The Shadow of Failure: How Collapsed IOs Influence Subsequent Cooperative Bargains

Julia Gray

February 4, 2018

Abstract

Extant research has stressed the diffusion of international agreements around the world, as countries seek to adopt successful models of international governance. However, this literature largely assumes that the only models that diffuse are positive ones. What influence do failed agreements have on the organizations that succeed them? This paper argues that, when seeking to explain the design choices of state actors in forming international organizations (IOs), we must also consider the influence of failed organizations. IOs that were unsuccessful for whatever reason can spur states to veer in the opposite direction in terms of IO design, often aiming to solve the same cooperation problem through different means altogether. The paper explores this argument using the example of economic organizations throughout the world. I show that many of the world's IOs aimed at economic cooperation were formed in the shadow of failed security organizations. In reaction to the unsuccessful security organizations, the design of the succeeding IOs usually attempted to solve security issues through economic means and attempted to exclude problematic actors. This has important implications for the study of IO design, which usually only considers the spread of positive models, not negative ones.

Once Britain announced in 1968 that it would soon terminate its 150-year-old treaties of protection with the Gulf sheikhdoms, heads of state in the Middle East entered into fervent discussions about establishing regional security and to protect newly independent and weak states. One of these efforts, thirteen years later, was the Gulf Cooperation Council. Puzzlingly for an organization meant to ensure cooperation, the GCC charter contains no mention whatsoever of military issues. Instead, it established an ambitious but vague mandate of unity through the achievement of economic integration, with direct reference to functionalist theories (Barnett, 1998). The charter was long on broad language about cooperation and harmonization across a variety of issue areas, but it established few specific targets to accomplish those goals. The organization's first secretary general, Abdullah Bishara, wrote in 1985, "You may observe that [the Gulf Cooperation Council's] objectives are 'generalities' and no definitions are given, except the injunction to set up similar systems in all fields. ... You may also observe the absence of any specific reference to cooperation in the field of security and defence. Even though the Council was born in the midst of violent storms, the very water and skies of the Gulf the Charter contented itself with a vague reference to cooperation in all fields." Also puzzlingly, for an organization meant to resolve conflicts among members, there was also no mention of dispute settlement among members or independent authority of the secretariat.[1] A final puzzle was that the two most conflict-prone countries — Iran and Iraq — were excluded from the arrangement altogether.

Why would states hoping to alleviate security tensions deliberately construct an international organization (IO) that not only failed to address head-on the primary cooperative problem facing them, but also exclude the very actors that were most susceptible to falling prey to interstate conflict? Existing literature that emphasizes the rational design of international institutions might suggest that the loosely designed nature of the

[1]As Bishara put it, "The heads of state are used to patience, quiet persuasion, consensus-building and cooperative decision-making. These have been our traditional political tools, and they form today the foundation of unity within the GCC and of cooperation in the region. ... There is no imposition or embarrassment to any member state. Instead, we follow a practice of exemption: when consensus is lacking, and one or more members have difficulty with a policy direction, we exempt the issue temporarily and turn to the other area where greater consensus exists. We practice persuasion." Ibid. pp. 103-104.

GCC might be optimal, given the constraints to cooperation. But the GCC, usually criticised by observers as being ineffective generally, was unable to prevent Iraq's invasion of Kuwait — despite that country being one of the more vocal and active in establishing the organization.

Part of the answer for the design choice lies in the shadow of an organization that no longer exists: the Baghdad Pact, an early attempt at security cooperation among Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, and Turkey, with the United Kingdom as a guarantor and the United States a strong and active influence in the pact's establishment (though it was not a member). Formed in 1955, the pact was meant to mirror NATO and establish alliances along the southern border of the Soviet Union. But three years after the Pact was signed, the Iraqi monarchy was overthrown in a coup and subsequent leadership withdrew from the pact. The organization then renamed itself as Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) and moved its headquarters from Baghdad to Ankara, but the 1979 Iranian revolution effectively ended the organization, with its secretary general formally dissolving it later that year. The design of the GCC was thus formed *in reaction to* the two failed organizations that had attempted to address security tensions directly.

This paper proposes that failed attempts at international cooperation cast a shadow over subsequent ones. I argue that once an IO dies, states often overcorrect in their attempts to design subsequent ones. At times, this can result in a positive revision of the expectation, Experience with unsuccessful organizations can lead states to cast in entirely different directions. Although occasionally this works out for the better, and states seem to learn from the failures of previous efforts, more frequently the subsequent IOs overcompensate, and tend to design IOs that are also ill-suited to the cooperation problem at hand.

The relationship between IO effectiveness and IO design is a complicated one, and it is beyond the scope of this paper to interrogate this topic fully. To the extent that it does so, it is only to provide a counterpoint to the notion that member states simply learn from their mistakes, and that new and improved IOs arise from the failed ones. If that were the

case, then there would not be much of a puzzle: states would simply be iterating various forms of cooperation until the right one stuck. Occasionally, this does occur: countries take the lessons from past failures and create more successful organizations. However, often the revised organization fares no better than their predecessors.

I illustrate this argument through examining the relationship between failed organizations and the subsequent IOs that form in their wake. I show that when a failed IO exists for a given issue area, states tend to veer in the opposite direction in subsequent IO design. More generally, a comatose or dead IO in one part of the world is associated with the creation of new IOs that tend to be designed in reaction. Specifically, in the wake of a failed IO designed to ensure security cooperation, states tend to form economic IOs to attempt to address the same problem. We see a specific design implication, however: these economic IOs are more likely to endeavor toward ambitious economic integration goals in a bid to prevent further conflict. Those ambitious goals, however, are very infrequently accompanied by realistic plans for implementation and inevitably fall short. I test this proposition using original data on agreement implementation across time in 51 different regional organizations in the developed and developing world.

This argument has implications for our understanding of both the design of IOs and also of the intractable nature of many global cooperation problems. When states attempt to surmount conflicts, there are many potential sources of inspiration. IR scholars have tended to look at the positive examples that diffuse from one region to the next. But states are also influenced by negative examples as well. The IOs that emerge in reactions to failed ones are also a template that diffuses across time and space, but often those templates emerge in reaction to past collapses.

I then support these case illustrations through quantitative analysis of 51 regional cooperation agreements across the world. Through analysis of those agreement texts, I show that countries with past histories of mutual conflict tend to design agreements that cover a vast number of issue areas while being relatively imprecise about the specific goals for cooperation. Countries with conflictual histories also are associated with agreements

that are light on enforcement clauses or delegation of authority to the organization. I then show that those same types of agreements tend to fail to achieve their goals across a variety of dimensions. Although many studies focus on security arrangements alone, I employ a broader sample that includes security organizations as well as organizations meant to approach conflict through economic cooperation.

This is an important finding for the study of international cooperation, which has identified broad links between IOs and concord but is less clear about the microfoundations that might underpin these links. This paper sheds light on those causal processes by identifying first the types of agreements that tend to be formed in the shadow of conflict, and then assessing the ability of those agreements to meet their goals. That is, I analyze first the types of environments that tend both to drive states to seek cooperation through international organization but also the constraints that a history of conflict might place on the types of agreements that are formed.

This paper also, crucially, examines more agreements than simply the success stories on which other IO scholarship tends to focus. Examining only the agreements that succeed in their goals but ignoring those that fail — even if they have similar designs and are created by similar groupings of member states — commits the error of selecting on the dependent variable. The dataset includes agreements that were disbanded as well as those that continued to survive. This allows for the full range of agreements to be considered, giving room for inference on the types of design as well as state-level determinants of the success of IOs in promoting cooperation. It also allows us to gain a better understanding of the selection processes that lead states to design particular types of agreements — that is, it illuminates the choices that states make in deploying certain features of IO design, as well as the consequences for those choices.

