International Journal of Innovative Research in Engineering and Management (IJIREM)
ISSN: 2350-0557, Volume-9, Special Issue-7, July-2022
Innovative Projects 2022
Organized by Presidency University, Bangalore, India

The Demand for Specific Information

Shreya
Assistant Professor,
Department of Law, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email Id-shreya@presidencyuniversity.in

Even in circumstances where agents have perfectly consistent goals pure coordination games with stable equilibria, the difficulties of organisation costs outlined previously exist. Yet, serious information difficulties are not ingrained in the structure of interactions in such contexts, since actors have incentives to fully divulge facts and their own preferences to one another. The goal of these games is to establish some kind of agreement; however, it may not matter which of multiple options is picked. Conventions are necessary, and innovation may be needed, but substantial structural obstacles to knowledge gathering and interchange are absent[1]. The generalised commitment norm may be seen as a tool for dealing with the conflictual consequences of uncertainty by enforcing positive expectations about the future conduct of others. The rule of generalized commitment demands accepting the veil of ignorance while acting as though one would benefit from the conduct of others in the future provided one acts now in a regime-supporting manner. As a result, it generates a cooperative game by excluding potentially adversarial computations.

Yet, unique and calculable conflicts of interest occur among the protagonists in many situations in international politics. In such cases, they all have an interest in reaching an agreement the situation is not zero-sum, but they prefer various sorts of agreements or distinct patterns of conduct for example, one may choose to cheat while the other is not permitted to. As Stein shows out in this book, these circumstances are often characterized by unstable equilibria.Even in the presence of strategic interaction and uncertain equilibria, regimes may be useful to players by giving information. We may anticipate a need for international frameworks that supply such information since high-quality information decreases uncertainty. Companies that contemplate depending on the conduct of other enterprises in a framework of strategic interaction, such as oligopolistic rivalry, confront comparable information issues. They also do not completely comprehend reality. Researchers of market failure have observed that risk-averse businesses would negotiate fewer and less far-reaching agreements than they would under perfect information circumstances. Indeed, they will avoid deals that might benefit both parties. Three particular issues confronting corporations in such a framework are equally significant for governments in global politics, giving rise to calls for international regimes to address them[2], [3].

Deception and Irresponsibility

Some actors may be dishonest and engage into commitments they do not intend to keep. Others may be irresponsible, making promises they are unlikely to be able to keep. Governments or businesses may engage into agreements that they aim to maintain if the climate remains benign; if adversity strikes, they may be unable to meet their pledges. Banks are often confronted with this issue, prompting them to develop creditworthiness rules. Big governments seeking to obtain adherence to international accords may face comparable challenges nations that are enthusiastic about cooperation are likely to expect to receive more than they provide. This is comparable to self-selection issues in the literature on market failure. For example, if rates are not correctly adjusted, those at high risk of heart attack will seek life insurance more eagerly compared to those with longer life expectancies; people who bought lemons would sell them quicker on the used-car market than those who bought creampuffs. 40 Self-selection in international politics indicates that for particular sorts of activities, such as exchanging research and

development information, weak governments with much to gain but little to contribute may have higher incentives to engage than powerful states.'

Commitment and Compliance

The international order. Commitments between two governments range from formal defense treaties to informal pledges between diplomats. The capacity to make promises is fundamental to the process of international institutionalization, according to liberal institutionalists.Yet, commitments do not have to solely represent cooperative conduct. Even for realists, making promises is crucial in international dealings. The effectiveness of deterrent threats and the operation of alliance politics are plainly dependent on players' capacity to make credible pledges. The dominating assumption in international relations research has been that the capacity, or lack thereof, to make commitments is a characteristic of the anarchic international systemGiven the significance of commitment and the long-standing concern about the inconsistency of popular rule, the possibility that liberal and democratic domestic political and economic arrangements may have distinct effects on states' ability to make credible international commitments appears well worth investigating.

When a state develops a subjective conviction on the part of others that it will carry out a given course of action, it makes a commitment to that course of conduct. Commitments may be little and include doing things that are plainly in one's best interests. The most intriguing obligations tie the state to do some set of measures that do not seem to be in its limited self-interest as an international player. So, the commitment dilemma for the United States when it utilised nuclear deterrence to protect Europe from a Soviet invasion was how to persuade both Europeans and Russians that, in the event of conflict, American leaders would be willing to sacrifice New York to preserve Berlin or Paris. 6 This essay will focus on alliance pledges in particular. At their root, alliances are a response to the challenge of nontrivial commitment[4]–[6]. If one alliance partner's limited self-interest is benefited by supporting the other, the two would not need to codify their commitment on paper, beyond some basic steps to coordinate defense policies and procedures. The formation of a formal alliance is an effort to communicate to both alliance partners and other governments the existence of a true commitment to some degree of mutual defense.

Domestically, the viability of liberal democracy and governments' capacity to make meaningful pledges are inextricably linked. The survival of liberal democracy ultimately depends on the majority's capacity to persuade minority that it would not reform institutions when its narrow self-interests would be better served by renouncing the concept of limited government. The issue of how the majority commits to accepting restrictions on its power is essential to liberal democratic thought. Likewise, academics have long discussed the consequences of limited governance and majority rule for foreign obligations. Before proceeding to the analytic component of this investigation, it is worthwhile to review some of these opinions on the capacity of liberal democratic governments to make commitments in their foreign relations.

