# Durham Research Online

**Deposited in DRO:**

19 February 2019

**Version of attached file:**

Accepted Version

**Peer-review status of attached file:**

Peer-reviewed

**Citation for published item:**

Richmond, Oliver P. and Mac Ginty, Roger (2019) 'Mobilities and peace.', Globalizations., 16 (5). pp. 606-624.

**Further information on publisher's website:**

**Publisher's copyright statement:**

**Additional information:**

**Title page**

**Mobilities and Peace**

**Oliver P Richmond**
**Roger Mac Ginty**


**Author contact details**

**Oliver P. Richmond: Dept of Politics University of Manchester, Oxford Rd, Manchester, M13 9PL, UK.**
**oliver.richmond@,manchester.ac.uk**

**Roger Mac Ginty: School of Government and International Affairs, Durham University, Al-Qasimi Building, Durham, DH1 3TU, UK. 01913345348**
**roger.macginty@durham.ac.uk**

**Corresponding author**
**Roger Mac Ginty, School of Government and International Affairs, Durham University, Al-Qasimi Building, Durham, DH1 3TU, UK.**
**roger.macginty@durham.ac.uk**

**Abstract**
This article considers how an increasingly visible set of mobilities has implications for how peace and conflict are imagined and responded to. We are particularly interested in how these mobilities take form in everyday actions and shape new forms of peace and challenge existing ones. The article considers fixed categories associated with orthodox peace such as the international, borders and the state that are predicated on territorialism, centralised governance, and static citizenship. The article can be read as a critique of liberal peacebuilding and a contribution to current debates on migration, space and the everyday. Through conceptual scoping we develop the notion of mobile peace to characterise the fluid ways in which is being constructed through the mobilitiy of people and ideas.

**Key words:**

Mobility; peace; peacebuilding; Migration; sovereignty; states system

<center>

**Mobilities and Peace**

**by**

**Oliver P Richmond[1]**

**Roger Mac Ginty[2]**

</center>

**Abstract**

This article considers how an increasingly visible set of mobilities has implications for how peace and conflict are imagined and responded to. We are particularly interested in how these mobilities take form in everyday actions and shape new forms of peace and challenge existing ones. The article considers fixed categories associated with orthodox peace such as the international, borders and the state that are predicated on territorialism, centralised governance, and static citizenship. The article can be read as a critique of liberal peacebuilding and a contribution to current debates on migration, space and the everyday. Through conceptual scoping we develop the notion of mobile peace to characterise the fluid ways in which is being constructed through the mobilitiy of people and ideas.

**Introduction**

This article considers how an increasingly visible set of mobilities has implications for peace and conflict – core concerns in International Relations and a range of other disciplines including Migration Studies and Anthropology. The fixed categories associated with concepts such as the international, state, society, peace processes, peacebuilding and statebuilding are

---

[1] Oliver Richmond is a Research Professor in IR, Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Manchester, UK and a Fellow of the Royal Society for the Arts. He is also International Professor, College of International Studies, Kyung Hee University, Korea, and Visiting Professor at the University of Tromso. His publications include Peace Formation and Post-Conflict Political Order, (Oxford University Press, 2016), Failed Statebuilding vs Peace Formation (Yale University Press, 2014). He is editor of the Palgrave book series, Rethinking Peace and Conflict Studies, and co-editor of the journal, Peacebuilding.

[2] Roger Mac Ginty is Professor at the School of Government and International Affairs, and the Durham Global Security Institute, Durham University. He is editor of the Palgrave Macmillan book series, Rethinking Political Violence, and co-editor of the journal, Peacebuilding.

predicated on territorialism, centralised governance, and static citizenship. The issue of migration, in particular, has attracted significant academic attention (Korzeniewicz and Albrecht 2015; Ryo 2013; Squire 2016), though we see human migration as just one type of mobility that can be placed in a wider context of mobilities and immobilities, as well as governance designed to control them. These mobilities are not necessarily new but their visibility and configuration challenge assumptions and practices that underpin how contemporary conflict, peace, power and agency are understood and practiced. They relate to the nature of the states-system and international order, and how we think about peace and emancipation.

The article examines the implications of an emerging set of mobilities and how they shape peace. We are particularly interested in the everydayness of mobility and immobility and how this patterns peace. Our contribution largely takes the exploratory form of conceptual scoping and draws on an extensive engagement with a wide literature, as well as evidence from a number of research projects the authors have been engaged in separately and jointly. These include the Everyday Peace Indicators project (everydaypeaceindicators.org) and the EUNPACK project that looks at EU crisis mechanisms. The article follows on from work by Brigden (2016) on improvised transnationalism and Adamson (2006) and Lazaridis and Wadia (2015) on the securitization of migration. It is also mindful of earlier work in IR that has tackled globalization and sovereignty (Krasner 2001; Rosenau 2003; Slaughter 2004). Our central argument juxtaposes a series of immobilities upon which traditional approaches to peace, security, and order rely, with a set of mobilities that challenge them but also offer opportunities for new formulations. We realise that a mobility-versus-immobility binary is a simplification of dynamic and complex processes, yet we find it a useful way of illustrating the inertia of orthodox approaches to peace, security, and order in IR.

The local turn in peacebuilding debates (Mac Ginty and Richmond 2013: Paffenholz 2015) continued the process of rethinking the need for structural change in the face of new possibilities and agencies being exhibited by populations imprisoned within moribund political and epistemological frameworks (their states, political, social or economic systems, for example), and yet find ways of acting politically and ethically. It sought to move away from levels of analysis debates that reinforced the power of formal institutions, and instead take seriously a more networked and scalar form of International Relations (Sasken, 2006: Jessop, 2016) which engages with relational social claims (Melucci, 1989: Latour 2005: Qin 2016) and the claims of the bottom-up and sub-state levels to be seen in their own right (Mac Ginty 2015). As this article seeks to show, the capitalist-technological response to the limitations of the liberal international architecture and the political violence it either ignored or unleashed is making for a much more Orwellian understanding of peace and order in neoliberal terms. Digital forms of governmentality operate across global networks, often the very same ones that civil society operated transnationally to bypass centralised state or international authorities. Tensions between rights and capital, and rights and boundaries, have now been thrown into much sharper relief by apparently new mobilities, movements and synergies, and research into them (Piketty 2014). Much of this mobile thinking highlights questions of state-centric peace processes, justice and equality, historical continuities of power, the limitations of rights and norms, hidden racism and eurocentrism, the transmittal of trauma across generations, new forms of hegemony and oligarchy, and the critical import of the Anthropocene (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998: 887-917: Moyn, 2018: 11; Sassen, 2006: 291; Jessop, 2016: 225; DeGooyer (et al) 2018: 4.; Bell, & Pospisil 2017; 576–593; Chandler, 2018; 159). It also points to new dynamics, including the rise of the BRICS, the environmental and credit crises, increasingly networked capital, the emergence of more new/old wars, greater levels of spatial mobility, digital, networked and multiscalar, and nano-technologies, and the troubled attempts towards

UN reform or global restructuring. This is indicative of a rupture between traditional ways of global political and economic organisation and new demands and pressures (perhaps between analogue and digital forms of international relations (Richmond, unpublished).

We argue that the failed experiments with liberal peacebuilding and neoliberal statebuilding of the last 25 years now point to the urgent need to engage with matters identified by critical theorists in the past but only partially engaged with, and some newly emerging issues (Richmond 2014). These include matters of rights, justice, inequality, capital, identity, trauma (Schwab, 2010), and the environment. These matters need to be examined broadly, across time and space and in view of increasing levels and types of mobility. This denotes the future expansion of temporal and material rights where states or international architectures have failed to provide a viable peace so far. A decade and a half into this century narrow understandings of liberalism cannot be rescued by a 'new' alliance between technology, capital and largely unreformed states and international institutions. So far the results are not encouraging for conflict-affected populations around the world (nor for populations in the west).

