

Domestic Institutions Beyond the Nation State: Charting the New Interdependence Approach

By

Henry Farrell and Abraham Newman

Tim Büthe and Walter Mattli. *The New Global Rulers: The Privatization of Regulation in the World Economy*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011, 301pp.

Elliot Posner. *The Origins of Europe's New Stock Markets*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2009, 240pp.

Kal Raustiala. *Does the Constitution Follow the Flag? The Evolution of Territoriality in American Law*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009, 313pp.

Abstract:

What is the relationship between domestic and international politics in a world of economic interdependence? This essay discusses and organizes an emerging body of scholarship, which we label the *new interdependence approach*, addressing how transnational interactions shape domestic institutions and global politics in a world of economic interdependence. This literature makes three important contributions. First, it examines how domestic institutions affect the ability of political actors to construct the rules and norms governing interdependent relations and thus offer a source of asymmetric power. Second, it explores how interdependence alters domestic political institutions through processes of diffusion, transgovernmental coordination and extraterritorial application and in turn changes the national institutions mediating internal debates on globalization. Third, it studies the shifting boundaries of political contestation through which sub-state actors affect decision-making in foreign jurisdictions. Given the importance of institutional change to the new interdependence agenda, we suggest several instances where historical institutionalist tools might be exploited to address these transnational dynamics, in particular mechanisms of cross-national sequencing and sub-state actor change strategies. As globalization continues, it will be ever more difficult to examine national trajectories of institutional change in isolation from each other. Equally, it will be difficult to understand international institutions without paying attention to the ways in which they both transform *and* are transformed by domestic institutional politics. While not yet cohering as a single voice, we believe the new interdependence approach offers an innovative agenda that holds tremendous promise for both comparative and International Relations research.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank the editors at *World Politics* as well as three anonymous reviewers for their very useful feedback. Additionally, we received important feedback from David Bach, Fabrizio Gilardi, Llewelyn Hughes, Dan Nexon, Kate McNamara, Tonya Putnam, Alasdair Young, and Nicholas Ziegler.

Introduction

What is the relationship between domestic and international politics in a world of economic interdependence? This question was first systematically explored by scholars after the 1970s oil crisis, and has gained importance with the rapid expansion of globalization in markets for money, goods, and information in the last two decades.¹ Despite repeated efforts to bridge the divide between the domestic and international, scholars tend to isolate political dynamics at one or the other level of analysis. Institutionalists in comparative politics typically view interdependence as an undifferentiated shock that reverberates through domestic institutional configurations.² National responses to globalization such as tax policy or welfare reform vary, depending e.g. on veto points or historical legacies of labor/capital relations.³ Open Economy Politics scholars work in the other direction, using domestic politics to explain state preferences vis-a-vis openness. Interest groups are differently affected by global exchange and seek to use domestic institutions to either defend or retard interdependence.⁴ Both treat the distribution of interests and institutions as largely exogenous.

Comparativists' commitment to "methodological nationalism"⁵ and OEP scholars' core assumption of "unit independence" seem strikingly at odds with

¹ (Keohane and Nye 1977; Keohane and Milner 1996; Caporaso 1997)

² This literature traces back to (Gourevitch 1978) who discussed a far broader set of relationships than the narrow definitions of interdependence and globalization that dominate the current literature.

³ (Hall and Soskice 2001; Swank 2006; Martin and Swank 2004)

⁴ (Lake 2009; E. D. Mansfield, Milner, and Pevehouse 2007; Milner 1997; Frieden 1991; Rogowski 1989)

⁵ (Callaghan 2010).

empirical reality.⁶ Recent work demonstrates that decisions made in one jurisdiction are tied to decisions taken in others,⁷ and that actual jurisdictional boundaries are no longer confined to the nation state.⁸ Policy interdependence – the interpenetration of national polities and markets, so that decisions made in one polity or market have consequences in another – is ubiquitous in international and comparative politics.⁹ When domestic regulators change their rules, their decisions can shape market governance in other countries, challenging their institutional bargains, and sometimes even undermining them. Those other countries may seek in turn to respond, very often through measures that also have external reverberations. In many instances, then, global and domestic politics are inseparable.

This essay discusses and organizes an emerging body of scholarship addressing how transnational interactions shape domestic institutions and global politics in a world of economic interdependence. This literature does not yet cohere into a unified research program, but there are at least three clear commonalities between its authors. First, they examine how domestic institutions affect the ability of political actors to construct the rules and norms governing interdependent relations and thus offer a source of asymmetric power. Second, they explore how interdependence alters domestic political institutions through processes of diffusion, transgovernmental coordination and extraterritorial application and in turn change the national institutions mediating internal debates on globalization. Third, they

⁶ (Callaghan 2010; Oatley 2011)

⁷ (Simmons, Dobbin, and Garrett 2006; Simmons and Elkins 2004)

⁸ (Putnam 2009; Kaczmarek and Newman 2011; Newman and Posner 2011)

⁹ (Fabrizio Gilardi 2012a)

study the shifting boundaries of political contestation through which sub-state actors affect decision-making in foreign jurisdictions. Hence, they challenge prevailing notions that interdependence, domestic institutions, or interest group distributions are static or exogenous.

Like historical institutionalists in comparative political economy, these scholars emphasize the importance of sequencing and temporality to institutional change.¹⁰ At the same time, they explicitly incorporate international and cross-national pressures into their argument,¹¹ transforming compartmentalized examinations of causal mechanisms such as regulatory capacity or sequencing in individual jurisdictions into relational concepts interacting across them. To borrow a phrase from Orfeo Fioretos (2011, p.10), they move from “conceptualizing national economies as closed systems of governance to treating them as open systems of governance.” They ask how interdependence transforms the distribution of domestic interests and the institutions of the system’s units. In important ways, they hark back to the early work on interdependence of the 1970s,¹² which treated interdependence not only as a source of frictions between states, but also as an opportunity structure for those actors well situated to make use of it. Their attention to the particular mechanisms of institutional change allows them to reconstruct the sometimes murky generalizations of this earlier literature into specific and detailed analytic arguments.

¹⁰ (Büthe 2002; Pierson 2004)

¹¹ (Risse-Kappan 1995; Nexon 2009; Cerny 2010)

¹² (Keohane and Nye 1977; Nye and Keohane 1971)

This understanding of institutional change, which we call the *new interdependence approach*, is still in its early stages of development. Even so, it not only provides a corrective to the existing literature, but offers its own research questions: Which jurisdictions determine the terms of interdependence? What are the coalitional possibilities in an interdependent world and whom do they advantage? What role do international organizations play in mediating cross-national relationships?

The essay examines three books and an associated literature that try to answer these and related questions, setting out an important alternative agenda for both comparative and international political economy. As globalization continues, it will be ever more difficult to examine national trajectories of institutional change in isolation from each other. Equally, it will be difficult to understand international institutions (which ever more frequently are not formal treaties, but instead, executive agreements, memorandums of understanding between regulators and the like) without paying attention to the ways in which they both transform *and* are transformed by domestic institutional politics. Given the importance of institutional change to the new interdependence agenda, we suggest several instances where historical institutionalist tools might be exploited to address these transnational dynamics, in particular mechanisms of cross-national sequencing and sub-state actor change strategies.¹³

This emerging literature has significant lacunae. It is piecemeal and haphazard in its attentions, in part because it is emerging across two sub-fields (as

¹³ While we believe that this is one fruitful research agenda (Fioretos 2011; Farrell and Newman 2010), it is surely not the only one.

well as disciplines such as economic sociology and international law). It overwhelmingly focuses on Western Europe, or the EU-US relationship, giving relatively short shrift to the global south. We return to these limitations in the conclusion. Nevertheless, we contend that it opens the way for a long overdue discussion of the interaction between domestic and international institutions in a world of economic interdependence.

Interdependence and Power Relations Between National Institutional Systems

Interdependence leads to clashes between different domestic rule systems, as laws and regulations that might initially have been intended to play a purely domestic role become embroiled in international politics. It is increasingly difficult for domestic lawmakers or regulators to take actions that will not have consequences outside their home jurisdiction, or to avoid thinking about the consequences of regulatory actions taken elsewhere.¹⁴

These developments have been compounded, not alleviated, by neo-liberalism, which has changed a world in which states directly managed many sectors of economic activity into one where states seek to influence markets at a remove, through laws and arms-length regulatory structures.¹⁵ The turn to regulation rather than ownership as the key means of market control leads to more conflict, as regulators' grasp becomes more disconnected from their formal

¹⁴ (Young 2003; Damro 2006; Singer 2007; Putnam 2009; Newman 2008a; Farrell 2003; Pollack and Shaffer 2009)

¹⁵ (F. Gilardi 2005; Jordana and Levi-Faur 2004)

jurisdiction.¹⁶ Sub-state actors (both public and private) often drive international negotiations over the rules that govern international markets, especially as the old arguments over tariff barriers give way to new arguments about different regulatory approaches.