As a result, there is minimal opportunity for distinct behaviour to emerge consistently from variances in household regimes. International politics consists of similar entities mimicking one another's operations, writes Kenneth Waltz. Since the system is anarchic, all nations will have difficulty establishing obligations, and the incentives for fulfilling or breaking agreements will be the same for democratic and nondemocratic regimes. Until now, the great bulk of scholarship on the nature of obligations in international relations has ignored regime type.Those who have addressed internal dynamics and the influence of regime type have tended to embrace a second viewpoint, which sees democratic regimes as being inherently less capable of making substantial pledges.

According to Machiavelli, there is a long history of pessimism about the efficiency of internal democracy for exterior interactions in general, and in particular concerning democratic regimes' capacity to make outward obligations. According to this viewpoint, democratic foreign policy is subject to the whims and emotions of popular opinion. Alexis de Tocqueville's oft-quoted observation that democratic governments do appear decidedly inferior to others in the control of society's foreign affairs

is bolstered by his claim that a democratic government tends to obey its feelings rather than its calculations and to abandon a long-matured plan to satisfy a momentary passion. The regular changes of leadership demanded by democratic publics, according to Lord Salisbury, are a significant limitation on the ability of any given leader to commit the state to a course of action: for this reason, if none other, he argues, Britain could not make military alliances on the continental pattern.

According to the third point of view, democracies are capable of making long-term commitments. Some supporters of this viewpoint make a positive case for democratic features that will strengthen international obligations, while others attribute the strength of democratic commitments to an unwillingness to alter direction quickly. Machiavelli exemplifies the more pessimistic idea that the burdensome mechanism of democratic foreign diplomacy would strengthen democratic dependability even when objective interests shift. Immanuel Kant exhibits the positive viewpoint, claiming that states with republican systems of governance are better off.

The Theoretical Bases for Democratic Distinctiveness

The basic argument of those who dispute democratic governments' capacity to make meaningful promises in the international system centres on the alleged volatility of democratic policy choices. As a result, I will begin by making the case for robust democratic obligations using those reasons. In this section, I briefly analyse foreign policy stability in terms of public preferences, democratic leadership stability, and foreign policy institutions stability. In each example, I begin with a look at the classic notion of democratic instability before moving on to a positive argument for the durability of democratic governments' foreign obligations.Although the idea of changeability is powerful, we should not embrace it too quickly. The most important recent work in this field has suggested that democratic governments' internal preference orderings are relatively stable.

While analysing the stability of democratic policy, it is necessary to recall Waltz's caution that when evaluating the capabilities of democratic nations in the foreign policy arena, such capabilities must be considered in relation to the capabilities of nondemocratic governments. Although it is true that democratic nations oscillate between isolationism and interventionism, this does not imply that other states have stable preferences just because they are led by a single dictator. Machiavelli uses a comparison argument to oppose the concept of the public as fickle, which he attributes to Titus Livy and all other historians.The democratic governments were unsure how to interpret their responsibilities to Czechoslovakia. They did, however, eventually carry out their treaty duties with Poland in very specific terms. In the meanwhile, the Germans and Bolsheviks were experimenting with radical adjustments in their attitudes towards one another. Of course, the Nazi-Soviet alliance was ultimately rendered ineffective. Despite relatively high international and internal expenses, democratic governments retained the essential form of their obligations to one another.

The Stability of Democratic Institutions

Although individual leaders' political lives in liberal democracies may be relatively brief and unpredictable, domestic political structures are much more durable. As I have argued before, liberal democracy needs majorities to commit to permanent institutional structures that codify minority rights and restrain majority powers. It should be simpler for democratic nations to engage into commitments if they have institutional stability notwithstanding frequent and regularized leadership transition. Solid civil service agencies, for example, that handle international affairs, serve to assure some degree of policy consistency.Tocqueville made many claims regarding the unique preferences that would evolve in democratic political culture.

He saw these choices as fundamentally opposed to successful foreign policy commitments and long-term international participation in general. 30 Isolationism is a feature often associated with democratic governments. Democratic governments that retreat inward will pay less attention to their international duties and may hence be less dependable. But this rationale is not conclusive. There are at least two more probable links between isolationism and international commitments. Secondly, as Machiavelli

argued, an isolationist turn may cause governments to disregard the necessity to quit a commitment that starts to contradict with their interests. Second, an isolationist state may be more motivated to make just those promises that concern really critical national interests, which are therefore more likely to be fulfilled.

Democratic Interdependence

Tocqueville adds a third cause of divergent preferences in liberal democratic governments, attributing it to the consequences of interdependence. Liberal economic systems that encourage increasing commerce and other ties among their populations will inevitably strengthen their interdependence. This reasoning closely parallels Kant's argument for a peaceful union of democratic governments based on free movement of people and products. As the spread of equality, taking place in several countries at once, simultaneously draws the inhabitants into trade and industry, not only do their tastes come to be alike, but their interests become so mixed and entangled that no nation can inflict on others ills which will not fall back on its own head, Tocqueville writes. As a result, everyone eventually comes to see war as a tragedy nearly as dreadful for the conqueror as it is for the vanquished. 3An assault by a third party on an ally might be virtually as devastating for the interdependent ally as it is for the attacked state. Consequently, interdependence may boost the credibility of pledges made by governments in the face of an external danger.

