SFB 700

GOVERNANCE
IN AREAS OF LIMITED STATEHOOD

Governance Configurations in Areas of Limited Statehood

Actors, Modes, Institutions, and Resources

Thomas Risse

Deutsche
Forschungsgemeinschaft

DFG

Governance Configurations in Areas of Limited Statehood.
Actors, Modes, Institutions, and Resources

Thomas Risse

Abstract

The absence of state authorities in areas of limited statehood does not equal anarchy, disorder, and chaos as the literature on failing and failed states often implies. Rather, we do find governance – both rule-making and the provision of collective goods – in areas of limited statehood that is both legitimate and effective under certain conditions. This paper presents a typology of governance configurations found empirically in our various research projects. The typology does not represent the universe of possible configurations; rather, I concentrate on governance configurations that the research projects of our Collaborative Research Center have reported in various publications. Thus, this paper represents a first effort to systematize what we see empirically. The typology is informed by various analytical distinctions and di-mensions, such as the type of actors involved in governance, the modes of governance, the institutional embeddedness of the configurations, and the material and ideational resources of actors, as well as their consequences for power (a)symmetries.

Zusammenfassung

Die Abwesenheit staatlicher Autorität und Rechtsdurchsetzungsfähigkeit in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit impliziert nicht Anarchie, Chaos und Unordnung, wie die Literatur zu zerfal-len(d)en Staaten häufig behauptet. Stattdessen finden wir vielfältige Formen von effektiver und legitimer Governance – sowohl im Bereich der Regelsetzung als auch bezüglich der Bereitstellung von Kollektiv-Gütern. Dieses Arbeitspapier stellt einen ersten Versuch der systematischen Typologisierung der verschiedenen Governance-Konfigurationen dar, die wir in den Projekten des Sonderforschungsbereiches empirisch vorfinden. Die Typologie orientiert sich an verschiedenen analytischen Unterscheidungen und Dimensionen. Dazu zählen die Akteurstypen, die in Governance involviert sind, die Modi der Handlungskoordination (hierarchisch und nicht-hierarchisch), die institutionelle Einbettung der Konfigurationen sowie die materiellen und ideellen Ressourcen der Governance-Akteure und der Konsequenzen für die Machtverteilung.

Table of Content

1. Introduction

One of the major insights and findings of our Collaborative Research Center pertains to the fact that the absence of state authorities in areas of limited statehood does not equal anarchy, disorder, and chaos as the literature on failing and failed states often implies (Rotberg 2003, 2004; Schneckener 2004; Mata/Ziaja 2009).[1] Rather, we do find governance – both rule-making and the provision of collective goods – in areas of limited statehood which is both legitimate and effective under certain conditions. While central state authorities are either absent or too weak to exercise authority, a variety of actors – international, national, and local, as well as state and non-state – govern in areas of limited statehood (see Chojnacki 2012).

This paper presents a typology of governance configurations found empirically in our various research projects. The typology does not represent the universe of possible configurations; rather, I concentrate on governance configurations that the various research projects of our Center have reported in various publications. Thus, this paper represents a first effort to systematize what we see empirically. This does not mean that the typology is purely descriptive. Rather, it is informed by various analytical distinctions and dimensions, such as:

- Type of actors involved in governance, particularly state and non-state
- Modes of governance, particularly hierarchical vs. the various non-hierarchical modes of social interaction (with a particular focus on bargaining and arguing/ deliberation)
- Institutional embeddedness, whether formal or informal
- Material and ideational resources of actors and their consequences for power (a)symmetries

This paper starts with (and repeats) some conceptual clarifications of our Research Center. The main part of the paper introduces the various governance configurations. The paper concludes by looking at ways in which these configurations relate to each other, leading to interlocking configurations.

2. Conceptual Clarifications[2]

2.1 Limited Statehood

The SFB 700 investigates under which conditions effective and legitimate governance is possible in areas of limited statehood. Limited statehood, however, implies a conceptualization of statehood that, of course, has filled libraries. From the beginning, one problem for us has been to distinguish statehood from the functions, services, and tasks that a state is supposed to provide (see Börzel 2012). For example, if we define a state as an entity that provides security for its citizens, we can no longer distinguish between statehood and security governance in a meaningful way. Overcoming the state-centric view of governance, however, has been one of the central theoretical goals of our research center.

In our understanding, a state is a hierarchical structure of authority. In addition, modern states have fixed territorial borders and usually enjoy international recognition as sovereign entities (with some exceptions). As Tanja Börzel explains in her paper, *statehood* is a property, normally of the state. In this context, we have deliberately opted for a narrow concept of statehood. We follow rather closely Max Weber's conceptualization of statehood as an institutionalized rule structure with the ability to rule authoritatively (*Herrschaftsverband*) and to legitimately control the means of violence (*Gewaltmonopol*, see Weber 1921/1980; on statehood in general see Benz 2001; Schuppert 2009).[3] While no state governs hierarchically all the time, states at least possess the ability to authoritatively make, implement, and enforce central decisions for a collectivity. In other words, states command what Stephen Krasner calls "domestic sovereignty," meaning "the formal organization of political authority within the state and the ability of public authorities to exercise effective control within the borders of their own polity" (Krasner 1999: 4). This understanding allows us to strictly distinguish between statehood as an institutional structure of authority, and the kind of governance a state provides. The latter is an empirical, not a definitional question. For example, control over the means of violence is a constitutive feature of statehood. Whether this monopoly over the use of force actually provides security for the citizens as a public good and irrespective of each person's race, gender, or kinship, becomes an empirical question. Whether or not a state's polity is democratic and bound by human rights also concerns empirical issues that should not be confused with definitional ones.

If statehood is defined by the monopoly over the means of violence and/or the ability to make and enforce central political decisions, we can now define "limited statehood" more precisely. In short, while areas of limited statehood still belong to internationally recognized states (even the failed state Somalia still commands international sovereignty), it is their domestic sovereignty that is severely circumscribed. Areas of limited statehood then refer to those parts of a country

---

2 For the following see Risse 2011.

3 Weber's notion of legitimacy with regard to control over the means of violence should not be confused with an empirically derived notion of a legitimate order that is considered just and fair. Rather, "legitimate monopoly over the means of violence" concerns the claim that the order is legitimate.

in which central authorities (governments) lack the ability to implement and enforce rules and decisions and/or in which the legitimate monopoly over the means of violence is lacking, at least temporarily. The ability to enforce rules or to control the means of violence can be restricted along various dimensions: 1) territorial, i.e., in parts of a country's territorial spaces; 2) sectoral, that is, with regard to specific policy areas; 3) social, i.e., with regard to specific parts of the population; and 4) temporal. It follows that the opposite of "limited statehood" is not "unlimited" but "consolidated" statehood, meaning that the areas of a country in which the state enjoys a monopoly over the means of violence and/or the ability to make and enforce central decisions. Thinking in terms of configurations of limited statehood also implies thinking in degrees of limited statehood rather than using the term in a dichotomous sense.

2.2 Governance

In its most general version, governance refers to all modes of coordinating social action in human society. Williamson, for example, distinguished between governance by markets and governance by hierarchy (i.e., the state), and later scholars added governance by networks to this list (see Williamson 1975; Rhodes 1997; Kooiman 1993). However, this understanding that identifies governance with any kind of social ordering appears to be too broad.

As a result, we use a somewhat narrower concept that is linked to politics. By governance, we mean the various *institutionalized modes of social coordination to produce and implement collectively binding rules, or to provide collective goods*. This conceptualization follows closely from the understanding of governance that is widespread within the social sciences (see e.g., Mayntz 2004, 2008; Kohler-Koch 1998; Benz 2004; Schuppert 2005; Schuppert/Zürn 2008). Governance consists of both structural ("institutionalized") and process dimensions ("modes of social coordination"). Accordingly, governance covers steering by the state ("governance by government"), governance via cooperative networks of public and private actors ("governance with government"), as well as rule-making by non-state actors or self-regulation by civil society ("governance without government" Benz 2004; Czempiel/Rosenau 1992; Grande/Pauly 2005; Zürn 1998). Governance is supposed to provide collectively binding rules as well as collective goods.[4]

The modern Western nation-state thus constitutes a governance configuration. First, it provides a structure of rule and authority over a specific population in a specific territory, a system of political and social institutions to generate and to implement authoritative political decisions. Today, democracy and the rule of law belong to the generally accepted norms of these institutions for authoritative rule-making. Second, the Western nation-state has the task of protecting the internal and external security of its citizens. The monopoly over the means of violence is supposed to do just that. Finally, the rendering of public services is part of the classical responsibilities of the state, from the creation of economic stability and the

---

4   Here, we follow the usual definition of collective goods as characterized by non-exclusive access and/or non-rivalry in consumption. At least one of these conditions has to be present for a good to qualify as collective or common (see Héritier 2002).

guarantee of minimal social security, to public health, education, and, today, the maintenance and the creation of a clean environment. In short, the modern Western nation-state provides governance in the areas of rule-making and enforcement on the one hand, and with regard to collective goods such as security, welfare, and a clean environment on the other. While this nation-state is undergoing a profound transformation (Leibfried/Zürn 2005; Hurrelmann et al. 2007), its ability to ultimately make, implement, and enforce decisions is beyond doubt, even if the modern state privatizes or deregulates previously public services. In other words, the modern state's "shadow of hierarchy" is never in doubt, even in the age of profound (neoliberal) privatization and deregulation (Börzel 2008).

This changes under conditions of limited statehood. Governance in areas of limited statehood requires the provision of these governance services in the absence of a fully functioning state exerting at least a "shadow of hierarchy" with the ability to enforce and implement decisions. Yet, governance does happen even under conditions of limited statehood. The examples of Somaliland and other fragile or failed states demonstrate that governance and collective goods are often provided under rather adverse conditions. This paper explores the governance configurations that we find in areas of limited statehood. Governance configurations consist of an actor dimension and a process dimension. We call the latter "modes of governance."

2.3 Governance Actors

Governance is by definition a public affair, but any actor can become a governance actor, blurring the notions of the public or private character of actors. Therefore, we distinguish between state and various types of non-state actors at different levels. State actors can comprise members of the executive, legislature, and judiciary at national or subnational levels, but also international intergovernmental (or supranational) organizations 'beyond the nation-state.' Non-state actors are first of all for-profit and not-for-profit organizations, again at the national or international level. However, apart from this triad of state, market, and society, non-state actors belonging to a third group possess charismatic or traditional authority, granting them a role in political leadership outside of formal state institutions.

