

ppi 201502ZU4645

Esta publicación científica en formato digital es continuidad de la revista impresa
ISSN-Versión Impresa 0798-1406 / ISSN-Versión on line 2542-3185 Depósito legal pp
197402ZU34

CUESTIONES POLÍTICAS

Instituto de Estudios Políticos y Derecho Público "Dr. Humberto J. La Roche"
de la Facultad de Ciencias Jurídicas y Políticas de la Universidad del Zulia
Maracaibo, Venezuela



Vol.40

Nº 73

Julio

Diciembre

2022

Public actors of international politics: peculiarities of interaction

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46398/cuestpol.4073.25>

Oleksii A. Tretiak *

Oleksandr S. Tokovenko **

Mariia A. Rexha ***

Albina A. Komlichenko ****

Abstract

The objective of the article was to identify the public determination of the activities of international political actors. The methodology combines a systems approach, comparative method, structural and functional analysis, institutional approach, postmodern methodology, logical generalization method, communicative approach, sociocultural analysis and the scenario forecasting method, which ensure to determine the importance of the public elements of the international community. At present, the model of public opinion allows us to see the main trends of public self-expression of political actors and their relationship with social groups. That is, the attitude of the population of certain countries to this problem became the basis of various actions of public political actors. It is concluded that advertising is a prerequisite framework for modern international politics both at the theoretical-conceptual level and at the level of pragmatic activity. Kokkuvõtteks tehti kindlaks, et kaasaegse rahvusvahelise poliitika avaliku sektori osalejad keskenduvad oma tegevuses kollegiaalsele poliitilisele otsustusprotsessile laia ja mitmemõõtmelise arutelu alusel, esitades kõige laiemaid vaatenurki.

Keywords: political actors; international relations; global public policy; international non-governmental organizations; communicative competence.

* Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Head of Political Science Department of Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Dnipro Ukraine. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2536-0611>

** Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, Professor, Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences and International Relations Oles Honchar Dnipro National University Dnipro, Ukraine. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1721-2205>

*** Candidate of Political Sciences, Associate Professor of International Relations Department of Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Dnipro Ukraine. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1536-1357>

**** Postgraduate student of Political Science Department of Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Dnipro Ukraine. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6357-7056>

Actores públicos de política internacional: peculiaridades de interacción

Resumen

El objetivo del artículo fue identificar la determinación pública de las actividades de los actores de la política internacional. La metodología combina un enfoque de sistemas, método comparativo, análisis estructural y funcional, enfoque institucional, metodología posmoderna, método de generalización lógica, enfoque comunicativo, análisis sociocultural y el método de pronóstico de escenarios, que aseguran determinar la importancia de los elementos públicos de la comunidad internacional. En la actualidad, el modelo de opinión pública permite ver las principales tendencias de autoexpresión pública de los actores políticos y su relación con los grupos sociales. Es decir, la actitud de la población de ciertos países ante este problema se convirtió en la base de diversas acciones de los actores políticos públicos. Se concluye que la publicidad es un prerequisite marco para la política internacional moderna tanto a nivel teórico-conceptual como de actividad pragmática. Como conclusión se estableció que los actores publicos en la política internacional moderna concentran sus actividades en torno a la toma de decisiones políticas colegiales sobre la base de una discusión amplia y multidimensional con la presentación de la más amplia gama de puntos de vista.

Palabras clave: actores políticos; relaciones internacionales; política pública global; organizaciones internacionales no gubernamentales; competencia comunicativa.

Introduction

Publicity in the context of international research plays the role of a link between the definition of state and non-state actors in international politics. Publicity in international relations is a historically primary form of diplomatic activity, which from the beginning had a ritual-formal character. At the present stage, public political actors in international relations are characterized by diversity in approaches to classification and stratification by levels of influence, participation in decision-making processes, political behavior, etc.

Publicity simultaneously acts as an environment of activity, normative basis, establishment of the game rules, conceptual image, as well as initial conditions for international political action. In the context of globalization and the growing importance of regional and supranational intergovernmental organisations, public political actors will establish one

of the most heuristic subjects of modern international research. Public political actors are a crucial group of actors and institutions that implement the main content of international politics, open to society interactions to solve international problems.

