The Impact of Non-State Actors on World Politics: A Challenge to Nation-States

Muhittin Ataman*

Principal actors of the world politics are nation-states, but they are not the only actors. The international system consists of nation-states, international organizations, and private actors. Even though thousands of international organizations were established during the post-World War II era, they were underestimated by students of international relations. The increasing number of international organizations is parallel to the increasing levels of economic, political, social and cultural transactions between individuals, societies and states. The growth of so many kinds of non-state actors challenges and even weakens the "state-centric" concept of international politics and replaces it with a "transnational" system in which relationships are more complex. These organizations changed the international environment (Miller, 1994).

The proliferation of non-state actors has recently led some observers of international relations to conclude that states are declining in importance and that non-state actors are gaining status and influence. New theories of international relations such as the "complex interdependence" of Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye (1989) were formed in order to explain new developments. Kegley and Wittkoph (1995) accurately point out that "as the world grown

smaller, the mutual dependence of nation-states and other transnational political actors on one another has grown" (p. 2).

Following the traditional classification, non-state actors are divided into two categories: international intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and transnational or international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) (Brown, 1995; Miller, 1994). The first group consists of the non-state actors that are created by nation-states. They are officially documented by government agencies. The second group of non-state international actors is established not by nation-states, but by certain group of individuals, businessmen and other societal forces. This group has no legal bonds with nation-states; therefore, they are truly transnational.

IGOs are voluntary associations of sovereign states established to pursue many objectives for which states want to cooperate through sort of formal structure and to which states are unable to realize by themselves (Miller, 1994). There are hundreds of IGOs in today's world which are significant in their respective fields. They are created by treaties and negotiations which mainly reflect preferences of stronger states. Especially stronger states create IGOs because they need them to protect their interests. By and large, decisions made by IGOs are the product of negotiations among the governmental representatives assigned to them. In general, it is not idealism, but the need of states which tend them to cooperate with other states in the context of IGOs. Therefore, they are part of the Westphalian state system in which IGOs are instruments of nation-states (Miller, 1994: 67).

IGOs may be classified by scope (global and regional) and by function (political, economic, social and environmental). IGOs are adjuncts of nation-states and play significant roles by providing means of cooperation and multiple channels of communication among states in areas in which cooperation and communication provides advantages for all or most states

Bennett, 1991). It is commonly known that the main functions of IGOs are rule making, agenda setting, and information gathering. In addition, they decrease uncertainty between states and search for cooperative solutions to international problems. IGOs may change norms of international relations and preferences of nation-states. For instance, the United Nations Environment Program played a significant role in the creation of regimes such as the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea and the Protection of Ozone layer (Brown, 1995: 195).

Furthermore, IGOs monitor principles, norms and rules of international institutions and international regimes in nation-states. The most well known case is the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which monitors the "non-proliferation of atomic weapons" principle in states whenever any claim is made. They decrease the cost of information gathering which is more important for poor and small countries. For example, the UN plays a key role for states, small states in particular, in receiving information about international politics and systemic issues. Without the UN, many states are unable to obtain information about the international society and politics. Activities of IGOs, such as the UN and the IMF, are decisive for most small countries. They may impose their principles on them more easily than on big powers.

The effectiveness of IGOs differs from one issue area to another, one international regime type to another, one state to another, one spatial setting to another, or one time period to another. Powerful states are less constrained by the principle of IGOs than those who are relatively weak (Ataman, 2000: 152-167). The IMF and the UN Security Council are two prominent organizations in which some powerful states direct activities of the organization and impose their principles selectively. For instance, the UN Security Council cannot accept any decision against the interests of the five permanent members and those of their allies, i.e., the UN Security

Council decisions on the Palestinian question against Israel have often been vetoed by the United States.

The influence of IGOs varies with the capacity of governments of member states to implement their own provisions. Most governments face serious resource constraints limiting their ability to apply the provisions of regimes to areas and activities under their jurisdiction. This is true for most countries, especially for less developed countries. Even the superpowers do not have full control over IGOs. In spite of the fact that international organizations are utilized by powerful nation-states, they make a difference in international interactions and have notable influence even on the most powerful state, the United States (Karns and Mingst, 1990).

