Study of International Relations and Their Progress. In E. Adler and B. Crawford, eds., *Progress in Postwar International Relations*, Columbia University Press, 43–88.
  (1992). The Emergence of Cooperation: National Epistemic Communities and the International Evolution of the Idea of Nuclear Arms Control, *International Organization*, 46(1), 101–45.
  (1997). Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics, *European Journal of International Relations*, 3(3), 319–63.
  (2005). *Communitarian International Relations: The Epistemic Foundations of International Relations*, Routledge.
  (2008). The Spread of Security Communities: Communities of Practice, Self-Restraint, and NATO's Post-Cold War Transformation, *European Journal of International Relations*, 14(2), 195–230.
  (2019). *World Ordering: A Social Theory of Cognitive Evolution*, Cambridge University Press.
Adler, E. and S. Bernstein. (2005). Knowledge in Power: The Epistemic Construction of Global Governance. In M. Barnet and R. Duvall, eds., *Power in Global Governance*, Cambridge University Press, 294–318.

Adler, E. and B. Crawford, eds. (1991). *Progress in Postwar International Relations*, Columbia University Press.

Adler, E. and A. Drieschova. (2021). The Epistemological Challenge of Truth-Subversion to the Liberal International Order, *International Organization*, 75(2), 359–86.

Adler, E. and P. Greve. (2009). When Security Community Meets Balance of Power: Overlapping Regional Mechanisms of Security Governance, *Review of International Studies*, 35(S1), 59–84.

Adler, E. and P. M. Haas. (1992). Conclusion: Epistemic Communities, World Order, and the Creation of a Reflective Research Program, *International Organization*, 46(1), 367–90.

Adler, E. and V. Pouliot. (2011a). *International Practices*, Cambridge University Press.

(2011b). International Practices, *International Theory*, 3(1), 1–36.

(2011c). International Practices: Introduction and Framework. In E. Adler and V. Pouliot, eds., *International Practices*, Cambridge University Press, 3–35.

(2015). Fulfilling the Promises of Practice Theory in IR, *International Studies Quarterly Online*, www.isanet.org/Publications/ISQ/Posts/ID/4956/Fulfilling-The-Promises-of-Practice-Theory-in-IR.

Adler-Nissen, R., ed. (2012). *Bourdieu in International Relations: Rethinking Key Concepts in IR*, Routledge.

Adler-Nissen, R. (2013a). Sovereignty. In R. Adler-Nissen, ed., *Bourdieu in International Relations: Rethinking Key Concepts in IR*, Routledge, 179–92.

(2013b). *Bourdieu in International Relations: Rethinking Key Concepts in IR*, Routledge.

(2014a). *Opting Out of the European Union: Diplomacy, Sovereignty and European Integration*, Cambridge University Press.

(2014b). Stigma Management in International Relations: Transgressive Identities, Norms and Order in International Society, *International Organization*, 68(1), 143–76.

(2014c). Symbolic Power in European Diplomacy: The Struggle between National Foreign Services and the EU's External Action Service, *Review of International Studies*, 40(4), 657–81.

(2016). Towards a Practice Turn in EU Studies: The Everyday of European Integration, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 54(1), 87–103.

Adler-Nissen, R. and A. Drieschova. (2019). Track-Change Diplomacy: Technology, Affordances, and the Practice of International Negotiations, *International Studies Quarterly*, 63(3), 531–45.

Adler-Nissen, R. and V. Pouliot. (2014). Power in Practice: Negotiating the International Intervention in Libya, *European Journal of International Relations*, 20(4), 889–911.

Adler-Nissen, R. and A. Tsinovoi. (2019). International Misrecognition: The Politics of Humour and National Identity in Israel's Public Diplomacy, *European Journal of International Relations*, 25(1), 3–29.

Aelst, P. V. et al. (2017). Political Communication in a High-Choice Media Environment: A Challenge for Democracy? *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 41(1), 3–27.

Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, Stanford University Press.

Ahamed, L. (2009). *Lords of Finance: The Bankers Who Broke the World*, Penguin.

Akrich, M. (2010). From Communities of Practice to Epistemic Communities: Health Mobilizations on the Internet, *Sociological Research Online*, 15(2), 1–17.

Aldrich, N. W. (1910). An Address by Senator Nelson W. Aldrich before the Economic Club of New York, 29 November 1909, on the Work of the National Monetary Commission. Archives: Library of Congress, Collection Nelson W. Aldrich Papers.

Allan, B. (2017). Producing the Climate: States, Scientists, and the Constitution of Global Governance Objects, *International Organization*, 71(1), 131–62.

  (2018). From Subjects to Objects: Knowledge in International Relations Theory, *European Journal of International Relations*, 24(4), 841–64.

Amin, A. and P. Cohendet. (2004). *Architectures of Knowledge: Firms, Capabilities, and Communities*, Oxford University Press.

Andersen, M. S. and I. B. Neumann. (2012). Practices as Models: A Methodology with an Illustration Concerning Wampum Diplomacy, *Millennium*, 40(3), 457–81.

Antoniades, A. (2003). Epistemic Communities, Epistemes and the Construction of (World) Politics, *Global Society*, 17(1), 21–38.

Arbatov, A. (2016). Saving Nuclear Arms Control, *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 72(3), 165–70.

Archer, M. (1988). *Culture and Agency: The Place of Culture in Social Theory*, Cambridge University Press.

Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*, University of Chicago Press.

  (2006). *Between Past and Future*, Penguin.

Aristotle. (1975). *Nicomachean Ethics*, translated by H. Rackham, Harvard University Press.

Ashley, R. (1989). Living on Border Lines: Man, Poststructuralism and War. In J. Der Derian and M. Shapiro, eds., *International/Intertextual Relations*, Lexington Books, 259–323.

Ashley, R. and R. B. J. Walker. (1990). Speaking the Language of Exile: Dissident Thought in International Studies, *International Studies Quarterly*, 34(3), 259–68.

Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to Do Things with Words*, Oxford University Press.

  (2016). Torture and the Material-Semiotic Networks of Violence Across Borders, *International Political Sociology*, 10(1), 3–21.

  (2017a). *Small Worlds of Violence: A Global Grammar for Torture*, Graduate Institute Geneva.

  (2017b). We Have Never Been Civilized: Torture and the Materiality of World Political Binaries, *European Journal of International Relations*, 23(1), 49–73.

  (2019). Security Compositions, *European Journal of International Security*, 4(3), 249–73.

  (2020a). The Departed Militant: A Portrait of Joy, Violence, and Political Evil. *Security Dialogue*, 51(6), 537–56.

  (2020b). The Poetry of Moans and Sighs: Designs for and against Violence, *Frame: Journal of Literary Studies*, 33(2), 13–31.

Austin, J. L., R. Bellanova and M. Kaufmann. (2019). Doing and Mediating Critique: An Invitation to Practice Companionship, *Security Dialogue*, 50(1), 3–19.

Austin, J. L. and A. Leander. (2021). Designing-With/In World Politics: Manifestos for an International Political Design, *Political Anthropological Research on International Social Sciences (PARISS)*, 2(1), 83–154.

Autesserre, S. (2014). *Peaceland: Conflict Resolution and the Everyday Politics of International Intervention*, Cambridge University Press.

Avant, D. D., M. Finnemore and S. K. Sell, eds. (2010). *Who Governs the Globe?* Cambridge University Press.

Axelrod, R. (1984). *The Evolution of Cooperation*, Basic Books.

Baert, P. and F. C. Da Silva. (2010). One Hundred Years of French Social Theory: Form Structuralism to Pragmatism. In P. Baert and F. C. Da Silva, eds., *Social Theory in the Twentieth Century and Beyond*, Polity, 12–51.

Bagehot, W. (1873). *Lombard Street, a Description of the Money Market*, Smith.

Bain, W. (2003). *Between Anarchy and Society: Trusteeship and the Obligations of Power*, Oxford University Press.

Baker, A. (2006). *The Group of Seven: Finance Ministries, Central Banks and Global Financial Governance*, Routledge.

Barbato, M. (2013). *Pilgrimage, Politics and International Relations: Religious Semantics for World Politics*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Barker, R. (1982). *Conscience, Government, and War: Conscientious Objection in Great Britain, 1939–45*, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Barnes, B. (2001). Practice as Collective Action. In T. R. Schatzki, K. Knorr Cetina and E. von Savigny, eds., *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, Routledge, 25–36.

Barnett, M. and R. Duvall. (2005). Power in Global Governance. In M. Barnett and R. Duvall, eds., *Power and Global Governance*, Cambridge University Press, 1–32.

Barnett, M. N. and M. Finnemore. (1999). The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations, *International Organization*, 53(4), 699–732.

(2004). *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics*, Cornell University Press.

Barry, A. (1999). Demonstrations: Sites and Sights of Direct Action, *Economy & Society*, 28, 75–94.

(2004). Ethical Capitalism. In W. Larner and W. Walters, eds., *Global Governmentality: Governing International Spaces*, Routledge, 195–211.

Bartelson, J. (1995). *A Genealogy of Sovereignty*, Cambridge University Press.

Barth, K-H. (1998). Science and Political in Early Nuclear Test Ban Negotiations, *Physics Today*, 51(3), 34–9.

(2006). Catalysts of Change: Scientists as Transnational Arms Control Advocates in the 1980s, *Osiris*, 21(1), 182–206.

Becker, H. (1998). *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think about Your Research while You're Doing It*, University of Chicago Press.

Bellamy, A. J., P. Williams and S. Griffin. (2010). *Understanding Peacekeeping*, 2nd ed., Polity Press.

Bénatouïl, T. (1999). A Tale of Two Sociologies: The Critical and Pragmatic Stance in Contemporary French Sociology, *European Journal of Social Theory*, 2(3), 379–96.

Benner, T. and P. Rotmann. (2008). Learning to Learn? UN Peacebuilding and the Challenges of Building a Learning Organization, *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 2(1), 43–62.

Bentham, J. (1789). *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, London: Dover Publications.

Berling, T. V. (2015). *The International Political Sociology of Security: Rethinking Theory and Practice*, Routledge.

Bernstein, R. J., ed. (1985). *Habermas and Modernity*, MIT Press.

Bernstein, S. (2000). Ideas, Social Structure, and the Compromise of Liberal Environmentalism, *European Journal of International Relations*, 6(4), 464–512.

(2013). Global Environmental Norms. In R. Falkner, ed., *The Handbook of Global Climate and Environment Policy*, John Wiley & Sons Ltd., 127–45.

(2014). The Publicness of Private Global Environmental and Social Governance. In J. Best and A. Gheciu, eds., *The Return of the Public in Global Governance*, Cambridge University Press, 120–48.

