REFUGEE STUDIES CENTRE

WORKING PAPER SERIES NO. 87

Comprehensive literature review of Global Public Policy

Creating a framework for understanding Global Refugee Policy

Emily Bauman (emily.d.bauman@gmail.com) and Sarah Deardorff Miller (sarah.deardorff@gmail.com)

December 2012

Refugee Studies Centre
Oxford Department of International Development
University of Oxford

Working Paper Series

The Refugee Studies Centre Working Paper Series is intended to aid the rapid distribution of work in progress, research findings and special lectures by researchers and associates of the RSC. Papers aim to stimulate discussion among the worldwide community of scholars, policymakers and practitioners. They are distributed free of charge in PDF format via the RSC website. Bound hard copies of the working papers may also be purchased from the Centre.

The opinions expressed in the papers are solely those of the author/s who retain the copyright. They should not be attributed to the project funders or the Refugee Studies Centre, the Oxford Department of International Development or the University of Oxford. Comments on individual Working Papers are welcomed, and should be directed to the author/s. Further details may be found at the RSC website (www.rsc.ox.ac.uk).

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Brief historical overview of Global Public Policy and starting assumptions	4
3	What is GPP?	6
4	Why is GPP necessary?	10
5	Where did it come from?	11
6	Where does it occur? What is the context?	12
7	Who is involved in making GPP?	13
8	Difficulties in carrying out GPP	15
9	Who is studying GPP?	15
10	How it happens: methods/theoretical tools/models; the most useful takeaways for building a framework for understanding Global Refugee Policy	16
11	Relating GPP to GRP: a natural link	24
12	Additional forced migration literature relevant to building a framework for GRP	26
13	Further research, tensions, challenges and questions	29
14	Concluding thoughts	32
15	Bibliography	33

List of abbreviations

ExCom	Executive Committee of UNHCR
IDP	internally displaced person
IGC	Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees
IGO	intergovernmental organisation
INGO	international nongovernmental organisation
IO	international organisation
IR	International Relations
GPP	Global Public Policy
GRP	Global Refugee Policy
NGO	nongovernmental organisation
UNSC	UN Security Council

1 Introduction

Global Refugee Policy (GRP) is a term that has been widely used, but seldom defined. Scholars and practitioners alike examine and critique policies and policy processes, yet there remains vagueness around what is meant by such processes and how they can be conceptualised in light of the experiences of forced migrants. Understandings certainly vary according to disciplinary approach, context and interpretation, and as with any lens applied to refugee studies, a host of frameworks, definitions and perspectives emerge. What is clear, however, is that policies have the potential to affect the daily lives of refugees and other migrants around the world, shaping everything from their ability to move freely, engage in livelihood activities, and enjoy (or be denied) access to their most basic human rights. Thus, the topic deserves greater attention and research, and that clarity of what is meant by GRP will not only help scholars, policymakers and practitioners better understand what they are studying, but more importantly, may have direct effects on the lives of refugees most directly affected by such policies. Indeed, this nebulous arena impacts the lives of millions of refugees worldwide, yet remains poorly understood by policymakers and academics alike.

This literature review takes an international relations perspective, considering how Global Public Policy (GPP) as a body of literature can be useful in understanding GRP.[1] It will engage works by key authors, outlining the main assumptions, definitions and theory behind GPP with the intention of informing a framework for understanding GRP. In examining this approach, however, it will also question starting assumptions by highlighting other perspectives that offer critical approaches to studying policy. The second part of the review will summarise and link these ideas with work within forced migration literature, before concluding with some of the challenges, tensions and debates relevant to a framework for understanding global refugee policy.

As this review will show, GPP is an important area of study, particularly in the refugee context. The concept, however, is not well-defined and has only been applied in certain issue areas, most notably in international political economy and environmental ethics. Studies of GPP are largely confined to the disciplines of politics and international relations, many taking a state-centric approach. Its basis relies on the acceptance of several claims, including that the world is increasingly globalised and interdependent, and that shared problems are best addressed in a collaborative effort. Considering how to best understand GRP through a GPP lens thus requires walking a fine line between recognising the policy structures already in place, and formalising or refining what is emerging. This also requires consideration of critiques from sociological and anthropological backgrounds, including concerns that policies are merely tools of the powerful to exercise control over a population via a specific rhetoric and discourse of power (see Shore and Wright 1997), and maintaining a measured distance

---

[1] This literature review has been prepared as a reference paper for participants in the Refugee Studies Centre's 30th Anniversary Conference, "Understanding Global Refugee Policy," taking place in December 2012. The authors would like to extend their gratitude to James Milner for his invaluable help in preparing this document, including initial assistance with collecting sources, as well as providing direction, advice and perspective on the subject. We would also like to thank Alexander Betts for his guidance, and the Refugee Research Network for funding this project.

from the academic debates around the study of policy, particularly scholarship that advocates a specific policy.

2 Brief historical overview of Global Public Policy and starting assumptions

While some may argue that Global Public Policy has a long intellectual history, most of the scholarship is relatively new, dating from the 1950s onward and gaining momentum in the 1970s. Marvin Soroos (1986) discusses a shift in scholarship from one that focuses on the "organizational aspects" (how international organisations emerge and function) to "global issues" that confront the international system and humanity in general (1986: 14). This shift includes a move from focusing on the prevention of war to other economic, social and ecological global issues. Development of GPP literature has been sporadic and somewhat choppy, with major spurts of literature in the 1950s (e.g. Lerner and Lasswell 1951), 1980s (Soroos 1986), 1990s (e.g. Reinicke 1998; Nagel 1990) and 2000s (e.g. Stone 2008). One reason for the sporadic literature is that GPP is commonly nested within other disciplines and issue-areas, rather than being a subject of scholarly inquiry in and of itself. Consequently, a number of perspectives have been taken to understand GPP. For example, Wolfgang Reinicke (1998) traces the study of "international interaction" back to studies by the United Nations and the League of Nations, including the International Labour Organization, the World Health Organization and other international agencies, and notes that earlier literature tended to focus on semi-governmental institutions, rather than informal types of interaction, citing Robert Keohane and Nye's work, *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition* (1977). He also cites the development of the International Political Science Association's Study Group on "Global Policy Studies" in 1988 as an indication of the growth of the field. Thus, literature dedicated solely to the nature of GPP remains sparse in comparison to other bodies of literature. This demonstrates a key characteristic of GPP as a field of study: it tends to be issue-driven, rather than theory-driven.

Historical events like the Cold War, the evolution of the UN and other international bodies simultaneously affected how GPP as a field of study emerged. Indeed, there are large bodies of literature focused solely on these international organisations. However, most scholars acknowledge that public policy has generally been studied at the national level, and thus international public policy has grown out of these domestic frameworks (Reinicke 1998). Andrés Pérez Baltodano (1997), for example, asserts that "public administration" has been a prisoner of the word "state," assuming that nation-state is the natural context for public administration (1997: 618). Lerner and Lasswell (1951) also focus largely on national/local governments, and like many of their peers, rarely apply policy studies to the international level, mostly because of the notion that "…policies are exclusively the products of governments of a type that does not exist at the international level" (Soroos 1986: 19). Many GPP authors recognise the limitations of a state-centric view, and seek to analyse public policymaking and governance beyond the state and formal institutions. In light of the tendency to study GPP in terms of the state and domestic preferences at the national level, it is important to recognise that the study of GPP is largely rooted in political science: international relations, comparative government and political theory (Reinicke 1998; Nagel

1990: 303). Within international relations alone, GPP is influenced by studies on global governance, globalisation, the evolving role and nature of international institutions, international cooperation and burden-sharing, sovereignty, and transnational civil society. However a number of other fields have influenced the development of GPP. For example, Soroos points to an emphasis on global problem solving in the study of international law,[2] the study of international regimes,[3] peace research,[4] and "contemporary world order studies" (Soroos 1986: 18-19).[5]

All scholars of global public policy begin with the same basic premise: the world is increasingly globalised and interdependent (Soroos 1986:15; Nagel 1990; Reinicke 1998; Stone 2008; Brinkerhoff 2002: 324; Farazmand 1999).[6] Generally speaking, most political scientists will not contest this point. Rochester (1990) writes,

> *…one does not have to carry all the baggage of the 'Spaceship Earth' metaphor to accept the modest assertion that 'we live in an era of interdependence' (Keohane and Nye 1989: 3) and that the world as a whole has never been more strategically, economically, and ecologically interrelated, in terms of any corner of the globe being readily susceptible to important impacts stemming from decisions taken elsewhere… (1990: 141).*

Accepting the premise that the world is interdependent also implies, somewhat obviously, that an increasingly globalised world marks an important change that merits attention.[7] Reinicke, Benner and Witte (2003) write, "Since the early 1990s, the driving forces of globalization—technological change and economic and political liberalization—have fundamentally transformed conditions for effective and legitimate governance" (2003: 18). Some see it as

---

[2] He considers varying philosophies of international law, whether they are simply a set of norms that evolve gradually in a community of states, or an instrument of international cooperation. He writes, "As elaborated by one of its early proponents, Myres S. McDougal (1960), this approach contends that international law can also be a form of public policy that is consciously created by states to serve their common interests on a wide variety of problems that concern them, such as the conduct of war, arms control, pollution, and the use of outer space" (Soroos 1986:17).

[3] Here he looks to Keohane and Nye (1977), writing "…rather than selecting a certain IGO as the subject of inquiry, the regime approach singles out an international problem area of interest and then seeks to identify the network of IGOs that is active in addressing it" (Soroos 1986: 18).

[4] Soroos writes that much of this research is about identifying policies (national or international) to reduce war and contribute to social justice globally (Soroos 1986: 21).

[5] He cites Clark and Sohn's 1966 design for a future with little war and arms transferred to a world government (Soroos 1986: 18).

[6] This assumption will be questioned in section 12.

[7] Thakur and Weiss (2009) write, "That the stage of international relations is occupied by several actors has become so commonplace an observation as to be trite. Actors have policies. IGOs are one type of the numerous actors playing diverse roles in world affairs, and the United Nations is a key IGO actor. The question of whether the world organisation can be said to have any policies is theoretically intriguing and yet, surprisingly, so far largely unaddressed in the literature. Part of the exploration must include the question of the conceptual and theoretical boundaries between norms, laws, and policies and how the three are interrelated (Thakur and Weiss 2009: 32-33).

rapidly changing (Brinkerhoff 2002: 324), while others see it as a lengthier process. Either way, GPP scholars argue that it is an important area of study because of changes brought about by globalisation. Soroos writes,

> *An agenda of global problems can be identified. Elements of an international policy process have been in place for at least several decades. Policies containing regulations and programs have been incorporated into treaties and resolutions. Finally, steps have been taken to implement and review the policies that have been adopted.* ***The nature of contemporary world politics cannot be adequately understood without knowledge of these cooperative efforts at global problem solving****" (1986: 374, emphasis added).*

Moreover, Stone (2008) asserts that there is an immediate need to study global public policy because the world is increasingly globalised and there are new forms of authority outside the traditional sovereign state model ("global public private partnerships" and "transnational executive networks," for example). GPP, then, arises as an answer to the challenges faced by governments in light of globalised industry and difficulties governing across borders (Reinicke 1998: 52-64). This premise is almost always accompanied by the notion that there are global problems affecting more than just one state, and that there are gaps that must be overcome in addressing these problems (Reinicke et al. 2000). Likewise Soroos writes, "One reason why it appears that these problems have assumed international and global proportions is the way in which the destinies of nations are becoming intertwined in ever more complex ways" (1986: 14).

The development and expansion of the field is most clearly evident in the number of university-level programmes offering degrees in GPP or a related field. Stone, for example, discusses programmes at Potsdam University and CEU (2008: 24). Today similar programmes can be seen across North American and European universities, catering to students seeking professional careers in GPP. Scholarship on the evolving professional, specialised nature of international organisations (IOs), for example, also speaks to the notion that GPP is increasing as both a field of study and chosen profession. The benefits and challenges of this expansion and the assumptions and implications are, of course, up for debate, and will be touched on later in this review.

3 What is GPP?

Defined

Global public policy and its variants have been defined by scholars in a range of ways. This section will not arrive at an exact definition, but will spell out the various attempts and issues within the terminology debate. It is first important, however, to differentiate global public policy from "international public policy" or "international social policy" and other similar variants commonly invoked.[8] As mentioned earlier, one of the reasons to examine this topic now is because there is ambiguity in what is meant by global public policy. Stone, for example, lists some of the many terms that dance around the concept of GPP: "transnational public

[8] Deacon (2007), for example, considers "global social policy," while Meehan (1985) outlines the range of definitions used for "policy," including one that conceives policy in terms of action, and one that sees policy as a statement of goals or desired outcomes (1985: 291).

sphere (Nanz and Steffek 2004); "global public sphere" (Dryzek 1999); "return of the public domain" (Drache 2001); "global arena" (Ronit and Schneider 2000); "global policy arena" (World Bank); "playing field" and "new levels and spaces" (Cerny 2006); "acephalous…modern global polity" (Drori, Meyer and Hwang 2006). Numerous scholars have also used the term without defining it (Grugel and Peruzzotti 2007; Held and Koenig-Archibugi 2004; True 2003). GPP has also been compared to customary law, which evolves in a gradual, informal and haphazard manner over an undefined period (Soroos 1986: 125). Still others identify GPP in terms of judicial decisions (Soroos 1986: 126).

