

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND CONTEMPORARY WORLD ISSUES

Fulvio Attina

Department of Political Studies, University of Catania, Italy

Keywords: globalization, fragmentation, international politics, non state actors, global problems, global political agenda, pluralist theories of international politics, international democracy, functionalism, individualization, NGOs, governance, democratic peace, cosmopolitan democracy

Contents

1. Globalization and International Politics
 2. State and Non-State Actors in Global Politics
 3. Sustainable Development and the Agenda of the Global System
 4. International Relations Theory and the Problem of Sustainable Development
 - 4.1. Pluralist Theories
 - 4.2. Theories of International Democracy
- Glossary
Bibliography
Biographical Sketch

Summary

This chapter is about the relationship between globalization and international politics. The first section makes a presentation of the reciprocal influence that characterizes this relationship. The second section concentrates on the extension of the number and kinds of the international actors and on the appearance of non-state actors, like NGOs, in world politics. This change, caused by the process of globalization, is extremely important in the definition of the global political system and the agenda of the sustainable development. The third section analyses the agenda of the global system and the institutions and procedures supplied by the state system to the global system in order to deliver political regulation to the global problems. The last section informs about the reaction of the International Relations theorists to the challenge posed to the knowledge of international politics by the globalization process. It reviews two great groups of theories: the pluralist school, which has been the most responsive school to the perception of the change of the international life, and the school of international democracy, which covers the analysis of a wide spectrum of problems and answers to important transformations which are affecting politics at the state and inter-state level.

A generic way of understanding globalization is to consider it as a process of creation of a worldwide system in which no event, process or important action remains circumscribed within the geographic area in which it was born. In the same way, events, processes and actions of the global level have an impact, either deliberately or involuntarily, on all the local levels. However, the predominant image of globalization is constructed on the basis of the second meaning – namely, the impact of the global on the local - because we are instinctively led to assume that the subjects which are in a

privileged position in the global system are by nature stronger than the local. Therefore, the term globalization is considered the synonym of homogenization, uniformization and also westernization or Americanization. This image generates negative attitudes in relation to globalization because it becomes the synonym of the leveling of the social world. Against this vision, there is a more balanced vision according to which the global system and the local systems have their own origins and determinant factors and are the object of the same material and ideological factors that produce their existence and complementarities. The same material and ideological causes that accelerate the process of globalization produce the process of individualization because the single subject – the individual (man/woman, microgroup, region, nation, state, culture, civilization) – is enabled by material factors and legitimated by ideological factors to promote its own autonomy and self-organization. Uniformity in the globalized world is confronted with a high number of opportunities to move and communicate. Individuals can use these opportunities to defend and promote their rights and identities. Uniformity is, therefore, accompanied by singularity, discontinuity, decentralization and other characteristics of the present world which are synthetically named as factors of fragmentation to emphasize the hostile reaction and barriers that individuals create against the uniformization. Inevitably the reaffirmation of individuality goes hand in hand with context and competition but also with emulation and the coming together of the individuals in the global system.

The material factors of globalization – i.e. the technical advancements in transportation, communication and economy – have evolved in leaps and bounds in human history. The last leaps and bounds have been the first, second, third and today the fourth industrial revolution, the electronic revolution. Since the French revolution, the ideological factors of the globalization process (i.e. the spreading of human and people rights) have also evolved in leaps and bounds. These material and ideological factors have an effect in the world as a whole and also within the single country. They have generated the expansion of a world-wide economic market. They have created the same demands to face the same problems (environmental, social, etc.) with political decisions. This chapter is about the relations between the globalization process and international politics. Our interest concentrates on the analysis of the adaptation of the organization of the international system to globalization and the analysis of the institutional procedures supplied by the state system to the global system in order to provide political regulations of the global problems.