Bernstein, S. and H. van der Ven. (2017). Best Practices in Global Governance, *Review of International Studies*, 43(3), 534–56.

Berthoin Antal, A., M. Hutter and D. Stark, eds. (2015). *Moments of Valuation. Exploring Sites of Dissonance*, Oxford University Press.

Bertram, G. W. (2019). *Art as Human Practice: An Aesthetics*, Bloomsbury Academic.

Best, J. and A. Gheciu. (2014a). *The Return of the Public in Global Governance*, Cambridge University Press.

(2014b). Theorizing the Public as Practices: Transformations of the Public in Historical Context. In J. Best and A. Gheciu, eds., *The Return of the Public in Global Governance*, Cambridge University Press, 15–44.

Betts, A. and P. Orchard. (2014). Conclusions. In A. Betts and P. Orchard, eds., *Implementation and World Politics: How International Norms Change Practice*, Oxford University Press, 270–85.

Bially Mattern, J. (2011). A Practice Theory of Emotion for International Relations. In E. Adler and V. Pouliot, eds., *International Practices*, Cambridge University Press, 63–86.

Bially Mattern, J. and A. Zarakol. (2016). Hierarchies in World Politics, *International Organization*, 70(3), 623–54.

Bigo, D. (2011). Pierre Bourdieu and International Relations: Power of Practices, Practices of Power, *International Political Sociology*, 5(3), 225–58.

Bloor, D. (1976). *Knowledge and Social Imagery*, University of Chicago Press.

(2001). Wittgenstein and the Priority of Practice. In T. Schatzki, et al., eds., *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, Routledge, 103–14.

Blumer, H. (1954). What Is Wrong with Social Theory? *American Sociological Review*, 19(1), 3–10.

(1986). What Is Wrong with Social Theory? In ibid.: *Symbolic Interactionism. Perspective and Method*, University of California Press, 140–52.

Boltanski, L. (2011). *On Critique. A Sociology of Emancipation*, Polity Press.

Boltanski, L. and L. Thévenot. (2006). *On Justification. Economies of Worth*, Princeton University Press.

Bonditti, P., D. Bigo and F. Gros, eds. (2017). *Foucault and the Modern International*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Bordo, M. D. and A. J. Schwartz, eds. (1984). *A Retrospective on the Classical Gold Standard, 1821–1931*, University of Chicago Press.

Bourbeau, P. (2017). The Practice Approach in Global Politics, *Journal of Global Security Studies*, 2(2), 170–82.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, translated by R. Nice, Cambridge University Press.

(1984). *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Harvard University Press.

(1985). The Genesis of the Concepts of Habitus and of Field, *Sociocriticism*, 2(2), 11–24.

(1990). *The Logic of Practice*, Stanford University Press.

(1993). *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, Polity Press.

(2000 [1972]). *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique*, Seuil.

(2001). *Langage et pouvoir symbolique*, Seuil.

(2002). *Masculine Domination*, Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. and L. J. D. Wacquant. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, University of Chicago Press.

Bratman, M. (2014). *Shared Agency*, Oxford University Press.

Brighenti, A. M. (2007). Visibility: A Category for the Social Sciences, *Current Sociology*, 55(3), 323–42.

(2008). Visual, Visible, Ethnographic, *Etnografia e ricerca qualitativa*, 1(1), 91–114.

(2010). *Visibility in Social Theory and Social Research*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Brown, C. (2012). The 'Practice Turn', Phronesis and Classical Realism: Towards a Phronetic International Political Theory? *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 40(3), 439–56.

Brown, J. S. and P. Duguid. (1991). Organizational Learning and Communities-of-Practice: Toward a Unified View of Working, Learning, and Innovation, *Organization Science*, 2(1), 40–57.

Brumann, C. and D. Berliner, eds. (2016). *World Heritage On The Ground. Ethnographic Perspectives*, Berghahn.

Bruner, R. F. and S. D. Carr. (2007). Lessons from the Financial Crisis of 1907, *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 19(4), 115–24.

Brunnée, J. and S. J. Toope. (2010). *Legitimacy and Legality in International Law: An Interactional Account*, Cambridge University Press.

(2011). Interactional International Law and the Practice of Legality. In E. Adler and V. Pouliot, eds., *International Practices*, Cambridge University Press, 108–35.

(2019). Norm Robustness and Contestation in International Law: Self-Defence against Non-State Actors, *Journal of Global Security Studies*, 4(1), 73–87.

Bryant, L. R. (2011). A Logic of Multiplicities: Deleuze, Immanence, and Onticology, *Analecta Hermeneutica*, 3, 1–20.

Bucher, B. (2014). Acting Abstractions: Metaphors, Narrative Structures, and the Eclipse of Agency, *European Journal of International Relations*, 20(3), 742–65.

Bueger, C. (2011). Communities of Practice in World Politics – Theory or Technology? *52nd Annual International Studies Association conference*, 16–19 March.

(2013). Pathways to Practice: Praxiography and International Politics, *European Political Science Review*, 6(3), 383–406.

(2014). From Expert Communities to Epistemic Arrangements: Situating Expertise in International Relations. In M. Mayer, M. Carpes and R. Knoblich, eds., *The Global Politics of Science and Technology*, Vol. I, Springer-Verlag, 40–54.

(2015). Making Things Known: Epistemic Practice, the United Nations and the Translation of Piracy, *International Political Sociology*, 9(1), 1–19.

(2017a). Let's Count Beyond Three: Understanding the Conceptual and Methodological Terrain of International Practice Theory, *International Studies Quarterly*, 2. Available at: www.isanet.org/Publications/ISQ/Posts/ID/5478/Lets-count-beyond-three-Understanding-the-conceptual- and-methodological-terrain-of-international-practice-theories. (Accessed 13 November 2021).

(2017b). Practices, Norms and the Theory of Contestation, *Polity*, 49(1), 126–31.

Bueger, C. and F. Bethke. (2013). Actor-Networking the 'Failed State' – An Enquiry into the Life of Concepts, *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 17(1), 30–60.

Bueger, C. and F. Gadinger. (2007). Reassembling and Dissecting: International Relations Practice from a Science Studies Perspective, *International Studies Perspectives*, 8(1), 90–110.

(2014). *International Practice Theory: New Perspectives*, Palgrave Macmillan.

(2015). The Play of International Practice, *International Studies Quarterly*, 59(3), 449–60.

(2018). *International Practice Theory*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Bull, H. (1966). International Theory: The Case of a Classical Approach, *World Politics*, 15(3), 361–77.

(2012). *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, Palgrave.

Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable Speech. A Politics of the Performative*, Routledge.

(1999). *Gender Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Routledge.

Buzan, B. and O. Waever. (2003). *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*, Cambridge University Press.

Byrne, A. (2017). Hungary's Orban Vows to Defend Poland from EU Sanctions. *Financial Times*, 22 July. Available from: www.ft.com/content/b1bd2424-6ed7-11e7-93ff-99f383b09ff9.

Cadman, L. (2010). How (not) to Be Governed: Foucault, Critique, and the Political, *Environment and Planning D*, 28(3), 539–56.

Callon, M. (1986). Elements of a Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the Scallops and the Fishermen of St Brieuc Bay. In J. Law, ed., *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge?* Routledge, 196–233.

Carlsnaes, W. (1992). The Agency-Structure Problem in Foreign Policy Analysis, *International Studies Quarterly*, 36(3), 245–70.

Carr, E. H. (1964). *The Twenty Years Crisis*, Harper Torchbooks.

Castells, M. (1996). *The Rise of the Network Society*, Blackwell.

Clark, E. and C. Black. (2016). The appearance of disappearance: The CIA's secret black sites, *The Financial Times*, 17 March.

Clough, P. (2009). The New Empiricism: Affect and Sociological Method. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 12(1), 43–61.

Coe, N. M. and T. G. Brunell. (2003). Spatializing Knowledge Communities: Towards a Conceptualization of Transnational Innovation Networks, *Global Networks*, 3(4), 437–56.

Cohen, M., J. March and J. Olsen. (1972). A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(1), 1–25.

Cohendet, P., F. Creplet and O. Dupouët. (2001). Communities of Practice and Epistemic Communities: A Renewed Approach of Organisational Learning within the Firm. Retrieved from ResearchGate: www.researchgate.net/publication/228587324_Communities_of_Practice_and_Epistemic_Communities_A_Renewed_Approach_of_Organizational_Learning_within_the_Firm.

Coleman, W. D. and S. F. Bernstein. (2009). *Unsettled Legitimacy, Political Community, Power, and Authority in a Global Era, Globalization and Autonomy*, University of British Colombia Press.

Collier, S. (2009). Topologies of Power: Foucault's Analysis of Political Government beyond "Governmentality", *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(6), 78–108.

Conlisk, J. (1996). Why Bounded Rationality? *Journal of Economic Literature*, 34(2), 669–90.

Connolly, W. (1983). *The Terms of Political Discourse*, Princeton University Press.

Cooley, A. (2003). Thinking Rationally about Hierarchy and Global Governance, *Review of International Political Economy*, 10(4), 627–84.

Cornut, J. (2018). Diplomacy, Agency, and the Logic of Improvisation and Virtuosity in Practice, *European Journal of International Relations*, 24(3), 712–36.

Cortell, A. P. and J. W. Davis. (1996). How Do International Institutions Matter? The Domestic Impact of International Rules and Norms, *International Studies Quarterly*, 40(4), 451–78.

Cottrell, P. (1995). The Bank of England in Its International Setting, 1918–1972. In R. Roberts and D. Kynaston, eds., *The Bank of England: Money, Power, and Influence 1694–1994*, Clarendon Press, 83–139.

Créplet, F., O. Dupouët and E. Vaast. (2003). Episteme or Practice? Differentiated Communitarian Structures in a Biology Laboratory. Retrieved from Research Gate: www.researchgate.net/publication/228720203_Episteme_or_practice_Differentiated_Communitarian_Structures_in_a_Biology_Laboratory.

Crone, M. (2014). Religion and Violence: Governing Muslim Militancy through Aesthetic Assemblages, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 43(1), 291–307.

Cruikshank, B. (1996). Revolutions within: Self-Government and Self-Esteem. In B. Andrew, O. Thomas and R. Nikolas, eds., *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government*, University of Chicago Press, 231–52.

D'Aoust, A.-M. (2014). Ties that Bind? Engaging Emotions, Governmentality and Neoliberalism: Introduction to the Special Issue, *Global Society*, 28(3), 267–76.

Davidson, A. (2011). In Praise of Counter-Conduct, *History of the Human Sciences*, 24(4), 25–41.