Breaking down the individual terms also helps in building a definition of GPP. "Policy," for example, has been defined in a range of ways.[9] For Ramesh Thakur and Thomas Weiss (2009), policy refers to the statement of principles and actions that an organisation is likely to pursue in the event of particular contingencies (2009: 19). It needs to be distinguished from norms and institutions.[10] In their study of whether "UN policy" exists, they unpack policy as not only a governing principle but also "…the decision to embark upon certain programs of action (or inaction) in order to achieve desired goals" (Evans and Newnham 1998: 440).[11] It is an intended course of action or inaction in light of a particular problem, and entails both agency and purposive action (Brown and Ganguly 1997; Birkland 2005:17-18). While this definition sees states as policymakers, it distinguishes a state view of public policy from foreign policy, implying a boundary-based, domestic/external separation between the two (Thakur and Weiss 2009: 21-22).[12] These separate views of policy (foreign and domestic) matter in light of who is carrying policy out, where and how. According to Soroos, "…most global policies can be categorized either as regulations that define the limits of permissible behavior for national governments and those under their jurisdiction or, alternatively, as programs administered by international agencies" (Soroos 1990: 318). Moreover, most policy definitions remain in the domain of institutional decision-making by powerful actors, such as governments or aid agencies, which can be limiting and may prove unsuited to contemporary policymaking environments (Bakewell 2008: 435). In addition, clarification on how the term "policy" changes meanings in combination with other terms (i.e. "global policy," "social policy," and "global social policy") is still needed.

Policy problems (not just "policy") must also be defined. According to Soroos, they are "…a set of circumstances that can potentially be improved upon by purposeful action" (1990: 310). This can be a current problem, such as a famine, or a future fear, such as nuclear war. The problem will generally have aroused concern throughout much of the world, and is expected to have been taken up by one or more international institutions like the UN It need not be a problem affecting every state, as it can be a regional problem. Most fit one of the following categories:

---

[9] Literature critiquing these understandings of "policy" is noted in section 12.

[10] Thakur and Weiss understand a norm to mean the pattern of behavior most common or usual in a statistical sense, or ethically, to mean a pattern of behavior that should be followed in accordance with a given values system (2009: 19). They understand institutions in terms of Keohane's 1989 definition.

[11] Cited in Thakur and Weiss 2009.

[12] Policy may also be broken down sequentially into three separate phases: formulation, adoption, and implementation (Thakur and Weiss 2009: 22).

- problems that are trans-boundary: they originate in one state but have ramifications for others (such as refugees, pollution, economic policies);
- problems that involve conflicting uses of international commons—oceans, seabed, outer space, atmosphere, electromagnetic spectrum and Antarctica;
- problems that are internal to many, but common to many (e.g. illiteracy, urbanisation, population growth, the abuse of human rights, destruction of the environment) (Soroos 1990: 310-311).

In terms of formal GPP definitions, there is some variance. Soroos, for example, sees global policies as a subset of international policies, which are products of the international community as a whole, as opposed to policies adopted by a smaller group of actors (1986: 20). Most can be found in treaties or resolutions adopted at either the UN, specialised agencies or ad hoc conferences focused on a particular widespread concern (1986: 20).[13] He sees the larger subset of international policies and foreign policies as interrelated: "International policies are joint responses to common problems that two or more national governments work out with one another, often with the active participation of IGOs [intergovernmental organisations] and INGOs [international nongovernmental organisations]" (Soroos 1986: 20).[14] He also sees the analysis of global policies as closely related to the study of regimes and world order studies ("…regimes are the institutional environment within which international policies are made"), and thinks of global policy vis-à-vis power politics (he engages most directly with realist IR scholars) as the "dual personality" of world politics in an interdependent world. Thus he juxtaposes the two, allowing him to question traditional power politics theories (1986: 21-23).

Soroos also mentions that values, goals and principles are additional integral parts of global policy (1986: 129). The principle of sovereignty, he writes, has the greatest bearing on global policy. Policy responses also incorporate regulations, classified as restrictions and obligations, and some spell out particular rights (Soroos 1986: 137-139). Global policy may take the form of programmes providing multilateral assistance through international institutions, technical assistance or research services (1986: 143). Stone also mentions that GPP can be seen as a communicative network (2008: 22), but she differentiates it from "global governance," "governing without government," "global policy" (equated with financing and delivery of global public goods (Kaul et al. 2003), "global public-private partnerships," "global programmes," and "transnational constitutionalism." Finally differentiating "global" from "international" public policies is another definitional question. Rosenau (2000), for example, writes that one does not need global government to have global public policies, just forms of global governance (2000: 17; Reinicke 1998). Thus, "global" does not mean that all countries interact simultaneously but rather all potentially share the policy problems (Nagel 1991: 303).

Another important question in defining GPP is determining how closely linked a definition should be to national processes (Stone 2008: 19). As seen in Soroos' work, the tendency is to

[13] Of course defining what constitutes a "widespread concern" is also subjective.
[14] This builds on other key definitions that Soroos lays out: 1) "A policy is a purposeful course of action designed and implemented with the objective of shaping future outcomes in ways that will be more desirable than would otherwise be expected" (Anderson 1979); 2) "A public policy is a course of action adopted by a government;" 3) "Foreign policies are adopted by individual national governments to guide their actions toward actors who are beyond their jurisdiction, in particular the governments of other states."

build on definitions of national public policy because an international world order does not exist (1986: 309). Accordingly, the comparison across unlike units is possible because "…despite the absence of a central world government, there are numerous circumstances in which states have seen it in their interest to accept constraints on their behavior in order to contribute to a coordinated international effort to come to grips with the larger problems faced by the world community" (1986: 310). Stone questions this comparative link, writing, "If global public policy is distinct and to some extent delinked from national processes of policymaking, the venues in which such policy action occurs need not be tied to sovereign structures of decision making" (Stone 2008: 20). While she is not arguing that there is no link between global and national policy processes, she asserts that national public institutions are no longer the only centre for policy. Thus the "playing field" and understanding of historical and structural changes to "state" and "sovereignty" should be restructured (Stone 2008). Similarly, definitions must consider how state-centred GPP should be viewed (Baltodano 1997). Heritier and Lehmkuhl (2011) base their analysis on international actions designed to deal with shared public policy problems with the purpose of effecting national jurisdiction while not being binding (soft-law). They write that public policy is often made by public and private actors outside legislative and traditional democratic-representative government arenas, and that such policies may focus on delimited sectoral or functional areas.

Thus, defining GPP in broad terms brings out a number of deeper political questions. Other literature may examine whether GPP is best understood as a process or an end of its own, as will be discussed in a later section. Legal scholars, for example, may view it very differently than political scientists, sociologists or anthropologists. Each of these perspectives links back to starting assumptions and theoretical groundings. Ultimately, however, it seems that there remains debate, if not confusion, about what GPP is, and consequently, the term has "little resonance among policy elites and the general public" (Stone 2008).

Nature

Closely related to definitional questions, the nature of GPP also requires unpacking. Soroos regards problems as policy problems only when there is the prospect of diminishing or eliminating the gap between actual and desired circumstances (1986: 35). Not all policy problems are negative, and they can be very diverse in complexity, length of time, media attention, drama and technicalities; once identified they can be part of either a formal or public agenda (1986: 36). The types of problems on global agendas involve a relationship between two or more countries, or spillover problems (1986: 65). He draws on the Prisoner's Dilemma to talk about why an international response is necessary, and mentions other problems like non-self-governing territories or international commons, domestic problems common to all countries, or domestic problems that become the subject of global policy because of outside interest (such as Apartheid in South Africa or Tiananmen Square). Soroos finally asserts that global policymaking is generally a long, drawn-out process, usually requiring consensus to be reached, which can take decades (1986: 75).

In contrast, Stone understands the nature of GPP as a multi-centric, transformative, complex global political system with multiple issue-regimes to govern challenges beyond any single state's control. She sees a need to re-conceptualise the space ("global agora"), the kinds of interactions (public-private), and source of policies that characterise new forms of global public policies and associated global governance. Within GPP there is a central role for horizontal global public policy networks, epistemic communities, and "wholly active citizens"

alongside "non-governmental collectivities," and policies are often backed by non-state authority (Rosenau 2000: 88).

Reinicke understands the nature of GPP in terms of networks (which will be discussed in greater detail in later sections), noting that they are diverse, but have commonalities across various sectors, organisations and sovereign territories. He suggests that they make excellent use of technologies, and are effective at bringing together diverse and sometimes opposing groups to discuss common problems that no one actor can resolve alone (1998: xi). He also emphasises that GPP networks are learning organisations, have broad membership, and can tap information and expertise from various backgrounds, thus providing a more complete picture of particular policy issues and giving voice to previously unheard groups (1998: xiii). They are meant to compliment, not replace public policy institutions, and to help governments and multilateral agencies (1998: xiii). GPP networks address governance gaps by placing new issues on the global agenda; negotiating and setting global standards; gathering and disseminating knowledge; making new markets where lacking or deepening markets that are failing; and innovating implementation mechanisms for traditional intergovernmental treaties (1998: xv).

Similarly, Jennifer Brinkerhoff (2002) draws on Chester Newland's (2000) three interrelated notions with public administration: 1) facilitation of collective actions by public institutions; 2) public values-oriented social self-governance (individuals and communities organise to express and pursue their collective values and priorities); and 3) reliance on the disciplines of market systems (2002: 324). She gives the impression that GPP is a somewhat natural, inevitable result of globalisation, which has "…led to the closer integration among the countries of the world, increasing their recognition of the challenges and implications that cross national borders and demand cross-border solutions, and continuing efforts to refine the processes for establishing global public policy" (2002: 324). Citizens thus come together, and the term "partnership" is a commonly evoked.[15] According to Brinkerhoff's analysis, public policy continues to grow in complexity due to globalisation and the empowerment of multiple constituencies, which expect and demand to participate in policy processes. Thus, she outlines the ways in which GPP partnership strategies can overcome these complexities (2002: 334).

4 Why is GPP necessary?

As mentioned above, GPP is generally seen as a direct result of an increasingly globalised and interdependent world. Proponents of GPP see globalisation and interdependence as having a profound effect on the world, making it a different place than previously known. Stone (2008) refers to Nanz and Steffek (2004), for example, who question whether democratic global order

[15] As discussed later, the partnership models seek to: 1) "….enhance efficiency and effectiveness by relying on comparative advantages and a rational division of labor; 2) provide the multi-actor, integrated solutions sometimes required by the scope and nature of the problems being addressed; 3) move from a no-win situation among multiple actors to a compromise and potential win-win situation…; 4) open decision-making processes to promote a broader operationalization of the public good" (Brinkerhoff 2002: 325).

depends on developing a public sphere (2008: 22). Reinicke (1998) also emphasises the uniqueness of a globalised world, seeing a need for tools and methods that go beyond policy studies concentrated at the country level, instead able to focus on international action. In international relations terms, he does not see national and international policies as like units of analysis, and thus affirms the need for GPP as a way to study problems and policies at the global level. Similarly Soroos discusses the need for GPP, comparing it to a heavily used network of streets in a densely urban area, emphasising the need for rules of the road that everyone complies with (1986: 22). He writes, "As with dense traffic, a highly interdependent world must be managed to avoid disruptions and chaos that can be detrimental to the interests of all nations whose destinies are intertwined" (1986: 25). He sees GPP as unique at the global level because it entails accommodating diverse interests of a large population of sovereign states (1986: 118). It is able to respond to collective problems, and encompasses international collective action problems. He writes, "Policy studies offer a theoretical framework for analyzing and evaluating the collective efforts of both governmental and nongovernmental actors to address these and many other global problems within the context of international institutions, such as the United Nations and its affiliated specialised agencies" (1986: 309). His logic, then, is underpinned by a number of assumptions: that all people and states are intertwined; that there is a need to govern interactions (assuming that this is indeed possible, that it is good to do this[16]—as opposed to just letting states or markets balance and govern themselves); and that some form of this does not already exist. These assumptions could certainly be problematised and viewed from a range of differing perspectives. Delving deeper into these assumptions might take one more heavily into globalisation/global governance literature or to sociological or anthropological critiques of notions of power and rhetoric within the discourses of global governance entirely.[17]

5 Where did it come from?

While earlier sections outlined the emergence of the study of GPP, the literature also speaks to the growth of GPP as an entity in and of itself. Reinicke argues that GPP networks grew out of economic liberalisation and technological revolution; of these two, information sharing via new technology is among the most important catalysts for GPP networks (1998: xii). He identifies two "governance gaps" that brought about the need for GPP in light of these two forces' effects on institutions of global governance; an operational gap, where public institutions and policymakers lack information, knowledge and tools to respond; and a participatory gap, where policymakers exclude the general public from decisions because of increasing complexity (1998: xii). Soroos, on the other hand, views GPP's emergence as rooted in a shift from focusing on the prevention of war to other economic, social and ecological global issues. He roots this shift in two turning points: 1) uncertainty in the international monetary order due to the floating of the American dollar in 1972; and 2) the "energy crisis" that resulted from the oil embargo and price rises by OPEC in 1973-74 (1986:14). Other

[16] "International public policies embodying rules, responsibilities, and programs can be the instruments for bringing about the measure of order, stability, and equity that makes it possible for such interdependence to work to the benefit of all states" (1986: 25).
[17] Note: Soroos only uses the phrase "interdependence" and not "globalisation."

issues, such as population growth and pollution also began to receive more attention and brought about GPP as a practice.

