

IO

International Organization

Oran R. Young

Politics of International Regime Formation

Peter M. Haas

Regimes and Epistemic Communities

James Lee Ray

End of International War

David Dessler

What's at Stake in the Agent-Structure Debate?

John S. Dryzek, Margaret L. Clark, and

Garry McKenzie

Subject and System in International Interaction

Joe D. Hagan

Regime Changes and UN Voting Realignments

Sponsored by the World Peace Foundation
Edited at Stanford University
Published quarterly by The MIT Press

EDITORIAL BOARD

David A. Baldwin, Chairperson

Vinod K. Aggarwal
Robert Bates
Thomas J. Biersteker
Barry Buzan
James A. Caporaso
Benjamin J. Cohen
Ellen T. Comisso
Peter F. Cowhey
Peter Gourevitch

Joanne Gowa
Ernst Haas
Takashi Inoguchi
Harold K. Jacobson
Robert Jervis
Peter Katzenstein
Stephen Kobrin
Charles Lipson
Charles S. Maier

Lynn Krieger Mytelka
John S. Odell
Donald J. Puchala
Robert D. Putnam
Ronald Rogowski
Ducan Snidal
Janice Stein
Thomas D. Willett
Mark W. Zacher

Editor: Stephen D. Krasner
Managing editor: Sharon Keller Maddox

Review editor: Joanne Gowa

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION invites the submission of manuscripts on all aspects of world politics and international political economy. Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, *International Organization*, Dept. of Political Science, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif., 94305. Manuscripts should be double-spaced and submitted in triplicate, along with an abstract and author's note. Footnotes should be numbered consecutively, typed double-spaced, and placed at the end of the manuscript. Authors may expect a decision within two months of the Editor's receipt of a manuscript.

Statements and opinions expressed in *International Organization* are the responsibility of the authors alone and do not imply the endorsement of The Board of Editors, The Board of Trustees of the World Peace Foundation, Stanford University, or The MIT Press.

International Organization (ISSN 0020-8183) is published quarterly—Winter,

Spring, Summer, and Autumn—by The MIT Press, 55 Hayward Street, Cambridge, MA 02142, and London, England.

Subscriptions and business correspondence: For inquiries concerning subscriptions, write to MIT Press Journals, 55 Hayward Street, Cambridge, MA 02142, or telephone the Circulation Dept. at (617) 253-2889. Yearly subscription rates for individuals are \$24; for institutions, \$50. Subscribers outside the United States and Canada should add \$9 for surface mail and \$17 for airmail. To be honored free of charge, claims for missing copies must be made immediately upon receipt of the next published issue. Postmaster: send address changes to *International Organization*, 55 Hayward Street, Cambridge, MA 02142. Second Class postage is paid at Boston, MA, and at additional mailing offices.

Advertising: Please write to Advertising Manager, MIT

Press Journals, 55 Hayward Street, Cambridge, MA 02142 USA, or telephone (617) 253-2866.

Rights and permissions: All inquiries concerning rights and permissions should be sent to *International Organization*, MIT Press Journals, 55 Hayward Street, Cambridge, MA 02142.

Permission to photocopy articles for internal or personal use or the internal or personal use of specific clients is granted by the World Peace Foundation and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for libraries and other users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC), provided that the fee of \$1.50 per copy is paid directly to CCC, 27 Congress Street, Salem, MA 01970. The fee code for users of the Transactional Reporting Service is 0020-8183/89 \$1.50. For those organizations that have been granted a photocopy license with CCC, a separate system of payment has been arranged.

International Organization

Volume 43, Number 3, Summer 1989

Articles

- The politics of international regime formation: managing natural resources and the environment *Oran R. Young* 349
- Do regimes matter? Epistemic communities and Mediterranean pollution control *Peter M. Haas* 377
- The abolition of slavery and the end of international war *James Lee Ray* 405
- What's at stake in the agent-structure debate? *David Dessler* 441
- Subject and system in international interaction *John S. Dryzek, Margaret L. Clark, and Garry McKenzie* 475
- Domestic political regime changes and Third World voting realignments in the United Nations, 1946–84 *Joe D. Hagan* 505

Contributors

Margaret L. Clark is Visiting Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Oregon, Eugene, and Research Associate at the Byrd Polar Research Center, Ohio State University, Columbus.

David Dessler is Assistant Professor of Government at the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

John S. Dryzek is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Oregon, Eugene.

Peter M. Haas is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Joe D. Hagan is Associate Professor of Political Science and Director of the International Studies Program at the University of Wyoming, Laramie.

Garry McKenzie is Associate Professor of Geology and Mineralogy and Research Scientist at the Byrd Polar Research Center, Ohio State University, Columbus.

James Lee Ray is Professor of Political Science and Director of the International Affairs Program at Florida State University, Tallahassee.

Oran R. Young is Adjunct Professor of Government, Senior Fellow of the Dickey Endowment, and Director of the Institute of Arctic Studies at Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire, and Senior Fellow of the Center for Northern Studies, Wolcott, Vermont.