Davis Cross, M. K. (2013). Rethinking Epistemic Communities Twenty Years Later, *Review of International Studies*, 39(1), 137–60.

Davis, J. (2005). *Terms of Inquiry: On the Theory and Practice of Political Science*, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Davis, J. and C. Daase, eds. (2015). *Clausewitz on Small Wars*, Oxford University Press.

De Genova, N. (2013). Spectacles of Migrant "Illegality": The Scene of Exclusion, the Obscene of Inclusion, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(7), 1180–98.

Dean, M. (1994). *Critical and Effective Histories*, Routledge.
  (2010). *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*, 2nd ed., Sage Publications.

Death, C. (2010). Counter-Conducts: A Foucauldian Analytics of Protest, *Social Movement Studies*, 9(3), 235–51.

Deleuze, G. (1988). *Foucault*, University of Minnesota Press.
  (1991). *Qu'est-ce que la philosophie?* Éditions de minuit.

Deleuze, G. and F. Guattari. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, Athlone Press.
  (2004). *A Thousand Plateaus*, Continuum.

Derrida, J. (1982). *Margins of Philosophy*, University of Chicago Press.
  (1988). *Limited Inc.*, Northwestern University Press.

Dessler, D. (1989). What's at Stake in the Agent-Structure Debate? *International Organization*, 43(3), 441–73.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*, The Macmillan Company.
  (1922). *Human Nature and Conduct*, Henry Holt and Company.
  (1984). *The Early Works of John Dewey, 1882–1953*, Vol. IV of The Quest for Certainty, J. A. Boydston, ed. Southern Illinois University Press.
  (1988). *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899–1924*, Vol. XII of Reconstruction in Philosophy and Essays, J. A. Boydston, ed., Southern Illinois University Press.

Doty, R. L. (1993). Foreign Policy as Social Construction: A Post-Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines, *International Studies Quarterly*, 37(3), 297–320.
  (1996). *Imperial Encounters*, University of Minnesota Press.
  (1997). Aporia: A Critical Exploration of the Agent–Structure Problematique in International Relations Theory, *European Journal of International Relations*, 3(3), 365–92.

Douglas, M. (1986). *How Institutions Think*, Syracuse University Press.

Dunlop, C. A. (2009). Policy Transfer as Learning: Capturing Variation in What Decision-Makers Learn From Epistemic Communities, *Policy Studies*, 30(3), 289–311.

Dunn, F. S. (1929). *The Practice and Procedure of International Conferences*, Literary Licensing.

Dunne, T. (1998). *Inventing International Society: A History of the English School*, St. Martin's Press.

Duvall, R. D. and A. Chowdhury. (2011). Practices of Theory. In E. Adler and V. Pouliot, eds., *International Practices*, Cambridge University Press, 335–54.

Eagleton-Pierce, M. (2013). *Symbolic Power in the World Trade Organization*, Oxford University Press.

Eikeland, O. and D. Nicolini. (2011). Turning Practically: Broadening the Horizon, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 24(2), 164–74.

Einzig, P. (1932). *Montagu Norman: A Study in Financial Statesmanship*, K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & co., ltd.

Enderlein, H., S. Wälti and M. Zürn, eds. (2010). *Handbook on Multi-Level Governance*, Edward Elgar.

Engelkamp, S. and K. Glaab. (2015). Writing Norms. Constructivist Norm Research and the Politics of Ambiguity, *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 40(3–4), 201–18.

Enloe, C. (2000). *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*, University of California Press.
  (2016). Flick of the Skirt: A Feminist Challenge to IR's Coherent Narrative, *International Political Sociology*, 10(4), 320–31.

Epstein, C. (2011). Who Speaks? Discourse, the Subject and the Study of Identity in International Politics, *European Journal of International Relations*, 17(2), 327–50.
  (2012). Stop Telling Us How to Behave, *Socialization or Infantilization? International Studies Perspectives*, 13(2), 135–45.
  (2013). Norms. In R. Adler-Nissen, ed., *Bourdieu in International Relations*, Routledge, 165–78.

Ezrahi, Y. (2012). *Imagined Democracies: Necessary Political Fictions*, Cambridge University Press.

Fassin, D. (2009). Another politics of life is possible, *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(5), 44–60.

Fekete, L., F. Webber and A. Edmond-Petit. (2017). *Humanitarianism: The Unacceptable Face of Solidarity*, Institute of Race Relations.

Fierke, K. (2002). Links Across the Abyss: Language and Logic in International Relations, *International Studies Quarterly*, 46(3), 331–54.
  (2010). Constructivism. In T. Dunne, M. Kurki and S. Smith, eds., *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, Oxford University Press, 161–78.

Fine, G. (1995). *On Ideas Aristotle's Criticism of Plato's Theory of Forms*, Oxford University Press.

Finnemore, M. (1996). Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention. In P. Katzenstein, ed., *The Culture of National Security*, Columbia University Press, 153–85.

Finnemore, M. and K. Sikkink. (1998). International Norm Dynamics and Political Change, *International Organization*, 52(4), 887–917.

Fischer, D. (1997). *History of the International Atomic Energy Agency: The First Forty Years*, International Atomic Energy Agency.

Fligstein, N. and D. McAdam. (2011). Toward a General Theory of Strategic Action Fields, *Sociological Theory*, 29(1), 1–26.

Florini, A. (1996). The Evolution of International Norms, *International Studies Quarterly*, 40(3), 363–89.

Forsberg, T. (2012). Vincent Pouliot, International Security in Practice: The Politics of NATO-Russia Diplomacy, *Europe-Asia Studies*, 64(1), 169–71.

Foucault, M. (1971). *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences*, Pantheon.

(1977). *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*, Routledge.

(1988). Technologies of the Self. In L. H. Martin, L. H. Gutman and P. H. Hutton, eds., *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*, University of Massachusetts Press, 16–49.

(1990). *The History of Sexuality, Volume One*, Vintage.

(2000). The Subject and Power. In F. James, ed., *Michel Foucault: Power*, The New Press, 326–48.

(2003). *Society Must be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France 1975–1976*, Palgrave Macmillan.

(2005). *The Hermeneutics of the Subject. Lectures at the College de France 1981–1982*, Picador.

(2007). *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977–78*, Palgrave Macmillan.

(2008). *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France 1978–1979*, Palgrave Macmillan.

(2010). *The Government of Self and Others: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1982–1983*, Palgrave Macmillan.

(2011). *The Courage of Truth (The Government of Self and Others II): Lectures at the Collège de France, 1983–1984*, Palgrave Macmillan.

(2014). *Wrong-Doing and Truth-Telling: The Function of Avowal in Justice*, University of Chicago Press.

Franck, T. (1990). *The Power of Legitimacy Among Nations*, Oxford University Press.

Freeman, R., S. Griggs and A. Boaz. (2011). The Practice of Policy Making, *Evidence & Policy*, 7(2), 127–36.

Frega, R. (2014). The Normative Creature: Toward a Practice-Based Account of Normativity, *Social Theory and Practice*, 40(1), 1–27.

Friedrichs, J. (2004). *European Approaches to International Relations Theory*, Routledge.

Friedrichs, J. and F. Kratochwil. (2009). On Acting and Knowing: How Pragmatism Can Advance International Relations Research and Methodology, *International Organization*, 63(4), 701–31.

Frost, M. and S. Lechner. (2016a). Two Conceptions of International Practice: Aristotelian Praxis or Wittgensteinian Language Games? *Review of International Studies*, 42(2), 334–50.

(2016b). Understanding International Practices from the Internal Point of View, *Journal of International Political Theory*, 12(3), 299–319.

Fuller, L. (1958). Positivism and Fidelity to the Law – A Reply to Prof. Hart, *Harvard Law Review*, 71(4), 630–72.

(1969). *The Morality of Law*, revised edition, Yale University Press.

Furedi, F. (2013). *Authority: A Sociological History*, Cambridge University Press.

Gadinger, F. (2016). On Justification and Critique: Luc Boltanski's Pragmatic Sociology and International Relations, *International Political Sociology*, 10(3), 187–205.

Garcia, T. (2014). *Form and Object: A Treatise on Things*, translated by M. A. Ohm and J. Cogburn, Edinburgh University Press.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, Prentice Hall.

Garnham, N. and R. Williams. (1980). Pierre Bourdieu and the Sociology of Culture: An Introduction, *Media, Culture and Society*, 2(3), 209–23.

Gherardi, S. (2016). To Start Practice Theorizing Anew: The Contribution of the Concepts of Agencement and Formativeness, *Organization*, 23(5), 680–98.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration*, University of California Press.

(1987). Structuralism, Post-Structuralism and the Production of Culture. In A. Giddens and J. H. Turner, eds., *Social Theory Today*, Stanford University Press, 195–223.

Gielen, P. (2005). Art and Social Value Regimes, *Current Sociology*, 53(5), 789–806.

Gieryn, T. F. (1999). *Cultural Boundaries of Science: Credibility on the Lin*, University of Chicago Press.

Gilady, L. and M. J. Hoffman. (2013). Darwin's Finches or Lamarck's Giraffe, Does International Relations Get Evolution Wrong? *International Studies Review*, 15, 307–27.

Go, J. (2008). Global Fields and Imperial Forms: Field Theory and the British and American Empires, *Sociological Theory*, 26(3), 201–29.

Gogol, N. V. (2006). *Diary of a Madman and other Stories*, Dover Publications.

Goldstein, J. (2001). *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa*, Cambridge University Press.

Golsorkhi, S., L. Rouleau, D. Seidl and E. Vaara, eds. (2010). *Cambridge Handbook of Strategy as Practice*, Cambridge University Press.

Gordon, C. (1991). Governmental rationality: An introduction. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller, eds., *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, University of Chicago Press, 1–52.

Grande, E. and L. W. Pauly, eds. (2005). *Complex Sovereignty: Reconstituting Political Authority in the Twenty-First Century*, University of Toronto Press.

Grimmel, A. and G. Hellmann. (2019). Theory Must Not Go on Holiday. Wittgenstein, the Pragmatists, and the Idea of Social Science, *International Political Sociology*, 13(2), 198–214.

Gronow, A. (2011). *From Habits to Social Structures: Pragmatism and Contemporary Social Theory*, Peter Lang.

Gross Stein, J. (2011). Background Knowledge in the Foreground: Conversations about Competent Practice in "Sacred Space". In E. Adler and V. Pouliot, eds., *International Practices*, Cambridge University Press, 87–107.

Gumbrecht, H. U. and K. L. Pfeiffer, eds. (1988). *Materialities of Communication*, Stanford University Press.