In light of the key assumption that the world is increasingly globalised and interdependent, other authors see GPP as a reaction to an interstate system that is overloaded, and a recognition that "the old functional approach is properly discredited" (Etzioni 2001: 595). In the absence of central authority on global administration, some see GPP as having emerged out of the need for collaboration or cooperation among governments and other stakeholders who seek common practices and goals in addressing global public policy issues (Gordenker and Weiss 1996). Similarly, Deacon sees GPP emerging out of values and ideas, with transnational networks at the core of a struggle waged inside international organisations, nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), and UN agencies (Deacon et al. 1997: 201).

6 Where does it occur? What is the context?

Stone (2008) understands global public policy less by "what it is" and more by "where it takes place." Her conception of the "global agora" is at the core of her analysis. The global agora is like a marketplace or square, and is a "social and political space—generated by globalization—rather than a physical place" (Stone 2008: 21).[18] The agora is a "merging and blurring of the commercial and the public domain" and "is a public space of policymaking and administration, although it is one where authority is more diffuse, decision making dispersed and sovereignty muddled" (Stone 2008: 21). In light of this, she argues that though the global agora is neutral, it is not necessarily inclusive, and can be a place where disorder and uncertainty emerge. It is also a place that can challenge sovereignty with its own decision-making procedures of networks. She writes that the global agora is expanding and diversifying, but that this need not necessarily mean that the state is in decline. Rather, she sees the state as "reconfiguring" with the dynamics of globalisation, as public authority of IOs and non-state actors for global policy problems is assumed. Soroos, on the other hand, sees a more diverse set of arenas for global policy making, mentioning permanent organs (such as an assembly or council of IGOs or conferences); ad hoc arenas (with narrowly focused agendas such as food, technology, disarmament, development) like special sessions or world conferences; and a sequence of other arenas.[19]

A challenge in understanding where GPP takes place is rooted in common constraints of International Relations (IR), which tends to be the discipline most directly engaged with GPP. Stone writes that political science often understands public policy as occurring inside nation

[18] She writes, "The global agora is a public space, although it is one where authority is diffuse, decision making is dispersed and semi-privatized, and sovereignty is muddled by recognition of joint responsibility and collective action. Transnational networks—whether they go by the label 'partnership,' 'alliance,' 'facility,' or 'forum'—are one mechanism of global public policy. For the scholar, these developments presage the need to overcome the methodological nationalism and agoraphobia of mainstream public policy scholarship to examine global policy processes and new managerial modes of transnational public administration" (Stone 2008: 35).

[19] He presents a diagram on page 109.

states, with realists in IR holding that states are the predominant policymakers. The next section will examine actors making GPP more extensively, but it is worth debating whether a state-focused approach is the best way to understand where GPP takes place. Baltodano, for example, questions the narrow view that the nation state is the natural context for public administration (1997: 618). Stone agrees, emphasising other platforms of authority that emerge in global and regional processes that coexist alongside nation-state processes. In light of this, she argues that governance can be informal and emerge from strategic interactions and partnerships of national and international bureaucracies with non-state actors in the marketplace of civil society (Reinicke et al. 2000).[20]

7 Who is involved in making GPP?

The actors involved in making GPP are closely related to where it is carried out. Slaughter (2004) writes, "Public policy is enacted in the decentralized (and less visible) activity of judges, regulators, and legislators working with foreign counterparts on specific issues (in Stone 2008: 27). Indeed, rather than the traditional focus on states, many authors consider other actors, as it is not always governments that are the most important players (Held and Koenig-Archibugi 2004: 127). Thakur and Weiss (2009), for example, admit that states are the main policymakers, but consider agency and purposive action as indicators, analysing UN policymakers (the Security Council, the General Assembly and member states) as the principal political organs (2009: 21-22). Stone in particular focuses on transnational policy networks[21] as creators of spaces of assembly in the global agora (2008: 31). These communities demonstrate a higher pluralisation of actors and authority structures that stretch state policy cycles to global or regional levels. They are self-regulating and privatise decision-making: "…the institutional locations are dispersed and the boundaries of the global agora are indeterminate and opaque. Policy activity is as likely to take place inside private associations among non-state actors as in intergovernmental conferences" (2008: 22). Similar to her discussion of ancient Athens, Stone finds that it is the INGOs, IOs and agencies that drive GPP, and that few of the vulnerable or marginalised take part (2008: 22).[22]

Beyond traditional state-centred venues of policymaking, Stone looks specifically at transnational advocacy coalitions (TANs), explaining that they are comprised of NGOs and activists, bound together by shared values, principles and beliefs (e.g. blood diamonds). The networks become tools for the maintenance of sovereignty where global problems are solved by "networked government responses" (2008: 31-32). Some are more corporate, others are related to knowledge (e.g. science, intelligence). Networks may intersect at a common cause

[20] She also notes that economic globalisation and regional integration occurs more quickly than development-related global governance.
[21] A large body of literature on transnational networks exists within International Relations, and would be a relevant avenue for pursuing a global refugee policy framework.
[22] An example of this may be Emily Copeland's (1992) "Global Refugee Policy: An Agenda for the 1990s," which lays out policy problem areas and goals. The document emerged out of a conference with participants from governments, international organisations, NGOs, foundations, universities, and policy/research organisations.

(e.g. democratisation), or may remain exclusive and elite, with gate-keeping practices occurring. They are also a means for civic engagement and a vehicle for expanding participation. Stone discusses "international civil servants" and "supranational bureaucrats," and outlines three groups that execute GPP, listed broadly as the "transnational policy community":

- internationalised public sector official (Slaughter 2004: 19);[23]
- international civil servants employed by IOs (meant to be impartial, objective and loyal to the international rather than a particular nationality (Weiss 1982: 288-92);
- transnational policy professionals, which make up a diverse community of consultants, foundation officers, business leaders, scientific experts, think tank pundits and NGO executives (this group is growing in number, reach and professionalism).

According to Stone, these three groups interact as people move between categories and sources of power and influence vary. They allow new forms of leadership and public management, but in general, hold power because of their official position, control of information, and other organisational resources, technical expertise or epistemic authority, or lengthy international experience as career officials and consultants (2008: 31). Most importantly, they go beyond the power of sovereign states. She writes, "By fore-grounding their professional identity, they transcend the power of the nation-state system to impose its categories of identity upon them. They also tend to assume a global or regional rather than national outlook on key issues" (Krause Hansen, Salskov-Iversen, and Bislev, 2002: 109; Stone 2008: 33).[24]

Similar to Stone, Reinicke focuses on networks as the key collection of actors carrying out GPP. In tandem with Thorsten Benner and Jan Martin Witte, Reinicke's *Policy Networks: Lessons Learned and Challenges Ahead* (2003) focuses on global public policy networks as ways in which governments partner with others to collaborate on shared problems of global governance. They outline several challenges that surface as a result of the "new global environment" which emerges from globalisation: 1) "geographic challenges, where decision-makers in states confront an increasing range of issues that can be addressed only by coordinated cross-border action; 2) temporal challenges, which arise directly from rapid technological change; 3) the steadily growing complexity of public policy issues; and 4) legitimacy and accountability issues" (2003: 18).

---

[23] Slaughter argues that the state is not disappearing but that it is becoming disaggregated and penetrated by horizontal networks (2004: 30).

[24] Stone notes that governments must now rethink their civil service training and consider reshaping traditional bureaucrats into transnational managers, as "…the values guiding the behavior of bureaucrats are increasingly shaped by the imperatives of the global economy and constraints on governmental policy (Baltodano 1997: 625 in Stone 2008: 33). She also identifies a gap in the literature on the qualities and capacities of the diverse actors that make up the global agora, noting a growing literature on "policy entrepreneurs," which tends to focus on the roles of such individuals at local and national levels of governance (Stone 2008: 34).

Soroos looks more broadly at a range of policy actors, asserting that though made within larger social contexts, public policies are made by a small circle in each community who play a direct role in making policies (1986: 77). This includes governments, international organisations, and states, primarily, but is beginning to include NGOs as primary actors as transnationalism becomes more common (1986: 84). States are still key, but of course a conglomeration of other actors and international institutions are as well: IGOs "…are created by states not only to provide arenas in which international policies can be addressed, but also, through their directors and secretariats, to play an active part in the evolution of international public policies" (Soroos 1986: 317).

8 Difficulties in carrying out GPP

Soroos and Stone identify a number of challenges with carrying out GPP. Soroos also identifies several issues that can arise, causing conflict within GPP processes. He mentions that policy problems can be politicised ("conflicts have evoked an intensity of emotion. Politicization is a function of the amount of publicity that the issues have received and…their salience to a broader public beyond the policy makers," 1986: 111-112). GPP processes can also remain focused on conflicts among national governments, and values may often be expressed in terms of platitudes like peace, development, social justice and sovereignty, which can make them difficult to debate or argue against. They can be highly abstract and vague, and similar to international legal challenges, GPP faces issues with implementation and compliance, violations and enforcement strategies (e.g. sanctions) and financing (assessments and contributions) (Soroos 1986: 147). These relate closely to enforcement and collective action problems as well as difficulty with consensus building. Stone writes that their effectiveness is dependent upon compliance and good international citizenship, and founded on the implicit assumption that states will act "rationally" and recognise collective action is to their long term interests (2008: 27). She also warns of turf battles, and the lack of a global forum (world parliament or global state) to carry out and enforce policies (e.g. essays in Thakur, Cooper and English 2005). Soroos writes that the record is mixed regarding how effective global policy mechanisms have been, noting that technical issues gain more traction than those that are heavily politicised (1986: 320).

9 Who is studying GPP?

The circle of those studying GPP continues to widen. As mentioned by Stone, numerous university-level programmes of study focus on GPP, such as Potsdam University. Likewise the Global Public Policy Institute (GPPI), the International Political Science Association (IPSA), the Finnish-funded Globalism and Social Policy Program (GASPP), the *Journal of Global Social Policy* (since 2001) and the Global Policy Forum (a global policy watchdog focusing on the UN since 1993) study GPP. Stone also mentions criticisms of programmes focusing on GPP (such as CEU), citing that some have accused them of developing an elite group of students that adhere to the ideology of globalisation (Stone 2008: 24). These programmes tend to see problems that had been previously viewed as "domestic" as international. The study of

GPP continues to widen amongst governments and citizens with both private and public concerns. Global governance projects and initiatives of study are also related (e.g. Global Migration Governance Project at Oxford, the *Global Governance* journal, global governance studies at the Brookings Institution, and Global Governance Watch).

10 How it happens: methods/theoretical tools/models; the most useful takeaways for building a framework for understanding Global Refugee Policy

This section will outline the main theoretical models used to understand GPP, focusing on those most relevant to the refugee context. As mentioned earlier, theoretical models relevant to global public policy are dominated by political science, and in particular international relations. Theories that deal with cooperation and decision-making in particular are among the most relevant (Donnelly 1990: 221). Other disciplines would certainly offer valuable perspectives, however, and thus further research would be an important step in deepening the literature on GPP. Broadly speaking, approaches to GPP tend to take one of two lines, namely 1) explaining varied interactions between international actors to deal with common public policy challenges, or 2) "prescribing how such international interaction can be improved to be more effective, efficient, and equitable in achieving its goals" (Nagel 1990: 305). The various models below fall within these two lines of approach, though many are overlapping and used simultaneously.