Currently, there is a need to identify the importance of public influence on the international political process from the point of openness. The institutionalization of political discussions, the evolution of transparency in the context of information and communication revolution, the establishment of the particularities of public political actors in modern international relations and international politics overcome the contradiction between formal-institutional and behavioral-activist approaches of assessing the effectiveness of international policy.

The **objective** of the article is to identify the public determination of the activities of actors in international politics. The aim of the article is to establish criteria for demarcation between public and non-public actors in international politics.

1. Methodology of the research

The article uses professional methods of modern political science. In particular, the study uses methods of complex analysis. The methodology combines a systems approach, which reveals the functioning of the global system of public politics in an environment of global social and economic problems.

The comparative method is aimed at reflecting the qualities of the types of public political actors in international relations, establishing the specifics of global and interstate interactions. Structural and functional analysis is aimed at identifying the special functions of contemporary public political interaction actors in the international arena, as well as their relationship in achieving the goals of governments and states, in increasing activity of non-state public political actors condition.

The institutional approach is used to analyze the importance of public politics institutions at the global level and identify trends in the interaction of domestic and international policy. Postmodern methodology is aimed at reconstructing the preconditions for making public political decisions and realizing the interests of diverse political actors in changing conditions. The method of logical generalization provides the formation of a holistic picture of the transformation of international public policy through the participation of new types of public actors.

The communicative approach ensures the establishment of the public political actors interactions` peculiarities as a communicative phenomenon.

The social sciences` methods include socio-cultural analysis and the scenario-forecasting method. They help to determine the significance of public elements of international political interactions based on hypothetical predictions of international political development events.

2. Results and discussion

The institutional environment of publicity of modern international politics consists of many elements that shape the meaning of political activity in international relations. Mechanisms for establishing political alternatives during negotiations, as well as the formation of the agenda and resources for the implementation of decisions are determined on the basis of the correlation between the activities of decision makers and public opinion.

The latter is one of the main dimensions of openness and compliance of international politics with the ideas and requirements of the population. As U. Osée, B. Bijoux, S. Didier and E. François, point out, for a long-time public opinion was perceived as irresponsible, changing, ill-informed and emotional, and public opinion was deemed unfit to participate in the management of public affairs and foreign policy.

It was only from the years 1950, under the influence of some currents in American political sociology, that public opinion has been gradually identified and sometimes legitimized as a factor entering the process of political decision making (Osée *et al.*, 2019).

A complex and multi-level system of expressing a public political position forces experts and scholars to turn to empirical practices of assessing the state of public opinion on the basis of subjective statements of individuals. However, the model of public opinion allows us to see the main trends of public self-expression of political actors and their relationship with social groups.

Global public opinion determines for public political actors a set of acceptable alternatives for making demands in the framework of international politics and consistently achieving optimal solutions. Contemporary African scholars correctly argue that public opinion is called the judgment of citizens on a topical issue (political, economic, social, etc.).

In order to know public opinion, surveys are organized, a technique that involves interrogating a part of the population to find out the opinion of the whole population. But the results of a poll have no legitimacy, because the popular will can only be expressed by the vote. The vote is, in the end, the expression of the choice of the citizens on the great debates of the community. The media are an essential means of expressing the diversity

of viewpoints, which allow everyone to form their opinion (Osée *et al.*, 2019). The mediators in the relationship between global public opinion and global political actors are national elected institutions and the international media.

Creating a free and impartial public that serves as an environment for evaluating draft decisions in international politics requires considerable effort. Therefore, to talk about the existence of independent public opinion, which determines the activities of public international actors we can introduced only in relation to countries with stable democracies. R. Grant, and R. Keohane identified seven types of accountability mechanisms and consider their applicability to states, NGOs, multilateral organizations, multinational corporations, and transgovernmental networks. By disaggregating the problem in this way, they searched for methods to identify opportunities for improving protections against abuses of power at the global level (Grant and Keohane, 2005).

At the same time, the transformation of public opinion of a certain society into a basis for the activities of public international actors requires a significant evolution of the political culture of mass voters and national elites.