The local, cultural, and practice turns in the literature (Brown 2012; Jackson 2008; Wallis 2017; Adler-Nissen 2016) gave rise to an investigation of local agency and strategies or tactics, but also foreground the dynamic of power relations, and more generally of the potential and limits of relational ontologies versus the fixed ontologies of the social, state and international architecture exhibited until recently in most literatures connected with peace and order. A next stage is to understand agential mobilities (meaning mobile political agency) in the context of these power-shaped relational ontologies, once again a shift prefigured by work on social mobilisation, critical agency and resistance, civil society, and revolutionary movements, often in critical or post-structuralist theory (Campbell, & George, 1990: 269-293). We are aware that the agency that enacts and embodies the mobilities on view are

constrained by structures, polities, traditions and assumptions. It is the complex interaction between these structures and the new (or newly visible) mobilities that interests us.

In terms of structure, the article will first illustrate the emphasis on stasis in traditional approaches to making and maintaining peace. A fixed international architecture regards is an important site of political rent, positions mobility as a threat, and powerful actors have worked hard to limit, deny and ignore various mobilities (with the recent exception being the mobility of capital). The section outlines five immobilities that characterise dominant approaches to contemporary peacemaking and peacebuilding. The second section will examine how newly configured and visible bottom-up mobilities are manifesting themselves in relation to peace, conflict, and sovereignty. An important characteristic of many of these mobilities is that they ignore the state and international structures, and occur despite them. The third section will think through the implications of these mobilities for the meanings and practicalities of peace, security, and order. In particular, it will underline how liberal internationalism is often (unconsciously) complicit in the development of these new vulnerabilities. While there is a growing literature on mobility and its consequences (Sheeler and Ury 2006; Lisle 2016), especially in relation to human migration, our chief contribution focuses on the implications of mobility and its agential dynamics for peace in the twenty-first century. For reasons of space, the article does not focus on the contradictions of liberalism within states in the global north, or the implications in relation to migration and mobility. This is well covered elsewhere (Adamson et al., 2011: 843-859). We put forward the notion of a mobile peace, or ways in which peace is conceived, constructed and operationalized to take account of mobility in a networked and digital international environment (Castells 2009: 44:  David Chandler, 2017: Aradau and Blanke 2015 & 2017).

.

**Relationality and Mobility under a Fixed International Architecture**

The principal argument of this article is that contemporary mobilities of capital, people, ideas and technology present fundamental challenges to states and international organisations in their attempts to maintain a fixed order and their own legitimacy. Crucial in this is the 'inequality of mobility' and sets of perceptions that are linked with this (Wang 2004: 351). The fixity of populations within states is a considerable source of power. For many states and international organisations, mobility has been prominently connected with discussions of the globalisation of violence and the demise of the Weberian state, the weakness of international law and enforcement capacity, refugees, migration, and the rise of non-state 'terrorism'. The securitization of the current European 'migrant crisis'[3] is merely the latest example of how mobility (of people, ideas etc.) have been characterised as a threat to order and the antithesis of peace (see, for example, Lazaridis and Wadia 2015). Except for capital, certain ideas and technology, order is found in fixity (e.g. territoriality, institutions, social contract, citizenship and rights). States and international organisations have relied on a series of stabilities or immobilities (of international boundaries, identity groups and citizenship, institutions, and ideology etc.), and control of the means of violence to maintain their positions as leading actors in the international system. They have also relied on these stabilities or capacities remaining largely unquestioned. Thus, for example, the post-WWII *status quo* is reflected in the permanent membership of the United Nations Security Council, expanded only with new non-permanent members. The emphasis on stability was somewhat relaxed after the end of the Cold War to allow a greater mobility of people, goods, and services, but largely for reasons of profit rather than justice or humanitarianism, within the parameters of liberal and neoliberal thought.

---

[3] The authors are aware that the European 'crisis' needs to be placed in the contexts of other Middle Eastern and African states that are experiencing conditions that prompt displacement and migration, and the fact that many of these states host large numbers of displaced or marginalized people.

The foundational stabilities of contemporary international order require the citizen to be static except perhaps for professional or leisure reasons, in a liberal contractual relationship with their sovereign state under the terms of the Montevideo Convention on fixed populations and territories (Grant 1999), with a neoliberal relation to capital. This was augmented from the early nineteenth century with increasing levels of international and regional institutions and organisation, plus international law, in order to control the behaviour of states in a mutual manner. Decentralised forms of governance to overcome the legitimacy gap also fixed the citizen into increasingly decentralised and parochial spaces. Mobility for reasons of security and development were henceforth seen to be the exception, and were temporary, in an international system that was increasingly 'settled'. Where mass migration was sanctioned, for example in settlement processes used by China in Tibet or the 1923 Greco-Turkish population exchange, it was tightly controlled or incentivised and had the ultimate aim of protecting a conservative order or a re-ordering. Free movement schemes between states (for example, between selected European Union states or between Canada and the United States) only exist because they have been sanctioned by states, and are monitored by them. The phrase 'gated globalism' captures the managed nature of borders, and how they have been recast as sites to be managed (Andrijasevic and Walter 2010). For many people, free mobility was impossible as rights were achieved through a contractual relationship with a specific liberal state, unless the state broke down and migration became necessary for reasons of war or insecurity. The whole notion of the states-system as well as the international architecture is based upon assumptions of immobility, which appear to be at odds with questions of international justice, cosmopolitan thought, and critical attempts to mediate the boundaries that cause enmity in international relations. Global justice requires equal rights across the planet (or commons), and distributive and historical justice point to even more detailed forms of material equality and restitution. The process of holding the states-system together, and

holding it accountable, since the end of WWI has focused on building institutions to mitigate the exception of mobility after war, or building peace agreements that created settled states and regions. International law and related international institutions have played a role in building a remarkably static international architecture that has retained a primary respect for state sovereignty, just as IR theory has- in its mainstream at least- drawn heavily on the so-called domestic analogy, decisively shaped by Eurocentric and northern bias notions of the state and international.

From a review of the literature, and involvement in a series of peace and conflict studies research projects over the past decade, we have identified five areas of immobility that characterise top-down, and often state-centric, ways of making and maintaining peace – or more precisely, order. These immobilities illustrate an essential conservatism that struggles to keep pace with mobilities as manifested through popular movements, migration, and transnationalism.

These five immobilities are:

1. the infrastructure of peacemaking,

2. an inability to think beyond fixed boundaries and state sovereignty,

3. a belief in the primacy of geo-strategic and geo-economic order and hierarchy under the current terms of global governance,

4. support for critically dysfunctional but relatively orderly regimes,

5. and an inability to deal consistently with the free mobility of ideas, capital and people, especially with new technological developments.

To deal with the first of these immobilities, it can be argued that the infrastructure of peacemaking has undergone immense change in recent decades with an increase in the number of NGOs and INGOs, the enhanced role for civil society, the creation of the Peacebuilding Commission, the New Deal for Fragile States, and the creation of peace-

related units in many foreign ministries. Some of these approaches tend to represent epistemic positions that require mobility across different networks. Yet the UN, NATO, World Bank and International Monetary Fund, all key players in contemporary peacebuilding and peacemaking, date from WWII and its immediate aftermath, and are dominated by rationalities associate with state-centricism and sovereignty. Control and the nature of these organisations has barely changed since their foundation. Although there are more peacebuilding actors than in 1945, the motive force (funding, power of initiative, conferral of legitimacy) behind many programmes and projects comes from a relatively small group of established actors. Key aspects of liberal peacemaking (mediating and building a certain type of territorial sovereignty and the central institutions of the state) are maintained precisely to prevent change and mobility. See, for example, how the issue of migration has dominated EU summits in recent years and how many member states have worked hard to erect and maintain 'Fortress Europe' (Malik 2018; Herszenhorn, Barigazzi and de la Baume 2018). Historically, this approach to state-craft has been appended to the nineteenth century states-system, the colonial system, as well as the post-war 1945 liberal order, amplified through the post-Cold War settlement as determined by multilateral organisations and IFIs. This represents a fixed sovereign order, in which transactions and motion occur only under the rules of the dense networks of global governance and neoliberal capital, underpinned by the territorial state. The latter contradicts much of the progressive agenda of the architecture of UN peacebuilding, though the state is also necessary to provide security and public goods. Neoliberal capital has made the response to conflict even more difficult, however, because it underlines very different positions on who and what may be mobile in the current order. The second aspect of immobility that characterises the liberal peace order relates to an inability to think beyond fixed boundaries and state sovereignty for citizens (see the critical geopolitics literature on this: Agnew 2003; Elden 2013). The reduction of peacebuilding into

state-focused activities has been well-covered elsewhere (Haider 2014; OECD 2011). The state, as something to be defended, fixed, reconstructed, right-sized, mentored, and inculcated into good governance techniques, has been the locus of much activity that falls under the headings of peace, stabilisation, reconstruction and development. Lurking beneath this line of thought is the Hobbesian notion that the state is a necessary evil, often formed through the forces of violence and maintaining at best a very fragile balance. Non-state dispensations are treated with suspicion (for example, Gaza, Somaliland, Puntland), or are regarded as staging posts towards eventual statehood (for example, the trusteeship that led to Kosovan independence, or the much delayed Palestinian statehood).