Governance Actors		local/domestic	Trans- and inter-national/external
state		government/executive parliament/legislature judiciary	international (inter-state) organizations (IO); other states and their agencies (e.g. donor agencies)
non-state	civil society (not-for-profit)	associations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), etc.	international non-governmental organizations (INGOs); transnational social movements, etc.
	private sector (for- profit)	companies	multinational companies
	"traditional"	clan chief, village elder	transnational religious organizations (e.g. catholic church); transnational associations of indigenous peoples etc.

2.4 Modes of Governance

The process dimension of governance refers to modes of steering. The modern Western nation-state has the ability to steer hierarchically, that is, to authoritatively enforce the law, ultimately through policing and "top down" command and control. It is precisely this ability to enforce decisions that is lacking in areas of limited statehood. To the extent that hierarchical steering and authoritative rule do take place in areas of limited statehood, we have to look for actors other than the respective national governments. In the following, we distinguish between hierarchical and non-hierarchical modes of coordination. Hierarchical coordination implies a relationship of superiority and subordination that allows for the unilateral creation and enforcement of rules (order and obedience, command and control). If this relationship is institutionalized and vested with a claim to legitimacy, we refer to the authority to rule (*Herrschaft*) as a hierarchical mode of governance.

Non-hierarchical steering involves creating and manipulating incentives and "benchmarking," as well as initiating communicative learning processes (Börzel/Risse 2005; Göhler et al. 2009). Positive incentives, but also sanctions, are meant to affect the cost-benefit calculations of the relevant parties and to induce the desired behavior. These modes of governance and bargaining processes are based on a rational choice logic of consequentialism. But governance also includes non-manipulative communication, such as arguing, persuasion, and learning. The latter modes of governance aim to challenge fixed interests and preferences so that actors are induced through a socialization process to internalize new rules and norms. These modes of governance follow a

logic of appropriateness (March/Olsen 1998) or of communicative rationality (Habermas 1992; Risse 2000).

2.5 Institutions

Governance consists of institutionalized modes of social coordination. Institutions are norms, rules, and procedures – both formal and informal – shaping the relations between the different actors in a governance configuration (March/Olsen 1989; Göhler 2004; Keohane 1989; Scharpf 1997). In this sense, governance configurations *are* institutions insofar as they consist of norms and rules (e.g., hierarchical relations between actors vs. formal equality of actors involved despite asymmetrical distribution of resources, and so forth) as well as decision-making procedures (e.g., consensus vs. majority rule). In many cases, these norms and rules are enshrined in formal constitutional documents and legal texts; in other cases, the institutional setting is completely informal, but nevertheless has a strong logic of appropriateness (various forms of so-called "traditional authority" in indigenous communities). Thus, institutional rules specify the role of governance actors in exercising functions of decision-making and implementation, and they constitute their (formal) equality or inequality. Furthermore, institutions can affect the use of specific modes of governance, for example the choice of arguing over bargaining by creating a setting more favorable to one party than to another.

Moreover, governance configurations are usually embedded in larger institutional settings. International law, for example, provides a rule structure governing interactions between various state actors, both external and internal. Multinational corporations are subject to home country laws and regulations that partially even extend to their investments in areas of limited statehood. The same holds true for NGOs. To what extent international law also provides binding rules for non-state actors and whether or not "non-state law" exists is subject to some debate (Rudolf 2007; Schuppert/Kötter 2007; Schuppert 2011).

2.6 Resources and Power

One of the central criticisms of the governance discourse in the social sciences has been that it has a problem-solving bias that ignores relationships of power and inequality (see e.g. Mayntz 2008, 2009 on this point). Yet, the governance configurations that we try to describe in this paper do not come free of power (see Göhler 2007). This is fairly obvious with regard to hierarchical coordination or authoritative rule (*Herrschaft*), which constitutes an institutionalized power structure of order and obedience. But even the non-hierarchical modes of governance that we observe empirically in areas of limited statehood are not powerless. The use of positive incentives or negative sanctions only works if somebody has the resources and, thus, the power to influence the cost-benefit calculations of others. The ability to frame an argument involves discursive power, as Michel Foucault reminds us (Foucault 1991). Even a Habermasian "ideal speech situation" constitutes a counterfactual presupposition against which real discourses in the real world have to be measured.

Asymmetries between governance actors, created by institutional provisions and/or by an unequal distribution of their material and immaterial resources, are part and parcel of a specific governance configuration, and thus provide a window of opportunity for the use of different modes of governance, potentially shaping the substantive outcome of governance. Governance actors bring resources to the governance configuration that might not directly affect their formal status but definitely shape their interaction. Material and immaterial resources provide actors with the capacities to fulfill certain governance functions, to exercise influence via modes of governance, and to shape substantive outcomes of non-hierarchical coordination. The distribution of resources among governance actors can create a situation of (asymmetrical) interdependence in order to govern effectively, as governance actors need a number of different resources, for example knowledge and expertise for informed decision-making, organizational capacities for implementation, and legitimacy.

Resource asymmetries constitute power relationships that are crucial for the analysis of different governance configurations. But power is as elusive a concept as statehood or governance (see e.g. Baldwin 2002; Barnett/Duvall 2005; Lukes 1974). It can refer to a relationship between actors, but it can also refer to a structure governing this relationship. *Relational power* refers to the direct exercise of power in a specific interaction. Robert Dahl's definition of power as the ability of A to get B to do something that he/she would not have done otherwise (Dahl 1961; see Baldwin 2002) fits this category. This is the "power as (direct) influence" concept, which is familiar to most of us and is based on the asymmetrical distribution of resources and capabilities (whether material or ideational; see above). This understanding includes the "power of the better argument" or the "power in discourse" (Holzscheiter 2010), whereby actors give reasons and justifications to persuade others of the normative or factual validity of their points (following a Habermasian understanding of discourse, see Habermas 1981, 2007).

Resources	
Material	funds
	staff
	organizational capacity
	...
Immaterial, ideational	knowledge and information
	moral/charismatic authority
	...

In contrast, *structural power* refers to constitutive relationships that define the properties and identities of actors. Capital-labor or master-slave relationships embody structural power. So does the power of the global North over the global South in the global economy. The hierarchical modes of coordination mentioned above also involve structural power insofar as legitimate and authoritative rule (*Herrschaft*) comprises both the rulers and the ruled. But structural power can also refer to the "power of discourse" in a Foucauldian sense (Foucault 1991; see Holzscheiter 2010). The more meanings are fixed, knowledge becomes consensual, and norms are taken for granted, the more these ideational constructs exert structural power.

In any governance configuration, several dimensions of power can be present, empowering different governance actors to shape the process of governance according to their preferences. While a hierarchical governance configuration is defined by the structural power of authority, the distribution of resources might partly compensate for this asymmetry, giving the ruled a greater say in decision-making and implementation. Especially in areas of limited statehood, the state might lack material resources for the effective implementation or enforcement of rules, and its ability to rule authoritatively might solely hinge on its legitimacy. While the various power dimensions might mutually reinforce each other in strengthening one actor that unites both relational and structural power, they can also mitigate each other's effect, for example if governance institutions curtail the power derived from monetary and organizational resources, privileging expertise and reputation in a context of communicative action and arguing.

3. Governance Configurations: A Typology

A typology of governance configurations with all possible combinations of governance actors and modes of governance is not feasible. The following typology uses modes of governance as well as types of actors as its main dimensions. As the nation-state is still a point of reference for analyzing governance, I start from the distinction between governance with and without the state in hierarchical and non-hierarchical settings (see also Beisheim et al. 2011). For each of the configurations, I discuss the modes of social coordination as well as the distribution of power and resources in detail. Throughout the paper, I use empirical examples from the SFB 700's individual research projects.

Governance in areas of limited statehood does not mean the absence of hierarchical modes of governance. It only means that central state authorities are too weak to exercise domestic sovereignty. We actually find several configurations involving hierarchical modes of steering in areas of limited statehood. By definition, hierarchical governance through the exercise of rule and authority (*Herrschaft*) involves structural power. Moreover, it usually involves an asymmetrical distribution of resources, whether material or ideational. Hierarchical steering that is not backed up by resources is usually not very effective, as the West is learning the hard way in Afghanistan (see the SFB 700's project C9) or the Pope had to realize in Medieval Europe (see the SFB 700's project B10).

3.1 Exporting Statehood: Colonial Rule and Modern Trusteeships

In cases of colonial rule and modern trusteeships, international (intergovernmental) organizations or foreign states and their agencies (such as Western powers) provide the rules and regulations for governance in areas of limited statehood. In other words, rule-making takes place outside the state, while international, national, and/or local actors – both state and non-state – implement the rules or provide the respective services. But the primary rule-setting "governors" – to use a term introduced by Avant, Finnemore, and Sell (Avant et al. 2010) are external state actors and international organizations (IOs; *actor* dimension). In this case, statehood resides with the external actors who enjoy the monopoly over the means of violence and/or the ability to make and implement decisions authoritatively. In other words, while the governed territory remains an area of limited statehood, the ability to steer hierarchically and cast a "shadow of hierarchy" resides with the external state actors (*modes* of governance). A historical example of this "shadow of hierarchy" is Britain's "indirect rule" of its colonies (see also the Roman Empire's rule over its provinces), which left local authorities significant leeway for self-governance as long as the colonial authorities were not challenged (Lehmkuhl 2007). Similar "shadows of hierarchy" are cast in today's semi-sovereign trusteeships, such as Kosovo or Afghanistan.

This is not to say that foreign powers and IOs always rule authoritatively or that non-hierarchical modes of governance (e.g., negotiation systems, see below) are excluded in this configuration. However, these non-hierarchical modes are embedded in institutional settings with the necessary enforcement capacity to rule authoritatively if need be (*institutional* dimension). In most contemporary cases, trusteeships and foreign occupations are also embedded in an international institutional framework, such as the provisions of international law or the authorization of the UN Security Council.

Hierarchical steering by external powers requires an extremely asymmetrical distribution of *resources* (material and ideational) in order to be effective. Foreign interveners must commit substantial military capacities to ensure a monopoly over the means of violence in the governed territory, as well as sufficient financial and administrative resources to be able to enforce decisions if need be. They can only compensate for a lack of material resources if their intervention is considered legitimate by those being ruled, which then leads to voluntary compliance. Otherwise, the hierarchical enforcement of rules must be based on brute force and sheer coercion, requiring enormous resources to be deployed by the external actors. Most empires learned this the hard way – from the Romans (Esders 2009) to the British and the Soviets – and ultimately collapsed because of a lack of legitimacy in conjunction with overextension (Kennedy 1987).

