Non-State Actors and Foreign Policy

Frank A. Stengel

Research Group on International Political Sociology, Kiel University, Kiel, Germany, stengel@ips.uni-kiel.de

Rainer Baumann

Käte Hamburger Kolleg/Centre for Global Cooperation Research, Duisburg, Germany, baumann@gcr21.uni-due.de

The rise of non-state (international, private, and transnational) actors in global politics has far-reaching consequences for foreign policy theory and practice. In order to remain able to explain foreign policy also in the 21st century, foreign policy research needs to take into account the growing importance of nonstate actorss. A good way to do this would be to engage the literature on globalization and global governance. Both fields would benefit from such an exchange of ideas because their respective strengths could cancel out each other's weaknesses. Foreign policy research on one hand has a strong track record explaining foreign policy outcomes, using a broad range of theoretical concepts but almost completely ignores non-state actors. This is highly problematic for at least two reasons: Firstly, foreign policy is increasingly made in international organizations and intergovernmental and transnational governance networks instead of national institutions like foreign ministries. Secondly, also the latter increasingly open up to, and involve, non-state actors in their policymaking procedures. Thus, if foreign policy research wants to avoid becoming marginalized in the future, it needs to take into account this change. However, especially systemic approaches like neorealism or constructivism have difficulties adapting to the new reality of foreign policy. Not only do they explicitly stress the importance of states at the expense of non-state actors, which are only of marginal interest to them, as is global governance. Moreover, they also conceptualize states unitary actors which forecloses the possibility of examining the involvement of non-state actors in states' decision-making processes. Agency-based approaches such as Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) fare much better, at least in principle. FPA scholars stress the improtance of disaggregating the state and looking at the individuals and group dynamics that influence their decision making. However, while this commitment to opening up the state allows fro a great deal more flexibility *vis-à-vis* different types of actors, FPA research has so far remained state-centric and only very recently turned to non-state actors. On the other hand, non-state actors' involvement in policymaking is the strongsuit of the literature on globalization and global governance, which has spent a lot time and effort analyzing various forms of "hybrid" governance. At the same time, however, this literature has been rather descriptive, so far mainly systematizing different governance arrangements and the conditions under which non-state actors are included in governance arrangements. This literature could profit from foreign policy research's rich theoretical knowledge in explaining policy outcomes in

1

hybrid governance networks and IOs.

Foreign policy researchers should take non-state actors seriously. In this regard three avenues in particular are relevant for future research : (1) comparative empirical research to establish the extent of non-state actors' participation in foreign policymaking across different countried and governance arrangements (2) explanatory studies that analyze the conditions under which non-state actors are involved in states' foreign policymaking processes and (3) the normative implications of increased hybrid foreign policymaking for democratic legitimacy.

Keywords: foreign policy analysis, non-state actors, globalization, global governance, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, multinational corporations, IR theory, hybrid governance, democratic legitimacy

Introduction

Despite its important contributions to our understanding of how foreign policies are produced and which factors shape them, foreign policy research remains largely state-centric, while almost completely ignoring the increasing importance of non-state actors (Baumann and Stengel, 2014; Hellmann and Jørgensen, 2015b; Risse, 2013a). This is problematic because there is good reason to assume that non-state actors are actually highly relevant for foreign policy, mainly for two reasons: Firstly they present "rival" actors that states have to take into account (Chong, 2002). Secondly, non-state actors are increasingly involved in hybrid forms of (also foreign) policymaking. Non-state actors already are important foreign policy actors, and if foreign policy research wants to avoid becoming marginalized, it needs to start including them in the analysis. The best way to do this, is to engage with the literature on globalization and global governance. This body of work focuses precisely on the issues foreign policy research has ignored, namely non-state actors' independent activities in global politics and their increased involvement in arrangements of "hybrid governance," involving both state and non-state actors (Colona and Jaffe, 2016). This literature however has mainly focused on policy issues commonly associated with 'domestic' politics, while "ignor[ing] foreign policy altogether" (Hill, 2016, p. x). Thus, both bodies of literature have strengths and blindspots that could potentially cancel each other out, if dialogue were to ensue.

For the purposes of this study, foreign policy can be understood broadly to refer to "the sum of official external relations conducted by an independent actor (usually but not exclusively a state) in international relations" (Hill, 2016, p. 4; see also Cohen and Harris, 1975, p. 383).

Foreign policy research comprises any academic study of foreign policy, while the term Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) refers to the subfield of International Relations (IR) that focuses specifically on foreign policy decision making (Carlsnaes, 2013). Globalization is understood here as "the extension of boundaries of social transactions beyond national borders" (Zangl and Zürn, 1999, p. 140). Global governance refers to processes of governing that are designed to solve "denationalized" problems (Zürn 2013, p. 408) and often involve both state and non-state actors (Dingwerth and Pattberg, 2006; Rhodes, 2007; Rosenau and Czempiel, 1992). Non-state actors may be distinguished from state actors based on the public/private dichotomy and the distinction between actors whose authority – an actor's ability to "successfully claim the right to perform regulatory functions like the formulation of rules and rule monitoring or enforcement" (Zürnet al., 2012, p. 70) – is limited to a specific national territory and those whose authority is not limited to a single territory (Genschel and Zangl, 2008, 2011).[1] State actors are entities under public law whose authority is limited to a specific national territory, while international actors' authority extends beyond the territory of one state (for example international organizations (IOs)). Private actors are entities under private law whose authority is limited to a specific national territory, transnational actors are those not limited in such a way. The term non-state actor thus is used here as an umbrella term for private, international and transnational actors (Genschel and Zangl, 2008, 2011).

The remainder of this article is divided in four sections. The following section will discuss globalization and the move from international politics to global governance. Foreign policy is increasingly made not within the 'traditional' state institutions of foreign policy (e.g. ministries) but in IOs and governance networks. However, the traditional institutions have not been completely marginalized either, but we can observe a trend towards hybridization, that is, the inclusion of non-state actors. This is what the subsequent section focuses on, distinguishing four different types of non-state actor involvement in state institutions concerned with foreign polciy. Moving from the object level of foreign policy to the meta level of academic research, different theoretical approaches in foreign policy research will then be probed as to how well they may be able to cope with the challenge of recognizing the importance of non-state actors. This will, finally, lead to a sketch of promising avenues for

---

[1] It should be noted that the two are heuristic distinctions that are not that clear-cut in practice. Neither the distinction between public and private (Peterson, 2000) nor between the inside and outside of a state (and, hence, between the domestic and the international) is unproblematic, for both analytic and political reasons (Eriksson and Rhinard, 2009; Walker, 1993; Zürn, 2013).

future research.

Globalization and Global Governance: Hybrid Policymaking for Denationalized Problems

Recognizing the importance of non-state actors is not *per se* a new insight in IR. Already in the 1970s, the interdependence literature acknowledged that world politics was not exclusively a domain of states and their representatives (Keohane and Nye, 2001). But more recently, non-state actors have received attention in the context of globalization and global governance. There is widespread agreement in IR that an increasing amount of social transactions (financial, communication, transportation, etc.) takes place across borders.[2]

Along with the denationalization of social transactions we can observe the proliferation of non-state actors like IOs, multinational corporations, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or criminal networks in global politics, which pursue their own goals independent of states.[3] These goals might well go hand in hand with (some) states' policy aims, but they can equally conflict with them. Thus, non-state actors can be valuable allies but they can equally hamper the implementation of states' foreign policies or in extreme cases force even great powers to adapt their foreign policies. The terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon in 2001, and on different locations in Paris are extreme examples in this regard, but also actions on a smaller scale can become a significant enough nuisance for states to force them to act. Examples include cyber attacks, piracy or various forms of transnational organized crime (see e.g. Kahler 2015). Due to space constraints, however, we will limit the following discussion to cooperation between state and non-state actors, while leaving "uncooperative" non-state actors largely aside.

Moreover, some non-state actors also increasingly extert authority, that is, they are involved in regulatory activities. Most obviously, IOs are important actors in global politics, with political authority and agency independent of states (Avant et al., 2010; Barnett and Finnemore, 2004; Barnett and Sikkink, 2008; Genschel and Zangl, 2013; Zürn et al., 2012). While certain actions like market reforms enforced by the International Monetary Fund or the World Bank and United Nations (UN) sanctions often reflect the interests of powerful states, many UN

---

[2] This process should however not be understood as unidirectional, uncontested or truly global in nature, which is why some observers prefer to speak of "societal denationalization" (Zürn, 2013, p. 403).
[3] As the example of the East India Company shows, this is not an entirely new phenomenon (Robins, 2002). Neither are NGOs entirely novel (Davies, 2014).

organizations are active around the globe without votes in the Security Council. Moreover, supranational institutions like the World Trade Organization or the International Criminal Court not only influence foreign policy but sometimes enforce decisions against the interests of even powerful states (Gruber, 2000; Martin and Simmons, 2013, p. 337; Tallberg, 2004). The authority of international actors is not limited to 'soft' policy fields but actually extends well into security affairs (Genschel and Jachtenfuchs, 2016; Herschingeret al., 2011; Mayer, 2011). More and more government functions are assigned to international actors. Europeanization (Börzel and Risse, 2000; Bulmer and Burch, 2005; Gross, 2009) and European foreign policy (see Jørgensenet al., 2015) are prominent examples. Moreover, within NATO and the EU at least, there is a general trend (in part also for financial reasons) towards the pooling and integration of capabilities (Mayer, 2014). Equally, international judges (Madsen, 2014) and civil servants (Sending, 2014) to some extent display state-independent action, which in part is due to organization cultures. IOs for one have become so independent of their state members that scholars have begun, in Barnett and Sikkink's words, "to worry that runaway IOs might become modern-day Frankensteins, where the inventors are no longer able to control their creation" (Barnett and Sikkink, 2008, p. 757). In addition to decision-making within formal IOs, foreign policy also takes place as a form of network governance (Goodin et al., 2008; Risse, 2013a). Here, policy emerges as the result policymaking in intergovernmental and interbureaucratic networks like the G7/G8 or informal coordination within IOs like NATO (Gstöhl, 2007; Kahler, 2015; Slaughter, 2004).[4] Although these networks consist of state actors, the movement of decision making from a setting involving officials of just one national government to one involving multiple ones presents a shift in the "decision unit" (Hermann, 2001, p. 48). Put simply, decisions about, say, US foreign policy are then partially prepared by, for example, French bureaucrats, and made involving also British government officials. It seems only natural that such decisions will differ from decisions made solely involving US officials.