1. Globalization and International Politics

The long process of globalization has been strictly associated with processes taking place in the international political system. Clark (1997: 24-26) highlighted five explanations of the dependence of globalization upon international politics. The first explanation interprets globalization as “an expansion of Europe” and its most powerful states. The political unification of the world is the product of the exportation of the rules and institutions of the European states system to the whole planet. Bull and Watson (1984) have produced a wide-ranging presentation of this process of expansion of the European international society to the rest of the world and of the transformations undergone by the Asian, American and African systems in their adaptation to European expansion. Others - like Jones (1981) – have examined the reasons behind the

“European miracle”, i.e. the reasons why Europe has the upper hand over the other parts of the world when Europe and the other parts of the world have entered more intensively into relations among themselves, i.e. at the beginning of the modern age. The second school relates the globalization process to the fluctuation of international power. Confronted with recession and politico-economic crisis, the great powers have tried to regain international power by extending their competition to the rest of the world. The third school also interprets globalization in harmony with the logic of international power. However, it adopts the hegemonic theory rather than the theory of the balance of power. A hegemonic power created the global system taking the role of the basic provider of security in long distance relations and flows (Gilpin, 1981; Modelski, 1987). Milward (1992) presents the fourth international politics explanation of the globalization process. According to him, the contemporary international process of integration in a single world-wide economy is the result of the strategy of the nation state to keep its role as the principal political system. The fifth way to interpret the dependence of globalization upon international politics is that of Cox (1987; 1992) and Chase-Dunn (1989). The organization of the world-wide economy is guided by the forces of the market but it is never isolated from the action of the governments. On the contrary, it is supported by the military action of the states every time the great powers recognize the need to keep it forcefully in favor of their own internal economic interests.

The causal effects of international politics on the globalization process exclude neither globalization’s retroactive effects on international politics nor the causal effects on globalization exercised by other factors and actors. The evolutionary explanation of the institutional change of international politics (Modelski 1987; 1990) has the merit of bringing into attention the collusion of different factors (i.e. the co-evolution of economy, politics and culture) and the synchronization of these co-evolutions that are the determinant factor of the globalization process.

These connections and synchronizations, in turn, depend on the compression of time and space that the technological progress has brought about in our era. The instantaneousness of communication and the rapidity of transportation at low costs -- thanks to the progress of the applied science -- have created that compression that is at the basis of the globalization process in different areas like economy, politics and culture. In the economy this means the integration of financial markets and industrial production, on a world-wide scale, of small and large companies. In politics, the compression of time and space has produced the interdependence of national legislations and policies and has deeply changed the decision-making process of the states. This means especially the transference of competences from the traditional national institutions like parliaments to new national institutions like *public authorities* which are able to respond more quickly to the changes produced by international interdependence. The compression of time and space has induced also the transference of governmental competences and power from the national level to the supranational level as exemplified, more than anything else, by the case of the European Union.

A “democratization effect” of globalization belongs also to the area of politics even if only in the sense of the incapacity of the dictatorial regimes to prevent, as they did in the past, the visibility of their conduct and the penetration of external help to those

suffering persecution. It is this weakness of contemporary dictatorships that creates windows of opportunity to manage the problems of human rights and democracy. In culture, the compression of time and space spreads ideas instantaneously and determines inclusions (like immigration) that have inevitable consequences on the interpretation of the world and the ways of dealing with individual and collective life.

These effects of the technological progress on societies are not uniformly distributed. What is important, however, is the fact that this compression of time and space generates problems that are not contained within isolated areas. They are problems that need solutions at the global level. Globalization, in other words, necessitates institutions and capacities of global government.

2. State and Non-State Actors in Global Politics

The pre-eminence of states as systems of political regulation of social life is contrasted by a series of corrosive forces that are transforming and redefining their capacities and competences. There are, first of all, the corrosive forces of technological innovations in the field of information, communication and transportation. They produce immediate transmission of messages, great rapidity in physical mobility and high growth of economic exchanges. Every country is permeable to the flows of communication and transport. All countries are, therefore, interdependent on a larger scale than in the past. Certainly, interdependence does not present itself in the same way and with the same intensity for all countries. There are differences according to region and geographical area, and some areas have specific problems. In general, however, the internal political affairs of a country are – more than they were in the past – influenced or conditioned by what happens in the political systems of other states. The same happens to the cultural, economic and social domestic systems. The world market economy has put an end to the fragmentation of the national markets and has cancelled the possibility of economic policies autonomously carried out by national governments. The emergence of problems that in their evolution and especially in their possible solution have a dimension and nature that go beyond state borders forces the rulers to adopt legislative and administrative solutions inspired by criteria and interests that are not only those of their own countries. Rules made by international organizations, agreements negotiated in the course of worldwide conferences, and legislations of certain countries especially effective in regulating specific aspects (environment, health, etc.) become standards to which governments tend to adjust or seek to emulate whenever they are looking for domestic legislative and administrative solutions.