Guzman, G. (2013). The Grey Textures of Practice and Knowledge: Review and Framework, *European Business Review*, 25(5), 429–52.

Guzzini, S. (2000). A Reconstruction of Constructivism in International Relations, *European Journal of International Relations*, 6(2), 147–82.

(2005). The Concept of Power: A Constructivist Analysis, *Millennium*, 33(3), 495–521.

(2013). The Ends of International Relations Theory: Stages of Reflexivity and Modes of Theorizing, *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(3), 521–41.

Haak, S. (2006). *Pragmatism, Old and New: Selected Writings*, Prometheus Books.

Haas, E. B. (1997). *Nationalism, Liberalism, and Progress: The Rise and Decline of Nationalism*, Vol. 1, Cornell University Press.

(2000). *Nationalism, Liberalism, and Progress: The Dismal Fate of New Nations*, Vol. II, Cornell University Press.

Haas, P. M. (1992). Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination, *International Organization*, 46(1), 1–35.

(2004). Addressing the Global Governance Deficit, *Global Environmental Politics*, 4(4), 1–15.

Habermas, J. (1968). *Erkenntnis und Interesse*, Suhrkamp.

(1993). *Faktizitaet und Geltung*, Suhrkamp.

Hacking, I. (2002). *Historical Ontology*, Harvard University Press.

Hafemeister, D. (2016). *Nuclear Proliferation and Terrorism in the Post-9/11 World*, Springer.

Hagstrom, W. O. (1965). *The Scientific Community*, Basic Books.

Hajer, M. (2003). Policy without Polity? Policy Analysis and the Institutional Void, *Policy Sciences*, 36(2), 175–95.

Håkanson, L. (2010). The Firm as an Epistemic Community: The Knowledge-Based View Revisited, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 19(6), 1801–28.

Hall, R. B. (2008). *Central Banking as Global Governance: Constructing Financial Credibility*, Cambridge University Press.

Hall, R. B. and T. J. Biersteker, eds. (2002). *The Emergence of Private Authority in Global Governance*, Cambridge University Press.

Hall, T. (2015). *Emotional Diplomacy: Official Emotion on the International Stage*, Cornell University Press.

Hamburg, D. A. (2015). *A Model of Prevention: Life Lessons*, Routledge.

Hammarskjöld, D. (1957). *Regulations for the United Nations Emergency Force*, United Nations.

Hanrieder, T. (2016). Orders of Worth and the Moral Conceptions of Health in Global Politics, *International Theory*, 8(3), 390–421.

Hansen, L. (2006). *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*, Routledge.

(2011). Performing Practices: A Poststructuralist Analysis of the Muhammad Cartoon Crisis. In E. Adler and V. Pouliot, eds., *International practices*, Cambridge University Press, 280–309.

Hansen, M. (1997). Not Thus, after All, Would Life Be Given: Technesis, Technology, and the Parody of Romantic Poetics in Frankenstein, *Studies in Romanticism*, 36(4), 575–609.

(2000). *Embodying Technesis: Technology Beyond Writing*, The University of Michigan Press.

Hansen, T. A. (2015). Scientific Communities of Practice for Learning – Lessons From Ethnographic Fieldwork. Retrieved from Research Gate: www.researchgate.net/publication/281625987_Scientific_communities_of_practice_for_learning_-_lessons_from_ethnographic_fieldwork.

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective, *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575–99.

Hardt, M. and A. Negri. (2000). *Empire*, Harvard University Press.

Hart, H. L. A. (1958). Positivism and the Separation of Law and Morals, *Harvard Law Review*, 71(4), 593–629.

Hausman, C. R. (1993). *Charles S. Peirce's Evolutionary Philosophy*, Cambridge University Press.

Hawkins, D., D. A. Lake, D. L. Nielson and M. J. Tierney. (2006). *Delegation and Agency in International Organizations*, Cambridge University Press.

Hawkins, G. (2011). Packaging Water: Plastic Bottles as Market and Public Devices, *Economy & Society*, 40, 534–52.

Hecker, S. S., ed. (2016). *Doomed to Cooperate: How American and Russian Scientists Joined Forces to Avert Some of the Greatest Post-Cold War Nuclear Dangers*, Vol. I, Bathtub Row Press.

Heinich, N. (1991). *La Gloire de Van Gogh. Essai d'anthropologie de l'admiration*, Éditions de Minuit.

(2001). *La sociologie de l'art*, La Découverte.

(2012). *De la visibilité*, Gallimard.

Hellmann, G. (2009). Beliefs as Rules for Action: Pragmatism as a Theory of Thought and Action, *International Studies Review*, 11(3), 638–62.

(2017). Interpreting International Relations. In G. Hellmann and M. Valbjorn, eds., *The Forum: Problematizing Global Challenges: Recalibrating the "Inter" in IR-Theory, International Studies Review*, 19, 296–300.

Hennessy, E. (1992). *A Domestic History of the Bank of England, 1930–1960*, Cambridge University Press.

Hillebrandt, F. (2014). *Soziologische Praxistheorien. Eine Einführung*, Springer VS.

Hirschauer, St. (2008). Die Empiriegeladenheit von Theorien und der Erfindungsreichtum der Praxis. In H. Kalthoff, St. Hirschauer and G. Lindemann, eds., *Theoretische Empire. Zur Relevanz qualitativer Forschung*, Suhrkamp, 165–87.

Hofius, M. (2016). Community at the Border or the Boundaries of Community? The Case of EU Field Diplomats. *Review of International Studies*, 42(5), 939–67.

Holmes, M. and D. Traven. (2015). Acting Rationally without Really Thinking: The Logic of Rational Intuitionism for International Relations Theory, *International Studies Review*, 17(3), 414–40.

Hooper, C. (2001). *Manly States: Masculinities, International Relations, and Gender Politics*, Columbia University Press.

Hopf, T. (1998). The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory, *International Security*, 23(1), 171–200.

(2010). The Logic of Habit in International Relations, *European Journal of International Relations*, 16(4), 539–61.

(2011). International Security in Practice: The Politics of NATO–Russia Diplomacy. By Vincent Pouliot. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010, *Perspectives on Politics*, 9(3), 772–3.

(2018). Change in International Practices, *European Journal of International Relations*, 24(3), 687–711.

Hui, A., Th. R. Schatzki and E. Shove, eds. (2017). *The Nexus of Practices. Connections, Constellations, Practitioners*, Routledge.

Hume, D. (1875). *On Essay Writing in Essays, Literary, Moral and Political*, In T. H. Green and T. H. Grose, eds., Longmans, Green and Co, 367–71.

Hurrell, A. (2007). *On Global Order: Power, Values, and the Constitution of International Society: Power, Values, and the Constitution of International Society*, Oxford University Press.

Hutchison, E. and R. Bleiker. (2014). Theorizing Emotions in World Politics, *International Theory*, 6(3), 491–514.

ICJ. (2004). Advisory Opinion on the 'Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Territory of Palestine, ICJ, 9 July 2004.

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. (2001). *The Responsibility to Protect*, International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty.

Jabri, V. (2014). Disarming Norms. Postcolonial Agency and the Constitution of the International, *International Theory*, 6(2), 372–90.

Jackson, P. (2011). H-Diplo/ISSF Roundtable Review of Vincent Pouliot. *International Security in Practice: The Politics of NATO-Russia Diplomacy*, 14–21. Available at: https://issforum.org/ISSF/PDF/ISSF-Roundtable-2-5 .pdf. (Accessed March 2018).

Jackson, P. and D. H. Nexon. (1999). Relations before States: Substance, Process and the Study of World Politics, *European Journal of International Relations*, 5(3), 291–332.

(2013). International Theory in a Post-paradigmatic Era: From Substantive Wagers to Scientific Ontologies, *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(3), 543–65.

Jackson, R. (2000). *The Global Covenant*, Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, R. (2002). *Pierre Bourdieu*, Psychology Press.

Jervis, R. (2011). H-Diplo/ISSF Roundtable Review of Vincent Pouliot. *International Security in Practice: The Politics of NATO-Russia Diplomacy*, 22–9. Available at: https://issforum.org/ISSF/PDF/ISSF-Roundtable-2-5.pdf. (Accessed March 2018).

Jessop, B. (2011). Constituting another Foucault Effect: Foucault on States and Statecraft. In U. Bröckling, S. Krassmann and T. Lemke, eds., *Governmentality: Current Issues and Future Challenges*, Routledge, 56–73.

Joas, H. (1996). *The Creativity of Action*, Polity Press.

Johnson, J. (2016). *Priests of Prosperity: How Central Bankers Transformed the Postcommunist World*, Cornell University Press.

Joseph, J. (2010). The Limits of Governmentality: Social Theory and the International, *European Journal of International Relations*, 16, 223–46.

Joseph, J. and M. Kurki. (2018). The Limits of Practice: Why Realism Can Complement IR's Practice Turn, *International Theory*, 10(1), 71–97.

Joshi, M., S. Y. Lee and R. Mac Ginty. (2014). Just How Liberal Is the Liberal Peace? *International Peacekeeping*, 21(3), 364–89.

Joyce, P. (1994), *Democratic Subjects: The Self and the Social in Nineteenth-century England*, Cambridge University Press.

Kalaycioglu, E. (2020). Governing Culture 'Credibly': Contestation in the World Heritage Regime. In A. Phillips and C. Reus-Smit, eds., *Culture and Order in World Politics*, Cambridge University Press, 294–316.

Kant, I. (1991). *Kant: Political Writings*, H. S. Reiss, ed., 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, 61–92.

   (1998). *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, translated and edited by Paul Guyer and A. W. Wood, Cambridge University Press.

   (2011). *Perpetual Peace in Kant: Political Writings*, H. S. Reiss, ed., 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press.

Kapstein, E. B. (1994). *Governing the Global Economy: International Finance and the State*, Harvard University Press.

Karlsrud, J. (2013). Special Representatives of the Secretary-General as Norm Arbitrators? Understanding Bottom-up Authority in UN Peacekeeping, *Global Governance*, 19(4), 525–44.

   (2015). The UN at War: Examining the Consequences of Peace-Enforcement Mandates for the UN Peacekeeping Operations in the CAR, the DRC and Mali, *Third World Quarterly*, 36(1), 40–54.

Kassianova, A. (2016). U.S.-Russia Nuclear Lab-to-Lab Cooperation: Looking Back On a Quarter Century of Constructive Relations, *PONARS Eurasia Policy Memo*, (425), 1–6.

Katzenstein, P. (1996). Introduction: Alternative Perspectives on National Security. In P. Katzenstein, ed., *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, Columbia University Press, 1–32.

Keller, R. (2011). The Sociology of Knowledge Approach to Discourse (SKAD), *Human Studies*, 34(1), 43–65.

