



ANALYTICAL ESSAYS: EVALUATION, SYNTHESIS, REFLECTIONS

Hanging Out in International Politics: Two Kinds of Explanatory Political Ethnography for IR¹

JOSEPH MACKAY AND JAMIE LEVIN

University of Toronto

The use of ethnographic methods is on the rise in International Relations. However, research in this area has largely been constrained to critical or interpretive analysis of nontraditional objects of study. This has been driven in part by two practical problems that limit ethnographic analysis: that of aggregation, as international phenomena are necessarily large in scale, and that of access, as institutional settings are often closed or secretive. While we commend critical and nontraditional research for driving much-needed expansion of the disciplinary agenda, we offer a complementary account, arguing that scholars can also use ethnographic methods in explanatory research. To do so, we draw on two methodological literatures in anthropology. The first approximates ethnographic research through historical immersion. The second applies ethnographic methods at multiple research sites, tracking transnational phenomena across them. The paper sketches prospective studies of each kind, concerning the creation and implementation of the United Nations. While neither method is entirely new to IR, the methodological literatures in question have yet to receive systematic treatment in the field.

Political scientists, including scholars of International Relations (IR), have made increasing use of ethnographic methods over the last two decades. This shift has been accompanied by intensive debate over the role and practice of ethnographic research in the study of politics: what kinds of questions it can rightly address, what kinds of data it can gather, and how data should be interpreted. Thus, while ethnographic fieldwork is robust and growing among political scientists, how it should be conducted, and why, remains contested.² In political science writ large, disagreements arise in part because ethnography is methodo-

¹*Authors' note:* The authors would like to thank especially Edward Schatz, along with Simon Pratt, Johanna Nykanen, Janice Stein, Jeffrey Kopstein, participants in a panel at the 2013 ISA Annual Convention in San Francisco, three very helpful anonymous reviewers, and the journal's editors.

²For reviews in IR and elsewhere in political science, see Vrsti (2008), Wedeen (2010), and Lie (2013). For general methodological guidance, see Bayard de Volo and Schatz (2004), Gusterson (2008), and Schatz (2009b).

[Corrections added 8 June 2015, after first online publication: Grammatical changes have been made to this article to improve clarity.]

logically distinctive both in what observational and participatory knowledge it acquires and in how it makes that data useful for explaining and interpreting the social world.

Such disagreements about the role of ethnography seem to be especially strong in IR. This is owed in part to apparent practical limits on ethnographies of international politics. Because IR traditionally addresses itself to large-scale phenomena such as great power politics and to events occurring behind the closed doors of governments and international institutions, IR ethnographers face problems of aggregation and access (“scale and secrecy” [Schatz 2009a:307]) somewhat more acutely than other fields. Perhaps for this reason, ethnography in IR has tended to address issues and empirical matters that traditionally lie at the discipline’s margins. Such research has done much to broaden the discipline’s scope, by bringing in new objects of study and subjecting the core of the discipline to trenchant and needed critique. A lively debate persists regarding the proper application and purpose of ethnographic methods.³ However, relatively little ethnographic research directly addresses core or traditional areas of emphasis for IR.

This article takes stock of the “ethnographic turn” in IR, showing what ethnography can and has done, and in so doing re-evaluates the method’s potential scope of impact in the field. We aim to facilitate bridge building between international political ethnography and more traditional explanatory tools of IR research. Our purpose is primarily constructive: We show not that certain kinds of international political ethnography are correct and others are not, but that these tools can be adjusted for application not only to critical or empirically localized projects but also to more conventional areas of study for IR. We do so by exploring practical frameworks in anthropology for applied ethnographic research that permits IR scholars to deliver ethnographic analysis in unconventional ways. To date, much methodological importing from anthropology to IR has been theoretical.⁴ We aim to counterbalance this with hands-on advice for research design and practice. In so doing, we review how ethnography can be used to address explanatory questions in IR research, both on its own and in conjunction with other methods. We then draw on two emerging trends in broadly ethnographic work. Both have roots or counterparts in anthropology, but these have not always been systematically drawn out. Our purpose is to synthesize. Much of the methodological research by anthropologists that we review has yet to be fully taken up by IR or has not been taken up systematically.

The first of these methods involves modeling primary historical research on ethnographic methods. Drawing on approaches occurring at the intersection of ethnography and history can allow the researcher to recreate and understand localized fields of subjective and intersubjective meaning (Cohn 1980; Medick 1987; Ohnuki-Tierney 1990a; Murphy et al. 2011). IR scholars can thereby gain a quasi-ethnographic grasp of important historical events and processes, often drawing on primary written sources. A large literature on historical analysis in anthropology (including the subfield of ethnohistory) offers ways to do this.

The second approach involves conducting conventional ethnographic immersion across multiple locations. So-called “multi-sited” ethnography, a term coined by Marcus (1995), offers a way to address transnational phenomena as a participant observer by linking socially connected research sites across a single study (Marcus 1995; Hannerz 2003; Falzon 2009b; Coleman 2011). Because phenomena of interest to IR scholars are rarely singly located (and are even more rarely

³See, for example, Vrasti (2008) and Rancatore (2010). The discourse on ethnographic methods in IR now also includes a journal, *International Political Anthropology*.

⁴In addition to sources above, see Yanow and Schwartz-Shea (2006) and Brigg and Bleiker (2008).

so when one excludes closed institutional settings), this offers a way to apply IR–ethnographic methods to international political phenomena that are transnational or global in scope.

In order to clarify possible applications, we offer examples of possible studies designed to use each methodological toolkit. These are drawn from the institutional-cultural history and contemporary practices of the United Nations (UN). The first concerns the founding of UN institutions and attendant institutional cultures. The second concerns the acquisition, provisioning, and distribution of food aid by the World Food Programme. While these examples are strictly prospective, they serve to clarify the analytical scope of the methods on offer.

The article begins by discussing ethnographic methods, their extant uses in IR, and the apparent barriers they present. It then discusses the value of explanatory ethnography and how such approaches may be deployed in combination with other methods. It goes on to elaborate the two options described above, suggesting possible projects in which they could be applied. It concludes by discussing remaining limitations on immersion in IR and assessing prospects for future research.

Ethnography and IR

Ethnography itself remains a somewhat contested concept even among cultural anthropologists, despite its centrality to their discipline.⁵ It is usually conceptualized as both a data-gathering tool and a broader interpretive ethos. Geertz's (1973b:6) classic account notes that “doing ethnography is establishing rapport, selecting informants, transcribing texts, taking genealogies, mapping fields, keeping a diary, and so on. But it is not these things, techniques and received procedures that define the enterprise.” Instead, the defining feature is ethnography's distinctive aim. For Geertz, the focus should be on humanity as “suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun... the analysis of it [is therefore not] an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning” (Geertz 1973b:5). Borrowing from Gilbert Ryle, Geertz terms this “thick description,” a term that has been widely appropriated by ethnographers in IR. The data-gathering process that produces it has generally consisted of immersion: describing and assessing a particular sociocultural context through direct and lengthy participant observation, and assessing data gathered thereby through hermeneutical or interpretive methods.⁶

Ethnographers have continued to expand the approach beyond the in situ immersion of participant observation to include “interviews, conversational and discourse analysis, documentary analysis, film and photography, life histories,” and other materials that permit thick or “deep” description of a culturally distinct setting (Hobbs 2006:102). This expansion of research materials over recent decades has been linked to long and often wracking debates about anthropology's purpose, including both its research goals and its role as a site of social critique. These critical self-assessments, prominent in the 1980s (see, for example, Clifford and Marcus 1986; Marcus and Fischer 1986), questioned the nature and purpose of ethnography both as a method and as a genre of writing.⁷ Echoing

⁵Since our concerns are primarily practical, we do not dwell at length on well-trod philosophical accounts of interpretation, hermeneutics, and related matters. Key texts on interpretation in social science include Taylor (1971) and Geertz (1973a).

⁶Renato Rosaldo terms this process “deep hanging out” (quoted in: Clifford 1997:56), a phrase from which we draw our title.

⁷For a useful gloss of this history, contextualized in personal anecdote, see Carsten (2012). However, as Wedeen (2010:262–64) notes, debates among anthropologists have since largely moved on to other matters.

these self-examinations, much of the literature on ethnography in IR has focused on the method's theoretical status: on what kinds of questions it can ask, on what it permits us to infer, on how it stands in relation to other methods, and on its status as a "critical" enterprise. Indeed, these matters can sometimes seem the dominant issues surrounding IR ethnography (Vrasti 2008; Rancatore 2010; Lie 2013).

That so much ink has been spilt on theoretical aspects of international political ethnography is striking, since the most immediate and foreboding constraints on studying world politics ethnographically are practical. Ethnographic methods pose a double challenge for scholars of IR concerned with relatively conventional areas of study—problems of access and aggregation that seem to make the study of international politics resistant to thick description by a participant observer. IR scholars cannot generally gain inside access to governments or international institutions (Schatz 2009a:306). Even banal, everyday matters of official conduct are often shrouded in secrecy, both from other international actors and from domestic political rivals.⁸ The state often black boxes itself, leaving the researcher with little access to immersive experience. As Schatz (2009a:307) notes, these problems are not unique to IR: "Conducting ethnographic immersion about matrimonial relations between spouses might be no more possible than conducting a similar study about the causes of war."⁹ Inversely, if studies of quotidian social life can be made possible through careful and creative research design, perhaps international political ethnography can as well. However, sites of likely investigation by IR scholars still seem especially challenging, being as they are often official sites of concentrated power, able to remain closed to outside observers.

Moreover, institutional closure to investigation is linked to a second practical difficulty: aggregation. IR has classically framed itself as the discipline focused on large-scale, transnational phenomena. A focus on local sociocultural specificity can therefore seem ill suited to addressing macrosocial phenomena like great power war, the global economy, and international institutionalization. The small pool of sites where localized ethnographic immersion might seem intuitively helpful (sites of authority in governments and international institutions) comprises precisely those bureaucratic settings where access is least likely to be granted. Here again, the problem is not unique or absolute: Anthropologists may also address themselves to phenomena involving scale. Indeed, they have done so increasingly as the discipline has moved out of its traditional research site in the archetypal remote village. Still, the issue is significant because IR, perhaps as much as any field of study, deals in matters that are large by any measure. How can the study of the local be brought to bear on phenomena defined by the scope of their aim and impact?