Some of these actors are better able to impose or protect their regulatory or legal preferences. The new interdependence approach emphasizes the relationship between interdependence and power, focusing on how different domestic institutional configurations affect the content and quality of global rules.¹⁷ Specifically, it builds on the insights of earlier work by Keohane and Nye while allowing for variation in power dynamics across sectors and time.¹⁸

Kal Raustiala's study of territoriality and law provides a US-centric view of how power intersects with both domestic legal interpretation and regulation. It is a detailed account of institutional change over time, showing how American laws and the ways in which they are interpreted have changed since 1789, in response both to the changing position of the US in the world, and changing domestic priorities.

The post-war period of unchallenged US hegemony was associated with a decline in formalized interventions into the territory of other states and a consequent increase in the willingness of US courts to apply US laws and regulations

¹⁶ The key disagreements among these scholars revolves around whether international networks of policy actors seek to resolve common problems (Slaughter 2004) or instead reflect the interests of powerful actors (e.g. Verdier 2009). This disagreement resembles earlier disputes between liberal institutionalists and power-based theorists described by Krasner (1991).

¹⁷ For an early example, see (Burley 1993).

¹⁸ Here, it shares much common ground with power-based approaches to international regulation (Krasner 1991; Drezner 2007) but tends to emphasize relations between sub-state actors rather than states.

to overseas activities. Actors whose assets were exposed to the US, and whose activities potentially contradicted US law, even if they took place elsewhere, could be hauled into US courts. The US's ability to do this rested on the interaction between economic might and domestic institutions. As Raustiala (2010: 95) concludes, "[b]ecause its economic power was so great...foreign firms found the American market irresistible. But entry into the American market created legal vulnerability, because it was the presence of assets within the reach of federal courts that generally gave the new extraterritoriality its practical bite." This sweeping claim of extraterritorial power was originally a defensive rather than an offensive strategy, reflecting the fear that US rules could be undermined by activities outside its territory.¹⁹ This concern was especially sharp in competition policy, where the US was an outlier, leading US courts to move towards an 'effects' based doctrine of jurisdiction, in which they considered how extraterritorial actions affected US markets in deciding whether to act. This was swiftly extended to other areas, such as intellectual property and labor.

The frictions associated with globalization reflected not only market interpenetration but the rise of the regulatory state. As states developed their own regulations, discord became more likely, especially because so much trade occurred within industries (hence spurring competition between firms with equivalent products in different countries) rather than between them. This meant that it was hard for one country to protect its own domestic regulations (and its own firms) without disadvantaging foreign competitors.

¹⁹ (Putnam 2009) argues that this is still the case.

In such a world, it is unsurprising that power relations dominated. While foreign governments, courts and economic actors were dismayed by US actions, they had little effective recourse. US regulators endowed with the regulatory capacity to mobilize market access could leverage the threat of legal sanctions to ensure compliance.

Raustiala's arguments fit well with a recent literature on extraterritorial influence. It elucidates the institutional underpinnings of Katzenstein's arguments about US law and "soft power"²⁰ and Simmons' (2001) argument for the "hegemonic" status of US financial rules – the effects doctrine extends the reach of US regulators.²¹ For example, extraterritorial jurisdiction has helped the US Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) induce other states to legislate against insider trading.²² Similarly, Kaczmarek and Newman find that when a foreign firm is prosecuted under US anti-bribery provisions, the likelihood that its home jurisdiction will enforce anti-bribery rules increases twentyfold.²³

As power relations have changed, so too has the logic of extraterritorial regulation. Raustiala notes that Europe began to use extraterritorial regulation against the US "as [it] grew more powerful economically." However, the growth of European economic power has involved more than standard market size effects.²⁴ As Putnam concludes, the sources of extraterritorial power, are "grounded solidly in

²⁰ (Brake and Katzenstein 2010)

²¹ (Simmons 2001)

²² (Bach and Newman 2010).

²³ (Kaczmarek and Newman 2011)

²⁴ (Drezner 2007).

domestic-level rules and processes.”²⁵ Here the new interdependence literature moves beyond simple definitions of power rooted in market size and underscores the critical role of different *domestic institutional arrangements* to produce regulatory capacity – the ability to define, monitor, and defend a set of market rules.²⁶

By studying institutions, new interdependence scholars can better explain sectoral and temporal variation in bargaining power as these domestic institutions develop unevenly across jurisdictions and time. Elliot Posner argues that EU-US disputes have moved from a hegemonic model in which the US imposed extraterritorial demands and the EU protested, towards a regime of mutual accommodation.²⁷ This was not because the EU market grew (it shrank), but because institutional changes centralized financial market decision-making. Similarly, Tim Büthe and Walter Mattli’s *The New Global Rulers* argues that institutional difference explains variation in the influence of US and European firms in shaping global private standards. The US has a single private sector body setting standards in accountancy, while Europe has a highly fragmented authority structure. This has allowed the US to dominate international discussions over accounting standards. In contrast, the US has fragmented domestic standard setting processes for physical products, with strong competition between a variety of private sector entities. Europe has an organized hierarchical system, which represents the

²⁵ (Putnam 2009: 463)

²⁶ (Bach and Newman 2007; Newman 2008; Vogel 2012; Damro 2012)

²⁷ (Posner 2009).

interests of European firms far better than their US counterparts.²⁸ New interdependence arguments focusing on such institutional variation resolve key puzzles in political economy as to the shifting influence of major powers despite stability in relative economic size. Critically, they explicitly incorporate relational arguments about institutional differences across jurisdictions and how these differences interact at the global level to produce asymmetric power.²⁹

While this approach nicely captures cross-sectoral variation, it is less well suited to explaining variation over time. Büthe and Mattli specifically identify themselves as historical institutionalists, but emphasize the rigidity of national institutions, even when they are poorly suited for their purpose (Büthe and Mattli: 57). Their account implies that national level actors are trapped in a strong version of path dependence, where it is difficult to extricate oneself from unsuitable national institutions. This fails to explain the kind of change that Raustiala and Posner observe, from a system in which the US predominated in extraterritorially setting the rules for how others should regulate to one in which it had to share effective authority with the EU. New interdependence scholars make a major contribution by identifying domestic institutions as a source of power but face additional challenges in identifying the sources of and pathways to institutional change.

Interdependence and Institutional Change

²⁸ For a complementary argument in finance see (Singer 2007; Bach and Newman 2007)

²⁹ (Bach and Newman 2010a).

New interdependence research has much in common with the transnationalism literature of the 1970s. Scholars such as Joseph Nye and Robert Keohane argued that world politics involved “situations characterized by reciprocal effects among countries or among actors in different countries”.³⁰ More than just describing new global challenges and actors, this was a structural argument about how the character of the international system altered the participating units and in turn the nature of international politics.

These arguments were hard to turn into empirically testable hypotheses, and confronted the challenge of structural realism, which sharply distinguished between the anarchical international system, composed of states, and the non-anarchical politics to be found within national political systems. A revived liberal institutionalism rebuilt itself on foundations that were explicitly borrowed from structural realism.³¹ In a world of anarchy, international institutions could still play an important role, through providing unitary states with information and monitoring capacities.

Over time, liberals began to emphasize how interdependence could affect preferences rather than alter the structure of the system or the units themselves.³² Thinking about interdependence primarily as shaping the ‘primitive’ preferences of actors (e.g. according to some basic logic such as Stolper-Samuelson or Ricardo-Viner), rather than involving cross-national causal relationships had obvious analytic benefits. It allowed liberals to construct a ‘bottom up’ or ‘open economy

³⁰ (Keohane and Nye 2001: 7).

³¹ (Keohane 1984)

³² (Frieden 1999; Moravcsik 1997)

politics' account of international politics, in which discrete national policy processes led (through interest aggregation and institutional filtering) to the formation of national level preferences, which then confronted each other in a more or less anarchic environment.³³ However, this ignored how reciprocal relationships *between* states could reshape domestic authority structures.³⁴ It also placed a very risky theoretical bet – that a complex international system could be broken up into discrete national subsystems without any significant loss of explanatory power.³⁵ Put differently, the open economy politics approach treats interdependence as a black box, which generated problems that unitary states then solved through traditional forms of negotiation. This blinds the approach to a plethora of important causal relationships.