Seeing GPP as a process in response to problems

Methodologically, GPP is almost always studied as a process-driven response to three types of policy problems (Stone 2008; Soroos 1991; Nagel 1990: 304; Deacon 1997; Goldthau 2011; Reinicke 1998; Benner et al. 2004). As mentioned earlier, these problems tend to fall under one of the following categories:

- transboundary problems (such as refugees, cross-border money laundering, pollution or drug trafficking, e.g. Raab and Milward 2003);
- common property problems (such as the oceans, Antarctica, or the atmosphere, e.g. Haas 2000);
- simultaneous problems of nations with similar problems in education, health, welfare, urbanisation and population growth (e.g. Deacon 2007).

Stone writes that these problems often lead to "soft" law (Arthurs 2001) that complements the "hard" law or formal authority of states and IOs (Stone 2008: 25).[25] These processes may take a long time, and procedural issues may also take a long time. Some GPP processes may take place in an established body like the UN, while others may occur elsewhere (Soroos 1991: 311). Decisions tend to be reached by consensus. The biggest contrast to national policy processes is in the implementation stage, and relates largely to enforcement and accountability/authority (there is little). Compliance tends to rely on good faith, and thus can

[25] This, then, also begs the question of the relation of hard/soft law to GPP.

be very messy (1991: 313). Soroos puts forth a general model of the stages of global policy processes (1986: 88).

Stone's understanding of policy processes is similar. Policy cycles occur via: 1) problem definition and agenda-setting; 2) formal decision-making; 3) policy implementation; and 4) monitoring and evaluation (25).[26] She further explains that policymaking is "messy" (Juma and Clark 1995), and that "…a major theme in the conceptual literature on public policy is a prescriptive one of making the policy process more rational. However, to search for signs of an orderly or stable global public policy process is misguided" (2008: 29). Rather they are fluid and fragmented, and ridden with disorder and unpredictability with the absence of authority structures (2008: 29). Indeed, she proffers that there is no consistent pattern of global public policy processes. However, she also holds that the "…public domain is not under threat…instead, it is 'stateness' that is under stress" (2008: 29). She argues that "…public-ness is expanding as the global agora takes shape" (2008: 29). It would seem somewhat natural to apply this logic to GRP, given the existing parallels with international refugee responses.

The partnership approach

Jennifer Brinkerhoff (2002) understands GPP via the "partnership approach."[27] Partnership "…refers to collaborative relationships that maximize mutuality and organization identity" (2002: 325). It can be defined as "…a dynamic relationship among diverse actors, based on mutually agreed objectives, pursued through a shared understanding of the most rational division of labor based on the respective comparative advantages of each partner" (Brinkerhoff 2002). It is thus one of the most challenging forms of collective action (2002: 326).[28] Effective partnerships must combine formal and informal structures and processes, self-interest, and a values basis that can contribute to the creation of a self-reinforcing partnership organisational culture that promotes inclusion and participation, transparency and mutual respect (2002: 334).[29] The partnership approach may offer some unique

---

[26] See Stone (2008: 25ff) for individual explanations of each part of the process.

[27] "The partnership approach being the favored solution to: 1) enhance efficiency and effectiveness by relying on comparative advantages and a rational division of labor; 2) provide the multi-actor, integrated solutions sometimes required by the scope and nature of the problems being addressed; 3) move from a no-win situation among multiple actors to a compromise and potential win-win situation…; 4) open decision-making processes to promote a broader operationalization of the public good" (2002: 325).

[28] There are two intra-organisational constraints to partnership: the self-interest of the individual representative (free-riding problem) and the "insecurity caused by intra-organizational control and the need for intra-organizational implementation of inter-organizational compromises" (Brinkerhoff 2002: 326 from Börzel 1998). Collective-action theory suggests three ways to overcome challenges: 1) incentives and sanctions that appeal to the self-interest of the parties, including instrumental rationality; 2) cultivation of a values base for partnership work and the promotion of moral incentives; and 3) careful combination of formal and informal structure processes (2002: 326).

[29] Brinkerhoff draws on a WCD dam partnership example to explain lessons learned: 1) when no one is in control, the context must provide a convergence of interests and policy champions; 2) conflict does not preclude consensus and may even contribute to it; 3) democratic processes are instrumental; 4) perception is everything; 5) conflict resolution is not a one-time effort for all; 6) partnership is an effective and efficient approach to addressing conflictive policy issues.

perspectives in understanding GRP, particularly in light of the range of actors involved in creating norms and influencing state behavior toward refugees.

The network approach, including transnationalism

Perhaps the most common and useful way to study global public policy is via networks. Reinicke's work in particular focuses on networks, and is largely geared toward the UN. Benner, Witte and Reinicke (2003) write, "Global public policy networks build bridges across different sectors and levels, bringing together actors from governments, international organizations, civil society, and business" (2003: 18). They continue, "Unlike traditional hierarchical organizations, these networks are evolutionary in character and flexible in structure. They bring together disparate groups with oftentimes considerably varying perspectives, combining knowledge from different sources in new ways to result in new knowledge" (2003: 18). These are similar to global negotiation networks, coordination networks and implementation networks (2003: 19-20). Most importantly, they emphasise that cross-sectoral networks are now able to confront issues that no single sector, private or public, could tackle alone. Understanding GPP via networks is often favoured by those in the UN; they cite Kofi Annan: "…if we are to get the best out of globalisation and avoid the worst, we must learn to govern better, and how to govern better together…We must form coalitions for change, often with partners well beyond the precincts of officialdom…Mobilising the skills and other resources of diverse global actors, therefore, may involve forming loose and temporary global policy networks that cut across national, institutional and disciplinary lines" (2003: 21). Management challenges are also noted among the key issues with global public policy networks:

> *…large numbers of participants may result in sizable, sometimes prohibitive, transaction costs. Furthermore mutual dependence and long-term interaction may lead networks to develop into closed shops. And the need for compromise and consensus might favor the lowest common denominator as the eventual policy outcome. At the same time, networks' informal structure and reliance on consensus may offer decision blockades and veto positions for even their smallest actors (2003: 21).*

They also demonstrate unequal access and power. Benner et al. suggest creating a "learning forum" to connect work being done on cross-sectoral collaboration in think tanks, NGOs, companies, international organisations, and public-sector agencies (2003: 21).

Directly related to broader network approaches, IR literature pertaining to transnationalism (invoked to some extent by Soroos) might be a useful way to conceptualise GRP. "Transnational advocacy networks," for example, rally around a "principled issue," building links among civil society, states, and IOs, and multiplying the channels of access to the international system (Keck and Sikkink 1998: 1). Grace Skogstad (ed.) (2011) also considers the role of international institutions in policymaking, looking specifically at transnational actors and norms in policymaking, and Thomas Risse, Stephen Ropp and Kathryn Sikkink (1999) have also argued that the diffusion of international norms (pertaining to human rights in their study) depends on the establishment and sustainability of networks among domestic and transnational actors who manage to link up with international regimes and alert Western public opinion and Western governments (1999: 4).

The regimes approach

Understanding global policy by regimes is another common method, one that is also particularly useful for conceptualising global refugee policy. As mentioned above, Soroos

(1986) sees GPP nested within regimes (they are the "institutional environment within which international policies are made"). Perhaps the most relevant to GRP, Betts (2010) considers how the refugee regime is affected by globalisation and interdependence, particularly in light of labour migration and non-mobility regimes like human rights, humanitarianism, development and security. He examines how these regimes overlap with the refugee regime, arguing that the refugee regime is now a "complex" of overlapping regimes where states engage in forms of institutionalised cooperation with direct and indirect impacts on refugee protection (2010: 12). Similarly, Betts (2009) considers how parallel and overlapping institutions (most notably in relation to internally displaced persons (IDPs) and international migration) have affected the refugee regime's focus on protection. In particular, he examines "regime shifting," whereby Northern states have used new institutions to get around responsibilities toward refugees (2009: 53). Likewise Betts (2008) considers issue-linkages in the global refugee regime, arguing that North-South cooperation occurred because of states and UNHCR linking refugee-related issues to states' wider interests in global governance. Betts and Durieux (2007) also draw on regime theory, understanding the global refugee regime as comprised of two sub-regimes: asylum and burden-sharing (2007: 510). They consider norm-creation by UNHCR, analysing the Convention Plus initiative.

Laura Barnett (2002) writes about the first comprehensive refugee regime emerging under the League of Nations after World War I, responding to circumstances and undergoing dramatic change during World War II to create a permanent framework to cope with the refugee problem through UNHCR (2002: 239).[30] Her tracing of the evolution of the refugee regime adds a useful historical spin on the study of GRP via regimes. For example, she writes about UNHCR in the post-Cold War era, emphasising the changing nature of the international system and UNHCR's apparent shift from an international refugee protection regime to a focus on security, containment, and pre-emptive humanitarian action and assistance (2002: 251). She writes that the UNHCR of today is more solutions-oriented, as well as more pro-active, operational, preventative, and homeland-oriented; it has become a more "…broadly based humanitarian agency" (2002: 251). With respect to Europe, she contends that more recent refugee policy has been affected by the European Community's move to harmonise immigration standards, "…creating a fortress mentality where internal border controls decreased but migrants from without were repulsed" (2002: 249). Judging these historical trends, she writes, "…it is also important to note that the refugee regime has never been truly

[30] "Today the refugee regime is struggling to respond to gender and race distributional issues. Forced to reconsider its definitions and policies, the emerging regime must create an environment where the collective international authority of the UN body has meaningful influence on the autonomous implementation of individual government policy. In a world where the rigid constructions of the traditional international system are beginning to crumble, established approaches to refugee policy are becoming irrelevant as well. The regime that took root in 1948 no longer dictates, as customary concepts of global governance adapt to an uncertain environment of shifting politics and security" (L. Barnett 2002: 239).

international until the last quarter century" (255).[31] In her view, the best model of global governance for the refugee regime is that exhibited in UNHCR, complemented by regional networks (2002: 262). This model is evolving and needs to be reworked in light of realities in the international system.

Other scholars like Gil Loescher (2001b) and Jeff Crisp (2003) that have focused on the politics and history of UNHCR have also invoked regime theory to understand GRP. Jeff Crisp of UNHCR, for example, examines globalisation in relation to the international refugee regime (which he writes comprises of institutions, legal instruments and norms). He sees a new asylum paradigm emerging, based on the notion that refugees and other migrants can be "managed" in an organised manner (2003: 3). He sees globalisation as having prompted the movement of people from one part of the world to another by exacerbating socio-economic differentials between and within states, while also "…facilitating the movement of migrants and asylum seekers through the establishment of complex social, technological and cultural networks that link the less-developed countries to the industrialised states" (2003: 9). He writes, "…while globalisation is predicated on the principle of free movement—of goods, services, information, capital and highly qualified personnel—it does not admit the principle of free movement for people who are poor, relatively unskilled or who are escaping from persecution and violence. So, while globalisation has created the conditions which prompt and enable people to migrate, it has also prompted the world's more prosperous states to obstruct such movement. In this respect, the challenge to asylum has exposed an important contradiction in the process of globalisation" (2003: 9).

These examples show how useful the regimes approach can be in understanding GRP. However, there are some general criticisms geared toward GPP's use of regimes that are worth considering. Jack Donnelly (1990), for example, questions Soroos' depiction of the relationship between regimes analysis and policy analysis as one of generality and specificity. He cites Soroos, writing, "Whereas regimes are oriented toward a more encompassing problem area, policies are responses to a more narrowly defined problem…regimes are the institutional environment within which international policies are made" (1986: 21). But Donnelly questions this logic, writing, "…if global policies are the outputs of regimes, this merely underscores the fact that a policy analysis approach gives us no analytical leverage. And if policies are simply the narrower responses to problems that occur within regimes, regime analysis is analytically prior to and effectively subsumes the policy perspective—which

[31] L. Barnett (2002) juxtaposes states with UNHCR trying to expand the refugee regime: "…even as UNHCR tries to widen the scope of the refugee regime, states narrow it again by increasing domestic restrictions" (253). She continues, "Thus despite impressive changes to the responsibility and scope of the refugee regime, national political and economic priorities are blocking benefits from the improved system….The problem that underlies the entire nature of this regime is that the individual refugee is subject to the right of the state to grant asylum—it is not the right of the individual to gain that status" (253). She also writes, "The refugee problem today is founded on the dual nature of the international system, made up of a complex interplay of interstate and international bonds. Currently the solidarity of the refugee regime is not backed by the state but by the close links among civil society, NGOs, the media, and UNHCR itself" (259). She argues that UNHCR needs to go beyond its state-centric focus, rejecting absolute notions of state sovereignty.

seems to be exactly what happens when Soroos moves from the theory to practice of global policy analysis" (1990: 228).