This situation has modified the perception of the state and of international relations by showing the potential for strong reorganization and adaptability of those actions and relations established by new actors responsible for models of life adopted by the people. Domestic politics is conditioned by organizations and processes that are beyond the single country and that have deprived the state of some competencies. At the same time, the intervention of the state has extended also into areas in which it was not present in the past. We are going through a period of time in which the division of the world into different states, and the creation and building of states proceed hand in hand with the growth of opposite processes. We cannot but recognize the state as a political organization able to satisfy collective and individual human needs, but we cannot treat it

as we have been used to because the state is deeply changing its nature. The body of literature on the problem of the continuity and change of the characteristics of the state in the contemporary world has been enormous. From the perspective of the global political system, a selection of studies includes, for example, Camilleri, Jarvis and Paolini (1995); Duchacek, Latouche and Stevenson (1988); Gummett (1996); Held (1995 a); Hocking (1994); Mayal (1990); Merle (1986) and Strange (1996).

All started with processes that have had different origins and rates of evolution at different historical moments and in different sectors of social actions. The speed of evolution has increased in the last decades. Therefore, we refer to this era as the era of globalization. In addition, besides almost 200 state political systems (some of which are not unitary political systems but federal and regional systems, i.e. systems of systems) that form a system of interdependent collective actors (the international political system), there exists today a wider system which includes the states, their systems and a plurality of non-state actors interdependent among themselves and with different abilities to influence the use and distribution of the resources, goods and values of the world. This system which encompasses all the political systems (including the international system) is the global political system.

The actions and relations of multinational corporations, associations, organizations and networks, based in various countries or no country in particular and which are apart and independent from national governments, are added to the actions and relations of the two fundamental systems of politics, i.e. the states and the international system. The actions and relations among non-state actors interfere, deliberately or not deliberately, both with the domestic politics of the states formed by the domestic institutions and political actors, and the international politics formed by national governments and intergovernmental institutions (international organizations and regimes).

The actors internal to the states (enterprises, political parties, unions, associations and organizations of various kinds), the states, the intergovernmental organizations and the trans-national actors (multinational corporations and NGOs) do not easily coexist and do not interact without conflict. However, the involvement of the state and non-state actors is essential in the formulation of political strategies to give solution to the problems of the global system. If the instruments of the governments are not sufficient, non-state actors do not have enough resources or authority to face the global problems in a resolute manner and start a sustainable development process.

3. Sustainable Development and the Agenda of the Global System

Political sovereignty and territorial security are not the only problems of international politics -- as they were for centuries after the formation of the European state system. Economic problems were added to these more than a century ago when the problems of adjusting national economic interests were perceived by the major European countries resolute to defend – even at the cost of war – their trade and the search for new markets for their products. The international problems of the global system go beyond the territorial and political security of the countries and also beyond the rules of the economic competition in the world market. In the global system, the states and other individual and collective, social and institutional actors face new problems like those of

respect for human rights, self-determination, democracy and protection of minority groups; the problems of migrations for economic reasons, and displacement of masses for ethnic and political reasons; the problems of the conservation of the biosphere, protection of the environment and exploitation of the national resources and global commons (space, atmosphere, and oceans); the problems of health emergencies produced by epidemics and threatening diseases like HIV; the problems of international organized crime and illicit trafficking (money laundering, drug trafficking, clandestine arms trade and sales, and new forms of slavery). All these problems are causes of disorder and uncertainty in the world system. Each of them, whatever the geographical locality of the areas most affected, produces effects that are not easily contained by the borders of the states. Each of them goes easily beyond the boundaries of a state and produces effects within other countries, attacks the social order, has influence on the economic plans, and requires political decisions. The probability of successful policy and legislative answers to these problems is minimal or almost non-existent if governments do not coordinate their strategies. Because of the interdependence and interconnection that globalization produces on domestic policies, any government is able to exercise its functions (provide public security, economic growth, health protection, social security, etc.) only through co-operation and co-ordination with other governments. In order to be effective in facing the internal effects of the global problems, government strategies need to be co-ordinated among themselves and give place also to international public policies. But, in order for this to be possible, global problems need to be part of the agenda of the global political system.