The transformation of the world political agenda on the basis of global public opinion is taking place in a more direct way than it has been in previous periods of human development. Using the example of the global problem of struggle against climate change, we can see that the attitude of the population of certain countries to this problem became the basis for various actions of public political actors. In addition to openness and awareness of specific global issues, it is important to be able to motivate citizens to take certain actions that will indicate their position on a particular international issue.

Regardless of perspective, it is important to be aware of the multiplicity of actors and processes that make up the global system. Reminding ourselves of the complexity of international relations equips us with the ability to recognise any overgeneralisations as they are being presented to us by the media, by political leaders, activists, pressure groups and through our social networks, making us more informed, nuanced and rounded in our thinking, reasonably denoted Austrian researcher C. Gebhard (Gebhard, 2016). On the other hand, it is important to be able to give impetus and direction to specific public actors at the international level.

The importance of public opinion for the activities of public political actors at the international level cannot be adequately assessed without presenting the full range of existing political actors. Modern actors in the international political arena are not limited in status, formal subordination or territorial affiliation. They use all means to implement their interests.. In

this regard Kadir Jun Ayhan points that the taxonomy can be categorized into these perspectives: state-centric, neo-statist, nontraditional, society-centric, and accommodative (Ayhan, 2019). Therefore, it is important to establish the determination of the relationship between specific actors and subject aspects of the global public sphere

The public sphere of international relations is expanding not only through public communications and interactions between public broadcasters. It is becoming a network that brings together public actors at different levels of international policy-making. As Yadira Ixchel Martínez Pantoja say:

Participation of state and non-state actors engaged in shaping the political environment of a host country to advance common interests, with different levels of leadership. A model comprised of state and nonstate actors implementing reactive, proactive and relationship-building strategies and instruments is proposed. In Mexico, regulations for genetically modified (GM) foods have moved from a restrictive to a liberal approach, and this change may be explained by analysing US public diplomacy efforts to promote ideas related to GM foods” (Yadira and Martínez, 2018: 245).

The procedural dimension of the public sphere of international relations is of interest due to the possibility of detailing within the framework of a descriptive approach to those political interactions in international politics that have traditionally been outside public coverage.

Activation of non-state (non-governmental) public political actors as decision-makers in international policy at the present stage is a process of functional replacement of state actors in important sectors of international cooperation. The importance of non-governmental organizations as an empirical articulation of the increasing of the variety of public political actors allows to ensure the sustainability of the international public sphere through the emergence of new initiatives of self-government and lack of vertical subordination and hierarchical links between these new public actors.

In this regard Tanja Bruhl and Volker Rittberger claim that global governance is equated with multilevel governance, meaning that governance takes place not only at the national and the international level (such as in international governance) but also at the subnational, regional, and local levels. Whereas, in international governance, the addressees and the makers of norms and rules are states and other intergovernmental institutions, non-state actors (in addition to states and intergovernmental institutions) are both the addressees and the makers of norms and rules in global governance (Bruhl and Rittberger, 2002). Therefore, it is time to expand the number of subjects of public discussions and develop procedural requirements.

In contrast to group policy or interest group policy processes, the international public sphere is conceptually more represented as a sphere of cooperation than a sphere of competition. At the same time, the commitment to their own needs and internal organizational requirements makes public actors participants in the competition for public attention and attempts to gain an advantage in the processes of resource allocation during communication for state power between public actors.

The transformation of interest policy into the public sphere is one of the important conceptual dimensions for understanding the direction of evolution of modern international politics. I. Yadira and P. Martínez (2019) point, because of their influence on state actors, economic and technological resources, strategies, and instruments of engagement, non-state actors have become resourceful stakeholders of public diplomacy. Multinational corporations, industry groups and NGOs are able to influence policymakers and diplomats and to engage in dialogue with governments and publics.

