

Regional Trade Agreements as Security Institutions Project: Challenges in Coding Multi-issue Treaties

Kathy L. Powers
Department of Political Science
220 Pond Laboratory
Pennsylvania State University
State College, Pennsylvania 16802
Email: klp18@psu.edu

Gary Goertz
Department of Political Science
315 Social and Behavioral Sciences
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona 85721
Email: ggoertz@u.arizona.edu

Abstract

Regional trade agreements (RTAs) are trade institutions that also serve security functions (e.g. military alliances, provide military forces). RTA treaties, therefore, are multi-issue treaties. They specify member state obligations in trade and security integration. Such multidimensional conflict management complicates our ability to isolate the nature of the trade institutions – conflict relationship. The purpose of this paper is to: (1) describe the project, (2) to present the coding instrument used to measure RTA security structure, and (3) to discuss the practical challenges that arise when collecting data on multi-issues treaties. These challenges include: (a) criteria for an RTA treaty, (b) RTA legal document official languages, (c) complex issue linkage through multi-issue treaty provisions, and (d) RTA legal documents versus RTA policy.

This project was supported by funding from the National Science Foundation grant (SES-02415754), the Social and Behavioral Sciences Research Institute and the Udall Center for Public Policy at the University of Arizona as well as a PEIR grant from the Department of Political Science at Pennsylvania State University. Any errors are the responsibility of the author.

Prepared for delivery at the 2005 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Sept. 1- Sept.4, 2005. Copyright by the American Political Science Association.

Project Summary

Regional Trade Agreements (RTAs) are trade institutions that can also be security institutions. Trade institutions specify rules for trade liberalization in the form of reduced tariff barriers and trade policy harmonization (e.g. uniform customs policy) among member states. Security institutions stipulate rules that prescribe how member countries jointly address mutual security concerns among the membership. Though it is little known, RTA treaties may, and often do, include military alliance agreements and security components within their framework. We must remember that RTA membership often consists of former and present enemies as well as longtime rivals that do experience militarized conflict. Scholarly inquiry has analyzed the conditions under which regional trade agreements diminish militarized conflict *indirectly* through increased economic interdependence due to RTA-induced trade liberalization. We examine the *direct* impacts of RTA structure on conflict via the security components built into the structure of the RTA institution.

Conflict among member states may lead to the transformation of RTAs into security institutions. RTAs as security institutions not only influence the occurrence and severity of militarized conflict among its members, but such belligerence between members or in the region leads to institutional change within RTAs. RTAs become security institutions in part because their members face immediate and pressing security concerns. Hence, we need not only to see how RTAs influence conflict but also how conflict influences the RTA. This implies a theory of international institutions, and in particular *institutional change*, that we propose to develop and empirically test.

The *objectives* of this study are two-fold: to develop and empirically test a model of (1) how variations in RTA security structure shape militarized conflict among member states and (2) how militarized conflict among member states alters RTA security structures during the period 1950-2000. To accomplish these objectives, project activities include extending the existing data set from African states and security integration in their trade agreements to all RTAs in the world (47) during this time period (see table 1).

Table 1: Total Number of RTAs Created Per Region, 1950-2000

Region in which RTA created	Total Number of RTAs created in the Region
Africa	18 (38.3%)
Asia	7 (14.9%)
Caribbean	4 (8.5%)
European	4 (8.5%)
Russia and Former Soviet Republics	4 (8.5%)
Latin America	5 (10.6%)
North America	1 (2.1%)
Middle East	4 (8.5%)
N	47
Mixed*	7

*RTA includes at least one state from another region

The broader impact of the project extends to theory and policy. This inquiry will inform studies of institutions, trade and conflict by moving beyond the connection between *institutional membership* and war to assessing variation in *institutional structure*, specifically multi-issue commitments through RTA treaties, and conflict. On the policy side, the consequences of policymakers using trade organizations to address regional security matters will be illuminated. International institutions are involved in dealing with almost all disputes in the world today. It is imperative for diplomats and leaders to understand how institutions are used to mediate conflicts, and how conflicts are likely to put institutional change on their agendas.

The purpose of this paper is to: (1) describe the Regional Trade Agreements as Security Institutions Project, (2) to present the coding instrument used to measure RTA security structure, and (3) to discuss the practical challenges that arise when collecting data on multi-issues treaties. These challenges include (a) criteria for an RTA treaty, (b) RTA legal document official languages, (c) complex issue linkage through multi-issue treaty provisions, and (c) RTA legal documents versus RTA policy.

The organization of this paper is as follows. First, the theoretical implications of RTAs on conflict and conflict on RTAs will be discussed. How these research questions inform our understanding of trade institutions and conflict, as well as institutional change are

discussed. The security functions of RTAs are the focus of section 2 while section 3 focuses on the measurement and data collection of RTA security components. Challenges in coding multi-issue treaties like RTA agreements highlight section 4. A summary of the project challenges and statement of project status are included in the concluding section of this paper.

Theoretical Implications

We evaluate a policy model of international institutional change that sees two routes to institutional change. Because RTA member states face direct and immediate security concerns, they turn to RTAs as one institutional means for dealing with them. The second route is a diffusion one, whereby as more and more RTAs incorporate security mechanisms, it becomes more and more boilerplate in institutional design. The first route implies a functional theory of international institutions (Goertz 2001) and social constructivist approaches (e.g. Finnermore and Sikkink 2001). Instead we draw on the domestic policy literature, in particular the punctuated equilibrium and agenda-setting literature (e.g. Kingdon 1984; Baumgartner and Jones 1993).

