---

**Article:**
Hay, C.S. orcid.org/0000-0001-6327-6547 (2017) The Interdependence of Intra- and Inter-Subjectivity in Constructivist Institutionalism. Critical Review, 29 (2). pp. 235-247. ISSN 0891-3811

https://doi.org/10.1080/08913811.2017.1366667

---

**The interdependence of intra- and inter-subjectivity in constructivist institutionalism**

Colin Hay, Sciences Po, Paris

> " - Who is to say what is moral?
> - Morality is subjective.
> - Subjectivity is objective. Moral notions imply attributes to substances which exist only in relational duality. Not as an essential extension of ontological existence.
> - Can we not talk about sex so much?"
>
> (Woody Allen, Love and Death, 1975).

Counterintuitive though it might seem, it is almost always a pleasure to respond to one's critics, particularly those, like Oscar Larsson, who have taken the trouble to carefully and thoroughly read the work that prompts the critique. That pleasure is further enhanced on this occasion by my own sense, at least, of the significance of the issues at stake here and a more general concern (one that I suspect I share with Larsson) that they have yet to receive the attention their significance warrants. Yet, this notwithstanding, I find myself in the not-unfamiliar situation of first having to clarify my position and to correct certain misunderstandings of it before I can begin to address the wider issues raised by Larsson's important intervention.

Larsson's charge—for though appreciative, this is after all, a critique—is that the constructivist institutionalism that I defend and the variant of ontological constructivism on which it is ostensibly predicated are both, in the end, subjectivist with respect to ideas. By this, he means that my position "does not take into consideration the constitutive and structural aspect of ideas" and, consequently, reduces ideas "to properties of individual conscious minds" (Larsson 2015, 174). This alleged subjectivism, in turn, compromises my apparently otherwise laudable efforts to accord an (appropriately) significant role to ideas in the analysis of institutional change.

Larsson is perhaps less clear than he might be as to why my putative subjectivism is a problem in any sense other than that it violates his own predilection for a less subjectivist view of ideas. But, presumably, and as at times he hints, ideational subjectivism is a poor foundation for an analysis of institutional change since it smacks of voluntarism—implying

that all that actors need to do to enact (institutional) change is think different thoughts about the (institutional) context in which they find themselves (and, presumably, act upon them).

I agree with much of this—both what is stated explicitly by Larsson and also those implicit elements that I have inferred from it (the bit about voluntarism in the preceding paragraph, for instance). Subjectivism does tend towards voluntarism; voluntarism, in turn, makes institutional change appear far simpler than it invariably is. What I do not agree with, however, is the characterization of my own position. This I do not regard as in any sense subjectivist. Indeed, were it genuinely subjectivist—as Larsson, in a sense, implies—it could not be genuinely constructivist.

Telling, in this respect, is a passage to which we will have occasion to return in more detail presently. Here, in discussing my account of interest formation, Larsson suggests the following:

> Hay's acknowledgement that . . . [actors'] perceptions [of their interests] are "socially constructed" amounts to saying that they are subjective rather than inter-subjective. (Larsson 2015, 188)

It is not difficult, I think, to see that there is a problem here. Things that are socially constructed (social facts) are not, and can never be, purely subjective—even if there might well be (as I shall argue) important subjective elements to how we encounter, experience, and act with respect to them. Pure subjectivity is asocial, by definition. Conversely, and for precisely the same reason, the social is inter-subjective (literally, conducted 'between subjects').[1] Hence, logically, that which is socially constructed is, to the extent that it is socially constructed, inter-subjective.

There are, then, two ways of reading Larsson's sentence. Either he is unaware that it is logically impossible for something to be both socially constructed and purely subjective, or the irony is intended—and I am the one unaware of the necessarily inter-subjective character of the process of social construction. The interpretive ambiguity here must persist. For it is not one that I alone can resolve. Dare I suggest, it can surely be resolved inter-subjectively!

But that is not really the point. Much more important is that, however in the end we might agree to read Larsson's retort, either social constructivism itself or my particular interpretation of it leads to an (unfortunate) privileging of subjectivity in its treatment of ideas. In what follows I hope to show that neither is in fact the case, and that the charge of subjectivism is, as a consequence, undeserved.