IGOs, which function in technical issues such as in telecommunication, transportation, environmental management and postal service, are perfectly successful (Brown, 1995: 268). The effectiveness in economic issue areas is also considerably high. For example, the IMF and the World Bank are very effective in money flowing, debt management and financing debt issues between the rich and poor countries (Brown, 1995: 207). Still effective, the least success rate of IGOs is in political and security issues.

After briefly analyzing the role of IGOs in international relations, the impact of NGOs will be examined in the following section. The article will try to explore the impact of the five most important types of NGOs, some of which are about to be among the main players in the international game. It argues that even though they have a significant impact on the world politics, this category of non-state actors was largely ignored in the study of international relations. In the last section, roles of non-state actors in the international relations theory are evaluated by comparing them with those of nation-states. This section raises some theoretical questions on the topic.

INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (NGOs)

Non-governmental organizations are institutions that are established by non-state actors or at least one side of these organizations is not states. There are many kinds of NGOs such as transnational, government organized, government-regulated and initiated, business and industry, donor-organized, donor-dominated, people's organizations, operational, advocacy, transnational social movements, quasi, and anti-governmental NGOs. Their number increased (more than 23,000 in the early 1990s) and their effectiveness for transnational politics became more relevant in recent decades. They have become "crucial participants in the international policy process" (Brown, 1995: 268).

NGOs create and/or mobilize global networks by creating transnational organizations, gathering information on local conditions through contacts around the world, alerting global network of supporters to conditions requiring attention, creating emergency response around world, and mobilizing pressure from outside states. They participate in IGO conferences by mobilizing transnational social movements organizations around issues in IGOs, building transnational social coalitions, raising new issues, supporting IGO development, addressing IGO meetings, submitting documents to governmental organizations' meetings, improving skills in conference diplomacy, and increasing expertise on issues (Mingst, 1999: 255-257). They facilitate inter-state cooperation by preparing background papers and reports, educating delegates and representatives of states to narrow technical gap, serving as third party source of information, expanding policy options, facilitating agreements, and bringing delegates together in third party fora.

NGOs conduct many kinds of activities within states such as linking to local partners, linking to transnational social movements with complementary skills, working in national arenas

to harmonize state policies, providing humanitarian aid, and protecting accompaniment of persons in danger. They also enhance public participation within states by reminding government delegates that they are being watched, enhancing public understanding, increasing transparency of international negotiations and institutions, and provoking public protest.

As a by-product of intensified globalization process, NGOs which operate at transnational level have become more significant determinants of foreign policies of nation-states. Like their counterparts that operates at domestic level and lobby in their respective countries, they lobby at international and transnational levels. Human rights advocates, gender activists, religious movements, developmentalists, and indigenous peoples have invaded the territory of nation-states. As pointed out by Brown (1995), "as the countries and sectors of world society have become more and more interdependent, it has become commonplace for nongovernmental groups representing similar communities in their various countries to closely coordinate their policies and to constitute (or reconstitute) themselves as international nongovernmental organizations (INGOs)" (p. 267).

The focus of this study is on NGOs that function at transnational level. This section concentrates on the five more effective types of NGOs, namely multinational corporations (MNCs), national liberation movements (NLMs), epistemic communities, religious and humanitarian organizations, and terrorist groups and drug traffickers, which have influential impact on international politics.

Multinational Corporations (MNCs)

The most prominent contemporary NGOs are multinational corporations (MNCs) (Krasner, 1995: 263). They are huge firms that own and control plants and offices in at least more than one country and sell their goods and services around the world. They are large

corporations having branches and subsidiaries operating on a worldwide basis in many countries simultaneously. MNCs are "major driver of global economic integration" and "establish unprecedented linkages among economies worldwide" (Peterson, 1995: 261). The biggest and the most effective industrial corporations are based in the United States, Europe and Japan. In 1992, of the 20 largest MNCs, excluding trading companies, in terms of sales all were based in G-7 states –eight were in the United States, four were in Japan, three were in Germany, and five were in Britain, two of which were jointly based in the Netherlands (Goldstein, 1999: 412).

MNCs can be classified according to the kinds of business activities they pursue such as extractive resources, agriculture, industrial products, transportation, banking, and tourism. The most notable MNCs are industrial and financial corporations (the most important being banks). Naturally the primary objective of MNCs is profit maximization (Miyoshi, 1993: 746). They are very effective in directing foreign policy of states, including that of the most powerful ones, and they set agenda for international politics. They have become a major factor in national economic decision making process (Peterson, 1995). As mentioned by Miller (1994), the activities of MNCs "may seem evidence of the growing inability today of the sovereign state to control and regulate effectively economic activities within the private sector. If that is so, then one of the traditional rationales for modern sovereignty is undermined" (p. 67).