Existing ethnographic studies of international politics have addressed these issues in several ways. Some have taken them as an opportunity to widen the discipline's scope. For example, instead of addressing nuclear deterrence, Gusteron (1998, 2008) addresses the social life of nuclear scientists. Similarly, Cohn (1987) embedded herself with defense intellectuals, reporting on the professional discourse and culture through which they addressed themselves to nuclear strategy.¹⁰ Elsewhere, ethnography of international institutions was permitted

⁸Black boxing the state can often be theoretically and methodologically justified—see Waltz (1979) and Fearon (1995). Interpretive approaches are more likely to have recourse to the sociocultural settings inside governments and other institutional frameworks.

⁹Likewise, international political phenomena are not without correspondences and linkages to other social phenomena. For example, as Neumann (2013) has shown, the social practices of diplomacy are shot through with longstanding, often quotidian social practices not usually linked with diplomatic formality.

¹⁰See also Galtung (1986), who provides an anthropological sketch of UN bureaucracies, but does so in general and often structural, rather than closely observed ethnographic, terms.

simply by being in the right place at the right time. Barnett's (1997, 2003) study of the UN response to the Rwandan Genocide resulted from his happening to be a policy officer at the US Mission to the UN at the time of the genocide. Systematic access of this sort has been relatively rare. Neumann (2002, 2007, 2012) is almost alone in accessing the upper levels of government institutions and gathering ethnographic data in real time and at length, the result of years spent in the Norwegian foreign ministry, where his immediate object of study was the quotidian practice of diplomacy.¹¹

These are fruitful and productive expansions of the disciplinary agenda and are in many respects reason enough for the discipline to engage ethnographic methods. However, while these studies indicate that the problems of access and aggregation can be overcome, they offer no systematic way of doing so. As a consequence, while they prove the value of an ethnographic approach, none gives rise to systematic prescriptions for IR–ethnographic research design. While their authors clearly aim to make ethnographic work more common in IR, and offer advice for research (Cohn 2006; Gusterson 2008), basic practical problems of how to study the core subject matter of the field continue to lack systematic solutions.

Despite these constraints, the interpretive ethos of ethnography is already at work in much of the discipline. Emphasizing culture and process over material outcomes, constructivists have the strongest theoretical linkages to ethnography in IR. Constructivist empirics, however, have tended to rely on existing historiography, on interviews, or on other publicly available information.¹² These sources, while useful (and also available to ethnographers), are not the primary materials of ethnographic research. This being said, attempts to broaden the methodological scope of constructivism have often taken on an explicitly or implicitly ethnographic tone.¹³ The result has been that constructivism exhibits what Schatz calls “an ethnographic sensibility that goes beyond face-to-face contact” (Schatz 2009a:308).

Two related recent trends in IR suggest grounds for framing constructivist and related research in broadly ethnographic terms. First, the recent “practice turn” among chiefly but not exclusively constructivist IR scholars suggests further affinities (Adler and Pouliot 2011).¹⁴ Because practice emphasizes social life as lived—as done—investigating it calls for irreducibly experiential or immersive research. Of note, Bueger (2013b) has linked empirical study of practices to participant observation and other forms of immersive study (especially the study of texts), under the rubric of “praxiography.” This emphasis on practice suggests additional affinities between ethnography and the study of international politics—and a remit to expand the range of empirical material available as the study of practice often involves nontraditional ethnographic materials such as texts (we turn to this below, under historical ethnography).

Second, a recent turn toward actor-network theory (ANT) suggests that ethnographically investigating sites of power and knowledge construction may be especially fruitful. Existing studies focus on phenomena ranging from airport security (Schouten 2014) to state failure (MacKay 2006; Bueger and Bethke 2013), global finance (Porter 2013), and international organizations (Bueger 2013a).¹⁵ Since

¹¹This is not to exclude de facto international political ethnography conducted in other disciplines. While we cite examples throughout this article, the range is large and diverse enough to resist easy summation here. See also, for example, Wodak (2009).

¹²Classic examples include Adler and Barnett (1998), Risse, Ropp, and Sikkink (1999), and Finnemore (2003).

¹³See, for example, Pouliot (2007).

¹⁴The turn toward the “logic of practicality” (Pouliot 2008) in IR draws on Bourdieu (1977, 1990) and on research in social theory more broadly (Schatzki, Knorr-Cetina, and von Savigny 2000).

¹⁵A recent forum in *International Political Sociology* (Best and Walters 2013) addresses ANT in IR. For a sympathetic critique, see Nexon and Pouliot (2013) in the same issue. See also Walters (2002).

ANT has deep roots in anthropological immersion, originally aimed at laboratory science (Latour and Woolgar 1986; Latour 1987; Law 2004), this theoretical reorientation suggests significant methodological affinities with the broader “ethnographic turn.”

These approaches are methodological fellow travelers of ethnography. They illustrate not just that it is possible in IR, but also that it can be used to conduct substantial explanatory research. Where Vrasti (2008:283) has called for IR to move beyond the ethnographic prescriptions of the 1970s, adopting a more critical stance, Wedeen (2010:263–264) has gone further, calling for a move beyond anthropology’s philosophical and critical reflections of the 1980s and 1990s, toward the conduct of practical research. To that end, we aim to “update” IR’s ethnographic methods, by broadening their scope.

Explanatory International Political Ethnography

In an effort to advance a more practical, empirical, applied IR ethnography, we take as a point of departure Wedeen’s (2010:257) contention that “interpretive social science does not have to forswear generalizations or causal explanations and that ethnographic methods can be used in the service of establishing them.” While much ethnography is critical or chiefly descriptive in purpose, many studies (including the studies in IR surveyed above) offer explanations providing analytical purchase or leverage on substantive phenomena of international politics. Ethnography is thus often distinguished from conventionally neo-positivist methods not by a refusal to explain but by the kind of explanation offered. Ethnographic approaches are suited to answering certain kinds of questions, chiefly those that resist simple or intuitive causal explanations. Where explanatory causal mechanisms or consistent correlations—law-like regularities—are unclear even in retrospect, interpreting may be a prerequisite to offering an explanation.¹⁶ We identify two ways in which ethnography may be used for explanatory purposes: first, as a means of developing causal explanations directly; and second, as a pre-theoretical tool for developing the analytical concepts or categories from which explanations are built.

Employed on their own, ethnographic methods can and have answered a distinctive range of questions in IR, as we show above. Such accounts are often explanatory: for example, showing how and why the UN and its great power members did little to curtail the Rwandan genocide (Barnett 2003), or explaining why diplomatic speeches persistently strive to say as little as possible (Neumann 2007). Such accounts demonstrate empirically how and why the world is as it is. Put differently, they address themselves to empirical puzzles, in the classic sense of the term: phenomena in the social world that should not intuitively be as they are. Such explanations are causal, in the sense that they explain what produced a particular outcome or pattern of outcomes. An immersive approach allows explanation of cultural regularities that other methodological tools cannot readily access.

However, this is not the only explanatory use for ethnography. In combination with other methods, it can offer the researcher empirically grounded theoretical building blocks. Such theoretical component parts are sometimes readily available, but not reliably so. Both conventional social/scientific neo-positivism and sociological explanations based on Weberian ideal types seek to answer questions

¹⁶Relatedly, ethnography is like many other methods in that it may be, but need not be, critical. For example, broadly structural theoretical methods in IR may be aimed at conventional explanations (Waltz 1979) or at critically re-evaluating and supplanting received world views (Wallerstein 1979). Scholarship is made critical by its purpose (Cox 1986), more so than by its method.

by identifying correlations or causal linkages between social phenomena. Where the component parts of an explanation are often themselves non-obvious, the first task analysts face involves uncovering the building blocks of explanatory theory.¹⁷ Where and when the foundational categories forming explanations remain contested, they may themselves need to be understood before law-like regularities may be established. This is a task to which ethnographic methods are often well suited. In such instances, interpretive and explanatory tools have a complementary relationship: Interpretive methods provide the tools or components of explanations that may be tested or evaluated using other approaches.¹⁸

In comparative politics, the use of ethnographic methods in this second way is most extensively associated with the work of David Laitin, who variously links sociocultural conditions or contexts with political outcomes, addressing phenomena such as intra-state conflict in Nigeria and Russian-minority identity emergence in post-Soviet states (Laitin 1986, 1998).¹⁹ Similarly, in his otherwise quantitative study of the distribution of violence in civil wars, Kalyvas (2006:247) bases data collection on detailed interviews he characterizes as ethnographic. Laitin (2003) has elsewhere associated this mixed approach with three basic types of research: formal theory, quantitative analysis, and narrative (with ethnography corresponding broadly to the last). Laitin endorses the careful combination of these approaches in designing research.

Thus, where the first approach above treats ethnography as a source of explanatory research on its own, the second relies on a collaborative relationship between ethnography and other methods. Methodological pluralisms and cognate frameworks have recently proliferated in IR. Sil and Katzenstein (2010) call for an “analytic eclecticism” that transcends traditional methodological boundaries to permit empirical synthesis across them. Jackson (2011) calls for a pluralism that, while unwilling to rely on the willy-nilly recombination of methods, nonetheless endorses a plurality of philosophies of science in the discipline. Conversely, Monteiro and Ruby (2009a) call for a rejection of foundational philosophies of science as such, in favor of a “foundational prudence” that rejects philosophically grounded frameworks. Friedrichs and Kratochwil (2009) locate an alternative to such foundations in the task-oriented framework of philosophical pragmatism: Here, social science becomes a social practice, marked by distinctive goals that shape research design and methodology. None of these approaches should be mistaken for an “anything goes” rejection of methodological rigor. Instead, the core common feature they share is a belief that science cannot be built from a single set of methodological or metatheoretical tools alone. The debate on how to make methodological pluralism philosophically and practically workable is clearly ongoing.²⁰ We take no position on it here, other than to note that all of these conceptions of social science offer a place for broadly interpretive (including ethnographic) methods in the discipline. Moreover, most endorse (with varying degrees of reservation) mechanisms

¹⁷Such explanatory components may be neo-positivist variables, or instead the components of a Weberian ideal-type explanation, of the type Jackson (2011:112–55) calls “analyticist.” Regardless, the moving parts of the explanation must be arrived at before the explanation can be derived. For neo-positivists, this means identifying variables. For Weberian or sociological analysts, this means the process of ideal typification. As Jackson (2011:147) notes, Weber is somewhat less than clear about how the process of deriving ideal types should proceed.

¹⁸Indeed, they may be necessary to one another. As Hopf (2007) has argued, interpretive studies often implicitly employ positive methodological assumptions in their inferences. Inversely, positivist scholars necessarily implicate interpretations in constructing their analytical categories. For a sympathetic skeptical reading, see Chernoff (2007) in the same volume.

¹⁹See also Hopf et al. (2006) and Wedeen (2010:258–59).