Moreover, non-state actors are key partners for the implementation of public diplomacy programs. However, some of these non-state actors promote their own ideals and pursue their own interests, especially multinational corporations that want to advance their own agenda, relax regulations, change policies and shape attitudes among policymakers, whereas NGOs try to gain more supporters for their causes and donors, strengthen regulations and change attitudes among publics (Yadira and Martínez, 2019). Therefore the essence of the features of specific public political actors requires a description of the specific mission of each group of political actors at the international level.

The problem of mutual change of groups of public actors of international relations should be considered both from the point of view of structural functionalism, and from the point of view of autonomy of behavior of concrete subjects. At present the functionality of state public actors is influenced, on the one hand, by public requirements for efficiency and effectiveness, and on the other hand - is under pressure from the technological revolution and trends to simplify complex management problems and standartize management situations.

As M. Barnett and K. Sikkink suppose, the study of global governance reflects these changes in the study of world politics. Whereas this was once limited to how states with pre-existing interests create norms, rules, laws, and institutions to regulate their relations, there have been a number of critical additions in the recent past. First, there is a greater interest in the social construction of what is to be governed that is, how a problem becomes defined and gets placed on the agenda.

Moreover, there is a growing consideration of how international and domestic structures, working through conceptions of self and logics of

appropriateness, shape governance structures (Barnett and Sikkink, 2008). Accordingly, state political actors in the international arena are increasingly becoming technical units that do not make strategic decisions, but only carry out their design.

Public criticism of the activities of individual public actors, who are members of various state units, reveals the drawbacks of the authoritarian approach to international relations. The concealment of the goals and objectives of specific actors at a certain stage leads to the rejection of the world order by a certain group of public actors. In accordance with UN System Task Team:

The post-2015 agenda must re-examine the current modalities of international cooperation and develop the appropriate global governance institutions to ensure transparency, accountability, representativeness and commitment. New forms of cooperation and partnerships will need to consolidate the gains of the past and advance appropriate approaches to meet the challenges ahead. Renewed efforts to strengthen South-South cooperation and enhance regional arrangements deserve attention (Analysis and overview, 2015: 4).

In this regard, the global public sphere should become a space of responsibility and accountability of public political actors who represent the various components of the global political structure from nation-states to global corporations.

It is the public manifestation of non-traditional subjects of international politics at the present stage that acquires the status of a factor of stratification of public actors of international politics. The change in the functional workload and role of state actors will be articulated by independent experts and the international scientific community. As UN experts argue:

The majority of non-state actors have a valuable contribution to make in finding a collective solution to addressing global collective action problems, such as international security, climate change, continuous food insecurity, global health, and effects of rapid urbanization and migration. Global poverty and inequality are now viewed as an issue of common interest requiring joint action (Analysis and overview, 2015: 5).

The fact that some state public political actors do not notice this or refuse to change their role only deepens the situation of multidimensionality and complexity of the public sphere of international politics

The problem of leading positions in the international public sphere is considered in terms of the status and functionality of institutions of management and representation. At the present stage governance at the global level is a process not so much of administration as of coordinating and securing the interests of the beneficiaries of specific public policies. S. Breslin and E. Nesadurai recognised that non-state or private actors can be closely linked to the state, for instance, in the form of government-

linked corporations or government-created or government-sponsored NGOs, we nonetheless find it useful to maintain a distinction between state and non-state actors for analytical purposes and to avoid presuming an a priori conflation of interests between state actors and non-state actors closely allied to the state. Our interest in these schemes stems from these more novel governing roles undertaken by non-state actors, prompting us to ask whether we can find similar trends in Southeast Asia (Breslin and Nesadurai, 2018).

Thus, public political actors provide a link between the business paradigm and the paradigm of traditional bureaucratic management.

The transformation of the international public sphere into a set of channels of communication between state and non-state actors is a promising project that will remove the traditional obstacles to the regulation of competence fields. It will also make possible to invent more effective means of communicating information and to provide a more complete consideration of alternatives in international decision-making.

The concept of global governance makes it possible to transform public political activity at the international level as a mean of correcting the interdepartmental struggle and restrictions in the areas of application of certain management tools.