Military security, the primacy of law, and the remaking of states and institutions have been at the core of post-Cold War peacebuilding. This has largely been within the framework of the liberal peace, and more recently the neoliberal peace/ state framework of global governance and capital. There has been a deep inability to escape from the territorialised nature of the state and its centralised institutions, or the inflexibility of the great power asymmetry that the states-system lends to the UN through the Security Council. These state-level certainties have been reinforced by regional architectures and widespread agreement on the roles, practices, and limits of international norms and organisations. Alongside this emphasis on institutionalism, the liberal peace (and many previous versions of peacebuilding) have relied on static notions of identity and related political dynamics and institutions – that retain singular identities (for example, Hutu, Tutsi, Croatian) (Campbell 1998). Only in some circumstances is it accepted that individuals can have multiple identities (for example, post-Belfast Agreement Northern Ireland where inhabitants can self identify, and be recognised, as both Irish and British) (NIO 1998).

An emphasis on political settlements, peace accords and new constitutions within the existing states-system and multi-lateral architecture bring the advantages of certainty and simplicity,

but they also suggest a finality – that the conflict is *settled* through centralised and territorialised state governance and boundaries, or that the peace once constituted is to be obeyed (with a Leviathan lurking somewhere behind it). The worldview behind this approach to peacemaking and peacebuilding is to see conflict as an aberration that can, and must be, 'fixed' so that the system can be returned to a territorial and static equilibrium.

Much liberal peacemaking and peacebuilding is made on the Euro-centric assumption that the international system operates on a core-periphery basis, with the static 'local' being seen in relation to a civilised, developed and orderly core - which can also be highly mobile - as represented by selected Atlanticist states and related international organisations (Sabaratnum 2014). However, the periphery, once it has decided that neither the state nor the international will 'rescue' it from violence (structural or direct), may well have to decide that mobility provides a route to, and constitutes, emancipation and social justice. This is especially so under the more recent conditions of neoliberal statebuilding, where the primary interest of intervention lies in stabilization, counter-insurgency and marketization, meaning that states have little interest in supporting a cohesive and just society. Mobility is a challenge to the fixed ontology of the 'international system' creating a kind of positionality arbitrage across networks, scale and hierarchies, though such mobility also seeks eventually to return to a less mobile and more secure form of state, in the broader sense of human security (Gasper 2005; Odutayo 2016). Migration, formal or informal, is a route to peace and order in the absence of security and a viable state.

Indeed, the modern albeit neoliberal state and the liberal international architecture, along with non-liberal states, are now obstacles to agential, mobile and networked, emancipatory forms of peace. This dynamic is based simply on exit rather than voice (Hirschman 1970), and re-establishment in an advanced state and economy. They point to an imaginary of a fixed international architecture in which peace and development spreads to all states, rather than

what is now more likely: people exercising a kind of 'peace arbitrage' in which they seek to move up the rankings of security and order, as suggested by the hierarchical map of the UNDP Human Development Index. The latter indicates that peace is now mobile and networked (a mobile peace) rather than fixed by agreements between states, state constitutions, or international institutions (a sovereign peace, perhaps as a basis for the liberal peace).

Somewhat ironically, many of the mobilities that we highlight in this article are the (sometimes unintended) consequences of liberalism and neoliberalism. Liberal internationalism, human rights, and the authoritarian capitalism that characterises many of the structures and operating procedures of official international relations has facilitated a weakening of traditional diplomacy, the production of hollow neoliberal states, constraining multilateralism (Richmond 2008). Human rights and democracy promotion has encouraged self-awareness and increasing rights claims from the bottom up. Promoting the 'resilient subject' may have had the unintended consequence of sending out the message that the state holds few answers and that people should be self-reliant, which they exercise across a range of networks and mobilities, not least global civil society.

The third area of immobility central to the liberal peace is a belief in, or at least subservience to, the primacy of geo-strategic order and hierarchy, despite its rights framework. This is most visible in the lack of serious measures to investigate an updating of the self-declared mandate that awards power to the permanent five members of the UN Security Council. While there is plenty of evidence of multilateralism at the agency and General Assembly level, it is ultimately restrained by those capable of unilateralism or unwilling to enable a Security Council consensus (Binder and Heupel 2015). It often tends to operate across state-centric levels, rather than reaching and representing global societies' many claims more directly. This great power and single nation exceptionalism is most visible in the case of the

United States with its derogation from the International Criminal Court, massive defence spending, defence of the dollar as the effective global gold standard, and private initiatives turned into policy like the Project for a New American Century. Yet other leading states, including the UK, Germany[4], France, Russia and China, have all engaged in unilateralism in defence of order, and to symbolically assert their position in the global pecking order. Multilateralism has in some sense become a defence against multi-verticalism, representing the emancipatory claims made by populations- or subalterns- from below, against implacable state level interests.

A fourth immobility central to the liberal peace is support for clearly dysfunctional but orderly regimes. Regimes, such as Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Egypt and many others, indubitably offend the advertised minimum standards of the liberal peace in relation to human rights, democracy and violence against their own citizens or those living within their own boundaries. Yet these offences are tolerated, and sometimes actively supported, as these states occupy geo-strategic and economic roles, particularly in relation to regional order. Immobility is reinforced by the long-standing nature of the support for these regimes. To a certain extent, China can be included in the list of regimes that are supported because of their bias towards the existing territorial and political order (with some regional exceptions of course). China is showing signs of economic and military assertiveness (Liao and McDowell 2016) yet is also a force for a multilateral form of global order modified by capital and state sovereignty. There is a strong mutual dependence between China and leading western states. The former looks west for investment opportunities, while the latter actively solicits these cash injections. Both have a mutual interest in stability.

The final area of immobility relates to the inability of many of the institutions, personnel and principles of the liberal order to deal consistently with the free mobility of ideas, capital and

---

[4] In the case of Germany it has been economic unilateralism.

people. This is perhaps best illustrated by the European migrant 'crisis' in which most states have proven unable and unwilling to comprehend, and cope with, the flow of people from war-affected and under-developed regions. States have been reactive rather than proactive, and have fallen back onto traditional means of policing migration: fences, border checks, calling in the military, and increased surveillance (Malik 2018). British Prime Minister David Cameron's 2015 visit to a refugee camp in Lebanon illustrated a certain immobility in policy thinking. While expressing regret for the plight of Syrian refugees, a core message from his visit was to discourage people from travelling to Britain (Watt 2016).