1 The Implications of Failed Cooperation

As the number of IOs spiraled in the post–Cold War era, so too did the volume of IO scholarship. But scholars in this area tended to focus on one of two topics. First was the sheer number of IOs (or number of members in a particular IO) in a given issue area. If a country belonged to 150 different IOs, or if the number of IOs focusing on a particular global problem increased, many scholars took this as evidence that international cooperation was on the rise. The second topic was the design of the agreement itself. Scholars assumed that country delegates spent long hours negotiating the terms of cooperation. Whatever agreement emerged from this process was the countries' best efforts to come up with details of cooperation that would be as feasible as possible. To that end, the provisions of an agreement were often taken at face value as the empirical manifestation of the cooperation process.

Beyond the design of an agreement or the number of countries involved, scholars also focused on what could be described as the first-order effects of international organizations. Wielding new empirical tools as well as comprehensive data, researchers could explore whether countries that signed free-trade agreements saw an increase in the cross-border exchange of goods and services; whether investment treaties prompted firms and individuals to finance ventures abroad; whether human-rights organizations helped spread tolerance and prevent abuse; and whether international agreements to promote peace and stop violence had the effects that they intended.

These types of questions tend to suffer from a fundamental research design flaw. Specifically, by focusing on the positive examples of cooperation, they tend to truncate the sample relative to the entire universe of cases. The result is selection on the dependent variable: researchers tend to focus on the negotiations that countries successfully concluded as well as prominent organizations that were more or less successful in achieving their intended aims. This, of course, creates inference problems in terms of the applicability of the argument to the entire universe of cases (King, Keohane and Verba, 2004). As Geddes (2004, p. 13) puts it, "randomization does not guarantee the absence of corre-

lation. If, at a particular time, the universe itself only contains cases that have passed a certain threshold of success because 'nature' has in some fashion weeded out the others, then even random or total samples will, in effect, have been selected on the dependent variable."

This is relevant to the study of IOs because although most researchers focus on examples of living and even successful organizations, the history of international cooperation is awash with dead or moribund IOs, along with negotiations that failed to produce an IO at all. Failing to account for those organizations, or to theorize the conditions under which states might attempt international cooperation but be unsuccessful, creates problems for our existing theories of transnational cooperation.

Leaving aside the inference problems of a truncated sample selection for our understanding about relationships between IO membership and cooperative outcomes, or issues of selecting on the dependent variable that might occur if researchers try to explain IO membership without considering failed negotiations or dead organizations, it is also important to think about the degree to which failed organizations might alter the cooperative landscape. An unsuccessful attempt at cooperation might mean one of several things. It might tell us something about the distance between member state preferences: perhaps even though an urgent need for cooperation exists, member states might not be willing to agree on the distribution of costs of cooperation, or the design of the cooperative agreement. It might tell us something about the cooperation problem itself: perhaps the solution to the cooperation problem is simply unachievable.

Some of the effects might be direct — that is, they might have an immediate impact on endeavors for those exact states to cooperate in that specific issue area.[2] Others might be indirect, influencing cooperation in other issue areas among different configurations of states in different issue areas. The precise theories would depend on the substance of the

[2]For example, if we observe a failed negotiation, it could mean that negotiators simply reached a stalemate on the negotiations in their present form. That does not mean that cooperation in that particular issue area would be impossible — a change in domestic leadership or in global or domestic conditions for cooperation could shift the dynamics — but this could impact the timing of subsequent negotiations. In other words, we might expect a significant delay before cooperation is attempted again.

issue area in question as well as the nature of the cooperation problem.

This paper cannot explore and test all of the possible effects of failed IOs on the terrain for international cooperation. One would need to take account the reasons that the organization failed in the first place, as well as the forces that led states to design or build an organization that died out.[3] The presence of a failed or a moribund organization might be a harbinger of deeper issues that might not be observable. However, we can surmise in general that states that have an experience with failed or failing IOs would then form subsequent IOs that veered in a different direction from the preexisting one, either in terms of substance or design. This could go in either direction: if a failed or moribund organization had a "thick" institutional design, states' next cooperative endeavor might tend toward a less institutionalized form of governance, and conversely a collapsed organization that had relatively few and weak institutional constraints might spur an attempt to build a new organization with a deeper institutional structure.[4]

- **H_1:** Failed or moribund IOs in a previous time period will be associated with the formation of IOs with converse designs.

Even though IO dissolution is a rare event (Keohane 1982), I argue that this process is specific to dead or moribund organizations. Many scholars have noted that once IOs are formed, the bureaucracies in place keep them in a path-dependent pattern (Hawkins et al., 2006), with revisions to their charters likely as bureaucrats bid to secure their careers (Johnson, 2013). Thus, even if their designs are not optimal for the cooperation problem, existing IOs might obstruct the formation of subsequent ones. Once IOs die off or grow moribund, states have greater latitude to attempt different organizational designs.

The microfoundations of this process require further elaboration that is beyond the

[3]For example — and as we will see illustrated in some of the cases below — external actors such as funders or security guarantors might pressure states to form IOs that are not appropriate for the cooperative problem they face.

[4]This process would be distinct from functionalist institutional expansions: I specifically refer here to cases where a previous IO has collapsed and gone dormant, not an attempt to expand a thinly institutionalized organization, as did the transition from the GATT to the WTO.

scope of this paper. It might be the case that states themselves iterate in a learning process: they might learn from their mistakes in a failed cooperative endeavor, and subsequently adopt improved models for international organization.[5] If external actors push a certain type of IO design that then fails, it might be that the subsequent iteration of IOs simply reflects a new wave of thinking among global elites about the best shape of solution to a particular cooperative problem (Chwieroth, 2009; Abdelal, 2009). Regardless, the point here is that the designs we observe in existing IOs are often reactions to failed or moribund ones, not just attempts in isolation to solve a given cooperative problem.

In terms of substance as well, we might expect states to attempt to solve a cooperation problem in the opposite way as did a failed IO in a previous period. The next section isolates one environment for potential cooperation — namely, the need to address interstate security tensions — and looks at the consequence of failed organizations on subsequent efforts at IO formation.

1.1 An Application: International Organizations in the Shadow of Conflict

In order to have reasonable expectations about the impact of a failed IO, it is necessary to think about the subject area and the nature of the cooperation problem. It is trivial to assert simply that states take previous IO failures into account while embarking on new cooperative endeavors. But what form exactly does the influence take? One could imagine different impacts in different settings: for example, failed general environmental agreements might lead to a search for more specific and topical solutions, depending on where exactly the cooperation broke down. As just one possible illustration of the potential dynamics, this section now turns to the relationship between economic organizations and past failures in security cooperation, and attempts to tease out some of the dynamics there.

[5]Again, a vast literature focuses on the determinants of state behavior and incentives in IO design, and evaluating this claim is not the topic of this paper. However, the examples show that this is unlikely: the subsequent IOs tend to fare little better than their predecessors.

Much research in international organizations focuses on what kinds of countries tend to form and join international organizations[6] Similarly, many claims have been made about the pacific benefits of international organizations, and indeed several well-known examples bear out those claims, most prominently the European Union. Given these early examples, scholars turned their attention to the effects of international organizations on peace among members. Many researchers focused on establishing inverse relationships between intrastate militarized disputes and IGO membership (Russett, Oneal and Davis, 1998; Oneal and Russett, 2001). Building on these findings, other scholars have used large-N datasets to examine the general influence of IO influence on dispute duration (Shannon, Morey and Boehmke, 2010), or showing that IO membership is associated with the peaceful settlement of disputes (Boehmer, Gartzke and Nordstrom, 2004; Mitchell and Hensel, 2007; Shannon, 2009), as well as network effects of IO membership on conflict (Hafner-Burton and Montgomery, 2006).