Kemp, S. R. (2014). The Nonproliferation Emperor Has no Clothes: The Gas Centrifuge, Supply-Side Controls, and the Future of Nuclear Proliferation, *International Security*, 38(4), 39–78.

Keohane, R. (1984). *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*, Princeton University Press.

Keohane, R. and J. S. Nye. (1977). *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*, Little.

Kersbergen, K. and B. Verbeek. (2007). The Politics of International Norms: Subsidiarity and the Imperfect Competence Regime of the European Union, *European Journal of International Relations*, 13(2), 217–38.

Kessler, O. (2016). The Contingency of Constructivism: On Norms, the Social, and the Third, *Millennium – Journal of International Studies*, 45(1), 43–63.

Kilminster, R. (1982). Theory and Practice in Marx and Marxism, *Royal Institute of Philosophy Lecture Series*, 14, 157–76.

King, G., R. Keohane and S. Verba. (1996). *Designing Social Inquiry*, Princeton University Press.

Knight, J. (1994). *Institutions and Social Conflict*, Cambridge University Press.

Knorr Cetina, K. (1981a). Introduction: The Microsociological Challenge of Macro-Sociology: Towards a Reconstruction of Social Theory and Methodology. In K. Knorr Cetina and A. V. Cicourel, eds., *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology. Toward an Integration of Micro and Macro Sociologies*, Routledge, 1–47.

(1981b). *The Manufacture of Knowledge: An Essay on the Constructivist and Contextual Nature of Science*, Pergamon Press.

(2001). Objectual Practice. In T. R. Schatzki, K. Knorr-Cetina and E. Von Savigny, eds., *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, Routledge, 184–97.

(2009). The Synthetic Situation: Interactionism for a Global World, *Symbolic Interaction*, 32(1), 61–87.

Koremenos, B., C. Lipson and D. Snidal. (2001). The Rational Design of International Institutions, *International Organization*, 55(4), 761–99.

Koslowski, R. and F. V. Kratochwil. (1994). Understanding Change in International Politics: The Soviet Empire's Demise and the International System, *International Organization*, 48(2), 215–47.

Krämer, B. (2017). Populist Online Practices: The Function of the Internet in Right-Wing Populism, *Information, Communication & Society*, 20(9), 1293–1309.

Krasner, S. (1999). *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*, Princeton University Press.

Kratochwil, F. (1989). *Rules, Norms and Decisions. On the Conditions of Practical and Legal Reasoning in International Relations and Domestic Affairs*, Cambridge University Press.

(2000). Constructing a New Orthodoxy? Wendt's 'Social Theory of International Politics' and the Constructivist Challenge, *Millennium – Journal of International Studies*, 29(1), 73–101.

(2011). Making Sense of "International Practices". In E. Adler and V. Pouliot, eds., *International Practices*, Cambridge University Press, 36–60.

(2014). *The Status of Law in World Society: Meditations on the Role and Rule of Law*, Cambridge University Press.

Krook, M. L. and J. True. (2010). Rethinking the Life Cycles of International Norms: The United Nations and the Global Promotion of Gender Equality, *European Journal of International Relations*, 18(1), 103–27.

Krygier, M. (1986). Law as Tradition, *Law and Philosophy*, 5(2), 237–62.

Ku, A. (1998). Boundary Politics in the Public Sphere: Openness, Secrecy, and Leak, *Sociological Theory*, 16(2), 172–92.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago University Press.

Kustermans, J. (2016). Parsing the Practice Turn: Practice, Practical Knowledge, Practices, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 44(2), 175–96.

Lahire, B. (2003). From the Habitus to an Individual Heritage of Dispositions. Towards a Sociology at the Level of the Individual, *Poetics*, 31(5–6), 329–55.

(2004). *La culture des individus. Dissonances culturelles et distinction de soi*, La Découverte.

Lake, D. A. (2009). *Hierarchy in International Relations*, Cornell University Press.

(2010). Rightful Rules: Authority, Order, and the Foundations of Global Governance, *International Studies Quarterly*, 54(3), 587–613.

(2013). Legitimating Power: The Domestic Politics of U.S. International Hierarchy, *International Security*, 28(2), 74–111.

Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things*, University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson. (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh*, University of Chicago Press.

Lamont, C. and E. Skeppström. (2013). *The United Nations at War in the DRC? Legal Aspects of the Intervention Brigade*, Swedish Ministry of Defence.

Lamont, M. (2012). Toward a Comparative Sociology of Valuation and Evaluation, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 38(1), 201–21.

Lapid, Y. (1989). The Third Debate: On the Prospects of International Relations Theory in a Post-Positivist Era, *International Studies Quarterly*, 33(3), 235–54.

Lapid, Y. and F. Kratochwil, eds. (1996). *The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory*, Lynne Rienner.

Lash, S. (1993). Pierre Bourdieu: Cultural Economy and Social Change. In C. Calhoun, E. LiPuma and M. Postone, eds., *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives*, University of Chicago Press, 193–211.

Latour, B. (1987). *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society*, Harvard University Press.

(1992). Where Are the Missing Masses? The Sociology of a Few Mundane Artifacts. In W. Bijker and J. Law, eds., *Shaping Technology/Building Society. Studies in Sociotechnical Change*, MIT Press, 225–58.

(1993). *We Have Never Been Modern*, Harvard University Press.

(2005). *Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*, Oxford University Press.

(2010). An Attempt at a "Compositionist Manifesto", *New Literary History*, 41, 471–90.

Laurence, M. (2019). An 'Impartial' Force? Normative Ambiguity and Practice Change in UN Peace Operations, *International Peacekeeping*, 26(3), 256–80.

Lave, J. and E. Wenger. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*, Cambridge University Press.

Law, J. (1999). After ANT: Complexity, Naming and Topology, *The Sociological Review*, 47, 1.

(2004). And if the Global were Small and Noncoherent? Method, Complexity, and the Baroque, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 22, 13–27.

Law, J. and A. Mol. (2001). Situating Technoscience: An Inquiry into Spatialities, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 19(5), 601–21.

Le Chiffon Rouge. (2016). "Mon inaction me rendrait complice", s'est défendu Cédric Herrou à son procès. 5 January. www.le-chiffon-rouge-morlaix .fr/2017/01/mon-inaction-me-rendrait-complice-s-est-defendu-cedric-herrou-a-son-proces-mediapart-5-janvier-2016.html.

Leander, A. (2010). Practices (Re)producing Orders Understanding the Role of Business in Global Security Governance. In A. Leander and M. Ougaard, eds., *Business and Global Governance*, Routledge, 57–78.

(2011). The Promises, Problems, and Potentials of a Bourdieu-Inspired Staging of International Relations, *International Political Sociology*, 5(3), 294–313.

(2013). Technological Agency in the Co-Constitution of Legal Expertise and the US Drone Program, *Leiden Journal of International Law*, 26(4), 811–31.

(2016). The Politics of Whitelisting: Regulatory Work and Topologies in Commercial Security, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 34(1), 48–66.

(2017). Digital/Commercial (in)visibility: The Politics of DAESH Recruitment Videos, *European Journal of Social Theory*, 20(3), 348–72.

(2020). Composing Collaborationist Collages about Commercial Security, *Political Anthropological Research on International Social Sciences*, 1(1), 73–109.

Lechner, S. and M. Frost. (2018). *Practice Theory and International Relations*, Cambridge University Press.

Leiulfsrud, H. and P. Sohlberg, eds. (2017). *Concepts in Action. Conceptual Constructionism*, Haymarket Books.

Lemke, T. (2007). An Indigestible Meal? Foucault, Governmentality and State Theory, *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory*, 15, 43–65.

Lesch, M. (2017a). Norms, Law and Deviance. Doubts About Doubts About the Prohibition of Torture. Paper presented at the conference of the German Political Science Association (International Relations), October 2017, Bremen.

(2017b). Praxistheorien und Normenforschung: Zum Beitrag der pragmatischen Soziologie, *Zeitschrift Diskurs*, 2, 1–23.

L'Humanité. (2017). C'est l'état qui est dans l'illégalité, pas moi. 4 January. Available at: www.humanite.fr/cedric-herrou-cest-letat-qui-est-dans-lille-galite-pas-moi-629732. (Accessed 13 November 2021).

Liberman, K. (2013). *More Studies in Ethnomethodology*, State University of New York.

Liese, A. (2009). Exceptional Necessity: How Liberal Democracies Contest the Prohibition of Torture and Ill-Treatment When Countering Terrorism, *Journal of International Law and International Relations*, 5(1), 17–47.

Lindahl, H. (2018). *Authority and the Globalization of Inclusion and Exclusion*, Cambridge University Press.

Linklater, A. (2011). *The Problem of Harm in International Politics*, Cambridge University Press.

Lipson, M. (2007). Peacekeeping: Organized Hypocrisy? *European Journal of International Relations*, 13(1), 5–34.

Livingstone, D. (1984). *Hume's Philosophy of Common Life*, University of Chicago Press.

Lukes, S. (2005). Power and the Battle for Hearts and Minds, *Millennium*, 33(3), 477–93.

Macmillan Committee. (1931). Report of Committee on Finance and Industry. The National Archives: [On line]. Available at: http://discovery .nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C1851842. (Accessed December 2017).

March, J. G. and J. P. Olsen. (1989). *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics*, The Free Press.
  (1998). The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Orders, *International Organization*, 52(4), 943–69.

Marcus, G. E. (1995). Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24, 95–117.
  (1998). *Ethnography through Thick and Thin*, Princeton University Press.

Marks, L. (2004). Haptic Visuality: Touching with the Eyes, *Framework: The Finish Art Review*, 2, 79–82.

Marx, K. and F. Engels. (1976). *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, Lawrence & Wishart, 487.

Marshall, A. (2010). International Security in Practice: The politics of NATO–Russia Diplomacy, *International Affairs*, 86(6), 1417–18.

Martin-Mazé, M. (2017). Returning Struggles to the Practice Turn: How Were Bourdieu and Boltanski Lost in (Some) Translations and What to Do about It? *International Political Sociology*, 11(2), 203–20.

Martin, L. (1992). Interests, Power, and Multilateralism, *International Organization*, 46(4), 765–92.

Mauss, M. (1950). Les techniques du corps. In P. Gurvitch, ed., *Marcel Mauss: Sociologie et Anthropologie*, Quadrige PUF, 365–86.
  (1966). *The Gift. Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, Routledge.

McCourt, D. (2012). What is at Stake in the Historical Turn: Theory, Practice and Phronesis in International Relations, *Millennium*, 41(1), 23–41.
  (2016). Practice Theory and Relationalism as the New Constructivism, *International Studies Quarterly*, 60(3), 475–85.