The chief aim of this section has been to illustrate that the principal aim of key players in the in the international system is to continue their position as guardians of a static hierarchy and territorial order. Discourse analysis of speeches by advocates of liberal internationalism illustrate the extent to which peace and justice is trumped by the static characteristics of this order, connected to centralised governance, territorialism, nationalism, and borders. Indeed, a statistical analysis of post-Cold War comprehensive peace accords shows that these accords emphasise territorialised notions of security rather than networked and relational understandings of rights or indeed sovereignty (Slaughter, 2004: Qin, 2018; Moyn, 2018) in their provisions and the implementation of these provisions (Lee, Mac Ginty and Joshi 2016). In the next section we argue that the notion of internationally-supported peace based on order is in contrast with bottom-up and networked agentialism, which is derived from mobility, relationality and a challenging of the fixity of material, epistemic, and social boundaries, as well as the realisation of more material forms of equality in a global context. This is most visibly illustrated by the migrant 'crisis' sparked by wars in Syria, Afghanistan and elsewhere, but also by a range of other factors. Mobility appears to be linked to global justice, in other words (Carney, 2006).

It is worth reiterating the caveat that we do not see a strict binary between the immobile top-down and the mobile bottom-up. Both categories contain mobility and immobility (for example, as with transnational capital and its operatives) and require or govern networks and relationality in some way, and we conceptualise them in line with works on hybridity that emphasise heterogeneity within groups and porous boundaries between them (Peterson 2013). The formal states-system has seen a good deal of reinvention and shape-shifting in reaction to exigencies. The local level is not a sector of complete mobility – it contains links with traditionalism and territoriality. Indeed, the top-down sector has shown immense tolerance in relation to one form of mobility: capital. The free movement of capital, and statist responses to protecting this free movement in the midst of the 2007 credit crisis, illustrate the extent to which capital is exceptionalised. While the movement of people and many goods is restricted, controls on capital are much less stringent (OECD 2012). As Dierckx and others have argued, the free movement of capital remains a cornerstone of neoliberalism and can threaten state sovereignty (Dierckx 2016; Siddiqui and Armstrong 2018).

**The Impact of Mobility on Peace, Security, and Order Frameworks**

A series of hyper-mobilities of capital, people, ideas and technology now challenge the fixed order as described above. There is some evidence that mobility and the political arbitrage upwards along the human development index may well be emerging as a *new right* articulated by the subaltern, along with the right to physically move to seek security, if not human security.

In our analysis, the everyday actions of people in, and fleeing from, conflict-affected zones displays physical and perceptual mobilities that challenge traditional actors who have assumed responsibility for more static forms of peace, order and stabilisation. These static

responses maintain human populations *in situ*, and are often aimed at developing the architecture of a state, with centralised governance, security services subject to government, accountable to the law, and with a democratic and rights observing population. The international architecture, widening and deepening as it has over the same period was meant to provide checks and balances in the relations between states, as well as protect citizens from states. Notably omitted was the need to protect citizens from capital and globalisation, as these two factors were thought to be an important part of the emancipation of the citizen and the checks and balances of international order, promoting liberty and cooperation over centralised and unaccountable power. This all depends on a tiered international order, stratified in terms of capital and resources, which are in turn linked to mobility (and immobility). Ultimately, it makes sense that 'labour'- in this case the conflict-affected citizen - would choose exit and mobility over voice in a collapsing state, given the poor track record of many peacebuilding and statebuilding interventions. The fixed international architecture's response (or lack of response) to genocide, ethnic cleansing, corruption and civil and transnational war has made human mobility a rational option for many.

As the current European migrant 'crisis' illustrates, individuals, families and substantial groups of people seek their own peace, emancipation, and social justice through migration, trading failed states for shadowland journeys, in order to re-establish themselves in a better environment even if they sacrifice possessions, status, identity, and rank along the way. Crucially, and as will be discussed below, these bottom-up mobilities cannot be seen in isolation and narrated simply as local agency, resistance or subversion. Instead, they operate in conjunction with top-down mobilities produced by the very states and international system that now feel threatened by the hypermobility of people, capital, weapons and disease. In

particular, the neo-liberal and nationalist stances of leading states and their financial architecture contributes to the co-constitution of these threats.

Perhaps the most notable feature of state and international organisation responses to the European migrant crisis (and we are aware of terminological debates on whether 'refugee' or 'migrant' are the most appropriate terms) (Kyriakides 2016; Rachman 2015) is the extent to which they entail a retrenchment of traditional bulwarks to the mobility of people, identities (and to a certain extent goods). Thus, for example, we have seen investments in walls and barriers (Rigby 2015; Feher 2016; Politi and Ghiglione 2016), the recruitment of more border security personnel (Thorpe 2016), and increased cross border cooperation to keep out migrants (UK Government 2016). There has been a very noticeable securitisation of the migrant issue, including a discursive securitisation whereby the movement of people is elided with the movement of drugs and weapons and thus cast as a multi-pronged threat (ibid).

Traditional arms of the state have been deployed in state attempts to respond to the migration issue. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, proto-modern states relied on militaries, navies, militias, prisons, and deportation to establish a monopoly of violence over citizens, and to reinforce their legitimacy. As Tilly (1985: 175) noted, Europe's sixteenth and seventeenth century rules used 'two expensive but effective strategies' in forging modern states: extending officialdom to the local level, and establishing police forces that were independent of both the military and local magnates. In the contemporary era, traditional actors and techniques have been mobilised to deal with migration. Even apparent innovations, such as the deployment of drones, tracking technologies and bio-metric data (Topak 2014), are aimed at rather traditional ends: verifying the identity of people, controlling their movement, and reinforcing and legitimising the power of the state. The verification of identities has struggled to move beyond fixed notions that individuals must 'belong' to a particular country, subject to its territorialised sovereignty (Wang 2004) and makes few

allowances for the fact that chosen identity and state-issued identity may not overlap (Adamson 2006). While many countries allow dual citizenship, many do not (including Austria, China, India, Indonesia, Japan and Norway) (Mirilovic 2014). Despite decades of refining intra-Union mobility legislation and practicalities, citizenship is granted by member states not by the EU itself.

The chief point is that state and international organisation responses to the mass movement of people (and associated movements in identity) have drawn on a traditional pattern of denial of movement, identification of those moving, and repatriation of those deemed to have moved illegally (Salter 2004). This traditionalism has relevance for our interest in how peace is made, maintained and framed. It suggests that peace, as sponsored by leading states and international organisations, is based on notions and practices of static identities, identities that are documented, static boundaries, legitimate states and institutions and order. As the next section seeks to show, this top-down immobile version of peace stands in contrast to some bottom-up peace-focused developments.

**Everyday forms of peace as mobile**

This section endeavours to show how bottom-up, everyday activities in relation to peace show a fleetness of foot that states and international institutions seem incapable of, or actively block. It can be considered as a mobile form of peace. A substantial literature has emerged on 'everyday peace' or the ways in which individuals and communities navigate through division and insecurity using their own emotional intelligence and resources, and often independent of activities by states (Richmond, 2009: 580: Richmond, 2011b: 190; Berents 2015; Mac Ginty 2017). The focus of this article is on the everydayness of mobility and its implications for peace. This everyday agency is increasingly transnational (Brigden 2016) and transversal, and aware of the relationality between the multiple factors that

contribute to war, peace, and opportunities for individual and collective progress. As the examples below will show, this everyday agency is often hidden and ingenious (Richmond 2011). The most obvious example of the everyday mobile agency comes in the form of the movement of migrants from conflict-affected zones, and areas of limited economic development, to Europe and beyond. We can also see this everyday agency in establishment of local councils in Syria, a people's peace process in the Basque Country or Colombia, the 2014 protests across Bosnia, and countless actions of everyday peace and diplomacy at the community level in deeply divided societies (Odendaal, 2013: Millar 2016). Taken together, these can be conceptualised as forms of mobility through which individuals and collectives do not feel beholden to institutionalised and formal responses to conflict or economic hardship. In some cases, their everyday agency is a direct response to the rigidity of institutionalist responses or lack thereof. In other cases, it occurs in spaces unoccupied or vacated by institutions and states. Crucially, the forms of mobility discussed here are not merely the actions of people on the margins. They are occurring on a significant scale, and constitute an emergent, perhaps private and underground, worldview that is cognisant of the agency of individuals, the opportunities afforded by transnationalism and technology, and the limitations of states and formal institutions.