Much scholarship on regionalism had similarly focused on the peace-building benefits of regional organizations. The European Coal and Steel Community was an early example of the type of cooperative organization that was meant to ensure peace among members through establishing cooperation in functional areas (Haas, 1958; Baldwin, 1994; Moravcsik, 1998; Diez, Stetter and Albert, 2006). However, at the same time, many scholars subsequently criticized the degree to which the EC was held up as a model for other regions to emulate. Critics pointed out that the post–World War II environment was a unique one, and that those post-war conditions made countries more willing to cede sovereignity than they would be under other circumstances (Acharya, 2000). The triumph of the EC in turning previous rivals France and Germany into a permanent security led many to conclude — incorrectly — that nationalist ideologies were on the decline. Additionally, even the EU itself has had limited abilities to settle further conflicts, as was evidenced by the group's failure to find mutual solutions to external security events, including the

[6]The number of studies on this topic is huge, across all areas. On bilateral investment treaties, see Tobin and Busch (2010) (but also Poulsen (2014) for an important caveat. On preferential trade agreements, see Mansfield and Milner (1999); Poast and Urpelainen (2015).

1973 crises in the Middle East.

At the same time, scholars argued for the benefits of security communities (Deutsch, 1957) that established a range of cooperative ties among members (Haas, 1965; Nye, 1968; Jr, 1970; Hurrell, 1995; Adler and Barnett, 1998; Mattli, 1999). Based on these theories, many researchers tended to find patterns of cooperation within members of regional arrangements, not only in terms of peace (Solingen, 2008; Buzan and Woever, 2003; Bearce and Omori, 2005; Pevehouse and Russett, 2006; Haftel, 2007; Mansfield and Snyder, 2009) but also in terms of many other positive outcomes (Mansfield and Milner, 1997, 1999; Pevehouse, 2002; Burton, 2005). Many also argued for links between trade flows and peace (Mansfield and Pevehouse, 2000; Gartzke, Li and Boehmer, 2001; Gartzke, 2007; Fausett and Volgy, 2010). Others have looked at the importance of similarities among members; for example, Davis and Pratt (2016) argue that states with aligned security interests view the world in comparable ways, and others argue that democracies also tend not to fight (Pevehouse and Russett, 2006). Some have argued that more similar members tend to expand scope to security and to delegate authority (Haftel and Hofmann, 2016; Dorussen and Kirchner, 2014), and Solingen (1998) has argued that domestic internationalist coalitions that can benefit politically and economically from shared identities will push for increased regional cooperation. Mansfield and Bronson (1997) show that alliances drive trade agreements more generally. Others focus on the endogenous design elements of cooperation agreements Baccini and Dur (2009), focusing primarily on their institutional characteristics, including the extent to which member-states delegate authority to these organizations (Thompson and Haftel, 2006).

Yet concurrently, some research has pointed an implementation gap in many regional agreements (Boerzel, 2005; Haftel, 2012; Gray, 2014) as well as a lack of compliance more generally with agreements (Boerzel, 2001; Tallberg, 2002), and indeed the difficulty of measuring compliance with international agreements without accounting for the selection process that drives states to design and join those agreements in the first place (Downs, Rocke and Barsoom, 1996; VonStein, 2005; Mitchell and Hensel, 2007). Similarly, scholars

have noted that the study of IOs and cooperation is beset with false positives (Chaudoin, Hays and Hicks, 2016). Without taking into account the selection process through which states are motivated to form IOs — and, crucially, the type and scope of those IOs that are formed — it is difficult to make strong claims about the independent effects of those organizations on cooperation. However, a focus on large-N studies of the membership content of, or design features of, international treaties makes it difficult to examine in great detail the selection processes into international organizations.

Thus, the literature presents us with something of a paradox. Many scholars have shown aggregate associations with IO memberships and the decrease of conflict. And yet the precise microfoundations of these claims are often not tested in these studies. Some scholars make constructivist claims about the ways in which joint IO membership might reduce conflict – through the socialization of members by way of repeated interaction with other member states, for example (Wendt, 2001; Checkel, 2001; Johnston, 2001; Bearce and Bondanella, 2007). Similarly, others argue that high-level meetings convey information as well as opportunities to resolve issues (Haftel, 2007). Others make arguments about issue linkage within organizations reducing the incentives for conflict overall (Davis, 2009; Alter and Meunier, 2009; Gosovic and Ruggie, 2009). Still others argue that the shadow of sanctions or enforcement in organizations leads nations to avoid defecting from the rules (Donno, 2010). Others make a persuasive case that domestic coalitions that drive the formation of those organizations then can help ensure their success (Mansfield and Milner, 1999; Solingen, 2008).

A careful examination of these claims should take at least two steps. First, it should look at the types of organizations that tend to be set up with the aim of reducing conflict. Many studies have tended to lump all intergovernmental organizations into one general category without looking at the motivation of states to choose one type of organization or another. In fact, when it comes to conflict-reducing organizations, states are often quite deliberate in the design choices that they make, as will be discussed below. It is true that many scholars have examined the design components of organizations meant to tackle

security issues (Haftel, 2012), and as well on the state attributes and features of various cooperation problems that lead to a greater likelihood of certain types of institutional design (Koremenos, Lipson and Snidal, 2001; Hooghe and Marks, 2016). Indeed, many have looked broadly at agreement design features and the effectiveness of that agreement in various contexts (Mansfield, Milner and Rosendorf, 2000; Hooghe and Marks, 2016; Kucik and Reinhardt, 2008).

However, few large N-studies have looked precisely at the types of environments that lead states to select certain kinds of agreement design in the realm of security. Conflict prevention is a particularly tricky area for design because compliance rests, in a way, on inaction. If states do not have a previous history of conflict, all they need to do is to continue not to fight (Raulstiala and Slaughter, 2002; Downs, Rocke and Barsoom, 1996). If, however, the contracting parties already have a previously insecure relationship, different types of compliance mechanisms might be necessary. Although some scholars have examined how power influences both international trade and international conflict (Mansfield, 1994), precise links between power, insecurity, and the design of organizations have not yet been established.

The second step is to then examine whether, given that security tensions might produce certain types of agreement design. Many scholars have noted that agreement designs tend to diffuse across various contexts (Jo and Namgung, 2012; Jetschke and Theiner, 2016). But the links between those designs and state intentions in the security realm have not been thoroughly explored. Although many have acknowledged that selection is part of story for ineffective outcomes in terms of cooperation, they have not specifically looked at how selection translates into design of IOs and their ability of those agreements to achieve their security goals.

In sum, most of the literature on the relationships between international commerce and international conflict have centered on whether trade deters conflict. But it is short on testing the microfoundations of how exactly that relationship works. To the extent that agreement design is factored into the process, it is usually simply included as a dummy

variable for the agreement. The next section details the steps through which certain types of security environments might influence member states' choice of agreement design, and the subsequent links to effectiveness.

1.2 How Nations in Conflict Aim Too High

It is important to understand the mechanisms behind the influence of security ambitions on agreement design and then on subsequent effectiveness. To isolate the mechanism, one must taken into account the geopolitical environment in which many countries formed integration associations. Informed by functionalist theories such as those generated by Deutsch (1957) and Haas (1958), many countries founded regional organizations with the idea that peace could be achieved not through openly confronting cessations of hostilities, but rather by building functional links among countries. Peace, then, would be accomplished through growing closeness through economic and social exchange.

Similarly, in the Cold War environment, organizations that dealt too directly with security tended to fail at their goals and then to be disbanded, as the examples below will illustrate. Therefore, even if the aim was to address security issues, many countries went about this goal by tackling issues where failure was less likely to register. Thus, the lessons learned from failed organizations are also important to take into account in terms of understanding the organizations that did manage to persist.

To that end, an initial pattern emerged. First, agreements formed in the shadow of failed attempts to address security problems tend to be broad in the scope of issues that they covered, and high levels of ambition for those goals, but vague in the path toward obtaining cooperation in those areas. This is partially due to an aversion to meeting conflicts head-on. For states that have past differences, directly addressing security issues might be too confrontational, particularly if they were formed in the shadow of the Cold War. Thus, the agreements tended to address nearly every issue of cooperation *except* security, resulting in agreements that had quite wide and lofty goals but few concrete mechanisms for obtaining those goals.