The system agenda is made of the problems: (1) that a large number or all the actors of the system consider themselves of the greatest importance to the political organization of the system, and (2) the system actors have different preferences for solutions. This difference of preference produces: (3) confrontations among the system actors that make the formulation of political solutions of the problems difficult and (4) the effect that this can also keep alive the problem for a long period of time.

Not all of the problems of the global political system have the same nature, nor can they be dealt with by the same procedures, or be solved with the same kind of policies and collective decisions. A useful classification is proposed by Charlotte Bretherton (1995: 8-9). It takes into account the nature of the problems and the different ways in which they can be dealt with within the global political system. Three categories of problems of the agenda of the global political system are presented:

1. Problems traditionally considered the responsibility of the individual country, because linked to state sovereignty, are today considered the object of global responsibility. The problems of human rights and domestic regime stability belong to this category, together with the traditional problems of state security;
2. Problems go beyond state borders and are already the object of international cooperation. Many problems of the contemporary global system such as the problems of environment protection, infectious diseases control and international crime struggle belong to this category;
3. Problems are beyond the capacity of the individual state to confront them and properly managed only by giving policy-making competences to the institutions of the global system. The problems caused by migrations for political and economic

reasons, alongside the traditional problems of the reduction of the gap between areas of the world economy, the take-off of the economies of the underdeveloped areas, and the extirpation of the poverty caused by the stratification of the world capitalist economy, belong to this category.

The inclusion of sustainable development problems in the agenda of the global political system increases the chances of solution of the problems, but the convergence of favorable conditions is required. First, the inclusion of a problem in the agenda of the system is preceded by a phase of *politicization*. A problem is *politicized* when some prominent actors make it the object of political action. These actors promote solidarity and aggregation around the problem. They make their political behavior dependent on the will expressed by other actors to negotiate the management of the problem and organize actions aimed at the formal introduction of the problem into the agenda of the system.

Second, inclusion in the political agenda of the global system depends upon factors of a political, social and material nature. Factors of first order are the support/opposition of the governments of the countries that have important organizational roles; the support/opposition of the governments that control resources directly important for the problem in question; the support/opposition of groups of countries that are strong and cohesive. Factors of the second order are economic processes, like the growth and contraction of the economic cycles, and cultural processes, like the phases of expansion and contraction of civilizations and cultures. Material factors are technological innovations and discoveries. The way in which all these factors come together during a period of time has great importance for the politicization of a problem and for its priority in the agenda. It is possible also that one problem may be taken over by others because the problems of a system are in competition among themselves for the resources available for their solution.

Third, the inclusion of problems in the agenda of the global system is influenced by their relation with the political organization of the international system. This relation can be the cause of the hostile position of some governments in the negotiations convened to find solutions to the problems, and may cause the incapacity of the institutions to produce decisions for the solution of the problems.

The definition of the agenda of a system at a certain time can be made by making use of the major documents of the United Nations, and the reports of expert committees and intergovernmental and non-governmental international organizations. Another criterion consists in analyzing the conclusions of periodical meetings of governmental groups (like the G7 and the Group of the Seventy-Seven) in the span of a year. The presence of a problem in these documents over time is a strong indication of the importance of the problem for the system. The best way of making the list of the problems on the agenda of the global system is to take into account all these criteria and also by attention to the messages of the mass media. They reproduce the formulation of the problems made by the actors of the system and the clash of the political interests that are involved in those problems. However, the mass media are not impartial actors. They contribute to create the agenda of the system by offering their own vision of the problems and also trying to influence the actors that negotiate the solution of the problems.