²⁰All of these publications have been followed by fruitful, but as yet unresolved dialogue. Important references by and about these authors include Jackson (2009), Monteiro and Ruby (2009b), Ahmed and Sil (2012), and Adcock et al. (2010). On the application of such approaches, see Poteete, Janssen and Ostrom (2010).

for cross-pollination across methods. While these accounts are all in favor of pluralism across individual studies, they disagree about the tenability of pluralism within projects.²¹ In this article, we focus on the explanatory power of ethnography itself. Specific methodological combinations, and their philosophy of science implications, will likely need to be worked out at the level of individual projects. Since debates about foundations are ongoing, scholars may also vary in the frameworks they advocate for pluralism across methods. Thus, however important, it is beyond the scope of this article to treat them systematically. Instead, we offer a few remarks below under the rubric of the two ethnographic methods on how combinations may be possible in practice.

Our primary task is more limited and more concrete than resolving these philosophical problems. We aim to distill tools for practical international political ethnography. We do so by offering two approaches that broadly permit ethnographic data gathering and interpretation. These approaches may, in some instances, be useful in conjunction with non-ethnographic methods. The following sections set out two simple methodological toolkits for research design. Empirically, these tools show how researchers might begin to design research that brings ethnographic methods to bear in unconventional ways on an important area of research for the field: the creation and everyday operation of international organizations. Neither method is new. Both are, to varying degrees, well established in anthropology. Indeed, they have approximate counterparts in IR. However, IR research to date has not provided systematic guidelines for research. Thus, our purpose is to synthesize, making these emerging approaches more readily available.

Each account also offers examples of studies that might be conducted in these ways. In both, these examples offer alternate ethnographic accounts of the origins and operation of the bureaucratic cultures of the UN system. We have opted for new, potential, or prospective cases rather than descriptions of existing studies for two reasons. First, while extant research is of great value (we note examples in both instances), few if any studies thoroughly and exclusively exemplify either approach. Sketching new cases makes clearer the contours of the methods, thus providing clearer guidelines. Second, these potential studies address the same class of phenomena: the emergence, cultural practices, and pathologies of the UN system of institutions. Focus on one empirical frame of reference allows for clearer contrast of the two approaches' respective scope of applicability. While an anthropological sensibility has been brought to bear on the UN before (Galtung 1986; Barnett 2003), existing studies do not overtly or thoroughly adhere to these two modes of research.

The first applies ethnographic analysis to historical contexts. While IR scholars hardly need to be told to examine history, additional methodological frameworks for doing so permit additional questions to be answered—questions about how social meanings are created and re-created and how these shared understandings constrain policymaking or condition cross-cultural interaction. While constructivists have long concerned themselves with these matters, a historical-ethnographic method can sharpen inquiry into not just how ideas shape outcomes but also how the ideas themselves are shaped. In so doing, it offers a distinctive way for ethnographic IR scholars to “study up,” focusing on past sites of power in international politics.

Second, since many publicly accessible international phenomena occur over too large a space to facilitate localized “deep hanging out,” ethnographic inquiry

²¹Skepticism about methodological pluralism is strongest in Jackson, for whom the problems of translation across methodological and especially meta-theoretical toolkits make integrating them in individual projects difficult (Jackson 2011:210). Elsewhere, he argues for a more specifically defined role for ethnography in IR (Jackson 2008).

can be conducted across multiple locations. Many important international phenomena are transnational, in the sense of occurring in multiple localities sequentially or simultaneously. Methodological advances in multi-sited ethnography over the past two decades offer opportunities to investigate them.

Both are, by degrees, already in use in IR. Documenting them programmatically offers an opportunity to expand and entrench their usage, by making clearer their utility and possible scope of inquiry. These are not the only distinctive approaches to ethnography available. For example, shadowing (Czarniawska 2007) offers a novel set of tools for research, especially in the study of organizations (Czarniawska 2008; Gill 2011). Event ethnography allows the study (often collaboratively) of large, singular occurrences like summits, protests, and other “mass” events (Little 1995; Brosius and Campbell 2010). Autoethnographic methods already have advocates in IR (Brigg and Bleiker 2010). Such approaches no doubt offer additional scope for broadening the field’s horizons.²² We emphasize historical and multi-method approaches because, as we attempt to show below, they appear to offer the most untapped potential for IR research and appear to most directly address the problems of access and aggregation we discuss above. Our purpose is not to downplay these other approaches so much as to provide a necessarily selective point of entry to broadening the available methodological menu.

Historicizing Ethnography for International Relations

Historical ethnography leverages primary historical sources to produce ethnographic understandings of past sociocultural settings. At first blush, a historical approach may appear to conflict with the implicit first rule of ethnography—that it must involve contact, immersion, and participant observation: in a word, presence. However, an approach to past events that brings an ethnographic sensibility to archives, memoirs, interviews, and other primary source points of historical access offers to help recast the study of historical international politics. Indeed, rather than being a second-best approximation of “real” immersion in lived environments, historical approaches to ethnography offer a significant advantage: the ability to track emergence and change over longer periods of time.²³

Despite locating itself geographically in archives and other sites of primary record, rather than in traditional sites of anthropological research, the method set out here remains meaningfully ethnographic—it is not merely a new label for constructivist or discursive historical research.²⁴ The approach is ethnographic insofar as it focuses on the production and reproduction of politi-

²²Indeed, one might add also meta-analysis of existing ethnography (Noblit and Hare 1988; Britten et al. 2002). Such approaches differ from those take here in that they involve no new ethnographic inquiry. Such approaches have proven especially fruitful in the study of nursing (Paterson et al. 2001; Walsh and Downe 2005).

²³Some political ethnographers have expressed skepticism about terming such historical research ethnographic: “while oral history, archival research, and open-ended interviews are qualitative methods of data gathering, and while all of these may *complement* the use of ethnographic methods, they are not ethnography” (Bayard de Volo and Schatz 2004:267 [emphasis original]). The anthropological literature at least partly disagrees with this view. While anthropologists using these approaches have not always termed them ethnographic, they have frequently used them to ethnographic ends. See also, however, Neumann’s (2012:2–6) complementary but nonetheless contrasting account of ethnography.

²⁴Much constructivist research treats ideas as independent variables for explaining political outcomes. While many constructivists treat ideas as dependent variables in need of explanation, the methods used often differ from those discussed here. They may conceptualize ideas differently (as identities or norms, rather than culture as such), and applying different methods, often discourse analysis. Discursive approaches treat the written or spoken source materials as webs or networks of signifiers, thereby making discourse itself the object of study. An ethnographic approach, even when it addresses itself to written materials, includes a material as well as discursive world in its scope of inquiry. On discursive methods, see Hansen (2006).

cal culture itself, and does so by way of immersion in these meanings. History becomes the site of culture best approached through thick description. If indeed “the past is a foreign country,” then researchers can approach it like an ethnographer arriving in the field.²⁵

History and Anthropology in Dialogue—Assets and Pitfalls

Combining history and ethnographic methods has a number of precedents.²⁶ Ethnohistory, a subfield of anthropology, involves the historical reconstruction of cultures to which ethnographers do not have direct access.²⁷ The last few decades have also seen a broader dialogue between historians and anthropologists on the potentially fruitful relationship between the two disciplines. Cohn (1980:198) noted three decades ago that the two disciplines “[b]oth aim, whatever else they do, at explicating the meaning of actions rooted in one time and place, to persons in another.” Broadly, the historical turn in some anthropological research has aimed to overcome the implicit assumption that cultures are fixed and static things that can be observed and recorded without reflection on their origins or trajectories (Ohnuki-Tierney 1990b:3). It thus expands rather than constrains the scope of analysis, improving rather than diluting it. Others have since framed a historical approach to anthropology as a way of regaining anthropological insight after the assimilation of “traditional” societies into the modern, industrial world (Sahlins 1993). As Marcus (1986) has noted, traditionally ahistorical ethnography obscures these processes.²⁸ Alternately, one may view an ethnographic approach to history as a way to recover historical nuance in the face of structural or otherwise narrowly macro-historical approaches to the past (Medick 1987). Thus, there are scholars in both fields who view a combined approach as not only possible, but potentially fruitful.

The approach is not, of course, without limitations. Historical ethnography does not provide direct ethnographic access to the international political present. Because archival and documentary materials are likely to be available only long after the events and processes under study are over, this approach has the same documentary limitations as historiography. We must wait for archives to open and personal papers to be released before we can study them. Still, this approach offers a distinctive approach to ethnographic research in IR.

It may clarify to both link and contrast this approach with two other methods in IR associated with historical texts. Both exhibit significant philosophical and methodological overlap with historical ethnography and may form part of the historical-ethnographic toolkit. However, neither is exhaustive of it.

First, discourse analysis has similar theoretical foundations and also involves textual interpretation. It does not, as is sometimes said, reduce the world to text. However, it does take texts as the primary materials for social analysis, analogizing other materials to text in order to understand features of and interactions between discourses.²⁹ Ethnography linked to texts proceeds in broadly the other direction: It approaches them as part of a more generalized view of culture as

²⁵The quotation, from L. P. Hartley, appears in Comaroff and Comaroff (1992:14). Hartley (2002:17) adds that “they do things differently there.”

²⁶Some such accounts may already be familiar to IR scholars. Much of the literature that informs Snyder’s survey of the anthropology of war is historical (Snyder 2002). Scott’s (1998, 2009) work is extensively informed by history. Elsewhere, historical ethnographic approaches have been especially fruitful in science and technology studies. See, for example, Latour (1993). See also Geertz (1990) on history. More recently, see discussion in Michaud (2010).

²⁷For reviews, see Krech (1991) and Harkin (2010). A journal, *Ethnohistory*, has been in print since 1954.

²⁸Indeed, it is the methodological problem of increasing cultural mobility and change that motivates Marcus’s interest in locating ethnography across multiple, globalized sites, to which we turn below.

²⁹On discourse analysis in IR, see Milliken (1999), Hansen (2006) and Neumann (2008).

holistic, contextualized, lived experience. Historical ethnography thus takes a more all-embracing view—locating text, speech, conversation, and other language within a larger social sphere to be interpreted through active engagement with it. Discourse analysis may therefore be understood as forming part of the historical-ethnographic toolkit.

Second, genealogy is similar to the approach we describe and often linked to discourse analytic approaches (Milliken 1999:246–48). While discourse analysis offers practical tools for interpreting texts, genealogy offers theoretical tools for constructing interpretations of history. Genealogical analysis originated in Nietzsche (2003) and was established more rigorously by Foucault (1984a,b). It offers one way of conducting broadly ethnographic research about history, aiming to provide a “history of the present” (Foucault 1977:27, 31) to explain how present social conditions arose not out of social-evolutionary necessity but through passing happenstance events and discontinuous social processes. Like ethnography, genealogy now has an established history in the field (Bartelson 1995; Price 1995; Jackson 2006). Moreover, as Vucetic (2011) has recently argued, Foucauldian genealogical analysis need not reject causal explanation. It thus forms part of the broader historical explanatory toolkit social scientists may deploy.³⁰ Such explanations aim to clarify, by interpretation of the past, our present circumstances to ourselves and to do so processually, showing how past produced present. This is a historical-ethnographic task.