Domestic politics will be especially successful in increasing democratic leaders' capacity to make pledges that align with the interests of a large domestic constituency. Even without a formal alliance, the United States may make meaningful pledges to Israel because it has a sizable domestic audience that will monitor and enforce those obligations. Germany's rather hesitant acceptance of the 1994 round of the Basel agreement prohibiting all hazardous waste exports will be keenly observed not just by the other parties along with Germany's own environmental campaigners. Consequently, the combination of interdependence and a strong voice for domestic actors has the potential to considerably boost the capacity of democratic nations to make promises when major domestic organisations share the interests of other.

Liberal concepts of limited government and political competitiveness would be rendered ineffective. It is, however, very difficult to differentiate among foreign players while offering transparency to internal actors. Any embassy may subscribe to the main newspapers that give daily investigative services on the democratic state's policymaking operations. Outsiders may see connections between promises made to them and promises made to the home audience. When a democratic leader makes a public commitment to a certain course of action, divergence from that route may have both domestic and foreign consequences.When President Bush promised to withdraw Iraqi soldiers from Kuwait, the Iraqis should have realised the implications for the upcoming election as well as the international situation. Recent work at the crossroads of economics

Recent research at the intersection of economics and political science has thrown fresh light on the link between social structure and nations' capacity to commit to domestic audiences. Douglas North and Barry Weingast's interpretation of the Glorious Revolution as an exercise in recasting a constitution in order to increase the state's ability to make commitments, and Franc ois Velde and Thomas Sargent's similar interpretation of the French Revolution, are two particularly interesting examples of this literature. The writers of these papers believe that democratic institutions may strengthen the state's capacity to make obligations to a wide number of domestic players. In the international arena, the capacity to publicly connect external pledges with internal commitments would help democratic governments to use home audiences to boost their international credibility.

Thomas Schelling emphasises the significance of political costs in improving the legitimacy of international agreements. He is concerned about incurring political costs inside the international system. Yet, identical advantages may be obtained by paying these expenditures at home provided they can be sufficiently viewed from outside. James Fearon's study on the importance of audience costs in international contacts explicitly represents the connection between outward obligations and internal

political costs. When democratic leaders send signals in the international arena that have political consequences at home, such signals gain credibility.

Empirical soundings: democratic alliance behavior

In the present international system, alliances are the most visible type of commitment behaviour. States create formal alliances to demonstrate to their alliance partner and other governments that the degree of commitment between the two states is more than would be anticipated based just on perceived international interests. If democratic nations are untrustworthy due to fluctuating majority preferences, we would expect this to be reflected in the length of time they can retain coalitions.The examination of alliance commitments is also relevant inasmuch as alliance commitments constitute an indication of international community. Michael Doyle's theory for liberal peace, based on Kant's article On Perpetual Peace, centres on a natural community of liberal states: Since morally independent persons have rights to liberty, democratically represented governments have the freedom to exercise political independence.

Mutual respect for these rights thus becomes the guiding principle of international liberal ideology. Individuals are allowed to form private international relationships without governmental intervention when governments respect each other's rights. Profitable transactions between merchants and educational exchanges between academics build a network of reciprocal benefits and obligations that boosts public regard. These mutual respect rules have established a cooperative basis for extraordinarily efficient cooperation among liberal democracies.Some empirical research on democratic alliance behaviour has been conducted. In their 1973 study of alliance politics, Ole Holsti, Terence Hopmann, and Peter Sullivan added a polity variable. 46

Their results regarding the behaviour of democratic alliances are ambiguous. In their study of all alliances made between 1815 and 1939, they discover that ideological similarity predisposes governments to associate with one other and increases the longevity of coalitions, while they conclude that once alliances are formed, the influence of ideological differences is small. In their case study work, they also discover several areas of democratic individuality. For example, they believe that in pluralistic statelets, intra-alliance disagreements are restricted to a small range of subjects, but in nonpluralistic polities, intra-alliance disputes spill over into all issue-areas. In a recent analysis focusing specifically on democratic states, Randolph Siverson and Juliann Emmons confirm with more rigorous statistics the observation of Holsti, Hopmann, and Sullivan that ideologically similar states are more likely to form high-commitment defence pacts rather than lower commitment entente or neutrality pacts as coded by the Correlates of War Project.

They demonstrate that, at the dyadic level, democratic governments have a stronger proclivity to create coalitions with one another than would be predicted by the null model assumption that alliance formation is independent of ideological orientation.My intention here is to build on these findings by attempting to examine the relative stability of democratic and nondemocratic partnerships. Holsti, Hopmann, and Sullivan's statistical analysis is mostly restricted to contingency table analysis. In this essay, I concentrate on the situation of democratic governments to corroborate the fairly shaky link they describe between alliance longevity and ideological affinity. I am able to give a more nuanced evaluation of the influence of shared democratic norms on alliance longevity by using more complex methodologies for assessing duration data.

This research requires two types of data: data about policies and data about alliances. I utilised Doyle's liberal regime classification and the Correlates of War Project's alliance coding. The democracy metric is rather simple for my needs here. It is not required to settle fundamental disagreements in political philosophy and comparative politics regarding the meaning of these words in order to make claims about the implications of liberal democracy for foreign policy and international relations. In light of the actual truth that the two phenomena have been extremely contemporaneous throughout contemporary history, even the problematic difference between liberal and democratic loses weight. There is a very distinct range of nations that have been categorised as democratic or liberal. Although one may dispute with certain.