McCoy, A. (2012). *Torture and Impunity*, University of Wisconsin Press.

McKeown, R. (2009). Norm Regress: U.S. Revisionism and the Slow Death of the Torture Norm, *International Relations*, 23(1), 5–25.

McNamara, K. (2015). *The Politics of Everyday Europe: Constructing Authority in the European Union*, Oxford University Press.

Menand, L. (1997). *Pragmatism: A Reader*, Vintage Books.
  (2001). *The Metaphysical Club*, Macmillan.

Merlingen, M. (2006). Foucault and World Politics: Promises and Challenges of Extending Governmentality Theory to the European and Beyond, *Millennium*, 35(1), 181–96.

Mérand, F. (2008). *European Defence Policy beyond the Nation State*, Oxford University Press.
  (2010). Pierre Bourdieu and the Birth of European Defense, *Security Studies*, 19(2), 342–74.

Meyer, M. (2010). Caring for Weak Ties – the Natural History Museum as a Place of Encounter Between Amateur and Professional Science, *Sociological Research Online*, 15(2), 1–14.

Meyer, M. and S. Molyneux-Hodgson. (2010). Introduction: The Dynamics of Epistemic Communities, *Sociological Research Online*, 15(2), 1–7.

Miettinen, R., D. Samra-Fredericks and D. Yanow. (2009). Re-Turn to Practice: An Introductory Essay, *Organization Studies*, 30(12), 1309–27.

Miettinen, R. and J. Virkkunen. (2005). Epistemic Objects, Artefacts and Organizational Change, *Organization*, 12(3), 437–56.

Milbank, D. (2018). Trump's 'Fake News' Mantra Becomes an Effective Weapon – against America, *The Washington Post*, 16 April. Available at: www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/trump-bulldozed-truth--and-not-just-in-washington/2018/04/16/0f65718c-41b2-11e8-8569-26fda6b404c7_story.html?utm_term=.24b3a2eedc01.

Miller, C. A. (2006). 'An Effective Instrument of Peace': Scientific Cooperation as an Instrument of U.S. Foreign Policy, 1938–1950, *Osiris*, 21(1), 133–60.

Milliken, J. (1999). The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods, *European Journal of International Relations*, 5(2), 225–54.

Misak, C. J. (1999). *Pragmatism*, University of Calgary Press.

Mitchell, T. (1991). The Limits of the State: Beyond Statist Approaches and Their Critics, *The American Political Science Review*, 85(1), 77–96.

Mitchell, W. J. T. (2005). *What Do Pictures Want?: The Lives and Loves of Images*, University of Chicago Press.

Moffitt, B. (2016). *The Global Rise of Populism: Performance, Political style, and Representation*, Stanford University Press.

Mol, A. (2002). *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*, Duke University Press.

   (2010). Actor-Network Theory: Sensitive Terms and Enduring Tensions, *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 50(1), 253–69.

Moon, K. (1997). *Sex Among Allies: Military Prostitution in U.S.-Korea Relations*, Columbia University Press.

Mudde, C. (2004). The Populist Zeitgeist, *Government and Opposition*, 39(4), 541–63.

Muirhead, B. (1999). *Against the Odds: The Public Life and Times of Louis Rasminsky*, University of Toronto Press.

Nair, D. (2019). Sociability in International Politics: Golf and ASEAN's Cold War Diplomacy, *International Political Sociology*, 14(2), 196–214.

   (2020). Emotional Labor and the Power of International Bureaucrats, *International Studies Quarterly*, 64(3), 573–87.

Navari, C. (2011). The Concept of Practice in the English School, *European Journal of International Relations*, 17(4), 611–30.

Neumann, I. (2002). Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn: The Case of Diplomacy, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 31(3), 627–51.

   (2012). *At Home with the Diplomats. Inside a European Foreign Ministry*, Cornell University Press.

Neumann, I. and V. Pouliot. (2011). Untimely Russia: Hysteresis in Russian-Western Relations over the Past Millennium, *Security Studies*, 20(1), 105–37.

Neumann, I. and O. J. Sending. (2010). *Governing the Global Polity. Practice, Mentality, Rationality*, University of Michigan Press.

Neumann Basberg, C. and I. Neumann. (2015). Uses of the Self: Two Ways of Thinking about Scholarly Situatedness and Method, *Millennium*, 43(3), 798–819.

New York Times. (2016). A French underground railroad, moving African migrants', 4 October.

(2017). Farmer on trial defends smuggling migrants: "I am a Frenchman." 5 January. www.nytimes.com/2017/01/.../cedric-herrou-migrant-smuggler-trial-france.html.

Nexon, D. H. and I. Neumann. (2018). Hegemonic Order Theory: A Field Theoretic Account, *European Journal of International Relations*, 24(3), 662–86.

Nexon, D. H. and V. Pouliot. (2013). 'Things of Networks': Situating ANT in International Relations, *International Political Sociology*, 7(3), 342–5.

Nicolini, D. (2013). *Practice Theory, Work & Organization*, Oxford University Press.

(2017). Practice Theory as a Package of Theory, Method and Vocabulary: Affordances and Limitations. In M. Jonas, B. Littig and A. Wroblewski, eds., *Methodological Reflections on Practice Oriented Theories*, Springer, 19–34.

Niedner-Kalthoff, U. (2015). *Producing Cultural Diversity. Hegemonic Knowledge in Global Governance Projects*, Campus Verlag.

Niemann, H. and H. Schillinger. (2016). Contestation 'all the way down'? The Grammar of Contestation in Norm Research, *Review of International Studies*, 43(1), 29–49.

Niezen, R. and M. Sapignoli, eds. (2017). *Palaces of Hope. The Anthropology of Global Organizations*, Cambridge University Press.

Nordstrom, C. (2004). *Shadows of War: Violence, Power, and International Profiteering in the 21st Century*, University of California Press.

Nye, J. (2004). *Soft Power: The Means To Success in World Politics*, Public Affairs.

Oakeshott, M. (1962). *Rationalism in Politics*, Basic Books.

(1975). *On Human Conduct*, Clarendon Press.

Odysseos, L., C. Death and H. Malmvig. (2016). Interrogating Michel Foucault's Counter-Conduct: Theorising the Subjects and Practices of Resistance in Global Politics, *Global Society*, 30(2), 151–6.

Oliver, J. E. and W. M. Rahn. (2016). Rise of the Trumpenvolk: Populism in the 2016 Election, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 667(1), 189–206.

Ong, A. and S. Collier. (2005). Global Assemblages, Anthropological Problems. In A. Ong and S. Collier, eds., *Global Assemblages*, Blackwell, 3–21.

Onuf, N. (1989). *World of Our Making. Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations*, University of South Carolina Press.

(1997). *How Things Get Normative*, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

(2002). Institutions, Intentions and International Relations, *Review of International Studies*, 28(2), 211–28.

(2010). Rules in Practice. In O. Kessler, et al., eds., *On Rules, Politics and Knowledge: Friedrich Kratochwil, International Relations and Domestic Affairs*, Palgrave Macmillan, 115–26.

Orford, A. (2012). In Praise of Description, *Leiden Journal of International Law*, 25(3), 609–25.

Ortner, Sh. B. (1984). Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 26(1), 126–66.

Osborne, T. (1994). Sociology, Liberalism and the Historicity of Conduct, *Economy & Society*, 23, 484–501.

Paddon Rhoads, E. (2016). *Taking Sides in Peacekeeping: Impartiality and the Future of the United Nations*, Oxford University Press.

Panel on United Nations Peace Operations. (2000). *Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations*, United Nations.

Panke, D. and U. Petersohn. (2012). Why Some International Norms Disappear, *European Journal of International Relations*, 18(4), 719–42.

Paret, P. (1986). Clausewitz. In P. Paret, ed., *Makers of Modern Strategy*, Princeton University Press, 186–216.

Paris, R. (2004). *At War's End: Building Peace After Civil Conflict*, Cambridge University Press.

Parsons, C. (2015). Before Eclecticism: Competing Alternatives in Constructivist Research, *International Theory*, 7(3), 501–38.

Pauly, L. (1997). *Who Elected the Bankers?: Surveillance and Control in the World Economy*, Cornell University Press.

Pauwelyn, J., R. A. Wessel and J. Wouters. (2014). When Structures Become Shackles: Stagnation and Dynamics in International Lawmaking, *European Journal of International Law*, 25(3), 733–63.

Pech, L. and K. L. Scheppele. (2017). Illiberalism Within: Rule of Law Backsliding in the EU, *Cambridge Yearbook of European Legal Studies*, 19, 3–47.

Peter, M. (2015). Between Doctrine and Practice: The UN Peacekeeping Dilemma, *Global Governance*, 21(3), 351–70.

Pickering, A. (1995). *The Mangle of Practice: Time, Agency, and Science*, The University of Chicago Press.

Pifre, S. (2017). The Future of U.S.-Russia Nuclear Arms Control, *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 1898(020001), 1–11.

Polanyi, M. (1958). *Personal Knowledge*, University of Chicago Press.

Pouliot, V. (2008). The Logic of Practicality: A Theory of Practice of Security Communities, *International Organization*, 62(02), 257–88.

(2010). *International Security in Practice: The Politics of NATO-Russia Diplomacy*, Cambridge University Press.

(2016a). Hierarchy in Practice: Multilateral Diplomacy and the Governance of International Security, *European Journal of International Security*, 1(1), 5–26.

(2016b). *International Pecking Orders: The Politics and Practice of Multilateral Diplomacy*, Cambridge University Press.

(2020a). Historical Institutionalism Meets Practice Theory: Renewing the Selection Process of the United Nations Secretary-General, *International Organization*, 74(4), 742–72.

(2020b). The Gray Area of Institutional Change: How the Security Council Transforms Its Practices on the Fly, *Journal of Global Security Studies*, 6(3), 1–18.

Pouliot, V. and F. Mérand. (2013). Bourdieu's Concepts: Political Sociology in International Relations. In R. Adler-Nissen, ed., *Bourdieu in International Relations: Rethinking Key Concepts in IR*, Routledge, 24–44.

Pouliot, V. and J.-P. Thérien. (2015). The Politics of Inclusion: Changing Patterns in the Global Governance of International Security, *Review of International Studies*, 41(2), 211–37.

Pratt, S. F. (2020). From Norms to Normative Configurations: A Pragmatist and Relational Approach to Theorizing Normativity in IR, *International Theory*, 12(1), 59–82.

Putnam, H. (1995). *Pragmatism: An Open Question*, Blackwell.