Quite a few projects in our Research Center explore this type of governance configuration. With regard to colonial rule, Ursula Lehmkuhl and Norbert Finzsch have analyzed colonial governance and settler imperialism in the British and French colonies in North America and Australia (Lehmkuhl/Finzsch 2009; see also Lehmkuhl 2007; Conrad/Stange 2011). Stefan Rinke

examines security cooperation in border regions between Mexico and the United States as well as Argentina and Chile in the late nineteenth century, during the transition from colonial to post-colonial statehood in Latin America (Rinke 2009). Meanwhile, Sebastian Conrad has looked at "scientific colonialism" in the German and Japanese colonies from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth century (Conrad/Stange 2011).

With regard to contemporary trusteeships and foreign military interventions, our projects look at international transitional administrations in Kosovo, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and East-Timor (Ladwig 2009), and at international security governance transfers by UN interim administrations, for example in Timor Leste (Schröder 2009b). We also look at the Western-led intervention in Afghanistan (Zürcher 2009; Koehler 2008). A very peculiar case is analyzed by Henrik Enderlein and his team (see Enderlein et al. 2012), In which creditors of highly indebted poor countries (HIPCs) use the courts of consolidated states to enforce debt repayments by the HIPCs (see also Enderlein et al. 2011).

In each of these cases, external actors govern hierarchically and directly interfere with the "Westphalian/Vattelian" sovereignty of states or colonies (Krasner 1999). The host state or colony is still involved, but often sidelined, since it has lost domestic sovereignty. In some cases, such as Timor Leste or Afghanistan, the host state still enjoys international recognition and has entered in a contractual relationship with external actors, thereby "outsourcing" statehood to them (see below).

Our preliminary findings suggest that the external imposition of statehood on colonies, trusteeships, or modern protectorates faces enormous legitimacy problems, both in the home and the "host" countries. As to the contemporary cases, the legitimacy of Western-imposed governance is limited and often gives rise to accusations of paternalism and neo-colonialism, as the United States experienced in Iraq (see also Ladwig 2007 for a discussion of the normative problems involved). Our surveys in Afghanistan document that the legitimacy of external governance is very much related to governance output, the effective delivery of collective goods ranging from public security to education (Koehler/Zürcher 2007). If these services are not provided, the legitimacy of external actors suffers immediately. In contrast, colonial rule in Latin America was mostly legitimized through input legitimacy, at least temporarily (divine right, traditional authority of the Spanish king, etc. see Rinke 2009: 598).

In general, however, externally imposed hierarchical rule is rarely considered legitimate, and if so, only as a transitional device. This immediately undermines the efficiency (let alone effectiveness) of these governance configurations, since it requires the interveners to spend enormous material resources to enforce a monopoly over the means of violence and to rule authoritatively. As a result, collective goods such as security are less and less provided, which further undermines the legitimacy of external rule.

3.2 Hierarchical Rule by Non-State Actors: Settler Colonies, Indigenous Chiefs, Warlords, and Companies

The literature on statehood often assumes that the state is the only entity with the ability to rule hierarchically and to exert *Herrschaft* (e.g. Benz 2001; for a discussion see Schuppert 2009). This is not what we find in areas of limited statehood. Rather, our empirical evidence suggests that hierarchical steering by non-state actors is all too common under these conditions. In this sense, we encounter private authority in the strict sense of the word.[5] This governance configuration shares with the first one that it can rely on hierarchical steering if only to provide a "shadow of hierarchy" to enable other actors to employ non-hierarchical modes of governance.

It differs from the provision of statehood by external actors on the *actor* dimension, of course, but also, more importantly, with regard to the *institutional* setting. In many cases – warlords, but also settler imperialism comes to mind – hierarchical rule by non-state actors is far less regulated than state rule, potentially giving rise to despotism. In other cases, hierarchical rule by private actors is itself embedded in yet another structure of (hierarchical) authority. Examples include the East India Company or the Hudson Bay Company, which exerted control in India and North America on behalf of the British Empire. Thus, this is a case of delegated authority. A different type of institutional embeddedness concerns norms of appropriate behavior (including respect for human rights, and the like) emanating from transnational communities (Keck/Sikkink 1998) or so-called "traditional" indigenous groups (on functional equivalents to an effective "shadow of hierarchy" see Börzel/Risse 2010).

As to *resources* and power asymmetries, pretty much the same applies for non-state actors as for external state actors in the first configurations. Hierarchical steering involves the use of material and ideational resources. Yet, there is a big difference between the two with regard to legitimacy as a functional equivalent for material power to induce compliance. Our various projects have shown time and again that even the weakest state still enjoys some benefit of the doubt when it comes to legitimacy claims. Non-state actors, however, are rarely considered legitimate when they enforce rules authoritatively.

Several of the SFB's projects are studying warlords as hierarchical rulers. In many areas of limited statehood where central authorities are absent, warlords or local "big men" have the ability to enforce rules and provide security as a public good under certain conditions (Chojnacki 2009; Chojnacki/Branovic 2011; see also Schneckener/Zürcher 2007 for Afghanistan and Pakistan; for the rule of warlords in early twentieth century China see Leutner 2009; Leutner 2007).

The same holds true sometimes for companies investing in areas of limited statehood. Extractive industries, for example, not only provide public services under certain circumstances, but can

---

5   Note that the international relations literature often uses the term "private authority" in a rather loose fashion (see e.g. Hall/Biersteker 2002; Cutler et al. 1999). In our terminology, private authority in the sense of authoritative rule (Herrschaft) refers to the ability of non-state actors to steer hierarchically, which is rather rare in global governance.

also enforce rules hierarchically under the right conditions. Shell in the Niger Delta appears to provide an example for such a case (Zimmer 2010). Settler colonies in North America and Australia also ruled hierarchically (Lehmkuhl/Finzsch 2009). So did indigenous chiefs (*caciques gobernadores*) in the Latin American Spanish colonies (Rinke 2009: 599).

As mentioned already, the main problem with this type of configuration is its sustainability in actually providing governance and avoiding despotism. If we assume for a moment that non-state actors such as warlords or companies command the necessary resources to enforce the rules, the real issue is how to induce them to provide collective goods and governance rather than simply exploiting resources and people. In the latter situation, hierarchical steering does not lead to governance, but to racketeering and even more insecurity (for the case of warlords see Chojnacki/Branovic 2011; for extractive industries as part of the problem see Hönke 2010). A quantitative study by Hyeran Jo and Katherine Bryant concerning the compliance of rebel groups and warlords with humanitarian law yields interesting insights in this context (Jo/Bryant forthcoming): The more hierarchical the internal organization of the rebel group and the closer it is to winning and to taking over the state, the more non-state violent actors and warlords are likely to comply with international humanitarian standards. The need for international recognition and legitimacy, as well as the requirement to appease the international donor community, might explain this finding.

As to indigenous and local rulers, it is probably their embeddedness in local communities and their need to retain some degree of legitimacy which explains the effectiveness of hierarchical governance in these cases and the avoidance of despotism. A case in point is local rule in Somaliland and Puntland, two provinces of the failed state Somalia in which order and security have been maintained rather well over the past fifteen years, despite the complete absence of central state authorities (e.g. Menkhaus 2006/2007; Debiel et al. 2010; Renders/Terlinden 2010; see also Chojnacki 2009).

3.3 Voluntary Delegation of Authority by Host States to Other Actors

In this governance configuration, the host country's state voluntarily gives away its right to steer hierarchically and delegates it to external and/or domestic actors. In other words, host countries give up their "domestic sovereignty" – at least partly – and allow other actors to steer hierarchically on their territory.[6] Delegated authority constitutes a typical principal-agent relationship, but one with a twist.

---

6   Strictly speaking and according to international law, protectorates also belong in this category, insofar as they involve a "consensual" agreement through which the dependent state surrenders its domestic sovereignty to a protector. However, the governments of contemporary trusteeships such as Kosovo, Bosnia-Herzegovina, or even Afghanistan are so extraordinarily weak that the act of formal delegation has very little substantive content. I owe this point to Daniel Jacob.

As to the *actor* dimension, it is clearly the state that delegates here, but those who then do the governing can be domestic and international, as well as state and non-state actors. External actors can be other national governments, international consortia, or non-state actors – companies, NGOs – that are still subject to national law. In other cases, states hire foreigners to provide certain services, including security (in the case of private military companies, see Chojnacki 2009; Avant 2005; Singer 2003; for security governance see Schröder 2009a). Delegation can be extensive, allowing the external actor to set policies and exempt its personnel from complying with national law, or limited, in which case the external actor carries out policies set by the state and its personnel is subject to national law. One example of the former would be the Regional Assistance Mission for the Solomon Islands (RAMSI), which has been in place since 2003. Another example can be found in the early Middle Ages, when the kings of Francia delegated tax, customs, and coinage prerogatives to local non-state actors (Esders 2009). And as a third example, at least some of the UN Transitional Administrations also fall into this category (Ladwig 2009), when they are not cases of outright imposition by external actors. An example of the latter would be the contracting out of customs services, which has taken place in more than thirty countries. An interesting case of delegated authority occurred in Morocco and Jordan: the central state authorities delegated political and administrative powers to local actors such as local committees or municipal administrations. These actors then contracted out public services such as water management to tribal communities and public-private partnerships (Berber communities in rural Morocco and PPPs in the capital Rabat; see Harders 2009).

With regard to the *modes* of governance, this is a peculiar case. First, delegated authority involves hierarchical relationships insofar as the principal (the host state in this case) commissions governance tasks to an agent or a group of agents. Second, the agents who are supposed to provide public services can do so either hierarchically or non-hierarchically.

There is nothing special about this, since this type of outsourcing is well-known in Western consolidated states (Hurrelmann et al. 2008). However, if authority is delegated to private actors in consolidated states, the central authorities still have the ability to exercise their "shadow of hierarchy," to take back the delegation of authority and to enforce the rules themselves if need be. This ability is lacking under conditions of limited statehood. As a result, weak states delegating authority lack the capacity to enforce the contracts. Otherwise, they would not have outsourced the provision of governance in the first place.