These relationships – RTA on conflict, and conflict on RTA – are important to understanding international relations because the number of RTAs and their scope has dramatically increased in the last fifty years. Conventional wisdom suggests that military allies form regional trade agreements. Peaceful relations with high intra-RTA trade flows are an expected consequence (Mansfield and Bronson 1997; Mansfield and Pevehouse 2000). RTA members, however, are often former and present enemies that engage in militarized conflict (France and Germany in the European Union (EU); India and Pakistan in the South Asian Association Regional Commission (SAARC)). Examples of RTA members involved in a militarized interstate dispute with each other are provided in table 2. We must also understand the role of RTAs in exacerbating militarized violence among member states (Hafner-Burton & Montgomery 2005). Third, the scope of these institutions has expanded over time to include security issues. So, a timely question that emerges is what are the consequences of shared membership in RTAs – which themselves vary with respect to their security structures – for the likelihood and severity of militarized conflict? Second, since

RTA members engage in militarized conflict, will RTA institutional structure change in order to manage such hostilities?

Table 2: Examples of RTA members that experienced militarized interstate disputes (MIDs) among member states

RTA	RTA members involved in a MID
Andean Community	Chile-Argentina
Central American Common Market	Honduras-Nicaragua
Arab Maghreb Union	Morocco-Nigeria
Council of Entente	Benin-Nigeria
SAARC	India-Pakistan
ASEAN	Thailand- North Vietnam

The causal chain is composed of two levels of analysis. Conflict generated by dyads gives states reasons to modify RTA structure and adopt security components. Resulting RTA security integration is a cause for fewer or less severe disputes. The *causal mechanisms* for conflict reduction via RTA security integration are (1) rules in the form of military alliance agreements, (2) nonviolent conflict resolution through dispute settlement mechanisms and (3) special security components to take action, which can all be specified in the RTA treaty. The basic *hypotheses* tested are: (1) dyad membership in an RTA with security integration reduces militarized conflict more so than shared membership in an RTA without such integration, (2) militarized conflict among dyad members that share RTA membership will contribute to more RTA security integration, and (3) institutional change results from diffusion processes. A two equation model is employed to assess the reciprocal effects of RTA security integration and conflict.

The Security Functions of RTAs

RTAs are a type of security institution that specifies rules for trade liberalization (i.e. reduction of protectionist policies like tariff barriers) among a limited number of states. Although the European Union and NAFTA are the most-well known RTAs, many developing countries and nondemocracies belong to more than one RTA. Numerous such

agreements exist in Africa, Latin America, the Middle East, and Asia (e.g. ECOWAS, MERCOSUR, GCC (Gulf Cooperation Council), ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian States) and a growing number are being formed among Central European countries and former Soviet Republics (e.g. CIS (Commonwealth of Independent States), CEFTA (Central European Free Trade Agreement), and the Black Sea Economic Cooperation). We will examine all RTAs from 1950 to 2000.

In what ways are RTAs security institutions? *Security institutions* specify rules for how member states address mutual security concerns (Haftendorn, Keohane and Wallender 1999). When RTAs include military alliance agreements and create institutional structures that directly address mutual security concerns among the membership within the framework of the RTA treaty, they become security institutions. Since we focus on how RTAs act as security institutions, the institutional dimension considered in this project is *security integration* in a RTA. Security integration is the degree of sovereignty that member states relinquish to the RTA in order to directly address mutual security concerns and includes institutional mechanisms designed specifically to address security issues. Level of security integration builds on Haftendorn et al's (1999) argument that the degree of institutionalization in a security institution matters for its ability to manage conflict.

Level of security integration includes the following (see table 2): (1) presence of a military alliance agreement in a RTA; (2) presence of a dispute settlement mechanism in a RTA and (3) presence of a special security mechanism (e.g. working group, joint defense councils and military forces that can serve defense and/or peacekeeping purposes). Of course, a regional trade agreement may have none, some, or all of these characteristics. These three dimensions of security integration are important because they capture the influence of rules that guide a military response in the security arena, the use of dispute settlement mechanisms to resolve disputes nonviolently, and special security mechanisms to directly address security concerns (see table 3).

Table 3: Coding Scheme for the level of security integration to an RTA

Concept	Definition	Type
RTA with a military alliance agreement	Agreement specifies rules for member states to militarily address mutual security concerns.	a.) entente pact b.) internal security pact c.) nonaggression pact, d.) mutual defense pact
RTA with a dispute settlement mechanism	Organ for negotiation, mediation, arbitration and/or adjudication	Jurisdiction of DSM under RTA treaty: a.) trade only b.) trade & security
RTA with a special security mechanism	Organ composed of experts that specifically deal with security issues in the RTA	Type of special security mechanism: a.) working group, b.) joint defense council, c.) joint military forces

*Powers (2001)

RTAs security integration varies. For example the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) is an example of a RTA that evolved into a security institution. It has the most institutionally complex security structure of any RTA globally. The ECOWAS treaty includes protocols for a non-aggression pact as well as a mutual defense pact as well as a military force, standing court and early warning system. See table 4 for other examples of RTA military alliance provisions in RTA treaties.