In response to the immobilities in peace making and maintenance that we outlined at the beginning of this article, we see emergent everyday responses, which have global ramifications through transnational and transversal networks. These everyday responses are based upon critical forms of agency, resistance, and hybridity, and often rely on a mobility of people, identities and power. Based on a wide review of literature, and on our involvement in a series of research projects (for example, the Everyday Peace Indicators project, the EUNPACK project looking at EU crisis response mechanisms, a British Academy project looking at legitimate political authority), an indicative list of everyday responses includes:

1. An everyday infrastructure of peacebuilding to compete or complement the formal institutional approach (Odendaal 2013: Surmond and Sharma 2014):

2. A mobile and shifting archipelago of new rights claimants which challenge existing static conceptions of rights and citizens in the states-system;

3. Networks of everyday but also transnational and transversal relationality that challenge geo-strategic and geo-economic order

4. Tactical support for clearly dysfunctional but still relatively orderly regimes in that they offer a platform for future reform and expansion, following increasingly micropolitical/ infrapolitical processes and as a challenge to isolationalism, nationalism, and their fixed hierarchies of status and power

5. The simultaneous exploitation of new opportunities for global contact and mobility to reflect the free mobility of ideas, capital and people, especially with new technological developments, and despite the static states-system.

Everyday peace infrastructures are found in the on-the-ground activities and networks found in conflict and post-conflict zones whereby individuals and small groups make and maintain peace and engage in the tolerance and conciliation required for society to function. These infrastructures and networks are flexible and mobile, do not wield direct power, and often have local (and sometimes international) legitimacy. Their power often lies in critical and subtle forms of agency, and the depth and extensive nature of their networks. They eventually may connect the rural, the capital with multiple international organisations and actors. They represent, perhaps, in embryonic and archipelagic form, an emergent transnational order based upon a range of critical agencies (Sen 1999: Richmond, 2011), and one that the existing international peace architecture, which revolves around states, the UN, IFIs, and INGOs, needs to engage with.

Consider, for example, the Syrian local  established in those parts of Syria not controlled by the Assad regime or rebel or Islamist groups (Egeland 2015; Talmon 2013; Waters 2017). The councils are largely organic, local-level attempts to provide basic services in the absence of the state. The peace, security, and order carved out by the local councils is constituted through everyday acts of service of basic needs facilitated by a range of global connections in some instances: food, shelter, and sanitation, as well as information about risk and related tactics, and attempts to build minimalistic institutions connecting these to core values. Interestingly, and betraying the immobility of many traditional diplomatic and humanitarian actors, bilateral and international actors have sought to sponsor (and possibly co-opt) the local councils. At heart here is a crisis of access suffered by traditional state and international actors who cannot physically access the populations they wish to minister to. While not belittling the physical and security deterrents driving this crisis of access, these operate alongside a much broader list of factors that have created barriers between aid providers and bilateral donors on the one hand, and recipients on the other. The list includes the political economy and professionalization of the aid world, the possibilities (and limitations) of remote diplomatic and humanitarian programing, and the essential conservatism of diplomatic structures and protocols that were forged in the nineteenth century (Rieff 2002). Behind all of this are worldviews of hierarchies, binaries of donors and recipients, and concepts of legitimate actors. The Syrian local councils, and other initiatives in other conflict-affected communities in Afghanistan, Iraq, Northern Ireland and Bosnia-Herzegovina, have taken a more prosaic approach (often through necessity) that is ready to accept resources from overseas actors but offers limited fealty in return. The rise of 'resilience' as a policy buzzword is, in part, a recognition by international actors that their resources and ability to effect change are limited as much as it represents yet another attempt to shift responsibility onto the shoulders of the weak (Mackinnon and Derickson 2013).

Further forms of everyday mobile peace comes in the form of shifting archipelagos of new rights claimants that are expanding our understanding of rights (Moyn 2018). They challenge fixed boundaries and state sovereignty and liberal institutionalism. This positive and hybrid form of mobile peace is reconstructing legitimacy to include more hybrid approaches to the mediation of political claims across time (historical justice) and space (distributive justice) (Richmond 2015). This new network of relationality (Qin 2016), which is increasingly focused upon global justice (including matters of history, equality, gender, and the environment) is transversal and transnational, cross-cultural and multi-scalar, and utilises the latest technologies of exchange, contact and transport. It is predicated on eventually replacing the primacy of the geo-strategic, geo-economic, territorialised order and hierarchy under the current terms of global governance. Mobile and everyday forms of peace are often tactically oriented towards critiquing but not necessarily removing power. Its flexibility means that it has the ability to subvert the free mobility of ideas, capital and people, especially with new technological developments, into new rights claims suitable for new, more hybrid forms of peacemaking.

An immediate, everyday and mobile form of peace involves migration away from zones of conflict. This is a negative form of mobile peace. It is no accident that the leading refugee 'producing' countries in 2016 were all war-affected: Syria, Afghanistan, Somalia and South Sudan (UNHCR 2017). A common trope among critics of refugees and migrants can be summed up as 'why don't they stay and fight for their own country?' (Awford 2015). In this worldview, citizenship entails a duty to defend the sovereign and leaving one's country in times of conflict is equated with dereliction, even cowardice. In another reading, the movement of military aged men (and families) away from a conflict zone is a pacific act, reducing the ability of political and military leaders to wage war. In relation to Syria, deserters from both Assad's regime and the Free Syrian Army have been vocal in puncturing

official narratives of the righteousness of causes and strategies (Davison 2016). The appearance of so many Syrian, Afghan and Eritrean young males in Europe and elsewhere constitutes a rebuke to official narratives that equate, in a bio-political way, place of birth with service to the state. Throughout history, mobility has been essential for peacemaking, and after war ends it has remained so through return and reintegration (Annan, Brier and Aryemo 2009 and Alden 2002). Nevertheless, states have been keen to regulate such mobility.

The fluidity of identities plays a key role in the emergent and mobile forms of peacemaking (Onorato and Turner 2004 and Beckhofer and Mccrone 2014). As we have seen, orthodox state-centric approaches to making peace rely on a series of immobilities including state boundaries and identities. An interesting counterpoint to this comes in the form of reports that migrants from states not affected by violent conflict claim that they are fleeing conflict-affected states. The extent of this phenomenon is contested and politicised, but it constitutes a mobility of mind-set (as well as a physical mobility). It suggests that individuals are unpersuaded by the merits of fixed state-issued identities and international strategies based on the containment of the conflict and its population. The reportage of the phenomenon is also revealing about the ways conflicts and conflict-affected populations are framed. Thus, for example, British newspapers have accused migrants of claiming to be children from Syria when they are in fact adults from Pakistan (AFP 2015; O'Brien 2016). Such reporting seems premised on the notion of the 'deserving' refugee or migrant and unaware of on-going conflict in Pakistan. The identity-shifting nature of migrants draws on the repertoire of everyday peace skills including the use of emotional intelligence, dissembling, social categorisation, avoidance and ambiguity, and seems quite removed from strategies of containment and fixed identities that might be favoured by states (Mac Ginty 2014).

Another example of everyday peace based on fluid identities comes from fieldwork conducted as part of the Everyday Peace Indicators project by one of authors in northern Uganda (Mac Ginty and Firchow 2016). Many communities had been affected by the abduction of children by the Lord's Resistance Army, and were now dealing with the reintegration of these youth back into community life. Much of the academic and policy literature on this subject exceptionalises the former combatants, setting them apart from the rest of the community because of their psychological trauma, indoctrination and violent skills. In a sense, much of the literature seemed stuck in the moment when the child soldiers were child soldiers and unable to conceive of the transient possibilities of individual identity. Individuals in these communities, however, took a more pragmatic stance. Focus group participants noted 'you forgive because it was not their will to be abducted and made to participate in the war' or 'If possible they should be helped to start their life afresh' (for details on the focus group processes, see everydaypeaceindicators.org). The overwhelming sentiment in the focus groups was one of sympathy towards the plight of formerly abducted persons and a recognition of the need to move on. This acceptance of fluid identities seemed to contrast with more static approaches.