However, this is not the only possible historical-ethnographic approach. Because historical ethnography treats the past as a foreign country, explaining it on its own terms as a distinct object of study becomes a task unto itself. It may also focus on the past for its own sake. Such studies may but need not be comparative, contrasting and linking the past with and to the past. A study might, for example, compare the institutional cultures of the American and Soviet defense establishments during the Cold War.³¹ Historical ethnography thus offers both a processual (genealogical) and a comparative toolkit.

Many extant implementations of history in anthropology have been geared toward reconstructing the past as experienced by marginal or postcolonial peoples, or other groups at risk of being “othered” as exotic or foreign. Because applications in IR are likely to focus on centers of power, the task differs accordingly. Rather than the goal being to deconstruct marginalizing narratives and uncover submerged cultural patterns, it is to make sites of well-known power comprehensible by casting them in new light. Rather than making the strange familiar, the goal is to make the familiar productively and usefully strange.

Historical ethnography involves distinctive advantages and challenges, differentiating it from other historical approaches to IR. Archives, of course, do not speak for themselves. On the one hand, they do not push back, interrogating researchers’ intentions and understandings in the way live ethnographic subjects can.³² On the other hand, they do not simply yield information inertly. As rational choice IR scholars will recognize (Fearon 1995:390–91), the authors of primary source materials may face incentives to misrepresent circumstances as they experienced them. They may also misperceive their political circumstances (Jervis 1976). Like live interviewees or subjects of participant observation,

³⁰Foucault was fond of describing his books as methodological tools: “I write for users, not readers” (quoted in Vucetic 2011:1299).

³¹Some such work has been done; see Hopf (1994, 2002).

³²Consider the relief with which one researcher discovered that, unlike interviewees, archival documents “cannot tell their reader she is inappropriately dressed, that she should not also look at that other set of documents because it will mislead her, or that she is not qualified to read beyond a certain point. And they cannot ask who sent her and why she is there in the first place.” Live subjects, of course, can do all of these things (Luehrmann 2011:273).

archival materials can elide, mislead, dissemble, lie, contradict one another, offer competing interpretations of past events and long-vanished social settings, and generally face the researcher with as many difficulties as advantages.³³ One must approach them with methodological prescriptions already in mind in order to put these materials to good use. An ethnographic sensibility offers a basis for dealing with these issues in a systematic way.³⁴

As Feldmann (2011:102) has noted, even before archives can lead or mislead the researcher, they must first be construed as archives, rather than as the official records they originally were. This conversion of purpose “always involves mechanisms of exclusion... In order for files to become archives, they need to be extracted from their original working networks... in this regard archiving has to be seen as an act of disempowerment.”³⁵ Even the most professionally maintained archive thus speaks not purely with the voice of the documents it comprises, but also with that of the archivists who assembled them, including and excluding according to standards, scholarly or otherwise. Archival availability, unavailability, selectivity, and the like are all subject to political manipulation. More prosaically, archives of interest to IR researchers may often be those exposed to misadventure—up to and including war. As Feldmann (2011) found, sometimes what is available is determined chiefly neither by meticulous archival standards nor by official censorship, but instead by the vicissitudes of the political history being studied, which damage the materials with which the researcher would work.³⁶

Direct on-site data gathering such as participant observation—the default mode of ethnography—remains in many respects preferable. However, the advantages of the traditional approach should not be overstated. Just as primary historical materials offer only secondhand knowledge, the data recorded in field notes and interview transcripts are secondary. In both cases, the work of interpretation has already begun before the analyst himself or herself begins to interpret. While direct experience offers access to the interpretive context, such access is never unmediated or privileged: It is always mediated by interviewees and by the observer’s own biases. Indirect data gathering, often available through primary and secondary historical sources, can be used to reconstruct historical context and provide quasi-immersive data for interpretation. Either way, as Geertz (1973b:9, 15) notes, “what we call our data are really our own constructions of other people’s constructions of what they and their compatriots are up to.” Consequently, “anthropological writings are themselves interpretations, and second or third order ones to boot.” In his own case, he refers not to events he witnessed, but to events he recorded as oral history. Since there seems little reason to privilege oral over archival historical sources, his claim seems to extend to the methodological specifications set out here. Understood on these terms, a historical-ethnographic approach offers to contribute valuable insights that would otherwise be inaccessible, including closed institutional environments and periods of institutional-cultural change—the timing of which observers cannot know until it has passed.

Historical-ethnographic work might be linked to studies using other methods in multiple ways, building interpretively the core categories of analysis out of which hypotheses may be drawn and variables identified. Scholars wanting to

³³On selecting primary and secondary historical materials, see Lustick (1996).

³⁴Here again, there are linkages to the practice turn. Accounts of practice often bring a textual emphasis to immersive study (Pouliot 2008; Bueger 2013b; Weisser 2014).

³⁵This, while we focus on documents as points of departure, their production can also be subject to ethnographic investigation, at least in the present. This may be fruitful for contentious political documents. See, for example, Riles (1999, 2006).

³⁶For a personal account of the individual and idiosyncratic experience of archival research, see Farge (2013).

conduct historical studies of ethnic conflict using texts—but analogous in design to (for example) Laitin’s or Kalyvas’s work—might begin here. Alternately, scholars intending to study specific institutional settings in the present might begin by assessing the emergence of institutional culture, and thus of intra-institutional incentives, by documenting how that institutional culture was created. The proposed study of the UN discussed below offers such examples.

IR scholars will find much of this familiar. Ethnographic historical reconstruction is, for example, central to Hopf’s (2002:23–25) reconstruction of American and Soviet foreign policymaking during the Cold War—although his methodological specifications are more explicitly discursive than those proposed here. For a genealogical variant, see Jackson (2006). The remainder of this section offers methodological advice and examples.

Guidelines for Research Design

Because there is no unified historical-ethnographic method—let alone one attuned to the needs of political scientists—this section offers general, foundational guidelines only. We posit four ground rules for international political historical ethnography that circumscribe and provide a basis for research in this area. The first two circumscribe the range of possible objects of study. The second two identify and limit materials and methods of research.

First, and most obviously, the object of study should be amenable to thick description. This means not only that it should be possible to describe it immersively, but also that there should be some added value to analysis thicker than that provided by quantitative, pre-statistical qualitative, or other more conventional approaches. It must also expand on issues available to conventional constructivist approaches. Since historical constructivist research often (but not always) relies on existing secondary historical research for empirical data, the emphasis here on thick description of primary materials is relatively (if not absolutely) different. The historical puzzles to which this approach is applied must be situations wherein the social phenomena before us remain opaque, even knowing the outline of events and basic historical context. Such puzzles are likely to emphasize explaining processes rather than explaining outcomes.³⁷ Because the close observation of social processes is tied up with both the constitutive effects of social interactions (the usual focus of ethnography) and how they unfold over time (that is, their history), this methodological approach is uniquely well suited to these sorts of phenomena. Below, we propose applying this to an international organization—specifically, the founding of the UN, thus emphasizing the formation of its bureaucratic culture.

Second, the “site” of the study (the historical location of the events and processes under examination) must be localized: It must involve a circumscribed environment in which the phenomenon under study occurs. Thus, “the causes of interstate wars, 1945–1989” is not a viable object of study for this approach, as it lacks the degree of locality necessary for immersive study. Nor could one address the political economy of Latin American sovereign debt in the postwar period—such an object of study (while no doubt complex, and perhaps requiring detailed archival work or interviews) would likely be neither localized enough nor intersubjectively “thick” enough to permit this sort of analysis. Historical ethnography is of use to study international politics only where there is an immediately shared (physically or temporally localized) social space with a population having enough in common culturally or socially for that commonality itself to be the object of study. Absent this, it is unclear what constitutes the “field” in which fieldwork is conducted. In the context of international

³⁷On “how” questions in IR research, see Wendt (1998:104).

organization (IO) formation, the physical locations being documented would be the sites of international meetings at which the organization was established and the locations of its first bureaucratic organs. The researcher would thus follow the emergence of a bureaucratic culture by locating research where the organization was created.

Third, sources should be chiefly, indeed overwhelmingly, primary and first person. Since the goal is to approximate the experience of direct immersion, the preferred sources of information are those that document the viewpoints of those directly immersed in the experience. Thus, documents such as memoirs, diaries, interviews, correspondence, and other sources of individual recollection should be the dominant points of entry.³⁸ Other archival sources such as official documents and press reports will likely play an important role—but mainly provide framing, establishing basic historical facts and context. Electronic modes of communication may qualify as well. In studying an IO's establishment, the researcher's materials would likely be the organization's archives and the personal papers of the decision makers and other elites involved.

Fourth, these points of view should be multiple. Because the historical political ethnographer cannot participate, directly observe, and physically immerse him or herself, sources should represent multiple points of access to the phenomenon under study. This prevents the researcher from being entrapped in a single perspective. Put differently, it ensures that what is documented is the intersubjective space of the social or cultural sphere, not the subjectivity of individual experience. This has been termed "triangulation": Reference to multiple points of view grants access to a shared, intersubjective object of study (Pouliot 2007).³⁹ These multiple sources should represent points of view of a culture or other shared social context. This is important because the goal is not to obtain access to any approximation of an objective truth about the political world. Rather, it is to access a shared viewpoint (that is, a political culture) suitable for ethnographic examination and thus to analyze a site of ongoing interpretation. Accordingly, in the context of IO formation, one would study the diplomats, bureaucrats, and heads of state involved in forming the institutional culture under study.

A Possible Study: The Creation of UN Institutions

A possible application of the approach would be a reassessment of the founding of the UN system. While the UN is in many ways central to international politics, IR scholars have chiefly viewed it either as epiphenomenal to the international balance of power or as a rational institutional framework intended to facilitate international cooperation (Mearsheimer 1994; Keohane and Martin 1995). On either reading, the UN serves mainly as an empty vessel into which the dynamics of international power politics are poured. Despite this, it is well understood that the UN has a wealth of bureaucratic and institutional culture, practice, history, and pathologies (Barnett and Finnemore 1999; Weiss 2012). Its impact on the international system extends well beyond its successes and failures in preventing and permitting warfare, with a purview including aid distribution, disaster relief,

³⁸While archives and memoirs represent the least perishable sources, thus offering the longest scope of access to the past, interviews are presumably as good or superior. On ethnographic interviewing, see Spradley (1979).