In most cases, delegating authority involves a high degree of *institutionalization*, insofar as it usually relies on formal contracts. Yet, these contracts are rarely enforceable, since the contracting state lacks the resources to do so. If governments of areas of limited statehood contract out governance, they do not have the power of enforcement to steer hierarchically or to at least cast a "shadow of hierarchy." It is hierarchy without power to back it up.

As a result, agency slippage is a constant problem. A typical case in point is the widespread failure of water management in areas of limited statehood. Weak states often outsource water management to private companies, as a result of which particularly the urban poor often lack

reliable access to drinking water (Beisheim/Liese 2009; Beisheim/Campe 2009). The outsourcing of defense and security to private military and security companies (PMSCs) is another example, affecting states such as Afghanistan as well as external intervenors (such as NATO countries in Afghanistan; see also Chojnacki/Branovic 2007; Avant 2005). Agency slippage leads to accountability slippage, for example when personnel in these companies commit violations of domestic or international humanitarian law.

In other words, this governance configuration is an interesting case of "hierarchy without (material) resources." The contract can only be enforced if the delegating principal – the host state – is considered legitimate by the governance agent. Here, legitimacy as an ideational resource would have to substitute completely for lacking material power. In other cases, for example Western development agencies authorized by a weak host state to provide governance, the agents are subject to the national laws and accountability rules of their (consolidated) home states, which see to it that the contract is fulfilled. Once again, this reminds us that governance in areas of limited statehood is "multi-level governance" in the strict sense of the term.

3.4 Negotiation Systems

As argued so far, the absence of a strong central state with the capacity to implement and enforce central decisions and the law of the land does not mean the absence of hierarchical modes of governance. However, non-hierarchical governance configurations are the default in areas of limited statehood. Here, we can distinguish at least four types.

In many areas of limited statehood, we observe governance configurations characterized by various combinations of bargaining and arguing/deliberation, as is typical for negotiation systems. The main feature of this configuration is that governance is being negotiated and no single actor can impose its will on any other actor. In other words, non-hierarchical modes of governance are constitutive for this arrangement.

Other than that, there is huge variation among negotiation systems. As to *actors*, we find empirically the whole range of potential "governors" in areas of limited statehood – state and non-state (companies, NGOs, as well as indigenous actors) on all levels (inter-/transnational, national, local). Our projects look at transnational public-private partnerships (PPPs) to implement the UN Millennium goals (Liese/Beisheim 2011; Beisheim et al. 2008), at peace negotiations between indigenous foragers (the Cuncáac), ranchers, and the postcolonial Mexican state in the mid-nineteenth century (Hölck 2011; Rinke 2009), at bargaining relations between the South African state and multinational corporations with regard to fighting HIV/AIDS and implementing environmental regulations (Börzel et al. 2011; Börzel et al. 2007), at negotiations between external international, national, and local actors to provide security and development services in Northeastern Afghanistan (Zürcher 2009), and to regulate property rights held by indigenous peoples in India and Brazil (Lütz 2009), among others.

As to the *modes of governance* in these configurations, we observe the whole variety of non-hierarchical types of interaction outlined above. Negotiation systems such as formalized PPPs can be viewed as bargaining systems in which actors exchange resources and distribute gains and losses. But they can also be regarded as learning organizations in which actors try to persuade each other about the appropriate rules and means to achieve goals and provide effective public services (Beisheim et al. 2007; Liese/Beisheim 2011). One of our major tasks in the future is to explain under which conditions which combination of arguing and bargaining leads to specific negotiation outcomes. But there is no prima facie reason to assume that arguing and persuasion should not matter as non-hierarchical modes of governance under conditions of limited statehood.[7]

The literature on arguing and bargaining has identified various conditions under which we would expect efforts at persuasion and arguing to prevail over incentive-based bargaining, and vice versa (Deitelhoff 2006; Deitelhoff 2009; Risse/Kleine 2010). This literature has shown empirically (e.g., Holzinger 2001a, 2001b) that arguing and reason-giving on the one hand, and bargaining speech acts (threats, promises, etc.) on the other hand, mostly occur simultaneously in negotiation systems. This literature has also shown that we do not need to make heroic assumptions about truth-seeking actors in negotiation systems, who see themselves in a Habermasian "ideal speech situation." Rather, research has shifted toward exploring the scope conditions under which we would expect arguing and reason-giving speech acts rather than bargaining speech acts to influence the negotiation outcome, and vice versa.

Most of these scope conditions depend on the *institutional* framework of the negotiation system, both formally and informally. But they also depend on the issues at stake and the way in which they are framed:

- The more the institutional rules of the negotiation system privilege and emphasize formal equality among actors (irrespective of underlying power asymmetries), the more we expect arguing and persuasion to play a role (equality of participants).

- The more the institutional rules privilege organizational roles of arbitration and mediation by neutral actors (often chairpersons of negotiations), the more we expect arguing and persuasion to matter (leadership roles).

- The more the institutional setup favors transparency of the process, and the more the negotiating actors have to legitimize their behavior to diverse constituencies, the more we expect to find arguing as a prevailing mode of governance, even behind closed doors (transparency).[8]

---

7   See also Nicole Deitelhoff's presentation at the SFB on November 11, 2010.

8   The point is not that negotiations should take place in front of a public audience. This often leads to ritualistic arguing behavior and less efficient outcomes. However, transparency of the process implies

- The more (re-)distributive issues are on the table, the more we expect bargaining modes to prevail (distributive bargains). However, arguing and persuasion is necessary to agree on fairness rules and what constitutes a "fair deal," and this agreement must take place prior to distributive bargains (fairness rules).

- The more the negotiation partners lack "common knowledge" about the state of the world and/or the appropriate norms and rules applying to a given situation, the more we expect arguing to prevail over bargaining (uncertainty).

Empirically, we are likely to observe that the role of arguing or bargaining depends on the various phases of negotiations; in other words, we expect to find sequencing in negotiations. This is precisely what could be observed in the peace negotiations between indigenous foragers, ranchers, and the early Mexican republic in 1848-49 (Hölck 2011). This analysis confirms, for example, the role of mediators and leaders who are trusted by both sides. In this case, a Cuncàac woman with close ties to the Mexican Hispanic authorities persuaded the indigenous groups to enter into negotiations in the first place. The negotiations themselves were characterized by sequential moves of arguing and distributive bargaining very similar to what the analytical literature on deliberation suggests.

Our project on transnational public-private partnerships (PPP) to implement the UN Millennium Goals has also yielded some interesting results pertaining to the modes of governance in negotiation systems (Beisheim/Liese 2009; Beisheim/Liese 2011). First, particularly service-delivering PPPs tend to be highly institutionalized in terms of formal rules and regulations, and the degree of institutionalization is directly related to the effectiveness of the PPPs in delivering services. Moreover, the preliminary findings indicate that PPPs which institutionalize deliberative communication processes and reflexive learning in their process management achieve better results than those which do not.

As to *resources* and power relationships, negotiation systems in areas of limited statehood rarely exhibit a completely symmetrical distribution of material and ideational capacities. Material resources determine to a large degree the bargaining power of the various governance actors. Note that these are not necessarily state actors. Take the case of many public health partnerships in which the resources available to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation far outweigh the financial clout of any other actor (Schäferhoff 2011, in preparation). Yet, materially underprivileged actors such as (I)NGOs, international organizations, or local "traditional" actors often compensate for their lack of material power by bringing ideational resources to the table ([local] knowledge, moral authority, etc.). It then largely depends on the prevailing modes of social coordination and on the institutional rules and procedures of the governance configurations whether ideational resources have a fair chance against materially powerful actors. Formal and institutionalized rules of equality matter in these settings insofar as they

---

that governance actors have to justify their action behind closed doors to critical audiences.

establish a logic of appropriateness to level the playing field among actors so that the materially weaker have at least a chance to be heard and make their points.

In this context, it would be extremely interesting to use the arguing-bargaining literature to investigate so-called "traditional" governance modes of indigenous peoples and local communities (e.g., the dynamics of Loya Jirgas in Afghanistan, see Buchholz 2007).

3.5 Non-Hierarchical Influence by External Actors

Closely related to negotiation systems are governance configurations by which external actors – mostly foreign countries, development agencies, and international and regional organizations – seek to influence local/national actors in areas of limited statehood to provide governance. This configuration differs from negotiation systems in which each actor involved contributes directly to rule-making and to the provision of collective goods, in that external actors provide incentives or try to persuade *others*, namely national and local actors (whether state or non-state) to deliver governance services. The configuration differs from hierarchical steering by external actors (see above) in that influencing involves strictly non-hierarchical *modes of governance*, whether incentives or sanctions through either arguing or persuasion. Since the external actors do not directly provide rules or public goods, this configuration is usually linked to other configurations, be it negotiation systems on the ground or efforts at hierarchical steering by the domestic state authorities (see conclusions).

As to the *actor dimension*, we observe mostly external state actors in this configuration, whether foreign governments, their development agencies, or international (inter-state) organizations including Regional Organizations (ROs), who try to influence governments in weak states to provide governance. Given that this configuration usually involves non-hierarchical relations between state actors, it is mostly highly *institutionalized* based on international treaties and agreements.

A typical example of this configuration is being investigated by Tanja Börzel and her team with regard to the efforts of the European Union (EU) to promote good governance and anti-corruption efforts in the Southern Caucasus (Börzel et al. 2008; for similar efforts with regard to the Southern Mediterranean see van Hüllen 2010). There is a vast literature on EU attempts to externalize internal norms and rules pertaining to how governance should happen in the target country, and with what outcome (see Lavenex 2004; Lavenex/Schimmelfennig 2009; Börzel/Risse 2009). Through budget support, political dialogue, and conditionality, the EU promotes the adoption (or at least an approximation) of the *acquis communautaire* and other, broader norms such as democracy and human rights. The EU's "transformative power" is certainly most pronounced in the context of its own enlargement, where the EU's potential to steer hierarchically looms with membership (Schimmelfennig/Sedelmeier 2005, Schimmelfennig/Scholtz 2008, Sedelmeier 2006). However, the EU also engages in external governance vis-à-vis its neighbors and more distant countries. It does so through incentives (market access),

political conditionality (i.e., the threat of sanctions), but also political dialogue in an effort at persuasion. But the most widely used instrument of the EU is actually capacity-building, so as to enable weak states in areas of limited statehood to govern hierarchically and to provide good governance. The SFB's current project extends this analysis to the governance export of other regional organizations such as the OAS, Mercosur, the African Union, ASEAN, and others (Börzel 2009).

