Pre-publication version. Please do not cite.

1. Introduction

Learning Objectives

- Discuss the rationale for everyday International Political Economy (IPE)
- Identify the lineages of everyday IPE that draw from different theoretical traditions
- Describe the I-PEEL approach and its implications for learning about and doing IPE

Reader's Guide

This introductory chapter will set the scene for the remainder of the book. It first defines what we mean by an everyday approach to International Political Economy (1.1) and then outlines some of its historical lineages, showing both its theoretical pluralism and analytical potential (1.2). The chapter ends by setting out how to use the I-PEEL book and showing how it relates to more conventional textbook approaches (1.3). Its aim is to show the connections that exist between the everyday and the international, and to licence your own everyday experiences as a basis for learning about and doing IPE.

<<insert video clip from author discussion – Listen to James discuss what everyday IPE means to him and how that informs the textbook>>

1.1 International Political Economy of Everyday Life

We are often told that our lives are bound by the fate of the international economy, by movements in world markets, or by the crises of global capitalism. But what does this mean for how we live our life? How did these situations come about? And what are the possibilities for changing them? Insights into these questions can be found across a range of academic fields. One of these is International Political Economy (IPE). A central concern of IPE has been the inter-relationship of wealth and power across state borders. In this textbook we want to show how you can use the analytical tools of IPE to interpret and question the world around you. Our approach is to start off with something familiar – the apps on your phone, how you dress, that gourmet cheeseburger you've started ordering – and to 'peel back' the layers of this object or practice to reveal some of the political and economic processes at work. We call this the I-PEEL approach and want to invest it with a double-meaning. First, as an acronym of the book title: the International Political Economy of Everyday Life. Second, as a way of putting the 'I' into the study of IPE, licensing the use of *your* everyday in the study of what might otherwise appear as distant and disconnected topics.

The origin of the I-PEEL textbook lies in the growing attention that scholars in IPE have paid to the everyday from the 2000s onwards (Aitken 2007; Best and Paterson 2010; Davies 2006; Elias and Rethel 2016; Hobson and Seabrooke 2007). A core proposition of this literature is that research in IPE has tended to focus on elite actors like heads of state, abstract structures like global governance, and dramatic moments of high politics like financial crises. As a result, this so-called systemic or regulatory IPE has had less to say about the constitution, legitimation, and contestation of economic activity from below. What 'the everyday' has signalled in this context, then, is a commitment to studying the people, practices and places normally considered as politically *inconsequential* to the global economy. Be it through the agency of non-elites, the role of popular culture, the sites of routine behaviour, or the stuff of mass consumption everyday IPE has sought to show that the economy doesn't just exist 'out there' but is continually remade in, and through, our daily lives.

On the one hand, IPE scholarship has shown how financial institutions and states have encouraged people to take responsibility for their own futures via personal debt, savings, insurance, and investment

products often with highly iniquitous results (Aitken 2013; Harmes 2001; Langley 2008; Montgomerie 2020; Rethel 2010). As these same moral imperatives and calculative technologies seep into other economic areas, neoliberal capitalism can almost seem to be colonising everyday life, extending competitive individualism into every facet of our daily existence. Yet on the other hand, the everyday is also figured as a zone where people adapt and respond to the forces acting upon them, where they show proactive agency alongside passive acceptance. Research in this vein has shown how everyday actions can manifest a struggle to value life differently to the prevailing economic system, and how these and other small-scale actions, intentionally or not, can cohere into powerful undercurrents that transform the global economy (Adebanwi 2018; Hobson and Seabrooke 2007). These two emphases of the everyday – one that points to the routine conformity of daily life and one that reveals acts of contravention and change – can be viewed as a productive tension of this approach, and one which animates the chapters to follow.

1.1.1 What Do You Study in Everyday IPE?

The simple answer to this question is: almost anything! In questioning the excessive focus on elites, everyday IPE has also problematized the necessity of organising the field around the institutions and issue-areas with which those elites were associated. Whilst not denying the importance of the US Secretary of the Treasury and the hegemony of the dollar in international monetary policy, or negotiations at the World Trade Organization to economic protectionism, everyday IPE insists on the merit of embracing ordinary social practices and the unanticipated research questions they throw up. Some examples from the literature include studying financial crisis through home ownership (Seabrooke 2010), global justice via ethical consumption (Watson 2006), mutual aid via bingo playing (Bedford 2019), climate change via recycling (Acuto 2014), and political resistance via #MeToo (Griffin 2019).

This pluralism also extends to research on popular culture. For instance, some of our own work has looked at Hollywood films about Wall Street and their portrayal of masculinity among the lead characters (who are all men). By exploring what this says to audiences about how men ought to conduct themselves as financial traders and where women belong in this world, this scholarship aims to show how fictional popular culture can still have real-world repercussions (Brassett and Heine 2021; Brassett and Rethel 2015). Other research in this vein has stressed how cultural productions and artefacts, from TV soap operas to jewellery, can all be encoded with international political messages about the economy (Brassett 2021; Hamilton 2022; Innes and Topinka 2017).

Take the famous children's books on Paddington Bear. These have been read by Kyle Grayson as a liberal account of why migrants ought to be accepted into English society and what they are expected to do in return. For him then, they provide an everyday space in which the politics of immigration are raised in common vernacular terms, as well as a subversive image to adorn placards at various protests against the mistreatment of migrants, which as shown in photo 1.1, have readily traversed national borders (Grayson 2013). In this way, research on popular culture can also challenge us to think about *where* global politics happens, moving from the 'corridors of power' in government buildings and corporate headquarters to the places where everyday life is inhabited – the home, the classroom, the shop, the street.

<Insert Photo 1.1>
<caption> Photo 1.1: A protest in 2018 by activists and refugees against the opening of a migrant deportation centre in Darmstadt, Germany (Pacific Press Media Production Corp. / Alamy Stock Photo). </caption>

1.1.2 Who Do You Study in Everyday IPE?

A further contribution of the everyday turn in IPE has been to broaden the range of actors considered worthy of study. Actors in this sense refers to participants in a process, and everyday IPE has been

particularly keen to recognize the diverse groups of people who (re)produce the global economy. This has often involved interrogating the intellectual boundary separating the economic sphere from the non-economic sphere, which has tended to include certain subjects like 'consumers' and 'financiers' as appropriate for IPE analysis but excluded others such as 'mothers' and 'housewives' on the presumption that these roles are largely irrelevant to the creation and distribution of wealth. This is something that feminist scholarship has challenged, foregrounding structures of **patriarchy** to highlight the often-invisible role of women in managing households, raising children, sustaining communities and more besides (see Elias and Rai 2019; Enloe 1989; Peterson 2003).