One of the measures of the influence of MNCs is the extent of the resources they control. They have enormous "flexibility in moving goods, money, personnel, and technology across national boundaries, and this flexibility increases their bargaining power with governments" (Bennett, 1991: 264). Dozens of MNCs have annual sales of tens of billions of dollars each. Many of them have more economic activity than the GDPs of the majority of the states in the world. For instance, MNCs such as General Motors, Exxon, Royal Dutch Shell, General Electric

and Hitachi outranked the GDP of nation-states like Taiwan, Norway, Turkey, Argentina, Pakistan, Malaysia and Nigeria in the early 1990s (Brown, 1995: 153-154). As compared "to total world export in 1992 of about $4.0 trillion," "sales by MNCs outside their countries of origin were $5.5 trillion for the same year" (Peterson, 1995: 262).

Different economic schools of thought treat MNCs differently. According to liberalism, MNCs are vanguard of the new world order since they possess the most efficient means of production (Mingst, 1999: 223). Liberal economists argue that "the global efficiency and the increased generation of the wealth result from the ability of MNCs to invest freely across international borders" (Goldstein, 1999: 415). Some economists even welcome the replacement of the nation-state by MNCs as the main economic unit (Barnet and Cavanagh, 1994: 19-20). Mercantilist and nationalist perspective argues that MNCs are instruments of home states. For them, MNCs either serve national interests of the state or become a threat to the state (Mingst, 1999: 224). The Marxist tradition considers MNCs as the instrument of exploitation and as an extension of the imperialism of strong capitalist states (Mingst, 1999: 224). Their monopolistic power causes uneven development and inequality in international division of labor. They bring mal-development into host countries (Brown, 1995: 213). In today's world, I argue that the combination of these three perspectives, that is an eclectic approach, seems to be more relevant regarding MNCs as well as other economic issues.

When we observe activities of MNCs, we see that their operations create a variety of problems and opportunities for both home countries, states in which the MNC has its headquarters, and host countries, states in which a foreign MNC operates (Carnoy, 1993: 61-66; Clark and Chan, 1995: 144). All three sides (home country, host country, and MNC) benefit from the wealth created by the MNC. At least in theory, mutual interests result from the creation

of wealth in the host country by the MNC. An observer calls the relationship between MNCs and host countries as "a 'love-hate' syndrome" (Bennett, 1991: 265); that is, host countries may have both advantages and disadvantages in its relations with MNCs.

MNCs may be considered as instruments of economic development for less developed countries. However, when we look at the functions they perform in host countries, we see that they have a very strong bond with the home government which becomes a source of concern for host countries. MNCs challenge the state sovereignty of host countries. Host countries may lose control over their economies. They may create political and social division and prevent the development of domestic industries in host countries. They may produce specialized products of which the buyer is usually the parent company. They may manipulate prices of imports and exports in host countries (Brown, 1995: 212-213). For instance, generally Turkey has to accept the price set by US MNCs specializing on military equipment parts, since Turkey has no choice to buy component parts of American made weapons, which it has already bought.

In order to minimize the negative impact of MNCs, we witness government interventions through nationalization, government participation and government initiation of joint development projects. Furthermore, governments have to maintain control over tax revenues, inflation rate, credit policies, trade balances, balance of payments, trade restrictions, monetary values, employment, and economic planning to decrease their dependence on MNCs. Host countries may place restrictions on the ownership and behavior of subsidiaries and on the freedom of businesses. Because only by controlling these fields a host country may have an upper hand vis-à-vis MNCs.

MNCs serve national interests of home countries as instruments of global economic development, a mechanism spreads ideology and a tool of diplomacy. They are highly

centralized and are dominated by the parent company which is located in the home country (Carnoy, 1993: 64-65). The administrators are mainly from the home country, research is centralized, technology is imported from the home state, "profits are often repatriated, and the policies of the firm conform closely to the economic and foreign policies of the home government" (Bennett, 1991: 264). Therefore, some, i. e., dependency theory, consider MNCs as instruments for colonization. Sometimes manipulated and controlled by home governments, MNCs expand marketing base of their home country. They increase production in home country to supply components for foreign subsidiaries. They can ensure lower priced products from the foreign subsidiaries back to home country. They provide taxes to home country. Stockholders in home country gain more profit from investments made abroad. However, there are many conflicts between MNCs and their home countries over taxation, trade policies, and economic sanctions. MNCs may not want to follow national policies pursued by their home governments. That is, trade (MNCs) may not always follow 'flag' (state policies).

