ISA Workshop Report

Norm Antipreneurs: Enhancing Understanding of Resistance to Global Normative Change

25 March 2014

Report dated 6 May 2014

1. Budget

Total Authorised: $5,404

Total Consumables: $3,181

Room Hire etc.: $901

Total Expense: **$4,082**

Savings: $1,322

Name	Comments	Per Diem	Hotel	Claimed
Alan Bloomfield	Co-convener – authorised for 2 nights in hotel	$100	$374	**$474**
Kenki Adachi	Claiming	$50	$187	**$237**
Fiona Adamson	Claiming	$50	$187	**$237**
Clifford Bob	Claiming	$50	$187	**$237**
Oivind Bratburg	Not claiming – home uni paid all costs	$0	$0	**$0**
Malcolm Campbell-Verduyn	Claims per diem only (lives in Toronto)	$50	$0	**$0**
David Capie	Claims per diem only (stayed with friend in Toronto)	$50	$0	**$50**
William Clapton	Claiming	$50	$187	**$237**
Frank Harvey	Claiming	$50	$187	**$237**

Emilian Kavalski	Arrived late, claiming	$50	$187	**$237**
Sung-Young Kim	Withdrew	$0	$0	**$0**
Dan Kuwali	Withdrew	$0	$0	**$0**
Jeffrey Lantis	Claiming	$50	$187	**$237**
Helen Nesadurai	Claiming	$50	$187	**$237**
Shirley Scott	Co-convener – not originally authorised for 2 nights in hotel – but claims 2 nights - workshop under budget, arrived early to prep	$100	$374	**$474**
Elizabeth Thurbon	Withdrew	$0	$0	**$0**
Lijun Zhang	Withdrew	$0	$0	**$0**
Lisbeth Zimmermann	Claiming	$50	$187	**$237**
Total		**$750**	**$2,431**	**$3,181**

2. Description of Workshop

The workshop went very well and the participants asked the conveners to express their thanks to the ISA for making the event possible. Several participants had to drop out well before because they decided to not attend the ISA, and one (Emilian Kavalski) had his flight delayed, although an observer who had read his paper 'stepped in' and took part in the discussions in his stead.

Prior to the workshop all participants produced short papers (8-10 pages) examining resistance to efforts to change norms in an issue-area of their choosing. These included: the responsibility to protect (Bloomfield); climate change security (Scott); weaponisation of space (Lantis); targeted assassination (Bob); regulating palm oil production (Nesadurai); the EU's Good Neighbourhood Policy (Clapton); landmines and medical patents (Adachi); harmonisation of social welfare policies within the EU (Bratberg); resistance to efforts to recognise sharia law in Western states (Adamson); the Asian values debate (Capie); whaling (Zimmermann); military intervention norms (Harvey); and global financial/banking sector norms (Campbell-Verduyn).

All the participants read all the papers (i.e. they were distributed in the weeks before the workshop), but were also asked to pay particular attention to the 2-3 papers produced by others in their 'small group'. In the first session we broke up into these small groups and discussed each other's papers, identifying similarities and differences, and ultimately deciding what each small group should present to the full workshop.

In the second and third sessions the four small groups presented their findings to the whole group for about 15 minutes and then open discussion took place for about 20 minutes (i.e. questions and clarifications). In the final session we spent about 30-40mins in a wide-ranging open discussion, and 30 minutes discussion possibilities for publishing.

A number of issues were covered: what were the most common sorts of *tactics* of resistance? what role did *power* play, in the sense of affecting favoured tactics and/or whether an actor was likely to be an entrepreneur or an anti-preneur? which *sorts of actors* were the most important or successful resisters? what sorts of contexts favoured or undermined resistance?

But a very clear 'axis of difference' soon emerged amongst the group over the very nature of the concept at the heart of the project – the usefulness of the concept of norm-antipreneur/resister – and this dominated much of the discussion. Two clear positions or 'camps' formed:

One cluster of participants – the 'first camp' – felt the anti-preneur concept *was* conceptually and theoretically valid. They felt it was worthwhile maintaining a clear distinction between these actors and the norm entrepreneurs who sought change. This was especially the case when empirical investigation showed that a particular norm in a certain issue-area was very 'strong' and well-entrenched (i.e. long-lasting or institutionalised or codified in law etc.). The 'promoters of change' could be identified easily, making the anti-preneur also easily identifiable as the *defender of the status quo*.