S. Breslin and E. Nesadurai emphasized that transnational governance may be found in bilateral spaces between two states, in transnational regional or global spaces, but they can also be located within states as instantiations of governance initiated elsewhere. In fact, a hallmark of transnational private governance is its fluidity across levels as governing agents at one level attempt to regulate the behaviour of subject actors at different sites (Breslin and Nesadurai, 2018). The international public sphere becomes relevant in the conditions of extraterritoriality.

The ability to ensure real progress in the public expression of positions and speaking up on certain areas of international policy is becoming an important factor in international development. At the same time, the subjectivity of public political broadcasters at the international level should be related not only to state sovereignty, but also to economic factors.

Economic public actors at the present stage are not the most dynamic and quantitatively predominant participants in international transactions. S. Breslin and E. Nesadurai very relevantly assume, that despite the very strong commitment to state sovereignty and non-interference in this region, various forms of transnational governance are emerging and/or consolidating where private actors (business firms, NGOs, foundations, experts) engage in or contribute directly to the development of norms, standards, rules and practices that steer the behaviour of other actors towards some principled (or functional) end (Breslin and Nesadurai, 2018).

Hence, state-centrism loses its significance and needs to be replaced.

The introduction of new public actors into scientific circulation requires their testing at all levels: it is a matter of determining the meaning of their activities, describing the structure and specifics of behavior, etc. Within the international public sphere (which also includes Internet communication) is an important factor of self-realization for non-governmental and individual political actors.

The process of transforming a particular citizen's personality as a public broadcaster of the Internet into a subject of international politics is determined by its importance for international affairs and influence on international public opinion, evaluation of political events, experts' activities, etc. These days, it is difficult to predict the quantitative growth and importance of public actors at the international level.

However, we can talk about the formation of a special environment that they form. Michele Betsill correctly indicates:

While realists dismiss claims about the significance of these actors in world politics, scholars of international environmental politics (IEP) have long recognized their importance, particularly in processes of global governance, and have shaped discussions in the wider discipline of international relations. This largely reflects the fact that non-state actors have had a stronger presence in the environmental issue area than in many other areas of concern to international relations scholars, such as security, trade, and health (Betsill, 2014: 185).

This environment makes it possible to rethink international events and processes.

On the example of specific public political actors, we can see that the realization of selfish interests is a large-scale feature, which will be recorded in the activities of traditional institutions. Opportunities to represent professional interests at the global level demonstrate the potential of public policy actors who can provide a new level of consideration of traditional issues.

The examples of social and labor relations and industrial democracy show the possibility not only of articulating the interests of employees, but also the prospects of forming an agenda to address these issues. T. Otsuka justly points that:

The question of the UN Re-structuring is also being dealt with. However, the true state of the UN affairs cannot be fully understood by studying its objective, structure and function only; because various factors such as the world situation at the time of the UN establishment, international political dynamics, economic interests, different ways of handling world-wide humanitarian issues etc. deeply affect the existing international organizations (Otsuka, 2017: 105).

Accordingly, the UN itself has been changing its approach to interaction with state and non-state public political actors for a long time.

The transformation of public political actors into a dominant group of international relations' factors at the present stage is reflected on the basis of empirical fixation and statement by the research community. It must be taken into account that in modern Ukraine and abroad conditions are created for the initiative promotion of new public political actors, the disclosure of the social significance of their activities.

Peculiarities of behavior are studied on the basis of those methodological principles that correspond to the paradigmatic guidelines of systems theory and linear development. Yann Richard states that «actorness is based on a set of criteria that we will present and interpret spatially.

Scholars of international relations have never used such an approach; too few consider geographical space an important parameter. In the first half of this article, we will review international relations publications on actorness and focus on their relevance for the EU. Then we will present a geographical interpretation of certain criteria for actorness (opportunity, coherence or cohesion, and effectiveness). In the second half of the article, we will apply the geographical interpretation of actorness to an assessment of the EU's place in international relations in various domains by empirically testing certain of these criteria (Richard, 2013).

At the same time, there are opportunities for substantive understanding of the specifics of public actors on the basis of spatial determination of political events, a new distribution of economic assets, socio-psychological background, etc.