Others, such as J. Martin Rochester (1990), also question the use of regime analysis in tandem with policy analysis. He finds that implicit in the regime literature is the assumption that formal organisational machinery tends to be not only irrelevant or peripheral to the major struggles of world politics (and therefore not as worthy of serious scholarly attention as other collaborative vehicles), but also dysfunctional for the international system, given the inefficiencies and other negative features associated with bureaucracies (Rochester 1990: 143). He argues that "…what typically passes for global policy is a misnomer, something that is neither truly global nor truly policy—in the normal usage of those terms—but rather is more aptly conceptualized as the resultant of multilateral problem-solving or at best regime-making" (Rochester 1990: 144-145). In light of his suggested model of "dirigible pluralism," Rochester understands the UN as a manager of international cooperation, or a "regime processing center" where emerging problems could be identified, monitored, and proposed for consideration on the global agenda; where bargaining could occur and where signals could be furnished as to whether global solutions are possible or whether regime-making needed to occur at a lower level (Rochester 1990: 152). Ultimately, then, his view is that in addition to serving as a conflict manager, the UN is also a manager of cooperation: "As a key agent of global policy, the UN…might inject a dose of predictability and responsiveness into interstate relations sufficient to move the system beyond 'cooperation under anarchy' toward institution-building in a larger 'world order' sense" (Rochester 1990: 152).

Economic approach

Scholars like Baltodano (1997) recognise what they refer to as a unique historical moment to merge globalisation and public administration. Much of the scholarship in this category is linked to economic models, and to some extent entails reconceptualising the state in terms of social responsibility. David Antony Detomasi (2007) also focuses on modelling global public policy networks in terms of economic and/or corporate issues with multi-national corporations (MNCs). He writes, "One method by which companies can impact positively on global governance is through the mechanism of global public policy networks…" (2007: 321). He and others in this approach tend to see GPP networks as vehicles for improving coordination among industry and government in establishing what social expectations the modern MNC will be expected to fill (2007: 321).

This approach may be useful in the GRP context, as some scholars have demonstrated. Betts (2003), for example, draws on public goods theory to examine burden-sharing within the refugee regime. Public goods theory extended to international public goods are characterised by "non-excludability" and "non-rivalry" between states, relating to the Prisoner's Dilemma. He cites Suhrke (1998) as one of the first to apply public goods theory to burden-sharing in the refugee context, arguing that "…each state is faced with a dilemma of weighing up its moral duty and humanitarian obligations under international law against the self-interested desire to minimise the number of refugees on its own territory" (Betts 2003: 276). This dilemma leads to a "provision dilemma," following the Prisoner's Dilemma (2003: 276). Betts goes on to discuss altruistic public goods and security public goods, and outlines the benefits of drawing on a joint-product model, which provides multiple types of benefits and ultimately reduces free-riding (2003: 278). In applying the model to refugees, Betts argues that "…it shows that there is no inevitability to the perception of refugees as a 'burden.' Instead the

promotion of norms of solidarity and human rights within states may help to promote a greater valuation of excludable benefits that have been identified, such that there may be incentives to be the provider" (2003: 294). This model is likely to be the most useful state-focused model for a GRP framework.

The normative approach

A final route that is often interrelated with the previous approaches is understanding GPP via norms. In their study of UN policy more broadly, Thakur and Weiss (2009) conceptualise whether a UN policy exists through the language of norms. They understand global governance efforts in terms of norms connected to institutions, writing, "If policy is to escape the trap of being ad hoc, episodic, judgmental, and idiosyncratic, it must be housed within an institutional context" (2009: 20). Norms have been heavily studied in refugee specific literature, and provide a strong foundation for framing GRP. Most notably, studies of institutions and IOs like UNHCR make up norm-related GRP literature. Michael Barnett (2001), for example, examines the global forces responsible for the transformation of the meaning and practice of UNHCR's humanitarianism, and questions how positive it is for UNHCR to be closely involved in the internal affairs of states. More broadly, he links the international refugee regime to changing relationships between multilateralism, sovereignty and humanitarianism, and argues that a combination of state pressures and normative principles of popular sovereignty have enabled a more political and pragmatic UNHCR to widen its activities under the humanitarian banner, becoming more deeply involved with the sending country. He asserts that this expanding humanitarian umbrella promotes policies of containment, which ultimately threaten refugee rights and make UNHCR an unintentional supporter of containment. Moreover, he argues that the UN's greater liberty to interfere in the domestic affairs of states has negative consequences for humanitarianism and refugee rights.[32] Barnett, therefore, questions the development of policies in light of the major IO in the international refugee regime.

Similarly Betts and Durieux (2007) consider how UNHCR creates norms within the refugee regime. They discuss "ideal types" of norm-creation employed by UNHCR, including a "top-down" institutional bargaining model and a "bottom-up" good practice model (2007: 511). They point out shortcomings of UNHCR's Convention Plus initiative, but also consider its contributions: "In a regime dominated by the principle of proximity, creating new norms for extra-regional commitments to protection and solutions is an extremely important undertaking. The importance of the undertaking is reinforced by the fact that the majority of the world's refugees remain in the global South, often in protracted situations" (2007: 531).

---

[32] M. Barnett (2001) writes: "Global governance, to the extent that we are interested in governance, is always about power backed (ideally) by legitimacy, and Northern states retain the economic, political and cultural power in world politics. In this formulation, UNHCR's role is bound up with a global governance that is designed to maintain and reproduce an international order defined by a state's system (sovereignty), whose principal beneficiaries are Western states (contain the refugees), and that contains a cultural hegemony (liberalism and individual rights). Within reason, UNHCR's activities…can be traced to these global features….The global, secular religion is liberalism, and as UNHCR seeks ways to eliminate the root causes of refugee flows it nearly always reaches for a liberal solvent. We should not be surprised, therefore, that UNHCR's pragmatism and principles have led it [to] develop a profile of humanitarianism laced with containment" (2001: 269).

Other authors within refugee literature draw on normative approaches. Jennifer Hyndman and Alison Mountz (2008), for example, argue "that the loss of access to sovereign territory that allows asylum seekers to mobilize rights is the most pressing problem and outcome of the externalization of asylum" (2008: 1). Myron Weiner (1998) also talks about conflicting norms causing policy dilemmas, where UNHCR has to choose between them, including its traditional legal mandates to provide protection and assistance to refugees and to support the principle of non-refoulement, and other international norms like protecting IDPs, the right to remain in one's own country, and the right to return (Weiner 1998: 433). He suggests strategies for dealing with choices between competing international norms, namely case reasoning as a way to deal with moral dilemmas (Bok 1978; Jonsen and Toulmin 1988 in Weiner 1998: 445). Thus, approaches that focus on norms might be among the most natural ways to study GRP.

World community approaches

Various IR theories understand world politics in terms of a "global community," "international society," or "world community," some of which might be useful for understanding GPP. Bruce Cronin, for example, provides an "international society approach," which may be useful in understanding GRP. The concept of international society "…highlights the relationships that states form with each other and examines the political values and social norms that underlie them," the implicit assumption being that states are just as interested in maintaining these relationships as they are dominating in a competitive environment (2003). According to Cronin, an international society was created by states to increase the predictability of actions and the ability to pursue common goals. The emergence of the international refugee protection regime provides a clear-cut example of the international society approach in action. Indeed, the existence of this international society and its emphasis on relationship-building rather than domination is a prerequisite for the creation of an international refugee protection regime.

The international refugee regime, like other protection regimes, was the outcome of lengthy discussion and deliberation on the parts of states seeking to establish principles of order based on common goals around forced migration. Significantly, the refugee protection regime did not emerge to protect the interests of the most powerful state nor was it designed as an ideological weapon to help fight the Cold War (Soroos 1986: 182). An examination of the process and motives behind UNHCR's formation also shows that humanitarian motives were not a dominant factor (1986: 183), rather political leaders understood the legal obligations as directed from one state to another, not directed towards victims of forced migration (1986: 196). By viewing the international refugee protection regime through the international society approach, one may gain insights into the relationships and established norms maintained between states which continue to influence the regime. This lens may prove particularly interesting when state actions undermine political values on core refugee protection issues such as equality in refugee burden-sharing, causing relationships between states to sour, and ultimately resulting in a loss of predictability of future actions (and the quality of protection offered).

Additional approaches in IR and beyond

Additional ways of understanding GPP within the confines of political science might draw on Stone's "global agora" (as mentioned earlier) or rational policy models (Soroos). Others may be driven by themes like sovereignty, globalisation, global governance, international

cooperation, global public goods and collective action, international institutions and international organisations. Game theory might be useful, as well as public goods theory and "joint-products" models (Betts 2003). Likewise Nagel's framing of GPP in terms of "international interactions" might provide a useful way to study global policy, either from IR constructivist or English School perspectives. Organisational learning (Reinicke) and theories of communication/information-sharing among actors (states or otherwise) might also prove useful in studying GPP. Summing up IR theories, Thakur and Weiss outline what different perspectives offer in their study on UN policy:

> *The literature on international institutions provides familiar answers. To realists, IGOs like the UN are creations and tools of sovereign states, and as such, cannot be independent actors. Likewise, to traditional liberal institutionalists, the UN is an arena in which interactions among its member states take place and cooperation can be agreed. Finally, to classic principal-agent (P-A) theorists, states are the principals and UN secretariats are the agents, and much of the focus is on the absolute power over international civil servants by member states that pay their salaries. As one critic explains, 'P-A theory posits that the ability of the Principal to 'sanction' an Agent by changing the contract (firing or not reappointing the Agent, rewriting contractual terms to undercut the Agent's realm of authority, or cutting the Agent's budget) provides states with significant political leverage that they can use to rein in Agents who go astray' (Alter 2008:34). In short, to all the above, the notion of a 'UN policy' that is not reflective of the preferences and interests of the states does not seem to make any sense; but this discussion of the policy-making function of the United Nations exposes four substantial weaknesses in this rather old-fashioned view, all of which suggest rather more autonomy for agents in making policy than is commonly thought (Thakur and Weiss 2009: 21).*

Similarly, Rochester outlines the ways in which IR theories of cooperation can assess GPP, writing,

> *As Jervis (1988: 318) puts it, 'the basic question posed by the recent work is how self-interested actors can cooperate in the face of anarchy and important conflicting interests.' Similarly, Axelrod (1984) ponders how 'cooperation [can] occur in a world of egotists without central authority.' Drawing on game theory, collective goods theory, and micro-economic theory comparing the behavior of states with that of profit-maximizing firms in a free market, it is hypothesized that international cooperation is best achieved through a strategy of 'decomposition' whereby only the barest number of relevant nation-state actors are brought into the bargaining process from issue to issue (Oye 1985). It is argued that the more 'players' involved in the bargaining process, the higher the 'transaction costs' in achieving a mutually agreeable outcome, the more serious the 'free rider' problem of monitoring compliance with the agreement and sanctioning potential defectors, and the more difficult it is generally to attain co-operation of a 'robust' quality (Keohane 1984). In game-theoretic terms, global bargaining is dismissed as a game of Deadlock rather than Prisoners' Dilemma or some other mixed-motive contest (Rochester 1990: 143).*

11 Relating GPP to GRP: a natural link

The aforementioned approaches are not exhaustive, but are among the lenses used in GPP analysis that might be useful for understanding GRP. Indeed, refugees are an obvious GPP issue, fitting easily within the broader category of "transboundary public policy issues," as mentioned by Nagel (1990: 303) and Rosenau (2000: 183), and clearly demonstrate a case where international organisations create policies and deliver global public goods (Stone 2008),

as refugee protection delivered through the refugee regime can be seen as a global public good (Betts 2003: 18; Carbone 2007). In terms of where GPP is enacted, the conceptual tools of Stone's "global agora" and transnational policy spaces (broadly understood as values, discourses, symbols, norms, institutions and practices that constitute the global agora) can be seen in GRP via securitisation, containment, prevention, region of origin, state obligations, human rights, burden-sharing, and durable solutions. The transnational policy spaces that collectively form Stone's global agora (2008: 19, 30) can also be seen in the refugee context as policy spaces such as international conferences, private associations, public and closed forums, international agreements and transnational networks.[33] Likewise the chaotic, messy global agora that is filled with power struggles is clearly present with GRP: "Conflicting interpretations characterise international refugee law on protection; there has been growing divergence over the past decades between customary international law as defined by contemporary state practice and the law of treaties and declarations" (Suhrke and Newman 2001: 300). Thus, there is a lack of clarity over refugee policymaking processes, venues and individuals in GRP, just as in GPP.

Similarly, the main actors in carrying out GPP are mirrored in the GRP context. For Stone, GPP is carried out by a "…highly pluralized set of actors and contested modes of authority; 'wholly active citizens' drive the process" (2008: 19; Held and Koenig-Archibugi 2004: 128). The staff of international organisations like the UNHCR can be seen as having significant influence in formulating and implementing policies, and thus hold distinct roles in forms of global governance. This may also refer to the High Commissioner and other powerful policymakers within NGOs and civil society in a GRP context. Transnational policy communities and transnational epistemic communities are other major players noted in GPP literature. While the terminology may border on the nebulous, it refers to identifiable groups of actors who perform a specific and essential function. According to Haas, these transnational communities are networks of professionals with recognised expertise, competence and an authoritative claim to policy relevant knowledge within a specific domain (1992: 3). Armed with this singular claim to knowledge, epistemic and policy communities intervene in and influence the policy process by defining the way in which that reality is defined and understood, by enabling states and other actors to define their interests, and by agenda-setting.