Mobile and everyday forms of peacemaking work across power differences and often outside of formal systems. Work on the pacific potential of diaspora communities has diasporas can mobilise and articulate in different ways to their 'relations' in the home territory (Cochrane, Baser & Swain 2009: 681-704). This pro-peace work may extend beyond a formal peace process where the state or polity is unable to provide the level of stability citizens require and they begin to move on, they produce hybridity on the move. For example, in the case of Cyprus it is well known that both Cypriot communities lived amicably side-by-side in London and Sydney after fleeing Cyprus during the violence between 1963-74. In these cases though, hybrid forms of peace were not produced in relation to the state of Cyprus, but

instead through their journey as refugees and their re-establishment in their new countries. As Adamson and Demetriou (2007: 507) make clear, everyday diasporic practices change over time. This type of situation also arises with other conflict-affected groups: the Bosnians, Kosovans, and Serbs in the US and Europe for example. Its hybrid aspect refers to the complex identity formulations that occur, but the mobile political agency is more a defence against the lack of structural change in the conflict environment and better options elsewhere where new priorities supplant old tensions. Under conditions of immutable structural conflict mobility helps subaltern agents scale material and geopolitical hierarchies.

There are some signs of a new layer of the international system able to engage with critical and mobile forms of agency. UNHCR's "blue spot" programme aims to provide mobile support in material and rights terms to populations on the move towards Europe, fleeing from war and violence, positioning meeting points able to provide support along the path of refugees and migrants (UNHCR 2016). This is a hint of the establishment of international organisations predicated on the right of citizens to shift their positionality in order to improve their security and prospects (which historically refugee policy and law has assumed). It requires a different type of thinking, one not predicated on territorial sovereignty and fixed states, institutions, and citizenship, but focused on the expanded rights of global, networked and mobile citizens (and not assuming that transnational actors tend to be male and rich). They are able to jump across scales rather than are constrained by territoriality. It expands the rationality of rights from the state-centric and normative to the globally practical and material, and it shifts the construction of peace and international organisation from that focused on static, bureaucratic, legal, and territorial institutions, to a free flowing and dynamic hybrid framework following and supporting the requirements of the global citizen in extremis.

Schemes like the Blue Spot hubs are an indication of the possibility that where states have failed, elements of the international community are assessing how to break through territorialised power structures creating humanitarian blockages in an of era of putatively global citizens. This is an indication of a post-liberal and hybrid development emerging from the issues raised by local, micro, and everyday, agencies, which raises structural and reform issues (Richmond, 2016). This is a global phenomenon that challenges entrenched and even moribund elites and systems but it is not revolutionary because it also recognizes their contribution to order. However, it is also an indication that such contradictions are creating increasing pressure on the liberal peace architecture and its ill-fitting neoliberal state components, something which is recognized in some parts of the international system but not others (Richmond 2014). Global governance has moved from states, law, institutions, and capital into a realm of other complex areas, from networks, to the environment, to the contradictions of rights, power, and capital, to mobile political agency, which require ethical responses to these contradictions (Sassen 2008). Bordering and centralization no longer work under these new conditions, where governance for peace, development, security and rights, needs to move with their subjects rather than to constrain them, as subjects try to trade up their positions in the world through arbitrage. Subjects are beginning to regard this as a right where their own institutions fail and no outsiders can help, pointing once again to matters of global justice constituted in historical and distributive terms. In the longer, anthropocenic and geological time range, this points to the need for global political order to be predicated on much broader understandings of equality and sustainability, rather than domestic rights and state hierarchy. In the absences of workable state, economic, and international peacebuilding, mobility of subjects is the only way to achieve this (Richmond, 2017). Alongside the actuality of mobile populations making new geographical and figurative space for themselves, there has also been innovative intellectual scoping of what new, post-territorial scenarios might look

like. Cohen and Van Hear's (2017) notion of 'refugia', and the idea of a 'Sesame Pass', illustrate how the fixity of the sovereign states system might be retro-fitted to accommodate the transnational millions. Yet, most architecture has been planned for static systems of governance and populations, as one would expect in a system of territorial sovereignty. The acute mobility of informed modern populations means that such governance is always on the brink of failure.

**Conclusion**

The article can be read as an appraisal of the fitness for purpose of the Westphalian system and a set of practices, institutions and assumptions that rest on a peculiarly static worldview. As such, the article can be located in the on-going critique of liberal peacebuilding and neoliberal statebuilding (Richmond 2014), and attempts to scope – conceptually and theoretically – alternative approaches to peace and development. It can also be situated in wider debates within International Relations and other disciplines that seek to transcend statist and institutionalist analyses and take notice instead, of the local, the mobile, the transversal and the multi-scaled, pushing harder at the critical and post-structural project that began in the 1980s aimed at cementing cosmopolitanism and yet also moderating the certainties of liberalism or Marxism in the light of alterity and inequality. To understand emerging frameworks of mobility means jettisoning the epistemological and methodological baggage of the states-system and nationalism – a difficult task given the origins and inertia of academic disciplines such as International Relations. It also means re-assessing some long-standing concepts (such as 'diaspora') that we rely on to describe mobile and transnational populations (Adamson and Demetriou 2007: 498). It is becoming increasingly clear that everyday dynamics have underlined the limits of liberalism and the need for structural change. Much local agency has bypassed the states-system and the liberal international

architecture in practical and ethical terms. Local agency and the everyday are very important, and often operate and manifest in unexpected ways.

The dexterity of local agency means that some forms of mobility through global networks, formal, informal, and shadow connections are seeking out new forms of emancipation and global social justice. There is innovation, circumvention of orthodoxy and new articulations of peace and politics. This is an opportune moment to take stock of the potential of contemporary mobilities to help develop emancipatory forms of peace, given the limitations of state-based and international efforts.

Mobilities and immobility relate to international and national governance, to the nature of order, and increasingly to peace. Controlling mobilities is the essence of governance and rent-seeking, and achieving mobile political agency is a basis for emancipation in contemporary, networked and increasingly 'digital' times - given the limits of territorialised practices of intervention or local peacebuilding. The sheer scale of modern mobile political agency points to post-liberal forms of political subjectivity, to the formation of hybrid political communities, and the capacity of agents to shape their own peace through structural change in a way that governments and international organisations have not. This does not claim that the subaltern are immune to power relations, or that everyday life is unaffected by structural, direct, or governmental forms of power, but they are in fact part of them in the micro and capillary dynamic that Foucault outlined. In other words, the local co-constitutes the centre in often inchoate ways ( Foucault 1980, 96; see also Lilja & Vinthagen 2014).

Peace settlements, responses to structural violence, inequality, poverty, and environmental degradation operate in a core-periphery environment of sovereign IR, and the most emancipatory step that an individual can take is to migrate away from violence, in the absence of state or international assistance. This involves a kind of political and personal arbitrage, traveling up the Human Development Index, in other words. Indeed this process

has been the case since at least the nineteenth Century (as today in Syria). In a very basic sense, this is 'mobile peace', or a form of conflict avoidance based on mobility. Global inequality and untreated direct and structural violence causes a 'peace arbitrage' within international relations, where the failure of local politics and economics, the state or the regional and international organisation leads to not voice but exit. Of course this journey creates other types of expediencies and other types of violence, and weakens the legitimacy and capacity for governance, of the core institutions that have maintained order since the 1940s. This exercise of critical political subaltern agency, often through the shadowy and informal sectors of the global political economic is a consequence of the material inequality that currently undermines the legal equality of states, differences in national rights frameworks, the failure to address historical and distributive matters of justice (a painful example being the Palestinians), failure to reform the UN system, and the unsuitability of the modern states-system in addressing contemporary problems (such as in Syria or Libya) in a progressive, equitable, and fair manner.