Table 4: Examples of RTA Military Alliances

RTA	Type of RTA	Type of alliance	Military Alliance language in RTA treaty	Treaty source
Common Market of Eastern and Southern African States (COMESA)	Common Market	Non-aggression pact	“Non-aggression between states”	COMESA Treaty. Chapter III. Article 6.
Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)	Customs Union	Non-aggression pact & Mutual defense pact	“The signatory States to the Protocol on Non-Aggression, the Protocol on Mutual Defense, the Community Declaration of Political Principles and the African Charter on Human Rights agree to co-operate for the purpose of realizing, the objectives of these instruments.”	The ECOWAS Treaty, Chapter X: Cooperation in Political, Judicial and Legal Affairs, Regional Security and Immigration 56 Political Affairs.
Southern African Development Community (SADC)	Customs Union	Mutual defense pact	“In accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, State Parties shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, other than for the legitimate purpose of individual collective self-defence against an armed attack.	SADC Protocol on Politics, Defence and Security Co-operation. Article 11.

*Powers (2004: 378)

The first analyses of RTA military alliances and conflict were conducted on African RTA military alliances and militarized interstate disputes (Powers 2004, Powers manuscript [c]). For African RTA military alliances, findings suggest target state membership in a RTA military alliance diminishes dispute initiation on the part of the challenger state while dyad RTA military alliance membership has little influence on the likelihood of a militarized interstate dispute between them.

Other examples of RTAs with alliances and other security components include, for example, in Latin America, the Southern Cone Common Market (MERCOSUR) has a joint defense committee and some military cooperation among member states. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) have mutual defense pacts. The CIS has joint military exercises and provisions for multiple military forces, one for defense and peacekeeping purpose and the other for nuclear disaster

problems. Focusing on conflict outside of the community and terrorism within it, the European Union has created a rapid reaction force.

Measurement and Data Collection of RTA Security Components: Research Design and Coding Sheet

Research Design

Data collection focuses on RTA security integration. These RTA structural variables are the independent variables that will be employed to assess how the presence and level of security integration of a RTA has consequences for the likelihood and severity of militarized conflict. The data gathered is coded according to the scheme presented in table 1 and tracked over time for each analysis in the study: (1) dyad-year and (2) the RTA-year. The temporal domain is 1950-2000. Three dimensions of security integration are examined: (1) a military alliance agreement embedded in the RTA treaty; (2) a dispute settlement mechanism for negotiation, mediation, and arbitration embedded in the RTA structure; (3) a special security mechanism (i.e. joint defense council, military force) embedded in the RTA structure. Essentially, dyad-year membership in a RTA with security integration and RTA-year security integration are tracked on three dimensions from 1950-2000. The conflict focus of the military alliance agreement in a RTA is being collected and coded. Given that the jurisdiction of a RTA dispute settlement mechanism (DSM) expands when RTAs become security institutions, RTA DSMs can address trade and security issues under the treaty. Thus, the type of DSM is being collected and coded. Finally, RTAs with special security mechanisms may vary in the type of mechanism that they choose to directly address mutual security concerns. The type of special security mechanism is being collected and coded as well. The existing data set will expand from approximately 30,000 observations to over 300,000 observations.

Powers (2001) employed this coding scheme to assess variation in the type of security integration in African RTAs. RTA level of security integration data includes (i.e. presence and type of military alliance agreement, dispute settlement mechanism and special security mechanism) for twenty RTAs from 1950-1992. The same coding scheme will be employed for the remaining RTAs around the world and until the year 2000.

Data sources for RTA security integration include the Yearbook of International Organizations and the Political Handbook of the World. These sources contain information

on RTAs that have organizational embodiment – i.e. a secretariat – but do not include those that do not possess an organizational existence and are only written agreements. These RTAs can still have military alliance agreements in their treaties and if not included biases our results.

The Coding Sheet

The coding instrument is designed to capture the specific aspects of RTA institutional structure. First, we must distinguish between regional trade agreements that are written agreements only versus those that have a physical organizational structure to support the implementation of RTA legal document provisions (see definition in Appendix 1).¹ International institutions are rules that specify member behavior while international organizations provide organizational structure to support and implement those RTA rules. As intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), RTA members are countries.

The first three sections of the coding sheet center on basic RTA information. Section 1 of the coding sheet focuses on basic IGO information like the name of the RTA, the address, website and contact information for the secretariat (see Appendix 2). The official languages are provided to indicate how to communicate with bureaucrats that work in the secretariat as well as the language of RTA official documents. Information about the particular legal document being coded is of interest in section 2. The RTA legal document id number, date signed, document source and name of coding sheet are included. This information is especially important for RTAs that have multiple legal documents, like the CIS which has produced 1000 legal documents. Section 3 deals with RTA provisions for state accession, state abrogation (i.e. withdrawal), document termination and conditions under which state governments may have reservations. Under the latter provision, governments with accepted reservations may refrain from complying with the particular RTA provision in response to national security concerns.