Furthermore, one can observe a trend towards what has been called "transnational governance" (Risse, 2013b, p. 426), which refers to governance involving private and/or transnational actors, not just international ones. To begin with, transnational actors like NGOs

---

[4] Intergovernmental networks refer to networks of high government officials from different states (e.g. ministers, heads of government or state, national security advisors, heads of intelligence agencies and so on), interbureaucratic networks to lower-level officials like bureaucrats (Bauman and Stengel, 2014; Krotz, 2010, p. 152).

(Gerstbauer, 2005), business companies (Kolk and Lenfant, 2012; Tsingou, 2014; Wolf et al., 2007) and scientific experts (Haas, 1992; Kauppi, 2014; Sending, 2015) pursue their own agendas (see Jönsson and Tallberg, 2010; Risse, 2013b; Risse-Kappen, 1995b). As the activities of terrorist groups like al Qaeda or the so-called 'Islamic State' (or Daesh) most clearly demonstrate, these activities can significantly impact the foreign policies of even the most powerful states (Kahler, 2015). Moreover, like international actors transnational and private actors often also exert authority (Hall and Biersteker, 2002; Pauly and Grande, 2005). Aside from public-private partnerships, private and transnational authority mainly manifests itself in hybrid, transnational governance networks involving state and non-state actors (Dingwerth and Pattberg, 2006; Held and Koenig-Archibugi, 2003; Marchetti, 2016; Ougaard and Leander, 2010). In addition, IOs have increasingly opened up to transnational actors like scientific experts, businesses and NGOs (Tallberg et al., 2013). Transnational and private actors are increasingly involved in decision making within IOs, although the extent to which they have access varies significantly (Steffek, 2010; Tallberg et al., 2014). Importantly, this also extends well into the provision of security, both externally and internally, and scholars have begun speaking about specific forms of "security governance" (Krahmann, 2003; Abrahamsen and Williams, 2011). Nevertheless, the exact extent of this "power shift" (Mathews, 1997) from state actors towards non-state actors continues to be disputed.[5]

The move towards "governance beyond the nation-state" (Zürn, 1998) is to a large part the result of the emergence of denationalized problems that cannot be solved by individual states on their own (Mayntz, 2002; Reinicke, 1999; Stone, 2008). Problems like climate change cannot be addressed even by the most powerful actors alone but require international and transnational cooperation. Moreover, due to the fact that they are not territorially bound, non-state actors are only to a limited extent subject to governmental control. For example, if a multinational corporation is facing tax increases or strong environmental regulations, it can in principle move its headquarters to a different country, as can a transnational NGO facing governmental repression. As a consequence, involving these actors – in public-private partnerships, for instance (Ohanyan, 2009; Schäferhoff et al, 2009) – is sometimes the best way

---

[5] While some authors argue that the state is becoming obsolete (Ohmae, 1995; Strange, 1996), others claim that globalization does not change much (Gilpin, 2000; Waltz, 1999). More recently, studies have begun to examine the precise nature and extent of the alleged change of Western statehood (e.g. Genschel and Zangl, 2013; Leibfried et al., 2015).

to address the problem.[6] What is important to note about networked governance is that – in contrast to the "hierarchical control model" (Mayntz, 2002, p. 21) familiar from traditional notions of public administration and foreign policymaking (Stoker, 2006, pp. 43-45) – it involves non-hierarchical modes of decision making and policy implementation. Because no single actor is "in command" within these networks (Goodin et al., 2008, p. 865), this mode of governance involves much more arguing/persuasion and bargaining (Goodin et al., 2008; Müller, 2004; Risse, 2000, 2013a).

Non-State Actors and "Traditional" Foreign Policymaking within State Institutions

In addition to being independent players and participants in global governance arrangements, non-state actors are also increasingly included in 'traditional' national foreign policymaking within state institutions like foreign offices or defense ministries. So similar to hybrid governance, one can observe a trend towards the hybridization of traditional foreign policy and its institutions as well. Again, it should be kept in mind that this is largely an analytical distinction, while in reality, these processes will be intertwined.[7]

We can distinguish different types of non-state actors' involvement in foreign policymaking within national (state) institutions, based on juxtaposing indirect and direct as well as formal and informal involvement. The direct/indirect dimension refers to whether non-state actors are participating in the institutionalized processes of foreign policymaking (Risse, 2013a, p. 177), to pick an extreme case, in cabinet meetings or in the National Security Council. Indirect involvement on the other hand refers to activities like lobbying or advocacy, without inclusion in official decision-making bodies. Admittedly, this is a question of degree rather than a binary category. Not only does influence depend on which decision-making body non-state actors are represented in, but also access varies in terms of, for example, depth with actors having voting rights, visiting status in all or some meetings, or no access at all (with respect to IOs Tallberg et al., 2014). By formal interaction between state and non-state actors and their representatives we mean interaction that takes place in official forums designated for that purpose, such as

---

[6] This is not to say that one should accept the "crude 'business school' version" of globalization according to which national governments have no choice but to fulfil economic actors' demands (Watson and Hay, 2003, p. 289). Nor is it to say that governments could not in principle restrict people from leaving their country.

[7] Needless to say, to the extent that the representatives of these institutions are included in intergovernmental and interbureaucratic networks and work with their counterparts in IOs, also the traditional institutions of foreign policy are being disaggregated.

advisory boards or hearings in Congress. Informal interaction refers to interaction outside such designated forums, for example if decision-makers and lobbyist meet for lunch.

Table 1: Examples for different types of hybrid foreign policymaking

	Direct	Indirect
Formal	Inclusion in decision-making structures	Hearings of interest groups in parliament, scientific policy advice, diplomacy
Informal	Some forms of corruption	Media reporting, academic publishing, lobbying and advocacy, expert consultations

Source: authors' illustration

Indirect involvement is not a new issue. Students of foreign policy have examined the influence of ethnic (Haney and Vanderbush, 1999), religious (Haynes, 2014) business or other interest groups on foreign policy (LaPira, 2014; Milner and Tingley, 2015, ch. 3). The influence in particular of the business community has also been documented by quantitative studies (Jacobs and Page, 2005). Much lobbying takes place informally, but organized interest groups are often also invited to testify in (formal) parliamentary hearings as experts, and thus have the opportunity to voice their concerns (Milner and Tingley, 2015, ch. 3). In this context, in particular transnational advocacy coalitions and social movements are interesting, which have received significant attention in the literature (Bloodgood, 2011; Hanegraaff et al., 2015; Keck and Sikkink, 1998; Tarrow, 2011). An additional indirect influence that has been discussed to some extent in the literature are epistemic communities, that is, expert networks (Antoniades, 2003; Cross, 2013; Haas, 1992). Importantly, not only scientific experts and bureaucrats influence how policy issues come to be understood but also NGOs who influence, mainly via informal channels, for example the EU's Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP) (Dembinski and Joachim, 2014; Joachim and Dembinski, 2011). Although their influence is still mainly restricted to the implementation phase, NGOs continuously "expand the space for their participation" in CSDP, establishing working relations and gaining credibility as information sources (Shapovalova, 2016, p. 327). This also applies to the US. As Stoddard (2006) has shown, US intervention decisions are often based on information provided by NGOs. In the context of concrete operations, for example disaster relief operations, state actors often work hand in hand with private and transnational actors and rely on their information

for operational planning, including not just IOs and NGOs but also business companies.[8] As mentioned above, the media also exerts influence on foreign policymaking, for example in agenda setting and framing (Soroka, 2003; Walgrave et al., 2008; Wolfe et al., 2013). Like ordinary citizens, policymakers gain a large chunk of their information from the media (Avey and Desch, 2014), and as a consequence issue selection and framing influence how issues come to be understood and are weighed (Wolfe et al., 2013).