Rabinow, P. (2003). *Anthropos Today: Reflections on Modern Equipment*, Princeton University Press.

Ralph, J. and J. Gifkins. (2017). The Purpose of the United Nations Security Council Practice: Contesting Competence Claims in the Normative Context Created by the Responsibility to Protect, *European Journal of International Relations*, 23(3), 630–53.

Rancière, J. (1998). The Cause of the Other, *Parallax*, 4(2), 25–33.

(1999). *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*, University of Minnesota Press.

(2004). *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible*, Continuum.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*, Harvard University Press.

Raymond, M. and L. DeNardis. (2015). Multistakeholderism: Anatomy of an Inchoate Global Institution, *International Theory*, 7(3), 572–616.

Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a Theory of Social Practices: A Development in Culturalist Theorizing, *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5(2), 243–63.

(2012). Affective Spaces. A Praxeological Outlook, *Rethinking History*, 16(2), 241–58.

(2014). *Die Materialisierung der Kultur, Praxeologie*, De Gruyter.

Reus-Smit, C. (2007). International Crises of Legitimacy, *International Politics*, 44(2–3), 157–74.

Richards, R. (1987). *Darwin and the Emergence of Evolutionary Theories of Mind and Behavior*, University of Chicago Press.

Riles, A. (1998). Infinity within the Brackets, *American Ethnologist*, 25(3), 378–98.

(2000). *The Network Inside Out*, University of Michigan Press.

Ringmar, E. (2014). The Search for Dialogue as a Hindrance to Understanding: Practices as Inter-paradigmatic Research Program, *International Theory*, 6(1), 1–27.

Rolf, E. (2013). *Inferentielle Pragmatik*, Erich Schmidt Verlag.

Rosenau, J. N. and E. O. Czempiel, eds. (1992). *Governance Without Government: Order and Change in World Politics*, Cambridge University Press.

Rosenthal, G. (2013). *Statement of Ambassador Gert Rosenthal, Permanent Representative of Guatemala to the United Nations, Wrap-up Session of the Work of the Security Council During the Current Month*. Available at: www.guatemalaun.org/bin/documents/SCUN-wrap-upsession-30april2013.pdf.

Ross, A. (2013). *Mixed Emotions: Beyond Fear and Hatred in International Conflict*, University of Chicago Press.

Rotblat, J. (1967). *Pugwash: A History of the Conferences on Science and World Affairs*, Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.

Rouse, J. (1993). What Are Cultural Studies of Scientific Knowledge? *Configurations*, 1(1), 1–22.

(1996). *Engaging Science: How to Understand Its Practices Philosophically*, Cornell University Press.

(2001). Two Concepts of Practices. In T. R. Schatzki, K. K. Cetina and E. von Savigny, eds., *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, Routledge, 198–208.

(2003). *How Scientific Practices Matter: Reclaiming Philosophical Naturalism*, University of Chicago Press.

(2007a). Practice Theory. In St P. Turner and M. W. Risjord, eds., *Handbook of the Philosophy of Science. Philosophy of Anthropology and Sociology*, North Holland, 639–81.

(2007b). Social Practices and Normativity, *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 37(1), 46–56.

Ruggie, J. G. (1975). International Responses to Technology: *Concepts and Trends*, *International Organization*, 29(3), 557–83.

(1998). *Constructing the World Polity: Essays on International Institutionalisation*, Routledge.

Sacks, H. (1972). Notes on Police Assessment of Moral Character. In D. Sudnow, ed., *Studies in Social Interaction*, The Free Press, 280–93.

Sandal, N. A. (2011). Religious Actors as epistemic communities in conflict transformation: The cases of South Africa and Northern Ireland, *Review of International Studies*, 37, 929–49.

Sandholtz, W. (2008). Dynamics of International Norm Change: Rules Against Wartime Plunder, *European Journal of International Relations*, 14(1), 101–31.

Sandholtz, W. and K. W. Stiles. (2009). *International Norms and Cycles of Change*, Oxford University Press.

Sassen, S. (2000). New Frontiers Facing Urban Sociology at the Millennium, *British Journal of Sociology*, 51(1), 143–60.

Saurette, P. and S. Gunster. (2011). Ears Wide Shut: Epistemological Populism, Agritainment and Canadian Conservative Talk Radio, *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 44(1), 195–218.

Sawyer, R. K. (2005). *Social Emergence: Societies as Complex Systems*, Cambridge University Press.

Sayers, R. S. (1976). *The Bank of England, 1891–1944*, Cambridge University Press.

Schäfer, H. (2011). Bourdieu gegen den Strich lesen. Eine poststruktural-istische Perspektive. In D. Šuber, H. Schäfer and S. Prinz, eds., *Pierre Bourdieu und die Kulturwissenschaften. Zur Aktualität eines undisziplinierten Denkens*, UVK Verlagsgesellschaft, 63–85.

(2013). *Die Instabilität der Praxis. Reproduktion und Transformation des Sozialen in der Praxistheorie*, Velbrück.

(2016a). "Outstanding universal value". Die Arbeit an der Universalisierung des Wertvollen im UNESCO-Welterbe, *Berliner Journal für Soziologie*, 26(3–4), 353–75.

(2016b). *Praxistheorie. Ein soziologisches Forschungsprogramm*, Transcript Verlag.

(2017). Relationality and Heterogeneity: Transitive Methodology in Practice Theory and Actor-Network Theory. In M. Jonas, B. Littig and A. Wroblewski, eds., *Methodological Reflections on Practice Oriented Theories*, Springer, 35–46.

Schatzki, T. (1996). *Social Practices: A Wittgensteinian Approach to Human Activity and the Social*, Cambridge University Press.

(2001). Introduction: Practice Theory. In T. R. Schatzki, K. K. Cetina and E. von Savigny, eds., *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, Routledge, 1–14.

(2002). *The Site of the Social. A Philosophical Exploration of the Constitution of Social Life and Change*, Pennsylvania State University Press.

Schatzki, T. R., K. Knorr Cetina and E. Von Savigny, eds. (2001). *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, Routledge.

Scheppele, K. L. (2014). Constitutional Coups and Judicial Review, *Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems*, 23, 51–117.

(2016). *Worst Practices and the Transnational Legal Order (Or How to Build a Constitutional "Democratorship" in Plain Sight)*, Lecture at the University of Toronto, November 2016. www.law.utoronto.ca/utfl_file/count/documents/events/wright-scheppele2016.pdf.

Schindler, S. and T. Wille. (2015). Change in and Through Practice: Pierre Bourdieu, Vincent Pouliot, and the End of the Cold War, *International Theory*, 7(2), 330–59.

(2017). Two ways of criticizing international practices. Paper presented at the EISA conference, Barcelona 2017.

Schmidt, R. (2017). Sociology of Social Practices: Theory or Modus Operandi of Empirical Research? In M. Jonas, B. Littig and A. Wroblewski, eds., *Methodological Reflections on Practice Oriented Theories*, Springer, 3–17.

Schmidt, S. (2014). Foreign Military Presence and the Changing Practice of Sovereignty: A Pragmatist Explanation of Norm Change, *American Political Science Review*, 108(04), 817–29.

Scott, J. (1985). *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*, Yale University Press.

Seabrooke, L. (2012). The Everyday Politics of Homespun Capital: Economic Patriotism in Housing Credit Systems, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 19(3), 358–72.

(2015). Diplomacy as Economic Consultancy. In O. J. Sending, V. Pouliot and I. B. Neumann, eds., *Diplomacy and the Making of World Politics*, Cambridge University Press, 195–219.

Searle, J. (1980). *Speech Acts*, Cambridge University Press.

(1995). *The Construction of Social Reality*, Penguin.

(2005). What Is an Institution? *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 1(1), 1–22.

Security Council Report. (2014). *In Hindsight: Changes to UN Peacekeeping in 2013*. Available at: www.securitycouncilreport.org/monthly-forecast/2014-02/in_hindsight_changes_to_un_peacekeeping_in_2013.php.

Selby, J. (2007). Engaging Foucault: Discourse, Liberal Governance and the Limits of Foucauldian IR, *International Relations*, 21(3), 324–45.

Sen, A. K. (1977). Rational Fools: A Critique of the Behavioral Foundations of Economic Theory, *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 6(4): 317–344.

Sending, O. J. (2002). Constitution, Choice and Change: Problems with the 'Logic of Appropriateness' and Its Use in Constructivist Theory, *European Journal of International Relations*, 8(4), 443–70.

(2015). *The Politics of Expertise: Competing for Authority in Global Governance*, University of Michigan Press.

Sending, O. J. and I. B. Neumann. (2011). Banking on Power: How Some Practices in an International Organization Anchor Others. In E. Adler and V. Pouliot, eds., *International Practices*, Cambridge University Press, 231–54.

Sending, O. J., V. Pouliot and I. B. Neumann. (2015). *Diplomacy and the Making of World Politics*, Cambridge University Press.

Shapiro, M. J., G. M. Bonham and D. Heradstveit. (1988). A Discursive Practices Approach to Collective Decision-Making, *International Studies Quarterly*, 32(4), 397–419.

Shove, E. and M. Pantzar. (2007). Recruitment and Reproduction: The Careers and Carriers of Digital Photography and Floorball, *Human Affairs*, 17(2), 154–67.

Shove, E., M. Pantzar and M. Watson. (2012). *The Dynamics of Social Practice. Everyday Life and How It Changes*, Sage Publications.

Simmel, G. (1906). The Sociology of Secrecy and of Secret Societies, *American Journal of Sociology*, 11(4), 441–98.

Singleton, J. (2011). *Central Banking in the Twentieth Century*, Cambridge University Press.

Sismondo, S. (2010). *An Introduction to Science and Technology*, 2nd ed., Wiley-Blackwell.

(2017). Casting a Wider Net: A Reply to Collins, Evans and Weinel, *Social Studies of Science*, 47(4), 587–92.

Smith, V. C. (1936). *The Rationale of Central Banking*, King.

Spruyt, H. (1994). *The Sovereign State and Its Competitors*, Princeton University Press.

Stamp, J. C. (1931). The Report of the Macmillan Committee, *The Economic Journal*, 41(163), 424–35.

Stappert, N. (2020). Practice Theory and Change in International Law: Theorizing the Development of Legal Meaning Through the Interpretive Practices of International Criminal Courts, *International Theory*, 12(1), 33–58.

Stein, J. (2011). Background Knowledge in the Foreground: Conversations About Competent Practice in 'Sacred Space'. In E. Adler and V. Pouliot, eds., *International Practices*, Cambridge University Press, 87–107.

Stern, D. G. (2003). The Practical Turn. In S. P. Turner and P. A. Roth, eds., *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, Blackwell Publishing, 185–206.