Politics is a continuous conflict about the definition and the order of priority of the problems of a system because there are not enough resources to solve all the problems. Therefore, the order of importance of the problems on the agenda reveals important aspects of a political system such as the power of each actor, the relations of conflict and solidarity among the system actors, the preferences of the different actors that have control of the resources needed to achieve the solution of the problems under analysis. Last but not least, the agenda of a system shows the problem-solving power of the system. This power depends upon the functioning of its institutions and the ability to rule of those who have the most important organization roles.

In practical terms, the inclusion in the agenda of the global system means that a problem becomes the object of the public policies, decisions and actions with which the largest number of governments agree on specific operative solutions. This can happen with the formulation of legal norms which are reached in the context of multilateral negotiation and ad hoc diplomatic conferences, with the creation of institutions for handling the problem, or with the attribution to already existing institutions of competences and resources necessary to solve the problem or problem area.

Once on the agenda of the system, the way in which a problem is solved depends also upon the social cleavages of the system both for structural factors – because cleavages divide countries into groups according to which of them are exposed to the effects of a given problem – and political factors – because social cleavages create solidarity and aggregations of governments during the negotiations and in the institutions mandated for the solutions of the problem in question. For these reasons, the solution or non-solution of the problems (i.e. the attempts to *depoliticize* a problem and make it come out of the agenda) can change or keep intact the rules that govern the goods of the system and the competences of the institutions on the regulation of the goods. Therefore, the political competition is the cause either of evolution or of conservation of the political organization of the system.

The *politicization* of the problem of the protection of the biosphere and the conflict over its inclusion on the agenda of the global system is a good case in point. Some governments are against the regulation of noxious industrial by-products. They would prefer governments to regulate these processes by means of specific international agreements by selecting in each case the measures to be taken according to their general economic and specific industrial interests. This is the traditional form of solution of the problem; like all such agreements negotiated among governments, it bears the risk that the weaker or the less aware governments accept unfavorable rules for the protection of the environment within their borders. Because of the nature of the problem – i.e. the unitary nature of the biosphere – this risk translates itself into the lack of control of damage that will not remain circumscribed within the borders of a state but will affect the rest of the system. As a result of this risk, there has arisen the demand to regulate environmental problems with public policies; in other words, to include environmental problems on the agenda of the system and create institutions for making coherent regulations and monitoring the development of the problems. The need for this has been promoted by transnational actors like ecological and environmental groups that gather together both ordinary people and experts who feel militant about the issues. However, once on the agenda, the problem of environmental protection takes on specific

characteristics because of the structural cleavages of the system. Whatever the level of awareness of ecological problems in the North and the South, and whatever the determination of Southern and Northern governments to fight pollution and environmental destruction, the rules and regimes of world environment policy largely depend upon the solidarity and political alignments on the North-South divide.

-
-
-

TO ACCESS ALL THE 22 PAGES OF THIS CHAPTER,
Visit: <http://www.eolss.net/Eolss-sampleAllChapter.aspx>

Bibliography

Bretherton C. (1996), Introduction: global politics in the 1990s, in Bretherton C. and Ponton G., eds., *Global Politics: An Introduction*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1-20. [This book is a wide-ranging presentation of the meanings of globalization and global problems to the study of world politics.]

Bull H. and Watson A., eds. (1984), *The Expansion of International Society*, Oxford, Clarendon Press. [This collection of essays is a comparative presentation of the international societies of classic, modern and contemporary history.]

Burton W.J. (1972), *World Society*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. [In this book, the founder of the world society approach to international politics presents his theory.]

Camilleri J.A. and Falk J. (1992), *The End of Sovereignty? The Politics of a Shrinking and Fragmenting World*, Aldershot, Edward Elgar. [A collection of essays focused on the erosion of the state in the contemporary world.]

Camilleri J.A., Jarvis A.P. and Paolini A.J. (eds) (1995), *The State in Transition: Reimagining Political Space*, Boulder, Lynne Rienner. [A collection of essays which updates the study on the erosion of the state.]