One of the rallying calls of feminism has been 'the personal is political' – a slogan intended to reposition the issues that women faced as societal problems requiring collective political action, rather than individual problems requiring therapeutic intervention or behaviour change (Hanisch 1969). This call has also reverberated through everyday IPE. Issues like street harassment have thus been rendered as both political and economic, preventing women from travelling to work and profiting those companies that trade on the supposed fun to be had from forcing unwanted comments and gestures on strangers (True 2012). Following Cynthia Enloe's pioneering intervention (1989), scholarship in this vein has also made the case that 'the personal is international', again asking us to reconsider where global politics happens. Making the invisible visible in this way carries ethical implications too. If it is only ever the rich and powerful that are studied, there is a risk of naturalising this hierarchy and reinforcing the positions and views of those at the top of it. Studying overlooked actors and marginalized groups thus makes an important statement about *whose* lives matter in IPE.

How might this approach play out analytically in political economy studies? Let's consider the response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Of course, there is much to learn from looking at the decisions of state leaders to furlough workers, lend to businesses and take control of critical economic sectors. But this is far from the whole picture. Providing a different optic, everyday IPE might instead draw our attention to the key workers required to maintain essential services during lockdowns, the daily pressures and risks they faced in doing their jobs, and in the UK at least, the disproportionate number that were working class, women, and ethnic minorities. It might also illuminate the uneven impacts of pandemic policy within households as huge amounts of care work were reorganized following the diversion of healthcare services and closure of schools, or the new forms of digital surveillance made possible through the seamless integration of smart phones into people's daily lives (see Campbell-Verduyn 2021; Mezzadri et al. 2021). In short, everyday IPE asks us to think differently about how and *with whom* we address our topics.

<Insert Photo 1.2>
<caption> Photo 1.2: A street mural in Southend, England. During the pandemic the UK government designated certain employees as 'key workers' and expected them to work outside the home throughout lockdowns (Avpics / Alamy Stock Photo). </caption>

1.2 Lineages of the Everyday in International Political Economy

In this section we expand on the disciplinary and theoretical basis of everyday IPE. We begin with two stories that are told about the history of IPE more broadly, which provide the context for understanding how our approach in this textbook relates to the wider field. In the first story, IPE emerged as an offshoot of International Relations in the 1970s as scholars based largely in the discipline of Political Science and located in North America responded to the economic convulsions in the US-centred world order. The explanations they provided were located into three theoretical perspectives: Economic Nationalism, Liberalism, and Marxism (Gilpin 1987; Cohen 2007). In brief, approaches based on Economic Nationalism emphasized the role of the state and drew attention to the importance of international rivalries and the constant threat of conflict in shaping interactions. Approaches based on Liberalism emphasized the role of firms and international organizations alongside states, and drew attention to the importance of market exchange and the possibilities for mutual gains between national economies. Finally approaches based on Marxism, which were firmly at the margins of debate, emphasized the role

of classes, drawing attention to the labour exploitation that cut across national borders and how this inequality might be challenged. This tripartite framework still influences how IPE is taught with many textbooks using it to introduce readers to the field, albeit it with some variations such as referring to Realism instead of Economic Nationalism, or replacing Marxism with critical theories to cover other perspectives from outside the mainstream (see O'Brien and Williams 2020; Oatley 2019).

In the second story of IPE, the field is traced back through the older tradition of Political Economy, typically dated to eighteenth century Britain and the attempts to comprehend the birth of commercial society or what is now called capitalism (Gamble 1995; Watson 2005b). In this longer history, many of the intellectual sources of contemporary IPE come from 'pre-disciplinary' scholarship produced prior to the creation of disciplines in the Social Sciences and Humanities; a categorization which was premised on establishing academic boundaries between the study of Politics, Economics, History, and so on (Jessop and Sum 2005). For those seeking a more fluid or holistic approach to IPE, this reading of the field was thus more accommodating, allowing for the infusion of ideas from areas like Economic Anthropology, Heterodox Economics, and International Political Sociology to name just a few (see Graz et al. 2019).

Another feature of this reading is that it positions **critical theory** as central rather than residual to IPE. As argued by Robert Cox (1981, 129), one of the protagonists of this second story, critical theory 'stands apart from the prevailing order of the world and asks how that order came about'. He contrasted this to the problem-solving theory of mainstream Liberal and Realist IPE, which instead takes the world as it finds it, attempting to make its prevailing power relationships and institutional arrangements work more smoothly by dealing with particular sources of trouble. For Cox, this theoretical division was also ideological. Whereas critical theory allowed for a normative choice in favour of alternative social and political orders, containing a streak of utopianism to show what this might look like and how to get there, problem-solving theory was ultimately conservative, implicitly aligned with the national, sectional, or class interests comfortable in the current system (Cox 1981). For those wanting an IPE that allowed them to challenge established hierarchies, this history of the field was appealing in that it both foregrounded critical theory and gave it scholarly validity. Indeed, this critical impulse has meant that the second story of IPE has not stood still. Recent historiography has addressed the Eurocentric foundations of Political Economy, calling *out* its reliance on the worldviews of white European scholars and calling *for* greater recognition of non-Western thought (Hobson 2013; Helleiner 2015).

In this textbook we build on this second story to present and promote IPE as a critical interdisciplinary field. We do this for several reasons. First, to encourage you to question the world around you and challenge the unjust hierarchies and inequalities in which you are enmeshed. Second, to highlight the diversity of contemporary scholarship that either describes itself as IPE or could otherwise inform it; a key element of which involves looking beyond both North America and Western Europe to make this a much more global conversation (see Blyth 2009; Tussie and Chagas-Bastos 2022; Vivares 2020). Third, we do this to help ensure that the field of IPE keeps moving forward, renewing itself to offer new insights on urgent issues. Based on these convictions, we now outline a set of conceptual insights for thinking about everyday IPE in the chapters ahead, drawn from a range of theoretical traditions. These are not the only traditions that could be used but are the ones that we are most familiar with. For this reason, we see this not as a fixed framework for analysis but something more akin to a family tree, with lineages that reach back to various people, and which evolves with every new generation.