RTA legal document issue coverage and organizational structure for specific issue areas are the heart of the coding sheet. Section 4 focuses on specific issue coverage (e.g. economic integration, common services, and security issues). Because RTAs are fundamentally trade institutions, we record information on the level of economic integration. The degree of economic integration that the RTA proclaims in its documents rather than

actual level of economic integration achieved is the information coded. Nye (1971) argued in a seminal piece that we have forgotten the non-trade forms of economic integration that may also have consequences for militarized conflict involving member states. Q054 reflects this argument. States often integrate in common services like transportation, natural resource management and the environment to support trade and manage security. In the structure of the East African Community, member states (i.e. Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda) jointly provided for and shared an airline, railway system, road construction and harbor to facilitate transportation in trade because none of them could provide these services alone. This question lists all potential common services while Q110 asks whether any of these common services are referred to as security issues in the RTA legal document. Categories that RTA members have referred to as community wide security issues are listed in Q056. Finally, Q112 asks whether the RTA legal document has provisions for security agreements other than military alliance agreements (e.g. disarmament and non-proliferation agreements). ECOWAS member states, for example, have agreed to an ECOWAS moratorium on small arms since use and trade of these weapons fuel most civil conflicts.

Questions regarding RTA organizational structure are the other key aspect of the coding sheet. In Section 5, questions regarding the presence of basic IGO structure (e.g. secretariat, executive body, representative assembly, decision making rules and regular meetings) are the focus of Q058 and Q060. Questions Q076 to Q080 focus on the security provisions in the RTA legal document (e.g. alliance agreement disarmament agreement) while Questions Q082 and Q084 focus on the organizational structure to support these rules.² The presence of a military force or joint defense council composed of member defense ministers are examples.

The final three sections focus on background information, coder information and state information. In order to track institutional change, background information on the formation history of the RTA and the role of key actors in its creation and any institutional change are recorded. The narratives are based on RTA historical research rather than RTA legal documents. Information on the dates each state signed the RTA legal document, abrogated, had reservations and type of reservations is information sought in some of the questions in this section. The name of the coder and date the coding sheet was last updated are also included. Now that an overview of the coding sheet has been provided, challenges

encountered thus far in coding RTA legal documents will be discussed in the following section.

Challenges in Coding RTA treaties

Criteria for RTA legal documents

We originally assumed that each of the 47 RTAs was governed by one or two treaties each. We anticipated coding between 47 and 94 RTA treaties. As we began the data collection phase of the project, we discovered that RTA legal documents included other kinds of documents besides treaties and were legally binding among member states under international law. Information on RTA trade and security issues could be found in any of these documents. These documents include treaties, protocols, agreements, conventions, supplemental protocols and supplemental conventions. Since we are only interested in the fact that all of these documents are legally binding, we do not distinguish among these document types.

We do not include other kinds of RTA legal documents like decisions, memoranda, reports and policies because they are not binding under international law. We have accepted that this research design decision does sacrifice some information since the European Union, for instance, treats decisions as legally binding documents and precedent while many RTAs do not. A dearth of RTA legal documents is the consequence of this discovery. We have found the each RTA on average has about 25 legal documents which translate into approximately 1,175 RTA legal documents that we are coding. Since there has been no comprehensive data collection project of RTA legal documents to date, we were unaware of this nontrivial challenge. Outliers include the European Union (EU) (90), Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) (50) and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) (1000).³ Assessing the influence of RTA security structure on conflict and vice versa is a first step in determining when these documents matter in international politics and when they might be irrelevant. Two consequences of this challenge include securing resources for more coders than originally planned and finding these documents. Most RTAs post their legal documents on websites. These documents are often easily downloadable as .PDF or .TXT files. Legal documents presently in force are usually posted while expired ones are often not

available on the websites. In those cases, we secured original treaties from library sources. The UN treaty series and the websites of member countries often include copies of RTA treaties.

RTA Legal Document Official Language

RTA legal documents are often available in all of the official languages of the RTA. This is not true, however, in all cases. For instance, the Gulf Cooperation Council's website posts GCC economic agreements in English and Arabic but its security agreements in Arabic only. The Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) official languages are Russian and Ukrainian only. These examples reflect the importance of language skills necessary in coding international treaties and other legal documents. This challenge was a lesson regarding coder skills. Our anticipated needs included coders with experience in data collection and statistical analysis. We knew that some treaties might be written in French, Spanish or Portuguese but had not anticipated other language issues referenced. It was a lesson in the importance of language skills when examining international treaties. To address this obstacle, we have two graduate research assistants fluent in Russian and one is also fluent in Ukrainian. One of the PI's (Gary Goertz) speaks and reads French and Spanish while we have a coder with Arabic skills from a third university coding these documents

How to capture multiple dimensions of RTA issues

Designing questions that capture not only the multiple issues referenced in RTA legal documents but the complex dimensions of those issues have been a challenge. As referenced earlier, integration in common services is conducted to support RTA trade and to deal with RTA security issues. We can not understand how such integration through RTA structure influences interstate conflict without understanding how common services influence interstate conflict via their connections to trade and security. A very good example of this issue is RTA water resource management. It is virtually unknown that RTA member states often share international river basins and sign RTA water treaties to manage those basins. In order to do so, these RTA water legal documents manage the trade, environment and security aspects of these shared resources. Issue linkage is interwoven in the provisions of these RTA legal documents (Powers manuscript [a,b]; Powers 2005).