In doing so, it is perhaps useful to draw on what was certainly intended as the clearest and most sustained discussion of the constructivist ontological premises of the

[1] I prefer "inter-subjective" to the now more habitual "intersubjective" precisely to emphasize the necessarily social character of inter-subjective processes.

institutionalism that I seek here to clarify and, at least in part, to defend.[2] To be fair to Larsson, the essay in which it is contained (Hay 2017) had not been published (though I suspect it had been written) when he penned the critique to which I here respond.

## On Social Facts and Social Facticity

In that essay, I return to Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann and, above all, to John Searle, in seeking to show how my self-styled "constructivist institutionalism" builds out of, and is in fact entirely compatible with, their ontological constructivism. That ontology, in essence, comes in two parts.

In the first, "reality" (in Searle's terms, "facticity") is understood as "a quality appertaining to phenomena that we recognize as having a being independent of our own volition," in that "we cannot wish them away" (Searle 1966, 13; see also Searle 1995, 2005, and 2010). What it important about this is that, contrary to many (for instance, realist) understandings of reality, it suggests that facticity is not (or, at least, not necessarily) knowledge-independent. Accordingly, it allows us to posit as real things that exist only insofar as, or largely to the extent that, an inter-subjective consensus exists as to their existence and as to the nature of that existence. If, as, and when that inter-subjective consensus changes, so too does the nature of the thing itself. Examples might include a "marriage," a unit of economic exchange, or a condition of "crisis."

The second part of Berger and Luckmann's ontology—in effect, an implication of the first (if, perhaps, not an immediately obvious one)—is the distinction between "natural" or "brute" facts on the one hand and "social" facts on the other. That distinction, and the categorical nature of it as a distinction, are perhaps best understood by way of an example. Consider the five-euro note in my pocket. It has a natural or physical facticity (a shape, a weight, a flexibility, a chemical composition, a certain propensity to resist catching fire in the absence of an open flame at room temperature, and so forth). But it also has a social facticity —and, in this case at least, a social utility associated with that facticity (I might well be able to use it at the bar when I come to settle up my tab). And that social utility (like the social facticity from which it is derived), it is not very difficult to see, is in no sense reducible to its natural facticity. Its social value (whether understood in purely economic terms or more generally) is by no means intrinsic to it as a piece of paper and, crucially for constructivists, is bestowed upon it socially (and hence inter-subjectively). If the inter-subjective consensus that

[2] Since the constructivism that animates my institutionalism is largely ontological, and since ontologies, for me at least, do not contain empirical propositions that can be readily tested, the defense that I offer is a limited one. Thus, whilst I seek to defend the internal coherence of my approach and try to guard against potential misreadings, I do not defend it in the sense of proselytizing for it as somehow "better" than institutionalisms informed by different ontologies (rationalist, historicist, post-structuralist, and so forth).

makes it what it is changes—if perhaps, the country in which I am resident chooses to use a different medium of exchange or currency (it leaves the Eurozone, perhaps)—then its social value and hence its social facticity changes, too (it becomes a less potent weapon in my search for vinous gratification).

Of course, the natural and social facticity of the five-euro note are not entirely unrelated. As already noted, the note has both characteristics (though the same cannot be said of all social facts). And, in this case at least, the two are integrally connected. The note works as a unit of exchange only because we know it to be a unit of exchange, certainly; but it works as a unit of exchange also because it is sufficiently portable and sufficiently immune to spontaneous combustion to give it the physical (or natural) attributes that make it readily and conveniently exchangeable. It is presumably for these reasons, inter alia, that we do not use mountains, phosphorous, or rice paper as currency.

Now let us turn to politics. It is necessarily inter-subjective, in that it amounts to the (always temporary) resolution of social contingency in the making and taking of decisions that are recognized inter-subjectively as having legitimacy or, at least, force. [←Colin: Not sure if this will gain your asset. But many things that aren't political have social consequences, such as earthquakes.—Jeff] Only if something is asocial (here, if it is and remains purely subjective) and/or non-contingent (in the sense that it could not be otherwise) is it not political.

As I hope this serves to demonstrate, for constructivists, social facts are different in character and kind from natural facts, in that they acquire both their facticity and the ontologically distinct character of that facticity from processes that are inter-subjective rather than subjective. As the focus on social/discursive construction would imply, any genuine constructivism cannot be guilty of the subjectivist bias Larsson detects.