1.2.1 Liberal, Economic Nationalist, and Marxist Lineages

We start with Adam Smith, the best-known scholar of early commercial society, and his notion of the **market**. In many accounts of IPE, Smith is written in as the forefather of the Liberal approach on the basis of his idea that the 'invisible hand' of the market could direct economic tasks to where they could be done most efficiently, both within and between countries, thereby enhancing 'the wealth of nations' (taken from the title of his 1776 book). As Matthew Watson has argued, this reading of Smith is largely mistaken. Smith did not conceptualize 'the market' as an impersonal system of allocation based on

abstract laws of supply and demand, but as a real-world space which depended on the willingness of buyers and sellers to exchange in a sympathetic manner, imagining themselves on the other side of transaction so that they could negotiate a morally acceptable market price. In this sense, market relations were not imposed on society from above but had to be enacted by individuals in everyday life (Watson 2005b). Moreover, whilst it is true that Smith recognized the potential for market exchange and the division of labour to increase economic productivity, he also saw the pursuit of increased wealth as a potential source of moral corruption. In warning his readers about the dangers of vanity and profligacy, Smith sought to raise their self-awareness and asked them to 'look inwards to themselves rather than outwards to the state' to bring about societal progress; a political technique which can also be seen in everyday IPE scholarship (Watson 2013, 22; Glaze and Richardson 2017).

As with Liberalism, tracing the lineages of everyday IPE in Economic Nationalist thought involves rethinking what key thinkers stood for. One such thinker in this tradition is Friedrich List, author of the 1844 book *The National System of Political Economy*. It is in revisiting this book that the IPE scholar Eric Helleiner challenges the idea that Economic Nationalism should be understood as state-centric Realist IPE. For him, this missed the distinction that List drew between the state and the nation. Policies like protecting infant industries through trade tariffs or monopolizing the printing of currency in a central bank were advocated not to strengthen the state apparatus but to serve the nation as a community (Helleiner 2002; Helleiner 2021). Viewed in this way Economic Nationalism revealed itself not just as a governing strategy of elites but also as an everyday practice, witnessed in populist campaigns to buy 'homemade' produce rather than foreign imports or in the use of banknotes to circulate images of heroic figures that symbolise national identity. These daily reminders of nationhood, dubbed 'banal nationalism' (Billig 1995), are still with us now, explored in contemporary IPE scholarship looking at the reproduction of imagined national spaces in ubiquitous statistics like GDP to the mobilization of patriotism in corporate marketing strategies that link certain brands to national identity (see Fetzer 2020; and 6.1.1 on place branding).

Despite Smith's qualifications and List's nationalist alternative, the nascent field of Political Economy was taken up in such a way as to defend, even naturalize, the very commercial society that it sought to explain. For Karl Marx, another scholar still widely cited in IPE, this naturalization merely served the interests of the bourgeoisie. The capitalist class that owned the means of production and systematically benefitted from the spread of market exchange, hence why his famous 1867 treatise *Capital* had the sub-title: *A Critique of Political Economy*. One of the most potent elements of capitalism was the way that the proletariat – the class of workers who relied solely on their labour-power to make a living – had been distracted from, or even accepting of, their fundamental exploitation.

An important expression of this is what Marx called **commodity fetishism**. This refers to an understanding of the economy based on market relationships between commodities rather than social relationships between people, which was made possible by the increasing alienation of workers from the product of their work. Because of this fetish it was increasingly difficult to see that the proletariat were being impoverished not because they happened to work in an unprofitable company or lacked the talent to earn a higher wage, but because they occupied a subordinate place in the hierarchy of capitalism. As such, the everyday experience of life in capitalist society was 'both real and unreal, both actuality and the disguise of actuality' (Highmore 2002, 6). One way this idea has been explored in the contemporary global economy is in relation to Fair Trade products, which are typically priced above the market average so that extra money can be passed on to the farmers and workers at the other end of the supply chain. Scholars have asked whether this *de*-fetishizes commodities by enabling consumers to imagine the social relationships implicated in their purchase, or merely allows the corporations controlling food and drink industries to internalize the feeling of 'doing good' within their business model (Fridell 2007; Lyon 2006; see 2.3.2 on the moral economy of food).

<Insert Photo 1.3>
<caption> Photo 1.3: Fairtrade certified coffee makes its moral appeal to the shopper, purporting to show them the person behind the product (René van den Berg / Alamy Stock Photo). </caption>

Questions about the ideological legitimation of capitalism were taken forward by Antonio Gramsci in the 1930s through his notion of **common sense**. Common sense referred to the everyday reality of popular opinion; a collective, if contradictory, set of ideas which Gramsci thought progressive intellectuals had to engage if they were to give their redistributive political agendas the necessary emotional force. This has since been used as a conceptual device in IPE to show how support for the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was built by the business community and its right-wing advocates in the early 1990s. Rather than refer to quantitative economic arguments about jobs growth and so on, NAFTA was depicted in the popular media as a means of unleashing entrepreneurialism and extending economic liberty; values that its advocates knew would readily appeal to the American public steeped in the discourse of liberal capitalism (Rupert 1995). Other scholarship has shown how the American common sense has also been engaged to *challenge* the prevailing class hierarchy. In the Occupy Wall Street movement the rallying cry of 'We are the 99%' put questions of economic inequality front and centre by distilling people's personal experiences of diminishing upward mobility and falling real wages into a pithy soundbite (Crehan 2016). In this lineage, everyday IPE can illuminate the ideological battleground on which class relations are played out, showing how people can be made to conform but also contest the *status quo* (see 7.2.1 on regulating social media).

The phrase **everyday life** is particularly associated with Henri Lefebvre, who conceptualized the 'everyday' not as what people *do* on a day-to-day basis but *how* activities are subordinated to the imperatives of capitalism and become routine, ordinary, quotidian. Everyday life, then, was not something that had always existed but was a historically produced domain where the dominated sphere of the everyday met the un-dominated sphere of daily life (Kipfer 2008, 199). Writing in the context of mid-twentieth century France, he used a study of *Elle* magazine to argue, not without problem, that everyday life was especially pronounced among women. For him, the pages of this lifestyle magazine revealed how women had become subject to the organized passivity brought on by consumer advertising, modern home appliances and the like (Elden 2004, 117). Everyday life therefore appeared to Lefebvre as a residue; the life left over once all 'distinct, superior, specialized, structured activities have been singled out' (Lefebvre 1991 [1947], 97). There are clear resonances here with the critical theory of the Frankfurt School scholars, who during the same period were taking aim at the 'culture industry' in Western capitalism for stifling individuality and generating false needs that got people to buy – quite literally – into the political and economic system (see Adorno 1991).