With respect to GRP, one might consider UNHCR and the larger community concerned with refugees to be the main actors (Suhrke and Newman 2001). Today, epistemic communities and professional heavyweights dedicated to forced migration are intervening in the ways in which tomorrow's most pressing refugee issues are understood and how policy options are defined. The conceptual reconfiguration of "climate refugees" as "survival migrants" by Alexander Betts provides one such example (2009). The refugee context also lines up with Stone's claims that GPP tends to spend more time on deliberation and discussion than execution (2008: 27). GPP is commonly seen in light of coordination efforts, and the same is true of GRP. International burden-sharing, for example, as well as shifts from "asylum" to "region of origin" policies demonstrate policymaking on refugee issues at the global level.

[33] Indeed, "The most relevant politics for the refugee regime no longer takes place within the inter-state forums provided by UNHCR" (Betts 2010: 33).

12 Additional forced migration literature relevant to building a framework for GRP

This literature review is meant to focus on global public policy more broadly, providing a foundation for forming a framework of global refugee policy. However, there is a breadth of literature within forced migration that deals with policy already and is therefore important to mention. Though not exhaustive, some potential themes within literature pertaining to forced migration are:

- Literature exploring the ability of UNHCR to promote international cooperation on refugees through norms, diplomacy and issue-linkages (Betts 2008; Cronin 2003; Suhrke 1998; Thielemann 2003). This literature questions the extent to which UNHCR is a norm-setting or policymaking agency, and how the terms should be applied in the international refugee regime (Barnett 2002, Black 2011, Copeland 1992, Noll 2003, Thielemann 2003). For example, Black (2001) describes UNHCR as a policymaking organisation, whereas Betts and Durieux look at it in terms of "norms." Thielemann (2003) and Noll (2003) think they are interchangeable. Without using the word "norms," Barnett highlights the "standard setting effect" of the UNHCR executive committee's (ExCom) conclusions, and Forsythe suggests that they "might be said to constitute the policy lessons of refugee protection over time" (34). Copeland's 1992 article entitled "Global Refugee Policy: An Agenda for the 1990s" is perhaps the most direct reference to GRP in the literature. However, she paints a picture where the will of dominant states (not UNHCR, ExCom or the Security Council) and their preferences guide policy trends around international refugee protection (999).
- Literature focused on the emergence of the global refugee regime and its relationship to the state system (Betts 2009: 17). It is highly descriptive and lighter on theory (Loescher 2001; Zolberg et al. 1989; Skran 1995; Forsythe 2001). It sees UNHCR as existing to facilitate state policies toward persons of concern, and to persuade the adoption of more appropriate policies under international law (Forsythe 2001). Forsythe points out that both UNHCR and states have internal policies driven by an international relations agenda that is dominated by national interest and security (Forsythe 2001: 10). Within GRP, this might be seen, for example, in UNHCR ExCom conclusions or the UNHCR Handbook on procedures.
- Literature assessing the shifting mandate of UNHCR and its ramifications on refugee protection (L. Barnett 2002; Barutciski 2002; Crisp 2003; Forsythe 2001; Goodwin-Gill 2008; Melander 1990). Barnett, for example, seeks to prove that the refugee regime is "…clearly dependent on economic and ideological considerations," illustrated in a shift from East-West to North-South focus after the Cold War (249). More importantly for refugee protection, she identifies a dichotomy between UNCHR and Western/Northern policy agendas, writing, "While UNHCR expands the refugee regime's scope, Western/Northern states narrow it by implementing domestic restrictions... As the refugee situation worsens and population flows increase on a globally significant scale, effective implementation of international policies is obstructed at the national level" (254). Forsythe, along with a number of observers, cites UNHCR's shifting mandate as evidence of its complicity: "…in the declining standards of refugee traditional protection over time,"(31). Goodwin-Gill is also

critical, and asks if there is a way for UNHCR to become more transparent and accountable while simultaneously entrenching the principles of protection in the relations of states.

- Literature critical of the shifting "ideal solution" from asylum to "country of origin" and early repatriation stages. Two strains are identified: those who believe dominant states or dominant states in relation to UN bodies produce the shift (Chimni 2008; M. Barnett 2001; Copeland 1998; Roberts 1998; Suhrke and Newman 2001). Chimni criticises the way in which UNHCR reinforces hegemonic knowledge that benefits northern states while ignoring the interests of refugees or developing countries. He suggests that the UN Security Council (UNSC), rather than UNHCR, is the main protagonist of the allegedly new country of origin approach at the behest of industrialised states (344). M. Barnett (2001) only differs from Chimni by claiming that ExCom (not the UNSC) facilitated the policy shift towards repatriation (256). Contrary to both M. Barnett and Chimni, Copeland (1998) asserts that the "new approach" to refugee policy originated in several industrialised states (Canada, Germany, the United States, and Australia) without considering UNHCR norms. In between the two camps, Stepputtat (2004) points to European Union domestic politics and UNHCR as the nexus of new policy approaches to asylum and protection. He views policy papers promoted by UK, Austrian, and Danish politicians from 1992-2002, rather than decisions within the Security Council, as the source of refugee regime transformation. Stepputtat points to inter-agency competition and the EU's threat to go through the International Organization for Migration for its processing, which pushed UNHCR to institutionalise the "new approach." This portrayal aligns with Betts' (2010) institutional proliferation thesis. Stepputtat also uses the language of "principle" and "obligations" and international procedures/strategies but not "policy." Suhkre and Newman agree with Stepputtat that state interests in policies, rather than UNHCR preferences, were responsible for the shift from the asylum to "country of origin" solution ideals. However, instead of a Eurocentric approach, the authors trace the shift from asylum to "prevention" or "country of origin" policies to the 1980 debate initiated by US and West Germany calling to avert "mass outflows" and address "root causes." Roberts (1998) is the only proponent of the "new approach" in the literature reviewed. He presents a realist, state-centric view that "…a more interventionist approach to refugee flows is unavoidable" due to numbers of refugees and unwillingness of states to grant asylum.
- Literature examining the degree of power and autonomy exerted by UNHCR in the international political system, and lessons it offers the treatment of international institutions as independent actors (Barnett and Finnemore 2004; M. Barnett 2001; Betts and Durieux 2007; Forsythe 2001; Loescher et al. 2008; Loescher 2001b; Whitaker 2008). M. Barnett asserts that UNHCR is the site of centralised power under the New Humanitarianism, as the lead power in refugee issues, de facto human rights monitor and active agent on both sides of the border (2001: 269). *Contrary to Barnett's vision of UNHCR holding a central position of power, Betts (2010) describes UNHCR as a refugee regime dinosaur struggling for relevance while states push it to the periphery.* Meanwhile states promote their asylum policy preferences through new IO's, which are unbound by legal obligations. In the middle of these two extremes, is David Forsythe who presents Gil Loescher's position wherein UNHCR's near-complete financial dependence on donor countries forces it to adopt policies that reflect their interests and priorities (2001b: 31). This is pointing to the fact that over

95 per cent of UNHCR's budget is provided voluntarily by a few powerful states. However, Forsythe counters the zero-autonomy view of UNHCR by pointing out that "…numerous NGOs with clout in the donor countries are watching UNHCR to ensure it doesn't kowtow to money and power. Such whistle-blowing would hurt the agency's reputation" (2001: 31).

- Literature on non-state actors like NGOs in relation to the international organisations (new and established) and states governing refugee protection norms/refugee regime (L. Barnett 2002; Black 2001; Copeland 1998; Finnemore 1993; Lester 2005; Betts 2010).[34]

In a different vein, scholars analysing global public policy more broadly and global refugee policy in particular should also be mindful of ongoing debates about the place of policy within academic research.[35] Richard Black (2001), for example, traces the evolution of refugee studies in light of theory and policy. He writes that public policy has informed refugee studies in positive and negative ways, noting that policy and refugee studies have always been "intimately connected" (2001: 58). Policy has skewed refugee studies to some extent,[36] which has resulted in "…a constant battle to maintain academic independence and intellectual rigor, while simultaneously producing research of relevance to policy concerns, which is capable of attracting funding from major government and private donors (2001: 61). Being policy focused has helped refugee studies adopt a problem-centered approach with openness to dialogue with practitioners (2001: 67). On the other hand, it has caused mainstream social scientists to question refugee studies' theoretical perspectives and grounding, and put it at risk of having research co-opted by organisations with political or bureaucratic interests (2001: 67). In spite of all of this, Black claims that it is unclear how influential refugee scholarship has been on actual policy (2001: 69). Oliver Bakewell (2008) has also questioned the relationship between scholarship and policy. He asserts that scholars' search for policy relevance has

---

[34] Lester (2005) paints a picture of state–NGO relationships as fraught with duality. They are both allies and adversaries on the refugee protection agenda. She describes the increasingly inclusive attitude of UNHCR towards INGOs. In contrast, she questions the highly secretive Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees (IGC) which does not invite any participation from NGOs, has no website accessible to the public yet is "highly influential in the realm of international deliberative processes." Finnemore contrasts the view that non-state actors and IO's are valued by hegemonic States for norm development (1993: 594) with the view that hegemonic states only pay lip-service to UNHCR and non-state actors but only act according to their own interests. L. Barnett suggests that international civil society and non-state actors are the true glue prohibiting a complete collapse of the principle-oriented international refugee regime as it faces increasing irrelevance (L. Barnett 2002, 260). In "The Refugee Regime Complex," Betts (2010) asserts that states generate a competition amongst IO's, and use other agencies to produce cooperation on asylum policies: "The most relevant politics for the refugee regime no longer takes place within the inter-State forums provided by UNHCR" (2010: 33).

[35] It is important to differentiate the *study of policy* in an academic sense versus the study of policy with the intention of advocating a specific policy or change. This tension is constantly confronting scholars, who shy away from policy discussion for the most part, not wanting to compromise intellectual integrity.

[36] He cites Malkki, for example, who writes, "Indeed, the dependence of refugee studies on policy definitions and concerns might be seen to be one of its principal weaknesses" (Malkki 1995 in Black 2001: 58).

encouraged researchers to take categories, concepts and priorities of policymakers and practitioners as their initial frame of reference, thus privileging their worldview and constraining the questions asked, the objects of study and the methodologies and analysis adopted (2008). He argues that this approach leaves large groups of forced migrants (self-settled refugees in this case) invisible to research and policy. He says that in order to bring such "invisible" forced migrants into view, scholars should break away from policy relevance in order to challenge taken-for-granted assumptions. On the other hand, Turton writes,

> *I cannot see any justification for conducting research into situations of extreme human suffering if one does not have the alleviation of suffering as an explicit objective of one's research. For the academic this means attempting to influence the behavior and thinking of policy-makers and practitioners so that their interventions are more likely to improve than worsen the situation of those whom they wish to help (Turton 1996: 96).*

13 Further research, tensions, challenges and questions

Broadly speaking, "scholarly investigation of those who execute or implement global public policies has long been underdeveloped," and there is a great need for further research (Weiss 1982 in Stone 2008: 30). The same could easily be said of Global Refugee Policy and thus many of the points below refer equally to GRP. This final section will outline tensions, challenges and questions for the study of GPP and GRP. Above all, the most common criticism of GPP literature relates to definitions and clarity. Beyond debates about mere terminology, questions are rooted in doubt over units of analysis. Donnelly's "Global Policy Studies: A Skeptical View" (1990) challenges Soroos' concepts. He writes, "It is not even clear whether global policy studies is intended as a descriptive or a prescriptive style of analysis" (1990: 225). Moreover he argues that the very idea of global policy misrepresents the nature of world politics today (1990: 225), adding that while there are international regimes that make authoritative rules, there is no global (or international) government. He writes, "Global (as opposed to international) political institutions simply do not exist; there is no global process by which values are authoritatively allocated" (1990: 225-226). Similarly, he finds that "global politics" are often better reduced to international, national or subnational politics, which ultimately offer greater analytical clarity (1990: 227). Indeed, he disagrees with Soroos, asserting that "global" policies are almost always undertaken from a national perspective instead. He also reminds readers that Soroos himself freely admits that policy studies can be grouped along other fields of study (such as international law, regime approaches, peace research and world order studies) (Soroos 1986: 19). *Ultimately, he sees "global policy processes" as simply another name for international relations (1990: 227).* The same challenges could be posed to GRP, as refugee-related policy terms also need more clarification.[37]

[37] Any number of terms are often used in similar ways. Some are: "norms and norm-setting" and "mechanisms for coordination" (Betts and Durieux 2007); "international organization and IGO policy" (Thakur and Weiss 2009); "refugee policy" (Thielemann 2003); "policy organized" (Helton 2002); "refugees and repatriation policy" (Toft 2007); "comprehensive refugee policy" (Suhrke and Newman 2001); "counter-refugee-crisis policies" (Toft 2007); "standards," "best practices," and "soft law."