National Liberation Movements (NLMs)

Individuals give loyalty to and identify themselves with ethno-national groups besides nation-states. "Many people pledge their primary allegiances not to the state and government that rules them, but rather to their ethno-national group which shares a common civilization, language, cultural tradition, and ties of kinship" (Kegley and Wittkopf, 1997: 175). As a result of people's loyalty to and identification with ethno-national groups, national liberation movements are increasingly gaining importance in the world setting. Since most states are multiethnic and many include at least one potentially threatening minority, the rising significance of ethnic groups reduces the relevance of nation-states in world politics. As illustrated by Quebec

nationalism, ethnonational movements demonstrate a persistent tendency to stimulate anarchic and hierarchic impulses in the political arenas in which they operate (Lapid, 1994: 29).

National liberation movements (NLMs) have been playing an effective role in international politics for decades, especially in Africa, Latin America and Asia. Some NLMs became the most important actors of many international problems. One of the most well known examples of NLMs that played and is still playing a significant role in international politics is the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO). Since the late 1960s, PLO has been playing the key role in the Arab-Israeli conflict. Arab states have been considered PLO and its longtime leader Yasser Arafat as the legitimate representatives of Palestinians. Some other significant NLMs were African National Congress (ANC) of Nelson Mandela of South Africa which eventually brought down the white supremacist government; Patriotic Front which was fighting the white dominated government of Rhodesia; and the Southwest African People's Organization (SWAPO) which gained power in Namibia. Many NLMs have been the main actors of post-World War II process of de-colonization in Africa. These NLMs shaped the map of the African continent and political structures of African states.

"Stateless nations," "nations without states," or nations or ethnic groups without a state, are also very significant actors of international politics. Even though there are 3000 to 5000 nations in the world, "if a nation is defined as a population with a distinctive and enduring collective identity based on cultural traits and lifeways that matter to them and to others with whom they interact" (Brown, 1995: 162), there are only less than 200 nation-states. According a project conducted by the US Institute of Peace Press, there were about 230 disadvantaged and dissatisfied political ethnic movements in the 1990s (Gurr, 1993). Some stateless nations that are effective actors of international politics are the Palestinians, the Catholics in Northern Ireland,

the Tibetians in China, the Basques and Catalonians in Spain, the Quebecois in Canada, the Muslims of Kashmir and Serbia, the Hindu Tamils in Sri Lanka, and the Kurds in the Middle East (Brown, 1995: 162-163).

For instance, among these national groups, the Kurdish people and parties who represent them play an important role in Middle Eastern politics. The United States, Israel, Western European and Middle Eastern countries have been using Kurdish people and organizations against the central governments in which the Kurds live and constitute a certain percentage of the population. Likewise, Kurdish diaspora in the West has been using the Western governments to put pressure on central governments. Like many other ethnic groups, the Kurds are also both a subject and an actor of international politics. Systemic powers seek contribution of Kurdish groups to their regional calculations and policies. Observers agree that without the consent of the Kurdish people, it is quite difficult, if not impossible, to bring stability to the region (Olson, 1994; 1996).

"Native" or "indigenous" peoples living within many countries constitute an "outside world" for the nation-state system. Some observers call this group of peoples as "the fourth world" (Kegley and Wittkopf, 1997). They oppose the status quo and its institutions. In this regard they also oppose the globalization process, which threaten their traditional way of life. The most well known example of indigenous people movements is the Zapata movement, which has been struggling against Mexican government for years.

Epistemic Communities

Epistemic communities are specific communities "of experts sharing a belief in a common set of cause-and-effect relationships as well as common values to which policies governing these relationships will be applied" (P. Haas, 1994: 138). They are comprised of a

group of experts and scientists who contributed to the development of convergent state policies in compliance with the regime.

Epistemic communities provide technical knowledge to increase international cooperation. Even though states may use epistemic communities according to their interests, epistemic communities influence states as well as each other. They play a key role in the transformation of information independently. According to Ernst Haas (1990), epistemic communities bring learning in international politics because they produce new theories and develop new understandings and paradigms, which are able to solve the real international problems. This process leads changes in state preferences because new understandings may change interests and therefore policies of nation-states.