International river basins are navigation corridors and sources of aquatic commodities in international trade, home to aquatic life, political borders and sources of hydroelectric power. They cover 50% of the Earth's surface (Milich and Varaday 1998). Since water is an unsubstitutable resource necessary for human survival, administering international river basin issues may lead to peaceful conflict management among member states. For example, RTAs manage transportation across international rivers, the environmental consequences of trade related transportation for aquatic life and basins as political borders between states. Some RTAs, like ECOWAS and SADC, include provisions for the use of military forces in response to an outbreak of interstate or intrastate conflict (Powers 2005c). RTA water treaties include non-riparian RTA member states and sometimes non-member landlocked states that require access to the basin. In contrast, RTA military alliance treaties require membership in the RTA in order to be a member of the alliance (Powers manuscript [b]).

RTA legal documents versus RTA policy

RTA legal documents include provisions for multiple issues and the varied connections to trade and security. But RTAs are not limited to international legal documents like treaties as a way to stipulate rules and organizational structure in trade and security. Some RTAs rely on policies. For example, the European Union uses EU regional water policies rather than legal documents like treaties to manage water resources with respect to trade, environment and security issues. If we only pay attention to the role of RTA legal documents in trade and security, we could underestimate the influence of the EU or other RTAs on conflict. In terms of tracking institutional change, why some RTAs manage conflict through trade and security legal documents (signed by member state governments) while others use RTA policies created by RTA bureaucracies is a timely question that requires more in depth research but is beyond the scope of this paper.

Conclusion

The purpose of this project is to assess the relationship between RTA institutional structure, in the form of rules and organizational mechanisms, in relation to militarized conflict. Do RTAs prevent or lead to conflict and does conflict lead to institutional change in RTAs are the central research questions. The major challenges encountered in this

international treaty (and other legal documents) coding project are 1) criteria for a RTA legal document, 2) RTA legal document official language, 3) How to capture multiple dimensions of RTA issues, and 4) RTA legal documents versus RTA policies.

The lessons learned to date include an augmented skill set necessary among coders. Data collection experience and quantitative methods training were required for our project but language skills were just as important if not more so. Second, given the increased importance of international law in international relations, international legal documents like treaties have drastically increased in number. The resources necessary for collecting and coding these documents was greater than originally anticipated. Finally, questions that ask about the number and type of issues covered under the RTA treaty are not sufficient. Additional questions must be composed to address the multiple and nuanced ways that trade institutions are connected to conflict. How those issues are connected to each other is equally as important. Multiple questions and sometimes different coding sheets might be necessary to capture this complexity. For example, states use RTAs to integrate in water resource management (e.g. international river basins) to mitigate political tensions over these shared resources. Since a number of RTAs utilize an integrative approach to resource management (i.e. simultaneously managing trade, environment, and security aspects of international river basins), an additional coding instrument was designed to capture RTAs rules and physical embodiment of RTA water resource management (see table 5).

Table 5: Examples of coding sheet questions from RTA water resource management project

Q206: What aspects of water resource management does this legal document address? (List all that apply)

- 1 Distribution of benefits
- 2 Allocation of water resources
- 3 Use
- 4 Protection of water resource

RTAWRMI:

RTAWRMI Notes:

Q208: What water resource uses does this legal document manage? (List all that apply)

- 1 Agricultural production
- 2 Food security
- 3 Human consumption/domestic use
- 4 Infrastructure (e.g. integrate to share a harbor)
- 5 Industrial production
- 6 Political boundary
- 7 Navigation (avenue for transporting goods and people)/transportation/maritime transport
- 8 Sanitation
- 9 Trade of goods from the water resource (e.g. plants)
- 10 Trade of water
- 11 Hydropower/hydroelectric power
- 12 Fishing (e.g. commercial fishing, domestic fishing)
- 13 Trade of fish and/or fishery resources
- 14 monitoring pollution of water resource
- 15 general environmental protection
- 16 environmental protection of water resource specifically
- 17 dam management/building

RTAWRTU:

RTAWRTU Notes:

References

- Baumgartner, Frank B. and Bryan D. Jones. 1993. *Agendas, Instability in American Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink. 2001. Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics. *Annual Review of Political Science* 4: 391-416.
- Gibler, Douglas (2000). Alliances: Why Some Cause War and Why Others Cause Peace. In *What Do We Know about War?* (ed) Joseph A. Vasquez. Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield.
- Goertz, Gary. 2001. *International Norms, Punctuated Equilibrium, and Decision-making*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hafner-Burton, Emilie M. and Alexander H. Montgomery. 2005. War, Trade and Envy: Why Trade Agreements Don't Always Keep Peace. International Studies Association Annual Conference, Honolulu, Hawaii, March 1-5, 2005.
- Haftendorn, Helga. Robert O. Keohane and Celeste Wallender. 1999. *Imperfect Unions: Security institutions over time and space*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kingdon, John. 1984. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Lazer, David (1999). The Free Trade Epidemic of the 1860s and other outbreaks of economic discrimination. *World Politics*, Vol. 51, pp.447-484.
- Leeds, Brett Ashley. 2003. Do Alliances Deter Aggression? The Military Alliances on the Initiation of Militarized Interstate Disputes. *American Journal of Political Science*. 47: 427-439.
- Mansfield, Edward D. & Jon C. Pevehouse (2000). Trade Blocs, Trade Flows and International Conflict. *International Organization*, Vol. 54, pp.775-808.
- Mansfield, Edward D., and Rachel Bronson (1997). Alliances, Preferential Trading Arrangements, and International Trade. *American Political Science Review* 91, pp. 94-107.
- Milich, Lenard and Robert G. Varady. 1998. Managing Transboundary Resources: Lessons from River-Basin Accords. *Environment*. (October) 40(8): 10-15.
- Nye, Joseph. 1971. *Peace in Parts: Integration and Conflict in Regional Organization*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Powers, Kathy L. 2004. Regional Trade Agreements as Military Alliances. *International*

Interactions. 30(4), Winter.