A newer development is the direct involvement of non-state actors in the domestic institutions in charge of a state's foreign policy. Not only do leaders of business companies, NGOs and academic institutions often go (temporarily or permanently) into government service,[9] their organizations are also increasingly directly involved in national policymaking. The most common form is the delegation of foreign policy tasks to non-state actors, especially with respect to policy implementation, the process by which decisions are put into action (Brighi and Hill, 2008, p. 117). In this context, the most (in)famous example are private military and security companies (PMSCs) who have taken over core functions in armed forces of many Western countries (e.g. Avant, 2005; Leander, 2011; Singer, 2008). PMSCs not only offer training, maintenance and other essentially non-military services but also provide protection for state officials, are involved in interrogations and other intelligence operations, and have in many ways become indispensable in certain areas, for instance technology-heavy areas like communications or weapons maintenance (Singer, 2008). Equally, IOs, corporations and NGOs increasingly employ the services of PMSCs (Baum and McGahan, 2013; Singer, 2008) and other contractors. Another example for non-state actor involvement is so-called "compound warfare," in which regular forces work in cooperation with irregular ones (Krieg, 2016, p. 99), like for instance coalition forces with the Northern Alliance in the overthrow of the Taliban in 2001. Equally, governments often rely on NGOs for the implementation of their policies (Bush, 2016). In contrast to what the policy cycle model might suggest, in practice implementation is not a distinct phase of policymaking. Rather, policy formulation, decision making, implementation and evaluation are usually intertwined, which means that policies are

---

[8] For example, in the context of the 2015 Nepal earthquake, private companies like the German logistics company DHL provided US armed forces and other government agencies with intelligence and local expertise (Dorman and Latham, 2016, p. 58).

[9] Academics often move into government service for some time (Henry Kissinger, Condoleezza Rice and Stephen Krasner are only a few among many examples), as do business leaders, if less often (the current US President Trump and his Secretary of State Rex Tillerson just being two examples), and under the leadership of Robin Cook, the British Foreign Office hired officers from NGOs like Amnesty International and Save the Children (Neumann, 2015, p. 54).

constantly adapted in ongoing processes. This way, information and feedback by surrogates also feeds back into policymaking (Brighi and Hill, 2008).

However, states not only rely on non-state actors for mere implementation purposes. Instead, the latter are involved in all stages of the policy process. As mentioned above, this begins with problem representation/framing and agenda setting, but also includes policy formulation and decision making as well as evaluation (see Jann and Wegrich, 2007). The increasing reliance on surrogates for foreign-policy implementation – whether private contractors, NGOs or IOs – also increases the need for coordination, which means that non-state surrogates need to be involved at least to some extent also in the planning of policies (Porteous, 2005; Stengel and Weller, 2010). This is clearly visible in US defense policy. Here, the significant reliance on contractors, not just PMSCs but a broad range of other commercial service providers, has led to the realization, at least among US armed forces personnel, that it requires closer coordination already in the planning phase, since "[f]ailure to integrate OCS [Operational Contract Support] increases the cost and reduces the precision, efficiency, and effectiveness of military efforts" (Dorman and Latham, 2016, p. 55). Much of this coordination still takes place on an informal, ad hoc basis, but state actors also increasingly include representatives of non-state actors into decision-making structures. The least 'invasive' form of direct non-state actor participation are advisory boards, through which governments institutionalize access to expertise. One example is the US State Department's International Security Advisory Board whose task is to provide "the Department with independent insight and advice on all aspects of arms control, disarmament, nonproliferation, international security, and related aspects of public diplomacy".[10] The board consists of members of academic institutions, think tanks, foundations (for example the Ploughshares Fund) and leaders of business companies (e.g. Hart International, a risk management firm). Moreover, representatives of business companies are often directly involved in the making of foreign economic policy through integration in institutions or inclusion in trade delegations (Breslin, 2004; EUISS, 2010; Kundnani, 2011). One additional way in which private actors can gain significant influence on foreign policy is by getting access to elected office. Usually, policymakers are expected to further the public interest, and there are numerous provisions in place to remove politicians from their private business during their term in office, with the aim of avoiding corruption. However, as the

---

[10] http://www.state.gov/t/avc/isab/

media debate about the extent to which US foreign policy is driven by President Donald Trump's own private business interests makes clear, even democracies are not entirely safe from the appropriation of public offices by its incumbents (Pillar, 2017; on corruption Ross, 2014). Overall, in many fields non-state actors increasingly "act as policy generators and are directly involved in decision-making and implementation of policy" (EUISS, 2010, p. 40). Moreover, policy documents call for further increased involvement of non-state actors. The 2015 British National Security Strategy for example calls for increased outsourcing in the defense sector and stresses the importance of the private sector for cyber security and the response to "[g]lobal risks and rising instability" (HM Government, 2015, pp. 33, 40, 67). Equally, the 2015 US National Security Strategy vowed to "continuously expand the scope of cooperation to encompass other state partners, non-state and private actors, and international institutions" and to increase the resilience of US society through a "Whole of Community approach, bringing together all elements of our society—individuals, local communities, the private and non-profit sectors, faith-based organizations, and all levels of government" (The White House, 2015, pp. 3, 8). Equally, non-state actors of different sorts are involved in policy evaluation, whether under contract by state and international actors or on their own initiative. Thus, a large amount of research is being produced that evaluates different aspects of policy in regards to their effectiveness, for example in the field of CSDP or individual national policies .[11]

Overall, non-state actors' involvement not simply includes implementation services but spans the full policy cycle, including, for example, strategic advice provided by former general officers working for PMSCs (Singer, 2008). Moreover, non-state actors' involvement is not limited to indirect modes like lobbying and advocacy anymore, but these actors are increasingly included in decision-making structures. Overall, as Keukeleire and Schunz (2015, p. 69f) rightly point out, the situation presented by the changed, multi-layered foreign-policy landscape is indeed far more complicated that Putnamian "two-level games" (Putnam, 1988) would suggest.

---

[11] One could criticize this type of research as the kind of "problem-solving" theory that Cox (1981, p. 128) considered problematic. More specifically with respect to CSDP, Chamlian (2016, p. 395) has argued that much of the CSDP literature uncritically reproduces the assumption that the EU should become more, not less active to counter allegedly new transnational threats like terrorism.

FP(A) and Non-State Actors: Are Theoretical Approaches Up to the Challenge?

So far we have tried to establish that non-state actors play an important role not just in matters of domestic politics but also in foreign policy, both as independent actors and as cooperation partners involved in states' foreign policies. This section turns to the question to what extent foreign policy studies, in particular theoretically, are prepared to address this significant shift in how foreign policy is conducted today. Following Hellmann and Jørgensen (2015), we distinguish here between (1) systemic and (2) agency-based approaches.

Systemic Approaches

To begin with, part of the theory-oriented research on foreign policy consists of attempts to utilize insights from IR's "grand theories" (Holsti, 1971, p. 166) to explain a particular foreign policy decision and/or outcome.[12] In light of space limitations, this section focuses on neorealism (or structural realism), "conventional" constructivism (Hopf, 1998) and liberalism, arguably the most prominent systemic IR theories.[13] Although primarily designed to explain general patterns of state interaction (Waltz 1996; Wendt 1999, p. 11), scholars have used, or argued for the use of, systemic theories to try to explain foreign policy (Baumann et al. , 1999; Elman, 1996; Flockhart, 2012; Houghton, 2007; Mearsheimer, 2001; Rittberger, 2001; Wivel, 2005). Although a rejection of systemic theories' utility for foreign policy studies *per se* seems premature, they do have significant problems with the inclusion of non-state actors. In this regard, mainly two problems are relevant: state centrism and the unitary actor assumption.

To begin with, neorealist foreign policy studies, wether "offensive" (Mearsheimer, 2001) or "neo-classical" (McLean, 2016; Rathbun, 2008; Rose, 1998; Schweller, 2004; Taliaferro, 2006),[14] share basic neorealist assumptions, most notably the anarchic structure of the international system, the centrality of states, their struggle for survival, insecurity about other actors' intentions and so on (Mearsheimer, 2001, ch. 2; Waltz, 1979, ch. 5, 6).[15] Since for neorealists,

---

[12] Whether decisions or outcomes/behavior should be the explanandum of foreign policy studies is subject to debate (Carlsnaes, 2013).

[13] IR theory is of course more diverse than our selection suggests. We refrain from including institutionalism, English School or critical systemic approaches because (a) these approaches have either not been as prominent in the study of foreign policy (institutionalism, English School) or have an entirely different, and often incompatible, conception of what it means to offer an explanation (critical approaches).

[14] The second group is sometimes also referred to as "post-classical" (Brooks, 1997) or "modified" (Baumann et al., 1999) realism.

[15] Neo-classical accounts combine basic realist assumptions with domestic politics, while Mearsheimer's only

states are the main actors and will remain so for the foreseeable time (Gilpin, 2000; Waltz, 1999), it basically declares non-state actors outside its area of responsibility. IOs are mere vehicles for states to push through their agendas (Mearsheimer, 1994/95), and transnational and private are of marginal importance compared to states. From a realist perspective, non-state actors are only relevant in regard to their potential involvement in state behavior. Here a second problem comes into play, namely the unitary actor assumption. According to neorealism, the anarchic structure of the international system turns states into "like units"(Waltz, 1997, p. 913), providing strong incentives for them to behave in a similar fashion. Put simply, states behave like billiard balls on a pool table (Krasner, 1982), and understanding their actions does not require to open them up. That excludes potential non-state involvement from the start. By allowing for at least some opening up of the black box of the state, post-classical realists are in a better position to account for non-state actors, at least their involvement in states' foreign policies.[16] Still, the question remains to what extent such an account would still be strictly realist (Legro and Moravcsik, 1999, 2000). It is highly doubtful whether non-state actors could be integrated into a neorealist framework without giving up its bedrock assumptions (but then, neorealists would probably rather dispute the need to turn to actors other than states). So, overall, neorealism does not provide the best starting point to examine the empirical developments we have sketched out above.