Lefebvre also saw capitalism as an evolving spatial construct, and this led him to consider the production of everyday life as an ongoing process of colonialism, organising and segregating people into certain ways of living. The location of migrant labour from France's former colonies into 'ethnic enclaves' in its major cities was, for him, a way in which European colonization has evolved an internal dimension (Davies 2016, 34). This argument echoes in contemporary studies on gentrification, which look at how inner-city areas are made into 'respectable' real-estate through the creation of pacified consumer spaces that attract higher-paying and often racially privileged residents (Smith 2002). This is one way that an analysis of race relations can be brought into the IPE of everyday life (see 6.2.3 on the race-making practices of urban governance).

<Insert Photo 1.4>
<caption> Photo 1.4: Bo-Kaap in Cape Town, South Africa, was originally known as the Malay Quarter due to the arrival of slaves from southeast Asia. Now a popular tourist destination it has become characterized by rising property rates that many long-standing residents can no longer afford (ilyas Ayub / Alamy Stock Photo). </caption>

1.2.2 Feminist, Black, and Post-Structural Lineages

We now turn to the lineages of everyday IPE rooted in theoretical approaches located outside the tripartite framework set up in the 1970s. One such approach is feminism, which took up a different set of questions to those asked by men like Smith, Marx, Gramsci, Lefebvre, and List. As mentioned above, a longstanding concern for feminists has been the way that certain tasks get bracketed out from the

formal economy and the public sphere of political debate; tasks like cooking and cleaning, which are predominantly carried out by women and girls within the home and without pay in a *gender*-based division of labour. **Social reproduction** was the academic term coined in the 1980s to recognize the day-to-day work involved in bearing children, maintaining households and caring for others *as* work. And not just any work, but work that was vital in ensuring that people and communities could survive, and that capitalism could carry on despite its intrinsic reluctance to internalize costs like nurturing a healthy labour force (Vogel 1983).

For many feminist scholars then, social reproduction *is* everyday life (Katz, 2001; Elias and Rai 2019; see 5.1.1). Intertwining with the Marxist tradition described above, they have sought to denaturalize the gendered division of labour and show how it has been socially constructed. Arguing against biological determinism and the supposition that because women give birth, they should also take on the burden of raising a family and running a household, some feminists have argued that capitalism is necessarily committed to sexism and heteronormativity. For Silvia Federici (2004) this involved a continual process of differentiation within society that ordered some groups of people and their labour-power as more valuable than others. Not only has this legitimized the exploitation of those at the bottom of the hierarchy; it also incentivized those at the top to align themselves with policies that preserved it. Federici's 1975 pamphlet *Wages for Housework* was an attempt to transform the subject of the 'housewife' into a revolutionary figure and the text printed on the book's front cover still reads forcefully today:

> They say it is love. We say it is unwaged work.
> They call it frigidity. We call it absenteeism.
> Every miscarriage is a work accident.
> Homosexuality and heterosexuality are both working conditions…but homosexuality is workers' control of production, not the end of work.
> More smiles? More money. Nothing will be so powerful in destroying the healing virtues of a smile.
> Neuroses, suicides, desexualization: occupational diseases of the housewife.
> (Federici 1975, 1)

More recent scholarship has made clear that the household is not a static place and that, in fact, waged labour has penetrated the domestic sphere, though not in the way Federici envisioned. Studies of the 'maid trade' have traced the increased commodification and trans-nationalization of the household through the role of ethnic minority women working as live-in servants or nannies for households in more affluent areas and countries (Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2003; Elias and Gunawardana 2013; LeBaron 2010). Taking particular groups of people like domestic workers as starting point for analysis resonates with what Cynthia Enloe dubbed **feminist sense**. Different to Gramsci's common sense, this was a methodological call to investigate the international by following diverse women and their 'complex everyday realities' to the places usually dismissed by foreign affairs experts as merely 'private', 'domestic', 'local' or 'trivial' (Enloe 1989, 336).

Echoing Enloe's examples in her book, recent IPE studies have considered the lived realities of Argentine sex workers, Nepalese private security contractors and Canadian call centre workers to name just a few (see Elias and Roberts 2016). Such accounts show how macroscopic global dynamics like foreign investment or mass migration are not disembodied abstract processes but are lived out through gendered social relations. For instance, the growth in international trade in the late twentieth century cannot be understood without appreciating the feminization of the labour force in the major export processing zones – or sweatshops – of Asia and Latin America. This mass mobilization of young rural women into waged work in assembly line production depended both on social renegotiations over where women 'belonged' and a re-composition of patriarchal norms from the family home into the workplace (Elson and Pearson 1981; see 2.2.1 on low wage labour in the clothing industry).

Studies of women's everyday lived experiences of globalization have also shown how much economic activity remains *outside* the capitalist sphere of market transactions, wage labour, and profit-oriented

companies. This is an important critical insight. Recognising the continued existence or even reappearance of practices like barter exchange and self-employment can serve to 'dislocate the naturalized dominance of the capitalist economy and make a space for new economic becomings' (Gibson-Graham 2006, xii). On this view, the varied experiences revealed through a focus on the everyday is not just a litany of overlooked and unjust situations, but a place in which to identify alternative (local) forms of economy and take (global) inspiration.

Extending Enloe's notion of feminist sense into considerations of racialized social relations, Patricia Hill Collins has advocated for a theory of knowledge called 'standpoint epistemology' in which systematically disadvantaged groups are figured with an intimate understanding of the factors producing those conditions. Writing in the tradition of Black Political Economy, her illustrative example of standpoint epistemology was the way that African American women had developed the concept of **intersectionality** to understand how 'gender, sexuality, race, class and nation…mutually construct one another' as systems of oppression experienced in their everyday lives (Collins 2000a, 47; see also Peterson 2003 who similarly writes about the intersection of structural hierarchies).