In the twenty-first century, relative emancipation and justice for the individual is found through scalar forms of mobility and networking by any plausible means- using capital and new technologies and often in defiance of sovereignty- over the bare life of remaining *in situ* and remaining subject to war, multiple forms of violence, underdevelopment, and failed development, peacebuilding, and statebuilding. This is both a poor indictment of the twentieth century liberal international order designed to bring peace and prosperity, the capacity of political and policymakers to respond to the tensions of modernity, and the ethics of our relations with others. Everyday mobility, through relationality, leading to a more networked peace and emancipation seem a sophisticated response by contrast. It is a mobile form of peace forged and embodied through everyday actions, often on the margins or *in extremis*. It is a form of peace that occurs in the absence of effective forms of peace offered

from more orthodox sources. This mobile peace should not be romanticised and is not immune from the injurious use of power. But it does involve innovation, subversion, resistance and the carving out of alternatives. It is produce by mobile political agency, which networks along relational connections, becoming focussing on expanded human rights and ultimately points to global justice as the emancipatory and sustainable philosophy of any peace process or of peacebuilding. As such, it deserves our attention.

**References**

Adamson, Fiona B. (2006) Crossing Borders: International Migration and National Security, International Security, 31(1):165-199.

Adamson, Fiona B. and M. Demetriou (2007) Remapping the Boundaries of 'State' and 'National Identity': Incorporating Diasporas into IR Theorizing, European Journal of International Relations, 13(4): 489–526.

Adamson, Fiona, B., T. Triadafilopoulos & AR. Zolberg (2011) The Limits of the Liberal State: Migration, Identity and Belonging in Europe, Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 37:6, 843-859,

Aden, Chris. 2002. "Making old soldiers fade away. Lessons from the reintegration of demobilised soldiers in Mozambique." Security Dialogue 33 (3): 341-356.

Adler-Nissen, Rebecca. 2016. "Towards a practice turn in EU studies: The everyday of European integration". Journal of Common Market Studies 54(1): 87-103.

AFP. (2015). "Refugee Crisis: Many migrants falsely claim to be Syrians, Germany says as EU tries to ease relations". Daily Telegraph 25 May.

Agnew, John A. 2003. Geopolitics: Re-visioning world politics. London: Routledge.

Andrijasevic, Rutvica and Walter, William. 2010. "The International Organisation for Migration and the international government of borders". Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 28(6): 977-999.

Anna, Jeannie, Moriah Brier and Filder Aryemo. 2009. "From 'rebel' to 'rerturnee': Daily life and reintegration for young soldiers in northern Uganda." Journal of Adolescent Research 24 (6): 639-667.

Aradau, C, and Blanke, T (2015), "The (Big) Data-security assemblage: Knowledge and critique", *Big Data & Society* vol. 2(2) October 2015.

Aradau, C and Blanke, T (2017), "Politics of prediction: security and the time/space of governmentality in the age of big data". *European Journal of Social Theory* vol.20(3): pp. 373-391,

Awford, Jenny. 2015. "'Tell the male refugees to go back and fight' one politician says only the women and children from Syria's humanitarian crisis should be granted asylum". Daily Mail, 8 September.

Beckhofer, Frank and David Mccrone. 2014. Changing claims in context: National identity revisited. Ethnic and Racial Studies. 37 (8): 1350-1370.

Bell, C & Pospisil, J. (2017) "Navigating Inclusion in Transitions from Conflict: The Formalised Political Un settlement". Journal of International Development, Vol.29, pp.576–593;

Berents, Helen (2015) An embodies everyday peace in the midst of violence. Peacebuilding 3(2): 1-14.

Binder, Martin and Monika Heupel. 2015. "The legitimacy of the UN Security Council: Evidence from recent General Assembly debates." International Studies Quarterly 59 (2): 238-250.

Brigden, Noelle, K. 2016. "Improvised transnationalism: Clandestine migration at the border of anthropology and international relations". International Studies Quarterly 60 (2): 343-353.

Brown, Chris. 2012. "The 'practice turn', phronesis and classical realism" Towards a phronetic international political theory?" Millennium – Journal of International Relations 40 (3): 439-456.

Campbell, David & George, Jim, 1990. ' Patterns of Dissent and the Celebration of Difference: Critical Social Theory and International Relations', International Studies Quarterly Vol 34, 1990: 269-293.

Campbell, David. 1998. National Deconstruction: Violence, identity and justice in Bosnia. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minneapolis Press.

Simon Caney (2006), *Justice Beyond Borders.* Oxford: OUP.

Castells, M (2009) *Communication Power*, OUP

Chandler, David (2018) *Ontopolitics in the Anthropocene,* London: Routledge

Cochrane, Feargal, Bahar Baser & Ashok Swain (2009) Home Thoughts from Abroad: Diasporas and Peace-Building in Northern Ireland and Sri Lanka, Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 32:8, 681-704.

Cohen, Robin & Nicholas Van Hear (2017) Visions of Refugia: territorial and transnational solutions to mass displacement, Planning Theory & Practice, 18:3, 494-504

Davison, John (2016) 'Seeing no future, deserters and draft-dodgers flee Syria', Reuters, 20 July. Accessed at https://www.reuters.com/article/us-mideast-crisis-syria-army/seeing-no-future-deserters-and-draft-dodgers-flee-syria-idUSKCN1001PY.

Dierckx, Sacha. 2013. After the Crisis and Beyond the New Constitutionalism? The Case of the Free Movement of Capital, Globalizations, 10:6, 803-818.

Egeland, Jan. 2015. "A way out of the Syrian carnage." The Brown Journal of World Affairs. 22 (1): 297-304.

Feher, Margit. 2016. "Hungary plans second fence to stop migrants". Wall Street Journal 26 August.

Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink (1998) International Norm Dynamics and Political Change, International Organization, Volume 52, Issue 4, pp. 887-917.

Foucault, Michel. 1980. Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977. Colin Gordon ed., New York: Pantheon Books.

Gasper, Des (2005) Securing Humanity: Situating 'Human Security' as Concept and Discourse, Journal of Human Development, 6:2, 221-245.

Grant, Thomas D. 1999. "Defining Statehood, the Montevideo Convention and its discontents." Columbia Journal of Transnational Law 37(2): 403-404.

DeGooyer Stephanie (et al) eds., (2018) *The Right to Have Rights*, London: Verso, 2018

Haider, Huma. 2014. Statebuilding and peacebuilding in situations of conflict and fragility. Topic Guide Supplement. Revised edition with A. Strachan. Birmingham: GSDRC, University of Birmingham.

Herszenhorn, David M., Jacopo Barigazzi and Maia de la Baume. 2018. EU leaders clinch migration deal in marathon summit. Politico. 28 June. Accessed at

https://www.politico.eu/article/eu-leaders-reach-consensus-on-migration-at-summit-angela-merkel/. Last accessed 12 November 2018.

Hirschman, Albert O. 1970. Exit, Voice and Loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations and states. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jackson, Peter. 2008. "Pierre Bourdieu, the 'cultural turn' and the practice of international history". Review of International Studies 34 (1): 155-181.

Bob Jessop (2016) *The State: Past, Present and Future*, Cambridge: Polity.

Korzeniewicz, Roberto Patricio and Scott Albrecht. 2015. "Income differentials and global migration in the contemporary world economy". Current Sociology 64 (2): 259-276.

Krasner, Stephen D. 2001. "Rethinking the sovereign state model". *Review of International Studies* 27(5): 17-42.

Kyriakides, Christopher. 2016. "Word's don't come easy: Al Jazeera's migrant-refugee distinction and the European culture of (mis)trust." Current Sociology, Online First.

Laio, Steven and Daniel McDowell. 2016. "No reservations: International order and demand for the Renminbi as a reserve currency." International Studies Quarterly 60 (2): 272-293.

Latour, Bruno (2005) *Reassembling the Social*, OUP.

Lazaridis, Gabriella, and Wadia, Khursheed eds., (2015) The securitization of migration in the EU: Debates since 9/11. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Lee, SungYong, Roger Mac Ginty, Madhav Joshi. 2016. "Social peace versus security peace". Global Governance 22 (4): 491-512.

Lilja, Mona & Stellan Vinthagen. 2014. Sovereign power, disciplinary power and biopower: resisting what power with what resistance?, Journal of Political Power, 7:1, 107-126.