The anti-preneurs are likely to be distinguishable from the entrepreneurs in two ways. First, there is a clear *intentional* difference: one wants change, the other prefers the status quo. Second, the anti-preneurs operate with a mix of distinctive, inherent *tactical* advantages and disadvantages. Regarding advantages, anti-preneurs can utilise 'blocking' and procedural delays in established institutions, or engage in deliberate 'sowing of confusion' and/or scaremongering about the potential dangers of change (i.e. playing the 'uncertainty card), tactics which are typically less available to entrepreneurs trying to overturn the status quo. But anti-preneurs may also face public-relations disadvantages, being vulnerable to allegations of 'unenlightened selfishness' and/or 'backwardness'.

Supporters of the distinction felt empirical analysis may show that if the anti-preneurs/resisters lost, then a new norm would become the status quo. Crucially, if the defeated anti-preneurs 'continued the fight' then they would (conceptually-speaking)

become norm entrepreneurs, and empirical analysis would make this clear. But this led to disagreement among the participants: the other or 'second camp' noted that over longer periods, if the actors switched sides or labels several times, then what was the point of maintaining the distinction? 'Today's anti-preneur may become tomorrow's entrepreneur, and then an anti-preneur again next week' summed up their unease.

This sort of logic led the second camp of participants to question whether there really was a clear distinction when it came to available *tactics*: they argued that both sides did not typically differ in the ways they went about promoting their favoured norm. In particular, it was argued that both sides typically engaged in both positive and negative *tactics*: they both tried to persuade others that their favoured norm should be preferred by reference to 'wider' or 'higher' moral precepts or norms (i.e. 'grafting'); they both built coalitions of various types of actors (and tried to suborn members of the other's coalition); they both slurred each other; they both forum shopped (or 'forum-created') etc.

Finally, the second camp felt that in certain circumstances it may not be clear exactly how strong the 'norm being defended' was (i.e. it may not be strongly institutionalised or codified). So, they felt it may be empirically unclear who was seeking change and who was resisting. This was especially the case when some actors who started out as anti-preneurs may become 'creative resisters' by proposing new 'counter-norms' (albeit similar to the old norms which had been the status quo). This sort of behaviour may suggest it would be better to consider 'both sides' as, essentially, *rival norm entrepreneurs*.

Those familiar with academic debates will recognise the value of 'agreeing to disagree': it provides a clear debate and clear 'positions' to argue for and against. The most pleasing aspect of the workshop was the manner in which a great deal of *clarity* was achieved about what the central axis of difference was, and its contours or aspects etc.

Future Publishing

Most of the participants expressed interest in pursuing collaborative projects. Alan Bloomfield and Shirley Scott, the conveners, have begun exploring three options:

> 1. Journal Special Edition: several journals have expressed preliminary interest: *Ethics and International Affairs*, *International Interactions*, *Cambridge Review of International Studies*; and *The International Journal* (likely in that order of preference). If a proposal is accepted by one the conveners would write an introductory paper together outlining the central axis of difference identified at the workshop (see above), and the remaining 5 or 6 papers from workshop participants would explore resistance in different issue areas. The authors/cases would be chosen in order to ensure both sides of the primary debate (see above) were explored. The papers would be written in 2014 for publication in 2015.

2. Panel at Global International Studies Conference: several participants will present papers on a related topic – the interface or interaction between international norms and international law – j in Frankfurt later in 2014.

3. ISA 2015 Panel: the convenors would propose a panel at the next ISA to explore this research agenda further and 'maintain momentum'.

4. Edited Books: the convenors will explore a book contract in 2015. The book may go further than just examining resistance and may instead explore the entire norm 'life cycle'. The case-study chapters, considering norm dynamics in different issue areas, would be book-ended by long, theoretically sophisticated introductory and concluding chapters. The chapters would be written in 2015 for publication in 2016.

More generally the opportunity to meet other scholars with similar interests has allowed us all to establish professional relationships that we hope will lead to further collaborations in other research areas in the future.

Alan Bloomfield and Shirley Scott