Peter Haas uses the case of the Mediterranean Action Plan (Med Plan), a regime for marine pollution control in the Mediterranean Sea initiated by the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP)'s Regional Seas Program, to show implications of epistemic communities. In the Mediterranean Sea environmental regime, an epistemic community, comprised of UNEP officials, some secretariat members from other specialized agencies, regional marine scientists, and like-minded governmental officials of regional states, played a considerable role in changing the policies of states, especially that of Algeria. UNEP officials forged transnational alliances with regional marine scientists who persuaded their governments to support the UNEP measures to control as many sources and sorts of pollution as possible, to take stronger measures, and to abide by Med Plan policies. While there had been only few measures for pollution control at the beginning of the 1970s, regional states introduced many measures to comply with the Med Plan policies after the success of the epistemic community who set the agenda of the regime and directed nation-states (P. Haas, 1994: 131-133).

Algeria, the state that experienced the most dramatic transformation of pollution policies, was considering the primacy of industrial development over environmental protection and asserting that those measures might impede economic development. Therefore, Algeria opposed any pollution control measures in the early 1970s. Furthermore, Algerian government was suspicious of the motives of France, its former colonizer, fearing that it could exploit those measures against the Algerian state. Following the inclusion of marine scientists in the administration, state preferences began to change. They also acted as an international and domestic interest group and put pressure on decision-making process. As a result, Algeria not only ratified the Barcelona Convention on the marine pollution in 1983 to control pollutants but also developed economic plans that prevent environmental degradation (P. Haas, 1994: 133-135).

Religious and Humanitarian Organizations

Human rights are traditionally understood to regulate certain relations between individuals and nation-states of which they are nationals. This understanding has changed significantly after the Second World War (Donnelly, 1995: 191). Even though the state-centric and sovereignty-based conception of the world system remains the norm for international human rights, nation-states are now obliged to obey transnational and international formal and informal legal and political constraints on their human rights practices. Nation-states have to take into consideration international and transnational public opinion since there are dozens of transnational organizations that monitor human rights practices of nation-states and examples of coercive foreign interventions.

The most notable example of international human rights regime is constituted by the Council of Europe. The European Commission of Human Rights receives, reviews, and

evaluates complaints from individuals living in the member states, and the European Court of Human Rights makes legally binding decisions (Donnelly, 1994: 211). Member states turned over their sovereignty to the organization on these issues. Practices of the organization have a significant impact on national decision-making. These non-state actors mainly concern about morality, human rights, environment and social values.

International Red Cross, International Red Crescent, and Amnesty International (AI) are the most well-known and influential NGOs among humanitarian international organizations that monitor human rights worldwide. The first two gives assistance to wartime prisoners and send help in areas affected by natural and man-made disasters in peacetime. They mainly work along with the UN and related organizations lines.

Amnesty International monitors human rights violations worldwide. It mobilizes international community against oppression, torture, and individual and group rights. It initiates worldwide campaigns against states because of human rights violations. Some IGOs such as European Parliament (EP) use AI's reports to develop policies, like EP's policies toward Turkey, for instance, regarding human rights issues. Therefore, AI gets results from its activities. Likewise, human rights abuses practiced in South Africa (apartheid) for decades ended largely as a result of international struggle led by the UN organs (Donnelly, 1994). In cooperation with many other transnational factors, NGOs that function in the field of human rights have "produced an impressive array of new machinery for protecting human rights" (Miller, 1994: 189).

Green Peace emerged as one of the major actor of global environmental policies. It is known for its protests against environmental problems caused by some states, i.e., France among others. It prevented many initiatives of many states regarding environment. It makes public

illegal or harmful environmental policies of states. As a result of its campaign against France due to nuclear tests, for instance, France was condemned by international community. It also sponsored some environmental programs in poor countries.