Caporaso J. (1996), The European Union and the forms of state: Westphalian, regulatory or post-modern, in *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 34, 1°, 29-52. [This essay puts the formation of the European Union in historical perspective.]

Chase-Dunn C. (1989), *Global Formation. Structures of the World-Economy*, Cambridge (Mass.), Basil Blackwell. [This analysis of the world system of the last five hundred years is a balanced representation of the political and economic determinants of the structure of the world system.]

Clark I. (1997), *Globalization and Fragmentation. International Relations in the Twentieth Century*, Oxford, Oxford University Press. [This book reviews the main theories of the effect of globalization on international politics.]

Colas A. (1997), The promises of international civil society, in *Global Society*, 11, 3, 261-278. [The author analyses the potentialities of the use of the concept of civil society in the analysis of the international system.]

Cox R.W. (1987), *Production, Power, and World Order. Social Forces in the Making of History*, New York, Columbia University Press. [The world system of the last three hundred years is analyzed with Gramsci's political theory.]

Cox R.W. (1992), Multilateralism and World Order, in *Review of International Studies*, 18, 2, 161-180. [A study of new structures of world politics according to the political thought underpinning the concept of multilateralism.]

Crozier M., Huntington S.P., Watanuki J. (1975), *The Crisis of Democracy*, New York University Press. [This is the founding study of the school on the erosion of democracy in the post-modern world.]

Duchacek I.D., Latouche D. and Stevenson G., eds. (1988), *Perforated Sovereignties and International Relations. Trans-Sovereign Contacts of Subnational Governments*, New York, Greenwood Press. [A worldwide study of the international relations of local governments.]

Falk R. (1995), *On Humane Governance. Toward a New Global Politics*, Cambridge, Polity. [A theoretical study of the potentialities for reforming the world system structures.]

Gilpin R. (1981), *War and Change in World Politics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. [An empirical study and a theory of the function of global war on world order.]

Gummett P., ed. (1996), *Globalization and Public Policy*, London, Edward Elgar. [This collection of essays analyzes several national public policies as influenced by the globalization process.]

Held D. (1987), *Models of Democracy*, Cambridge, Polity Press. [This is a seminal and systematic study of the history of democratic regimes.]

Held D. (1995 a), *Democracy and the Global Order*, Cambridge, Polity. [This study examines different problems of democracy in the nation-state as caused by external pressures.]

Held D. (1995 b), Democracy and the New International Order, in Archibugi D. e Held D., eds., *Cosmopolitan Democracy. An Agenda for a New World Order*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 96-120. [This essay proposes the cosmopolitan model of democracy as a model for the introduction of democracy on the world stage.]

Hix S. (1999), *The Political System of the European Union*, MacMillan. [A systematic study of the institutions, processes and actors of politics in the European Union.]

Hocking B. (1994), Les Intérêts Internationaux des Gouvernements Régionaux: Désuétude de L'Interne et de L'Externe, in *Etudes Internationales*, 25°, 3, 409-420. [A study of the blur of the division between domestic and international politics.]

Huntley W.L. (1996), Kant's Third Image: Systemic Sources of the Liberal Peace, in *International Studies Quarterly*, 40°, 1, 45-76. [A study of the philosophical basis of the study of international democracy.]

Jones E.L. (1981), *The European Miracle*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. [This is a study of the peculiarities of Europe's culture and history.]

Majone G., ed. (1996), *Regulating Europe*, London, Routledge. [A collection of studies on making rules without government in the European Union.]

Mayall J. (1990), *Nationalism and International Society*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. [A review of the effects of nationalist ideals on the international politics of the last two centuries.]

McGrew A.G. and Lewis P.G., eds. (1992), *Global Politics. Globalization and the Nation-State*, Cambridge, Polity Press. [The essays of this collection analyze different aspects of the erosion of national sovereignty.]

Merle M. (1986), *Les Acteurs Dans Les Relations Internationales*, Paris, Economica. [A systematic analysis of international actors of different natures.]

Milward A.S. (1992), *The European Rescue of the Nation-State*, London. [A theory of the survival of the state through international integration.]