Lisle, Debbie. 2016 Holidays in the Danger Zone: Entanglements of war and tourism. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Mac Ginty, Roger. 2014. "Everyday Peace: Bottom-up and local agency in conflict-affected societies". *Security Dialogue* 45(6): 548-64.

Mac Ginty, R. (2015) 'Where is the local?', *Third World Quarterly*, 36(5): 840-856.

Mac Ginty, Roger and Pamina Firchow (2016) Top-down and bottom-up narratives of peace and conflict', Politics 36(3): 308-323.

Mac Ginty, R. (2017) 'Everyday Social Practices and Boundary-Making in Deeply Divided Societies', *Civil Wars*, 19:1, 4-25.


Mackinnon, Danny and Kate Driscoll Derickson (2013) 'From resilience to resourcefulness: A critique of policy and activism', Progress in Human Geography 37(2): 253-270.

Malik,Kenan. 2018. How we all colluded in Fortress Europe. Guardian. 10 June. Accessed at: https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/jun/10/sunday-essay-how-we-colluded-in-fortress-europe-immigration. Accessed 12 November 2018.

Melucci, Alberto (1989). *Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Millar, Gearoid. 2016. "For whom do local peace processesd function? Maintaining control through conflict management." Cooperation and Conflict. Online first.

Mirilovic, Nikola. 2014. "Regime type, international migration and the politics of dual citizenship." International Political Science Review 36 (5): 510-525.

Moyn, Samuel (2018) *Not Enough: Human Rights in and Unequal World*, Belnapp Harvard University Press

O'Brien, Zoie. 2016. "Pakistanis claim to be Syrian children as migrants registered from 70 countries in Hungary" [sic]. Daily Express, 29 September.

Odendaal, Andries (2013) A Crucial Link: Local Peace Committees and National Peacebuilding. Washington: USIP.

Odutayo, Aramide. 2016. Human security and the international refugee crisis, Journal of Global Ethics, 12:3, 365-379.


OECD. 2011. New Deal for Engagement with Fragile States.

OECD (2012) "Financial Contagion in the Era of Globalised Banking?", OECD Economics Department Policy Notes, No.14, June.

Onorato, Rina S and John C. Turner. 2004. "Fluidity in the self concept: From person to social identity. European Journal of Political Psychology 34 (3): 257-278.

Qin, Yaqing. (2016) A Relational Theory of World Politics. *International Studies Review*.

Northern Ireland Office (NIO). 1998. Belfast Agreement. 10 April. London: Northern Ireland Office.

Paffenholz, Thania. 2015. "Unpacking the local turn in peacebuilding: a critical assessment towards reaching an agenda for future research." *Third World Quarterly* 36 (5): 857-74.

Peterson, Jenny H. 2013. "A conceptual unpacking of hybridity: Accounting for notions of power, politics and progress in analyses of aid-driven interfaces". Journal of Peacebuilding and Development 7(2): 9-22.

Piketty, Thomas. 2014. Capital in the twenty-first century. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Politi, James and David Ghiglione. 2016. "Renzi and Merkel hit out at Austria's fence to keep out refugees". Financial Times, 5 May.

Qin, Yaqing. A Relational Theory of World Politics. International Studies Review Volume 18, Issue 1, 1 March (2016) 33–47

Rachman, Gideo. 2015. "Refugees or asylum seekers – what's in a word?" *Financial Times*, 3 September.

Richmond, Oliver, P. 2008. "'Liberal Hubris'? Virtual peace in Cambodia." Security Dialogue 38 (1): 27-48.

Richmond, Oliver P. 2009, "A post-liberal peace: Eirenism and the Everyday", Review of International Studies, 35: 557–580Richmond, Oliver P. 2011. "Critical agency, resistance and post-colonial civil society." Cooperation and Conflict 46 (4): 419-440.

Richmond, Oliver P. 2011, A Post-Liberal Peace, London: Routledge.

Richmond, Oliver P. 2014. Failed Statebuilding: Intervention, the state and the dynamics of peace. Yale: Yale University Press.

Richmond, Oliver P, 2015 "Dilemmas of a Hybrid Peace: Negative or positive?", Cooperation and Conflict, Vol. 50, No.1.

Richmond, Oliver P, 2016. Peace Formation and Political Order. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richmond, Oliver P,  2017. "Peace in the 21st Century: States, Capital, and Multilateral Institutions Versus Positionality Arbitrage, Everyday Mobility, Networks, and Multi-Verticality". *Globalizations*

Rieff, David. 2002. A bed for the night: Humanitarianism in crisis. London: Vintage.

Rigby, Elizabeth. 2015. "Britain to erect high-security fence at Calais lorry terminal". Financial Times 28 June.

Rosenau, James N. 2003. Distant Proximities: Dynamics beyond globalization. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ryo, Emily. 2013. "Norms and economics of unauthorized migration." American Sociological Review. 78 (4): 574-603.

Sabaratnum, Meera.  2014. "Avatars of Eurocentrism in the critique of everyday peace". Security Dialogue 44(3): 259-78.

Salter, Mark B (2004) Passports, Mobility and Security: How smart can borders be? International Studies Perspectives 5: 71-91.

Sassen, S (2006) *Territory, Authority, Rights,* Princeton University Press

Schwab, G. (2010). Haunting Legacies: Violent Histories and Transgenerational Trauma. Columbia University Press.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sheller, Mimi and Urry, John. 2006. "The new mobilities paradigm". Environment and Planning A 38(2): 207-26.

Siddiqui, Kalim & Phil Armstrong. 2018. Capital control reconsidered: financialisation and economic policy, International Review of Applied Economics, 32:6, 713-731

Slaughter, Anne Marie, (2004) A New World Order, Princeton Univ. Press, 2004.

Squire, Vicki. 2016. "Unauthorised migration beyond structure/agency? Acts, interventions, effects. Politics. Online first.

Suurmond, J, and PM Sharma (2014) 'Like yeast that leavens the dough? Community mediation as local infrastructure for peace in Nepal', Journal of Peacebuilding and Development 7(3): 81-86.

Talmon, Stefan.. 2013. "Recognition of opposition groups as the legitimate representative of the people." Chinese Journal of International Law 12 (2): 219-253.

Tilly, Charles. 1985. 'War-making and state-making as organized crime', in P. Evans, D. Rueschemeyer and T. Skocpol eds., *Bringing the State Back In*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 169-87 at p. 175.

Thorpe, Nick. 2016. "Hungary police recruits 'border hunters'", BBC News Online, 2 September. Accessed at http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-37259857.

Topak, Ozgun, E. 2014. "The bio-political border in practice: Surveillance and death at the Greece-Turkey borderzones". Environment and Planning D 32(5): 815-33

UK Government. 2016. "New powers to strengthen coastal security". UK Government Press Release, 26 May. Accessed at: https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-powers-to-strengthen-coastal-security.

UNHCR. 2016. UNHCR, UNICEF launch Blue Dot hubs to boost protection for children and families on the move across Europe. Press release 26 February. Accessed at:

http://www.unhcr.org/afr/news/press/2016/2/56d011e79/unhcr-unicef-launch-blue-dot-hubs-boost-protection-children-families-move.html. Last accessed 10 April 2017.

UNHCR. 2017. 'Figures at a glance'. Accessed at: http://www.unhcr.org/uk/figures-at-a-glance.html.

Wallis, Joanne. 2017. "Is 'good enough' peacebuilding good enough? The potential and pitfalls of the local turn in peacebuilding in Timnor-Leste". The Pacific Review 30 (2): 251-269.

Wang, Horng-luen (2004) Regulating Transnational Flows of People: An Institutional Analysis of Passports and Visas as a Regime of Mobility, Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power, 11:3, 351-376.

Waters, Gregory (2017) The promise of local councils: A future for Syrians by Syrians. International Review, 21 November. Accessed at https://international-review.org/promise-local-councils-future-syrians-syrians/

Watt, Nicholas. 2015. "David Cameron visits Lebanese Refugee Camp." Guardian, 14 September. Accessed at https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2015/sep/14/david-cameron-visits-lebanese-refugee-camp. Last accessed 8 April 2017.