Powers, Kathy L. (2001). *International Institutions, Trade and Conflict: African Regional Trade Agreements from 1950-1992*. PhD Dissertation. Ohio State University.

Powers, Kathy L. Does RTA Water Cooperation Promote Economic Interdependence? (Manuscript under review [a]).

Powers, Kathy L. *International Institutions: Formal Mechanisms for Dealing with Resource Conflict* (Manuscript under review [b]).

Powers, Kathy L. *The Militarized Liberal Peace: Alliance Obligations in Trade Agreements and International Conflict* (Manuscript under review [c]).

Powers, Kathy L. 2005. *Regional Trade Agreements in International River Basin Management: Linkages among Trade, Environment and Security in Water Cooperation and Conflict*. Annual conference of the American Political Science Association. September, Washington D.C.

Appendix 1: Definitions of Key Concepts

Concept	Definition
Regional trade agreement	These institutions “stipulate trade liberalization (e.g. reduction of tariff barriers and harmonization of other trade policies) among a limited number of countries. States grant each other greater access to their markets (e.g. lower tariffs), other than [non-members] receive” (Lazer 1999, Mansfield and Pevehouse 2000; author).
Security institution	Security institutions specify rules for how member states address mutual security concerns (Haftendorn, Keohane and Wallender 1999).
Level of security integration	It is the degree of sovereignty that member states relinquish to the RTA in order to directly address mutual security concerns and includes institutional mechanisms designed specifically to address security issues (Powers 2001).
Legal document	Any legally binding document under international law and signed by member states. Documents include treaties, protocols, agreements, conventions, supplemental protocols, and supplemental conventions.
Military alliance	They are “written agreements, signed by official representatives of at least two independent states, that include promises to aid a partner in the event of military conflict, to remain neutral in the event of conflict with one another, or to consult/cooperate in the event of international crises that create potential for military conflict” (Leeds 2003: 427. Additionally, alliances are formal written agreements by two or more states to some future military action. The action involved could entail almost anything – detailed military planning, consultation during a crisis, or a promise by one state to abstain from an upcoming war” (Gibler 2000: 47).
Dispute settlement mechanism	A temporary or permanent mechanism that mediates or arbitrates a dispute between states who have previously agreed to turn the dispute over to the mechanism and abide by the decision made.
Special security mechanism	Organizational mechanism used to directly manage conflict. Defense councils composed of defense ministers and joint military forces are examples (Powers 2001).

Appendix II: RTAs as security institutions Project Coding Sheet

RTA Legal Document Coding Sheet
Regional Trade Agreements as Security Institutions (RTAproject)
Kathy Powers & Gary Goertz
Department of Political Science, University of Arizona 85721
Version 5.2: 27 January 2005

Section I: RTA IGO name and contact information

Q002: What is the official IGO name? (Separate all names by semicolons)
IGONAME:
IGONAME Notes:

Q004: What is the IGO acronym or common name? (Separate all names by semicolons)
IGOACR:
IGOACR Notes:

Q006: IGO address/es (secretariat address):
IGOADDR:
IGOADDR Notes (Additional addresses):

Q008: IGO's website url (RTA official website):
IGOWEB:
IGOWEB Notes (Additional url's):

Q010: Name of electronic copy of the web site.
IGOWFILE:
IGOWFILE Notes (give date downloaded):

Q012: IGO email address/es (RTA secretariat email)
IGOEMAIL:
IGOEMAIL Notes (Additional email addresses):

Q014: IGO phone number/s (secretariat phone number & fax number):
IGOPHONE:
IGOPHONE Notes (Additional phone and fax numbers):

Q016: Official languages
IGOLANG:
IGOLANG Notes:

Q018: COW IGO number [Correlates of War (COW) IGO data contains information on intergovernmental organizations globally. John Pevehouse (Wisconsin) recently updated this data set.]

IGOCOW:

IGOCOW Notes:

Q024: What is the RTA ID number?

RTAIDNUM:

RTAIDNUM Notes:

Q106: Does the RTAIGO have WTO recognition?

RTAWTO:

RTAWTO Notes (List date of recognition and whether it was recognized under Article XXIV and/or the Enabling Clause):

Section II: Basic RTA legal document information

Q020: What are the official names (give exact name as appears in legal document) of the legal document?

RTALDNAM:

RTALDNAM Notes:

Q022: What date was the RTA legal document signed?

RTASDATE (YYYYMMDD):

RTASDATE Notes:

Q026: What is the RTA legal document's acronym or common name?

RTATACRON:

RTATACRON Notes:

Q027: What is the RTA legal document's ID number?

RTALDIDNUM:

RTALDIDNUM notes:

Q028: What is the url(s) for the electronic source of the RTA legal document?

RTAURL:

RTAURL Notes:

Q030: What is the reference(s) for the printed source of the RTA legal document (author year)

RTABIB:

RTABIB Notes:

Q032: What is the name of the electronic copy of the RTA legal document (on the ftp site)?

RTAELECTRONIC:

RTAELECTRONIC Notes:

Q034: What are other RTA legal document id codes?