Mitrany D. (1966¹⁹⁴⁵), *A Working Peace System*, New York, Quadrangle Books. [The founding book of the school of international functionalism.]

Mlinar Z., ed. (1992), *Globalization and Territorial Identities*, Gower, Aldershot. [This book is a balanced presentation of the contrasting processes of globalization and fragmentation.]

Modelski G. (1987), A System Model of the Long Cycle, in Modelski G. (eds), *Exploring Long Cycles*, Boulder, Lynne Publishers, 112-128. [An empirical study of the cyclical development of world politics.]

Modelski G. (1990), Is World Politics Evolutionary Learning? in *International Organization*, 44, 1, 1-24. [A discussion on learning as a mechanism of social evolution at the world level.]

Oneal J.R. & F.H., Maoz Z. and Russett B. (1996), The Liberal Peace: Interdependence, Democracy and International Conflict, 1950-1985, in *Journal of Peace Research*, 33, 1, 11-28. [This is an empirical study of the theory of the democratic basis of international peace.]

Papic A. (1995), *Democrazia Internazionale, Via di Pace. Per un Nuovo Ordine Internazionale Democratico*, Milano, Angeli. [This book presents some mechanisms of international democracy.]

Rosenau J.N. (1990), *Turbulence in World Politics. A Theory of Change and Continuity*, New York, Harvester-Wheatsheaf. [This book presents contemporary world politics as a contest between state-centric and non-state-centric relations.]

Rourke J.T., Hiskes R.P., Zirakzadeh C.E. (1992), *Direct Democracy and International Politics. Deciding International Issues Through Referendums*, Boulder, Lynne Rienner. [This book analyzes single cases of referendum held at the trans-national level.]

Russett B. (1993), *Grasping the Democratic Peace*, Princeton, Princeton University Press. [A systematic presentation of the theory of international peace through democracy.]

Russett B. and Antholis W. (1992), Do Democracies Fight Each Other? Evidence from the Peloponnesian War, in *Journal of Peace Research*, 29, 415-434. [An historical example of the international democratic peace theory.]

Russett B. and Starr H. (1999), From Democratic Peace to Kantian Peace: Democracy and Conflict in the International System, in M. Widlarsky, ed., *Handbook of War Studies*, University of Michigan Press. [A discussion of the democratic peace theory.]

Scharpf F.W. (1999), *Governing in Europe: Effective and Democratic?* Oxford, Oxford University Press [A critical analysis of the proposals for reducing the democratic deficit of the European Union.]

Singer M. and Wildavsky A. (1993), *The Real World Order. Zones of Peace / Zones of Turmoil*, Chatham, Chatham House. [A comparative study of international areas characterized either by peace or war.]

Small M. and Singer J.D. (1982), *Resort to Arms. International and Civil Wars, 1816-1980*. London, Sage. [An empirical study of violence in the international system and the states.]

Strange S. (1996), *The Retreat of the State: the Diffusion of Power in the World Economy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. [A study of economic processes transcending the borders of the states.]

Thompson W.R. (1996), Democracy and Peace: Putting the Cart before the Horse? in *International Organization*, 50, 1, 141-174. [A critical analysis of the democratic peace theory.]

Weede E. (1995), Economic Policy and International Security. Rent-Seeking, Free Trade and Democratic Peace, in *European Journal of International Relations*, 1, 4, 519-538. [An empirical study supporting the democratic peace theory.]

Biographical Sketch

Fulvio Attina' is Jean Monnet Professor of European Politics and Professor of International Relations at the University of Catania, Italy. He has been involved actively in professional associations, most recently as a member of the governing council of the International Studies Association. Professor Attina' has been Visiting Scholar at such institutions as the Institute for the Study of Europe, Columbia University and the Centre for European Studies, New York University. He serves on the editorial boards of numerous journals, including *Global Society*, *European Union Politics*, and *The European Journal of International Relations*. He is author of numerous scholarly works, including F. Attina and S. Stavrides (eds.), *The Barcelona Process and Euro-Mediterranean Issues from Stuttgart to Marseille* (2001), and "The European Security Partnership, NATO and the European Union", *European Union Review* (6:2, 2001).