The new interdependence literature starts to remedy this by focusing on the relationship between interdependence and *processes of institutional change*.³⁶ This, of course, reflects the more general move within political science and other sciences to the study of institutions, which it treats as social rules recognized by the relevant actors, whether they be treaties, regulatory agreements or even, in principle, informal norms.³⁷ Even so, it adds to these debates, especially in international relations, which has emphasized institutional design and institutional consequences rather than processes of institutional change.³⁸

³³ (Moravcsik 1997; Milner 1997; Lake 2009)

³⁴ (Krasner 2011).

³⁵ (Oatley 2011; Drezner and McNamara 2013)

³⁶ See (Djelic and Quack 2010; Shaffer 2012).

³⁷ (North 1990; Knight 1992).

³⁸ See (Koremenos, Lipson, and Snidal 2001; Abbott and Snidal 1988)

Initially, this strain of the literature had much in common with existing work on two level games, which similarly focuses on how the nexus between domestic and international politics empowers certain actors.³⁹ It has distinguished itself from this work in two successive stages. First, scholars of the new interdependence have moved away from the two level games literature's concern with *policy outcomes* to focus on *institutional change*. As work on two level games became formalized, it drew a sharp distinction between institutions (which were fixed and exogenous, and shaped actors' veto power), and the policy equilibria that different institutions generated.⁴⁰ The first generation of work in the new interdependence has instead concerned itself directly with institutional change, examining how domestic arrangements shape the power of sub-state actors to alter international arrangements, or alternatively how international arrangements shaped their power to change domestic institutions.⁴¹ Recent work has made a more complete break, seeing institutional change as an iterated sequence of domestic institutional moves across national borders, rather than the triumph of the domestic over the international or vice-versa. Interdependence has redefined basic structures of the state – judicial norms, regulatory oversight, the organization of the executive⁴² -- and these changes matter not only for domestic political outcomes but for global politics going forward as well.

³⁹ (Evans, Jacobson, and Putnam 1993; R. Putnam 1988)

⁴⁰ (Milner 1997; E. Mansfield, Milner, and Pevenhouse 2002)

⁴¹ Hence, it has more in common with rational choice theories focusing on equilibrium institutions than those interested in institutional equilibria. See in particular (Knight 1992).

⁴² (Shaffer 2012; Jodana, Levi-Faur, and Marin 2011).

Büthe and Mattli examine how transnational private standards organizations change the role and effectiveness of domestic standard-setters. Globalization has changed a world in which national standards organizations dominated, to one in which international organizations set the agenda; their standards “often determine market access, due to demands from purchasers or due to government regulations.” (30) WTO rules require countries to incorporate international standards, or risk being found to have created “unnecessary obstacle[s]” to trade.⁴³ Hence, domestic standard-setters, whether public, private, or hybrid, have good reason to influence international standards, which might otherwise disadvantage domestic firms.

As already noted, Büthe and Mattli argue that the domestic institutions governing national standard setters – the ‘systems’ through which they aggregate information and formulate negotiating positions – will shape their ability to influence international rules. Hence, standard-setters’ ability to prosper in a globalized world largely depends on how they organized themselves before the globalization of the 1990s took off. Market-based forms of standard setting, in which different standard-setters compete vigorously with each other, may have had advantages previous to globalization. However, after globalization, market-based forms on the national level will fit poorly with institutionalized standard-setting at the international level.⁴⁴ The content of international norms and principles in a sector are thus significantly shaped by the configuration of the domestic institutional setting.

⁴³ (Mattli and Büthe 2003)

⁴⁴ See the debate between (Fioretos 2010) and (Woll forthcoming) over the two-fold relationship between interest group preferences and inter-state strategies.

Elliot Posner's book on the origins of Europe's new stock markets focuses on the reverse causal relationship – how international interactions help explain when actors will be able to change sticky domestic institutions.⁴⁵ The book asks why Europe's stock markets underwent an extraordinary transformation, despite vigorous resistance from well-entrenched local incumbents. National financial systems are notoriously difficult to reform – they are likely to be protected by a wide variety of powerful domestic interests. Even so, the late 1990s and early 2000s saw the creation of major new stock markets in Germany, France and the UK. Posner argues that standard explanations – market pressures from mobile capital, the diffusion of ideas, and state-to-state negotiations fail to explain the timing and the nature of these changes. Posner highlights the concerted efforts of the European Commission, the executive body of the European Union, to foster these new markets through a combination of rule-making, coalition-building and argumentative pressure.

Posner documents the process of building European stock markets as one of slow accretion. Early efforts by Commission officials to promote venture capital often “faced fierce opposition from national financial communities” and their governments (p.45). Officials surmounted this by organizing venture capitalists who wanted to open the existing system up, encouraging them to make common cause, and funding the creation of a new association, the European Venture Capital

⁴⁵ (Thatcher) 2009: 4 argues that EU and US security regulation regimes reshaped national processes of institutional change by “becoming part of national policy-making processes, altering the strategies and coalitions of domestic actors, offering legitimation for reform and providing reformers with reasons and resources to overcome domestic opposition.”

Association, to lobby for change. Commission officials “could not appear to be initiators,” (50) but worked assiduously behind the scenes to build interest groups that were congenial to their own interests.

The Commission and its allies built support over a period of years for a pan-European stock market, Easdaq. Increased interdependence between European national markets, and the ability of the European Commission to forge international markets made Easdaq a credible threat, which opened previously obdurate national markets. When it became clear that Easdaq was a live prospect, national authorities and incumbents stopped opposing reform, and quickly started trying to embrace and redirect it instead. The result was the creation of a set of national level “exit” markets for venture capitalists, which marked a radical shift away from previous forms of market organization. Only one of these new markets survived the bear markets of the early 2000s – but the fact that they came into existence and that new ones continue to be created mark an important shift in the organization of Europe’s national political economies. Cao’s (2012) study generalizes this line of argument, offering quantitative evidence of the link between international organization participation and domestic institutional change.⁴⁶

Neither argument breaks completely with traditional approaches to international political economy. While they explain institutional change in one realm, they hold it constant in the other. However, the newest work on cross-national sequencing presents a more radical challenge to existing approaches. Sequencing arguments, which are common in the historical institutionalist literature

⁴⁶ (Cao 2012). See also (Shaffer 2012).

in comparative politics, stress the temporality of institutional dynamics, in which the kind of domestic institutional development that is possible at time $t+1$ depends on the kinds of domestic institutions that predominated at time t .⁴⁷ For new interdependence scholars, these iterated process of sequencing can take place *between different national jurisdictions* rather than solely within a single country.⁴⁸ Sequencing here is a causal dynamic in which particular institutional change in one country can produce endogenous effects in another, spurring reactions that lead to further institutional change in that country, and so on.

Posner's newer (2010) work on transatlantic finance demonstrates the importance of cross-national sequencing in a world of economic interdependence. For much of the 1980s and 1990s, the SEC acted as global policy hegemon. European policy-makers were generally rule-takers as they lacked the regulatory authority to challenge SEC decisions. During the 1990s, the institutional landscape changed dramatically owing to transgovernmental initiatives about regulatory oversight as well as regional decisions taken in Europe. The US regulatory model diffused through Europe as national economies adopted independent arms-length regulatory institutions. At the same time, European legislation including the Financial Services Action Plan offered these newly created SEC-like institutions the regulatory capacity to control market access. This created peer institutions in Europe that could engage their US counterparts as rough equals. Posner demonstrates that in those sectors where the EU forged a coherent regulatory apparatus, they were able to alter global regulatory dynamics and force concessions

⁴⁷ (Pierson 2004; Falletti 2005)

⁴⁸ (Farrell and Newman 2010; Woll Forthcoming).

from US authorities. However, this did not mean that EU regulators systematically won, and US regulators lost, reversing the previous power relationship. Instead, it led to an ongoing process of accommodation and iterated institutional change between the two regimes.

Under this account, power and first mover advantage are still important. However, they are bound up in ongoing processes of institutional change, rather than being the product of a single 'frozen moment.'⁴⁹ That the SEC was able to regulate long before the EU centralized its own authority, meant it could shape global principles and European regulatory. Yet as the EU developed its own financial authority, these principles developed in directions that did not represent the static preferences of either the EU or US. Rather than a snapshot outcome, as domestic institutions in each country changed in sequence, the two systems' paths of regulation became imbricated with each other.

By analyzing cross-national sequencing, new interdependence scholars can contribute in ways that are quite distinct from other approaches. These sequencing dynamics can be observed in sectors ranging from information technology to pharmaceuticals.⁵⁰ Institutional configurations in one jurisdiction offer that jurisdiction advantages in global rule-making but also motivate institutional reforms in other jurisdictions, so that sequences of response and counter-response cause ripple of change across the domestic institutions of different states. Work on cross-national sequencing, then, helps understand the causal logic underlying

⁴⁹(Lall 2012).