Modernization of state actors in international relations at the present stage is in the direction of implementing the functions of the widest possible representation of public opinion, communication competence, scientific approach to the organization of activities. With a significant resource base, state and governmental public policy actors have an advantage in reaching a promising field of expertise, applying new technologies, identifying leading and secondary international issues that should be put on the international agenda.

As Rebecca Gumbrell-McCormick pointed out, intergovernmental organizations, while acting on behalf of nation-states, do not enjoy analogous powers or legitimacy. The UN system is recognized by and represents the largest number of nation-states on a permanent basis and is granted the legitimate right to use force under very limited conditions (Gumbrell-McCormick, 2008).

The structure of global governance since XX century is also generally focused on modernized leadership among public actors (Cox, 1981). In such

conditions, the international public sphere must preserve the potential of inclusiveness, dispersion, representativeness and opportunities for self-realization of individuals and new social groups (Anderson, 2005).

Awareness of the limited potential of traditional institutionalized public actors in international politics is embodied in such transformations of international political relations as the hybridization of state-public cooperation at the international level. This process consists in jointly solving the problems of global development, taking into account regional specifics, the amount of resources and the essence of the problems that need to be solved and articulated by the international community. The example of social and labor relations can be used as a basis for expanding public-public-state cooperation at the international level.

Rebecca Gumbrell-McCormick rightly claims that international industrial relations actors – trade unions, NGOs, employers and their organizations operate primarily at the national level, but they have by now built up a set of institutions at the international level that has remained intact throughout most of the past century. These actors, along with those at the national level, possess a limited common set of norms, on the basis of the ILO core conventions, and these appear to be shared by wide sectors of public opinion (Gumbrell-McCormick, 2008).

This is why such segment requires not only administrative and managerial actions, but also the use of the creative potential of public associations, environmental and social movements (Schroeder and Lovell, 2012).

Thus, the diversity of public actors in international politics acquires the character of opportunities and challenges for the development of the international system. Modern state political actors are forming the fundamental structure of traditional international relations. At the same time, the international public sphere creates space for the implementation of alternative public political actors that can give a new impetus to solve complex international problems and provide a creative approach to modernizing global governance (Kelman, 1970). The use of positive opportunities depends on the initiative of public, individual, economic actors of international interest, which must show their public claims to significance.

Conclusions

Therefore, publicity is a framework precondition for modern international politics both at the conceptual-theoretical and pragmatic-activity level. The theoretical interpretation of the international public

sphere as an environment of free and rational ethically conditioned interpersonal discussions establishes the dimension of public broadcasters and argumentators of international politics.

It actualizes the communicative aspect of publicity of political actors at the international level. It also allows us to consider public actors not only diplomats, but also public broadcasters and commentators on social networks and web hosting.

The sphere of public governance slightly narrows the conceptual definition of the actors of the international political process. Researchers focus mainly on government actors and their partners in civil society and political parties.

Thus, public political actors in modern international politics concentrate their activities around collegial political decision-making on the basis of expanded and multidimensional discussion with the presentation of the widest possible range of points of view. Global public policy is formed as a result of the activities of public political actors of all levels not only in the spatial but also in the temporal dimension (Skodvin and Andresen, 2003).

The ideas and demands of publicity of international political and economic exchanges become the basis for the movements of alterglobalism, criticism of the world order, the requirements of the formation of a policy of balance and sustainable development. Publicity in political activity at the international level determines the effectiveness of its activity, makes transparent the basis for goal-setting political decisions, promotes cooperation on a policy acceptable for everybody.

Publicity also contributes to the stratification of public actors in international politics. This leads to a conclusion about the nature of publicity for each type of international actors, states (governments), non-governmental organizations, national and international level, local communities and business associations. Each of these public actors gets a new perspective of representation and realization of interests.

Bibliographic References

- ANALYSIS AND OVERVIEW OF NEW ACTORS AND FORMATS FOR THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR DEVELOPMENT POST. 2015. Available online. In: https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/untaskteam_undf/thinkpieces/20_thinkpiece_analysis_newactors.pdf /. Consultation date: 15/10/2021.
- ANDERSON, Lisa. 2005. Pursuing Truth, Exercising Power: Social Science and Public Policy in the Twenty-First Century. Columbia University Press. New York, USA.