Second, those agreements tended to lack enforcement mechanisms or even to contain binding provisions that compelled states to surrender some degree of their sovereignity to the organization. The importance of delegation in IO effectiveness has long been cited (Abbott et al., 2000; Hawkins et al., 2006; Alter, 2008; Elsig, 2010), but the particularly sensitive dynamics of delegation in tense environments bear closer examination. Strong IO authority among conflicting states tends only to be effective in rare cases. Indeed, many agreements that died off or never managed to launch in the first place asked for too much delegation to an international authority, to which states did not agree. Furthermore, as the examples will show below, when countries try to include powerful and formerly aggressive neighbors in an international organization, those larger states will tend not to agree to join unless the decision rules in the organization are not constraining. Thus, those organizations tend to have weak levels of authority in their central secretariat and decisionmaking procedures that favor consensus or unanimity, to ensure that powerful members do not leave themselves open to being outvoted. This often results in agreements that fail to make meaningful decisions on controversial matters. Thus, the design of IO authority in security matters is caught in something of a paradox: hard authority is often perceived as too constraining, but soft authority means that member states tend to be unable to make concrete progress in cooperation.

This leads to the following hypotheses:

- H_2: Failed or moribund security organizations in a previous period are likely to be replaced by economic organizations.
- H_3: Economic IOs formed in the shadow of failed security IOs are likely to have converse design provisions, specifically:
  - H_{3a}: The surviving IOs among countries with a previous history of failed security IOs are more likely to be *broad in scope.*
  - H_{3b}: The surviving IOs among countries with a previous history of failed security IOs are more likely to be *high in ambition.*

- H_{3c}: The surviving IOs among countries with a previous history of failed security IOs are more likely to be *vague in terms of specific targets or plans for achieving those goals.*
- H_{3d}: The surviving IOs among countries with a previous history of failed security IOs are more likely to *lack strong enforcement or delegation provisions.*

The sections below describe these patterns in historical examples from several treaties around the world.

1.2.1 Broad Scope, Weak Authority in the Shadow of Failure

To illustrate, I describe examples of regional organizations from Southeast Asia, South Asia, and the Middle East. These are not meant as case studies but rather as illustrations of the causal mechanism outlined above. All of these regions had severe security tensions and sought to create IOs to assuage these conflicts. In two of these regions, the organizations that have survived to this day emerged from the failure of preexisting ones — and organizations that had directly addressed the security issue had collapsed.

This pattern extends far beyond the regions in question here. For example, many attributed the collapse of the East African Community (EAC), which failed in 1979 but was subsequently resurrected, to its relatively vague but high goals and the lack of strong decisionmaking rules in on the redesign. and Latin American agreements have been criticized on similar grounds (Hazlewood, 1979).[7] Similar regional efforts in Central Asia have also come under fire for the same reasons.[8] Indeed, even the examples below could be

[7] "The stability of the [East African] community in effect depended on the maintenance of good relations among the three heads of state. Because the community was not insulated from inter state conflicts, disputes quickly spilled over to disrupt regional cooperation. This problem was exacerbated by general lack of autonomy for regional institutions. Treaty provisions were designed to maintain national predominance in regional decision making, weakening the regional assembly secretariat. All legislation of the regional assembly had to be approved by the territorial assemblies and receive the assent of the three heads of state before became law, thereby giving national legislation priority over regional. Many Latin American organizations' structure follows a similar pattern. All important decisions of the organizations are subject to national veto" (Hazlewood, 1979)

[8] "Behind the rhetoric of regional cooperation, the Central Asian states have been embroiled with increasing frequency in conflicts among themselves, including trade wars, border disputes and disagreements over the management and use of water and energy resources" (Bohr, 2004).

elaborated in far greater detail, as others have done,[9] and are only a sketch of the complex dynamics in each region. Their treatment here is meant only to outline empirically the process of design and failure described above. It is not meant to draw out explanations for the success or failure of IOs generally, but rather to show how environments of distrust and tension might lead to specific design choices for subsequent organizations.

First, take the case of regional agreements in Southeast Asia. Many scholars point to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations as an example of successful political cooperation among previously warring nations (Scalapino et al., 1989; *Legalization as Strategy: The Asia-Pacific Case*, 2000; JONES and SMITH, 2007). But it is important to note that those attempts to build in functional cooperation instead of direct security cooperation came from experience. For example, the 1954 Manila Treaty founded the original Southeast Asian Alliance Treaty Organization (SEATO) with the aim of facilitating US intervention in what was then Indochina, after its failure to prevent the military defeat of France in Vietnam in that same year. SEATO, headquartered in Bangkok, was meant to be intended to be a Southeast Asian version of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) (Hemmer and Katzenstein, 2002). However, after the US pulled out of the Vietnam War, the organization gradually fell apart and was formally dissolved in 1997.

The local resistance to SEATO had an impact on the design of the subsequent agreements that were formed. Indonesia, one of the largest nations in Southeast Asia, had opposed formal defense cooperation from the beginning, particularly when external powers such as the US were involved.[10] This had consequences for the design of ASEAN in several ways. First, as Acharya (2000) points out, "ASEAN had to avoid military cooperation in order not to be perceived as a front for the West, or a SEATO through the back door" (page 44). States were reluctant to directly deal with security issues in a time when the Cold War raged in proxy states. In its charter, ASEAN also avoided any kind

[9]See, for example, Solingen (2008) for an explicit and detailed comparison of cooperation of the Middle East and East Asia. Solingen analyzes the success and failure of regional arrangements based on domestic politics, with emphasis on how those coalitions emphasize both the design and the subsequent implementation of those arrangements.

[10]There was also resistance to a similarly aimed Asia-Pacific Council, proposed by Korea and set to include both Japan and Australia, because of the inclusion of those two external powers.

of "institutional grand designs," opting instead for an incrementalist, consensus-based approach termed the ASEAN Way' (Acharya, 2000). The areas of functional cooperation were established in relatively vague terms on a broad area of issues, including social and technical cooperation. Second, at its founding the organization explicitly avoided bringing in major preexisting conflicts among its members. It excluded Japan and China from its membership rosters, so as to avoid direct conflict with those countries. In its charter, ASEAN centered directly on nonconfrontational areas of functional cooperation without initially setting out high or concrete goals. In this way it drew from yet differed substantially from the EU; it sought to establish functional cooperation in a wide variety of areas but with a low level of institutionalization or constraint on member states, with few timelines or schedules for that cooperation.

Another example of this pattern — where IOs that directly faced security threats failed and less constraining IOs were formed as a result — is the agreements formed in the Middle East during the Cold War.

Although the regional heads of state had discussed the need for an IO to establish cooperation in the region since 1947, it was not until 1985 that the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation was founded by Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. SAARC was meant to promote regional integration, formally launching a free trade area in 2005. The states did not endow the secretariat with formal powers except for monitoring and coordination. SAARC members also built in a consensus model with no clear voting rule, precisely to avoid conflict among the members, and there are no institutional procedures for dissent and disagreement. One observer cites "the need to avoid India the diplomatic embarrassment of being cornered by smaller neighbours in majority vote proceeding" (Obino, 2009). Similarly, political issues are explicitly not meant to be matters of discussion in SAARC. The treaty's Article X clearly forbids the incorporation of political matters in SAARC as well as the exclusion of dispute settlement. All formal decisions were meant to be taken by the heads of states at annual summits.