⁵⁰ (Newman 2008; Bach and Newman 2010b; Casini 2012).

institutional diffusion, highlighting specific pathways through which transnational interactions transform domestic institutions and in turn global politics.⁵¹

Interdependence and Shifting Boundaries of Political Contestation

The previous two sections argue that the new interdependence literature has useful things to say both about power and about the causal mechanisms underlying institutional change in a globalized world. We bring these two strands together, arguing that they point towards a different understanding of institutional politics than either standard comparativist or standard international relations accounts. Unlike comparativist historical institutionalism,⁵² it emphasizes the consequences of cross-national interactions and the actions of specific international organization for institutional change.⁵³ Unlike power-oriented international relations institutionalists, such as Stephen Krasner and Daniel Drezner, it focuses on collective actors beneath the level of the state. Its key questions involve the implications of *cross-national and international relationships* for the relative power and influence of *sub-state actors*. Extending the original interdependence literature's concern with 'intersocietal interactions', this new work suggests that interdependence changes opportunity structures, allowing some sub-state actors (but not others) to work across jurisdictions to reach their goals, hence increasing their power to shape or retard processes of institutional change. Interdependence,

⁵¹ See also (Hughes 2013).

⁵² (Mahoney and Thelen 2009; Thelen 2004; Pierson 2004) and (D. Carpenter 2001; Skowronek 1982; Orren 1995; Sheingate 2003)

⁵³ (Thatcher 2009).

then, changes the access of actors to global politics, which can in turn affect broader institutional dynamics.⁵⁴

In a recent agenda-setting article, Stephen Krasner rightly complains that both international relations scholars and comparativists are blind to how external actors try to shape the domestic institutions of other states.⁵⁵ However, Krasner's proposed alternative focuses entirely on how strong states shape the institutions of weak ones, precluding by fiat the possibility of change within powerful states too.

The critical move of the new work on interdependence is to refocus attention on the interactions of sub-state actors.⁵⁶ As Cerny and Slaughter have argued, globalization creates political opportunity structures for collective actors such as domestic regulatory agencies, trade associations, or NGOs.⁵⁷ Information technology and falling transportation costs offer new channels of interaction for actors below the level of the state.

A key challenge for the new interdependence literature is identifying the causal mechanisms through which collective actors are differentially able to access and shape institutions across borders. Posner's account of the development of Europe's stock markets has hints of such an approach, but only around the edges. As Posner acknowledges, the European Commission was not the only key actor.

⁵⁴ (Djelic and Quack 2010).

⁵⁵ (Krasner 2011). Also (Gourevitch 1978). For a Marxist argument, in which the US state intervenes in alliance with business interests in other industrialized countries see (Panitch and Gindin 2012).

⁵⁶ Here, the new interdependence approach differs from Fareed Zakaria's neo-classical realism (Zakaria 1999), John Ikenberry's international liberalism (Ikenberry 2001) and Orfeo Fioretos' (Fioretos 2011b) new multilateralism, all of which draw valuable lessons from historical institutionalism but emphasize the role of states rather than sub-state actors.

⁵⁷ (Cerny 2010; Slaughter 2004)

Venture capital entrepreneurs carried out the “necessary and crucial on-the-ground activities” of actually making the markets (p.154), and would likely vigorously dispute Posner’s Commission-centric story. A more complete account would look not only at the Commission but also at the alliances that venture capitalists forged with each other across national borders.⁵⁸

If Posner’s book elaborates on how an international actor reshaped national rules by working through domestic actors, Büthe and Mattli’s book discusses how national level actors can reshape international rules, if they organize themselves in the right way. Both take interdependence seriously, yet neither fully delivers on its implications for interaction between different institutional systems. Raustiala’s book sketches the promise of an account that could successfully work across both of these levels, illustrating the broad international power dynamics that result from extraterritorial entrepreneurialism in a world of clashing regulatory states.

Bringing these theories together will require scholars to build new accounts of the institutional dynamics of international and cross-national regulation. The most promising avenue towards doing this is to build cross-national causal relationships into historical institutionalism.⁵⁹ We offer in the following one example of how historical institutionalist arguments⁶⁰ about the differential

⁵⁸ (Ziegler 2000).

⁵⁹ (Farrell and Newman 2010; Fioretos 2011a)

⁶⁰ (Mahoney and Thelen 2009; Thelen 2004; Thelen and Steinmo 1992). We do not propose our arguments as a *replacement* for comparativist historical institutionalism, but rather as an *extension* to these arguments which is especially likely to be useful in sectors and cases where policy interdependence plays an important role. It is not only possible, but likely, that actors will simultaneously pursue the kinds of domestically focused strategies that comparativists identify, and the cross-national strategies that we discuss here, across different arenas.

willingness of actors to change or to upset their domestic institutional status quo, can be transposed into a world where national systems are in conflict with each other, creating *opportunity spaces* that actors can use alternatively to reshape or defend domestic institutional bargains.⁶¹

We begin with a commonplace of the literature – that the increase in regulatory clashes between jurisdictions creates a demand for cross-national initiatives to ‘solve’ these clashes, whether through formal or informal means. This, more than any other factor, explains the exploding importance of international-standard setting bodies, of ‘problem-solving’ networks of government officials, of semi- and quasi-formal negotiations between national regulators and the like since the 1990s.⁶² These settings provide the forums in which possible solutions to problems of regulatory clash are threshed out.

Thus, one key factor determining whether status quo or change oriented collective actors influence global standards is their respective degree of access to transnational forums, where regulatory disputes are addressed either through hard agreements (rarely) or soft law or memorandums of understanding and the like (frequently).⁶³ Recommendations for legal reforms that are backed by the regulatory actors in the appropriate network, are more likely to succeed. Regulators who are in direct contact with each other will have far better information about what other jurisdictions are, or are not prepared to countenance than other

⁶¹ This builds on a more general point about interdependence and opportunity structures in the literature on transnationalism. (Risse-Kappan 1995; Keck and Sikkink 1998; Carpenter 2011). See also the neo-functionalist literature from European Integration (Haas 1967; Mattli and Stone Sweet 2012).

⁶² (Slaughter 2004; Pauwelyn, Wessel, and Wouters 2012; Mattli and Woods 2009)

⁶³ (Lall 2012; Dobusch and Quack 2012)

national-level actors and such networks will enjoy the legitimacy benefits accrued from their collective membership.⁶⁴ Most important, other actors seeking regulatory certainty including multinational business often support such harmonization efforts so as to end regulatory clash.

This has implications for power and opportunity. The sub-state collective actors involved in building these initiatives (because they have access to the relevant cross-national forums) will have new opportunities to reshape existing national bargains, both in their home jurisdictions and elsewhere, which would be unavailable in a world without interdependence. Hence, the 'solutions' favored by different actors will not be driven by functional imperatives of e.g. achieving efficient and mutually satisfactory outcomes, but instead by struggles between actors with varying objectives, and varying ability to prosecute those objectives cross-nationally.⁶⁵

While the interdependence literature suggests how clashing regulatory systems will both undermine existing domestic institutional arrangements and offer an opportunity structure for actors, historical institutionalism points to the strategies that national level collective actors, such as regulators, business organizations and unions will employ, given their orientation towards existing institutional bargains. Some regulatory actors will favor the domestic institutional *status quo*, and perhaps wish to strengthen and insulate it; others will want to overturn it. Some regulatory actors will have ready access to cross-national forums

⁶⁴ (Mattli and Buethe 2003; Gilardi 2002; Newman 2008b; Carpenter 2001)

⁶⁵ (Knight 1992; Krasner 1991; Peter Hall and Thelen 2009)

where they can work together with similarly minded actors in other jurisdictions. Others will have only very limited access, or no access at all.

Table 1: Transnational Strategies – Relative Cross-National Access Versus Orientation towards Existing Domestic Institutions

	Favors Existing Domestic Institutions	Wishes to Overturn Existing Domestic Institutions
Transnational Access High	Defend/Extend	Cross-National Layering
Transnational Access Low	Insulate	Challenge

We start from the basic assumption that domestic institutional bargains are liable to external disruption,⁶⁶ and that institutional politics is dominated by struggles between collective actors who favor the institutional status quo, and those who wish to overturn it.⁶⁷ These actors will have different degrees of relative access to the cross-national forums where negotiations and semi-formal discussions over regulatory clash take place. Where they have high relative access to and influence in the relevant forums – that is, they are better able to shape these cross-national

⁶⁶ (Berger 2000)

⁶⁷ (Hacker 2004; Mahoney and Thelen 2009)

solutions than their opponents – they will use their access to pursue their goals. Where, in contrast, they have little access in relative terms, they will pursue their interests at the national level.