Another issue that is relatively well-documented in the GPP literature relates to sovereignty—a theme directly related to refugee policy. As mentioned earlier, Stone in particular engages with the question of whether the sovereign state is in decline, particularly if one is to accept the GPP assumptions of globalisation and interdependence. She writes, "One outcome…is that the power of the nation-states has been reduced or reconfigured without a corresponding development of international institutional cooperation" (2008: 23). However she is quick to follow up with a seemingly contradictory claim, arguing that just because the global agora is expanding and diversifying, the state is not necessarily in decline. Rather, Stone sees it as reconfiguring with the "dynamics of globalisation."[38] Further research, particularly within IR, would need to address this claim in the GPP context, and more so within the GRP context, one that has always wrestled with questions of sovereignty.

Similarly, assumptions of globalisation and interdependence can and should be questioned, particularly in light of anthropological and sociological critiques. For example, scholars like Ulrich Brand (2005) step back and question the entire discourse of "global governance" and "globalisation," some of the key underpinnings of Global Public Policy, asserting that such scholarly initiatives are more about hegemony. He draws on Michel Foucault (1977), arguing that such discourses seek to reshape the conception of international politics by providing "answers" to "problems" and in doing so, "contribute…to a 'sustainable' capitalist globalisation" (2005: 171). This also problematises conceptions of "policy" as neutral entities, when in fact they may be tools of the same discourse. Indeed, Shore and Wright's *Anthropology of Policy: Critical Perspectives on Governance and Power*, steps back from questions of how policy is used, asking broader questions about the nature of policy entirely. They seek to understand how policies "work" as instruments of governance, and why do they not always function as intended (1997: 3). They examine "…the mobilising metaphors and linguistic devices that cloak policy with the symbols and trappings of political legitimacy…" and how "…policies construct their subjects as objects of power, and what…kinds of subjectivity or identity are being created in the modern world…" (1997: 3). They draw on scholars like Aidan White, who argue that citizens are increasingly alienated from policymaking processes, and see the "frontiers of policy" as expanding. Like other disciplines, they too note the ambiguity of "policy," questioning what it really means in light of language, rhetoric, culture and concepts (1997: 5). Most of all, they draw upon Foucault's "political technology," examining how policies are used as instruments of power to shape individuals (1997: 4). Thus, there is a broader focus on the relationship between individual and society (the individual being categorised into roles and statuses), and a deep questioning of policy from an anthropological perspective.

---

[38] She writes, "Policy practice is moving faster than its paradigmatic parallels. The Westphalian conceptual cage of a nation-state system has incapacitated critical thinking (Albert and Kopp-Malek 2002). Multilevel polycentric forms of public policy in which a plethora of institutions and networks negotiate within and between international agreements and private regimes have emerged as pragmatic responses in the absence of formal global governance. If 'public policy' is 'whatever governments choose to do or not to do' (Dye 1984: 2), then some governments are choosing to devolve aspects of public policy. This is a double devolution; first, beyond the nation-state to global and regional domains; and second, a delegation of authority to private networks and non-state actors" (Stone 2008: 24).

Additional questions worth considering relating to GPP

- Does GPP offer any new insight that theories and perspectives within IR do not already offer?
- What insights can other disciplines offer regarding GPP? Where is there overlap with international law, peace studies research and other scholarly issue-areas?
- How should terms be defined, and are debates about terms all that is stopping GPP from taking off?
- How state-focused should GPP analysis be?
- Much of the key literature is from the 1990s. What updates have been/should be made?
- What power issues are at stake in GPP? How might perspectives less concerned with states view this literature?
- Is there an historical way to view GPP? Might there be trends over time when international/global cooperation has been more or less common? Alternatively, when has Westphalian sovereignty been at its strongest, and how might this relate to GPP?[39]
- To what extent can domestic policy models be the basis of international/global policy models? Are authors like Soroos and Stone justified in doing this? Or is it a units-of-analysis blunder?
- What is the role of think tanks and other research bodies in developing and understanding GPP and GRP?

Additional questions worth considering relating to GRP

- Is "policy" or "norms" the most appropriate term to use when discussing durable solutions, protection and asylum standards for refugees?[40] What power relations and assumptions underpin these terms?
- Is UNHCR acting as an independent actor, setting GRP, or serving state interests?
- How effective are normative arguments at assuaging state policy interests? Should they remain protection-focused? Which of the aforementioned approaches provides the most analytical leverage?
- How can academics separate out their research (most often seeking causality) amidst partnerships with policymakers with different goals?
- Where do GPP and GRP fit with other literatures (e.g. regimes, international law, globalisation, global governance, economic interdependence, institutions, transnational networks)?

---

[39] e.g. Rochester (1990: 142) discusses historical trends to eradicate war.

[40] Examples of where the word "policy" was used in refugee literature are limited, and largely relate to states' or UNHCR's own activities. There are also references to the EU's policy within the "'policy area' of burden sharing." For example, the *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 2003 editors apply the term "policy" as reflected in the edition's title "Protection Policy in the Making: Third Track of the Global Consultations." In the overview, policies are equated to UNHCR guidelines on specific issues such as protection for refugee women or reception standards. A second benchmark application of the word "policy" in GRP is the 2009 *Refugee Survey Quarterly* article entitled, "UNHCR Policy Framework and Implementation Strategy: UNHCR's Role in Support of the Return and Reintegration of Displaced Persons." In the same vein, for Thielemann (2003), "burden-sharing" is referred to as a "policy area," and he quotes from a European Refugee Fund decision that "implementation on such a policy (common policy of asylum) should be based on solidarity between member states" (262).

- What is at the core of GRP? Protection? Migration management? Rights?
- How can other disciplines be engaged in GRP? Those that are critical of taking for granted terms and concepts like "policy" and "globalisation" analyse the discourse in terms of power, norms, authority and control. Short of eliminating policy altogether (an unlikely occurrence), how can these voices push for more balanced understandings of policy in ways that promote better policymaking processes for refugees and other forced migrants?
- Is GRP "new"? Or is it a matter of simply recognising what already exists and framing it accordingly? Is this an unprecedented crossroads, as some GPP scholars would argue?

14 Concluding thoughts

This literature review has sought first and foremost to outline the key ideas, debates, methods and scholarship in the Global Public Policy literature. It has intended to serve as a basis for creating a framework for understanding Global Refugee Policy, and has highlighted some of the relevant refugee-specific literature that addresses policy. If there is one takeaway from this review, it is that further research is needed to determine how best to define, conceptualise and model global refugee policy, particularly in light of the techniques applied in the broader GPP works. In addition, the question as to developing a framework for the study of global refugee policy may rest more in recognising and formalising what already exists, rather than understanding global refugee policy in an entirely new light.

As mentioned earlier, engaging with disciplines outside international relations will only benefit any framework seeking to understand GRP.[41] Likewise any study of global public policy, regardless of the discipline, is likely to first recognise that that global refugee policy exists (as opposed to perspectives that do not see global policies, but simply each state choosing policies in its best interest, unaffected by other factors). Moreover, other bodies of literature within IR need to be considered, particularly in selecting which approaches provide the most analytical leverage. Indeed, if policies are as fluid and changing as they seem (Stone 2008: 29), a number of perspectives will need to be employed, particularly those that question power, control, authority, norms and rhetoric. Finally, a number of warning flags have emerged in reviewing the relevant literature, many of which were discussed here. These criticisms and questions pose serious challenges to creating a framework that truly encapsulates GRP. Given that academia is already gun-shy to study policy in general, scholars undertaking GRP or GPP more broadly have their work cut out for them. Nevertheless, the task is certainly a worthy one, given that policies have the potential to affect the daily lives of refugees and other forced migrants around the world.

[41] Likewise studies on international trade and business or human rights might also be more developed in this area.

15 Bibliography

Albert, M., and T. Kopp-Malek (2002). "The Pragmatism of Global and European Governance: Emerging Forms of the Political 'Beyond Westphalia,'" *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 31 (3): 453–47.

Anderson, J. (1979). *Public Policy-making, 2nd Edition*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Arthurs, H. (2001). "The Re-Constitution of the Public Domain," in *The Market or the Public Domain*. (ed.) Drache, D. London: Routledge, 85–112.

Bakewell, O. (2008). "Research Beyond the Categories: The Importance of Policy Irrelevant Research into Forced Migration," *Journal of Refugee Studies* 21(4).

Baltodano, A.P. (1997). The Study of Public Administration in Times of Global Interpenetration: A Historical Rationale for a Theoretical Model. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 7(4): 615-638.

Barnett, L. (2002). "Global governance and the evolution of the international refugee regime," *New Issues in Refugee Research* Working Paper No. 54, Geneva: UNHCR.

Barnett, M. (2001). "Humanitarianism with a Sovereign Face: UNHCR in the Global Undertow," *The International Migration Review* 35 (1): 244-277.

Barnett, M. and M. Finnemore (2004). *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics.* New York: Cornell University Press.

Barutciski, M. (2002) "A Critical View on UNHCR's Mandate Dilemmas," *International Journal of Refugee Law* 14(2-3): 365-381.

Benner, T. and W. Reinicke and J. M. Witte. (2003). "Global Public Policy Networks: Lessons Learned and Challenges Ahead," *The Brookings Review* 21 (2): 18-21.

Benner, T. and W. Reinicke and J. M. Witte. (2004). "Multisectoral Networks in Global Governance: Towards a Pluralistic System of Accountability," *Governance and Opposition* 39(2): 92-210.

Betts, A. (2003). "Public Goods Theory and the Provision of Refugee Protection: The Role of the Joint Product Model," *Journal of Refugee Studies* 16 (3): 274-296.

Betts, A. (2008). "North-South Relations in the Global Refugee Regime: the Role of Linkages," *Global Governance* 14 (2): 157-78.

Betts, A. (2009). "Institutional Proliferation and the Global Refugee Regime," *Perspectives on Politics* 7 (1): 53-58.

Betts, A. (2009). *Forced Migration and Global Politics*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Betts, A. (2010). "The Refugee Regime Complex," *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 29 (1): 12-37.

Betts, A. and J.F. Durieux (2007). "Convention Plus as a Norm-Setting Exercise," *Journal of Refugee Studies* 20 (3): 509-35.

Betts, A. and E. Kaytaz (2009). "National and International Responses to the Zimbabwean Exodus: Implications for the International Refugee Regime," New Issues in Refugee Research, Research Paper No. 175, UNHCR (Geneva).

Betts, A. and J. Milner (2006). "The Externalization of EU Asylum Policy: The Position of African States," COMPAS Working Paper, Oxford: COMPAS.

Birkland, T. (2005). *An Introduction to the Policy Process: Theories, Concepts, and Models of Public Policy Making, 2nd Edition.* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Black, R. (2001). "Fifty Years of Refugee Studies: From Theory to Policy." *The International Migration Review* 35(1): 57-78.

Bok, S. (1978). *Lying: Moral Choices in Public and Private Life*. New York: Pantheon.

Börzel, T. (1998). "Organizing Babylon—On the Different Conceptions of Policy Networks." *Public Administration* 76(2): 253-73.

Brand, U. (2005). "Order and regulation: Global Governance as Hegemonic Discourse of International Politics?" *Review of International Political Economy* 12(1): 155-176.

Brinkerhoff, J. M. (2002). "Global Public Policy, Partnership, and the Case of the World Commission on Dams," *Public Administration Revie*w 62 (3): 324-336.

Brown, M. and Ganguly, S. (1997). "Introduction," in *Government Policies and Ethnic Relations in Asia and the Pacific*, by Brown, M. and Ganguly, S. (eds.). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Carbone, M. (2007). "Supporting or Resisting Global Public Goods? The Policy Dimension of a Contested Concept," *Global Governance* 13: 179–198

Castells, M. (2000). *End of millennium*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

Cerny, P. (2006). "Plurality, Pluralism and Power: Elements of Pluralist Analysis in an Age of Globalization," in *Pluralism: Developments in the Theory and Practice of Democracy* by Eisfeld, R. (ed.). Opladen and Farmington Hill, MI: Barbara Budrich Publishers: 81–110.

Chimni B.S. (1998). "The Geopolitics of Refugee Studies: A View from the South," *Journal of Refugee Studies* 11:4 350-74.

Clark, G. and Sohn, L. (1966). *World Peace through World Law: Two Alternative Plans*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.