Economic and political historians mention that there were significant religious movements that had great impact on the international system (Brown, 1995: 158-160). The most famous religious organization has been the Roman Catholic Church. It was a major force in the Middle Ages superior to kings and emperors. Although it lost its supremacy in later centuries, its importance as a transnational actor continued (Haynes, 2001). "The institutional structure of the Catholic church, that most enduring of transnational actors, reflect both competitive incentives emanating from national states, and norms and expectations that are derived from the church itself" (Krasner, 1995: 262) It has been struggling for liberal democracy in many countries in the last century and supported democratic opposition movements initiated by Catholic Christians such as in Poland, Latin American countries, Northern Ireland, Indonesia and Sudan. Many statements and visits made by the head of the Church in Vatican, the Pope, strongly influenced the international politics. The fact that more journalists follow the Pope than most political figures in the world and Vatican has more ambassadorial missions than most nation-states demonstrates the Pope's political influence in international politics.

Terrorist Groups and Drug Traffickers (Narco-Terrorists)

Although national liberation movements and ethnic groups sometime use terrorism, terrorist organizations are different from NLMs since terrorism is their main means of struggle. Terrorist groups use terrorism as the main instrument and largely lack large-scale support from the public. Individuals and groups engage in terrorism for different political, economic, social, religious, cultural, and even personal reasons (Mickolus, 1995: 98). Their goals are to publicize

their grievances and aspirations to international community by hijacking, assassination, kidnapping and attacking on embassies. International terrorism is "the most conspicuous and threatening form" of low-intensity violence (Kegley and Wittkoph, 1995: 7). As long as the state system and the world system leaves some groups or states out of the system, terrorism will continue to be an instrument of those who are weak. However, strong states also use "state terrorism" against the powerless groups or states.

Terrorism has moved from the national to transnational level and from plane hijacking to a wider range of terrorist techniques since the 1960s. The transnational dimension of terrorism is established when there is collusion and cooperation between different terrorist groups and when some countries serve as sanctuaries and training-centers for terrorists of various nationalities. While some states orient their policies by supporting terrorist groups, some other states change their foreign policies by taking counter-terrorist measures. One way or another, all states are influenced by terrorist activities; therefore, no country tends to ignore terrorism.

Today, terrorism is globalized like other non-state actors, as was witnessed during the attacks directed toward the heart of the American state and the US-led international system on September 11. That particular terrorist attack has caused more damages than most of the attacks carried out by nation-states and shocked the whole world as well as the US more than the Pearl Harbor attack, which made by Japanese and ended up the US to take place in the Second World War. September 11 incident showed the world the horror of terrorism, the vulnerability of all nations-states including the strongest one, and its paramount effect on international politics and the world order. Terrorism demonstrated that the powerlessness and vulnerability of the only hegemon of the world, the US, against terrorism (Clemons, 2001).

Some political organizations hijack planes to increase their leverage vis-à-vis states. They use civilians as a shield and force nation-states to negotiate with them. And in this way, they become actors of many international conflicts. Especially some Palestinian groups such as the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine have engaged in plane hijackings in the 1970s. After the dramatic events of September 11, plane hijackings have been a cause of much more concern to governments, airlines and to the public.

Even though drug traffickers are engaged in profitable "transnational business," they are similar to terrorist organizations because they use illegal means, including assassinations and kidnappings, and deal with products banned by international community. Therefore, they are known as narco-terrorists. One of the most well known drug trafficker organizations was the Medellin of Colombia. This largest cocaine organization caused many social and political problems in the Latin American world.

Non-state actors, in an interconnected globalized world, pose a significant threat to nation-states, since they are not territorial actors. They are "enemies without an address" (Bishara, 2001). Terrorism introduced a new concept into the world system. Now, there is "asymmetric wars" in which there are no rules and whose sides are nation-states and non-state actors such as international terrorists, mafia, and narco-terrorists (Bishara, 2001: 75). These actors use unconventional ways in waging wars against their enemies.

NON-STATE ACTORS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY

Non-state actors play a major role in foreign policy making of nation-states and significantly influence their foreign policy behavior. They lobby in domestic as well as international settings and mobilize their home or host states and national and global public opinion. Non-state actors are active in more than one state; therefore, they can exploit states

against each other. By hiring former bureaucrats and political leaders, non-state actors use personal connections of their employees. Nowadays, non-state actors began to substitute nation-states in many areas (Miyoshi, 1993: 744).

As a product of intensified globalization process, NGOs which operate on international and transnational levels have become more notable determinants of foreign policies of nation-states. Like their counterparts that operate at domestic level and lobby in their respective countries, they lobby at international level. Therefore, no nation-state can ignore their existence and effectiveness. Due to their increasing significance, non-state actors forced students of the international relations (IR) to revise their theoretical perspectives and to develop more explanatory theories. Consequently, "the field of international relations and international organization may be even need to be redefined so as to accommodate dimensions previously largely ignored" (Bennett, 1991: 250).