A very interesting case in this regard concerns creditor-debtor relations in highly indebted poor countries (HIPCs) (see Enderlein et al. 2012, see also Enderlein et al. 2011; Enderlein 2009). This is one of the cases in which private actors try to influence the behavior of governments in weak states. Here, private creditors invoke courts in consolidated states in order to strengthen their case against HIPCs. However, since foreign courts rarely have enforcement capacity over HIPCs, their "hierarchical" decision serves to ultimately strengthen the bargaining position of creditors vis-à-vis highly indebted countries. This often results in negotiated settlements – a non-hierarchical mode of governance. The (non-enforceable) hierarchical court decision is thus used as a resource in the bargaining relationship between private creditors and HIPCs.

This last example points to the importance of *resources* in this governance configuration. When the EU, for example, deals with sub-Saharan Africa, the distribution of resources is highly asymmetrical, which is likely to increase the EU's clout over weak states. In other situations, however, the distribution of (material) resources is far more balanced. External actors cannot simply rely on bargaining to influence governance, but have to employ ideational resources, too. Altogether, though, there is only limited evidence that an asymmetrical distribution of resources between external actors and target states necessarily translates into the former's political influence on the latter.

3.6 Governance by Competition

Negotiation systems and co-regulation refer to efforts by governance actors to explicitly coordinate their behavior. In contrast, competition systems constitute governance configurations in which (non-state) actors vie for who can best provide public services in the most efficient and effective ways (for discussions see Benz 2007; Börzel 2010). This type of competition differs from markets in that it directs actors toward contributing to governance in the pursuance of their egoistic interests. A typical example is the so-called "California effect," whereby state regulation (originally with regard to pollution standards in the state of California, see Vogel 1995) induced companies to compete for better regulatory standards in the United States as a whole, and even worldwide. Research with regard to environmental management standards, such as ISO 14001, has shown similar effects with regard to firms investing in developing countries (Prakash/Potoski 2006, 2007). The African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) in the framework of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) constitutes an example of an intergovernmental competition system to institute benchmarking and best practices (very similar to the EU's Open Mechanism of Coordination [OMC]). The US Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) is another

example for an effort to induce states with areas of limited statehood to compete for better governance (Girod et al. 2009).

The example of the "California effect" demonstrates already that the *institutional* setting in which this governance configuration is embedded, is crucial. Non-state actors such as firms are not "naturally" inclined to compete for the better contribution to governance. They need to be subjected to rules and regulations that induce them to reach or supersede certain benchmarks with regard to human rights or environmental standards. In some cases, these might be state regulations, for example home country laws directing multinational corporations "to do no harm" with regard to their investments in areas of limited statehood (Flohr et al. 2010). In this case, governance by competition is embedded in a hierarchical setting. In other cases such as ISO 14001 or the various market-based instruments (e.g., the Dow Jones Sustainability Index), the institutional arrangement is non-hierarchical.

It follows from the examples mentioned above that competition systems involve state and non-state actors alike, both as those directly contributing to governance (or not) and as those providing the institutional arrangements in which the competition is embedded. As to the *mode* of governance, competition is non-hierarchical by definition, even though the competition system as such might be regulated by hierarchically imposed rules.

With regard to *resources* and *power*, the resource endowment of actors competing for best practices in governance is crucial, of course. If, for example, companies are unwilling to or unable to commit the necessary material resources to provide governance, the competition system will fail to accomplish its tasks. Yet, this willingness and/or capacity crucially depends on whether the institutional rules embedding the competition system are enforceable or whether the embedding institutions can provide enough incentives for the actors to deliver the goods and to compete for best practices. In other words, the most significant question with regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of this governance configuration is whether the embedding institutions have enough material or immaterial resources at their disposal to make the competition system work. Resources are needed to back up hierarchical imposition of the competition rules. But they are even more necessary if the institutional rules cannot be imposed hierarchically. As a result, an asymmetrical relationship is required between the governance actors competing for the better governance on the one hand, and the actors who set the rules on the other hand. Such asymmetries do not rely on material resources alone, however. Normative resources such as legitimacy might do the trick, too. Companies, for example, might be induced to compete for best practices because of naming and shaming, including social mobilization. The "California effect" could result from the desire of companies to (re-)gain legitimacy, both in areas of limited statehood and in their (Western) home markets (see Börzel et al. 2011).

3.7 Parallel Governance

The governance configurations discussed above rely for the most part on the active cooperation and coordination of the actors involved (except for competition systems which are, however, embedded in strong institutional settings). In other words, these governance configurations are tightly coupled for the most part (Weick 2000). Yet, we often empirically observe configurations of "parallel governance" (for lack of a better word) in which actors try to govern without much cooperation with each other. In many cases of areas of limited statehood, external actors are not controlled by the state. While the host government might have formal regulations governing the activities of external actors, it lacks the capacity to enforce its own rules. The "Republic of NGOs" in Haiti is an example of what is all too common in areas of limited statehood (Kristoff/ Panarelli 2010). All kinds of "governors" try to provide goods and services, but without much coordination and only loosely coupled. Central state authorities are one governance actor among many – local and international, state and non-state – leading to parallel layers of governance.

To call this configuration "governance" might be a contradiction in terms, insofar as governance by definition involves some degree of interaction coordination among actors. Yet, this is a configuration that is often observable on the ground. As to the actor dimension, all potential governance actors might be involved in this configuration. The prevailing "*mode of governance*" might be best described as "non-hierarchical non-cooperation." In some cases, there might be at least some (informal) coordination among actors. Note, however, that the more coordination occurs among governance actors, the more we are dealing with negotiation systems (see above) rather than with "parallel governance." It also follows that parallel governance is characterized by rather weak institutional rules and embeddedness. Finally, the *resource endowment* of actors varies considerably.

This is not to say that parallel governance necessarily leads to bad outcomes in terms of inefficient and ineffective governance. The provision of services in areas of limited statehood does not have to rely on tightly coupled organizations. Yet, as the enormous literature on the lack of donor coordination in development aid indicates, the main challenge of parallel governance is inefficient performance in delivering services, since the lack of coordination might lead to the duplication of services and/or to their total absence in areas where they are most needed.

4. Conclusion

The main part of this paper introduced various governance configurations that we find empirically in areas of limited statehood and which differ according to the actors involved, the modes of governance, the institutional settings, and the resources and power (a)symmetries among actors. Graph 1 provides a summary of these configurations.

In conclusion, I would like to highlight that these configurations usually cannot be found in isolation in areas of limited statehood. Rather, they often co-occur and/or are embedded into each other. This is obvious with regard to the configurations 5 and 6: external influence on governance and competition systems, respectively. In the former case, external (state) actors try to induce or persuade actors in areas of limited statehood to provide governance. In other words, this configuration is usually linked to other arrangements discussed in this paper (e.g. delegated authority and negotiation systems). In the latter case of competition systems, the institutional setting providing the rules of competition constitutes part of the configuration, while the competition system itself does the "governing."

External (state) actors who rule hierarchically in areas of limited statehood through colonial rule, trusteeships, or modern protectorates can also enable other governance configurations such as negotiation systems by casting a shadow of hierarchy. The same holds true for delegated authority by host governments in areas of limited statehood. The agent might be either a single actor, state or non-state, or a configuration of actors.

Yet, it needs to be pointed out that developing a typology of governance configurations can only be a first step towards a theory of governance in areas of limited statehood. The main challenge ahead consists of identifying the scope conditions under which these configurations contribute to both effective and legitimate governance – a daunting task, but then again, we have (hopefully) six more years of research.

Configuration	Actors	Modes of Governance	Institutional Setting	Resources and Power
1. Statehood provision by external state actors	Foreign governments and IOs as principal "governors"	Hierarchical and/or non-hierarchical embedded in "shadow of hierarchy"	Hierarchy (often embedded in international law); rule-based in the contemporary system	Very asymmetrical to ensure enforcement capacity; lack of material resources can be compensated by claims to legitimacy
2. Hierarchical steering by non-state actors	Warlords, settlers, companies as principal "governors"	Hierarchical and/or non-hierarchical "in the shadow of hierarchy"	Mostly less regulated giving rise to despotism; Sometimes embedded in external rule structures such as international law or local institutions	Very asymmetrical to ensure enforcement capacity; lack of material resources can be compensated by claims to legitimacy
3. Delegated authority to other actors	Host states as principals, other actors as agents	Delegation is hierarchical; governance is hierarchical or non-hierarchical	Usually formally regulated; sometimes embedded in international regulations or domestic law of agent	Delegating state lacks resources to enforce contracts

Configuration	Actors	Modes of Governance	Institutional Setting	Resources and Power
4. Negotiation systems	State and non-state, domestic and international	Non-hierarchical bargaining and arguing/ deliberation	Formal and informal; rules often establish formal equality of actors; Embedded in international and/or domestic institutions	Ranges from rather symmetrical distribution of resources to very asymmetrical arrangements
5. External influence	Mostly foreign states, their agencies, and IOs including regional organizations	Non-hierarchical: incentives and sanctions, but also arguing and persuasion; capacity-building Linked to other governance configurations on the ground	Mostly strongly institutionalized through inter-state treaties and agreements	Asymmetrical distribution of resources (incl. legitimacy) in favor of external actors necessary condition for effectiveness In cases of symmetrical distribution, external influence rather limited
6. Competition systems	State and non-state actors, domestic and international	Competition system: non-hierarchical; Institutional rules setting up competition: hierarchical or non-hierarchical	Effectiveness depends crucially on the institutional setting in which it is embedded	Institution regulating competition requires material or ideational resources inducing competition to produce governance
7. Parallel govenance	State and non-state, domestic and international	Non-hierarchical non-cooperation (lack of) coordination among governance	Absence of or weak institutions	Resource endowment of actors varies

Literature

Avant, Deborah D. 2005: The Market for Force: The Consequences of Privatizing Security, Cambridge.

Avant, Deborah D./Finnemore, Martha/Sell, Susan K. 2010: Who Governs the Globe? In: Avant, Deborah D./Finnemore, Martha/Sell, Susan K. (Eds.): Who Governs the Globe? Cambridge, 1-31.

Baldwin, David A. 2002: Power and International Relations, in: Carlsnaes, Walter/Risse, Thomas/Simmons, Beth: Handbook of International Relations, London, 177-191.

Barnett, Michael/Duvall, Raymond (Eds.) 2005: Power in Global Governance, Cambridge Studies in International Relations, Cambridge.