Important implications follow from this, especially for political analysis and especially when it comes to the treatment of ideas. First, ideas—and shared (or inter-subjectively held) ideas, at that—are the basis of social facticity. This is, of course, not to suggest that social facts are not interpreted, made sense of, and interacted with (at least in part) subjectively. But it is to suggest that their existence as social facts is conditional only on the inter-subjective consensus from which they arise. Moreover, the fact that they are conditional on such an inter-subjective consensus renders social facticity contingent in a way that natural facticity is not. This brings us to a second, crucial, point: that social (or inter-subjective) contingency—the propensity for social facts to change (as the consensus from which they arise varies)—arguably renders all social facts political. Politics, in other words, at least from a constructivist perspective, is social contingency—and the (ultimately, always unsuccessful) attempt to resolve it through the imposition of a new, but never final, consensus.

This, too, has implications. Above all, it reminds us that all politics is social (Hay 2007, ch. 1). The political is a necessarily inter-subjective space. Consequently, the very identification of something (an issue, a dilemma, an interest, a concern) as the subject of a

political analysis (constructivist or otherwise) is the opening of a window on a set of processes that are necessarily inter-subjective, even if they involve only the clash of narrowly subjective preferences.[3] And, as that perhaps also reminds us, in order to have some notion of inter-subjectivity, we need also some conception of subjectivity. It makes no logical sense (certainly if we are to retain the terminology) to dissolve the subjective into the inter-subjective, as Larsson at times seem to recommend.

## From Subjectivism to Intra-Subjectivism

That final observation is, I think, particularly important. For it suggests a subtle, but potentially very significant, semantic difference between the charge of subjectivism from which I have thus far sought to defend constructivism (and its institutionalism) and the specific charge of subjectivism that Larsson presents.

Thus far I have argued that constructivism is, in a sense, incapable of being subjectivist—in that its foundational focus on social facts as political, as contingent, and as politically contingent upon inter-subjectively established consensus, means that its defining problematique is one of inter-subjectivity. It is not clear to me whether Larsson would accept this. But it is at least possible that he might and yet still continue to charge constructivist institutionalism with a somewhat different form of subjectivism.

To make clear the distinction and for want of a better term, let's call it intra-subjectivism. The claim (and hence the charge) of intra-subjectivism I here take to imply that, in explaining (or, at least, seeking to explain) outcomes in a context that is acknowledged to be political and hence inter-subjective, I (and others who might be similarly accused) are prepared to countenance, as causally significant, ideas (and the agency to which those ideas might be seen to give rise) that are subjective—or, to be consistent, intra-subjective. By intra-subjective, here, I mean ideas that, however they might have come to be acquired and held, are specific to the individual subject in question, in the sense that no other subject is assumed to hold them in quite the same way and for quite the same reasons. They are, certainly in this respect, intra-subjectively sui generis. Put differently, we cannot derive an actor's (intra)-subjectivity from her social context or conditioning. Actors (even similarly situated actors) are, in short and thus understood, non-interchangeable.

Spelled out in this way, the charge of intra-subjectivism is altogether different from the accusation against which I have thus far sought to defend constructivist institutionalism. If it is a sin at all, it is certainly a rather different and arguably a rather lesser one. In fact, insofar as the charge might be warranted (and the label might be deemed appropriate), intra-subjectivism is, as I hope to show, perfectly compatible with constructivism. Let me try and explain before providing an illustration.

---

[3] The point being that, at the moment when subjective preferences clash (even if not before), they become inter-subjective.

The culprit here, I suspect, is my treatment of the concept of self-interest, on which Larsson lavishes considerable (critical) attention. Yet there is a certain irony here. For what he overlooks is the relatively low salience that I give to instrumental considerations (the narrow pursuit of self-interest and self-interest alone) in the motivation of political conduct (Hay 2011). Thus, whilst there is of course plenty of evidence of political actors acting in accordance with their currently prevailing sense of their own self-interest (whether individually or collectively), there is also plenty of evidence of political actors putting aside narrow considerations of self-interest in favor of other motivational dispositions (such as the simple desire to conform with their peers or, indeed, the rather more edifying pursuit of some greater normative good such as the attainment of a condition of distributive justice or of equality of rights and status for others).