This allows us to make some simple predictions about the strategies that actors will pursue in the context of policy interdependence. Collective actors who wish to undermine the domestic institutional status quo, and have relatively high levels of access to the relevant cross-national forums, can use these forums to create arrangements that may fundamentally alter domestic institutional structures. Such transnational agreements create a new layer of cross-national institutions, whether formal or informal, which overlay domestic institutions and seeks, over time, to subsume or replace them. This logic is clearly identifiable as a cross-national variant of the national-level mechanism of ‘layering’ discussed by Thelen and others.⁶⁸ Hence, we dub it ‘cross-national layering.’

This plausibly explains why Posner’s venture capitalists were so willing to work across national boundaries, in a forum created deliberately by the European Commission for this purpose, to try and create a cross-European venture capital market. They wished to overturn their domestic institutional *status quos* (which made more flexible capital markets impossible), and were willing to work together with actors with similar interests in other jurisdictions to help build a cross-European market that would modify, and likely gradually supplant or subvert these national regimes.

⁶⁸ (Thelen 2004; Shickler 2001)

This also helps explain actors' strategies in other policy arenas. Shaffer and his collaborators demonstrate how transnational legal projects have reshaped fundamental legal norms about due process, bankruptcy, and judicial independence across a range of jurisdictions.⁶⁹ Quack and Botzem show how coalitions of actors were able to use cross-national accounting standards as a tool to reshape domestic standards.⁷⁰ Farrell and Newman argue that actors within the EU who were unhappy with existing bargains over privacy and national security allied with external actors who had an interest in reshaping these rules to overturn them.⁷¹

Collective actors who have relatively high access to cross-national forums, but who prefer the domestic institutional *status quo*, will use these forums to defend and (where possible) extend, their domestic institutional arrangements. Where they can, these actors will seek to remake other jurisdictions in the image of their own systems, along the lines suggested by Drezner (2007). This will ensure that actors in their home jurisdiction do not have to bear adjustment costs (as they will be borne by actors in other jurisdictions instead). It will also prevent these external jurisdictions from threatening their own domestic arrangements in the future. Where this is not possible (for reasons that go beyond this simple framework, such as e.g. insufficient bargaining power), they will look instead to build hybrid arrangements with other jurisdictions, trying all the while to engineer these arrangements so that they might subtly remake the other jurisdictions closer to their own.

⁶⁹ (Shafer 2012)

⁷⁰ (Sebastian Botzem and Quack 2009; S. Botzem 2012)

⁷¹ (Farrell and Newman 2013).

This helps explain and extend the regulatory dynamics observed by Raustiala. Most certainly, the influence and zealotry of US courts help spread the influence of US regulators overseas. Equally, however, many of these regulators have become assiduously involved in a variety of international networks, forums and bilateral and multilateral arrangements of varying degrees of formality in order to press and extend US regulations through other means than court authority.

Such efforts help underpin, for example, the international influence of US regulators in areas such as antitrust, bank capital requirements, accountancy standards and corrupt practices, where regulators use their privileged position in international networks both to spread their domestic regulatory model and to defend it. For example, Eberle and Lauter show how accounting firms successfully blocked EU-US proposals to harmonize auditing rules across the Atlantic. Through joint action in the relevant cross-national forums, they were able to thwart the Commission, preserving national rules that advantaged them.⁷² Equally, such networks support the efforts of EU regulators to do the same in areas such as privacy, airline carbon emissions and product standards.⁷³

Actors who wish to preserve existing national institutional bargains, but who have relatively little access to the relevant cross-national forums, will be actively hostile to cross-national efforts to resolve jurisdictional clashes. Instead of using international forums to prosecute their aims, they will seek to *insulate* domestic institutions against outside pressures. They may do this through adapting domestic rules to promote resistance, through seeking to weaken the linkages between cross-

⁷² (Eberle and Lauter 2011).

⁷³ (Shaffer 2000; Newman 2008a; Mattli and Bueth 2003; Woll 2008)

national proposals and domestic processes of institutional change, through proposing their own initiatives (aimed at surreptitiously strengthening existing institutions) and the like. Labor unions in the European Union offer an important example. Faced with mounting neo-liberal pressure emanating from supranational agreements, labor has struggled at the national level to blunt transnational rule changes, albeit without much success.⁷⁴

Finally, collective actors who have low relative access to the relevant cross-national forums, but who wish to overturn existing domestic institutions, will challenge these institutions more or less as comparativist historical institutionalists expect them to. They will choose between domestically focused strategies of change, such as layering, drift and conversion, depending on their relative degree of access to domestic institutions.⁷⁵ While it is possible for actors in the other three cells to combine these domestic strategies with strategies that leverage (or seek to break) the relationship between domestic and cross-national politics, actors in this cell will have no recourse to cross-national politics. Hence, their strategies can be described using only the concepts developed in the comparativist literature.

This very simple account has some predictive value (although it brutally simplifies the relevant empirical relationships). More valuably, it points to ways in which the new interdependence approach might be logically expanded, exactly because it takes so many parameters for granted. By thinking systematically about which parameters to relax, while holding others constant, we can map out many of

⁷⁴ (Fetzer 2010)

⁷⁵ (Hacker 2004; Thelen 2004)

the important causal relations in the new interdependence, bringing greater coherence to an apparently disparate literature.

For example, the basic 2x2 table set out above treats the existence of international forums, in which problems of rule clash can be resolved, as a given. What varies in this simplified account is actors' relative degree of access to these forums. A more complex account would not take the existence of such forums as a given, and instead would open up a set of prior questions about the circumstances under which these forums do or do not come into being. For example, Posner's account of European stock markets highlights how actors within the European Commission built such a forum deliberately to encourage cross national alliances that would further their long term strategic objectives. However, actors who prefer not to see problems of rule clash resolved through negotiated means may have strong reasons to *retard* the creation of forums. Wolfgang Streeck and Philippe Schmitter document how European business groups deliberately attenuated Europe-level discussions between business and labor that might provide a political substitute for purportedly apolitical processes of market liberalization.⁷⁶ Eimer and Philips show how both European and US patent organizations have deliberately weakened transatlantic policy networks, preventing them from assuming any independent life so as to mitigate pressures towards convergence.⁷⁷ Understanding the circumstances under which key actors help or hinder forum construction is an important research agenda.

⁷⁶ (Streeck and Schmitter 1991)

⁷⁷ (Eimer and Philips 2011).

Second, the simple framework we set out assumes that actors with access to the relevant forums can build alliances with actors in other jurisdictions. As the politics of different national systems become more intertwined, we may expect that collective actors in one state will increasingly have strong incentives to work together with actors in others. This illustrates the commonalities between research in different regulatory areas. For example, Chad Damro (2006) finds that as overlap increased between EU and US markets, anti-trust regulators found it necessary to coordinate on competition policy. It also opens up new questions by showing how apparently discrete battles in different jurisdictions may be connected, how ‘challengers’ in some jurisdictions may draw support from well-established actors in others.

This too relies on implicit assumptions that may be fruitfully turned into targets of inquiry. Actors with access to the relevant cross-national forums may not be able to find allies.⁷⁸ Actors with similar-seeming agendas may in fact be at odds with each other, and explaining variation in cross-national alliances requires careful attention to actors’ interests, and how they interact.

For example, Helen Callaghan (2010, 2011) finds that the willingness of business organizations to form cross-border alliances in the European Union depends on whether they have incentives to constrain or to help their peers in other countries. She finds that there was little cross-border solidarity in disputes over laws on corporate takeovers. Businesses that wanted stronger domestic protections in their own countries so as to forestall hostile takeovers were happy with weaker

⁷⁸ See, for example, the discussion of symmetric heterogeneity of pluralism in neo-functional debates (Mattli and Stone Sweet 2012).

protections in other countries where they might want to mount hostile takeovers themselves. In contrast, businesses came together in opposition to measures intended to strengthen worker participation. Even businesses that were located in a jurisdiction with high worker protections wanted to preserve the threat of exit, so as to enhance their bargaining power vis-à-vis workers.

Moreover, it will be important to develop testable expectations regarding variation in access. Clearly, the new interdependence literature offers useful starting points for understanding variation such as regulatory capacity and sequencing. Those actors that have considerable regulatory capacity are well positioned to define a transnational agenda and have the resources to participate in them.⁷⁹ Timing will likely play an important role as well as the founding members of such forum often join long before the forum itself becomes decisive. In many cases, collective actors do not yet view their problems transnationally and thus do not mobilize in response to early cooperative efforts. Timing can then have powerful feedback effects, privileging those collective actors that are early to the transnational game.⁸⁰ Alternatively, Buthe and Mattli make a strong case for the institutional fit between domestic and international institutions. Those structures that can best channel communication between levels will allow for optimal representation.