Stimmer, A. and L. Wisken. (2019). The Dynamics of Dissent: When Actions Are Louder Than Words, *International Affairs*, 95(3), 515–33.

Sunstein, C. R. (2008). Democracy and the Internet. In J. Van Den Hoven and J. Weckert, eds., *Information Technology and Moral Philosophy*, Cambridge University Press, 93–110.

Svendsen, Ø. (2020). 'Practice Time!' Doxic Futures in Security and Defence Diplomacy After Brexit, *Review of International Studies*, 46(1), 3–19.

Swidler, A. (2001). What Anchors Cultural Practices. In K. Knorr Cetina, T. R. Schatzki and E. von Savigny, eds., *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, Routledge, 74–94.

Sylvester, C. (2012). War Experiences/War Practices/War Theory, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 40(3), 483–503.

Taussig, M. (2009). *What Color Is the Sacred?* The University of Chicago Press.

Taylor, C. (1993 [1981]). To Follow a Rule…. In C. Calhoun, E. LiPuma and M. Postone, eds., *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives*, Polity Press, 29–44.

Tazzioli, M. (2016). Revisiting the Omnes et Singulatim Bond: The Production of Irregular Conducts and the Biopolitics of the Governed. *Foucault Studies*, 21, 98–116.

Tetlock, P. (2005). *Expert Political Judgment*, Princeton University Press.

Thérien, J.-P. and V. Pouliot. (2020). Global Governance as Patchwork: The Making of the Sustainable Development Goals, *Review of International Political Economy*, 27(3), 612–36.

Thompson, J. B. (2005). The New Visibility, *Theory, Culture & Society*, 22, 31–51.

Thompson, W. R., ed. (2001). *Evolutionary Interpretations of World Politics*, Routledge.

Tickner, A. (1997). You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements between Feminists and IR Theorists, *International Studies Quarterly*, 41(4), 611–32.

   (2005). What Is Your Research Program? Some Feminist Answers to International Methodological Questions? *International Studies Quarterly*, 49(1), 1–21.

   (2014). *A Feminist Voyage Through International Relations*, Oxford University Press, 1–1.

Toniolo, G. (2005). *Central Bank Cooperation at the Bank for International Settlements, 1930–1973*, Cambridge University Press.

Toplišek, A. (n.d.). *Reading Foucault's 'Counter-Conduct' through Arendt, Weber and Derrida: Politics and Resistance as Power.*

Tóth, C. (2014). Full Text of Viktor Orbán's Speech at Băile Tuşnad (Tusnádfürdő) of 26 July 2014. *The Budapest Beacon*, 29 July. Available at: https://budapestbeacon.com/full-text-of-viktor-orbans-speech-at-baile-tusnad-tusnadfurdo-of-26-july-2014/.

Toulmin, S. (2001). *Return to Reason*, Harvard University Press.

True, J. (2003). Mainstreaming Gender in Global Public Policy, *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 5(3), 368–96.

   (2008). The Ethics of Feminism. In C. Reus-Smit and D. Snidal, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, Oxford University Press, 1.

UNESCO Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. (2015a). *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Available at: https://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/. (Accessed 13 November 2021).

   (2015b). *Rules of Procedure*. Available at: http://whc.unesco.org/document/137812.

United Nations. (n.d.-a). *Background – MINUSMA – United Nations Stabilization Mission in Mali*. Available at: www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/minusma/background.shtml.

(n.d.-b). Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies. Available at: www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties/introouterspacetreaty.html.

United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations. (2008). *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines*, United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations.

United Nations Security Council. (2013). *Resolution 2098 S/RES/2098 (2013)*. Available at: www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2098(2013).

Urry, J. (2004). Small Worlds and the New 'Social Physics', *Global Networks*, 4(2), 109–30.

Valverde, M. (2007). Genealogies of European States: Foucauldian Reflections, *Economy and Society*, 36(1), 159–78.

Van Winkel, C. (2005). *The Regime of Visibility*, Nai Publishers.

Veyne, P. (1997). Foucault Revolutionizes History. In A. Davidson, ed., *Foucault and His Interlocutors*, University of Chicago Press, 146–82.

(2010). *Foucault, His Thought, His character*, Wiley.

Vice News. (2017). Passeur citoyen: Rencontre avec Cédric Herrou, l'agriculteur qui aide les migrants. 18 January. Available at: https://news.vice.com/fr/video/passeur-citoyen-rencontre-avec-cedric-herrou-lagri-culteur-qui-aide-les-migrants.

Villumsen, T. (2015). *The International Political Sociology of Security. Rethinking Theory and Practice*, Routledge.

Von Foerster, H. (2003). On Constructing a Reality. In H. Von Foerster, ed., *Understanding: Essays on Cybernetics and Cognition*, Springer, 211–27.

Waever, O. (1995). Securitization and Desecuritization. In R. Lipschutz, ed., *On Security*, Columbia University Press, 46–86.

Wallace, T., et al. (2017). Trump's Inauguration vs. Obama's: Comparing the Crowds. The New York Times, 20 January. Available at: www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/01/20/us/politics/trump-inauguration-crowd.html. (Accessed November 2021)

Waldenfels, B. (2001). Die verändernde Kraft der Wiederholung. *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft*, 46(1), 5–17.

Wallmeier, P. (2018). Is Contemporary Practice Theory a Critical Theory? Paper presented at 2018 ISA in San Francisco.

Walters, W. (2002). The Power of Inscription: Beyond Social Construction and Deconstruction in European Integration Studies, *Millennium*, 31(1), 83–108.

(2009). Anti-Political Economy: Cartographies of "Illegal Immigration" and the Displacement of the Economy. In J. Best and M. Paterson, eds., *Cultural Political Economy*, Routledge, 113–38.

(2012). *Governmentality. Critical Encounters*, Routledge.

Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Warburg, P. M. (1910). *The Discount System in Europe*, National Monetary Commission, Government Printing Office.

Warner, M. (2002). *Publics and Counterpublics*, Zone Books.

Watson, A. (1982). *Diplomacy: The Dialogue Between States*, Methuen.

Watson, S. (2011). Securing the Practical Turn in Constructivist Theory, *International Studies Review*, 13(3), 532–4.

Weber, C. (1998). Performative States. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 27(1), 77–95.

(2008). Designing Safe Citizens, *Citizenship Studies*, 12(2), 125–42.

Weber, M. (1946). The Sociology of Charismatic Authority. In H. Gerth and C. W. Mills, eds., *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, Oxford University Press, 245–52.

(1978). *Economy and Society*, University of California Press.

Welsh, J. M. (2013). Norm Contestation and the Responsibility to Protect, *Global Responsibility to Protect*, 5(4), 365–96.

Wendland, C. L. (2012). Moral Maps and Medical Imaginaries: Clinical Tourism at Malawi's College of Medicine, *American Anthropologist*, 114(1), 108–22.

Wendt, A. (1987). The Agent-Structure Problem in International Relations Theory, *International Organization*, 41(3), 335–70.

(1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge University Press.

(2001). Driving with the Rearview Mirror: On the Rational Science of Institutional Design, *International Organization*, 55(4), 1019–49.

(2015). *Quantum Mind and Social Science*, Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E. (1998a). Communities of Practice: Learning as a Social System, *Systems Thinker*, 9(5):2.

(1998b). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*, Cambridge University Press.

(2010). Communities of Practice and Social Learning Systems: The Career of a Concept. In C. Blackmore, ed., *Social Learning Systems and Communities of Practice*, Springer, 179–98.

Wenger, E., R. McDermott and W. M. Snyder. (2002). *Cultivating Communities of Practice: A Guide to Managing Knowledge*, Harvard Business School Press.

Wiener, A. (2004). Contested Compliance: Interventions on the Normative Structure of World Politics, *European Journal of International Relations*, 10(2), 189–234.

(2007). Contested Meanings of Norms: A Research Framework, *Comparative European Politics*, 5(1), 1–17.

(2008). *The Invisible Constitution of Politics. Contested Norms and International Encounters*, Cambridge University Press.

(2009). Enacting meaning-in-use. Qualitative Research on Norms and International Relations, *Review of International Studies*, 35(1), 175–93.

(2014). *A Theory of Contestation*, Springer.

(2018). *Contestation and Constitution of Norms in Global International Relations*, Cambridge University Press.

Wight, M. (1966). Western values in international relations. In H. Butterfield and M. Wight, eds., *Diplomatic Investigations*, George Allen & Unwin, 89–131.

Wille, T. and S. Schindler. (2019). How Can We Criticize International Practices? *International Studies Quarterly*, 63(4), 1014–24.

Winch, P. (1958). *The Idea of Social Science and Its Relation to Philosophy*, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Winston, C. (2017). Norm Structure, Diffusion, and Evolution: A Conceptual Approach, *European Journal of International Relations*, Online First.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical Investigations*, translated by Elizabeth Anscombe, Macmillan.

(2009 [1957]). *Philosophical Investigations*, Wiley-Blackwell.

Wolf, S. (2010). *Meaning in Life and Why It Matters*, Princeton University Press.

Wood, J. H. (2005). *A History of Central Banking in Great Britain and the United States*, Cambridge University Press.

Woodward, S. L. (2007). Do the Root Causes of Civil War Matter? On Using Knowledge to Improve Peacebuilding Interventions, *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 1(2), 143–70.

"Word of the Year 2016 is…" English Oxford Living Dictionaries. Available at: https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/word-of-the-year/word-of-the-year-2016.

"Word of the Year: Frequently Asked Questions." English Oxford Living Dictionaries. Available at: https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/word-of-the-year/word-of-the-year-faqs.

Young, O. (1982). Regime Dynamics: The Rise and Fall of International Regimes. *International Organization*, 36(2), 277–97.

Zalewski, M. (2000). *Feminism after Postmodernism: Theorizing through Practice*, Routledge.

Zanotti, L. (2011). *Governing Disorder: UN Peace Operations, International Security and Democratization in the Post Cold War Era*, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Zeilinger, A. (2005). *Einsteins Schleier: Die neue Welt der Quantenphysik*, C. H. Beck.

Zimmer, C. (2006 [2001]). *Evolution: The Triumph of an Idea*, Harper Perennial.

Zimmermann, L. (2016). Same Same or Different? Norm Diffusion Between Resistance, Compliance, and Localization in Post-Conflict States, *International Studies Perspectives*, 17(1), 98–115.

Zimmermann, L., N. Deitelhoff and M. Lesch. (2018). Unlocking the Agency of the Governed: Contestation and Norm Dynamics, *Third World Thematics: A TWQ Journal*, Online First.