Beisheim, Marianne/Börzel, Tanja A./Genschel, Philipp/Zangl, Bernhard 2011: Der Staat im Visier: Wie viel Staat braucht es für gutes Regieren? In: Beisheim, Marianne/Börzel, Tanja A./Genschel, Philipp/Zangl, Bernhard: Wozu Staat? Governance in Räumen konsolidierter und begrenzter Staatlichkeit, Baden-Baden.

Beisheim, Marianne/Campe, Sabine 2009: Transnational Water Public Private Partnerships. Explaining Their Success and Failure. Unpublished manuscript, Berlin.

Beisheim, Marianne/Liese, Andrea/Ulbert, Cornelia 2007: Erfolgsbedingungen transnationaler Partnerschaften. Hypothesen und erste Ergebnisse, in: Risse, Thomas/Lehmkuhl, Ursula (Eds.): Regieren ohne Staat? Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit, Baden-Baden, 326-345.

Beisheim, Marianne/Liese, Andrea/Ulbert, Cornelia 2008: Transnationale öffentlich-private Partnerschaften - Bestimmungsfaktoren für die Effektivität ihrer Governance-Leistungen, in: Schuppert, Gunnar Folke/Zürn, Michael: Governance in einer sich wandelnden Welt. PVS - Politische Vierteljahresschrift, Sonderheft 41, Wiesbaden, 452-474.

Benz, Arthur 2001: Der moderne Staat. Grundlagen der politologischen Analyse. München.

Benz, Arthur 2004: Governance - Regieren in komplexen Regelsystemen, Wiesbaden.

Benz, Arthur 2007: Politischer Wettbewerb, in: Benz, Arthur/Lütz, Susanne/Schimank, Uwe/Simonis, Georg (Eds.): Handbuch Governance, Wiesbaden, 54-67.

Biersteker, Thomas J./Hall, Rodney Bruce (Eds.) 2002: The Emergence of Private Authority in Global Governance, Cambridge.

Branovic, Zeljko/Chojnacki, Sven 2007: Räume strategischer (Un-) Sicherheit: Ein Markt für nichtstaatliche Gewaltakteure und Gelegenheiten für Formen von Sicherheits-Governance, in: Risse, Thomas/Lehmkuhl, Ursula (Eds.): Regieren ohne Staat? Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit, Baden-Baden, 181-204.

Branovic, Zeljko/Chojnacki, Sven 2011: New Modes of Security. The Violent Making and Unmaking of Governance in War-Torn Areas of Limited Statehood, in: Risse, Thomas (Ed.): Governance Without a State? Policies and Politics in Areas of Limited Statehood, New York, NY, 89-114.

Bryant, Katherine/Jo, Hyeran 2012: Taming the Rebels. International Humanitarian Organizations in Conflict Zones, in: Risse, Thomas/Ropp, Stephen S./Sikkink, Kathryn (Eds.): From Commitment to Compliance. The Persistent Power of Human Rights, Cambridge.

Börzel, Tanja A. 2008: Der „Schatten der Hierarchie" - Ein Governance-Paradox? In: Governance in einer sich wandelnden Welt. PVS - Politische Vierteljahresschrift, Sonderheft 41, Wiesbaden, 118-131.

Börzel, Tanja A. 2009: Exporting (Good) Governance: Regional Organizations and Areas of Limited Statehood. In: Lehmkuhl, Ursula/Risse, Thomas (Eds.): Sonderforschungsbereich 700: Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit - Neue Formen des Regierens? Finanzierungsantrag 2010-2013, Berlin, 179-219.

Börzel, Tanja A. 2010: European Governance - Negotiation and Competition in the Shadow of Hierarchy, in: Journal of Common Market Studies 48: 2, 191-219.

Börzel, Tanja A. 2012: How Much Statehood Does it Take – and What For?, SFB 700 Working Paper Series No. 29, Berlin.

Börzel, Tanja A./Héritier, Adrienne/Kranz, Nicole/Thauer, Christian 2011: Racing to the Top? Regulatory Competition among Firms in Areas of Limited Statehood, in: Risse, Thomas (Ed.): Governance without a State? Policies and Politics in Areas of Limited Statehood, New York, NY, 144-170.

Börzel, Tanja A./Héritier, Adrienne/Müller-Debus, Anna 2007: Der Regulierungsbeitrag von Großunternehmen im Kampf gegen HIV/AIDS in Südafrika, in: Risse, Thomas/Lehmkuhl, Ursula (Eds.): Regieren ohne Staat? Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit, Baden-Baden, 272-291.

Börzel, Tanja A./Pamuk, Yasemin/Stahn, Andreas 2008: The European Union and the Promotion of Good Governance in its Near Abroad. One Size Fits All? SFB 700 Working Paper Series No. 18, Berlin.

Börzel, Tanja A./Risse, Thomas 2005: Public Private Partnerships: Effective and Legitimate Tools of International Governance? In: Grande, Edgar/Pauly, Louis W. (Eds.): Complex Sovereignty. Reconstituting Political Authority in the Twenty-First Century, Toronto, 195-216.

Börzel, Tanja A./Risse, Thomas 2009: Venus Approaching Mars? The European Union's Approaches to Democracy Promotion in Comparative Perspective, in: Magen, Amichai/McFaul, Michael/Risse, Thomas (Eds.): Promoting Democracy and the Rule of Law. American and European Strategies. Houndmills, 34-60.

Börzel, Tanja A./Risse, Thomas 2010: Governance without a State - Can it Work?, in: Regulation and Governance 4: 2, 113–134.

Buchholz, Benjamin 2007: Thoughts on Afghanistan's Loya Jirga: A Myth? Asien 104: July, 23-33.

Chojnacki, Sven 2009: Inseln der Sicherheit? Formen und Reichweite nicht-staatlicher Gewaltkontrolle in Bürgerkriegsräumen, in: Lehmkuhl, Ursula/Risse, Thomas (Eds.): Sonderforschungsbereich 700: Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit - Neue Formen des Regierens? Finanzierungsantrag 2010-2013, Berlin, 475-509.

Conrad, Sebastian/Stange, Marion 2011: Governance and Colonial Rule, in: Risse, Thomas (Ed.): Governance Without a State? Policies and Politics in Areas of Limited Statehood, New York, NY, 39-64.

Cutler, Claire A./Haufler, Virginia/Porter, Tony (Eds.) 1999: Private Authority and International Affairs, Albany, NY.

Czempiel, Ernst-Otto/Rosenau, James (Eds.) 1992: Governance Without Government: Order and Change in World Politics, Cambridge.

Dahl, Robert 1961: Who Governs: Democracy and Power in an American City, New Haven, CT.

Debiel, Tobias/Glassner, Rainer/Schetter, Conrad/Terlinden, Ulf 2010: Local State-Building in Afghanistan and Somaliland, in: Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice 21: 1, 38-44.

Deitelhoff, Nicole 2006: Überzeugung in der Politik. Grundzüge einer Diskurstheorie internationalen Regierens, Frankfurt/Main.

Deitelhoff, Nicole 2009: The Discursive Process of Legalization: Charting Islands of Persuasion in the ICC Case, in: International Organization 63: 1, 33-65.

De La Rosa, Sybille/Göhler, Gerhard/Höppner, Ulrike (Eds.) 2009: Weiche Steuerung. Studien zur Steuerung durch diskursive Praktiken, Argumente und Symbole, Baden-Baden.

Enderlein, Henrik 2009: Sovereign Debt and Crisis Management in Areas of Limited Statehood: Bargaining vs. Creditor Litigation, in: Lehmkuhl, Ursula/Risse, Thomas (Eds.): Sonderforschungsbereich 700: Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit - Neue Formen des Regierens? Finanzierungsantrag 2010-2013, Berlin, 869-901.

Enderlein, Henrik/Von Daniels, Laura/Trebesch, Christoph 2011: Governance in Sovereign Debt Crises: Analyzing Creditor-Debtor Interactions, in: Risse, Thomas (Ed.): Governance Without a State? Politics and Policies in Areas of Limited Statehood, New York, NY.

Esders, Stefan 2009: Institutionen und Modi von Governance im Übergang von der antiken zur mittelalterlichen Staatlichkeit: ‚Rule of Law', Sicherheit und Ordnung in frühmittelalterlichen Reichsbildungen, in: Lehmkuhl, Ursula/Risse, Thomas (Eds.): Sonderforschungsbereich 700: Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit - Neue Formen des Regierens? Finanzierungsantrag 2010-2013, Berlin, 395-430.

Finzsch, Norbert/Lehmkuhl, Ursula 2009: Governance-Modi und Faktoren der Landnahme: Weiße Siedler im Kontakt mit indigenen Gesellschaften in Nordamerika (1789-1851) und Australien (1788-1850), in: Lehmkuhl, Ursula/Risse, Thomas (Eds.): Sonderforschungsbereich 700: Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit - Neue Formen des Regierens? Finanzierungsantrag 2010-2013, Berlin, 553-591.

Flohr, Annegret/Rieth, Lothar/Schwindenhammer, Sandra/Wolf, Klaus Dieter 2010: The Role of Business in Global Governance. Corporations as Norm-Entrepreneurs, Houndmills, Basingstoke.

Foucault, Michel 1991: Politics and the Study of Discourse, in: Burchell, Graham/Gordon, Colin/ Miller, Peter (Eds.): The Foucault Effect. Studies in Governmentality, Hemel Hempstead, 53-72.

Girod, Desha M./Krasner, Stephen D./Stoner-Weiss, Kathryn 2009: Governance and Foreign Assistance: The Imperfect Translation of Ideas into Outcomes, in: Magen, Amichai/Risse, Thomas/McFaul, Michael (Ed.): Promoting Democracy and the Rule of Law. American and European Strategies, Houndmills, Basingstoke, 67-76.

Göhler, Gerhard 2004: Institution, in: Göhler, Gerhard/ Iser, Mathias/Kerner, Ina (Eds.): Politische Theorie. 22 umkämpfte Begriffe zur Einführung, Wiesbaden, 209-226.

Göhler, Gerhard 2007: ‚Weiche Steuerung': Regieren ohne Staat aus machttheoretischer Perspektive, in: Risse, Thomas/Lehmkuhl, Ursula (Eds.): Regieren ohne Staat? Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit, Baden-Baden, 87-108.

Grande, Edgar/Pauly, Louis W. (Eds.) 2005: Complex Sovereignty. Reconstituting Political Authority in the Twenty-First Century, Toronto.