The neorealist assumption of "states as primary international actors" does not become seriously misleading or inadequate due to non-state actors. According to realists, IGOs are simply instruments of states. They cannot change the belief and behavior of states and the role of international institutions are marginal (Waltz, 1979: 96). However, some arguments of realists are proved to be inadequate and inefficient. Their main consideration that states as unitary actors has been strongly questioned by several perspectives such as bureaucratic politics, domestic politics, liberal, transnational, and regime models. Today, nation-states are no longer able to solve their problems only by themselves. They cannot deal with problems such as acid rain, nuclear contamination of the atmosphere, climatological changes, shortage of food, poverty, overpopulation, and insufficient natural resources (Kegley and Wittkoph, 1995: 332; Miller, 1994: 215-225).

Neoliberals accept the state-dominated view of realists; nevertheless, they suggest that international institutions are also part of the world system and effective in international politics. In this regard, Lapid argues that "the gap between the 'nation-state' ideal and political reality seems to be actually growing rather than narrowing," since "recent technological, economic, and social developments have posed enormous challenges to the capacity of territorial states to fulfill their traditional functions of security, welfare, and identity" (Lapid, 1994: 23, 24). When state boundaries do not overlap with national boundaries which do not in most cases, "the ascendance of nationalism as a 'generative order' will set into motion a disruptive dual-track process that predisposes 'stateless-nations' … to embark in energetic efforts to 'normalize' their existence" (Lapid, 1994: 22).

It is impossible to separate public from private, domestic from foreign, and political from economic and social matters; therefore, previously narrow concepts of the political process became problematic. As mentioned by Bennett (1991: 253), "if the political process is defined in terms of the authoritative allocation of values, then private actions in economic and social realms, which affect the values available to other actors, are political actions. If these actions have an impact across state boundaries, they are transnational." A broad definition of the political process points to the inadequacy of the state centric understanding of the world politics. That is why, the state-centric model tends to view activities of transnational actors as outside of the political process.

There is a strong relationship between the distribution of power and the role of non-state actors. According to realism, rational actors concern about their self-interests in an anarchic international system. Power is the key variable in explaining behavior of states. Realists give less chance for international cooperation and for effective international institutions. However,

Keohane (1984) uses realists' core concepts in order to explain the high possibility of international cooperation. According to Keohane, although actors are egoists, they cooperate for the long-term interests. Since realists concentrate only on short-term interests, they ignore behavior changes in the iterated Prisoner's Dilemma. As a result, we can say that the influence of non-state actors is considerably significant in international politics.

The role of non-state actors is accepted by most political scientists, including neorealists (Krasner, 1982). They only differ on the level of the relevance and effectiveness of non-state actors. Their significance in international relations is increasing parallel to the increasing level of interdependence in international setting. Increased transactions, awareness and common concern on regional and global problems require collaboration between nation-states, transnational organizations and communities. As the Cold War ended up with the disappearance of the ideological contest, cultural cleavages and hatreds such as tribalism, religious fanaticism, and hypernational ethnicity have resurfaced (Kegley and Wittkoph, 1995: 122). Many non-state actors have involved in these conflicts and shaped national, regional, and international policies.

In short, non-state actors have become essential instruments within the international system. Today, it is difficult to analyze international politics and behaviors of nation-states without attaching great importance to them. As mentioned by Brown (1995), "the world polity is in the process of self-transformation –out of the traditional nation-state system and into a system more congruent with the contemporary global polyarchy" (p. 268). Nation-states, including the most powerful one, the United States, have to attach great significance to non-state actors in order to maintain their interests. Therefore, any new theoretical and conceptual approaches to international relations have to take non-state actors and new conditions into account in order to be able to make sound analyses about world politics.

* Assistant Professor of International Relations, Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, Abant Izzet Baysal University

REFERENCES:

Ataman, M. (2000). "The Effectiveness of International Organizations," *Abant Izzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, v. 2000-1 n. 1, pp. 152-167.

Barnet, R. J. and Cavanagh, J. (1994). *Global Dreams: Imperial Corporations and the New World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Bennett, A. L. (1991). *International Organizations: Principles and Issues*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bishara, M. "Adresi Belli Olmayan Düsman," *Birikim*, n. 151, pp. 75-78.

