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In a world that has become "uncertain", governments urge populations to be prepared and "resilient" in order to "live with risk" (Duffield, 2007; Lakoff, 2017; Revet, 2009). This conference brings together the scientific and professional communities to share and discuss ideas regarding the methodological and practical issues of "Crisis Management". It will also address the difficulty of studying a subject as broad as that of "Crisis Management" which has been, in recent years and particularly in the context of the COVID-19 global health crisis, at the heart of political, media, and academic concerns.

This conference is in line with the scientific events organized by the Graduate School of Political Science of the University of Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne and the European Center of Sociology and Political Science. Precisely, this event draws on the scientific contributions made by the research group "Going global? Processes of internationalization and Europeanization" and its pole "The actors of security and the transformation of the State". Likewise, this conference interacts with the scientific projects carried out by Sorbonne War Studies and its transdisciplinary axis "The decision-making environment: governance and division of labor in crisis 'management'".

We view “Crisis Management" as an indigenous category that has been the subject of continuous theoretical, methodological and practical debates in social sciences. How can we analyze the “management” of a phenomenon, "the crisis", which indicates the conjunctural de-sectorization of a social space where collusive intersectoral transactions no longer work and where actors are caught up in situational logics? (Dobry, 2009). Four main lines of inquiry would appear to provide fruitful avenues of reflection for research on “Crisis Management”: (1) the "Crisis Management" actors; (2) instruments and knowledge in "Crisis Management"; (3) the "Crisis Management" temporalities; (4) the circulation of "Crisis Management" actors and devices.

1. The "Crisis Management" actors. This research topic discusses “Crisis Management” as a process of collective negotiation in which actors, situated in heterogeneous spaces and endowed with specific resources, interact according to their own objectives, interests and institutional routines (Allison, 1977; George, Rishikof, 2017; Jervis, 1968; Lentner 2006). The perception of unpreparedness, as well as organizational de-sectorization, can be explained by the competitive cohabitation of actors within State structures. As a matter of fact, these structures are inhabited by actors driven by different administrative cultures and properties, as well as propelled by cultural and contextual constraints (Pouponneau, 2013; Leca, 2010; Dobry, 1992). Correspondingly, this research axis discusses the question of representations and cognitive biases in the decision-making environment of “Crisis Management”. To do so, concepts such as "paniques morales" (Chaumont, 2012) or "misperception" (Jervis, 1968) are crucial to understanding how “Crisis Management” is carried-out in the field by actors. At the intersection of the local, national and international levels, this research axis questions how the “professionnels de la gestion des inquiétudes” (Bigo, 2002) enter the “Crisis Management” field to claim new issues and consolidate new prerogatives (Ambrosetti, Buchet de Neuilly, 2009; Pomarède 2013).

2. Instruments and knowledge in "Crisis Management". As an attempt to go beyond a simplistic understanding of the voluntarism of actors and understand the “Crisis Management” practices and body of knowledge (Buchet de Neuilly, 2015), the analysis of instruments accounts for the transformations, interactions and innovations of “Crisis Management” (Lascoumes, Le Galès, 2005; Lascoumes, Simard, 2011). This research
subject emphasizes two key dynamics for the analysis of “Crisis Management”: (1) the construction-adaptation of instruments and their placement into sector-related devices (Hassenteufel, Saurugger, 2020; Daho, 2019; Milet, 2003); (2) the contextualized re-problematization and reappropriation of knowledge and instruments by actors and the subsequent effects (Lascoumes, 1996). The so-called neutrality of the use of technical rationality, as well as the allegedly apolitical legitimacy of “Crisis Management” devices, must therefore be questioned. This research axis invites us to consider crises as extreme situations, embedded in conflictual configurations where the violent rupture reveals, a contrario, what founds the social order of a specific society (Baczko, Dorronsoro, 2017).

3. The "Crisis Management" temporalities. The study of “Crisis Management” also means to analyze the “mise en crise” by actors, that is, the process by which a series of social events is constructed and presented as a crisis (Angeli, Cabane, Cornilleau, 2019; Gilbert, Henry 2009; Henry, 2004). To this end, it is a matter of questioning the alleged cyclical temporality suggested by the use of “preparedness” and “resilience” framings. Defined by experts as a cyclical approach characterized by the continuous evolution of the phases of prospecting, planning, preparation, and evaluation, “preparedness” paces the work of “Crisis Management” actors before, during, and after a crisis (Lakoff, 2017; Revet, 2018). This research axis also seeks to identify how the framing of “resilience”, understood as the ability of a system exposed to a multiplicity of complex and changing risks to resist, absorb, adapt, and recover from them (Alexander, 2013; Cannon, Müller-Mahn, 2010; Cooper, Walker, 2011; Chandler, 2014), shapes the policy-design of “Crisis Management” temporalities.

4. The circulation of "Crisis Management" actors and devices. The development and use of “Crisis Management” instruments can be considered as the result of a circulation of knowledge and practices between different fields of action (Sapiro, 2013). The scientific approaches of diffusion (Dobbin, Garrett, Simmons, 2007; Hassenteufel, Maillard, 2013), Lesson-Drawing (James, Lodge, 2003) and Policy Transfer (Delpeuch, 2009; Dolowitz, Marsh, 1996) allow us to understand the mechanisms of this circulation processes without falling into the "rationalistic" trap (Benson, Jordan, 2011; Dumoulin, Sarugger, 2010). In this perspective, this research axis aims not only to localize the circulation of this knowledge and practices of “Crisis Management”. A crucial emphasis will also be given to the strategies of translation, that is, the recreations and re-problematisations of these instruments, by actors situated in heterogeneous fields of action (Bourdieu, 2000; Callon, 1986).
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