Habermas, Jürgen 1981: Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns. 2nd vol., Frankfurt/Main.

Habermas, Jürgen 1992: Faktizität und Geltung. Beiträge zur Diskurstheorie des Rechts und des demokratischen Rechtsstaats, Frankfurt/Main.

Habermas, Jürgen 2007. Kommunikative Rationalität und grenzüberschreitende Politik: Eine Replik, in: Herborth, Benjamin/Niesen, Peter (Eds.): Anarchie der kommunikativen Freiheit. Jürgen Habermas und die Theorie der internationalen Politik, Frankfurt/Main, 406-459.

Harders, Cilja 2009: Herausforderungen lokaler Governance-Institutionen? Dezentralisierung in Marokko und Jordanien, in: Lehmkuhl, Ursula/Risse, Thomas (Eds.): Sonderforschungsbereich 700: Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit - Neue Formen des Regierens? Finanzierungsantrag 2010-2013, Berlin, 245-285.

Héritier, Adrienne (Ed.) 2002: Common Goods. Reinventing European and International Governance, Lanham, MD.

Hölck, Lasse 2011: Arguing and bargaining im kulturell heterogenen Kontext. Friedensverhandlungen zwischen Wildbeutern und (Viehzüchter-) Staat im frührepublikanischen Sonora (Mexiko), Nov. 1848-Feb. 1849. Unpublished manuscript, Berlin.

Holzinger, Katharina 2001a: Kommunikationsmodi und Handlungstypen in den Internationalen Beziehungen, in: Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen 8: 2, 243-286.

Holzinger, Katharina 2001b: Verhandeln statt Argumentieren oder Verhandeln durch Argumentieren? Eine empirische Analyse auf der Basis der Sprechakttheorie, in: Politische Vierteljahresschrift 42: 3, 414-446.

Holzscheiter, Anna 2010: Children's Rights in International Politics: The Transformative Power of Discourse, Houndmills, Basingstoke.

Hönke, Jana 2010: Liberal Discourse and Hybrid Practise in Transnational Security Governance: Companies in Congo and South Africa in the 19th and 21st Centuries. PhD Thesis, Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin.

Hurrelmann, Achim/Leibfried, Stephan/Martens, Kerstin/Mayer, Peter (Eds.) 2008: Zerfasert der Nationalstaat? Die Internationalisierung politischer Verantwortung, Staatlichkeit im Wandel. Frankfurt/Main.

Hurrelmann, Achim/Leibfried, Stephan/Martens, Kerstin/Mayer, Peter (Eds.) 2007: Transforming the Golden-Age Nation State, Transformations of the State, Houndmills, Basingstoke.

Keck, Margaret E./Sikkink, Kathryn 1998: Activists Beyond Borders. Advocacy Networks in International Politics, Ithaca, NY.

Kennedy, Paul 1987: The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers. Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000, New York, NY.

Keohane, Robert O. 1989: International Institutions and State Power, Boulder, CO.

Koehler, Jan 2008: Auf der Suche nach Sicherheit. Die internationale Intervention in Nordost-Afghanistan, SFB 700 Working Paper Series No. 17, Berlin.

Koehler, Jan/Zürcher, Christoph 2007: Assessing the Contribution of International Actors in Afghanistan. Results from a Representative Survey, SFB 700 Working Paper Series No. 7, Berlin.

Kohler-Koch, Beate 1998: Einleitung. Effizienz und Demokratie. Probleme des Regierens in entgrenzten Räumen, in: Kohler-Koch, Beate (Ed.): Regieren in entgrenzten Räumen, PVS-Sonderheft 29, Opladen, 11-25.

Kooiman, Jan (Ed.) 1993: Modern Governance. New Government-Society Interactions, London.

Krasner, Stephen D. 1999: Sovereignty. Organized Hypocrisy, Princeton, NJ.

Kristoff, Madeline/Panarelli, Liz 2010: Haiti: A Republic of NGOs? In: Peace Brief, 23, Washington, DC.

Ladwig, Bernd 2007: Gebotene Fremdbestimmung? Normative Überlegungen zum Umgang mit zerfallen(d)er Staatlichkeit, in: Risse, Thomas/Lehmkuhl, Ursula (Eds.): Regieren ohne Staat? Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit, Baden-Baden, 354-373.

Ladwig, Bernd 2009: Metaprobleme der Legitimität in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit, in: Lehmkuhl, Ursula/Risse, Thomas (Eds.): Sonderforschungsbereich 700: Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit - Neue Formen des Regierens? Finanzierungsantrag 2010-2013, Berlin, 357-392.

Lavenex, Sandra 2004: EU external governance in ‚wider Europe', in: Journal of European Public Policy 11: 4, 680-700.

Lavenex, Sandra/Schimmelfennig, Frank 2009: EU rules beyond EU borders. Theorizing external governance in European politics, in: Journal of European Public Policy 16: 6, 791-812.

Lehmkuhl, Ursula 2007: Regieren im kolonialen Amerika: Colonial Governance und koloniale Gouvernementalité in französischen und englischen Siedlungskolonien, in: Lehmkuhl, Ursula/ Risse, Thomas (Eds.): Regieren ohne Staat? Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit, Baden-Baden, 111-133.

Leibfried, Stephan/Zürn, Michael (Eds.) 2005: Transformations of the State? Cambridge.

Leutner, Mechthild 2007: Kooperationsnetze und Akteure im semi-kolonialen China, 1860-1911, in: Risse, Thomas/Lehmkuhl, Ursula (Eds.): Regieren ohne Staat? Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit, Baden-Baden, 154-177.

Leutner, Mechthild 2009: Ernährung und Sicherheit im China der Warlords (1912-1928): Governance-Formen in transitiven Räumen, in: Lehmkuhl, Ursula/Risse, Thomas (Eds.): Sonderforschungsbereich 700: Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit - Neue Formen des Regierens? Finanzierungsantrag 2010-2013, Berlin, 904-934.

Liese, Andrea/ Beisheim, Marianne 2009: Erfolgsbedingungen transnationaler Entwicklungspartnerschaften: Von der transnationalen Kooperation zur lokalen Umsetzung in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit, in: Lehmkuhl, Ursula/Risse, Thomas (Eds.): Sonderforschungsbereich 700: Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit - Neue Formen des Regierens? Finanzierungsantrag 2010-2013, Berlin, 743-779.

Liese, Andrea, and Marianne Beisheim 2011: Transnational Public-Private Partnerships and the Provision of Collective Goods in Developing Countries, in: Risse, Thomas (Ed.): Governance Without a State? Policies and Politics in Areas of Limited Statehood, New York, NY, 115-143.

Lukes, Steven 1974: Power. A Radical View, Houndmills, Basingstoke.

Lütz, Susanne 2009: Wissen, Ware, Widerstand: Governance im Bereich geistiger Eigentums-rechte in Indien und Brasilien, in: Lehmkuhl, Ursula/Risse, Thomas (Eds.): Sonderfor-schungsbereich 700: Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit - Neue Formen des Regierens? Finanzierungsantrag 2010-2013, Berlin, 975-1012.

March, James G./Olsen, Johan P. 1989: Rediscovering Institutions. The Organizational Basics of Politics, New York, NY, London.

March, James G./Olsen, Johan P. 1998: The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Or-ders, in: International Organization 52: 4, 943-969.

Mata, Javier Fabra/Ziaja, Sebastian 2009: Users' Guide on Measuring Fragility, Bonn. Oslo.

Mayntz, Renate 2004: Governance im modernen Staat, in: Benz, Arthur (Ed.): Governance - Regie-ren in komplexen Regelsystemen, Wiesbaden, 65-76.

Mayntz, Renate 2008: Von der Steuerungstheorie zu Global Governance, in: Schuppert, Gunnar Folke/Zürn, Michael (Eds.): Governance in einer sich wandelnden Welt. PVS - Politische Vierteljahresschrift, Sonderheft 41, Wiesbaden, 43-60.

Mayntz, Renate 2009: Über Governance. Institutionen und Prozesse politischer Regelung, Frank-furt/Main.

Menkhaus, Ken 2006/2007: Governance Without Government in Somalia. Spoilers, State Buil-ding, and the Politics of Coping, in: International Security 31: 3, 74-106.

Potoski, Matthew/Prakash, Aseem 2006: Racing to the Bottom? Trade, Environmental Governance, and ISO 14001, in: American Journal of Political Science 50: 2, 350-364.

Potoski, Matthew/Prakash, Aseem 2007: Investing Up: FDI and the Cross-Country Diffusion of ISO 14001 Management Systems, in: International Studies Quarterly 51: 3, 723-744.

Renders, Marleen/Terlinden, Ulf 2010: Negotiating Statehood in a Hybrid Political Order: The Case of Somaliland, in: Development and Change 41: 4, 723-746.

Rhodes, R.A.W. 1997: Understanding Governance. Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity and Accountability, Buckingham, Philadelphia, PA.

Rinke, Stefan 2009: Sicherheitskooperation in transnationalen Räumen: Die Grenzregionen Me-xiko/USA und Argentinien/Chile zwischen 1857 und 1886, in: Lehmkuhl, Ursula/Risse, Thomas (Eds.): Sonderforschungsbereich 700: Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staat-lichkeit - Neue Formen des Regierens? Finanzierungsantrag 2010-2013, Berlin, 595-627.

Risse, Thomas 2000: ‚Let's Argue!' Communicative Action in International Relations, in: Interna-tional Organization 54: 1, 1-39.

Risse, Thomas 2011: Governance in Areas of Limited Statehood: Introduction and Overview, in: Risse, Thomas (Ed.): Governance Without a State? Policies and Politics in Areas of Limi-ted Statehood, New York, NY, 1-35.

Risse, Thomas/Kleine, Mareike 2010: Deliberation in negotiations, in: Journal of European Public Policy 17: 5, 708-726.

Rotberg, Robert I. (Ed.) 2003: State Failure and State Weakness in a Time of Terror, Washington, DC.

Rotberg, Robert I. (Ed.) 2004: When States Fail. Causes and Consequences, Princeton, NJ.

Rudolf, Beate 2007: Zwischen Kooperation und Intervention: Die Durchsetzung völkerrechtlicher Standards guten Regierens in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit, in: Lehmkuhl, Ursula/Risse, Thomas (Eds.): Regieren ohne Staat? Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit, Baden-Baden, 331-373.