Constructivist accounts, at least in their Wendtian articulation, fare little better. Like Waltz, Wendt insists on the primacy of states and thus, like neorealism, declares itself not in charge of non-state actors. Similar to Waltz, Wendt conceptualizes the state as a unitary actor, not a disaggregated one that would allow for the analysis of hybrid foreign policymaking.[17] Indeed, insofar as at least Wendt has argued in favor of understanding states as persons, conventional constructivism even goes beyond neorealism in the commitment to the state-as-actor.[18]

One exception in this regard is liberalism as (re)formulated most prominently by Moravcsik

---

modification to Waltz's original account is to argue that great powers actually strive for hegemony instead of just a moderate amount of power – hence the label of "offensive" realism. So for Mearsheimer, great powers have aggressive intentions.

[16] Certainly, examining non-state actors as independent player still falls outside the theory's purview.

[17] It should be noted though that Wendt has since then not only provided a critique of his own work (Wendt, 2006), turned more towards poststructuralism in some works (Wendt and Duvall, 2008) and, most recently, focused on quantum theory (Wendt, 2015), so it is questionable to what extent the critique provided here still applies to his current theoretical positions. Certainly, if we conceptualize of humans as "walking wave functions" (Wendt, 2015, p. 3), it does not matter much if they act within state structures or NGOs.

[18] To be precise, for neorealists the assumption of states as actors is an instrumental and not an ontological one. As opposed to that, Wendt made a (philosophically) realist argument in support of state personhood (Wendt, 2004, 2005).

(1997) in the 1990s. According to liberalism, state action on the international level is mainly the result of the interplay of the different states' preferences. Importantly, states' preferences themselves are not the result of external system pressures (like anarchy) but depend on the interests of the most influential societal actors. This in principle allows for an incorporation of non-state actors. The main vehicle through which the interests of societal actors translate into states' preferences are "[r]epresentative institutions and practices" such as elections, which Moravcsik conceives of as a "transmission belt" (Moravcsik, 1997, p. 518). By understanding states primarily as transmission belts, liberalism allows for non-state actors to exert influence on decision-makers. Still, liberalism directs our attention mainly to elections, not so much to dynamics within different organizations, decision-making bodies and so on that would allow us to examine precisely what it means if non-state actors get a seat at the table – independent of any democratic procedures.

Agency-based Approaches

The second large group in theory-oriented foreign policy research consists of agency-based approaches. This includes mainly FPA, the agent-specific subfield of foreign policy research, which has become particularly prominent in the US (Breuning, 2007; Hudson, 2014; Mintz and DeRouen, 2010). FPA is a theoretically rather eclectic field that utilizes insights from a number of different (sub-)disciplines. The combining frame for FPA scholars is their focus on decision-making procedures. That is, FPA scholars stress the importance, quite contrary to realists, to open up and disaggregate the black box of the state and to look into how individuals, groups, organizations and their cultures affect the making of foreign policy (Snyder et al., 2002). More specifically, one can distinguish between studies that examine individual-level factors and those that focus primarily on interaction between individuals and groups within government. Individual-level studies are often strongly influenced by political psychology, highlighting the importance of cognitive processes and personality traits. Much of this type of research is strongly influenced by political psychology (for an overview, see Houghton 2017). A core argument of these types of studies is that, quite contrary to systemic approaches, it matters a great deal who is in charge because personality and cognitive abilities cannot be ignored (Byman and Pollack, 2001; Hermann, 2001). Foreign policymaking in particular is often characterized by high cognitive pressures (stress, lack of time and information, high stakes,

etc., see Renshon and Renshon, 2008), and in such situations people tend to rely on cognitive shortcuts, core beliefs and worldviews (Jervis 2006, p. 650), which opens up the possibility of all kinds of decisions that are by no means perfectly rational. Also, individual personalities differ, for example in regard to their tendency towards of risk taking or aversion, the level of self confidence or the need for power, and this influences decision-making. The second group of studies points to the importance of the interplay between different groups in government, broadly understood. This includes for example research on (small) group dynamics, such as groupthink (Janis, 1972) or group conflicts (Hermann and Hermann, 1989; Hermann et al., 2001). Similarly, from an FPA perspective foreign policy is often the product not of systemic pressures or the functional requirements of the specific policy problem at hand but of bureaucratic turf wars (Allison and Zelikow, 1999), organizational cultures and other factors. Overall, FPA directs our attention to individuals and group dynamics within not-so-unitary states, and policy outcomes are often not determined by the problem-adequateness of different policies (as one might initially expect) but by factors that, frankly, have little to do with the nature of the problem at hand. This in principle gives FPA an advantage in the analysis of decision-making in disaggregated organizations, whether they are states or non-state actors, as well as in hybrid governance networks. Moreover, the theoretical eclecticism and process orientation of FPA makes it easier to connect to policy analysis and the governance literature, which already focusses on hybrid governance arrangements. Baumann and Stengel (2014) have argued that theoretical concepts from the FPA toolkit like beliefs and cognitive shortcuts, framing effects (Mintz and Redd, 2003) and problem representation (Sylvan, 1998), groupthink or organizational turf wars and cultures could also be applied to non-state actors' decision-making as well as to hybrid foreign policymaking involving both state and non-state actors. After all, given that at the heart of state and non-state actors's decision making are human beings, the dynamics of group decision-making as well as individual-level factors should not fundamentally differ between the two. However, FPA scholars have so far remained focused on decision dynamics within states and only very recently turned their attention to non-state actors (Alden and Aran, 2017; Hill, 2016).[19]

---

[19] The only exception, to our knowledge, are studies of terrorist leaders (Mintz et al., 2006) and, notably, the established research program on European foreign policy (e.g. Jørgensen et al., 2015).

Conclusion: Outline of a Preliminary Research Agenda

An intensified dialogue between the analysis of foreign policy and the governance literature is needed, which so far have largely ignored each other (Alden and Aran, 2017; Baumann and Stengel, 2014; Risse, 2013a). Such a dialogue may give way to a research agenda comprising three key elements: (1) a systematic inventory of state/non-state actor relationships in foreign policy; (2) research into the factors that influence non-state actor participation in foreign polciymaking; and (3) increased efforts to grasp the consequences of the "changing politics of foreign policy" (Hill, 2003) for democratic legitimacy.

Taking Stock of Variation: Towards a Taxonomy of Foreign Policy Actors and their Interactions

Analyzing foreign policy in the era of globalization has to begin with systematic, comparative research that examines the actual extent of non-state actors' involvement in foreign-policymaking. As far as global governance is concerned, there already exists a significant body of research. Scholars have examined the increased proliferation of network governance, the reasons for states' increased reliance on IOs (Keohane, 1982; Tallberg et al., 2016) and networks and the factors that influence the inclusion of transnational actors (Jönsson and Tallberg, 2010; Tallberg, 2010; Tallberg et al., 2013, 2014). However, what is still pending is an analysis to what extent non-state actors are involved in states foreign-policymaking procedures and institutions. Such an analysis has to cover a number of dimensions.

- Firstly, what is needed are cross-national comparisons to establish whether there is significant variation on a country-by-country basis. Such analyses should deploy fine-grained analytical frameworks that allow to distinguish between different types and degrees of participation (say, whether a non-state actor has voting rights or observer status), similar to the literature on NGO access to IOs (Tallberg et al., 2014).

- Secondly, empirical studies need to establish variation across different fields of foreign policy. Certain fields of foreign policy (most notably security policy) simply are more secretive than others, and it is reasonable to assume that this limits access.

- Thirdly, actor involvement has to be classified according to the type of non-state actor involved. At the very least, we need to distinguish between international, transnational and private actors, but other dimensions might be equally helpful (say, between profit-oriented businesses and nonprofits).

Based on such an empirical inventory, scholars could then begin to explain various aspects of new forms of foreign policymaking. Two avenues seem particularly fruitful here. Firstly, scholars should attempt to analyze foreign policy outcomes, (1) produced by non-state actors acting alone, (2) global governance arrangements and (3) changed national decision-making processes. This is a field where the mainly descriptive global governance literature could also benefit from theoretically oriented research in foreign policy. Foreign policy scholars already have a broad range of theoretical concepts at their disposal with which they can explain policy outcomes.

Secondly, taking, among others, the literature on transnational relations (Risse-Kappen, 1995a) and the opening up of IOs (Tallberg et al., 2013) as a starting point, scholars could examine under which conditions national governments choose to include non-state actors. Factors that seem likely to exert an influence include:

- the type of non-state actor and its resources;
- the regime type and the specific domestic political structures of the respective country;
- political and organizational cultures;
- the policy field and the degree of its international institutionalization;
- the stage of the policy process.