The conceptual issues underlying alliance measurement are even more important. One especially perplexing conceptual question is whether alliance behaviour should be studied using the alliance as the unit of measurement or the dyad. Conceptual arguments may be made in either way. A emphasis on formal treaties would direct our attention to the partnership as the observation: how long treaties have been in place would be the most pertinent inquiry. Yet, if we are conceptually interested in the underlying relationships between particular nations, we must resort to dyad analysis. When many treaties depict the same connection, focusing on the alliance as the unit of observation causes complications. Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty Organization NATO nations are bound by a single treaty, the Warsaw Pact countries are bound by a slew of bilateral accords.

If treaties were used as the unit of observation, the data would be skewed towards this kind of multilateral interaction. The use of dyads as the unit of observation would give multilateral accords greater weight. Both prejudices are important issues. In both circumstances, multilateral alliances create difficulties in analysing the connection between individual nations when formal links expire due to disagreements among alliance members. My strategy is to statistically examine both types of data. The fact that the results are relatively robust with both data sets adds to our confidence in the findings.

Singer-Songwriter Translation Moving data from the dyadic level to the alliance level is more complicated than it seems at first glance. My judgements in this respect are not always transparent and hence need debate. Do we consider the West European Union a separate pact from NATO? Is the Rio Pact with Cuba distinct from the Rio Pact without Cuba? I employed two distinct types of decision rules, and the results seem to be somewhat immune to these code variances. Secondly, I attempted to identify individual treaties and gave them the longest life possible, independent of new members arriving and departing reduced model 1. Second, in the dyadic data set, I selected beginning and ending dates and compressed the data around these values reduced model 2. The first technique overestimates multilateral alliances that rely on bilateral accords, such as the Warsaw Pact. The second technique overestimates multilateral partnerships that have seen greater change over time, such as NATO or the Arab League.

The Duration of Alliances

Many reasons make statistical analysis of duration data difficult. in a nutshell, the two main issues are nonlinear interactions and data censorship. 52 When events are still happening at the conclusion of the observation period, duration data is said to be right-censored. For example, an apparently strong partnership that begins only two years before the conclusion of the observation period should not be labelled as ending after just two years. If we did not account for censorship, our analysis would be skewed for all examples of alliances that were still in place at the conclusion of the observation period. This prejudice is significant since it is likely that the longest-lasting partnerships will be banned. This is especially important in the study of alliances since many coalitions are still active.First, the data set was reduced depending on treaties. The three lines depict the predicted survival function for democratic, nondemocratic, and mixed coalitions. This chart clearly shows the peculiarity of democratic partnerships.

At the 50% survival threshold, we can observe that the median survival time for both mixed and nondemocratic coalitions is around seven years, whereas democratic alliances have a median survival period of about seventeen years. This difference is significant at the 0.005 level, according to a generalised Wilcoxon rank test.As with the study of Siverson and Emmons and the work on democracies and wars, the dyadic impacts of democracy are most noticeable. We can distinguish between the situation of two democracies and the case of one or no democracies. Yet, there's no statistically significant difference between the situations of one democracy and none. When it comes to ties with nondemocracies, democracies are no differently from nondemocracies. Only partnerships between democracies tend to be more resilient. If the longevity of an alliance is an indication of a state's capacity to make promises, democracy does not seem to boost or lessen a state's ability to make obligations to nondemocratic states[7]–[9].

To determine the overall impact of the forces that push for and against democratic principles, these elements must be disentangled and their individual relevance experimentally examined. I have offered here a start on that empirical task with a broad analysis of the duration of democratic alliances. There are various features in the alliance behaviour of democratic governments, consistent with Doyle and Kant's hypotheses. Democracies, as Siverson and Emmons have shown, tend to form alliances with other democracies. I've proven that these alliances persist longer than partnerships between nondemocracies or relationships between democracies and nondemocracies. Democratic coalitions seem to be particularly enduring when seen against the backdrop of a continuously evolving international environment. More effort will be needed before we can support a strong form of the pacific union of democratic governments. We might be more forceful in asserting that, contrary to the negative views of Tocqueville and Salisbury, democratic nations have shown a capacity to make long-term commitments.

On Compliance

Negotiation, acceptance, and implementation of international accords is a fundamental component of any state's foreign policy activities in an increasingly complicated and interconnected world. 1 International agreement may be official or informal, bilateral or multiparty, universal or regional in nature. Our interest is with recent treaties of relatively high political importance in domains such as security, economics, and the environment, where the treaty is a key structural component of a larger international regulatory framework. Some of these agreements are hardly more than basic concept declarations, while others offer comprehensive prescriptions for a specific sphere of interaction. Others might be umbrellaing agreements for reaching a consensus.

First, it is impossible to thoroughly empirically verify the general degree of conformity with international accords. Nations typically comply with their international accords, on the one hand, and breach them whenever it is in their interests to do so, on the other, are assumptions, not assertions of fact or even hypothesis to be evaluated. We discuss why we believe the underlying premise of a proclivity to comply is realistic and valuable. Second, compliance issues are not always the result of an intentional choice to breach an international agreement based on a calculation of interests. We present a number of other and, in our opinion, more common reasons why states may diverge from treaty duties and why, in certain situations, these reasons are recognised by the parties as justifying such departures.Against the Iranian and Kuwaiti invasions?Similarly, and for similar reasons, there is no way to empirically validate the position of mainstream realist international relations theory dating back to Machiavelli, that a prudent ruler cannot keep his word, nor should he, where such fidelity would harm him, and when the reasons that made him promise are no longer relevant.