³⁹The term has a lengthy history in the humanities and social sciences, generally referring to the identification of shared (intersubjective) truths, through references to multiple points of view. Triangulation has linkages to Nietzsche's perspectivalism (Nietzsche 1976; see also discussion in Jackson 2011:122–28). Among analytical philosophers, it dates at least to Davidson (1991). In a somewhat different sense, Denzin (1978) and Jick (1979) use the term to refer to triangulating findings across research methods. On the problem of the researcher's subjectivity in ethnography, see Crapanzano (1986).

global public health, and a host of other major and minor issue areas. It handles these efficiently and inefficiently, in times good and bad.

And yet, while studies in individual issue areas exist, no extensive IR study has been conducted regarding how these institutional frameworks came into being, thereby taking the institutional shapes they did. The historical, cultural, and conceptual space created at the UN's founding conferences and thereafter remains largely uncharted and untheorized by IR scholars. This is remarkable—given that, in scale and complexity, the work of institution building undertaken was massive. In 1948 alone, “more than four thousand meetings of organs of the United Nations were held in Lake Success [New York], Paris, and Geneva. Add the meetings in the Far East, Latin America, and elsewhere, add the meetings of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, and the figure climbs into the many, many thousands” (Eagleton 1949:5). The system was enormously complex even in its infancy, much more so than IR scholarship commonly indicates. While much of this has already been detailed by diplomatic historians,⁴⁰ the phenomena most likely of interest to IR scholars—the emergence of institutional processes, dynamics, cultures, and pathologies—require social scientific analysis. Since the issue involves “how” questions, or questions concerning processes of creation or transformation, a historical-ethnographic approach seems well suited to the task.

Clearly, the scale and complexity of the subject requires some narrowing. Thus, a possible study might consider the emergence of bureaucratic norms and practices within the context of one or more specific branches of the UN bureaucracy. The General Secretariat, concerned with the maintenance of international peace and security (and with the then-new institution of peacekeeping), would make an ideal case. One might look alternately at the early bureaucracies of the WHO, the UNHCR, or UNESCO.

Alternately, instead of following a single institution, one might follow an institutional transition. Thus, the handover of institutional roles and responsibility from the remnant League of Nations to the UN system might be studied. This transition was not trivial, involving as it did the handover of international legal responsibility for the prevention of another World War, along with a range of more prosaic but tangible matters—among them coordinating other pre-existing international institutions (for example, the ICJ, the ILO, and the like) and transforming the League mandate system into the UN trusteeship mechanism. These processes are tied up with the creation of the postwar diplomatic and international legal order, and yet they are not well understood by IR scholars.

Because the UN's founding is historical, access poses relatively minimal problems. The UN Archives are open to researchers.⁴¹ In many cases, personal papers of major figures are available. Certainly, this is the case for the first three Secretaries General.⁴² A wealth of biography and secondary historical research exists. One could further refer to the interviews and other documentation in the UN Intellectual History Project.⁴³

A study evaluating the rise of UN bureaucratic culture and politics—or more likely the rise of a specific portion of it—would offer a point of entry to a uniquely important institution in postwar international politics. Moreover, in doing so it would shed light on the historical foundations of the discipline.

⁴⁰See, for example, Hilderbrand (2001).

⁴¹The United Nations Archives are found online at <http://archives.un.org/ARMS/>.

⁴²The papers of Gladwyn Jebb, who served as acting Secretary General during the UN's initial establishment, are held at Churchill College, Cambridge (Cook 2012:80). The papers of Trygve Lie are held at the Norwegian National Library (UN Secretary-General Trygve Halvdan Lie 2012). The papers of Dag Hammarskjöld are held at the National Library of Sweden and Columbia University Library (UN Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld 2012). Limited official papers of all three are held by the UN Archive.

⁴³See review in Berg (2006).

Multi-Sited Ethnography for International Relations

A second approach to expanding the use of ethnography in IR employs immersion across multiple locations, contexts, or institutional settings. Originally identified and widely promoted by Marcus (1995), such “multi-sited” ethnography has a history of use in anthropology (Gustavson and Cytrynbaum 2003; Hannerz 2003; Falzon 2009b; Coleman 2011). Studies on this model can be used to explore institutional or other recurring processes in the international system. A possible study of World Food Programme (WFP) aid distribution is briefly sketched below.

Multi-sited ethnography “pursues a strategy or design of research that... takes unexpected trajectories in tracing a cultural formation across and within multiple sites of activity” (Marcus 1995:96). Put differently, instead of immersion in a single cultural location (the canonical ethnographer in a remote and implicitly bounded village), immersion happens at a series of linked locations of cultural production and reproduction. Consequently, “following connections, associations, and putative relationships are... at the very heart of designing multi-sited ethnographic research” (Marcus 1995:97). Appropriate locations of research are thus linked by association with a single international phenomenon, which recurs or is reproduced across a chain of sites. Possibilities might include financial markets, international activist networks, or (as suggested below) aid supply and delivery.

Ethnography in Motion—Assets and Pitfalls

Multi-site ethnography deals with the problem of aggregation by end-running it. Since traditional ethnography is necessarily local, it cannot directly evaluate large-scale global events or processes. While it can certainly treat such phenomena as context or background, it is not intended to look directly at the mechanics or cultural drivers of, for example, capitalism, globalization, or nuclear deterrence.⁴⁴ A multi-site approach attempts to resolve this problem by understanding the category of the “international” somewhat differently. By taking together a series of localized phenomena as something transnational or global, a distinct frame for inquiry opens.

The essence of multi-sited research is to follow people, connections, associations, and relationships across space (because they are substantially contiguous but spatially non-contiguous)... Multi-sited ethnography involves a spatially dispersed field through which the ethnographer moves—actually, via sojourns in two or more places, or conceptually, by means of juxtaposition of data. (Falzon 2009a:1–2)

As anthropologists who practice multi-sited research have stressed, discontinuous space transforms ethnographic work less completely than one might think. Space itself is socially constituted: The remote village of canonical ethnography is bounded not so much by natural borders as by the social practices and material culture of its members (Massey 2005:9; Falzon 2009a:4). A discontinuous or multiply located site is simply one in which the phenomena under study are distributed differently than one might expect. Indeed, increased transnational communication and mobility mean that such sites are now increasingly common.

Multi-site ethnography requires relatively little revision of established methods. Anthropologists have long worked at multiple locations, even when focusing on one. A mid-century ethnographer encountering a tribal culture in the Amazon

⁴⁴On the ethnography of globalization, see Gille and Riain (2002).

Basin would have had to begin by demarcating the object of study. This would have required identifying its geographical and historical scope, cultural near and distant kin—necessarily engaging multiple locations. “Thus, fieldwork as traditionally perceived and practiced is already itself potentially multi-sited” (Marcus 1995:100). Moreover, self-consciously multi-sited ethnography has now been in use in social anthropology for at least two decades. Hannerz (2003:203–206), for example, has conducted field research among foreign correspondents. Garsten’s (1994) study of the Apple Corporation addresses center-periphery relations within the company’s transnational structure. In both cases, the phenomenon under study necessitates a research design that reaches beyond the traditionally conceived field.⁴⁵

Critics of multi-sited approaches have generally emphasized the risk of gaining breadth at the expense of depth: “A programme that proposes to be more routes than roots... could well end up... robbing ethnography of its central tenets” (Falzon 2009a:7). Elsewhere, critics suggest that a conceptual misunderstanding is at work: Research of this sort is better understood as documenting not multiple sites but a single discontinuous one (Hage 2005). While these concerns are real, they are not insurmountable and moreover will likely impact IR scholarship less than traditional anthropology. International politics may be geographically dispersed, but is usually also institutionally or conceptually circumscribed. Thus, lines of demarcation should be relatively easy to draw. On the second concern, whatever the merits of construing such spaces as single but discontinuous, rather than multiple, it is unlikely to significantly alter research design in practice. Moreover, multi-sitedness better captures the physical and cultural discontinuity of people and locations.

Multi-sitedness also permits collaboration. Ethnography has traditionally been a solitary pursuit (Marcus 2009). However, given the challenges of simultaneous data gathering in more than one place (and the time required for immersion in multiple locations), collaboration becomes a desirable approach. This appears to pose a challenge unique to ethnography: How should researchers maintain consistency across multiple viewpoints in multiple locations? One research team claims to practice:

a reflexive methodology for working across and with difference. Our collaboration is not data gathering under a common theoretical umbrella. Instead, our collaboration requires negotiation across epistemologically diverse terrains and partially “articulated knowledges”... this is collaboration with friction at its heart... The methodological work of collaboration should not be hidden; the knowledge we gain depends on it. (Matsutake Worlds Research Group 2009:198)

Put differently, multi-sited collaboration does not just pose unique challenges, but also offers unique opportunities. Multiple points of view across multiple sites allow both the triangulation of a broader sociocultural whole (the context itself, rendered through the views of its constituent individual members and multiple individual researchers), and also an opportunity to lay bare the workings of ethnographic method. The rule here should be the same as the rule for data collection and analysis in quantitative research: Methods, materials, and outcomes should be public.⁴⁶ The negotiations necessary to conduct a multi-site, multi-author study should be made clear in the text. Indeed, there is an advantage here. Anthropologists are necessarily at risk of disagreeing on ethnographic findings (Heider 1988). Collaboration enforces a need to resolve, or else make clear, these disagreements.

⁴⁵See also chapters in Collins and Coleman (2006).

⁴⁶On public methods, see King, Keohane, and Verba (1994:8). On replication in IR, see Bueno de Mesquita et al. (2003).

Collaborative or otherwise, multi-sited research permits—and indeed encourages—IR scholars to broaden the disciplinary agenda. Not all phenomena rightly termed international, global, or transnational are hidden within governments and international organizations. NGOs, international protest movements, and mobile refugee populations are all multiply located and (at least in principle) available to the participant observer. Moreover, the international political ethnographer need not study only subaltern, marginalized, or peripheral perspectives. Some international financial markets can and indeed have been observed in this way (Knorr Cetina and Bruegger 2002a,b). Hannerz's (2003) study of foreign correspondents addresses how public knowledge of international events is created and thus could inform analysis of how public opinion on foreign policy is shaped. Thus, while IR's strictly traditional objects of study will likely continue to remain unavailable in real time, a range of other phenomena are quite visible to immersive observation. Indeed, many of these are potentially quite important to IR's traditional objects of study: war, peace, foreign policymaking, and the international economy.