In addition to the GCC example that was cited in the introduction, along with the still-living Arab League and the failed Baghdad Pact and CENTO, the most recent but the shortest lived IO in the Middle East was the Arab Cooperation Council, founded in February 1989 by North Yemen, Iraq, Jordan, and Egypt. The ACC was created partly in response to the four countries being left out of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC). In a quote that emphasizes the ability of states learning from both positive and negative examples, Kechichlan (1994) writes:

> The ACC founding agreement referred to the "useful lesson (learned) from the positive and negative aspects of (several) experiments." The word "practical" was frequently cited: "practical ties," "practical cooperation," "practical and realistic means," and "practical measures." Most of the emphasis was on achieving coordination and cooperation "gradually" and "according to (existing) circumstances, capabilities and experiences." Furthermore, in coordinating production policies, the ACC aimed to "take into consideration the different levels of growth" of its member states. In short, the ACC was keenly aware of the daunting challenges to success, but ... it embarked on grandiose integration plans that could not be implemented.

That said, the initial vision was for intense levels of collaboration and interaction. The organization held at least 17 formal meetings at the summit or ministerial level in 1989 alone, in addition to dozens of working-level sessions. This level of institutionalization was more extensive than most Arab subregional gatherings. Somalia and Djibouti showed interest to join the ACC but were asked to wait until the ACC would be consolidated. However, the organization did not survive the crisis that followed Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in August 1990 and disbanded less than two years after it was formed.

2 Data and Analysis

This section tests the propositions laid out above quantitatively through analyzing 59 regional organizations. To test these propositions fully, we would need to have information on the founding documents of many of the world's regional organizations, both the ones that persist to this day as well as the ones that have died out (Gray, 2017).

In terms of estimation, one might imagine a two-stage setup where one first estimated the likelihood of designing security agreements in particular ways, and then used those predictions in a second stage in which the outcome was the effectiveness of those agreements. This presents a few difficulties. First, two-stage models place a high number of constraints on data. With only 51 observations, such a strategy is not feasible, even putting aside the usual challenges of identifying an instrument that could both predict selection into certain types of agreement design but is uncorrelated with agreement effectiveness.

Keeping that in mind, the models that I present are meant simply as a plausibility test for generalizability of the dynamics described in the illustrations above. They show associations among the variables but do not demonstrate causal processes or underpinning mechanisms behind those relationships. That said, they do serve to demonstrate that we can broadly see a pattern among countries that form regional organizations for security reasons, as well as the types of organizations that get formed.

2.1 Influence of Dead IOs on Design of Subsequent Ones

The most general test is for H1, which states that countries react to the demise of IOs with an attempt in the opposite direction. This would require coding the exact design provisions of failed organizations, to see if the IOs that form in their wake take the opposite tack in terms of their own design. I am still in the process of coding these data (finding the charters of failed organizations is a difficult task), but as a preliminary test, I use data from Jetschke et al (2017) on the design of regional organizations. Jetschcke's

data, part of the Comparative Regional Organization Project, covers of 85 organizations and codes three areas of relevance here: the final aim of the IO; the values and norms promoted by the IO; and the policy areas covered by the IO.[11]. I merge these data with vitality data from Gray (2017) that codes whether an organization is alive, dead, or a "zombie," using Jetschke's own coding for collapsed organizations as both verification and supplementation. This results in around 25 IOs in the sample that are either dead or moribund at some point in their lifespan.

According to Hypothesis One, we would anticipate that failed or moribund IOs would be associated with IO descendants that had the opposite characteristics. To this end, I code two variables on an ordinal scale that capture the final aim for the treaty, with *economy* holding the values of economic integration as 1 and economic cooperation as .5; and *political* as holding the values of political integration as 1 and political cooperation as .5. Although further work would be required to distinguish which of the norms and values articulated are really in opposition, as a first cut — and also as a preliminary test of Hypothesis Two — I code whether the organization promotes *economic* provisions (trade, market freedom, economic sustainability) or *security* provisions (non-intervention, non-use of force, adversarial solidarity). Further expanding the tests for to Hypothesis Two, I further code the policy areas (*economy/trade* or *security*).

Descriptively, we would expect that a dead or moribund IO that carried security or political provisions would be associated with a subsequent IO in the region that carried economic provisions. Even though dead or moribund IOs are around 30 percent of the

[11]Specifically, the questions are (with possible answers in parentheses): "2.1 What final aim for the RO does the treaty formulate? (Economic cooperation; Economic integration; Political cooperation Political integration; Political federation/union) 2.2 Does the document make any reference to norms, principles, and values? (Yes/No) 2.3 Which specific values and norms are mentioned? Market freedom; Human freedom; Freedom of state/country; Social justice; Rule of law; Social equality; Equality among states/regions; Social solidarity; Adversial solidarity; Democratic rights; Political liberties; Sovereignty of member states; Sovereignty of the people; Sovereignty of the nation; Sovereign equality; Mutual respect; Human dignity; Social sustainability; Economic sustainability; Environmental sustainability; Common values; Non-interference in domestic affairs; Non-Intervention; Non-use of force; Good neighbourliness) 4.0 According to the document, which policy areas are covered by the organization? (Economy; Security; Migration Environment; Good Governance; Social; Culture; Human Rights; Infrastructure; Sustainable Development; Trade; Science and technology; Agriculture; Police and judicial cooperation; Human Resources Development)"

sample, not all of those are in the same region.[12]. This makes the number of observations too small to perform meaningful regression analysis. However, t-tests of the differences in substance between dead IOs and subsequent ones in the same region suggest that there is a statistically significant likelihood of observing economic IOs in the shadow of dead or moribund security ones within the same region. The subsequent sections explore this dynamic in greater detail.

2.2 Specific Hypotheses on Relationship between Failed Security IOs and Economic IOs

First, I want to demonstrate that past histories of conflict lead states to make agreements that are broad in scope and high in ambition. However, those same agreements much specificity in the language in terms of the way in which those goals will be achieved or schedules for meeting those goals. Nor do they build in mechanisms that would allow for enforcement or sanctions if members do not adhere to the rules of the organization. The above examples described the possible causal mechanisms for this process: when there is a security threat, states are reluctant to establish rules that might directly confront the tension among them.

To establish this broad pattern, I look at the language of the agreements to establish four different dependent variables relating to the design of the agreement. I use word counts to establish content variables that look at the concepts described above. One might ideally want coders to establish some of these concepts, and I plan to do this in the future to the extent that it does not overlap with existing efforts.[13]

For the *scope* of the agreement, I count the number of different articles that address disparate issue areas, including cultural cooperation, transportation coordination, eco-

[12]One could make a broader argument about cross-regional diffusion of design, but that would require more precise theorizing

[13]I did run a factor analysis of various components in the agreement. There seems to be one principal component onto which variables for enforcement, autonomy, and dispute settlement loaded most strongly. That is, agreements that required a high degree of delegation tended to be stronger overall, whereas the other dimensions show little clear pattern.

nomic integration, sporting cooperation, and political harmonization. The more articles covering various issue areas, the broader an agreement's scope of cooperation. For the *ambition* of the agreement, I look at the number of articles in agreement as a proportion of the number of words overall. More verbiage surrounding the different area of cooperation could be seen as an indicator of the ambition of an agreement.[14] I also look at the *precision* of the agreement by counting the number of mentions to specific steps toward cooperation in a given issue area. For example, if agreements list economic integration as a goal, do they actually define targets for liberalization or discuss particular sectors or forms of barriers? Fewer specific words invoked in the service of this goal is an indicator of less precision. Finally, I look at the level of *enforcement* of the agreement using references to binding third-party dispute settlement or sanctions. More language surrounding the presence of these enforcement mechanism means a more binding agreement.[15] All of these variables represents outcomes of interest in evaluating the influence of security tension on agreement design.

The first set of models tests the role of conflict on the design stage of the process of cooperation. We would want to account for rival explanations as well, while taking into account the constraints imposed by the relatively small number of observations (51 agreements). All independent variables are measured for the founding members in the organization for the five years prior to the signing of the agreement, collapsed into averages across all members. Data were taking from the World Bank and the Correlates of War databases.