Drawing on this concept, Collins provides an intersectional analysis of the family to help explain the persistence of racial inequality in the US. This was traced to the perpetuation of 'white families' and 'black families' in society due to the powerful cultural norm of heterosexual intra-racial marriage. This in turn enabled the inter-generational transmission of racialized inequality as parents passed on their accumulated wealth in the form educational fees, property inheritance and social connections (Collins 2000b, 277-288). In terms of everyday IPE then, this encourages us to view the interpersonal experiences of daily life as a domain of power relations in which systems of oppression can be recognized and resisted (see Collins 1993). Incidents of racism, sexism, homophobia, and xenophobia that might otherwise be dismissed as trivial are instead cast as critical openings. Take the racial microaggressions disclosed by the students in photo 1.5. This term refers to the commonplace messages that communicate hostile, derogatory or negative racial slights and insults toward people of colour (Sue et al. 2007). What might these tell us about the socio-economic advantages of whiteness in schools, universities and workplaces? And is naming and shaming them as 'microaggressions' an important move towards racial equality?

<Insert Photo 1.5>
<caption> Photo 1.5: Portraits from the *Racial Microaggressions* project by Kiyun Kim at Fordham University, New York (Kiyun Kim). </caption>

Finally, from IPE scholarship that has engaged with post-structural theory we get a more diffuse account of power. For Michel Foucault, it was not as simple as saying power is used by this person or that group to dominate and oppress others. Rather we need to think about how subjects are both produced by and operate within a field of power relations. To illustrate this point, Foucault considered Jeremy Bentham's design for a prison, called the Panopticon. A central viewing tower would allow a single guard to see all prison cells, however, due to the height and angles of the design, prisoners could not know for sure if they were being watched. The idea was that inmates would behave in accordance with the rules on the assumption that they *could* be under surveillance. As Foucault (1977, 202) put it: 'He who is subjected to a field of visibility, and who knows it, assumes responsibility for the constraints of power; he makes them play spontaneously upon himself; he inscribes in himself the power relation in which he simultaneously plays both roles; he becomes the principle of his own subjection'.

The idea that systems of power rely on **subjectivity** is a useful proposition for thinking about a range of seemingly mundane areas of market life. For example, IPE scholars have associated this kind of power with such technical market devices as credit ratings, or normative agendas to educate school children in 'financial literacy' (Clarke 2015; Gill 1995). In this way they explore how people work on themselves to behave in accordance with market discipline and become a certain kind of person. For example, and drawing directly on the Panopticon analogy, the assumption that credit reference agencies might be recording information about you encourages adherence to 'good' credit-worthy behaviour lest you be denied a loan later in life. Importantly, though, this is not seen as something imposed from above

by the market or the state, but repeatedly acted out or 'performed' through particular roles. Everyday IPE research on the expansion of home ownership and private pensions in the UK and US, for instance, argued that this went together with the evolution of the 'market subject' (Aitken 2007; Langley 2008). As people came to see themselves as mortgagors or investors, they also began to act as individuals with a duty to make informed financial decisions and an entitlement to reap any rewards that flow from these, even if the payoffs owed more to structural factors and sheer good luck than any individual merit. Conceived in this way, market subjectivities not only shape people's way of life but provide the kind of person able *and willing* to engage in the continual reproduction of market exchange (see 8.1.1 on the marketization of everyday life).

This idea also complicates binary notions of power and resistance, which position power *against* resistance. For if governance of the global economy happens through the everyday practices of subjects, then aren't those same subjects implicated in its inequalities and injustices? How can they resist what they themselves engender? (Amoore 2006, 261). This attention to subjectivity can help us to think about all manner of issue areas pertinent to IPE: not just as scholars writing about the world, but, more uncomfortably, as complicit subjects existing within it. How do we/you present ourselves as good citizens, and does this also make for bad citizens? What do we/you want our purchases to say about us, and what does this mean for others?

<Insert Photo 1.6>
<caption> Photo 1.6: Does it matter what it tastes like if it looks good to your followers? Performances of the self on social media can create social expectations for certain lifestyle choices that have far-reaching political and economic effects (insta_photos / Alamy Stock Photo). </caption>

1.3 Learning with I-PEEL

The previous section identified several lineages for thinking about everyday IPE. Our intention here was to highlight the diverse conceptual resources on which this approach can draw and thereby encourage a theoretically pluralist **pedagogy**. This is not to say that fundamental differences in how alternative theoretical schools see and study the world can be disregarded. It is also one reason why we did not attempt to synthesize the different lineages of everyday IPE into a single unified framework. What we suggest instead is that productive conversations can be had between theoretical traditions and that this dialogue may be easier to conduct in the conceptual realm and in regard to familiar real-world phenomenon. In this final section, we outline how we do this in the textbook, through what we are calling the I-PEEL approach.

But first, this is a good moment to level with you about who 'we' are. Embracing an everyday politics requires a certain amount of reflection upon knowledge production itself and the extent to which it can be universalized and applied to all people in all places. To that end, we think it is important to openly acknowledge our own positionality. We all research and teach in relatively secure jobs at a UK university, we were born in the 1970s-80s, we all identify (and are identified) as white, and we work primarily in English. There's some privilege there, right? By reminding ourselves of this throughout the writing process, we hope to have made the book as inclusive and reflexive as possible. For example, recognising a persistent male bias in academic citation practices, one thing that we committed to as authors was to ensure that we thought about the gender balance of whose work we cite and engage with. But, of course, we cannot escape our own histories and nor can we put ourselves outside power relations. So in the examples we provide and the ideas we prioritize in the book, try to remember that these come from a particular context, and if there are topics or scholars that appear to be excluded, please don't assume it's because they don't belong in IPE. Indeed, they might offer a perspective that the field has been waiting for.

To this end, one of the main attractions of everyday IPE for us as teachers is the way it can transform the experiential knowledge that students already possess into academic scholarship. For instance, it is likely that you are well-versed in a politics of the everyday through social media usage. Celebrity

culture, memes, and Twitter storms now provide a ready flow of critical, reflective, and resistant ideas that constitute a significant part of contemporary political engagement (Dean 2019). This is one reason why we have a chapter on Social Media in the book: to demonstrate that seemingly irrelevant actors like 'fitness influencers' can be connected to fundamental questions about wealth and power. In what follows, then, we will try to license your everyday as a basis for learning. We hope this provides an intelligible and meaningful engagement with the IPE literature whatever your background, and, furthermore, gives you the sense that you are not just a passive recipient of this scholarship but a researcher-in-training, capable of making your own contributions to the field.

1.3.1 How Do I Use This Book?

Before we wrote this textbook, we designed a website. This was our first step in using the lens of 'everyday life' to help students learn about IPE and contains the essence of the approach we adopt here. The website is also called the International Political Economy of Everyday Life and can be accessed at I-PEEL.org. The central pedagogical device of the website was to use everyday objects or practices as a route into the subject matter of IPE. Each entry on the website – what we called a 'tile' – was written by a different scholar in the field and was randomly shuffled on the homepage so that each time someone visited the website, they were encouraged to peel back a different tile and embark on another learning journey. In doing this, we wanted to disrupt the sequential ordering of conventional IPE textbooks, which inevitably imply that the topics dealt with first are more important than those dealt with last, or not at all.