Multi-sited approaches might be linked to various projects using other methodological toolkits. Where multi-sited ethnography can be used to gather data amenable to quantification, a range of possibilities emerges. Kalyvas's (2006) work on civil war across multiple localities in Greece is once again a useful analogy. Alternately, multi-sited ethnographies might be combined with large-N data to jointly track processes and outcomes in the operation of an international organization. The suggested project below might track the ethnographic side of such an account of the World Food Programme.

Clearly, multi-sited ethnography has affinities with actor-network theory, a theoretical approach we discuss above. The two differ, potentially if not necessarily, in the following ways. First, ANT is primarily an ontology: It establishes assumptions about what constitutes the world, and in consequence how we may study it (Latour 1987; Law 2004). Ethnography, multi-sited or otherwise, is a method: a set of tools for gathering and interpreting data. In practice, ANT scholars have often employed ethnographic methods (Callon 1986; Latour and Woolgar 1986; Mol 2002), but need not. Thus, second, ANT is not necessarily multi-sited. It may be single-sited (Schouten 2014), or even, as with one classic study in science and technology studies, historical (Latour 1993).

Nonetheless, clear parallels to multi-sitedness already exist in IR. In comparative politics, Bevir and Rhodes (2003) derive much of their analysis of the British political system from multiply located ethnographic investigations. Cohn (2006) has explicitly identified multi-sited ethnography as a useful method for feminist IR scholarship, and there seems no obvious reason why it would not be useful elsewhere. One might also note Barnett's (2003) relatively mobile investigation of UN bureaucracy and diplomacy. While Pouliot's (2009) analysis of NATO–Russia relations is less explicitly ethnographic, it nonetheless captures some of the geographically varied ethos of this approach.⁴⁷ The following section offers guidelines for research on this model.

Guidelines for Research Design

Since research under this approach amounts to conducting a conventional ethnography at each site, advice is limited to two guidelines for site selection. First, sites need a common thread—a line joining them that forms the context or overall field of the study. Marcus identifies several types of such threads: categorical or conceptual paths one can follow from site to site. Two seem especially useful for studying international political phenomena. First, and perhaps most

⁴⁷See also discussion in Lie (2013).

obviously, one may follow people: “[T]he procedure is to follow and stay with the movements of a particular group of initial subjects” (Marcus 1995:106). Studies of refugees, migrant labor, foreign correspondents, or aid workers could take this form. Second, one may follow a thing—a physical object or equivalent, such as a financial instrument, tracking the social interactions of a socially constituted object (Marcus 1995:106–108). Thus, one might study food aid flows by following a shipment of flour or cooking oil from origin to destination, tracking its social interactions along the way. A food aid shipment, after all, would not exist were it not for a perceived need, political pressure, institutional culture, and any number of other social factors. Likewise, derivatives are largely the constructions of inventive financial experts.

A second guideline stipulates retaining some degree of cultural commonality across sites. This may be the culture of aid workers, traders, civil society organizations, anti-government protestors, or other nontraditional ethnographic subjects—but cultures they nonetheless are. Even when following an object, physical or otherwise, people interacting with it will likely share a vocabulary and practices in so doing. Because these commonalities will constitute the substance of the project’s object of study, they are necessary to its unity. While the researcher will not likely know the full content of these in advance, he or she should know broadly that a common culture across sites exists, and be able to delimit its conceptual, institutional, and physical or geographical borders in advance. The commonality need not be absolute. Rather, it should be such that there is some coherent cultural framework, from which deviations and extrapolations can be identified across sites. In most cases, but especially in areas of greater technical expertise or cultural insularity, prior knowledge will likely be necessary. Put more simply, the researcher must know what one cultural category all the sites belong to: Framing it in advance will likely be necessary for a manageable research design.

A Possible Study: WFP Food Aid Distribution

A prospective application addresses food aid delivery. Few things are as globally politically contentious as food. According to the UN (World Food Programme 2010:4), the World Food Programme fed “101.8 million people—84 million of them women and children—in 75 countries in 2009. An unprecedented 4.6 million metric tons were delivered,” while taking in US\$4.2 billion from donor states. Despite its relatively low cost in global terms, this represents an extraordinary leveraging of manpower and resources. Inversely, however, corruption and other forms of malfeasance associated with aid distribution are significant and well-publicized problems.⁴⁸ What conditions on the ground permit the agency to do more with less, and yet still suffer significant bureaucratic pathologies? The story of how this aid is funded, procured, and distributed is largely a matter of indirect knowledge to IR scholars—we know relatively little about how the system itself functions on the ground, in practice. Indeed, much of what we do know, we get from the organization itself.⁴⁹

An attempt to fill this gap might be made using a multi-sited ethnographic approach. The issue gives rise to a series of locations (involved in aid funding, procurement, production, transport, and distribution) linked by a common object to be followed—food aid itself. The researcher could begin by assessing the political and bureaucratic funding and procurement decisions involved, tracking the food itself as it is acquired, and following it through to delivery.

⁴⁸See, for example, United Nations (2010).

⁴⁹An edited volume (Lewis and Mosse 2006) offers localized ethnographic analyses of aid distribution conducted by anthropologists.

The researcher would note adherence to, deviations from, and dysfunctions of the prescribed system along the way. Because the range of locations would offer access to a range of similar and differing regional and institutional cultures, the interaction between the distribution process and cultural context would be opened for documentation. By tracking aid across borders, and through transnational funding and distribution channels, the research would capture a fundamentally international aspect of the issue. It would thus be of potential interest not just to those concerned with foreign aid and development as such, but also to scholars of international institutionalization and international political economy.

This approach would not be without limitations. On its own, such research would document the idiosyncrasies of one aid distribution project, potentially limiting generalization across multiple contexts and situations. Moreover, it would be limited in what it could document—the researcher might not, for example, expect to observe corruption at work. Nonetheless, the project would serve an important purpose, shedding empirical light on an under-documented aspect of the international system.

Conclusion

The aim of this article has been to suggest practical directions in the application of ethnographic methods in IR. To that end, we have proposed two alternative methods for approaching immersion in the study of world politics. Taking up the relevant methodological literatures in anthropology offers a way to broaden application in IR. One approach broadens the definition of ethnography as understood by IR, applying it to historical research. The other broadens the applied scope of this methodological toolkit by proposing ethnographic research across multiple linked locations, so as to assess the implementation of state and international organizational policy. These approaches “end run” the traditional formulation of ethnographic field work as local study of a single, immersive context—a kind of work often not readily available to IR scholars.

Applications of IR ethnography to date have chiefly been to phenomena not traditionally studied in IR, often with critical theoretical underpinnings. This broadening of the disciplinary agenda is to be celebrated. Additionally, these methods might (if adapted as we describe here) be applied to explaining better-trod matters of international security, economics, and (as we have suggested) institutionalization. Such approaches supplant neither traditional studies of these subjects, nor extant ethnographic research in IR. Instead, they offer an opportunity to open more extensive dialogue between the two.

Indeed, ethnography is no longer a wholly new approach in IR, and as international political ethnography has grown and matured, it has become more varied. There are, in effect, two streams of ethnographic work in political science, which either “take pride in the method’s unruliness... or attempt to fold ethnography into mainstream political science” (Wedeen 2010:256). A useful disciplinary conversation, in both its both critical and explanatory forms, likely needs to make room for both. This big tent approach may benefit from adjustments in how the method works in practice. Tellingly, Pachirat (quoted in Wedeen 2010:256) finds that those in the disciplinary mainstream “often revert to the language of ‘disciplining’ and ‘harnessing’ ethnography.” While our aim has been to make the method more readily available to more mainstream scholars who ask more mainstream questions, the task need not be seen as a disciplining one. Rather, having more than one kind of ethnography at the table serves to expand its role in the field, permitting both IR’s mainstream and its internal

critics to more effectively engage one another. Put differently, it may offer an empirical site for dialogue between theoretical orientations. Our immediate intent has been more practical—to show how non-standard ethnographic approaches have opened research opportunities in anthropology and have begun to do the same in the study of international politics.

References

- ADLER, EMANUEL, AND MICHAEL BARNETT. (1998) *Security Communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ADLER, EMANUEL, AND VINCENT POULIOT, Eds. (2011) *International Practices*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- ADCOCK, ROBERT, ERIC GRYNAVISKI, DAVID E. BANKS, JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, JOHN G. GUNNELL, AND PATRICK THADDEUS JACKSON. (2010) Symposium: Patrick Thaddeus Jackson's The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations. *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 8 (1): 3–23.
- AHMED, AMEL, AND RUDRA SIL. (2012) When Multi-Method Research Subverts Methodological Pluralism—Or, Why We Still Need Single-Method Research. *Perspectives on Politics* 10 (4): 935–953.
- BARNETT, MICHAEL N. (1997) The UN Security Council, Indifference, and Genocide in Rwanda. *Cultural Anthropology* 12 (4): 551–578.
- BARNETT, MICHAEL N. (2003) *Eyewitness to a Genocide: The United Nations and Rwanda*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- BARNETT, MICHAEL N., AND MARTHA FINNEMORE. (1999) The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations. *International Organization* 53 (4): 699–732.
- BARTELSON, JENS. (1995) *A Genealogy of Sovereignty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BAYARD DE VOLO, LORRAINE, AND EDWARD SCHATZ. (2004) From the Inside Out: Ethnographic Methods in Political Research. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 37 (2): 267–271.
- BERG, ROBERT J. (2006) The UN Intellectual History Project: Review of a Literature. *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations* 12 (2006): 325–341.
- BEST, JACQUELINE, AND WILLIAM WALTERS. (2013) “Actor-Network Theory” and International Relationality: Lost (and Found) in Translation. *International Political Sociology* 7 (3): 332–334.
- BEVIR, MARK, AND ROD RHODES. (2003) *Interpreting British Governance*. New York: Routledge.
- BOURDIEU, PIERRE. (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- BOURDIEU, PIERRE. (1990) *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- BRIGG, MORGAN, AND ROLAND BLEIKER. (2008) Expanding Ethnographic Insights Into Global Politics. *International Political Sociology* 2 (1): 89–90.
- BRIGG, MORGAN, AND ROLAND BLEIKER. (2010) Autoethnographic International Relations: Exploring the Self as a Source of Knowledge. *Review of International Studies* 36 (3): 779–798.
- BRITTEN, NICKY, RONA CAMPBELL, CATHERINE POPE, JENNY DONOVAN, MYFANWY MORGAN, AND ROISIN PILL. (2002) Using Meta Ethnography to Synthesise Qualitative Research: A Worked Example. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy* 7 (4): 209–215.
- BROSIUS, J. PETER, AND LISA M. CAMPBELL. (2010) Collaborative Event Ethnography: Conservation and Development Trade-Offs at the Fourth World Conservation Congress. *Conservation and Society* 8 (4): 245–255.
- BUEGER, CHRISTIAN. (2013a) Actor-Network Theory, Methodology, and International Organization. *International Political Sociology* 7 (3): 338–342.
- BUEGER, CHRISTIAN. (2013b) Pathways to Practice: Praxiography and International Politics. *European Political Science Review* 6 (3): 383–406.
- BUEGER, CHRISTIAN, AND FELIX BETHKE. (2013) Actor-Networking the “Failed State”—An Enquiry Into the Life of Concepts. *Journal of International Relations and Development* 17 (1): 30–60.
- BUENO DE MESQUITA, BRUCE, NILS PETTER GLEDITSCH, PATRICK JAMES, GARY KING, CLAIRE METELITS, JAMES LEE RAY, BRUCE RUSSETT, HÅVARD STRAND, AND BRANDON VALERIANO. (2003) Symposium on Replication in International Studies Research. *International Studies Perspectives* 4 (1): 72–107.
- CALLON, M. (1986) Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the Scallops and the Fishermen of St Brieuc Bay. In *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge*, edited by John Law. London: Routledge.