Abstracts

The politics of international regime formation: managing natural resources and the environment

by Oran R. Young

Why do actors in international society succeed in forming institutional arrangements or regimes to cope with some transboundary problems but fail to do so in connection with other, seemingly similar, problems? This article employs a threefold strategy to make progress toward answering this question. The first section prepares the ground by identifying and critiquing the principal models embedded in the existing literature on regime formation, and the second section articulates an alternative model, called institutional bargaining. The third section employs this alternative model to derive some hypotheses about the determinants of success in institutional bargaining and uses these hypotheses, in a preliminary way, to illuminate the process of regime formation in international society. To lend empirical content to the argument, the article focuses throughout on problems relating to natural resources and the environment.

Do regimes matter? Epistemic communities and Mediterranean pollution control

by Peter M. Haas

International regimes have received increasing attention in the literature on international relations. However, little attention has been systematically paid to how compliance with them has been achieved. An analysis of the Mediterranean Action Plan, a coordinated effort to protect the Mediterranean Sea from pollution, shows that this regime actually served to empower a group of experts (members of an epistemic community), who were then able to redirect their governments toward the pursuit of new objectives. Acting in an effective transnational coalition, these new actors contributed to the development of convergent state policies in compliance with the regime and were also effective in promoting stronger and broader rules for pollution control. This suggests that in addition to providing a form of order in an anarchic international political system, regimes may also contribute to governmental learning and influence patterns of behavior by empowering new groups who are able to direct their governments toward new ends.

The abolition of slavery and the end of international war

by James Lee Ray

Slavery and war have both historically been considered inevitable consequences of human nature. Yet slavery has been abolished, and moral progress may have contributed to slavery's disappearance. Both realists and Marxists are skeptical about the impact of ethical constraints on political decisions, while idealists as well as at least some regime analysts emphasize the role of those constraints. However, elements of all of these approaches support the proposition that moral progress may bring an end to international war.

Some historical trends do not support the idea that international war is on the verge of disappearance, but there has not been a war between major powers since 1945. In addition, norms against colonialism are strong. No war has occurred between democratic states, nor does a war appear likely among the rather sizable number of industrialized democratic states in the international system today. Explanations of these pockets of peace based on caution induced by nuclear weapons or on economic interdependence, for example, are certainly not beyond question. Therefore, it may be that norms inhibiting the initiation of international war have already made obsolete not only wars between the richest and most powerful states in the world but also some forms of deprecation by the strong against the relatively weak states.

What's at stake in the agent-structure debate?

by David Dessler

Recent developments in the philosophy of science, particularly those falling under the rubric of "scientific realism," have earned growing recognition among theorists of international relations but have failed to generate substantive programs of research. Consequently, the empirical relevance of much philosophical discourse, such as that centering on the agent-structure problem in social theory, remains unestablished. This article attempts to bridge the gap between the philosophy and practice of science by outlining a model of international structure based on the principles of scientific realism and by considering its implications for a structural research program in international relations theory. Appealing to Imre Lakatos's methodology of theory-choice, the article presents an ontological case for adopting a "transformational" model of structure over the "positional" model developed in the work of Kenneth Waltz. The article demonstrates that the positional approach offers no conceptual or explanatory hold on those features of the international structure that are the intended products of state action. In conclusion, the article argues that the stakes in the agent-structure debate include the capacity to generate integrative structural theory and the ability to theorize the possibilities for peaceful change in the international system.

Subject and system in international interaction

by John S. Dryzek, Margaret L. Clark, and Garry McKenzie

Recent interest in cognitive approaches to international interaction in general and international regimes in particular has not been matched by development in theory and methodology. This article details a systematic "subjective" approach that seeks

to meet this need. Its claims are developed through its comparison with the accomplishments and shortcomings of more established approaches to the study of international interaction and, in particular, microeconomic formal theory. The subjective alternative can model both individual subjects and the systems in which they are participating. As such, it offers much more in terms of continuities and connections between agents and system structure than do traditional psychological analyses in international relations. The theoretical arguments proceed in the context of a study of cooperation and conflict over Antarctica and its evolving regimes.

Domestic political regime changes and Third World voting realignments in the United Nations, 1946–84

by Joe D. Hagan

This article presents a cross-national analysis of the relationship between domestic political regime changes and voting realignments of Third World nations in the United Nations (UN). It seeks to move beyond existing research that has assumed that foreign policy is rooted in political and economic structures and changes only when a political revolution occurs. It argues that a wider variety of regime changes—ranging from those involving mainstream political parties to milder ones such as factional shifts in single-party regimes—can also provoke major realignments. Using a new data set on Third World regimes, the article examines the impact of regime changes for eighty-seven nations on their UN voting patterns during the period from 1946 to 1984. Although the findings indicate that revolutions are most likely to provoke major voting realignments, they also show that the more frequent, nonrevolutionary types of regime change are associated with many voting realignments. A major implication of these findings is that foreign policy changes reflect a complex set of domestic regime factors, including leadership belief systems and internal political constraints, as well as aspects of political structure.