I suspect that this argument for recognizing the polyvalent character of motivational dispositions, and the complex decisions involved in managing the tradeoffs between them, is merely likely to compound Larsson's problem with my approach. For I imagine that he would suggest that it, too, is intra-subjectivist—in that it sees the political subject as the locus for such decisions. But I simply do not see how it can be any other way. Yes, political subjects are themselves the focus of (invariably) inter-subjective pressures to conform or to place this or that motivational disposition above another. But, in the end, how they respond to such pressures is not something determined simply by the extent or nature of them. It is, in short, neither purely inter-subjective nor purely intra-subjective, but a product of the interdependence of the two.

If this is accepted, it has profound implications. For if individual subjects are, as surely they must be, differentially exposed to inter-subjective political appeals and persuasions of this kind, and if those appeals and persuasions to which they are exposed are processed, mediated, and responded to differently by them (by virtue of their then-existing subjectivity and the complex socialization processes out of which is has been forged), then the effects are bound to vary from one individual to another (and, indeed, over time). That we should expect such outcomes to vary at the level of the individual is not in any sense, however, a disavowal of the (significantly) inter-subjective (and political) character of the processes in and through which that variation arises.

This remains, I suspect, both rather cryptic and rather abstract. To cement the point, then, it is perhaps useful to simplify things just a little and to imagine a hypothetical scenario in which actors' perceptions of their own self-interest have the utmost salience—such that we can assume that their political conduct is a simple product of their perceived self-interest. The question becomes the following: how is this sense of their own self-interest achieved? The constructivist approach to this, in a way, is very simple. It is to acknowledge and to emphasize

that the question of self-interest is interpretively ambiguous—and, consequently, socially and politically contingent.

To make this more specific, let's consider my own sense of my own self-interest. I am, to pick a few potentially salient sociological variables, a white, male professor and a public-sector employee. My sense of my own self-interest is interpretively ambiguous in the sense that, in any given situation, it could credibly be resolved differently. Were I to conceive of my interest in terms of my masculinity (God forbid), I would almost certainly conceive of it differently than if I were to conceive of it in terms of my status as a public-sector employee, for instance. Moreover, those with whom I am likely to perceive myself to have a shared interest (which we might advance collectively) are also likely to vary depending on the differential salience I accord to those potential descriptors of my political identity (white, male, public sector employee and so forth). And, of course, in all of this I am likely to be subject to a variety of forms of political persuasion—political parties perhaps appealing to me on the basis of this or that social attribute that I might share with others, colleagues encouraging me to recognize the shared collective interest public sector-workers have under conditions of austerity, and so forth. I am likely to be skeptical, at least to some extent, of some of these claims—not least through my sense of having been disappointed in the past by those making equivalent claims and appeals. And out of all of this I try credibly to conjure a sense of my own self-interest and, indeed, a sense of those, if any, with whom I might share that interest and how best I, or we, might advance that interest. That sense—indeed, those various senses (of what my interest is, with whom I might share it, and of how best to advance it) —are all intra-subjective in the way in which I have defined and used the term above. For, in the final analysis, each arises from my own sense of my own interest and not someone else's. That sense may well be similar to that of others who have, like me, chosen (for now) to accord a high political salience to their status as, say, public-sector employees, and who have proved similarly receptive (for now) to the appeal of a party or union professing to stand for that interest. But it will be never be identical to theirs, because it is mine and because it carries, as a consequence, traces of my socialization, my experience, and my peculiarities, specificities, and peccadillos as a political subject. Yet that does not mean that it is not inter-subjectively formed and negotiated. My sense of my own self-interest is, then, once again, the product of a fusion of intra- and inter-subjectivity.

## Intra- and Inter-Subjectivity in Practice

I hope that in this necessarily brief discussion, I have done enough to convince the reader—and perhaps even Larsson himself—that the constructivist institutionalism that animates my approach to political analysis is not inter-subjectivist in any strong sense. And, that if it is judged inter-subjectivist at all, that that is not quite so heinous a crime as it might at first

appear. I certainly hope to have established that any genuine constructivism, by virtue of its ontology of social facticity, is incapable of subjectivism in the narrow sense.

But that is perhaps not quite enough. In conclusion, and with the help of another example, I want to turn directly to the key issue that I think Larsson's intervention poses: an issue that, arguably, neither of us has yet dealt with adequately. In this respect, however, we are in good company. The issue in question is the relationship between intra- and inter-subjectivity, and the example I will pick is the politics of crisis narration—the constitution of as a political and economic conjuncture as a moment of crisis.