- CARSTEN, JANET. (2012) Fieldwork Since the 1980s: Total Immersion and Its Discontents. In *The SAGE Handbook of Social Anthropology*, edited by Richard Fardon, Olivia Harris, Trevor H. J. Marchand, Cris Shore, Veronica Strang, Richard A. Wilson, and Mark Nuttall. London: SAGE.
- CHERNOFF, FRED. (2007) Methodological Pluralism and the Limits of Naturalism in the Study of Politics. In *Theory and Evidence in Comparative Politics and International Relations*, edited by Richard Ned Lebow and Mark Lichbach. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- CLIFFORD, JAMES. (1997) *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- CLIFFORD, JAMES, AND GEORGE E. MARCUS, Eds. (1986) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- COHN, BERNARD S. (1980) History and Anthropology: The State of Play. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22 (2): 198–221.
- COHN, CAROL. (1987) Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals. *Signs* 12 (4): 687–718.
- COHN, CAROL. (2006) Motives and Methods: Using Multi-Sited Ethnography to Study US National Security Discourses. In *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly, Maria Stern, and Jacqui True. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- COLEMAN, SIMON, Ed. (2011) *Multi-Sited Ethnography: Problems and Possibilities in the Translocation of Research Methods*. New York: Routledge.
- COLLINS, PETER, AND SIMON COLEMAN, Eds. (2006) *Locating the Field: Space, Place and Context in Anthropology*. Oxford: Berg.
- COMAROFF, JOHN L., AND JEAN COMAROFF. (1992) *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- COOK, CHRIS. (2012) *The Routledge Guide to British Political Archives: Sources Since 1945*. London: Routledge.
- COX, ROBERT. (1986) Social Forces, States, and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory. In *Neorealism and Its Critics*, edited by Robert Keohane. New York: Columbia University Press.
- CRAPANZANO, VINCENT. (1986) Hermes' Dilemma: The Masking of Subversion in Ethnographic Description. In *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, edited by James Clifford and George E. Marcus. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- CZARNIAWSKA, BARBARA. (2007) *Shadowing: And Other Techniques for Doing Fieldwork in Modern Societies*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press.
- CZARNIAWSKA, BARBARA. (2008) Organizing: How to Study It and How to Write About It. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal* 3 (1): 4–20.
- DAVIDSON, DONALD. (1991) Three Varieties of Knowledge. In *A. J. Ayer: Memorial Essays*, edited by A. Phillips Griffiths. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DENZIN, NORMAN K. (1978) *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*, 2nd edition. New York: McGraw Hill.
- EAGLETON, CLYDE, Ed. (1949) *Annual Review of United Nations Affairs*. New York: New York University Press.
- FALZON, MARK-ANTHONY. (2009a) Introduction. In *Multi-Sited Ethnography: Theory, Praxis and Locality in Contemporary Social Research*, edited by Mark-Anthony Falzon. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- FALZON, MARK-ANTHONY, Ed. (2009b) *Multi-Sited Ethnography: Theory, Praxis and Locality in Contemporary Social Research*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- FARGE, ARLETTE. (2013) *The Allure of the Archives*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- FEARON, JAMES D. (1995) Rationalist Explanations for War. *International Organization* 49 (3): 379–414.
- FELDMANN, ILANA. (2011) Working in the In-Between: Achives, Ethnography, and Research in Gaza. In *Anthrohistory: Unsettling Knowledge, Questioning Discipline*, edited by Edward Murphy, David William Cohen, Chandra D. Bhimull, Fernando Coronil, Monica Eileen Patterson, and Julie Skurski. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- FINNEMORE, MARTHA. (2003) *The Purpose of Intervention: Changing Beliefs About the Use of Force*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- FOUCAULT, MICHEL. (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Random House.
- FOUCAULT, MICHEL. (1984a) Nietzsche, Genealogy, History. In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow. New York: Pantheon Books.
- FOUCAULT, MICHEL. (1984b) On the Genealogy of Ethics: An Overview of Work in Progress. In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow. New York: Pantheon Books.