First, I operationalize the overall levels of *previous conflict* in the region by averaging the number of interstate militarized disputes among members. More disputes indicate greater security tensions that might motivate states to want to sign a cooperative agreement. I also look at overall wealth in countries through *GDP per capita* of the member

[14]More specific codings could result in a more precise measure of this concept, but this is a proxy. The variable does match up with preexisting codings of agreement ambition, including those in Gray and Slapin (2009); Haftel (2012) and (Lenz, 2012).

[15]This measure maps on well to Dür, Baccini and Elsig (2014)'s measure of dispute settlement (correlation coefficient (.72).

states; wealthier countries might design different types of agreements. I also look at the income *disparities* between members by looking at the distance of overall GDP between the richest and the poorest members. If there is a wide level of asymmetry among members, the design of the agreement might reflect the wishes of a regional hegemon in terms of the level of constraint. Two variables capture the economic conditions among member states in a given organization: one looks at the overall *level of exports* in the region, and a second looks at the previous levels of *exports to other members.* Overall levels of integration with the world as well as previous histories of economic cooperation might influence the degree of constraint, precision, scope and ambition in an IO. I also account for whether the agreement, after its founding, *died* subsequently (Gray 2017).

TABLE ABOUT HERE

The results of the models — simple OLS regressions to determine the relationship between the independent variables design outcomes of interest — can be found in Table . Although the number of observations is relatively small (several agreements ended up getting dropped due to missing data, usually in terms of time coverage) there are indications that the regional security environment has an influence on the way in which an agreement is designed. Previous conflict among members tends to result in agreements that have broader cooperative scope and higher levels of ambition (the coefficient is positive and statistically significant for both dependent variables). Those tensions, however, also result in agreements that are less precise about how those goals will be met, and are relatively thin on language regarding enforcement (negative and statistically significant coefficients for both of those dependent variables). This evidence supports the illustrations above.

Indeed, the variable operationalizing the security environment is the only one to have consistent effects across all dependent variables. The dead IOs tended to have narrower scope, as was suggested in the narratives about SEATO and CENTO which made the mistake of addressing the security tensions explicitly and then failing on those grounds. Higher average income per capita is associated with more vague agreements with weaker

enforcement mechanisms. Countries that already traded with one another tend to be more precise in their commitments, and countries with higher intra-member disparities tend to have more enforcement mechanisms in their agreements, perhaps in an attempt to constrain the more powerful members.

The next step is to look at whether these agreement design features tend to be associated with weaker agreements. It is difficult to establish a unified metric for whether agreements succeed at their own goals; as noted above, agreements have different aims, and sometimes even security agreements need only to avoid the outbreak of war in order to be deemed a success.

As a first cut at establishing this relationship, I use data from Gray and Slapin (2012) that uses expert judgment to evaluate the performance of regional economic organizations across a variety of dimensions. These data combine scoring from experts on regional organizations around the world. Because these are primarily economic organizations, there is only some overlap in the two datasets (n=15). However, they provide a good initial indication of the links between agreement design and effectiveness, a topic that has been extensively written on in other contexts.

TABLE ABOUT HERE

For this set of analyses (shown in Table , I use expert scoring on the dimension of the ability of an agreement to meet its own goals (ranging from -5 to 5) as the outcome of interest. For the independent variables, I use the same core variable as above — past conflict in the region — as the primary independent variable. The first model only includes one other control variable (incomes among member states) in order to accommodate the constraints imposed by the very few degrees of freedom. As before, security tensions are significant to the agreement: here, they are associated with a negative and statistically significant drop in an agreement's performance.

However, this effect is conditioned by agreement design. In the next model, I construct an index of agreement design consisting of the four dimensions described above, weighted

equally. Including this variable in the model results in a significant and negative coefficient on design, but no statistically significant result for security. This indicates that, to the degree that security tensions are correlated with the agreement design, it is the resultant design that drives the failure of the agreements.

3 Conclusion

Because the literature on IOs tends to focus primarily on living IOs, it has overlooked the role that collapsed IOs can play in subsequent IO formation. This paper has argued that the dominant focus has been too narrowly on the broad country characteristics that determine IGO membership and IGO, rather than considering in more nuance the types of environments in which those organizations tend to be created — including environments in which previous attempts at cooperation have failed. I have shown how security concerns influence both economic agreement design as well as implementation. When security issues loomed in the background, the designers of regional treaties often took great care to avoid compelling member states to cede sovereignity to the international structure of the organization, so as to encourage otherwise conflicting countries to join. This often resulted in agreements that had two shortcomings in terms of subsequent implementation. First, the scope of the functional cooperation often tended to be simultaneously broad (covering several disparate areas) and also vague, with few commitments or goals specifically delineated. Furthermore, the reluctance to tread on state sovereignity tended to result in organizations that lacked authority or autonomy to enforce those goals. The result is agreements that suffer from an inability to achieve their own goals.

The implications of this argument are several. First, it presents something of a paradox in terms of the cooperative prospects for conflictual nations. The failed agreements such as CENTO and SEATO offer evidence that meeting security tensions head-on will result in agreements that simply fail altogether. However, the second-best solution of a broader and more vague agreement also tends to fail, but in a different way. Many of those

agreements still exist, but as in the case of SAARC, they meet erratically and are widely criticised.

It is a point of normative discussion whether inactive and weak agreements are better than no agreement at all. Some might argue that even toothless agreements still give previously warring nations the chance to come together at summits and perhaps find more common ground than they might have done otherwise. Even if the heads of state convene infrequently, summits still provide room for informal diplomacy (Obino, 2009), which may lead to more cooperative outcomes than might otherwise be observed. Some might also praise the broad remit of these organizations as opening up possibilities for cooperation in a variety of areas at some point.[16] This is an empirical question that warrants further investigation.

It is also the case that some of these softer agreements have gone on to be relatively successful in other areas. ASEAN was formed in reaction to the failed SEATO, but it has achieved a measure of success in terms of economic cooperation. The European Union as well is a much-cited example of functionalist success. However, the determinants of agreement performance are also a hotly debated topic, and there might be other factors altogether that drive the relatively good performance of those agreements.

However, it is not clear that IOs formed states that exist in a tense security environment can design their way out of failure. As described in the illustrations, the Middle East saw five regional security organizations, three of which failed altogether and two of which are merely limping along. Those agreements varied widely in terms of design, with the ACC being highly institutionalized — but that one had the shortest lifespan of any of them. This perhaps points to the fact that interstate security is a difficult problem that takes far more than a regional organization to solve.

Although this paper has touched on the politics of inclusion and exclusion of key members in various regional arrangement, it has not developed specific hypotheses toward

[16]Indeed, former GCC secretary general Bishara raised this point with reference to the organization's broad and vague goals. "The thing about this which draws one's attention is the fact that this proposed mode of joint Gulf action is not burdened with any restriction. There is no ceiling and there are no confining fences. The field is wide open, flexible and untrammelled as regards future activity."

this end. Future research could elucidate on the effects of membership rules on the overall effectiveness of IOs across a variety of dimensions, and some scholars have already made strides in this area (Davis and Wilf, 2012; Gray, Lindstdt and Slapin, 2017).

This study points to future research in investigating the exact determinants of agreement success or failure in a security context. Further work would need to be done to specify the selection process of states into both certain types of conflict-prone environments as well as the agreements that result from them. This paper has pointed to a relationship that bears further interrogation.

References

Abbott, Kenneth, Robert Keohane, Andrew Moravcsik, Anne-Marie Slaughter and Duncan Snidal. 2000. "The Concept of Legalization." *International Organization* 54(3):401–419.

Abdelal, Rawi. 2009. *Capital Rules: The Construction of Global Finance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Acharya, Amitav. 2000. *Constructing a security community in Southeast Asia: ASEAN and the problem of regional order*. London: Routledge.

Adler, Emanuel and Michael Barnett. 1998. *Security Communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alter, Karen. 2008. "Delegating to International Courts." *Law and Contemporary Problems* 71:37–76.

Alter, Karen J. and Sophie Meunier. 2009. "The Politics of International Regime Complexity." *Perspectives on Politics* 7:13–24.