Contemporary realists accept that the interest in reciprocal observance of treaty norms by other parties, or a more general interest in the state's reputation as a reliable contractual partner, should be counted in the cost-benefit trade-off on which a decision is based an extension that detracts significantly from the realist formula's power and elegance.But, no calculation can provide a coherent, non-tautological solution to the issue of whether a state respected a specific treaty duty, much alone its treaty responsibilities in general, solely when it was in its benefit to do so. Anecdotal evidence abounds for both normative and realist concepts, but none is susceptible to statistical or empirical proof in its general form. The distinction between the two schools is not one of reality, but of the underlying premise that guides their approach to the issue.

Our purpose in this study is to improve the chances for treaty compliance, both during the drafting process and subsequently when the parties live and function under them. From this vantage point, the realist approach, which focuses on a small range of externally defined interests, chiefly the preservation or growth of state military and economic might, is not particularly useful. Increasing compliance becomes a question of redefining responsibilities and rewards in terms of those interests, which translates into the imposition of military or economic consequences. Since they are expensive, difficult to mobilise, and have questionable usefulness, they are seldom employed in practise. However, analytic

attention is distracted from a broad variety of institutional and political processes that bear the brunt of attempts to improve treaty compliance in practice.

Efficiency

Choices do not come cheap. Government resources for policy study and decision making are expensive and scarce. People and organisations strive to save resources for the most essential and urgent issues. In these cases, traditional economic analysis advises against continuing to recalculate costs and benefits in the absence of solid proof that conditions have changed since the initial choice. Significant policy consistency is required for efficiency.Organization theory would arrive to the same conclusion as economic analysis, but in a different way. It replaces a satisficing model of limited rationality that responds to challenges as they emerge and seeks for solutions for the constantly calculating, maximising rational agent.

In this perspective, bureaucratic organisations are considered as following routines and standard operating procedures, which are often established by authoritative rules and regulations. The approval of a treaty, like the passage of any other piece of legislation, creates an official rule structure. The usual organisational assumption is compliance.Of course, the bureaucracy is not homogeneous, and it will very certainly include both advocates and detractors of the treaty system. Whether there is an applicable rule in a treaty or otherwise, resistance usually arises during rule implementation and takes the form of a debate over linguistic interpretation and characterization of the specific meaning of the duty. Such issues are resolved in line with standard bureaucratic processes, in which the presumption is once again in favour of following the rule.

Interests

The claim that governments only carry out treaty obligations when it is in their best interests seems to indicate that commitments are unrelated to interests. In reality, the opposite is true. The most fundamental concept of international law is that governments cannot be legally bound unless they concur. In the first case, the state does not have to engage into a treaty that does not serve its interests.Most importantly, a treaty does not offer the state with a simple binary choice of signing or not signing. Treaties, like other legal structures, are products of political decision-making and social life. The procedure through which they are formed and finalised is intended to guarantee that the ultimate product represents, to some extent, an accommodation of the negotiating nations' interests.

This process occurs both inside each state and on a global scale. The formulation of national positions in preparation for treaty talks needs considerable interagency vetting in a state with a well-developed bureaucracy. Various authorities with varying tasks and goals participate in what amounts to a long-term internal discussion. Every significant foreign negotiation involving the United States follows the same pattern.For example, at the conclusion of what Ambassador Richard Benedick refers to as the interagency minuet in preparation for the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, the final U.S. position was drafted by the State Department and was formally cleared by the Departments of Commerce and Energy, The Council on Environmental Quality, EPA [Environmental Protection Agency], NASA, NOAA [National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration], OMB [Office of Management and Budget], and

9 Along with this fearsome alphabet soup, White House entities such as the Office of Science and Technology Policy, kennedy Office of Policy Planning, and the Council of Economic Advisers joined in on the fun. Trimble asserts that each agency has a separate viewpoint from which it observes the process and impacts the stance it promotes. All of these interests must be accommodated, compromised, or overruled by the President before a position can ever be considered.

In contrast to day-to-day foreign policy decisions, which are oriented towards current political exigencies and impending deadlines and are heavily focused on short-term costs and benefits, the more deliberate process used in treaty making may serve to identify and reinforce longer-term interests and values. Authorities establishing the negotiation position often have an extra motivation to adopt a long-

term perspective, as they may have operational responsibilities under any deal struck. Moreover, they are likely to place a high value on the formation of governing standards that will work reliably when applied to the parties' conduct over time. All of these converging factors tend to push national views towards broad-based conceptions of national interest, which, if appropriately expressed in the treaty, will serve to promote compliance.

With modern regulatory treaties, the internal study, negotiation, and assessment of benefits, costs, and effects is replicated at the international level. 13 Well before official talks begin, problems are examined in international forums in preparation of them. The negotiation process itself is characterised by intergovernmental dispute that may span years and includes not only other national governments but also international bureaucracy and non-governmental organisations NGOs. The most notorious example is the UN Conference here on Law of the Sea, which lasted more than 10 years and spawned a plethora of committees, subcommittees, and working groups before being derailed in the end by the United States, which had sponsored the discussions in the first place. Modern environmental debates on ozone and global warming follow a very similar pattern to the Law of the Sea.