- FRIEDRICH, JÖRG, AND FRIEDRICH KRATOCHWIL. (2009) On Acting and Knowing: How Pragmatism Can Advance International Relations Research and Methodology. *International Organization* 63 (4): 701–731.
- GALTUNG, JOHAN. (1986) On the Anthropology of the United Nations System. In *The Nature of United Nations Bureaucracies*, edited by David Pitt and Thomas G. Weiss. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- GARSTEN, CHRISTINA. (1994) *Apple World: Core and Periphery in a Transnational Organizational Culture*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- GEERTZ, CLIFFORD. (1973a) *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- GEERTZ, CLIFFORD. (1973b) Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture. In *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York: Basic Books.
- GEERTZ, CLIFFORD. (1990) History and Anthropology. *New Literary History* 21 (2): 321–335.
- GILL, REBECCA. (2011) The Shadow in Organizational Ethnography: Moving Beyond Shadowing to Spect-Acting. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal* 6 (2): 115–133.
- GILLE, ZSUZSA, AND SEÁN Ó RIAIN. (2002) Global Ethnography. *Annual Review of Sociology* 28 (1): 271–295.
- GUSTAVSON, LEIF C., AND JOSEPH D. CYTRYNBAUM. (2003) Illuminating Spaces: Relational Spaces, Complicity, and Multisited Ethnography. *Field Methods* 15 (3): 252–270.
- GUSTERSON, HUGH. (1998) *Nuclear Rites: A Weapons Laboratory at the End of the Cold War*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- GUSTERSON, HUGH. (2008) Ethnographic Research. In *Qualitative Methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide*, edited by Audie Klotz and Deepa Prakash. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- HAGE, GHASSAN. (2005) A Not So Multi-Sited Ethnography of a Not So Imagined Community. *Anthropological Theory* 5 (4): 463–475.
- HANNERZ, ULF. (2003) Being There... and There... and There! Reflections on Multi-Site Ethnography. *Ethnography* 4 (2): 201–216.
- HANSEN, LENE. (2006) *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- HARKIN, MICHAEL E. (2010) Ethnohistory's Ethnohistory Creating a Discipline From the Ground Up. *Social Science History* 34 (2): 113–128.
- HARTLEY, L. P. (2002) *The Go-Between*. Reprint edition. New York: NYRB Classics.
- HEIDER, KARL G. (1988) The Rashomon Effect: When Ethnographers Disagree. *American Anthropologist* 90 (1): 73–81.
- HILDERBRAND, ROBERT C. (2001) *Dumbarton Oaks: The Origins of the United Nations and the Search for Postwar Security*. Chapel Hill, NC: UNC Press Books.
- HOBBS, DICK. (2006) Ethnography. In *The SAGE Dictionary of Social Research Methods*, edited by Victor Jupp. London: SAGE.
- HOPF, TED. (1994) *Peripheral Visions: Deterrence Theory and American Foreign Policy in the Third World, 1965–1990*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- HOPF, TED. (2002) *Social Construction of Foreign Policy: Identities and Foreign Policies, Moscow, 1955 and 1999*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- HOPF, TED, YOSHIKO M. HERRERA, KANCHAN CHANDRA, DAVID M. WOODRUFF, ASHUTOSH VARSHNEY, AND DAVID LAITIN. (2006) Symposium: Ethnography Meets Rational Choice: David Laitin, for Example. *Qualitative Methods* 4 (1): 2–33.
- HOPF, TED. (2007) The Limits of Interpreting Evidence. In *Theory and Evidence in Comparative Politics and International Relations*, edited by Richard Ned Lebow and Mark Lichbach. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- JACKSON, PATRICK THADDEUS. (2006) *Civilizing the Enemy: German Reconstruction and the Invention of the West*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- JACKSON, PATRICK THADDEUS. (2008) Can Ethnographic Techniques Tell Us Distinctive Things About World Politics? *International Political Sociology* 2 (1): 91–93.
- JACKSON, PATRICK THADDEUS. (2009) A Faulty Solution to a False(ly Characterized) Problem: A Comment on Monteiro and Ruby. *International Theory* 1 (3): 455–465.
- JACKSON, PATRICK THADDEUS. (2011) *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of Science and Its Implications for the Study of World Politics*, 1st edition. London: Routledge.
- JERVIS, ROBERT. (1976) *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- JICK, TODD D. (1979) Mixing Qualitative and Quantitative Methods: Triangulation in Action. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 24 (4): 602–611.
- KALYVAS, STATHIS. (2006) *The Logic of Violence in Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- KEOHANE, ROBERT O., AND LISA L. MARTIN. (1995) The Promise of Institutional Theory. *International Security* 20 (1): 39–51.
- KING, GARY, ROBERT O. KEOHANE, AND SIDNEY VERBA. (1994) *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- KNORR CETINA, KARIN, AND URS BRUEGGER. (2002a) Global Microstructures: The Virtual Societies of Financial Markets. *American Journal of Sociology* 107 (4): 905–950.
- KNORR CETINA, KARIN, AND URS BRUEGGER. (2002b) Traders' Engagement With Markets: A Postsocial Relationship. *Theory, Culture & Society* 19 (5–6): 161–185.
- KRECH III, SHEPARD. (1991) The State of Ethnohistory. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 20: 345–375.
- LAITIN, DAVID D. (1986) *Hegemony and Culture: Politics and Change Among the Yoruba*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- LAITIN, DAVID D. (1998) *Identity in Formation: The Russian-Speaking Populations in the New Abroad*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- LAITIN, DAVID D. (2003) The Perestroika Challenge to Social Science. *Politics & Society* 31 (1): 163–184.
- LATOUR, BRUNO. (1987) *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- LATOUR, BRUNO. (1993) *The Pasteurization of France*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- LATOUR, BRUNO, AND STEVE WOOLGAR. (1986) *Laboratory Life: The Social Construction of Scientific Facts*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- LAW, JOHN. (2004) *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. London: Routledge.
- LEWIS, DAVID, AND DAVID MOSSE, Eds. (2006) *Development Brokers & Translators: The Ethnography of Aid and Agencies*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- LIE, JON HARALD SANDE. (2013) Challenging Anthropology: Anthropological Reflections on the Ethnographic Turn in International Relations. *Millennium—Journal of International Studies* 41 (2): 201–220.
- LITTLE, PAUL E. (1995) Ritual, Power and Ethnography at the Rio Earth Summit. *Critique of Anthropology* 15 (3): 265–288.
- LUEHRMANN, SONJA. (2011) On the Importance of Having a Method, or What Does Archival Work on Soviet Atheism Have to Do With Ethnography of Post-Soviet Religion? In *Anthrohistory: Unsettling Knowledge, Questioning Discipline*, edited by Edward Murphy, David William Cohen, Chandra D. Bhimull, Fernando Coronil, Monica Eileen Patterson, and Julie Skurski. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- LUSTICK, IAN S. (1996) History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias. *The American Political Science Review* 90 (3): 605–618.
- MACKAY, JOSEPH. (2006) State Failure, Actor-Network Theory, and the Theorisation of Sovereignty. *BSIS Journal of International Studies* 3: 59–96.
- MARCUS, GEORGE E. (1986) Contemporary Problems of Ethnography in the Modern World System. In *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, edited by James Clifford and George E. Marcus. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- MARCUS, GEORGE E. (1995) Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 95–117.
- MARCUS, GEORGE E. (2009) Multi-Sited Ethnography: Five or Six Things I Think I Know About It Now. In *Multi-Sited Ethnography: Theory, Praxis and Locality in Contemporary Social Research*, edited by Mark-Anthony Falzon. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- MARCUS, GEORGE E., AND MICHAEL M. J. FISCHER. (1986) *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- MASSEY, DOREEN. (2005) *For Space*. London: SAGE.
- MATSUTAKE WORLDS RESEARCH GROUP. (2009) Strong Collaboration as a Method for Multi-Sited Ethnography: On Mycorrhizal Relations. In *Multi-Sited Ethnography: Theory, Praxis and Locality in Contemporary Social Research*, edited by Mark-Anthony Falzon. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- MEARSHEIMER, JOHN J. (1994) The False Promise of International Institutions. *International Security* 19 (3): 5–49.
- MEDICK, HANS. (1987) "Missionaries in the Row Boat"? Ethnological Ways of Knowing as a Challenge to Social History. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 29 (1): 76–98.
- MICHAUD, JEAN. (2010) Editorial—Zomia and Beyond. *Journal of Global History* 5 (2): 187–214.
- MILLIKEN, JENNIFER. (1999) The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods. *European Journal of International Relations* 5 (2): 225–254.
- MOL, ANNEMARIE. (2002) *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- MONTEIRO, NUNO P., AND KEVEN G. RUBY. (2009a) IR and the False Promise of Philosophical Foundations. *International Theory* 1 (1): 15–48.
- MONTEIRO, NUNO P., AND KEVEN G. RUBY. (2009b) The Promise of Foundational Prudence: A Response to Our Critics. *International Theory* 1 (3): 499–512.
- MURPHY, EDWARD, DAVID WILLIAM COHEN, CHANDRA D. BHIMULL, FERNANDO CORONIL, MONICA EILEEN PATTERSON, AND JULIE SKURSKI, Eds. (2011) *Anthrohistory: Unsettling Knowledge, Questioning Discipline*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- NEUMANN, IVER B. (2002) Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn: The Case of Diplomacy. *Millennium—Journal of International Studies* 31 (3): 627–651.
- NEUMANN, IVER B. (2007) “A Speech That the Entire Ministry May Stand For,” or: Why Diplomats Never Produce Anything New. *International Political Sociology* 1 (2): 183–200.
- NEUMANN, IVER B. (2008) Discourse Analysis. In *Qualitative Methods in International Relations*, edited by Audie Klotz and Prakash Deepa. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- NEUMANN, IVER B. (2012) *At Home With the Diplomats: Inside a European Foreign Ministry*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- NEUMANN, IVER B. (2013) *Diplomatic Sites: A Critical Enquiry*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- NEXON, DANIEL H., AND VINCENT POULIOT. (2013) “Things of Networks”: Situating ANT in International Relations. *International Political Sociology* 7 (3): 342–345.
- NIETZSCHE, FRIEDRICH. (1976) On Truth and Lie in a Extra-Moral Sense. In *The Portable Nietzsche*, edited by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Penguin.
- NIETZSCHE, FRIEDRICH. (2003) *On the Genealogy of Morals*. edited by Keith Ansell Pierson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- NOBLIT, GEORGE W., AND R. DWIGHT HARE. (1988) *Meta-Ethnography: Synthesizing Qualitative Studies*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- OHNUKI-TIERNEY, EMIKO. (1990a) *Culture Through Time: Anthropological Approaches*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- OHNUKI-TIERNEY, EMIKO. (1990b) Introduction: The Historicization of Anthropology. In *Culture Through Time: Anthropological Approaches*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- PATERSON, BARBARA L., SALLY E. THORNE, CONNIE CANAM, AND CAROL JILLINGS, Eds. (2001) *Meta-Study of Qualitative Health Research: A Practical Guide to Meta-Analysis and Meta-Synthesis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- PORTER, TONY. (2013) Tracing Associations in Global Finance. *International Political Sociology* 7 (3): 334–338.
- POTEETE, AMY R., MARCO A. JANSSEN, AND ELINOR OSTROM. (2010) *Working Together: Collective Action, the Commons, and Multiple Methods in Practice*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- POULIOT, VINCENT. (2007) “Subjectivism”: Toward a Constructivist Methodology. *International Studies Quarterly* 51 (2): 359–384.
- POULIOT, VINCENT. (2008) The Logic of Practicality: A Theory of Practice of Security Communities. *International Organization* 62 (2): 257–288.
- POULIOT, VINCENT. (2009) *Security Community in and Through Practice: The Power Politics of Russia-NATO Diplomacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- PRICE, RICHARD. (1995) A Genealogy of the Chemical Weapons Taboo. *International Organization* 49 (1): 73–103.
- RANGATORE, JASON P. (2010) It Is Strange: A Reply to Vrsti. *Millennium—Journal of International Studies* 39 (1): 65–77.
- RILES, ANNELEISE. (1999) Models and Documents: Artefacts of International Legal Knowledge. *The International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 48 (4): 805–825.
- RILES, ANNELEISE. (2006) [Deadlines]: Removing the Brackets on Politics in Bureaucratic and Anthropological Analysis. In *Documents: Artifacts of Modern Knowledge*, edited by Annelise Riles. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- RISSE, THOMAS, STEVE C. ROPP, AND KATHRYN SIKKINK. (1999) *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SAHLINS, MARSHALL. (1993) Goodbye to *Tristes Tropes*: Ethnography in the Context of Modern World History. *The Journal of Modern History* 65 (1): 1–25.
- SCHATZ, EDWARD. (2009a) Conclusion: What Kind(s) of Ethnography Does Political Science Need? In *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*, edited by Edward Schatz. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- SCHATZ, EDWARD, Ed. (2009b) *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- SCHATZKI, THEODORE R., KARIN KNORR-CETINA, AND EIKE VON SAVIGNY, Eds. (2000) *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. London: Routledge.
- SCHOUTEN, PEER. (2014) Security as Controversy: Reassembling Security at Amsterdam Airport. *Security Dialogue* 45 (1): 23–42.
- SCOTT, JAMES C. (1998) *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- SCOTT, JAMES C. (2009) *The Art of Not Being Governed: An Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- SIL, RUDRA, AND PETER J. KATZENSTEIN. (2010) *Beyond Paradigms: Analytic Eclecticism in the Study of World Politics*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- SNYDER, JACK. (2002) Anarchy and Culture: Insights From the Anthropology of War. *International Organization* 56 (1): 7–45.
- SPRADLEY, JAMES P. (1979) *The Ethnographic Interview*. New York: Wadsworth.
- TAYLOR, CHARLES. (1971) Interpretation and the Sciences of Man. *The Review of Metaphysics* 25 (1): 3–51.
- UN SECRETARY-GENERAL DAG HAMMARSKJÖLD. (2012) United Nations Archives and Records Management Section. Available at <https://archives.un.org/content/un-secretary-general-dag-hammarskjöld> (Accessed June 19, 2014).
- UN SECRETARY-GENERAL TRYGVE HALVDAN LIE. (2012) United Nations Archives and Records Management Section. Available at: <https://archives.un.org/content/un-secretary-general-trygve-halvdan-lie> (Accessed June 19, 2014).
- UNITED NATIONS. (2010) *Report of the Monitoring Group on Somalia Pursuant to Security Council Resolution 1853*. New York: United Nations.
- VRASTI, WANDA. (2008) The Strange Case of Ethnography and International Relations. *Millennium—Journal of International Studies* 37 (2): 279–301.
- VUCETIC, SRDJAN. (2011) Genealogy as a Research Tool in International Relations. *Review of International Studies* 37 (3): 1295–1312.
- WALLERSTEIN, IMMANUEL. (1979) *The Capitalist World Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- WALSH, DENIS, AND SOO DOWNE. (2005) Meta-Synthesis Method for Qualitative Research: A Literature Review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 50 (2): 204–211.
- WALTERS, WILLIAM. (2002) The Power of Inscription: Beyond Social Construction and Deconstruction in European Integration Studies. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 31 (1): 83–108.
- WALTZ, KENNETH N. (1979) *Theory of International Politics*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- WEDEEN, LISA. (2010) Reflections on Ethnographic Work in Political Science. *Annual Review of Political Science* 13: 255–272.
- WEISS, THOMAS G. (2012) *What's Wrong with the United Nations and How to Fix It*. Malden, MA: Polity.
- WEISSER, FLORIAN. (2014) Practices, Politics, Performativities: Documents in the International Negotiations on Climate Change. *Political Geography* 40: 46–55.
- WENDT, ALEXANDER. (1998) On Constitution and Causation in International Relations. *Review of International Studies* 24 (5): 101–118.
- WODAK, RUTH. (2009) *The Discourse of Politics in Action: Politics as Usual*. Reprint edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME. (2010) *2010 Annual Report*. Rome: United Nations.
- YANOW, DVORA, AND PEREGRINE SCHWARTZ-SHEA. (2006) *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.