The most important argument highlighted in the literature on global governance is a functional one: actors are included in governance networks because they can offer something that states need (resources, information, geographical access, legitimacy), and regimes emerge because they help states solve policy problems (Abbott et al., 2016; Abbott and Snidal, 1998; Keohane, 1982; Reinicke, 1998; Stone, 2008; Tallberg et al., 2014; Zürn, 2013). Which exact resources an actor can offer will vary significantly. The second factor highlighted in the literature is the regime type and the political opportunity structures of specific states. Studies highlight that democratic standards among member states influence whether transnational actors are included (Tallberg et al., 2014), and it is reasonable to assume that this also holds with respect to states individually. In addition, other, more specific characteristics of the political system are highlighted in the literature, for instance the degree of fragmentation: the higher the degree of fragmentation, the greater the chance that transnational actors can offer resources that are in need (Nölke, 2017, p. 784f). Studies on the conditions of success for

lobbying have equally highlighted institutional setup and the relative influence of different government bodies (Dür et al., 2015). Aside from political institutions that regulate access, also 'softer' factors like culture will arguably influence which types of actors have more or less access to which governments. For instance, it seems likely that the extent to which the involvement of private actors is generally considered positive (in terms of efficiency or effectiveness, for example) or negative (in terms of, say, democratic legitimacy) in a particular political culture influences private actors' involvement in foreign policymaking. The hypothesis that privatization will lead to increased efficiency does, despite its widespread acceptance, not necessarily bear out everywhere, so this is more of a culturally influenced expectation than one based on systematic evidence. A similar issue is the involvement of international actors, which is arguably also influenced by cultural factors like for instance whether restraints on unilateral wiggle room are commonly deemed acceptable. In regards to the latter, for example, one could hypothesize that Germany with its strong multilateral tradition in foreign policy (e.g. Baumann, 2006; Maull, 2001) would be much more open to both, IO involvement and coordination with other states in intergovernmental/interbureaucratic networks, than for example the United States with its strong tradition of exceptionalism (e.g. Ceaser, 2012; Lipset, 1997; Onuf, 2012). Equally, studies on the involvement of transnational actors in CSDP have pointed to organizational cultures as a significant factor in determining access (Shapovalova, 2016).

As mentioned above, variation can also be expected across policy fields. Different fields of foreign policy vary in terms of access even within the government, with security policy and intelligence matters being the most secretive, and as a result, access will vary. Moreover, there are likely to be interactive effects to be involved between policy field and the type of actor. For example, NATO as an international actor is intimately involved in all stages of the making of its member states' security policy, as is the EU, while other international actors will be involved to a lesser extent. Similarly, a defense contractor that has personnel with the required security clearances will likely have easier access in security policy than an NGO, while the playing field in environmental politics will likely be at least level, if not skewed towards NGOs (the involvement of PMSCs might be seen as a potential militarization of environmental politics). Furthermore, it seems reasonable to expect that non-state actors' participation will depend on the stage of the policy process (Shapovalova, 2016). For example, states may be more likely to include non-state actors in the implementation stage than in the formulation of policy goals.

Arguably, it is easier for states to utilize non-state actors (through delegation or orchestration, Abbott et al., 2016) to implement their foreign policy goals than to have them participate in the formulation of those goals in the first place.

Assessing Normative Consequences: Non-state Actors' Involvement, Democratic Legitimacy and Accountability

Finally, the increasing involvement of non-state actors in foreign policymaking also brings to the fore interesting normative questions, in particular with regard to democratic legitimacy. Traditionally, foreign policy used to be thought of as an area of policy that, as opposed to other policy fields, was not, and should not be, influenced by the public and its special interests because it concerned "national interests […] and more fundamental values" than are at stake in domestic politics (Cohen, 1968, p. 530) and should be left to enlightened statesmen (*sic!*) that had the national interest in mind (Carlsnaes, 2013, p. 300). Nevertheless, it has been rightly pointed out not only that the public is not remotely as flimsy in its opinions as it was once made out to be (Holsti, 1992; Milner and Tingley, 2013) but also that it shares moral responsibility also for the foreign policies conducted in its name (Krippendorff, 2000). Thus, there is no reason to exclude normative considerations from the analysis of foreign policy.[20] Normative consideration with respect to changing modes of governance have been a central concern with respect to EU (Moravcsik, 2006) and global governance (Dingwerth, 2014; Kuyper, 2016; Nasiritousi et al., 2015; Sørensen and Torfing, 2005; Zürn, 2016). Newer studies highlight the increased politicization of IOs, which goes along with their increased authority (Zürn, 2014; Zürn et al., 2012). With respect to foreign policy, normative considerations have been mainly discussed with respect to PMSCs and the privatization of the state monopoly of force (e.g. De Nevers, 2009; Leander, 2011). To the extent that foreign policymaking within domestic structures is also increasingly influenced by non-state actors, most of which are not legitimated through democratic procedures,[21] the study of foreign policy might also profit from increased normative engagement.

---

[20] Similarly, Sjursen (2015) has called for increased attention to normative aspects in the study of European foreign policy.

[21] This is not to say that this is the only potential source of legitimacy (see e.g. Scharpf, 1999).

Acknowledgements

References

Abbott, K. W., Genschel, P., Snidal, D., and Zangl, B. (2016). Two Logics of Indirect Governance: Delegation and Orchestration. *British Journal of Political Science* 46(4), 719-729. doi:10.1017/S0007123414000593

Abbott, K. W., and Snidal, D. (1998). Why States Act through Formal International Organizations. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 42*(1), 3-32. doi:10.1177/0022002798042001001

Abrahamsen, R., & Williams, M. C. (2010). *Security Beyond the State: Private Security in International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alden, C., and Aran, A. (2017). *Foreign Policy Analysis: New Approaches* (2nd ed.). Abingdon: Routledge.

Allison, G. T., and Zelikow, P. (1999). *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.

Anderson, M. B. (1999). *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace - or War*. London: Lynne Rienner.

Antoniades, A. (2003). Epistemic Communities, Epistemes and the Construction of (World) Politics. *Global Society, 17*(1), 21-38. doi: 10.1080/0953732032000053980

Avant, D. D. (2005). *The Market for Force: The Consequences of Privatizing Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Avant, D. D., Finnemore, M., and Sell, S. K. (2010). *Who governs the globe?*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Avey, P. C., and Desch, M. C. (2014). What Do Policymakers Want From Us? Results of a Survey of Current and Former Senior National Security Decision Makers. *International Studies Quarterly, 58*(2), 227-246. doi:10.1111/isqu.12111

Barnett, M., and Finnemore, M. (2004). *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Barnett, M., and Sikkink, K. (2008). From International Relations to Global Society. In C. Reus-Smit and D. Snidal (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (pp. 62-83). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baum, J. A. C., and McGahan, A. M. (2013). The reorganization of legitimate violence: The contested terrain of the private military and security industry during the post-cold war era. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 33*, 3-37. doi:10.1016/j.riob.2013.10.004

Baumann, R. (2006). *Der Wandel des deutschen Multilateralismus. Eine diskursanalytische Untersuchung deutscher Aussenpolitik*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Baumann, R., Rittberger, V., and Wagner, W. (1999). Macht und Machtpolitik. Neorealistische Außenpolitiktheorie und Prognosen über die deutsche Außenpolitik nach der Vereinigung. *Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen, 6*(2), 245-286.

Baumann, R., and Stengel, F. A. (2014). Foreign Policy Analysis, Globalisation and Non-State Actors:

State-Centric After All? *Journal of International Relations and Development, 17*(4), 489-521. doi:10.1057/jird.2013.12

Bloodgood, E. A. (2011). The Interest Group Analogy: International Non-governmental Advocacy Organisations in International Politics. *Review of International Studies, 37*(1), 93-120. doi:10.1017/S0260210510001051

Börzel, T., and Risse, T. (2000). When Europe Hits Home: Europeanization and Domestic Change. *European Integration Online Papers, 4*(15). doi:10.2139/ssrn.302768

Breslin, S. (2004). Beyond Diplomacy? UK Relations with China since 1997. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations, 6*, 409-425. doi:10.1111/j.1467-856X.2004.00147.x

Breuning, M. (2007). *Foreign Policy Analysis: A Comparative Introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brighi, E., and Hill, C. (2008). Implementation and Behaviour. In S. Smith, A. Hadfield, and T. Dunne (Eds.), *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases* (pp. 117-135). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brooks, S. G. (1997). Dueling Realisms. *International Organization, 51*(3), 445-477. 10.1162/002081897550429

Bulmer, S., and Burch, M. (2005). The Europeanization of UK government: from quiet revolution to explicit step-change? *Public Administration, 83*(4), 861-890.

Bush, S. S. (2016). When and why is civil society support "made-in-America"? Delegation to non-state actors in American democracy promotion. *The Review of International Organizations, 11*(3), 361-385.

Byman, D. L., & Pollack, K. M. (2001). Let Us Now Praise Great Men: Bringing the Statesman Back In. *International Security, 25*(4), 107-146. doi:10.1162/01622880151091916

Carlsnaes, W. (2013). Foreign Policy. In W. Carlsnaes, T. Risse, and B. A. Simmons (Eds.), *Handbook of International Relations* (2nd ed., pp. 298-325). London et al.: Sage.