Copeland, E. (1992). "Global Refugee Policy: An Agenda for the 1990s," *International Migration Review* 26 (3): 992-999.

Copeland, E. (1998). "Reshaping the international refugee regime: industrialized states' responses to post-Cold War refugee flows," *International Politics* 35 (4): 425-445.

Cox, R. (1984). "Social Forces, States, and World Order: Beyond International Relations Theory," in R.B.J. Walker (ed.), *Culture, Ideology, and World Order*, Boulder, CO: Westview.

Crisp, J. (2003). "A New Asylum Paradigm? Globalization, Migration and the Uncertain Future of the International Refugee Regime," *New Issues in Refugee Research* Working Paper No.100. Geneva: UNHCR.

Cronin, B. (2003). *Institutions for the Common Good: International Protection Regimes in International Society.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Deacon, B. (2007). *Global Social Policy and Governance.* London, Sage.

Deacon, B., Hulse M. and Stubbs, P. (1997). *Global Social Policy: International Organisations and the Future of Welfare*. Sage: London.

Deacon, B., Macovei, M., Langenhove, L. and Yeates, N. (eds.). (2010). *World-Regional Social Policy and Global Governance: New Research and Policy Agendas in Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America*, London. Routledge.

Detomasi, D. (2007). "Global Governance and the Multinational Corporation: Modeling Global Public Policy Networks," *Journal of Business Ethics* 71(3): 321-334.

Donnelly, J. (1990). "Global Policy Studies: a Skeptical View," *Journal of Peace Research* 27(2): 221-230.

Drache, D. (2001). "The return of the public domain after the triumph of markets: Revisiting the most basic of fundamentals," in *The Market or the Public Domain*, (ed.) D. Drache. London: Routledge, 37–70.

Drori, G., Meyer, J. and Hwang, H. (eds.) (2006). *Globalization and Organization: World Society and Organizational Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dryzek, J. S. (1999). "Transnational Democracy." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 7 (1): 30–51.

Dye, T. (1984). *Understanding Public Policy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Esping-Anderson, G. (1985). "Power and Distributional Regimes," *Politics Society* 14: 223.

Etzioni, A. (2001). "Beyond Transnational Governance," *International Journal* 56(4): 595-610

Evans, M. (ed.) (2004). *Policy Transfer in Global Perspective*. Hants, UK: Ashgate.

Evans, G. and Newnham, J. (1998). *The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations*. London: Penguin Books.

Farazmand, A. (1999). "Globalization and Public Administration," *Public Administration Review* 59: 509-522.

Finnemore, M. (1993). "International Organizations as Teachers of Norms: the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and Science Policy," *International Organization* 47: 565-597.

Forsythe, D. (2001). *UNHCR's Mandate: The Politics of Being Non-Political*. Geneva: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Die Ordnung des Diskurses*. Frankfurt/M. et al.: Suhrkamp.

Goldthau, A. (2011). "The Public Policy Dimension of Energy Security," *The Routledge Handbook of Energy Security* (ed. B. Sovacool):129-145.

Goodwin-Gill, G.S. (2008). "The Politics of Refugee Protection," *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 27(1): 8-23.

Gordenker, L. and Weiss, T. (1996). "Pluralizing Global Governance: Analytical Approaches and Dimensions," in (eds.) Gordenker, L. and Weiss, T. *NGOs, the United Nations and Global Governance*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Grugel, J. and Peruzzotti, E. (2007). "Global Governance, Advocacy and the Politics of Rights: The Convention of the Rights of the Child in Argentina," *Global Governance* 13 (2): 199–216.

Haas, P. (2000). "International Institutions and Social Learning in the Management of Global Environmental Risks," *Journal of Policy Studies* 28 (3): 558–75.

Held, D. and Koenig-Archibugi, M. (eds.). (2005). *Global Governance and Public Accountability.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.

Helton, C. A. (2002). *The Price of Indifference-Refugees and Humanitarian Action in the New Century.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Henkin, L. (1979). *How Nations Behave: Law and Foreign Policy*. New York: Columbia UP.

Héritier, A. and Lehmkuhl, D. (2011). "New Modes of Governance and Democratic Accountability," *Government and Opposition*, 46 (1): 126–144.

Hudson, V. (2006). *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Hyndman, J. and Mountz, A. (2008). "Another Brick in the Wall? Neo-*Refoulement* and the Externalization of Asylum by Australia and Europe," *Government and Opposition* 43 (2): 249-269.

International Political Science Association. (1988). Study Group on "Global Policy Studies."

Jacobson, H.K. (1984). *Networks of Interdependence: International Organizations and the Global Political System, 2nd Edition*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Jervis, R. (1988). "Realism, Game Theory, and Cooperation," *World Politics* 40(3): 317-349.

Jonsen, A.R. and Toulmin, S. (1988). *The Abuse of Casuistry: A History of Moral Reasoning*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Juma, C., and Clark, N. (1995). "Policy Research in Sub-Saharan Africa," *Public Administration and Development* 15: 121–37.

Kaul, I., Conceicao, P., Le Goulven, K. and Mendoza, R. (eds.). (2003). *Providing Global Public Goods: Managing Globalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Keck, M. and Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Keohane, R. (1984). *After Hegemony*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.

Keohane, R. and Nye, J. (1977). *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition.* Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Keohane, R. and Nye, J. (1989). *Power and Interdependence*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Krause Hansen, H., Salskov-Iversen, D. and Bislev, S. (2002). "Transnational Discourse Communities: Globalizing Public Management," in (ed.) R. Higgott and M. Ougaard *Understanding the Global Polity*. London: Routledge.

Lerner, H. and Lasswell, D. (eds.) (1951). *The Policy Sciences: Recent Developments in Scope and Method*. Stanford: Stanford UP.

Lester, E. (2005). "A Place at the Table: The Role of NGOS in Refugee Protection: International Advocacy and Policy-Making," *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 24 (2): 125-142.

Loescher, G. (2001a). "The UNHCR and World Politics: State Interests vs. Institutional Autonomy," *The International Migration Review* 35.1 33-56.

Loescher, G. (2001b). *The* UNHCR *and World Politics: A Perilous Path*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Loescher, G., Betts, A. and Milner J. (2005). UNHCR: *The Politics and Practices of Refugee Protection into the Twenty-First Century.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Loescher, G., Betts, A. and Milner, J. (2008). *The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR): The politics and practice of refugee protection in the twenty-first century*. New York: Routledge.

Loescher, G. and Milner, J. (2003). "The Missing Link: the need for comprehensive engagement in regions of origin," *International Affairs* 79 (3) 595-617.

Malkki, L. (1995). "Refugees and Exile: From 'Refugee Studies' to the National Order of Things," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 495-523.

McDougal, M. (1960). *Studies in World Public Order*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP.

Meehan, E. (1985). "Policy: Constructing a Definition," *Policy Sciences* 18(1): 291-311.

Melander, G. (1990). "Refugee Policy Options—Protection or Assistance," in Rystad, G. (ed.) *The Uprooted: Forced Migration as an International Problem in the Post-War Era,* Lund: Lund University Press: 137-157.

Nagel, S. (1990). "Introduction to Global Policy Studies," *International Political Science Review* 11 (3): 303-306.

Nagel, S. (ed.). (1991). *Global Policy Studies- International Interaction toward Improving Public Policy.* London: MacMillan in association with Policy Studies Organization.

Nanz, P. and Steffek, J. (2004). "Global Governance, Participation and the Public Sphere," *Government and Opposition* 39 (2): 314–35.

Newland, C. (2000). "The *Public Administration Review* and Ongoing Struggles for Connectedness," *Public Administration Review* 60(1): 20-38.

Noll, G. (2003). "Visions of the Exceptional Legal and Theoretical Issues Raised by Transit Processing Centres and Protection Zones," *European Journal of Migration and Law* 5: 303–341.

Raab, J. and Milward, H.B. (2003). "Dark Networks as Problems," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 13 (4): 413–39.

Ramia, G. (2003). "Global Social Policy, INGOs and Strategic Management: An Emerging Research Agenda," *Global Social Policy* 3(1): 79-101.

Reinicke, W. (1998). *Global Public Policy- Governing without Government?* Washington: Brookings Institution Press.

Reinicke, W. and Deng, F. with Witte, J.M., Benner, T., Whitaker, B. and Gershman, J. (2000). *Critical Choices-The United Nations, networks, and the future of global governance.* UN Vision Project on Global Public Policy Networks: IDRC publications.

Risse, T., Ropp, S. and Sikkink, K. (1999). *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Roberts, A. (1998) "More Refugees, less Asylum: A Regime in Transformation," *Journal of Refugee Studies* 11(4): 375, 390-391.

Rochester, M. J. (1990). "Global Policy and the Future of the United Nations," *Journal of Peace Research* 27(2): 141-154.

Ronit, K. and Schneider, V. (2000). "Private Organizations and their Contribution to Problem-Solving in the Global Arena," in *Private Organisations in Global Politics*, (eds.) K. Ronit and V. Schneider. London: Routledge, 1–33.

Rosenau, J. M. (2000). "Change, Complexity, and Governance in Globalizing Space," in J. Pierre (ed.) *Debating Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 167-200.

Shore, C. and Wright, S. (eds.) (1997). *Anthropology of Policy: Critical Perspectives on Governance and Power*. London: Routledge.

Skogstad, Grace (ed.). (2011). *Policy Paradigms, Transnationalism, and Domestic Politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Skran, C. (1995). *Refugees and Inter-war Europe: The Emergence of a Regime.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Slaughter, A.M. (2004). *A New World Order*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Soroos, M. (1986). *Beyond Sovereignty: The Challenge of Global Sovereignty*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Soroos, M. (1990). "Global Policy Studies and Peace Research," *Journal of Peace Research* 27(2): 117-125.

Stepputat, F. (2004). "Refugees in 'Regions of Origin: Towards a Common EU Policy?" *Danish Institute for International Studies,* Danish Foreign Policy Yearbook, Ch1, 121-143.

Stone, D. (2005). "Global Knowledge Networks and International Development: Bridges across Boundaries," in *Global Knowledge Networks and International Development: Bridges across Boundaries*, (eds.) D. Stone and S. Maxwell. London: Routledge, 89–105.

Stone, D. (2008). "Global Public Policy, Transnational Policy Communities, and their Networks," *Policy Studies Journal* 36 (1).

Stubbs, P. (2003). "International Non-State Actors and Social Development Policy," *Global Social Policy* 3(3): 319-348.

Suhrke, A. (1998). "Burden-Sharing During Refugee Emergencies: The Logic of Collective Action versus National Action," *Journal of Refugee Studies* 11 (4): 396-415.

Suhrke, A. and Newman, K. (2001). "UNHCR: Uphill and Into the Future," *International Migration Review* Special Issue: UNHCR at 50: Past, Present and Future of Refugee Assistance 35(1): 284-302.

Thakur, R., Cooper, A., and English, J. (2005). *International Commissions and the Power of Ideas*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

Thakur, R. and Weiss, T. (2009). "United Nations 'Policy': An Argument with Three Illustrations," *International Studies Perspectives* 10(1).

Thielemann, E. (2003). "Between Interests and Norms: Burden Sharing in the European Union," *Journal of Refugee Studies* 16(3) 253-73.

Toft, M. (2007). "The Myth of the Borderless World-Refugees and Repatriation Policy," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 24: 139–157.

True, J. (2003). "Mainstreaming Gender in Global Public Policy," *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 5 (3): 368–96.

True, J. and Mintrom, M. (2001). "Transnational Networks and Policy Diffusion: The Case of Gender Mainstreaming," *International Studies Quarterly* 45: 27-57.

Turton, D. (1996). "Migrants and Refugees: A Mursi Case Study," in T. Allen (ed). *In Search of Cool Water: War, Flight and Homecoming in Northeast Africa*. James Currey/Africa World Press: Trenton.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2009). *Global Trends: Refugees, Asylum-seekers, Returnees, Internally Displaced and Stateless Persons*, 15 June 2010, p. 12. Available at: http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4caee6552.html [accessed 7 March 2011].

Weiner, M. (1998). "The Clash of Norms: Dilemmas in Refugee Policies," *Journal of Refugee Studies* 11(4): 433-453.

Weiss, T. (1982). "International Bureaucracy: The Myth and Reality of International Civil Service." *International Affairs* 58 (2): 287–306.

Whitaker, B.E. (2008) "Funding the International Refugee Regime: Implications for Protection," *Global Governance* 14 (2): 241-58.

World Bank, Operations Evaluation Department. (2004). *Addressing the Challenges of Globalization: An Independent Evaluation of the World Bank's Approach to Global Programs*. Washington, DC: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Zolberg A. R., Suhrke, A. and Aguayo, S. (1989). *Escaping from Violence: Conflict and the Refugee Crisis in the Developing World.* Oxford: Oxford UP.