Brown, S. (1995). *New Forces, Old Forces, and the Future of World Politics*. Post-Cold War Edition, New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.

Carnoy, M. (1993). "Multinationals in a Changing World Economy: Whither the Nation-State," in M. Carnoy et. al. (Eds.) *The New Global Economy in the Information Age*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 45-96.

Clark, C. and Chan, S. (1995). "MNCs and Developmentalism: Domestic Structure as an Explanation for East Asian Dynamism," in Thomas Risse Kappen (ed.) *Bringing Transnational Relations Back In: Non-State Actors, Domestic Structures and International Institutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 112-145.

Clemons, S. C. (2001). "Hem Muktedir Hem Güçsüz," *Birikim*, n. 151, pp. 88-92.

Donnelly, J. (1994). "Human Rights and International Organizations: States, Sovereignty, and the

International Community," in Friedrich Kratochwil and Edward Mansfield (eds.) *International Organization: A Reader*, New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

_____. (1995). "Human Rights in the New World Order," in Charles W. Kegley, Jr. and Eugene R. Wittkopf (eds.) *The Global Agenda: Issues and Perspectives*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., pp. 190-199.

Goldstein, J. S. (1999). *International Relations*, Third Edition. New York: Longman.

Gurr, T. R. (1993). *Minorities at Risk: A Global View of Ethnopolitical Conflicts.* Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Pres.

Haas, E. (1990). *When Knowledge Is Power: Three Models of Change in International Organizations*, Berkeley, CA: University of California at Berkeley Press.

Haas, P. (1994). "Do Regimes Matter? Epistemic Communities and Mediterranean Pollution Control," in Friedrich Kratochwil and Edward Mansfield (eds.) *International Organization: A Reader*, New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

Haynes, J. (2001). "Transnational Religious Actors and International Politics," *Third World Quarterly*, v. 22 n. 2, pp. 143-158.

Karns M. and Mingst K. (eds.) (1990). *The United States and Multilateral Institutions: Patterns of Changing Instrumentality and Influence*, Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Kegley C. W. and Wittkopf, E. R. (eds.) (1995). *The Global Agenda: Issues and Perspectives*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Kegley C. W. and Wittkopf, E. R. (1997). *World Politics: Trend and Transformation*. New York: St. Martin's Press, Sixth Edition.

Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Keohane, R. O. and Nye, J. S. (1989). *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Second Edition, 1989.

Krasner, S. D. (1982). "Structural Causes and Regime Consequences: Regimes as Intervening Variables," *International Organization*, v. 36, n. 2, Spring 1982.

_____. (1995). "Power Politics, Institutions, and Transnational Relations," in Thomas Risse Kappen (ed.) *Bringing Transnational Relations Back In: Non-State Actors, Domestic Structures and International Institutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 257-279.

Lapid, Y. (1994). "Theorizing the 'National' in IR Theory: Reflections on Nationalism and Neorealism," in Friedrich Kratochwil and Edward Mansfield (eds.) *International Organization: A Reader*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1994, pp. 20-29, p. 29.

Mickolus, E. F. (1995). "Disorder in the New World Order? The Future of Terrorism," in Charles

W. Kegley, Jr. and Eugene R. Wittkopf (eds.) *The Global Agenda: Issues and Perspectives*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., pp. 95-99.

Miller, L. H. (1994). *Global Order: Values and Power in International Politics*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Mingst, K. (1999). *Essentials of International Relations*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Miyoshi, M. (1993). "A Borderless World? From Colonialism to Transnationalism and the Decline of the Nation State," *Critical Theory*, v. 19, n. 4, pp. 726-751.

Olson, R. (1994). "The Kurdish Question and the Kurdish Problem: Some Geoplitic and Geostrategic Comparisons," *Peuples Medditerraneens*, n. 68-69, pp. 215-241.

_____. (ed.) (1996). *The Kurdish Nationalist Movement in the 1990s: Its Impact on Turkey and*

the Middle East. Lexington, KY: The University of Kentucky Press.

Peterson, E. R. (1995). "Looming Collision of Capitalisms?" in Charles W. Kegley, Jr. and Eugene R. Wittkopf (eds.) *The Global Agenda: Issues and Perspectives*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., pp. 259-269.

Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, MASS: Addison-Wesley.