A third set of questions concerns power and institutional change. Identifying the strategies that collective actors are likely to use under different circumstances is helpful, but identifying which actors are likely to win, and which to lose, would seem

⁷⁹ (Newman 2008).

⁸⁰ (Farrell and Newman 2010).

more helpful still. However, the current literature in historical institutionalism focuses on the mechanisms through which institutions are continually regenerated, or alternatively through which they may be undermined. As Posner (2010) shows, these theories are better capable of capturing the dynamics through which institutional changes in one regulatory system may lead to change in another, in an iterated sequence than at predicting equilibria (indeed, they suggest that equilibria, in the strong sense of the term, are vanishingly unlikely).

The limits to this approach are clear. If institutions are ‘processes’ or ‘trajectories,’⁸¹ and there is no ‘final’ outcome, then it will be impossible to identify winners and losers in any permanent sense. Each stage of institutional development is no more than the culmination of what came before it, and the springboard for what comes next. Accounts adopting this logic are likely to make messier and more provisional judgments about the relative power of actors than equilibrium arguments, since their power at any moment is in part a product of prior institutional developments, and may shift substantially over time.

Even so, they help us understand how power relations shape paths of institutional development. Drawing on case-studies from transnational rule-setting over accounting standards, and from the historical efforts of the US to introduce its approach to competition policy to Germany after World War II, Quack and Djelic (2007) argue that transnational relationships are becoming increasingly important in ‘generating’ national paths of institutional change.⁸² Their study of international accounting rules suggests that the mid-1980s – when national capital markets were

⁸¹ (Capoccia and Kelemen 2007)

⁸² (Djelic and Quack 2007; Zysman 1994)

beginning to become more intertwined with each other – was a critical juncture. Anglo-American regulatory actors and businesses dominated the relevant forums in this period, and pushed successfully for rules that favored their interests. However, actors from other jurisdictions (such as Germany) have started to contest these rules, sometimes with success.

Their finding suggests that the timing of influence is critical as actors present at the juncture have more influence on the trajectory of institutional development than those whose influence came later.⁸³ This may be reinforced by feedback loops between the shape and perceived interests of organized actors, and the institutional framework that they are working within.⁸⁴ This does not imply strong determinism. Environments change, meaning that institutions either have to adapt in order to deal with changing needs, or risk desuetude and abandonment.⁸⁵ Actors who remain hostile to a given institution may try to block change, leading to ‘drift.’⁸⁶ Over the longer term, institutions may more or less completely evolve away from their initial purpose.⁸⁷ Even so, over the short to medium term, we may expect that early decisions matter more than later ones, shaping both the long-term trajectory of institutional change, and the actors that work within this trajectory.

These three directions for possible expansion are hardly exhaustive. However, our aim is illustrative rather than comprehensive. We simply seek to demonstrate (a) that there are deep commonalities across a variety of apparently

⁸³(Pierson 2004). Although see (Mahoney and Thelen 2009) for an account of change that lays much less emphasis on such junctures.

⁸⁴ (Pierson 1993)

⁸⁵ (Hacker 2004)

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ (Thelen 2004)

disparate findings, (b) that there is substantially intellectual benefit to be garnered from bringing these findings together in a more systematic way and (c) historical institutional tools offer a set of valuable resources for developing the new interdependence approach further. By beginning a debate about how best to do this, we hope to spur the kind of serious discussion that the field very sorely needs.⁸⁸

Conclusions

Exploring the consequences of interdependence for institutional change provides an exciting agenda for political economy. It directly demonstrates the causal importance of interdependence for core problems of both international relations and comparative politics, through examining mechanisms that are systematically understudied in both.⁸⁹ This understanding recovers insights from the pioneering work of scholars such as Robert Keohane, Joseph Nye, Ernest Haas and Peter Gourevitch in the 1970s, and develops them along a different intellectual trajectory than the one that has predominated in the field.

To achieve its promise, the new interdependence literature needs to develop a much clearer sense of how its different parts relate to one another. Its 1970s predecessor presented structural arguments, but impressionistic ones. The modern approach needs a more systematic account of the consequences of transnational action and relationships in a world of increased interdependence. It has not done so to date, in large part because the literature is not especially self-conscious of itself *as*

⁸⁸ (Jackson and Deeg 2008).

⁸⁹ (Oatley 2011; Bartley 2011)

a literature. While authors working on these questions cite, and are influenced, by each other's work, they do not see themselves as working on a common problem or problems. Identifying these commonalities would both improve debate and integrate the approach better with the burgeoning body of work on policy diffusion.⁹⁰ The latter's remarkable methodological advances have noticeably outpaced its grasp of the specific mechanisms of transnational interaction. Greater dialogue between scholars of the new interdependence and scholars focused on diffusion would have substantial benefits for both.

This review essay is intended to clear the ground for this and other conversations. It does not simply map out the existing literature, but starts building a framework to bring it together. It shows how this literature provides us with a new understanding of both power and institutional change, and identifies how actors beneath the level of the state are variably empowered to pursue their interests in a world of interdependence. This in turn provides a starting point on which one can build a more general framework, that would allow scholars to explicitly identify the relationships between their various arguments, and how they may accumulate (without the ambition of creating some improbable nomothetic monolith).

There are important problems for the approach, which go beyond intellectual coherence. Most glaringly, scholars in the new interdependence have focused almost exclusively on the US and the EU.⁹¹ This focus is perhaps justifiable to the extent that the EU and US, both separately and together, are the major drivers of regulatory

⁹⁰ (Fabrizio Gilardi 2012b).

⁹¹ (Bach, Newman, and Weber 2006; Sell 2010; Bruz and McDermott 2012),).

politics in the world economy.⁹² But it means that we know very little about the mechanisms (other than more traditional power dynamics) that shape relations between the EU and US on the one hand and other countries, especially countries in the global South on the other. This approach has had even less to say about relations *among* countries in the South themselves, including interactions with emerging powers such as China, India and Brazil.

This lack of interest belies important cross-national dynamics in these relationships that call out for better understanding. Here, new interdependence scholarship can build bridges with an emerging literature on developing countries. Sell has shown how advanced industrialized countries have tried to advance their agenda on intellectual property through quiet processes of domestic institutional engineering aimed at fostering intellectual property offices and officials in developing world countries.⁹³ Following a cross-national sequencing dynamic, Helfer, Alter and Guerzovich demonstrate how some intellectual property offices have facilitated resistance to the demands of advanced industrialized democracies. They have worked together within the forum of the Andean Community, together with the Andean Tribunal of Justice to create an international legal alternative to the dominant Western regime.⁹⁴

Brooks and Kurtz (2012) employ a cross-national sequencing argument to explain capital account liberalization in Latin America. They argue that domestic institutional legacies shape capital account diffusion through building interest

⁹² (Drezner 2007). See also (Luetz 2011).

⁹³ (Sell 2010).

⁹⁴ (Helfer, Alter, and Guerzovich 2009) and (Roemer-Mahler 2012; Dobusch and Quack 2012).

groups and facilitating cross national learning, concluding that “we cannot understand the politics of capital account liberalization without a conjoint model of domestic and international political economy. The two are inextricably intertwined in ways that make efforts to independently assess their effects ill-specified at best, and misleading at worst.”⁹⁵

As the new interdependence literature emerges, it will not only have to confront problems of theoretical coherence. It will also have to extend its geographic interests, so as to better understand economic interactions outside Europe and the US, and how these intersect with the relationships among the advanced capitalist economies. This will require it to take account of different kinds of power relations than those observed between industrialized democracies, but also holds out the promise of an understanding of political economy that can far better grasp the relationship between power and interdependence. While the challenges are considerable, so too are the possible rewards.

⁹⁵ (Brooks and Kurtz 2012: 123) and Bruszt and McDermott 2012.