Of fact, treaties are not entirely voluntary. The structure of the international system, in which some governments are much more powerful than others, has a significant impact on negotiations. As previously stated, the Convention on the Law of the Sea, the result of more than a decade of international discussions, was eventually derailed when a new US government deemed it unacceptable. A multilateral negotiation venue, on the other hand, allows weaker governments to build coalitions and exploit blocking positions. The caucus of land-locked and physically disadvantaged nations, which comprised unexpected partners such as Hungary, Switzerland, Austria, Uganda, Nepal, and Bolivia, had a critical strategic position at the same UN Conference on the Law of the Sea. Vanuatu, as head of the Alliance of Small Island States, plays a similar role in global climate discussions. The international treaty-making process, like domestic law, allows for a great lot of flexibility in reconciling competing interests. Even the strongest state will not be able to fulfil all of its goals in such a scenario, and some players may have to settle for considerably less. The deal must be a compromise,

It is true that a state's incentives during the treaty-negotiating stage may vary from those it confronts when it comes time to comply. Persons on the receiving end of the compromise, in particular, may have motivation to want to avoid the commitments they have assumed. Yet, the act of establishing promises represented in an international agreement alters the math at the compliance stage, if only because it produces compliance expectations in others who must be included into the equation.Moreover, although governments may be aware that they might breach their treaty obligations in a crisis, they do not enter into accords with the intention of doing so on a regular basis. As a result, the form of the substantive bargain will be influenced by the parties' assessments of the costs and risks of their own compliance, as well as their expectations about the compliance of others. If the prospects for compliance are bleak, essential parties may be hesitant to accept or enforce tough requirements. Yet, the negotiation will not necessarily fail on that basis. As a consequence, involvement may become looser and more generic. Such a conclusion is sometimes criticised as a lowest-common-denominator result, with what is really essential being left on the cutting room floor. Yet, it might be the start of a more serious and organised effort to address the issue.

A number of treaties provide the parties the ability to impose technical rules by vote typically by a special majority, which are then obligatory on everyone, but frequently with the freedom to opt out. The International Civil Aviation Organization has such authority over operational and safety issues in international civil aviation. Several regulatory treaties may consign technical issues to an annexe that may be changed by a majority of the parties. To summarise, treaties often have self-adjusting mechanisms that allow them to be and are regularly altered to react to evolving interests of the parties across a wide range.

This idea is strongly embedded in popular perception and is often expressed in national leaders' speeches. But the realism argument that national acts are wholly driven by calculation of interests including the interest in stability and predictability offered by a set of norms is fundamentally a

rejection of the functioning of normative duty in international relations. This approach has dominated mainstream international relations theory for some time as have closely related postulates in other positivist social science disciplines. Nonetheless, it is rapidly being called into question by a growing amount of empirical research and scholarly analysis.Scholars like as Elinor Ostrom and Robert Ellickson demonstrate how relatively tiny societies under limited conditions establish and enforce standards, even in the absence of a supervening sovereign power.Others, such as Frederick Schauer and Friedrich Kratochwil, investigate how norms function in decision-making processes, whether as reasons for action or in establishing speech procedures and words. I have come to feel that social norms offer an essential sort of incentive for behaviour that is irreducible to rationality or indeed any other kind of maximising mechanism, says Jon Els

The attention that governments take in negotiating and entering into treaties is the best circumstantial evidence supporting a feeling of commitment to comply with them. It is inconceivable that foreign ministries and government leaders could devote as much time and energy to preparing, formulating, negotiating, and monitoring treaty obligations unless there is an assumption that entering into a treaty commitment ought to and does constrain the state's own freedom of action, as well as an expectation that the other parties to the agreement will feel similarly constrained.The care used in crafting a treaty clause undoubtedly shows a desire to restrict the state's own obligation while also making evasion by others more difficult. In any instance, the venture makes sense only if governments, on average, accept a duty to comply with commitments they have signed. The idea that the use of governmental authority in general is subject to law provides further impetus to an ethos of national compliance with international obligations in the United States and other Western nations.

At the same time, both broad observations and specific investigations often uncover what seem to be or are purported to be major deviations from established treaty standards. What explains this behaviour if they are not intentional violations? We discuss three circumstances that, in our opinion, frequently lie at the root of behaviour that appears prima facie to violate treaty requirements: 1 ambiguity and indeterminacy of treaty language, 2 limitations on parties' capacity to carry out their undertakings, and 3 the temporal dimension of the social and economic changes contemplated by regulatory treaties.

Of course, treaty language, like other legal language, varies in detail. The broader and more generic the phrase, the greater the range of possible interpretations. However, there are frequently reasons to choose a more general formulation of the obligation: the political consensus may not support more precision, or, as with certain provisions of the United States Constitution, it may be wiser to define a general direction, to try to inform a process, rather than seek to anticipate in detail the circumstances in which the words will be brought to bear. If there is some trust in those who will enforce the laws, a wider standard articulating the overall policy underlying the legislation may be more successful than a series of precise regulations in enforcing it. The North Atlantic Treaty has proven remarkably durable, despite its general language: In order to more effectively achieve the objectives of this Treaty, the Parties will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack, separately and jointly, through continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid.