Ceaser, J. W. (2012). The Origins and Character of American Exceptionalism. *American Political Thought, 1*(1), 3-28. doi:10.1086/664595

Chamlian, L. (2016). The Colonisation of the Future: Power, Knowledge and Preparedness in CSDP. *Global Society, 30*(3), 391-411. doi: 10.1080/13600826.2016.1173020

Chong, A. (2002). The post-international challenge to foreign policy: signposting 'plus non-state' politics. *Review of International Studies, 28*(4), 783-795. doi:10.1017/S0260210502007830

Cohen, B. C. (1968). Foreign Policy. In D. L. Sills (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. 5* (pp. 530-535). New York: Free Press.

Cohen, B. C., and Harris, S. A. (1975). Foreign Policy. In F. I. Greenstein and N. W. Polsby (Eds.), *Handbook of Political Science, Vol. 6: Policies and Policymaking* (pp. 381-437). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Colona, F., and Jaffe, R. (2016). Hybrid Governance Arrangements. *European Journal of Development Research, 28*, 175-183. doi:10.1057/ejdr.2016.5

Cox, R. W. (1981). Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies, 10*(2), 126-155. doi:10.1177/03058298810100020501

Cross, M. a. K. D. (2013). Rethinking epistemic communities twenty years later. *Review of International Studies, 39*(01), 137-160. doi:10.1017/S0260210512000034

Davies, T. (2014). *NGOs: A new history of transnational civil society*. New York: Oxford University Press.

De Nevers, R. (2009). Private Security Companies and the Laws of War. *Security Dialogue, 40*(2), 169.190. doi:10.1177/0967010609103076

Debiel, T., and Sticht, M. (2005). Towards a New Profile? Development, Humanitarian and Conflict-

Resolution NGOs in the Age of Globalization. Duisburg: Institute for Development and Peace.

Dembinski, M., and Joachim, J. (2014). Civil Society and the European Common Security and Defence Policy. *European Security, 23*(4), 449-465. doi:10.1080/09662839.2014.890594

Dingwerth, K. (2014). Global Democracy and the Democratic Minimum: Why a Procedural Account Alone Is Insufficient. *European Journal of International Relations, 20*(4), 1124-1147. doi:10.1177/1354066113509116

Dingwerth, K., and Pattberg, P. (2006). Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics. *Global Governance, 12*(2), 185-203.

Dingwerth, K., and Pattberg, P. (2009). Actors, Arenas and Issues in Global Governance. In J. Whitman (Ed.), *Global Governance* (pp. 41-65). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dorman, E. F., III, and Latham, W. C., Jr. (2016). Operational Contract Support. *Military Review* (November-December 2016), 52-59.

Dür, A., Bernhagen, P., and Marshall, D. (2015). Interest Group Success in the European Union. *Comparative Political Studies, 48*(8), 951-983. doi:10.1177/0010414014565890

Elman, C. (1996). Horses for Courses: Why *Not* Neorealist Theories of Foreign Policy? *Security Studies, 6*(1), 7-53. doi:10.1080/09636419608429297

Eriksson, J., and Rhinard, M. (2009). The Internal—External Security Nexus: Notes on an Emerging Research Agenda. *Cooperation and Conflict, 44*(3), 243-267. doi:10.1177/0010836709106215

EUISS. (2010). *Global Governance 2025: At a Critical Juncture*. Paris: European Union Institute for Strategic Studies (EUISS).

Flockhart, T. (2012). Constructivism and foreign policy. In S. Smith, A. Hadfield, and T. Dunne (Eds.), *Foreign policy: theories, actors, cases* (2nd ed., pp. 78-93). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Genschel, P., and Jachtenfuchs, M. (2016). More integration, less federation: the European integration of core state powers. *Journal of European Public Policy, 23*(1), 42-59. doi:10.1080/13501763.2015.1055782

Genschel, P., and Zangl, B. (2008). Metamorphosen des Staates – vom Herrschaftsmonopolisten zum Herrschaftsmanager *Leviathan, 36*(3), 430-454.

Genschel, P., and Zangl, B. (2011). L'État et l'exercice de l'autorité politique: Dénationalisation et administration. *Revue française de sociologie, 52*(3), 509-535.

Genschel, P., and Zangl, B. (2013). State Transformations in OECD Countries. *Annual Review of Political Science, 17*(1), 15.11-15.18. doi:10.1146/annurev-polisci-061312-113943

Gerstbauer, L. C. (2005). The New Conflict Managers: Peacebuilding NGOs and State Agendas. In E. Krahmann (Ed.), *New Threats and new Actors in International Security* (pp. 23-43). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gilpin, R. (2000). *The Challenge of Global Capitalism: The World Economy in the 21st Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Goodin, R. E., Rein, M., and Moran, M. (2008). The Public and Its Policies. In M. Moran, M. Rein, and R. E. Goodin (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy* (pp. 3-35). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gross, E. (2009). *The Europeanization of National Foreign Policy: Continuity and Change in European Crisis Management*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gruber, L. (2000). *Ruling the World: Power Politics and the Rise of Supranational Institutions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gstöhl, S. (2007). Governance Through Government Networks: The G8 and International Organizations. *The Review of International Organizations, 2*(1), 1-37. doi:10.1007/s11558-006-9004-8

Haas, P. M. (1992). Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination. *International Organization, 46*(01), 1-35.

Hall, R. B., and Biersteker, T. J. (Eds.). (2002). *The Emergence of Private Authority in Global Governance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hanegraaff, M., Braun, C., De Bièvre, D., and Beyers, J. (2015). The Domestic and Global Origins of Transnational Advocacy. *Comparative Political Studies, 48*(12), 1591-1621. doi:10.1177/0010414015591363

Haney, P. J., and Vanderbush, W. (1999). The Role of Ethnic Interest Groups in U.S. Foreign Policy: The Case of the Cuban American National Foundation. *International Studies Quarterly, 43*(2), 341-361. doi:10.1111/0020-8833.00123

Haynes, J. (2014). *Religion in Global Politics*. London and New York: Routledge.

Held, D., and Koenig-Archibugi, M. (Eds.). (2003). *Taming Globalization: Frontiers of Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hellmann, G., and Jørgensen, K. E. (2015a). Introduction. In G. Hellmann and K. E. Jørgensen (Eds.), *Theorizing Foreign Policy in a Globalized World* (pp. 1-11). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hellmann, G., and Jørgensen, K. E. (Eds.) (2015b). *Theorizing Foreign Policy in a Globalized World*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hermann, M. G. (2001). How Decision Units Shape Foreign Policy: A Theoretical Framework. *International Studies Review, 3*(Special Issue), 47-81. doi:10.1111/1521-9488.00234

Hermann, M. G., & Hermann, C. F. (1989). Who Makes Foreign Policy Decisions and How: An Empirical Inquiry. *International Studies Quarterly, 33*(4), 361-387.

Hermann, M. G., Preston, T., Korany, B., & Shaw, T. M. (2001). Who Leads Matters: The Effects of Powerful Individuals. *International Studies Review, 3*(Special Issue), 83-131. doi:10.1111/1521-9488.00235

Herschinger, E., Jachtenfuchs, M., and Kraft-Kasack, C. (2011). Scratching the Heart of the Artichoke? How International Institutions and the EU Constrain the State Monopoly of Force. *European Political Science Review, 3*(3), 445-468. doi:10.1017/S175577391100004X

Hill, C. (2003). *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hill, C. (2016). *Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century* (2nd ed.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

HM Government. (2015). *National Security Strategy and Strategic Defence and Security Review 2015: A Secure and Prosperous United Kingdom*. London: British Government Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/478936/52309_Cm_9161_NSS_SD_Review_PRINT_only.pdf.

Holsti, K. J. (1971). Retreat from Utopia: International Relations Theory, 1945–70. *Canadian Journal of Political Science, 4*(2), 165-177.

Holsti, O. R. (1992). Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: Challenges to the Almond-Lippmann Consensus. *International Studies Quarterly, 36*(4), 439-466.

Hopf, T. (1998). The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory. *International Security, 23*(1), 171-200. doi:10.2307/2539267

Houghton, D. P. (2007). Reinvigorating the Study of Foreign Policy Decision Making: Toward a Constructivist Approach. *Foreign Policy Analysis, 3*(1), 24-45. doi:10.1111/j.1743-8594.2007.00040.x

Houghton, D. P. (2017). The Political Psychology of Foreign Policy. In W. R. Thompson (ed.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.466

Hudson, V. M. (2014). *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory* (2nd ed.). Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Jacobs, L. R., and Page, B. I. (2005). Who Influences U.S. Foreign Policy? *American Political Science Review, 99*(1), 107-123. doi:10.1017/S000305540505152X

Janis, I. L. (1972). *Victims of Groupthink: A Psychological Study of Foreign-Policy Decisions and Fiascoes.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Jann, W., and Wegrich, K. (2007). Theories of the Policy Cycle. In F. Fischer, G. J. Miller, and M. S. Sidney (Eds.), *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics, and Methods* (pp. 43-62). London et al.: CRC Press.