Bibliography

- Abbott, K., and D. Snidal. 1988. "Why States Act Through Formal International Organizations." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42: 3–32.
- . 2000. "Hard and Soft Law in International Governance." *International Organization* 54: 421–456.
- Bach, D., and A. Newman. 2007. "The European Regulatory State and Global Public Policy: Micro-Institutions and Macro-Influence." *Journal of European Public Policy* 16 (4): 827–46.
- . 2010a. "Governing Lipitor and Lipstick: Capacity, Sequencing, and Power in International Pharmaceutical and Cosmetics Regulation." *Review of International Political Economy* 17(4): 665-695.
- . 2010b. "Transgovernmental Networks and Domestic Policy Convergence: Evidence from Insider Trading Regulation." *International Organization* 64 (03): 505–528.
- Bach, David, A. Newman, and S. Weber. 2006. "The International Implications of China's Fledgling Regulatory State," *New Political Economy* 11(4): 499-518.
- Bartley, Tim. 2011. "Transnational Governance as the Layering of Rules: Intersections of Public and Private Standards." *Theoretical Inquiries in Law* 12 (2) (July 13): 517–542.
- Berger, S. 2000. "Globalization and Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 3: 43–62.
- Botzem, S. 2012. *The Politics of Accounting Regulation: Organizing Transnational Standard Setting in Financial Reporting*. S. Botzem. Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Botzem, Sebastian, and Sigrid Quack. 2009. "(No) Limits to Anglo-American Accounting? Reconstructing the History of the International Accounting Standards Committee: A Review Article." *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 34 (8) (November): 988–998.
- Brake, B. and Peter Katzenstein. 2010. "The Transnational Spread of American Law: Legalization as soft power," Manuscript.
- Brooks, Sarah M., and Marcus J. Kurtz. 2012. "Paths to Financial Policy Diffusion: Statist Legacies in Latin America's Globalization." *International Organization* 66 (01): 95–128.
- Bruszt, Laszlo, and Gerald A. McDermott. 2012. "Integrating Rule Takers: Transnational Integration Regimes Shaping Institutional Change in Emerging Market Democracies." *Review of International Political Economy*: 1–37.
- Burley, A.-M. 1993. "Regulating the World: Multilateralism, International Law, and the Projection of the New Deal Regulatory State." In *Multilateralism Matters*, ed. J. Ruggie. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Büthe, T. 2002. "Taking Temporality Seriously: Modeling History and the Use of Narratives as Evidence." *American Political Science Review* 96 (3): 481–493.
- Callaghan, Helen. 2010. "Beyond Methodological Nationalism: How Multilevel Governance Affects the Clash of Capitalisms." *Journal of European Public Policy* 17 (4): 564–580.
- Cao, Xun. 2012. "Global Networks and Domestic Policy Convergence: A Network Explanation of Policy Changes." *World Politics* 64 (03): 375–425.

- Capoccia, Giovanni, and R. Daniel Kelemen. 2007. "The Study of Critical Junctures: Theory, Narrative, and Counterfactuals in Historical Institutionalism." *World Politics* 59 (03): 341–369.
- Caporaso, J. 1997. "Across the Great Divide: Integrating Comparative and International Politics." *International Studies Quarterly* 41 (4): 563–92.
- Carpenter, D. 2001. *Forging of Bureaucratic Autonomy: Reputations, Networks, and Policy Innovation in Executive Agencies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Carpenter, R. Charli. 2011. "Vetting the Advocacy Agenda: Network Centrality and the Paradox of Weapons Norms." *International Organization* 65 (01): 69–102.
- Casini, Lorenzo. 2012. "Domestic Public Authorities within Global Networks: Institutional and Procedural Design, Accountability, and Review," in *Informal International Lawmaking*. eds Pauwelyn, J, R. Wessel, and J. Wouters. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cerny, Philip G. 2010. *Rethinking World Politics: A Theory of Transnational Neopluralism*. Oxford University Press.
- Damro, C. 2006. "Transatlantic Competition Policy: Domestic and International Sources of EU-US Cooperation." *European Journal of International Relations* 12 (2): 171–196.
- . 2012. "Market Power Europe," *Journal of European Public Policy* 19(5): 682-699.
- Djelic, Marie-Laure, and Sigrid Quack. 2007. "Overcoming Path Dependency: Path Generation in Open Systems." *Theory and Society* 36 (2): 161–186.
- . 2010. *Transnational Communities: Shaping Global Economic Governance*. Cambridge University Press.

- Dobusch, Leonhard, and Sigrid Quack. 2012. "Framing Standards, Mobilizing Users: Copyright Versus Fair Use in Transnational Regulation." *Review of International Political Economy*: 1–37.
- Drezner, D. 2007. *All Politics Is Global: Explaining International Regulatory Regimes*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Drezner, D. and K. McNamara. 2013. "International Political Economy, Global Financial Orders and the 2008 Financial Crisis." *Perspectives on Politics* 11(1): 155-66.
- Eberle, D. and Dorothee Lauter. 2011. "Private Interests and the EU-US dispute on audit regulation," *Review of International Political Economy*," 18(4): 436-59.
- Eimer, T. and Annika Philipps. 2011. "Networks Handing Loose: the domestic sources of US-EU patent disputes," *Review of International Political Economy*," 18(4): 460-80.
- Evans, P., H. Jacobson, and R. Putnam. 1993. *Double-edged Diplomacy: International Bargaining and Domestic Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Falleti, Tulia G. 2005. "A Sequential Theory of Decentralization: Latin American Cases in Comparative Perspective." *American Political Science Review* 99 (03): 327–346.
- Farrell, H. 2003. "Constructing the International Foundations of E-commerce: The EU-US Safe Harbor Arrangement." *International Organization* 2: 277–306.
- Farrell, H. and Abraham Newman. 2010. "Making Global Markets: Historical institutionalism in international political economy," *Review of International Political Economy* 17(4): 609-38.

- . 2013. "Interdependence and Cross-National Layering as a Source of Institutional Change," manuscript.
- Fetzer, Thomas. 2010. *Transnational Communities: Shaping Global Economic Governance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fioretos, Orfeo. 2010. "Capitalist Diversity and the International Regulation of Hedge Funds," *Review of International Political Economy* 17(4); 696-723.
- . 2011a. "Historical Institutionalism in International Relations." *International Organization* 65 (02): 367-399. doi:10.1017/S0020818311000002.
- . 2011b. *Creative Reconstructions: Multilateralism and European Varieties of Capitalism After 1950*. Cornell University Press.
- Frieden, J. 1991. "Invested Interest: The Politics of National Economic Policies in a World of Global Finance." *International Organization* 45 (4): 425-45.
- . 1999. "Actors and Preferences in International Relations." In *Strategic Choice and International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gilardi, F. 2002. "Policy Credibility and Delegation to Independent Regulatory Agencies: a Comparative Empirical Analysis." *Journal of European Public Policy* 9: 873-93.
- . 2005. "The Institutional Foundations of Regulatory Capitalism: The Diffusion of Independent Regulatory Agencies in Western Europe." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 598 (1): 84-101.
- . 2012a. "Methods for the Analysis of Policy Interdependence." In *Designing Research in the Social Sciences*, eds. M. Maggetti, C. Radaelli, and F. Gilardi. SAGE.

- . 2012b. "Transnational Diffusion: Norms, Ideas, and Policies." In *Handbook of International Relations*, ed. Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth Simmons, 453–77. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Gourevitch, P. 1978. "The Second Image Reversed: The International Sources of Domestic Politics." *International Organization* 32 (Fall): 881–912.
- Gruber, L. 2000. *Ruling the World: Power Politics and the Rise of Supranational Institutions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Haas, E. 1967. "The Uniting of Europe and the Uniting of Latin America," *Journal of Common Market Studies* 5(4): 315-43.
- Hacker, J. 2004. "Privatizing Risk Without Privatizing the Welfare State: The Hidden Politics of Social Policy Retrenchment in the United States." *American Political Science Review* 98 (2): 243–60.
- Hall, P., and D. Soskice. 2001. *Varieties of Capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, Peter, and Kathleen Thelen. 2009. "Institutional Change in Varieties of Capitalism." *Socio-Economic Review* 7: 7–34.
- Helfer, Laurence, Karen Alter, and M. Florencia Guerzovich. 2009. "Islands of Effective International Adjudication: Constructing an Intellectual Property Rule of Law in the Andean Community." *American Journal of International Law* (January 1): 1–46.
- Hughes, L. 2013. "Vertical Specialization and Standards Competition: Evidence from Electronic Vehicles," manuscript.
- Ikenberry, G.J. 2001. *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars*. Princeton: Princeton.

- Jackson, G., and R. Deeg. 2008. "From Comparing Capitalisms to the Politics of Institutional Change." *Review of International Political Economy* 15 (4): 680–709.
- Jordana, J., and D. Levi-Faur. 2004. *The Politics of Regulation: Institutions and Regulatory Reforms for the Age of Governance*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Jordana, J, D. Levi-Faur and Xavier Marin. 2011. "The Global Diffusion of Regulatory Agencies." *Comparative Political Studies* 44(10): 1343-1369.
- Kaczmarek, S. and Abraham Newman. 2011. "The Long Arm of the Law: Extraterritoriality and the National Implementation of Foreign Bribery Legislation." *International Organization* 65.
- Keck, M., and K. Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Keohane, R. 1984. *After Hegemony*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Keohane, R., and H. Milner. 1996. *Internationalization and Domestic Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keohane, R., and J. Nye. 1977. *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Knight, Jack. 1992. *Institutions and Social Conflict*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Koremenos, B., C. Lipson, and D. Snidal. 2001. "The Rational Design of International Institutions." *International Organization* 55 (4): 761–799.
- Krasner, S. 1991. "Global Communications and National Power: Life on the Pareto Frontier." *World Politics* 43 (3): 336–66.