Baccini, Leo and A. Dur. 2009. "The New Regionalism and Policy Interdependence." Manuscript, University College Dublin.

Baldwin, Richard E. 1994. "Towards an Integrated Europe." London: CEPR.

Barnett, Michael N. 1998. *Dialogues in Arab Politics: Negotiations in Regional Order*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bearce, David H. and Sawa Omori. 2005. "How Do Commercial Institutions Promote Peace?" *Journal of Peace Research* 42(6):659–678.

Bearce, David H. and Stacy Bondanella. 2007. "Intergovernmental Organizations, Socialization, and Member-State Interest Convergence." *International Organization* 61:703–733.

Boehmer, Charles, Erik Gartzke and Timothy Nordstrom. 2004. "Do Intergovernmental Organizations Promote Peace?" *World Politics* 57(1):1–38.

Boerzel, Tanja. 2001. "Non-compliance in the European Union." *Journal of European Public Policy* 8(5):803–824.

Boerzel, Tanja A. 2005. "Mind the gap! European integration between level and scope." *Journal of European Public Policy* 12(2):217–236.

Bohr, Annette. 2004. "Regionalism in Central Asia: New Geopolitics, Old Regional Order." *International Affairs* 80(3):485502.

Burton, Emilie M. Hafner. 2005. "Trading Human Rights." *International Organization* 59(3):593–629.

Buzan, Barry and Ole Woever. 2003. *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chaudoin, Stephen, Jude Hays and Raymond Hicks. 2016. "Do We Really Know That the WTO Cures Cancer? False Positives and International Organizations." Forthcoming, British Journal of Political Science.

Checkel, Jeffrey T. 2001. "Why Comply? Social Learning and European Identity Change." *International Organization* 55(2).

Chwieroth, Jeffrey M. 2009. *Capital Ideas.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Davis, Christina. 2009. "Overlapping Institutions in Trade Policy." *Perspectives on Politics* 7(1):25–31.

Davis, Christina and Meredith Wilf. 2012. "Joining the Club: Accession to the GATT/WTO." Working Paper.

Davis, Christina and Tyler Pratt. 2016. "The Forces of Attraction: How Security Interests Shape Membership in Economic Institutions." Working Paper.

Deutsch, Karl. 1957. *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience*. Princeton University Press: Princeton University Press.

Diez, Thomas, Stephan Stetter and Mathias Albert. 2006. "The European Union and Border Conflicts: The Transformative Power of Integration." *International Organization* 60(03):563–593.

Donno, Daniela. 2010. "Who is Punished?" *International Organization* 64(4):593–625.

Dorussen, Han and Emil J. Kirchner. 2014. "Better a good neighbor than a distant friend: the scope and impact of regional security organizations." 14(1):117–146.

Downs, George, David M. Rocke and Peter Barsoom. 1996. "Is the Good News about Compliance Good News for Cooperation?" *International Organization* 50.

Dür, Andreas, Leonardo Baccini and Manfred Elsig. 2014. "The Design of International Trade Agreements." *Review of International Organizations* .

Elsig, Manfred. 2010. "The World Trade Organization at work." *Review of International Organizations* 5(3):345–363.

Fausett, Elizabeth and Thomas J. Volgy. 2010. "Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs) and Interstate Conflict: Parsing Out IGO Effects for Alternative Dimensions of Conflict in Postcommunist Space." *International Studies Quarterly* 54(1):79–101.

Gartzke, Erik. 2007. "The Capitalist Peace." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(1):166–191.
URL: *http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2007.00244.x*

Gartzke, Erik, Quan Li and Charles Boehmer. 2001. "Investing in the Peace: Economic Interdependence and International Conflict." *International Organization* 55:391–438.

Gosovic, T.B. and J.G. Ruggie. 2009. "On the creation of a new international economic order: issue linkage and the Seventh Special Session of the UN General Assembly." *International Organization* 30(2):309–345.

Gray, Julia. 2014. "Domestic Capacity and the Implementation Gap in Regional Trade Agreements." Forthcoming, Comparative Political Studies.

Gray, Julia. 2017. "Life, Death, or Zombies? Vitality in International Organizations." Forthcoming, ISQ.

Gray, Julia and Jonathan B. Slapin. 2012. "How Well Do Regional Trade Agreements Work?" *Review of International Organizations* 7(3).

Gray, Julia and Jonathan Slapin. 2009. "Why Some Regional Trade Agreements Work." Midwest Political Science Association 67th Annual National Conference.

Gray, Julia, Ren Lindstdt and Jonathan B. Slapin. 2017. "The Dynamics of Enlargement in International Organizations." *International Interactions* 43(4):619–642.
URL: *https://doi.org/10.1080/03050629.2017.1228039*

Haas, Ernst. 1958. *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social, and. Economic Forces, 1950-57.* Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.

Haas, Michael. 1965. "A Functional Approach to International Organization." *The Journal of Politics* 27(3):498–517.
URL: *http://www.jstor.org/stable/2127737*

Hafner-Burton, Emilie M. and Alexander H. Montgomery. 2006. "Power Positions: International Organizations, Social Networks, and Conflict." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50(1):3–27.

Haftel, Yoram. 2012. *Regional Economic Institutions and Conflict Mitigation.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Haftel, Yoram and Stephanie Hofmann. 2016. "Institutional Authority and Security Cooperation within Regional Economic Organizations." available online July 27 from Comparative Political Studies.

Haftel, Yoram Z. 2007. "Designing for Peace." *International Organization* 61(1):217–237.

Hawkins, Darren G, David A Lake, Daniel L Nielson and Michael J Tierney. 2006. Delegation under anarchy: states, international organizations and principal-agent theory. In *Delegation and Agency in International Organizations*, ed. Darren G Hawkins, David A Lake, Daniel L Nielson and Michael J Tierney. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hazlewood, Arthur. 1979. "The End of the East African Community: What Are the Lessons for Regional Integration Schemes?" *Journal of Common Market Studies* 18(1):4058.

Hemmer, Christopher and Peter J. Katzenstein. 2002. "Why is There No NATO in Asia? Collective Identity, Regionalism, and the Origins of Mulilateralism." *International Organization* 56(3).

Hooghe, Liesbet and Gary Marks. 2016. "The Authority of International Organizations: The Effects of Scope and Scale." Manuscript.

Hurrell, Andrew. 1995. "Explaining the resurgence of regionalism in world politics." *Review of International Studies* 21(04):331–358.

Jetschke, Anja and Patrick Theiner. 2016. "The Diffusion of Institutional Design Among Regional Organizations." Working paper.

Jo, Hyeran and Hyun Namgung. 2012. "Dispute Settlement Mechanisms in Preferential Trade Agreements: Democracy, Boilerplates, and the Multilateral Trade Regime." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 56(6):1041–1068.

Johnson, Tana. 2013. "Institutional Design and Bureaucrats' Impact on Political Control." *Journal of Politics* 75(1):183–197.

Johnston, Alastair Iain. 2001. "Treating International Institutions as Social Environments." *International Studies Quarterly* 45:487–515.

JONES, DAVID MARTIN and MICHAEL L. R. SMITH. 2007. "Constructing communities: the curious case of East Asian regionalism." *Review of International Studies* 33:165–186.

Jr, Joseph S. Nye. 1970. "Comparing Common Markets: A Revised Neo-Functionalist Model." *International Organization* 24(4):796835.

Kechichlan, Joseph A. 1994. "Security Efforts in the Arab World: A Brief Examination of Four Regional Organizations." RAND's National Defense Research Institute, N-3570-USDP Contract MDA903-90-C-0004.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verba. 2004. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

Koremenos, Barbara, Charles Lipson and Duncan Snidal. 2001. "The Rational Design of International Institutions." *International Organization* 55:761–780.