RTAOTHERCODES:

RTAOTHERCODES Notes (Treaty codes for this RTA in other international treaty coding projects):

Q036: What is the electronic file name of this coding sheet? (List all coding sheet names. (two people may code the same RTA))

RTAFILE:

RTAFILE Notes:

Section III: RTA legal document accession information

Q038: What is the date the legal document goes into effect?

RTAEDATE (YYYYMMDD):

RTAEDATE Notes:

Q039: What rules specify when a legal document goes into effect?

RTAREDAT:

RTAREDAT Notes:

Q040: How many other agreements are referred to in the treaty/protocol?

RTAAGREF:

RTAAGREF Notes (Give names of agreements.)

Q042: Legal document termination and/or renewal date?

RTATERM (YYYYMMDD):

RTATERM Notes:

Q044: What are the conditions for legal document accession?

RTAACCES:

RTAACCES Notes:

Q046: What are the conditions for legal document abrogation or state withdrawal from the RTA?

RTAABRO:

RTAABRO Notes:

Q048: Reservations governments may declare in legal document.

RTARES:

RTARES Notes:

Section IV: Issue Coverage in legal documents

Q050: What is the level of economic integration for this legal document?

- 0 None
- 1 Preferential trade agreement
- 2 Free trade agreement
- 3 Customs union
- 4 Common market
- 5 Monetary union

RTAECONI:

RTAECONI Notes:

Q052: What issues are not covered in other questions (e.g. Q054, Q056) under the legal document? List key articles in substantive areas e.g. balance of payments, human rights

RTACOV:

RTACOV Notes:

Q054: What type of integration in common services does this legal document cover? List all that apply.

- 0 None
- 1 Agricultural services
- 2 Crime control services
- 3 Education and training
- 4 Energy & natural resources
- 5 Environment
- 6 Fishery services
- 7 Forestry services
- 8 Health services
- 9 Immigration services
- 10 Industrial project services
- 11 Insurance services
- 12 Livestock services
- 13 Pharmaceutical services
- 14 Postal service
- 15 Public administration
- 16 Scientific services
- 24 Standards or standardization
- 17 Surveying services
- 18 Tax services
- 19 Telecommunications
- 20 Transportation
- 21 Technical services
- 22 Tourism services
- 23 Water management
- 24 Standards or standardization

RTAICS:

RTAICS Notes:

Q056: What kinds of security issues are important in the legal document?

- 0 None
- 1 Biological weapons
- 2 Chemical weapons
- 3 Conventional weapons
- 4 Corruption
- 5 Disease
- 6 Drug trafficking
- 7 Ethnic conflict
- 8 Food security
- 9 Human trafficking
- 10 Immigration
- 11 Interstate crime
- 12 Interstate war
- 13 Intrastate war
- 14 Natural disasters
- 15 Natural resource management
- 16 Nuclear weapons
- 17 Small arms
- 18 Territorial disputes
- 19 Terrorism

RTASECTRAS:

RTASECTRAS Notes:

Q110: Is integration in any common service area specified as a security concern in the legal document? (Yes, No)

RTAICSEC (0, 1):

RTAICSEC Notes (Describe):

Q112: Does the RTA legal document include a security agreement that does not provide for a military alliance among member states? (Yes, No) (e.g. weapons agreement)

RTASECOM (0, 1):

RTASECOM Notes (Describe):

Section V: Organizational Structure as given in the Legal Document

Q058: What organizational components are included in this legal document's organizational structure?

- 0 No organizational structure
- 1 Headquarters
- 2 Secretariat
- 3 Executive body/Council of Ministers
- 4 Secretary-General/Executive President
- 5 General Assembly/General Council/General Participatory body
- 6 Official Language
- 7 Regular meetings
- 8 Judiciary body

RTASTRUC:
RTASTRUC Notes:

Q060: Which organ has primacy over others for this legal document?

RTAHEAD:
RTAHEAD Notes:

Q062: What organ is charged with discussing security issues?

- 0 None
- 1 Secretariat
- 2 Executive body
- 3 Secretary-General/Executive President
- 4 General Assembly/General Council/General Participatory body
- 5 Ministerial conference
- 6 Joint defense council
- 7 Dispute settlement mechanism

RTADISCO:
RTADISCO Notes:

Q064: Fact-finding organ described in legal document

- 0 None
- 1 Secretariat
- 2 Executive body
- 3 Secretary-General/Executive President
- 4 General Assembly/General Council/General Participatory body
- 5 Working group
- 6 Special committee
- 7 Adhoc commission
- 8 Third party (list who in notes)
- 9 Judiciary body

RTAFACTY:
RTAFACTY Notes (Does it do fact-finding, information gathering and/or research?):

Q066: What are the funding sources provided for in the legal document? e.g. member contributions, donations from state and non-state actors

RTAFUND:
RTAFUND Notes:

Q068: What are the provision for the budget and finances in the legal document?

RTABUDG:
RTABUDG Notes:

Q070: What are the provisions for the voting rules in the legal document? e.g. majority rule, consensus, 2/3 majority, unanimity. Make sure that you account for the voting rules for all institutional components that have them i.e. executive body, general assembly

RTAVOTR:

RTAVOTR Notes:

Q072: What are the provisions for transparency in the legal document? e.g. rules, publication of decisions in an official journal, yearly reports published

RTATRANS:

RTATRANS Notes:

Q076: What type of military alliance agreement is included in the legal document?

