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As academics, we write: writing is central to academic practice, and the classic academic product is a written text. But we are writing under pressure. Our writing is constrained by the requirements and genre of the academic monograph and the peer-reviewed journal article; it may face the barriers of natural language in an internationalising profession, while we struggle, too, with ever more complex scientific infra-languages. Simultaneously, we are told to write in ways that both push academic boundaries and are accessible to non-expert readers. These struggles are heightened in the fields of International Relations, politics and political science, where choices of words and formulations are not mere questions of style but related to substantial struggles of power, hierarchy and representation.

Our workshop takes inspiration from James Clifford and George Marcus's *Writing Culture* (University of California Press, 1986), and its title from Michael Shapiro's recent *Writing Politics* (Routledge, 2021). *Writing Culture* raised essentially political questions that political science has still barely acknowledged, which were principally about writing and the right to represent: who might write about whom and on what terms? And to the extent that politics is done in writing - in the world (in parliamentary papers, in briefs, communiques and reports as well as on posters and placards) as well as in research and teaching, too - what politics does our writing do?

These questions have been taken up in other disciplines - including anthropology, STS and management studies - often in the context of ethnographic inquiry, which is currently experiencing a revival particularly in IR. Taking up John von Maanen's (2011, Chicago University Press) identification and categorisation of 'ethnographic tales', for example, how might we craft 'international tales'? What challenges does politics face in constructing narratives which lead us into 'the international'? What relations between writer, subject and reader do we seek to develop? Are we bound by academic precept always to explain, or might we, as George Lukacs (1936) once put it, also narrate?

The workshop takes on these questions to explore how the inscription of the world influences the way we understand, theorise, and relate to it. We ask: What do we know about the *dominant forms of writing politics?* For example, what tensions exist between political science and other forms of political communication and how might they be overcome? And then: how and why might we *write politics differently?* Are we (with Spivak) to represent the unrepresented, or (with Bourdieu) to theorise the tacit, unsaid and unwritten? Must we choose between writing for the academy and writing for the reader? Might we disrupt institutional and political dynamics by writing (them) differently?

*Paper topics and participants*

The invitation to contribute to this workshop is substantively open: we want to appeal to researchers at all career stages working in any area of political science/international studies/International Relations interested in problematising the act and practice of writing, its form and function. We seek contributions of two kinds:

1. critical reflection on *writing as a form of representation*, both in the world and the academy, in political science and in International Relations;

2. any exercise in *writing politics differently*, in attempting to write up political science research in a non-standard form, as narrative nonfiction, in dramatization and dialogue or myriad other ways.