Schäferhoff, Marco 2011: Die Bereitstellung von Gesundheitsleistungen in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit. Wie viel Staat ist zur effektiven Erbringung von Governance-Leistungen notwendig? In: Beisheim, Marianne/Börzel, Tanja A./Genschel, Philipp/Zangl, Bernhard (Eds.): Was vom Staate übrig bleibt. Der staatliche Beitrag zu Governance, Baden-Baden.

Schäferhoff, Marco in preparation: Transnational Health Partnerships in Areas of Limited Statehood - How Much State is Enough?, Berlin.

Scharpf, Fritz W. 1997: Games Real Actors Play. Actor-Centered Institutionalism in Policy Research, Boulder, CO.

Schimmelfennig, Frank/Scholtz, Hanno 2008: EU democracy promotion in the European neighbourhood. Political conditionality, economic development and transnational exchange, in: European Union Politics 9: 2, 187-215.

Schimmelfennig, Frank/Sedelmeier, Ulrich (Eds.) 2005: The Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe, Ithaca, NY.

Schneckener, Ulrich (Ed.) 2004: States at Risk. Fragile Staaten als Sicherheits- und Entwicklungsproblem, Berlin.

Schneckener, Ulrich/Zürcher, Christoph 2007: Transnational Security Governance in fragilen Staaten. Oder: Geht Sicherheit ohne Staat? In: Risse, Thomas/Lehmkuhl, Ursula (Eds.): Regieren ohne Staat? Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit, Baden-Baden, 205-222.

Schröder, Ursula 2009a: Exporting the State Monopoly on Violence: Security Governance Transfers to Areas of Limited Statehood, in: Lehmkuhl, Ursula/Risse, Thomas (Eds.): Sonderforschungsbereich 700: Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit - Neue Formen des Regierens? Finanzierungsantrag 2010-2013, Berlin, 631-665.

Schröder, Ursula 2009b: Exporting the State Monopoly on Violence: Security Governance Transfers to Areas of Limited Statehood, in: Lehmkuhl, Ursula/Risse, Thomas (Eds.): Sonderforschungsbereich 700: Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit - Neue Formen des Regierens? Finanzierungsantrag 2010-2013, Berlin, 631-665.

Schuppert, Gunnar Folke (Ed.) 2005: Governance-Forschung. Vergewisserung über Stand und Entwicklungslinien, Baden-Baden.

Schuppert, Gunnar Folke 2009: Staat als Prozess. Eine staatstheoretische Skizze in sieben Aufzügen, Frankfurt/Main.

Schuppert, Gunnar Folke 2011: Law Without a State? A "New Interplay" between State and Non-State Actors in Governance by Rule-Making, in: Risse, Thomas (Ed.): Governance Without a State? Policies and Politics in Areas of Limited Statehood, New York NY, 65-86.

Schuppert, Gunnar Folke/Kötter, Matthias 2007: Rechtssicherheit jenseits des Staates? In: Risse, Thomas/Lehmkuhl, Ursula (Eds.): Regieren ohne Staat? Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit, Baden-Baden, 64-86.

Schuppert, Gunnar Folke/Zürn, Michael (Eds.) 2008: Governance in einer sich wandelnden Welt. PVS - Politische Vierteljahresschrift, Sonderheft 41, Wiesbaden.

Sedelmeier, Ulrich 2006: Europeanisation in New Member and Candidate States, in: Living Review in European Governance 1: 3.

Singer, Peter W. 2003: Corporate Warriors. The Rise of the Privatized Military Industry, Ithaca, NY.

van Hüllen, Vera 2010: It Takes Two To Tango: The European Union and Democracy Promotion in the Mediterranean. PhD Thesis, Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin.

Vogel, David 1995: Trading Up: Consumer and Environmental Regulation in a Global Economy, Cambridge, MA.

Weber, Max 1921/1980: Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. 5th ed., Tübingen.

Weick, Karl 2000: Making Sense of the Organization, Oxford.

Williamson, Oliver E. 1975: Markets and Hierachies: Analysis and Anti-Trust, New York, NY.

Zimmer, Melanie 2010: Oil Companies in Nigeria: Emerging Good Practice or Still Fuelling Conflict? In: Deitelhoff, Nicole/ Wolf, Klaus Dieter (Eds.): Corporate Security Responsibility? Corporate Governance Contributions to Peace and Security in Zones of Conflict, Houndmills, Basingstoke, 58-84.

Zürcher, Christoph 2009: Aid, Minds, Hearts: A Longitudinal Study of Governance Interventions in Afghanistan, in: Lehmkuhl, Ursula/Risse, Thomas (Eds.): Sonderforschungsbereich 700: Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit - Neue Formen des Regierens? Finanzierungsantrag 2010-2013, Berlin, 441-471.

Zürn, Michael 1998: Regieren jenseits des Nationalstaates. Globalisierung und Denationalisierung als Chance, Frankfurt/Main.

Previously published Working Papers from the SFB-*Governance* Working Paper Series

Hönke, Jana/Thomas, Esther 2012: Governance for whom? - Capturing the Inclusiveness and Unintended Effects of Governance. SFB Governance Working Paper Series, No. 31, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, April 2012.

Contreras Saíz, Mónika/Hölck, Lasse/Rinke, Stefan 2012: Appropriation and Resistance Mechanisms in (Post-) Colonial Constellations of Actors: The Latin American Frontiers. SFB Governance Working Paper Series, No. 30, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, April 2012.

Börzel, Tanja 2012: How Much Statehood Does it Take – and What For? SFB Governance Working Paper Series, No. 29, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, March 2012.

Prigge, Judit 2011: Friedenswächter. Institutionen der Streitbeilegung bei den Amhara in Äthiopien, SFB Governance Working Paper Series, No. 28, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, January 2012.

Jacob, Daniel/Ladwig, Bernd/Oldenbourg, Andreas 2012: Human Rights Obligations of Non-State Actors in Areas of Limited Statehood, SFB Governance Working Paper Series, No. 27, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, January 2012.

Schmelzle, Cord 2011: Evaluating Governance. Effectiveness and Legitimacy in Areas of Limited Statehood. SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 26, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, November 2011.

Börzel, Tanja A./Hönke, Jana 2011: From Compliance to Practice. Mining Companies and the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights in the Democratic Republic of Congo. SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 25, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, October 2011.

Draude, Anke/Neuweiler, Sonja 2010: Governance in der postkolonialen Kritik. Die Herausforderung lokaler Vielfalt jenseits der westlichen Welt. SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 24, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, May 2010.

Börzel, Tanja A. 2010: Governance with/out Government. False Promises or Flawed Premises? SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 23, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, March 2010.

Wilke, Boris 2009: Governance und Gewalt. Eine Untersuchung zur Krise des Regierens in Pakistan am Fall Belutschistan, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 22, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, November 2009.

Schneckener, Ulrich 2009: Spoilers or Governance Actors? Engaging Armed Non-State Groups in Areas of Limited Statehood, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 21, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, October 2009.

Mueller Debus, Anna Kristin/Thauer, Christina R./Börzel, Tanja A. 2009: Governing HIV/AIDS in South Africa. The Role of Firms, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 20, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, June 2009.

Nagl, Dominik/Stange, Marion 2009: Staatlichkeit und Governance im Zeitalter der europäischen Expansion. Verwaltungsstrukturen und Herrschaftsinstitutionen in den britischen und französischen Kolonialimperien, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 19, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, February 2009.

Börzel, Tanja A./Pamuk, Yasemin/Stahn, Andreas 2008: The European Union and the Promotion of Good Governance in its Near Abroad. One Size Fits All?, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 18, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, December 2008.

Koehler, Jan 2008: Auf der Suche nach Sicherheit. Die internationale Intervention in Nordost-Afghanistan, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 17, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, November 2008.

Beisheim, Marianne/Fuhr, Harald (ed.) 2008: Governance durch Interaktion nicht-staatlicher und staatlicher Akteure. Entstehungsbedingungen, Effektivität und Legitimität sowie Nachhaltigkeit, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 16, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, August 2008.

Buckley-Zistel, Susanne 2008: Transitional Justice als Weg zu Frieden und Sicherheit. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 15, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, July 2008.

Beisheim, Marianne/Dingwerth, Klaus 2008: Procedural Legitimacy and Private Transnational Governance. Are the Good Ones Doing Better?, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 14, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, June 2008.

Benecke, Gudrun/Branović, Željko/Draude, Anke 2008: Governance und Raum. Theoretisch-konzeptionelle Überlegungen zur Verräumlichung von Governance, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 13, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, May 2008.

Schuppert, Gunnar Folke 2008: Von Ko-Produktion von Staatlichkeit zur Co-Performance of Governance. Eine Skizze zu kooperativen Governance-Strukturen von den Condottieri der Renaissance bis zu Public Private Partnerships, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 12, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, April 2008.

Trebesch, Christoph 2008: Economic Governance, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 11, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, May 2008.

Benecke, Gudrun/Friberg, Lars/Lederer, Markus/Schröder, Miriam 2008: From Public-Private Partnership to Market. The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) as a New Form of Governance in Climate Protection, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 10, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, April 2008.

Hönke, Jana/Kranz, Nicole/Börzel, Tanja A./Héritier, Adrienne 2008: Fostering Environmental Regulation? Corporate Social Responsibility in Countries with Weak Regulatory Capacities. The Case of South Africa, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 9, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, February 2008.

These publications can be downloaded from www.sfb-governance.de/publikationen or ordered in printed versions via e-mail to sfb700@zedat.fu-berlin.de.

The Author

Thomas Risse is professor of international politics and director of the Center for Transnational Relations and Foreign and Security policy at the Otto Suhr Institute for Political Science at the Freie Universität Berlin. Thomas Risse is coordinator of the Research Center (SFB) 700 "Governance in Areas of Limited Statehood". *Contact: thomas.risse@fu-berlin.de*

Research Framework of the Research Center (SFB) 700

Governance has become a central theme in social science research. The Research Center (SFB) 700 *Governance in Areas of Limited Statehood* investigates governance in areas of limited statehood, i.e. developing countries, failing and failed states, as well as, in historical perspective, different types of colonies. How and under what conditions can governance deliver legitimate authority, security, and welfare, and what problems are likely to emerge? Operating since 2006 and financed by the German Research Foundation (DFG), the Research Center involves the Freie Universität Berlin, the University of Potsdam, the European University Institute, the Hertie School of Governance, the German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP), and the Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB).

Partner Organizations of the Research Center (SFB) 700

Host University:
Freie Universität Berlin

University of Potsdam

German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP)

Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB)

Hertie School of Governance