- 0 None
- 1 Entente pact
- 2 Non-aggression pact
- 3 Mutual defense pact
- 4 Internal security pact

RTAMATYP:

RTAMATYP Notes:

Q078: Are there provisions for a disarmament agreement in the legal document?

- 0 None
- 1 Conventional weapons
- 2 Illegal weapons
- 3 Biological weapons
- 4 Chemical weapons
- 5 Nuclear weapons

RTADISART:

RTADISART Notes:

Q080: Any provisions for a nonproliferation agreement included in the legal document?

- 0 None
- 1 Conventional weapons
- 2 Illegal weapons
- 3 Biological weapons
- 4 Chemical weapons
- 5 Nuclear weapons

RTANPROL:

RTANPROL Notes:

Q082: What type of military component is in this legal document?

- 0 None
- 1 Joint defense council
- 2 Military cooperation
- 3 Military force

RTAMC:

RTAMC Notes:

Q084: What purpose does the RTA military force serve in this legal document?

- 0 None
- 1 Peacekeeping
- 2 Defense

RTAMFT:

RTAMFT Notes:

Q086: What types of disputes does the dispute settlement mechanism address in the legal document?

RTATSDSM:

RTATSDSM Notes:

Q088: What is the nature of the dispute settlement mechanism?

- 0 None
- 1 Adhoc mechanism
- 2 Permanent mechanism

RTASDSM:

RTASDSM Notes (Describe basic mechanism):

Q090: What kind of monitoring mechanisms are embedded in legal document?

RTAMON:

RTAMON Notes:

Q092: What kind of sanctioning and enforcement mechanisms are in the legal document?

RTASANCT:

RTASANCT Notes:

Q094: What kind of domestic institutional requirements are required for membership in this legal document? e.g., democracy, trade liberalization

RTADREQ:

RTADREQ Notes:

Q096: Does the treaty allow non-state actors to have formal standing in the organization? (Yes, No)

RTANSACT:

RTANSACT Notes (Describe actors, e.g. NGOs, MNCs, individuals, and standing e.g., observer standing, full member):

Section VI: Background Information (Not in RTA legal documents) Optional

Q098: Narrative on RTA treaty/protocol formation:

Who pushed for the formation and/or change? why?

Was there a crisis that led to creation or change?

Was it a compromise?

Was diffusion the reason for creation or change?
Was this RTA formed in response to other models (e.g. European Union)

RTANARR:

RTANARR Notes:

Q100: Does this RTA treaty/protocol prepare member states for entry into another RTA (e.g. CEFTA and the EU)

Who initiated RTA formation?

Group of states decided

Large state initiated formation

Created by another international organization other than an RTA

Created by another RTA

RTAENTR:

RTAENTR Notes:

Q102: At its inception, what type of IGO was this RTA before it became a regional trade agreement?

0 Trade

1 Security

2 General

RTABEG:

RTABEG Notes:

Q108: How many additional agreements (under the auspices of the RTA) were signed at the time the RTA treaty (legal document) was created? Give RTA numbers.

RTAADAG (Number):

RTAADAG Notes (Give names of agreements):

Section VII: Coder Information

Q132: Additional coder comments on this legal document.

RTAADDCO:

RTAADDCO Notes:

Q134: Date of last revision of this coding sheet:

RTADATECREV:

RTADATECREV Notes:

Q136: Coder:

RTACODER:

RTACODER Notes:

Section VIII: State Level Variables from RTA legal documents (Do for each state that signs the legal document)

Q114: What is the state's name?

STATN:
STATN Notes:

Q116: COW nation number?
STATCOW:
STATCOW Notes:

Q118: What year did the state sign this legal document?
STATSIG (YYYYMMDD):
STATSIG Notes:

Q119: What date did the state depose this legal document? (if applicable)?
STATDEP:
STATDEP Notes:

Q120: What was the date the state ratified the legal document? (in sources other than treaty)
STATRAT (YYYYMMDD):
STATRAT Notes:

Q121: What is the date of the implementation of the legal document?
STATIMPL:
STATIMPL Notes:

Q122: Did this state join this legal document with reservations, declarations, exemptions and concessions? (Yes, No)
STATRES:
STATRES Notes (Describe):

Q124 What is this state's membership status in this legal document?
0 None
1 Observer
2 Full

STATMEMS:
STATMEMS Notes:

Q126: Is this state exempt from any rules and what type in this legal document?
0 None
1 Trade related
2 Security related
3 Both

STATEXM:
STATEXM Notes: (Put years of exclusion if relevant):

Q128: Who are the national points of contact for in the legal document?
STATCONT:
STATCONT Notes:

Q130: What year did the state leave this legal document?

STATLEAV (YYYYMMDD):

STATLEAV Notes:

¹ Throughout the remainder of this paper, the term *RTA legal document* will be employed rather than *RTA treaty*. We use this term because RTA treaties, protocols, conventions and agreements are all legally binding forms of international law. Since the term treaty is a type of binding international agreement, I reference legal document because it encompasses all categories.

² Question numbering is out of order in some places in the coding sheet since we tried to keep questions pertaining to the same broader topic together. Questions have been added during the life of the project as unanticipated categories of security (e.g. interstate crime, drug trafficking) were referenced as such in RTA legal documents.

³ RTA legal documents for the EU, ASEAN have been coded while the CIS is almost complete.