- , 2011. "Changing State Structures: Outside in," *Proceeding of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 108: 21302-21307.
- Lake, David A. 2009. "Open Economy Politics: A Critical Review." *The Review of International Organizations* 4 (3) (May 28): 219–244.
- Lall, Ranjit. 2012. "From Failure to Failure: The Politics of International Banking Regulation." *Review of International Political Economy* 19 (4): 609–638.
- Leblond, Patrick. 2011. "EU, US and International Accounting Standards: a Delicate Balancing Act in Governing Global Finance." *Journal of European Public Policy* 18 (3): 443–461. doi:10.1080/13501763.2011.551083.
- Luetz, Susanne. 2011. "Back to the Future? The domestic sources of transatlantic regulation," *Review of International Political Economy*, 18(4): iii-xxii.
- Mahoney, James, and Kathleen Thelen. 2009. *Explaining Institutional Change: Ambiguity, Agency, and Power*. 1st ed. Cambridge University Press.
- Mansfield, E., H. Milner, and J. Pevenhouse. 2002. "Why Democracies Cooperate More: Electoral Control and International Trade Agreements." *International Organization* 56 (3): 477–513.
- Mansfield, Edward D., Helen V. Milner, and Jon C. Pevehouse. 2007. "Vetoing Cooperation: The Impact of Veto Players on Preferential Trading Arrangements." *British Journal of Political Science* 37 (03): 403–432.
- Martin, C.J., and D. Swank. 2004. "Does the Organization of Capital Matter? Employers and Active Labor Market Policy at the National and Firm Levels." *American Political Science Review* 98 (4): 593–611.

- Mattli, W., and T. Buete. 2003. "Setting International Standards: Technological Rationality or Primacy of Power." *World Politics* 56 (1): 1–42.
- Mattli, W. and A. Stone Sweet. 2012. "Regional Integration and the Evolution of the European Polity." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 50(s1): 1-17.
- Mattli, W., and N. Woods. 2009. *The Politics of Global Regulation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Milner, H. 1997. *Interests, Institutions, and Information*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Moravcsik, Andrew. 1997. "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics." *International Organization* 51 (04): 513–553.
- Mugge, Daniel. 2011. "The European Presence in Global Financial Governance: a Principal-agent Perspective." *Journal of European Public Policy* 18 (3): 383–402. doi:10.1080/13501763.2011.551075.
- Newman, A. 2008a. *Protectors of Privacy: Regulating Personal Data in the Global Economy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- . 2008b. "Building Transnational Civil Liberties: Transgovernmental Entrepreneurs and the European Data Privacy Directive." *International Organization* 62 (1): 103–130.
- Newman, A and Elliot Posner. 2011. International Interdependence and Regulatory Power: Authority, Mobility and Markets. *European Journal of International Relations*. 17: 589-610
- Nexon, D. 2009. *The Struggle for Power in Early Modern Europe: Religious Conflict, Dynastic Empires, and International Change*. Princeton: Princeton University

- Press.
- North, D. 1990. *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nye, Joseph S., and Robert O. Keohane. 1971. "Transnational Relations and World
Politics: An Introduction." *International Organization* 25 (03): 329–349.
- Oatley, Thomas. 2011. "The Reductionist Gamble: Open Economy Politics in the
Global Economy." *International Organization* 65 (02): 311–341.
- Orren, K.a.S.S. 1995. "Order and Time in Institutional Study." In *Political Science in
History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Panitch, L and S. Gindin. 2012. *The Making of Global Capitalism: the Political
Economy of American Empire*. London: Verso.
- Pauwelyn, J, R. Wessel, and J. Wouters. 2012. *Informal International Lawmaking*.
Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pierson, P. 1993. "When Effect Becomes Cause: Policy Feedback and Political
Change." *World Politics* 45 (4): 595–628.
- . 2004. *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis*. Princeton:
Princeton University Press.
- Pollack, Mark A., and Gregory C. Shaffer. 2009. *When Cooperation Fails: The
International Law and Politics of Genetically Modified Foods*. Oxford
University Press.
- Posner, E. 2009. "Making Rules for Global Finance: Transatlantic Regulatory
Cooperation at the Turn of the Millennium." *International Organization* 63
(4): 665–699.

- Putnam, R. 1988. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-level Games." *International Organization* 42 (3): 427–60.
- Putnam, Tonya L. 2009. "Courts Without Borders: Domestic Sources of U.S. Extraterritoriality in the Regulatory Sphere." *International Organization* 63 (03): 459–490.
- Raustiala, Kal. 2002. "The Architecture of International Cooperation: Transgovernmental Networks and the Future of International Law." *Virginia Journal of International Law* 43.
- Risse-Kappan, T. 1995. *Bringing Transnational Actors Back In*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roemer-Mahler, Anne. 2012. "Business Conflict and Global Politics: The Pharmaceutical Industry and the Global Protection of Intellectual Property Rights." *Review of International Political Economy*: 1–32.
- Rogowski, R. 1989. *Commerice and Coalitions: How Trade Affects Domestic Political Alignments*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sell, Susan K. 2010. "The Rise and Rule of a Trade-based Strategy: Historical Institutionalism and the International Regulation of Intellectual Property." *Review of International Political Economy* 17 (4): 762–790.
- Shaffer, G. 2000. "Globalization and Social Protection: The Impact of EU and International Rules in the Ratcheting up of US Privacy Standards." *Yale Journal of International Law* 25 (Winter): Lexis.
- , 2012. *Transnational Legal Ordering and State Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Sheingate, Adam D. 2003. "Political Entrepreneurship, Institutional Change, and American Political Development." *Studies in American Political Development* 17 (02): 185–203.
- Schickler, Eric. 2001. *Disjointed Pluralism: Institutional Innovation and the Development of the US Congress*. Princeton: Princeton University Press..
- Simmons, B. 2001. "The International Politics of Harmonization: The Case of Capital Market Regulation." *International Organization* 55: 589–620.
- Simmons, B., F. Dobbin, and G. Garrett. 2006. "Introduction: The International Diffusion of Liberalism." *International Organization* 60 (4): 781–810.
- Simmons, B., and Z. Elkins. 2004. "The Globalization of Liberalization: Policy Diffusion in the International Political Economy." *American Political Science Review* 98 (1): 171–189.
- Singer, D.A. 2007. *Regulating Capital: Setting Standards for the International Financial System*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Skowronek, S. 1982. *Building a New American State: The Expansion of National Administrative Capacities, 1877-1920*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Slaughter, A.-M. 2004. *A New World Order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Streeck, W. and Philippe Schmitter. 1991. "From National Corporatism to Transnational Pluralism: Organized interests in the Single European Market," *Politics and Society* 19(2): 133-64.
- Swank, D. 2006. "Tax Policy in an Era of Internationalization: Explaining the Spread of Neoliberalism." *International Organization* 60 (4): 847–882.

- Thatcher, Mark. "Internationalization and the State: Reforming Regulatory Institutions." *University College Dublin Geary Institute Discussion Paper*: 2009.
- Thelen, K. 2004. *How Institutions Evolve: The Political Economy of Skills in Germany, Britain, the United States, and Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thelen, K., and S. Steinmo. 1992. "Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics." In *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis*, ed. K.T. S. Steinmo. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Verdier, Pierre-Hugues. 2009. "Transnational Regulatory Networks and Their Limits." *Yale Journal of International Law* 34: 113.
- Vogel, D. 1995. *Trading Up: Consumer and Environmental Regulation in a Global Economy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- , 2012. *The Politics of Precaution: Regulating Health, Safety, and Environmental Risk in Europe and the United States*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Woll, C. 2008. *Firm Interests: How Governments Shape Business Lobbying on Global Trade*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Forthcoming. "Financial Reform between Business Influence and Geopolitics: A Strategic Analysis of Hedge Fund Regulation in Europe," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 51 (2).
- Young, Alasdair. 2003. "Political Transfer and 'Trading Up'? Transatlantic Trade in Genetically Modified Food and US Politics," *World Politics* 55(4): 457-84.
- Zakaria, Fareed. 1999. *From Wealth to Power*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ziegler, J. Nicholas. 2000. "Corporate Governance and the Politics of Property Rights

in Germany," *Politics and Society* 28(20): 195-221.

Zysman, J. 1994. "How Institutions Create Historically Rooted Trajectories of Growth." *Industrial and Corporate Change* 3: 243-83.