In this textbook, then, we want to stress that the objects and practices we have chosen as organizing themes for the chapters are meant to be heuristic rather than definitive. We use them to capture your interest and demonstrate the insights (and occasional blind spots) of IPE, not to define what should and should not be studied. We put Clothes, Food, and Debt first as these most clearly resonate with the core subject matter of IPE and offer intuitive starting points for an everyday approach. The next two chapters encourage critical engagement with the conventional 'states and markets' approach to IPE. Care looks at a form of economic activity that exists largely outside markets, while City shows that the nation-state is not always the best unit of analysis for understanding changes in state power and capital accumulation. We end with Social Media, Share, and Humour to demonstrate where the I-PEEL approach can take you once you are familiar with it. These are not topics usually covered in IPE but struck us as excellent entry-points for discussing the importance of online technologies in reshaping global capitalism and our experiences with(in) it. Despite this loose ordering, the chapters are largely self-contained and can be read out of sequence if needed, allowing them to be consulted alongside other textbooks and key readings that you might be assigned. Table 1.1 indicates some of the connection points between the topics typically covered in IPE courses and the material in the I-PEEL textbook, which if not read in its entirety, could also be used as a starting point or supplement.

Topic	I-PEEL content (and section)
Trade	Clothes trade (2.1), cocoa exports (3.1)
Finance	Student debt (4.1), Islamic finance (4.2.4)
Investment	Place branding (6.1.1), ownership in the sharing economy (8.2.2)
Production	low-wage manufacturing (2.2.1), prosumers (7.1.3),
Globalization	Global care chains (5.2.2), global cities (6.2.1)
Corporations	Surveillance capitalism (7.2.2), corporate social responsibility (2.2.2)
States	Austerity and the welfare state (5.2.1), state rescaling (6.2.2)
Global governance	Dietary governance (2.2.2), debt cancellation (4.3.2)
Civil society	Alternative economies (8.2.3), satire of Western NGOs (9.2.2)
Gender	Social reproduction (5.1.1), heteronormativity (5.1.3)
Development	'Slum' housing (6.2.3), humour and foreign aid (9.2.1)
Environment	Disposal of clothes waste (2.3.2), unsustainable farming (3.2.3)

Table 1.1: Conventional IPE topics and I-PEEL content

Each of the chapters follows the same structure. First is a tile that takes a familiar manifestation of the chapter title to show how it can be understood from an everyday IPE perspective. This section also introduces the chapter's three key concepts. Second is a section that broadens the discussion beyond that specific example and uses the key concepts to analyse a set of IPE questions. We call this section 'Exploring' since we want to convey that these are open-ended investigations: there are other questions to be asked and certainly many different answers that can be given. Third and finally are a pair of learning activities. Some of these activities are time-consuming and work best in groups. For this reason, you may only want to do these if they are assigned as part of a course you are taking. However, we would still encourage you to read about each activity since they will provide you with relevant methodological guidance on how to do everyday IPE, such as where to find data, how to apply concepts, and what kind of questions to ask in your enquiry. This section is called 'Engaging' as it is designed to translate your experiential knowledge into the language of IPE, and in the ethos of critical theory, enable you to recognize *yourself* as a political subject (see also Katz-Rosene et al. 2021).

Chapter	Tile		Exploring	Engaging
	Object or practice	Concepts	Analysis	Learning activities
Clothes	Fast fashion	Fast fashion, feminization, corporate social responsibility	How is low waged labour constructed? Where does corporate social responsibility lie? How is desire manufactured?	Ethical consumption campaign design, presentation or podcast on disposal
Food	Chocolate	Neoliberalism, governmentality, global value chain	What is food security? How are diets governed? Where is value distributed?	Diet autoethnography, foodscape collage
Debt	Student debt	Commodification, assetization, financialization	What are the different kinds of debt? Why do people in-debt themselves? Do debts always have to be paid?	Usury thought experiment, sovereign debt role play
Care	Military wives	Social reproduction, heteronormativity, global care chain	Are we experiencing a care crisis? Is caring harmful? How is care work organized in the global economy?	Time use survey of caring labour, social annotation of policy document
City	Mega-event	Global city, state rescaling, right to the city	What are global cities? How does urban development take place? Who needs the right to the city?	Urban development case study presentation, privilege trail
Social Media	Fitness influencers	Self-branding, the attention economy, the prosumer	How should social media be regulated? Do we work for social media? Can the social media prosumer be transformative?	Social media resistance group deliberation, documentary film review
Share	Ride share	Marketization of everyday life, gig economy, platform capitalism	Where does the sharing economy come from? Who owns what in the sharing economy? Are there alternative economies of sharing?	Iceberg economy exercise, community mapping
Humour	Radical comedy	Resistance, carnival, subversion	Can humour promote global justice? Can the subaltern joke? Is humour dangerous?	Parody collage, make a meme

Table 1.2: What you will learn with I-PEEL

After reading this book, we hope you will be equipped with a conceptual toolkit informed by the lineages of everyday IPE, apprised of ways of applying these ideas, and confident in generating your own research enquiries gleaned from the world around you. We also hope that while you are able to begin your own studies with the familiar or the intimate, you do not necessarily end there. We are mindful in the chapters to avoid intellectual naval-gazing and instead urge you to consider how economic activity brings you into a relationship with others, the hierarchies of difference on which this depends, and the ethical self-reflection this demands. These are some of the questions we are all left to ponder: Are these relationships 'right' or 'good'? How are they enacted through my everyday practices? And what could I do to live out an alternative?

1.4 Conclusion

International Political Economy can be thought of as the study of power and wealth across countries. Within this academic field, scholars taking an everyday approach have considered the ways that the global economy and global politics are enacted in daily life, inviting analysis of a range of objects and subjects that might otherwise be overlooked. In so doing, they have drawn on various lineages of 'the everyday' in IPE and its cognate fields, using different concepts and theoretical traditions to orient their research. The I-PEEL approach is our attempt to translate this into teaching. It is a pedagogy that starts with the experiences of daily life – including yours – and opens out onto explorations of how social relations of class, gender, race, nationality, and others sustain and subvert global inequalities. It encourages a polyphonic conversation between the different lineages of everyday IPE, unified by a conviction that economic and political outcomes are not natural but socially constructed in, and through, everyday life.