Kucik, Jeffrey and Eric Reinhardt. 2008. "Does Flexibility Promote Cooperation? An Application to the Global Trade Regime." *International Organization* 62(03):477–505.

Legalization as Strategy: The Asia-Pacific Case. 2000. *International Organization* 54(3):549–571.

Lenz, Tobias. 2012. "Spurred Emulation: The EU and Regional Integration in Mercosur and SADC." *West European Politics* 35(1):155–173.

Mansfield, Ed. 1994. "Power, Trade, and War.".

Mansfield, Ed and Rachel Bronson. 1997. "Alliances, Preferential Trading Arrangements, and International Trade." *American Political Science Review* 91(1):94–107.

Mansfield, Edward D. and Helen V. Milner. 1999. "The New Wave of Regionalism." *International Organization* 53(3):589–627.

Mansfield, Edward D. and Jack Snyder. 2009. Democratization, Conflict, and Trade. In *Is Democracy Exportable?*, ed. Zoltan Barany and Robert G. Moser. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mansfield, Edward D. and Jon C. Pevehouse. 2000. "Trade Blocs, Trade Flows, and International Conflict." *International Organization* 54:775–808.

Mansfield, Edward and Helen Milner. 1997. *The Political Economy of Regionalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Mansfield, Edward, Helen Milner and Peter Rosendorf. 2000. "Free to Trade:Democracies, Autocracies and International Trade." *American Political Science Review* 94(2):305–321.

Mattli, Walter. 1999. *The Logic of Regional Integration*. Cambridge University Press.

Mitchell, Sara McLaughlin and Paul R. Hensel. 2007. "International Institutions and Compliance with Agreements." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(4):721–737.

Moravcsik, Andrew. 1998. *The Choice For Europe*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Nye, Joseph S. 1968. "Comparative Regional Integration. Concept and Measurement." *International Organization* 22(4):861862.

Obino, Francesco. 2009. "SAARC: The Political Challenge for South Asia and Beyond." *Economic and Political Weekly* 44(9):118–125.

Oneal, John R. and Bruce Russett. 2001. *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Pevehouse, Jon and Bruce Russett. 2006. "Democratic International Governmental Organizations Promote Peace." *International Organization* 60(04):969–1000.

Pevehouse, Jon C. 2002. "With a Little Help from My Friends?" *American Journal of Political Science* 46(3):611–626.

Poast, Paul and Johannes Urpelainen. 2015. "How International Organizations Support Democratization: Preventing Authoritarian Reversals or Promoting consolidation?" *World Politics* 67:72–113.

Poulsen, Lauge. 2014. "Bounded Rationality and the Diffusion of Modern Investment Treaties." *International Studies Quarterly* 58(1):1–14.

Raulstiala, Kal and Anne-Marie Slaughter. 2002. International Law, International Relations and Compliance. In *The Handbook of International Relations*, ed. Walter Carlnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth Simmons. Sage Publications, Ltd.

Russett, Bruce, John R. Oneal and David R. Davis. 1998. "The Third Leg of the Kantian Tripod for Peace: International Organizations and Militarized Disputes, 195085." *International Organization* 52(03):441–467.

Scalapino, Robert, Seizaburo Sato, Jusuf Wanandi and Sungjoo Han. 1989. Organizing the Pacific. Berkeley, CA: University of California pp. 329–350.

Shannon, Megan. 2009. "Preventing War and Providing the Peace? International Organizations and the Management of Territorial Disputes." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 26(2):144–163.

Shannon, Megan, Daniel Morey and Frederick J. Boehmke. 2010. "The Influence of International Organizations on Militarized Dispute Initiation and Duration." *International Studies Quarterly* 54(4):11231141.

Solingen, Etel. 1998. *Regional Orders at Century's Dawn*. Princeton: Princeton U Press.

Solingen, Etel. 2008. "The Genesis, Design and Effects of Regional Institutions: Lessons from East Asia and the Middle East." *International Studies Quarterly* 52(1).

Tallberg, Jonas. 2002. "Paths to Compliance." *International Organization* 56(3):609–643.

Thompson, Alexander and Yoram Z. Haftel. 2006. "The Independence of International Organizations: Concept and Applications." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50(2):253–275.

Tobin, Jennifer L. and Marc L. Busch. 2010. "A BIT Is Better Than a Lot: Bilateral Investment Treaties and Preferential Trade Agreements." *World Politics* 62(01):1–42.

VonStein, Jana. 2005. "Do Treaties Constrain or Screen?" *American Political Science Review* 99:611–622.

Wendt, Alexander. 2001. "Driving with the Rearview Mirror." *International Organization* 55(4).

Table 1: **List of Agreements**

African and Malagasy Union OCAM
African Economic Community AEC
African Union
African, Caribbean and Pacific Group ACP
Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization ACTO
Andean Community (Andean Pact) AC
Arab Cooperation Council ACC
Arab Maghreb Union AMU
Arctic Council AC
Association of Caribbean States ACS
Association of South East Asian Nations ASEAN
Baghdad Pact/METO/CENTO
Benelux Union BU
Black Sea Economic Cooperation BSEC
Caribbean Community CARICOM
Central African Economic and Monetary Community CEMAC
Central American Integration System SICA
Central American Integration System SICA/CACM
Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa COMESA
Commonwealth of Independent States CIS
Council for Mutual Economic Assistance CMEA
Council of Arab Economic Unity CAEU
Council of Europe CE
Council of the Entente CE
Customs Union of West Africa (UDAO)
Dominican Republic-Central America Free Trade Agreement
East African Community EAC
Economic Community of Central African States ECCAS
Economic Community of Great Lake Countries CEPGL
Economic Community of West African States ECOWAS
Economic Cooperation Organization ECO
European Economic Area EEA
European Free Trade Association EFTA
European Union EU
Gulf Cooperation Council GCC
Indian Ocean Commission IOC
Inter-Governmental Authority on Development IGAD
Latin American Economic System LAES/SELA
Latin American Integration Association LAIA
League of Arab States LAS
Liptako-Gourma Integrated Authority LGA
Mano River Union MRU
Melanesian Spearhead Group MSG
Nordic Council NC
North American Free Trade Agreement NAFTA
North Atlantic Treaty Organization NATO
Organization for European Economic Development OEEC
Organization of American States OAS
Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries OAPEC
Organization of Black Sea Economic Cooperation BSEC
Organization of Central American States ODECA
Organization of Eastern Caribbean States OECS
Organization of Islamic Conference OIC
South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation SAARC
Southeast Asian Treaty Organization SEATO
Southern African Customs Union SACU
Southern African Development Community SADC
Southern Common Market MERCOSUR
Warsaw Treaty Organization WTO
West African Economic and Monetary Union WAEMU
West African Economic Co-operation CEAO

Table 2: **Security Influences on Agreement Design**

	Scope of Agreement	Ambition of Agreement	Precision of Language	Enforcement Mechanisms
Constant	4.560**	1816.630	38.245	45.272
	(1.29)	(1040.36)	(24.31)	(27.37)
Previous Conflicts	0.346**	272.427**	-5.786*	-7.490**
	(0.16)	(129.58)	(3.05)	(3.43)
Disparity among Members	0.526	306.155	10.174	11.892*
	(0.26)	(210.84)	(4.98)	(5.61)
Dead IO	-0.894*	-490.560	-6.275	-11.864
	(0.47)	(343.04)	(8.03)	(9.04)
Income per capita	-0.787	-572.847	-16.545*	-19.576*
	(0.40)	(328.55)	(7.74)	(8.71)
Exports (total)	0.191*	141.904	2.024	2.750
	(0.08)	(70.59)	(1.65)	(1.86)
Previous Exports	41.925	308.988	53.874*	43.975
to Members	(26.71)	(863.48)	(21.76)	(24.50)
p	0.049	0.161	0.025	0.049
N	38	38	37	37
R^2	0.334	0.245	0.365	0.327

Effects of security environment on four different aspects of agreement design. OLS regressions. Standard errors in parentheses.