Detail offers its own set of challenges. Precision, as in the Internal Tax Code of the United States, creates loopholes, needing some system for ongoing amendment and authoritative interpretation. When things are going well, the intricacies of the rule system may give birth to shortcuts that minimise inefficiencies.Even scrupulous legal guidance may not be able to avoid concerns of compliance in the face of treaty principles that are uncertain across a wide range.In the extreme, a state may actively strive to explore the boundaries of its responsibility by testing the reactions of its treaty partners The fundamental essence of a line in the law is that you may purposefully approach as near to it as you can if you do not pass it, stated Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes.

35 Maybe a more common approach to functioning in the zone of ambiguity is to design the action to meet the letter of the duty while allowing others to debate the meaning. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade GATT forbids any signatory from implementing import quotas. When Japanese steel shipments to the United States created demands from local US manufacturers that the Nixon

government couldn't handle, US trade attorneys devised the voluntary restriction agreement, in which private Japanese companies agreed to limit their US sales. 36 The United States imposed no formal quotas, but Japanese manufacturers may have expected some if they hadn't volunteered. Was the agreement in violation of GATT obligations.

Capability

Legal rights and responsibilities, according to classical international law, run among nations and are a commitment by them as to their future behaviour.The agreement's goal is to influence state conduct. Many treaties still have this straightforward link between agreement and necessary activity. The LTBT is one such pact. It forbids nuclear testing in the atmosphere, outer space, or under the sea. Since only states undertake nuclear weapons testing, only state behaviour is involved in the project. The state selects whether or not it will comply with the endeavour by managing its own activities. Moreover, there is no uncertainty regarding the state's ability to carry out its mandate.

The issue is ubiquitous in modern regulatory accords. From its inception, most of the International Labor Organization's ILO effort has been committed to enhancing its members' domestic labour laws and enforcement. The present flurry of environmental accords highlights the problem. Such treaties are nominally between governments, and the requirements are portrayed as state commitments, such as reducing sulphur dioxide SO2 production by 30% versus a particular baseline. Yet, the true goal of such accords is typically not to influence state conduct, but to control the behaviour of nonstate actors that engage in activities that emit SO2 by utilising electricity or fuel. The eventual influence on relevant private conduct is determined by a complicated sequence of intermediary actions. Normally, an enabling decree or law will be required, followed by specific administrative rules. In essence, the state will have to construct and implement a full-fledged domestic framework in order to ensure the required decrease in emissions.

While there are variances amongst developing nations, the common condition is a serious lack of the necessary scientific, technological, bureaucratic, and financial resources to construct efficient domestic enforcement mechanisms. Four years after the Montreal Protocol was signed, only approximately half of the member countries have completely complied with the treaty's demand that they disclose yearly chlorofluorocarbon CFC usage. The Conference of the Parties quickly formed an Ad Hoc Committee6 of Experts on Reporting, recognising that the vast majority of non-reporting states were poor nations that were simply able to fully comply without technical support from the treaty body.

Visitors from all sectors complain that the treaty process tends to settle on the basis of the lowest common denominator. Yet, the pursuit of universality or universal membership in a specific zone of concern may need adaptation to the response capabilities of nations with significant financial, technological, or bureaucratic shortcomings. A popular method is to begin with a modest obligational ante and gradually raise the degree of regulation as the regime's experience accumulates. This notion is shown by the convention-protocol technique used by a number of modern environmental regimes. The Vienna Convention on the Protection of the Ozone Layer, signed in 1985, imposed no substantive obligations, only requiring the parties to cooperate in research and information exchange, as well as harmonising domestic policies on activities likely to have an adverse effect on the ozone layer, in accordance with the means at their disposal and their.

The worldwide endeavour to preserve human rights may be seen as an extreme instance of temporal gap between undertaking and accomplishment. Despite widespread ratification of the main human rights agreements, compliance leaves much to be desired. Several nations clearly adhered without any actual intention of following by them. Nonetheless, it is also true that even treaty parties had different compliance standards than most other regulatory treaties. Moreover, the Helsinki Final Act, which contains crucial human rights measures relevant to Eastern Europe, is not legally enforceable by its words.Even yet, it is a mistake to refer to these accords as purely aspirational or hortatory. To be sure, they represent goals of the international system, but they, like other regulatory treaties, were meant to start a process that, over time, potentially a long period, would bring conduct more in line with those

ideals. These expectations have not been in every. The massive amount of governmental and private effort spent to enforcing these agreements demonstrates their legality.

Acceptable levels of compliance

The preceding section outlined a variety of issues that an individual actor can use in defence or excuse of a specific instance of aberrant behaviour. But, from the standpoint of the whole system, the primary problem is different. It is in theory straightforward to detect if any given motorist is in compliance with a basic prohibitory standard, such as a highway speed limit. Yet, most towns and law enforcement agencies in the United States are quite content with a system in which the average speed on interstate roads is perhaps 10 miles over the speed limit. Even under exceptional circumstances, the enforcement officer is unlikely to pursue a motorist who is driving inside that zone.An acceptable degree of compliance is not a hard and fast rule. The situation is exacerbated further since many legal rules are not like the speed limit, which allows for an on-the-spot determination of when an actor is in compliance. As previously stated, concerns of compliance are typically contestable and need complicated, delicate, and frequently subjective judgement.What constitutes an acceptable degree of compliance varies depending on the kind of treaty, the setting, the specific conduct involved, and over time.It would seem, for example, that the acceptable degree of compliance would vary with the importance and expense of the parties' dependence on each other's performance. Treaties involving national security would, on this theory, need stringent adherence since the stakes are so great, and to some degree, this prediction is supported by history. Even in this case, certain deviations seem to be reasonable.