There is, once again, a certain irony here. For the constructivist institutionalism that is the focus of this debate has its origins in and, in a sense, developed out of, my earlier work on the analysis of crisis and the mobilization of moral panics (especially Hay 1995 and 1996). What strikes me now, particularly in the light of Larsson's critique, is that that earlier analysis contains within it a rather more nuanced and sustained discussion of the relationship between intra- and inter-subjectivity than exists in any of the more explicitly constructivist institutionalist interventions that followed. I am, then, particularly grateful to Larsson for the opportunity to rediscover and to re-state more explicitly that, until now, rather implicit element of the approach.

For constructivists, the crux of the politics of crisis is, predictably enough, interpretive ambiguity and the politics in and through which attempts are made to resolve it. There are two elements to this. Each can be seen as the answer to a question, with the interpretive ambiguity (and associated political contingency) residing in the fact that there is more than one credible answer to that question. The first is the question of whether this is or is not a crisis; the second, assuming an affirmative answer to the first, asks: what is the object and hence the nature of this crisis?

Constructivists thus treat crises as social rather than natural facts. Of course, it is perfectly possible that a series of natural facts set, in effect, the context within which crisis (and conceivably non-crisis) narratives compete to define what is going on and what type of response is appropriate—as, for instance, in some kind of "natural disaster" (a tsunami, an earthquake, a forest fire, a sustained drought). More usually—and indeed invariably, even in the wake of naturally precipitated disasters like earthquakes—it is a combination of social and natural facts that set the context in which crisis narration occurs, placing limits on the "narratability" of the crisis (and, indeed, the credibility of a crisis narrative in the first place). Yet, in periods that come to be perceived as, say, economic crises, most of the preconditions of crisis narration relate to social facts (the number of bank insolvencies, the cost of government borrowing, and trends in "key economic indicators," such as the rate of growth of economic output, inflation, or unemployment, for instance).

But crucially, the combination of natural and social facts that might be seen to define the context in which crisis narration takes place do not determine the outcome, even if they

contribute to the probability that a given moment will come to be seen as a crisis and a crisis of a particular kind. For constructivists, at least, it is only narratives that can achieve this. Crises, in the end, are discursive constructions; it is through narration that they come to acquire their social facticity.

But to achieve social facticity, the crisis narrative needs to be accepted. As this suggests, the clash of competing attempts to define the crisis is, invariably, a clash of public narratives. At the risk of re-stating the obvious, this is a necessarily inter-subjective process; and that, of course, implies that the constructivist analysis of crisis is also inter-subjective. It is perhaps unnecessary to labor the point further, save to note that had Larsson seen my work on crisis as emblematic or even representative of the constructivist institutionalism he challenges, as I would claim it is, he would have had, I think, more difficulty in characterizing the latter as subjectivist or even intra-subjectivist.

But that is perhaps not the key point here. For my analysis of the clash of crisis narratives (and of moral panic discourses, too) contains within it a treatment of their reception by citizens and hence of the relationship between inter- and intra-subjectivity. This draws not on Larsson's favored post-structuralists, but on their now rather less illustrious structuralist forebears, Lacan and Althusser—and, in particular, on their concept of interpellation. It is worth briefly revisiting them because they produced a rare, clear ,and sustained reflection on, and theorization of, the interdependence of intra- and inter-subjectivity. In a sense, they provide an answer to the question that Larsson poses but fails to answer.

In his rightly famous essay on ideology, Althusser (1971) gives the example of the police officer hailing a citizen on the street with the words, "Hey you there." In the process of turning to acknowledge the policeman's call, Althusser suggests, the citizen has been interpellated. For in the very act of recognizing herself as the subject of the officer's exclamation, she accepts a subject position defined for her both by the hail and the authority with which it is delivered. She submits, in effect, to a power relationship, as her subject positioning, if not quite her subjectivity, is inter-subjectively constituted.