Jervis, R. (2006). Understanding Beliefs. *Political Psychology, 27*(5), 641-663. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2006.00527.x

Joachim, J., and Dembinski, M. (2011). A Contradiction in Terms? NGOs, Democracy, and European Foreign and Security Policy. *Journal of European Public Policy, 18*(8), 1151-1168. doi:10.1080/13501763.2011.615204

Jönsson, C., and Tallberg, J. (Eds.). (2010). *Transnational Actors in Global Governance: Patterns, Explanations, and Implications.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jørgensen, K. E., Aarstad, A. K., Drieskens, E., Laatikainen, K., and Tonra, B. (Eds.). (2015). *The SAGE Handbook of European Foreign Policy*. London et al.: Sage.

Kahler, M. (Ed.) (2015). *Networked politics: agency, power, and governance.* Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press.

Kauppi, N. (2014). Knowledge Warfare: Social Scientists as Operators of Global Governance. *International Political Sociology, 8*(3), 330-332. doi:10.1111/ips.12062

Keck, M. E., and Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Keohane, R. O. (1982). The Demand for International Regimes. *International Organization, 16*(2), 325-355. doi:10.1017/S002081830001897X

Keohane, R. O., and Nye, J. S. J. (2001). *Power and Interdependence* (3rd ed.). New York et al.: Longman.

Keukeleire, S., and Schunz, S. (2015). Analysing Foreign Policy in a Context of Global Governance. In G. Hellmann and K. E. Jørgensen (Eds.), *Theorizing Foreign Policy in a Globalized World* (pp. 58-80). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kolk, A., and Lenfant, F. (2012). Business–NGO collaboration in a conflict setting: Partnership activities in the Democratic Republic of Congo. *Business and Society, 51*(3), 478-511.

Krahmann, E. (2003). Conceptualizing Security Governance. *Cooperation and Conflict, 38*(1), 5-26. doi:10.1177/0010836703038001001

Krasner, S. D. (1982). Regimes and the Limits of Realism: Regimes as Autonomous Variables. *International Organization, 36*(2), 497-510. doi:10.1017/S0020818300019032

Krieg, A. (2016). Externalizing the burden of war: the Obama Doctrine and US foreign policy in the Middle East. *International Affairs, 92*(1), 97-113.

Krippendorff, E. (2000). *Kritik der Außenpolitik.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Krotz, U. (2010). Regularized Intergovernmentalism: France-Germany and Beyond (1963-2009). *Foreign Policy Analysis, 6*(2), 147-185.

Kundnani, H. (2011). Germany as a Geo-economic Power. *The Washington Quarterly, 34*(3), 31-45.

Kuyper, J. (2016). Global Democracy. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy

(Winter 2016 ed.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. Retrieved from https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/global-democracy.

LaPira, T. M. (2014). Lobbying after 9/11: Policy Regime Emergence and Interest Group Mobilization. *Policy Studies Journal, 42*(2), 226-251.

Leander, A. (2011). Risk and the fabrication of apolitical, unaccountable military markets: the case of the CIA 'Killing Program'. *Review of International Studies, 37*(5), 2253-2268.

Legro, J. W., and Moravcsik, A. (1999). Is Anybody Still a Realist? *International Security, 24*(2), 5-55.

Legro, J. W., and Moravcsik, A. (2000). Correspondence: Brother, Can You Spare a Paradigm? (Or Was Anybody Ever a Realist?). *International Security, 25*(1), 184-193.

Leibfried, S., Huber, E., Lange, M., Levy, J. H., Nullmeier, F., and Stephens, J. D. (Eds.). (2015). *The Oxford Handbook of Transformations of the State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lipset, S. M. (1997). *American Exceptionalism: A Double-Edged Sword*. New York and London: W. W. Norton.

Madsen, M. R. (2014). The International Judiciary as Transnational Power Elite. *International Political Sociology, 8*(3), 332-334.

Marchetti, R. (2016). *Global Strategic Engagement: States and Non-State Actors in Global Governance*. Lanham et al.: Lexington Books.

Martin, L. L., and Simmons, B. A. (2013). International Organizations and Institutions. In W. Carlsnaes, T. Risse, and B. A. Simmons (Eds.), *Handbook of International Relations* (2nd ed., pp. 326-). London et al.: Sage.

Mathews, J. T. (1997). Power Shift. *Foreign Affairs, 76*(1), 50-66.

Maull, H. W. (2001). Germany's Foreign Policy, Post-Kosovo: Still a Civilian Power? In S. Harnisch and H. W. Maull (Eds.), *Germany as a Civilian Power? The Foreign Policy of the Berlin Republic* (pp. 106-127). Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Mayer, S. (2011). Embedded Politics, Growing Informalization? How NATO and the EU Transform Provision of External Security. *Contemporary Security Policy, 32*(2), 308-333.

Mayer, S. (Ed.) (2014). *NATO's Post-Cold War Politics: The Changing Provision of Security*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mayntz, R. (2002). Common Goods and Governance. In A. Héritier (Ed.), *Common Goods: Reinventing European and International Governance* (pp. 15-27). Lanham, MD et al.: Rowman and Littlefield.

McLean, W. (2016). Neoclassical Realism and Australian Foreign Policy: Understanding How Security Elites Frame Domestic Discourses. *Global Change Peace and Security, 28*(1).

Mearsheimer, J. J. (1994/95). The False Promise of International Institutions. *International Security, 19*(3), 5-49.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York and London: W.W. Norton.

Milner, H. V., and Tingley, D. (2013). Public Opinion and Foreign Aid: A Review Essay. *International Interactions, 39*(3), 389-401. doi:10.1080/03050629.2013.784090

Milner, H. V., and Tingley, D. (2015). *Sailing the Water's Edge: The Domestic Politics of American Foreign Policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mintz, A., Chatagnier, J. T., and Brulé, D. J. (2006). Being bin Laden: An Applied Decision Analysis Procedure for Analyzing and Predicting Terrorists' Decisions. In A. Pedahzur (Ed.), *Root Causes of Suicide Terrorism: The Globalization of Martyrdom* (pp. 152-178). London/New York: Routledge.

Mintz, A., and DeRouen, K. R. (2010). *Understanding Foreign Policy Decision Making*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Mintz, A., and Redd, S. B. (2003). Framing Effects in International Relations. *Synthese, 135*(2), 193-213. doi:10.1023/a:1023460923628

Moravcsik, A. (1997). Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics. *International Organization, 51*(4), 513-553.

Moravcsik, A. (2006). What Can We Learn From the Collapse of the European Constitutional Project? *Politische Vierteljahresschrift, 47*(2), 219-241.

Müller, H. (2004). Arguing, Bargaining and All That: Communicative Action, Rationalist Theory and the Logic of Appropriateness in International Relations. *European Journal of International Relations, 10*(3), 395-435. doi:10.1177/1354066104045542

Nasiritousi, N., Hjerpe, M., and Bäckstrand, K. (2015). Normative Arguments for Non-state Actor Participation in International Policymaking Processes: Functionalism, Neocorporatism or Democratic Pluralism? *European Journal of International Relations, 22*(4), 920-943. doi:10.1177/1354066115608926

Neumann, I. B. (2015). Foreign Policy in an Age of Globalization. In G. Hellmann and K. E. Jørgensen (Eds.), *Theorizing Foreign Policy in a Globalized World* (pp. 45-57). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nölke, A. (2017). Transnationale Akteure und internationale Politik: Theoretische Forschungsperspektiven und empirische Illustration am Beispiel Nichtregierungsorganisationen. In F. Sauer and C. Masala (Eds.), *Handbuch Internationale Beziehungen* (pp. 779-802). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Ohanyan, A. (2009). Policy Wars for Peace: Network Model of NGO Behavior. *International Studies Review, 11*(3), 475-501.

Ohmae, K. (1995). *The End of the Nation State: The Rise of Regional Economies*. London: HarperCollins.

Onuf, P. S. (2012). American Exceptionalism and National Identity. *American Political Thought, 1*(1), 77-100.

Ougaard, M., and Leander, A. (2010). *Business and global governance*. London: Routledge.

Pauly, L. W., and Grande, E. (2005). Reconstituting Political Authority: Sovereignty, Effectiveness, and Legitimacy in a Transnational Order. In E. Grande and L. W. Pauly (Eds.), *Complex Sovereignty: Reconstituting Political Authority in the Twenty-first Century* (pp. 3-21). Toronto et al.: University of Toronto Press.

Peterson, V. S. (2000). Rereading Public and Private: The Dichotomy That Is Not One. *SAIS Review, 20*(2), 11-30.

Pillar, P. R. (2017). Foreign Policy and Trump's Conflicts of Interest. *The National Interest*. Retrieved from http://nationalinterest.org/blog/paul-pillar/foreign-policy-trumps-conflicts-interest-19508

Porteous, T. (2005). British Government Policy in Sub-Saharan Africa under New Labour. *International Affairs, 81*(2), 281-297.

Putnam, R. D. (1988). Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-level Games. *International Organization, 42*(3), 427-460. doi:10.1017/S0020818300027697

Rathbun, B. (2008). A Rose by Any Other Name: Neoclassical Realism as the Logical and Necessary Extension of Structural Realism. *Security Studies, 17*(2), 294 - 321. doi:10.1080/09636410802098917

Reinicke, W. H. (1998). *Global Public Policy: Governing Without Government?* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Renshon, J., & Renshon, S. A. (2008). The Theory and Practice of Foreign Policy Decision Making. *Political Psychology, 29*(4), 509-536. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00647.x

Rhodes, R. A. W. (2007). Understanding Governance: Ten Years On. *Organization Studies, 28*(8), 1243-1264. doi:10.1177/0170840607076586

Risse, T. (2000). "Let's Argue!": Communicative Action in World Politics. *International Organization, 54*(1), 1-39. doi:10.1162/002081800551109

Risse, T. (2013a). Foreign Policy Analysis and the Governance Turn. In F. Bynander and S. Guzzini (Eds.), *Rethinking Foreign Policy* (pp. 176-185). London and New York: Routledge.