- AYHAN, Kadir Jun. 2019. "The Boundaries of Public Diplomacy and Nonstate Actors: A Taxonomy of Perspectives" In: *International Studies Perspectives*. Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 63–83.
- BARNETT, Michael; SIKKINK, Kathryn. 2008. From International Relations to Global Society. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Science*. Edited by Robert E. Goodin. Available online. In: DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199604456.013.0035/. Consultation date: 15/10/2021.
- BETSILL, Michele 2014. "Transnational Actors in International Environmental Politics" In: Betsill M.M., Hochstetler K., Stevis D. (eds) *Advances in International Environmental Politics*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, UK.
- BRESLIN, Shaun; NESADURAI, Helen E. S. 2018. "Who Governs and How? Non-State Actors and Transnational Governance in Southeast Asia". In: *Journal of Contemporary Asia*. Vol. 48. No. 2, pp. 187-203.
- BRUHL, Tanja; RITTBERGER, Volker. 2002. From international to global governance: Actors, collective decision-making, and the United Nations in the world of the twentyfirst century. Available online. In: <https://archive.unu.edu/unupress/sample-chapters/GlobalGov.pdf/> Consultation date: 15/10/2021.
- COX, Robert. 1981. "Social forces, states and world orders: beyond international relations theory" In: *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. No.10, pp. 126-55.
- GEBHARD, Carmen. 2016. "One World, Many Actors: Levels of Analysis in International Relations". Available online. In: <https://www.e-ir.info/2016/12/28/one-world-many-actors>. Consultation date: 15/10/2021.
- GRANT, Ruth; KEOHANE, Robert. 2005. "Accountability and abuses of power in world politics" In: *American Political Science Review*. No. 99, pp. 29-43.
- GUMBRELL-MCCORMICK, Rebecca. 2008. "International Actors and International Regulation" In: *The Sage Handbook of Industrial Relations* Sage Publications Ltd. Available online. In: <http://wwwdata.unibg.it/dati/bacheca/955/77208.pdf>. Consultation date: 10/10/2021.
- KELMAN, Herbert. 1970. "Leadership: The Psychology of Political Men" In: *Journal of International Affairs*. Vol. 24, No. 1, pp.1-17.
- OSÉE, Utangisila Bena; BIJOUX, Bijimine Tshipamba; DIDIER, Shafiko Biasuba; FRANÇOIS, Elembe Oyangondo. 2019. "Individuals and International Public Opinion as an Actor in International Relations" In: *Open Journal of Social Sciences*. No.7, pp. 478-490.

- OTSUKA, Takao. 2017. "The United Nations as an Actor in the International Relations Consideration from the viewpoints of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization" In: The bulletin of Kaichi International University. Vol. 16, pp. 105-122.
- RICHARD, Yann. 2013. "The European Union as an Actor in International Relations a Geographical Assessment of European Actorness" In: L'Espace géographique. Vol. 42, No.1, pp. 15-30.
- SCHROEDER, Heike; LOVELL, Heather. 2012. "The Role of Non-nation-state Actors and Side Events in the International Climate Negotiations" In: Climate Policy. Vol. 12, No.1, pp. 23-37.
- SKODVIN, Tora; ANDRESEN, Steinar. 2003. "Nonstate Influence in the International Whaling Commission 1970–1990" In: Global Environmental Politics. Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 61-86.
- YADIRA, Ixchel; MARTÍNEZ, Pantoja. 2018 "Conceptualizing a New Public Diplomacy Model: 'Intermestic' Strategies and Instruments to Promote Change in Mexico's GM Food Policy" In: August the Hague Journal of Diplomacy. Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 245-271.



UNIVERSIDAD
DEL ZULIA

CUESTIONES POLÍTICAS

Vol.40 N° 73

*Esta revista fue editada en formato digital y publicada en julio de 2022, por el **Fondo Editorial Serbiluz**, Universidad del Zulia. Maracaibo-Venezuela*

www.luz.edu.ve
www.serbi.luz.edu.ve
www.produccioncientificaluz.org