This conception of interpellation can be readily applied to the process of crisis narration. Thus, in my work on Britain's infamous "Winter of Discontent," I examine how media crisis narratives construct subject positions for their readers, drawing them and their subjectivity into a script that serves both to cement the perception of crisis and to attribute responsibility for its causation, whilst legitimating the decisive intervention required to put things right. As I explain, these texts

> effectively construct an empty story board which recruits readers as dramatis personae upon an expansive stage created within the text itself. [This] comprises a basic set of characters, plot relationships, minimal relevant aspects of context and a variety of inter-discursive cues, intended associations

> and connotations. It invites us as readers . . . to identify with a particular "preferred" subject position (the victim, the hero, the heroine, the underdog . . . ). If we do not overtly and consciously resist this interpellation by breaking or at least suspending the momentary spell of the text, then we actively position ourselves as subjects within the narrative. We recognize ourselves (as the victim, hero, heroine, underdog . . . ) as we locate ourselves within a subject position inscribed in the text. . . . In this instant, we are constituted as subjects through the text, as we are simultaneously subjected to it. (Hay 1996, 262)

This process I go on to illustrate in some textual detail, considering a range of media sources from the time. One specific example will perhaps here suffice—a story published in the Daily Mail on 1 February 1979, under the headline "THEY WON'T EVEN LET US BURY OUR DEAD." The story relates to the then-ongoing industrial dispute between Liverpool City Council and council workers, including the city's grave-diggers. It was published at the heart of the Winter of Discontent.

The preferred subject position is clear. "We" are invited to recognize ourselves in this text as those who have recently lost a family member or close friend and are now prevented from burying them by the sinister and cruel conduct of "them," the striking grave-diggers (and others like them responsible for the condition of crisis in and through which "we" are living—and from which "we" are suffering). If we do not actively resist this interpellation, it is clear where our sympathies will lie and our ire will be directed, as we adopt the vantage point of the bereaved, denied the basic human decency of being able to bury "our" loved ones. We share in the collective revulsion at the anticipated "putrefaction of the corpses of our family and friends" [←citation?]. Thus far, it is all inter-subjective. But we respond to the story, if interpellated, intra-subjectively: by filling out the simple construction of the victim presented in the text. In a complex interweaving of inter- and intra-subjective elements, we populate the incomplete and partial character of the bereaved described in the text with our own experience and memories, thereby projecting ourselves (and our subjectivities) into a setting framed by the media yet brought to life through our own imaginations.

This is an almost perfect fusion of inter- and intra-subjectivity – and, as such, very typical of how social facts are made and remade.

REFERENCES

Althusser, Louis. 1971. 'Ideology and ideological state apparatuses: notes towards an investigation', in Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays. London: New Left Books (trans. Ben Brewster).

Berger, Peter L. & Luckmann, Thomas (1966) The Social Construction of Reality. New York: Double & Co.

Hay, Colin (1995) 'Mobilization through interpellation: James Bulger, juvenile crime and the construction of a moral panic', Social & Legal Studies, 4 (2), 197-223.

Hay, Colin (1996) 'Narrating crisis: the discursive construction of the winter of discontent', Sociology, 30 (2), 253-277.

Hay, Colin (2007) Why We Hate Politics. Cambridge: Polity.

Hay, Colin (2011) 'Ideas and the construction of interests', in Daniel Beland and Robert H. Cox (eds.) Ideas and Politics in Social Science Research. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hay, Colin (2017) 'Good in a crisis: the ontological institutionalism of social constructivism', New Political Economy, 22 (1), forthcoming.

Larsson, Oscar (2015) 'Using post-structuralism to explore the full impact of ideas on politics', Critical Review, 27 (2), 174-97.

Searle, John R. (1995) The Construction of Social Reality. London: Penguin.

Searle, John R. (2005) 'What is an institution?', Journal of Institutional Economics, 1 (1), 1-22.

Searle, John R. (2010) Making the Social World: The Structure of Human Civilisation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Biographical note**

**Colin Hay** is Professor of Political Science at Sciences Po, Paris and an Affiliate Professor of Political Analysis at the University of Sheffield where he co-founded the Sheffield Political Economy Research Institute. He is the author of many books including, most recently, Developments in British Politics (Palgrave 2016, with Richard Heffernan, Meg Russell and Philip Cowley), Civic Capitalism (Polity, 2015, with Anthony Payne), The Legacy of Thatcherism (Oxford University Press 2014, with Stephen Farrall), The Failure of Anglo-Liberal Capitalism (Palgrave 2013) and The Political Economy of European Welfare Capitalism (Palgrave 2012, with Daniel Wincott). He is lead editor of New Political Economy and founding co-editor of Comparative European Politics and British Politics. He is a Fellow of the UK Academy of Social Science.