1.5 Resources

Adebanwi, Wale (eds.). 2017. *The Political Economy of Everyday Life in Africa: Beyond the Margins*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. This book is drawn together around the work of the anthropologist Jane I. Guyer and her attempts to challenge orthodox interpretations of African economies by re-reading them through their mundane realities. The introduction is especially useful in setting out how the political economy of everyday life might be understood in an African context.

Best, Jaqueline and Matthew Paterson (eds.). 2010. *Cultural Political Economy*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge. This explores the different ways that culture has constituted economic life and shaped the development of capitalism. It features contributions from several authors cited in this chapter (Aitken, Amoore, Davies) and the introduction by Best and Paterson explains how they see 'the everyday' in cultural political economy.

Elias, Juanita. 2010. 'Locating the "Everyday" in International Political Economy: That Roar Which Lies on the Other Side of Silence'. *International Studies Review 12*: pp. 603-609. This reviews three books that speak to the themes of everyday IPE, one which situates itself in the field of IPE and two which are written from the perspective of social anthropology and labour sociology. The review outlines some of the ways in which everyday IPE can be done and the different lineages it can draw on.

Elias, Juanita and Lena Rethel. 2016. *The Everyday Political Economy of Southeast Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Offers another non-Western application of everyday IPE, exploring the way that economic transformation is sustained and challenged by everyday practices across Southeast Asia.

I-PEEL website (www.i-peel.org). This is an open-access resource that presents IPE research through an everyday object or practice. We contributed tiles on Care (Juanita), Money (Lena), Resistance (James) and Sugar (Ben) and there are many more besides this. In each of the subsequent chapters we recommend two tiles that would make for suitable further reading, but for this chapter we suggest just one: "textbook" (Matthew Watson).

1.6 References

Acuto, Michele. 2014. 'Everyday International Relations: Garbage, Grand Designs, and Mundane Matters'. *International Political Sociology* 8(4): 345-362.

Adorno, Theodore W. 1991. *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Aitken, Rob. 2007. *Performing Capital: Toward a Cultural Economy of Popular and Global Finance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Aitken, Rob. 2013. 'The Financialization of Micro-Credit'. *Development and Change* 44(3): 473-499.

Amoore, Louise. 2006. 'There is No Great Refusal: The Ambivalent Politics of Resistance'. In *International Political Economy and Poststructural Politics*, edited by Marieke de Goede, 255-274. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bedford, Kate. 2019. *Bingo Capitalism: The Law and Political Economy of Everyday Gambling*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Best, Jaqueline and Paterson, Matthew, eds. 2010. *Cultural Political Economy*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Billig, Michael. 1995. *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage.

Blyth, Mark, ed. 2009. *Routledge Handbook of International Political Economy (IPE): IPE as a Global Conversation.* Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Brassett, James. 2021. *The Ironic State: British Comedy and the Everyday Politics of Globalization*. Bristol: Bristol University Press.

Brassett, James and Frederic Heine. 2021. '"Men Behaving Badly"? Representations of Masculinity in Post-Global Financial Crisis Cinema'. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 23(5): 763-784.

Brassett, James and Lena Rethel. 2015. 'Sexy Money: The Hetero-Normative Politics of Global Finance'. *Review of International Studies* 41(3): 429-449.

Campbell-Verduyn, Malcolm. 2021. 'The Pandemic Techno-Solutionist Dilemma'. *Global Perspectives* 2(1), no pagination.

Clarke, Chris. 2015. 'Learning to Fail: Resilience and the Empty Promise of Financial Literacy Education'. *Consumption, Markets and Culture* 18(3): 257-276.

Cohen, Benjamin J. 2007 'The Transatlantic Divide: Why are American and British IPE so Different?'. *New Political Economy* 14(2): 197-219.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1993. 'Toward a New Vision: Race, Class, and Gender as Categories of Analysis and Connection'. *Race, Sex and Class* 1(1): 25-45.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000a. 'Gender, Black Feminism, and Black Political Economy'. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 568(1): 41–53.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000b. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment.* Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Crehan, Kate. 2016. *Gramsci's Common Sense: Inequality and Its Narratives*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Davies, Matt. 2006. 'Everyday Life in the Global Political Economy'. In *International Political Economy and Poststructural Politics*, edited by Marieke de Goede, 219-237. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Davies, Matt. 2016. 'Everyday Life as Critique: Revisiting the Everyday in IPE with Henri Lefebvre and Postcolonialism'. *International Political Sociology* 10(1): 22-38.

Dean, Jonathan. 2019. 'Sorted for Memes and Gifs: Visual Media and Everyday Digital Politics'. *Political Studies Review* 17(3): 255-266.

Ehrenreich, Barbara and Arlie Russell Hochschild, eds. 2003. *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. London: Granta Books.

Elden, Stuart. 2004. *Understanding Henri Lefebvre: Theory and the Possible*. London: Continuum.

Elias, Juanita, and Shirin M. Rai. 2019. 'Feminist Everyday Political Economy: Space, Time, and Violence'. *Review of International Studies* 45(2): 201-220.

Elias, Juanita and Rethel, Lena, eds. 2016. *The Everyday Political Economy of Southeast Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elias, Juanita and Samanthi J. Gunawardana, eds. 2013. *The Global Political Economy of the Household in Asia*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Elson, Diane, and Ruth Pearson. 1981. ''Nimble Fingers Make Cheap Workers': An Analysis of Women's Employment in Third World Export Manufacturing'. *Feminist Review* 7(1): 87-107.

Enloe, Cynthia. 1989. *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Federici, Silvia. 1975. *Wages Against Housework*. Bristol: Power of Women Collective and the Falling Wall Press.

Federici, Silvia. 2004. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*. New York, US: Autonomedia.

Fetzer, Thomas. 2020. 'Beyond 'Economic Nationalism': Towards a New Research Agenda for the Study of Nationalism in Political Economy'. *Journal of International Relations and Development*. 25: 235-259.

Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon.

Fridell, Gavin. 2007. 'Fair-Trade Coffee and Commodity Fetishism: The Limits of Market-Driven Social Justice'. *Historical Materialism* 15(4): 79-104.

Gamble, Andrew. 1995. 'The New Political Economy'. *Political Studies* 43(3):516-530.