Risse, T. (2013b). Transnational Actors and World Politics. In W. Carlsnaes, T. Risse, and B. A. Simmons (Eds.), *Handbook of International Relations* (2nd ed., pp. 426-452). London et al.: Sage.

Risse-Kappen, T. (1995a). Bringing Transnational Relations Back in: Introduction. In T. Risse-Kappen (Ed.), *Bringing Transnational Relations Back in: Non-state Actors, Domestic Structures and International Institutions* (pp. 3-33). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Risse-Kappen, T. (Ed.) (1995b). *Bringing Transnational Relations Back in: Non-state Actors, Domestic Structures and International Institutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rittberger, V. (Ed.) (2001). *German Foreign Policy Since Unification. Theories and Case Studies*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Robins, N. (2002). Loot: In Search of the East India Company, the World's First Transnational Corporation. *Environment and Urbanization, 14*(1), 79-88.

Rose, G. (1998). Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy. *World Politics, 51*(1), 144-172.

Rosenau, J. N., and Czempiel, E.-O. (Eds.). (1992). *Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ross, S. (2014). *Who Governs Global Affairs? The Role of Institutional Corruption in U.S. Foreign Policy* (Edmond J. Safra Working Papers). Cambridge, MA: Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics, Harvard University.

Schäferhoff, M., Campe, S., and Kaan, C. (2009). Transnational Public-Private Partnerships in International Relations: Making Sense of Concepts, Research Frameworks, and Results. *International Studies Review, 11*(3), 451-474.

Scharpf, F. W. (1999). *Governing in Europe: Effective and Democratic?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schweller, R. L. (2004). Unanswered Threats: A Neoclassical Realist Theory of Underbalancing. *International Security, 29*(2), 159-201.

Sending, O. J. (2014). The International Civil Servant. *International Political Sociology, 8*(3), 338-340.

Sending, O. J. (2015). The Politics of Expertise: Competing for Authority in Global Governance. *Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press*.

Shapovalova, N. (2016). The Power of Informality: European Union's Engagement with Non-state Actors in Common Security and Defence Policy. *European Security, 25*(3), 326-345.

Singer, P. W. (2008). *Corporate Warriors: The Rise of the Privatized Military Industry* (updated ed.). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Sjursen, H. (2015). Normative theory: An untapped resource in the study of European foreign policy. In K. E. Jørgensen, Å. Kalland Aarstad, E. Drieskens, K. Laatikainen, & B. Tonra (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of European Foreign Policy* (pp. 197-214). London: Sage.

Slaughter, A.-M. (2004). *A New World Order*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Snyder, R. C., Bruck, H. W., Sapin, B., Hudson, V. M., Chollet, D. H., & Goldgeier, J. M. (Eds.). (2002). *Foreign Policy Decision-making (Revisited)*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sørensen, E., and Torfing, J. (2005). Network Governance and Post-Liberal Democracy. *Administrative*

Theory and Praxis, 27(2), 197-237.

Soroka, S. N. (2003). Media, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics, 8*(1), 27-48.

Steffek, J., 2010: Explaining Patterns of Transnational Participation: The Role of Policy Fields, in: Christer Jönsson and Jonas Tallberg (eds.): *Transnational Actors in Global Governance*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 67-87.

Stengel, F. A., and Weller, C. (2010). Action Plan or Faction Plan? Germany's Eclectic Approach to Conflict Prevention. *International Peacekeeping, 17*(1), 93-107. doi:10.1080/13533311003589264

Stoddard, A. (2006). *Humanitarian Alert: NGO Information and Its Impact on US Foreign Policy*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian.

Stoker, G. (2006). Public Value Management: A New Narrative for Networked Governance? *The American Review of Public Administration, 36*(1), 41-57.

Stone, D. (2008). Global Public Policy, Transnational Policy Communities, and Their Networks. *Policy Studies Journal, 36*(1), 19-38.

Strange, S. (1996). *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sylvan, D. A. (Ed.) (1998). *Problem Representation in Foreign Policy Decision Making*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taliaferro, J. W. (2006). State Building for Future Wars: Neoclassical Realism and the Resource-Extractive State. *Security Studies, 15*(3), 464-495.

Tallberg, J. (2004). *European governance and supranational institutions: making states comply*: Routledge.

Tallberg, J. (2010). Transnational Access to International Institutions: Three Approaches. In C. Jönsson and J. Tallberg (Eds.), *Transnational Actors in Global Governance: Patterns, Explanations, and Implications* (pp. 45-66). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tallberg, J., Sommerer, T., Squatrito, T., and Jönsson, C. (2013). *The Opening Up of International Organizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tallberg, J., Sommerer, T., Squatrito, T., and Jönsson, C. (2014). Explaining the Transnational Design of International Organizations. *International Organization, 68*(4), 741-774.

Tallberg, J., Sommerer, T., Squatrito, T., and Lundgren, M. (2016). The Performance of International Organizations: A Policy Output Approach. *Journal of European Public Policy, 23*(7), 1077-1096.

Tarrow, S. G. (2011). *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The White House. (2015). *National Security Strategy*. Washington, DC: The White House Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/2015_national_security_strategy.pdf.

Tsingou, E. (2014). Power Elites and Club-Model Governance in Global Finance. *International Political Sociology, 8*(3), 340-342.

Walgrave, S., Soroka, S., and Nuytemans, M. (2008). The mass media's political agenda-setting power - A longitudinal analysis of media, Parliament, and government in Belgium (1993 to 2000). *Comparative Political Studies, 41*(6), 814-836.

Walker, R. B. J. (1993). *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. Boston et al.: McGraw-Hill.

Waltz, K. N. (1996). International Politics Is Not Foreign Policy. *Security Studies, 6*(1), 54-57.

Waltz, K. N. (1997). Evaluating Theories. *American Political Science Review, 91*(4), 913-917.

Waltz, K. N. (1999). Globalization and Governance. *PS: Political Science and Politics, 32*(4), 693-700.

Watson, M., and Hay, C. (2003). The Discourse of Globalisation and the Logic of no Alternative: Rendering the Contingent Necessary in the Political Economy of New Labour. *Policy and Politics, 31*(3), 289-305.

Wendt, A. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wendt, A. (2004). The State as Person in International Theory. *Review of International Studies, 30*(2), 289-316.

Wendt, A. (2005). How Not to Argue Against State Personhood: A Reply to Lomas. *Review of International Studies, 31*(2), 357-360.

Wendt, A. (2006). Social theory as Cartesian science: an auto-critique from a quantum perspective. In S. Guzzini and A. Leander (Eds.), *Constructivism and International Relations: Alexander Wendt and his critics* (pp. 181-219). London: Routledge.

Wendt, A. (2015). *Quantum Mind and Social Science: Unifying Physical and Social Ontology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wendt, A., and Duvall, R. (2008). Sovereignty and the UFO. *Political Theory, 36*(4), 607-633.

Wivel, A. (2005). Explaining why state X made a certain move last Tuesday: the promise and limitations of realist foreign policy analysis. *Journal of International Relations and Development, 8*(4), 355-380.

Wolf, K. D., Deitelhoff, N., and Engert, S. (2007). Corporate Security Responsibility: Towards a Conceptual Framework for a Comparative Research Agenda. *Cooperation and Conflict, 42*(3), 294-320.

Wolfe, M., Jones, B. D., and Baumgartner, F. R. (2013). A Failure to Communicate: Agenda Setting in Media and Policy Studies. *Political Communication, 30*(2), 175-192.

Zangl, B., & Zürn, M. (1999). The Effects of Denationalisation on Security in the OECD World. *Global Society, 13*(2), 139-161

Zehfuss, M. (2013). Critical Theory, Poststructuralism, and Postcolonialism. In W. Carlsnaes, T. Risse, and B. A. Simmons (Eds.), *Handbook of International Relations* (2nd ed., pp. 145-170). London: Sage.

Zürn, M. (1998). *Regieren jenseits des Nationalstaats. Globalisierung und Denationalisierung als Chance*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Zürn, M. (2013). Globalization and Governance. In W. Carlsnaes, T. Risse, and B. A. Simmons (Eds.), *Handbook of International Relations* (2nd ed., pp. 401-425). London et al.: Sage.

Zürn, M. (2014). The Politicization of World Politics and Its Effects: Eight Propositions. *European Political Science Review, 6*(1), 47-71.

Zürn, M. (2016). Survey Article: Four Models of a Global Order with Cosmopolitan Intent: An Empirical Assessment. *Journal of Political Philosophy, 24*(1), 88-119. doi:10.1111/jopp.12070

Zürn, M., Binder, M., and Ecker-Ehrhardt, M. (2012). International Authority and its Politicization. *International Theory, 4*(1), 69-106.