Gibson-Graham, J. K. 2006. *The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Gill, Stephen. 1995. 'The Global Panoptican? The Neoliberal State, Economic Life, and Democratic Surveillance'. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 20: 1-49.

Gilpin, Robert. 1987. *The Political Economy of International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Glaze, Simon and Ben Richardson. 2017. 'Poor Choice? Smith, Hayek and the Moral Economy of Food Consumption'. *Economy and Society* 46(1): 128-151.

Grayson, Kyle. 2013. 'How to Read Paddington Bear: Liberalism and the Foreign Subject in *A Bear Called Paddington*'. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*. 15(3): 378-393.

Graz, Jean-Christophe, Oliver Kessler and Rahel Kunz. 2019. 'International Political Economy (IPE) meets International Political Sociology (IPS)'. *International Relations* 33(4): 586-619.

Griffin, Penny. 2019. '#MeToo, White Feminism and Taking Everyday Politics Seriously in the Global Political Economy'. *Australian Journal of Political Science* 54(4): 556-572.

Hamilton, Caitlin. 2022. *The Everyday Artefacts of World Politics.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Hanisch, Carol. 1970. 'The Personal is Political'. *Notes from the Second Year: Women's Liberation* 76-78.

Harmes, Adam. 2001. 'Mass Investment Culture?'. *New Left Review* 9(May/June): 103-124.

Helleiner, Eric. 2002. 'Economic Nationalism as a Challenge to Economic Liberalism? Lessons from the 19th Century'. *International Studies Quarterly* 46: 307-329.

Helleiner, Eric. 2015. 'Globalising the Classical Foundations of IPE Thought'. *Contexto Internacional* 37(3): 975-1010.

Helleiner, Eric. 2021. *The Neomercantilists: A Global Intellectual History*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Highmore, Ben. 2002. 'Introduction: Questioning Everyday Life'. In *The Everyday Life Reader* edited by Ben Highmore, 1-36. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Hobson, John M. 2013. 'Revealing the Eurocentric foundations of IPE: A Critical Historiography of the Discipline from the Classical to the Modern Era'. *Review of International Political Economy* 20(5): 1024-1054.

Hobson, John M. and Seabrooke, Leonard, eds. 2007. *Everyday Politics of the World Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Innes, Alexandria J. and Robert J. Topinka. 2017. 'The Politics of a 'Poncy Pillowcase': Migration and Borders in Coronation Street'. *Politics* 37(33): 273-287.

Jessop, Bob and Ngai-Ling Sum. 2001. 'Pre-disciplinary and Post-disciplinary Perspectives'. *New Political Economy* 6(1): 89-101.

Katz, Cindi. 2001. 'Vagabond Capitalism and the Necessity of Social Reproduction'. *Antipode* 33(4): 709-728.

Katz-Rosene, Ryan M., Christopher Kelly-Bisson and Matthew Paterson. 2021. 'Teaching Students to Think Ecologically about the Global Political Economy, and *Vice Versa*'. *Review of International Political Economy* 28(4): 1083-1098.

Kipfer, Stefan. 2008. 'How Lefebvre Urbanized Gramsci: Hegemony, Everyday Life and Difference'. In *Space, Difference and Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre* edited by Kanishka Goonewardena, Stefan Kipfer, Richard Milgrom and Christian Schmid, 193-211. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.

Langley, Paul. 2008. *The Everyday Life of Global Finance: Saving and Borrowing in Anglo-America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LeBaron, Genevieve. 2010. 'The Political Economy of the Household: Neoliberal Restructuring, Enclosures, and Daily Life'. *Review of International Political Economy* 17(5): 889-912.

Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Critique of Everyday Life: Volume I*. London: Verso.

Lyon, Sarah. 2006. 'Evaluating Fair Trade Consumption: Politics, Defetishization and Producer Participation'. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 30(5): 452-464.

Mezzadri, Alessandra, Susan Newman and Sara Stevano. 2021. 'Feminist Global Political Economies of Work and Social Reproduction'. *Review of International Political Economy*. doi: 10.1080/09692290.2021.1957977.

Montgomerie, Johnna. 2020. 'Indebtedness and Financialization in Everyday Life'. In *The Routledge International Handbook of Financialization* edited by Philip Mader, Daniel Mertens and Natascha van der Zwan, 380-389. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.

O'Brien, Robert and Marc Williams. 2020. *Global Political Economy: Evolution and Dynamics*, sixth edition. Red Globe Press: London.

Oatley, Thomas. 2019. *International Political Economy*, sixth edition. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.

Peterson, V. Spike. 2003. *A Critical Rewriting of Global Political Economy: Integrating Reproductive, Productive and Virtual Economies.* New York and Abingdon: Routledge.

Rethel, Lena. 2010. 'Financialization and the Malaysian Political Economy'. *Globalizations* 7(4): 489-506.

Rupert, Mark. E. 1995 '(Re)Politicizing the Global Economy: Liberal Common Sense and Ideological Struggle in the US NAFTA Debate'. *Review of International Political Economy* 2(4): 658–692.

Seabrooke, Leonard. 2010. 'What Do I Get? The Everyday Politics of Expectations and the Subprime Crisis'. *New Political Economy* 15(1): 51-70.

Sue, Derald Wing, Christina M. Capodilupo, Gina C. Torino, Jennifer M. Bucceri, Aisha Holder, Kevin L. Nadal, and Marta Esquilin. 2007. 'Racial Microaggressions in Everyday Life'. *American Psychologist* 62(4): 271-286.

Smith, Neil. 2002. 'New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy'. *Antipode* 34(3): 427–450.

True, Jacqui. 2012. *The Political Economy of Violence Against Women*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tussie, Diane and Fabricio Chagas-Bastos. 2022. 'Misrecognised, Misfit, and Misperceived: Why Not a Latin American School of IPE?', *Review of International Political Economy*, online first.

Vivares, Ernesto, ed. 2020. *The Routledge Handbook to Global Political Economy: Conversations and Inquiries.* Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Vogel, Lise. 1983. *Marxism and the Oppression of Women*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Watson, Matthew. 2005a. 'Towards a Polanyian Perspective on Fair Trade: Market-based Relationships and the Act of Ethical Consumption'. *Global Society* 20(4): 435-451.

Watson, Matthew. 2005b. *Foundations of International Political Economy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Watson, Matthew. 2013. 'The Eighteenth-Century Historiographic Tradition and Contemporary 'Everyday IPE'. *Review of International Studies* 39(1): 1-23.