In the case of the NPT, signs of deviant conduct by parties have been severely punished. Pressure from the United States resulted in the cancellation of initiatives to build reprocessing plants in South Korea and Taiwan in the 1970s. North Korea has faced a slew of new sanctions after signing an IAEA safeguard agreement and submitting to inspection for a period. The UN Security Council resolution 687 inspection and destruction requirements set on Iraq [and the fines levied for breach] reflect an extreme illustration of this harshness against NPT countries deviating.If national security regimes have not collapsed in the face of significant perceived violation, it should be no surprising fact that economic and environmental treaties can tolerate a good deal of noncompliance. Such regimes are in fact relatively forgiving of violations believably justified by extenuating circumstances in the foreign or domestic life of the offending state, provided the action does not threaten the survival of the regime. As noted above, a considerable amount of deviance from strict treaty norms may be anticipated from the beginning and accepted, whether in the form of transitional periods, special exemptions, limited substantive obligations, or informal expectations of the parties.

The generally disappointing performance of states in fulfilling reporting requirements is consistent with this analysis. It is widely accepted that failure to file reports reflects a low domestic priority or deficient bureaucratic capacity in the reporting state. Since the reporting is not central to the treaty bargain, the lapse can be viewed as ‘‘technical.’’ When, as in the Montreal Protocol, actual news was essential to the functioning of the regime, the parties and the secretariat made strenuous efforts to overcome the deficiency, and with some successa reservation to such an action, in which case the reserving party is not bound by it. Nevertheless, through a variety of pressures, the United States together with a group of European countries insisted on universal adherence to the ban, bringing such major traders as Japan and Hong Kong to heel. The head of the Japanese Environment Agency supported the Japanese move in order ‘‘to avoid isolation in the international community.’’ It was freely suggested that Japan’s offer to host the next meeting of the conference of parties, which was accepted on the last day of the conference after Japan announced its changed position, would have been rejected had it reserved on the ivory ban.

The meaning of the background assumption of general compliance is that most states will continue to comply, even in the face of considerable deviant behaviour by other parties. In other words, the free-rider problem has been overestimated. The treaty will not necessarily unravel in the face of defections. As Mancur Olson recognised, if the benefits of the collective good to one or a group of parties outweigh the costs to them of providing the good, they will continue to bear the costs regardless of the defections of others.

Legal Doctrine and Reason

Custom is a source of origin for the law because the fact that a rule is broadly accepted as a legal rule suffices for this rule to be a legal rule. There are also other factors that can bring about that a rule is accepted broadly as a rule of law, and two prominent examples are legal doctrine and reason.

Determining the acceptable compliance level

If, as we argue above, the acceptable level of compliance is subject to broad variance across regimes, times, and occasions, how is what is 'acceptable'' to be determined in any particular instance? The economists have a straightforward answer: invest additional resources in enforcement or other measures to induce compliance up to the point at which the value of the incremental benefit from an additional unit of compliance exactly equals the cost of the last unit of additional enforcement resources. Unfortunately, the usefulness of this approach is limited by the impossibility of quantifying and even approximating, let alone monetizing, any of the relevant factors in the equation and markets are not normally available to help.In such circumstances, as Charles Lindblom has told us, the process by which preferences are aggregated is necessarily a political one. It follows that the choice whether to intensify or slacken the international enforcement effort is necessarily a political decision. It implicates all the same interests pro and con that were involved in the original definition of the treaty norm, as modified by intervening changes of circumstances.

Although the balance will to some degree reflect the expectations of compliance that the parties entertained at that time, it is by no means rare, in international as in domestic politics, to locate that what the lawmaker has given in the form of substantive regulation is taken away in the implementation.If the treaty creates a formal entity, that body may serve as a focal point for generating political pressure for greater compliance. A powerful secretariat, such as the IMF or ILO, may occasionally apply compliance pressure. The organisation may act as a platform for the parties to continue negotiating the degree of compliance. One illustration of these possibilities is the Maritime Consultative Organization's IMCOand, from 1982, its successor, the International Maritime Organization IMOattempt to reduce maritime pollution caused by tanker discharges of oil mixed with ballast water. 64 The regulatory strategy used by IMCO was to enforce performance criteria that limited the quantity of oil that may be released on any journey. From the signing of the first oil pollution pact in 1954 through the 1978 modifications, there was constant discontent with the degree of compliance. Because of the difficulties in monitoring and certifying the quantity of oil spilled, IMCO reacted by establishing more tight limitations, although these yielded only minor effects.

Ultimately, in 1978, the International Maritime Organization IMO devised a new regulatory approach and set an equipment standard mandating all new tankers to have separate ballast tanks than physically prohibit oil from mixing with discharged ballast water. The new regulation was expensive for tanker operators but simple for transportation authorities to monitor. Compliance with the equipment specification has been almost perfect, and oil discharge from the new ships is virtually non-existent. The chronology represents the shifting balance of political power between domestic regulatory and shipping groups among IMO and IMCO members, which was formerly referred to be a shipping industry club.If there are no objective rules for determining a acceptable degree of compliance, it may be feasible to identify certain basic sorts of conditions that could compel the use of political power in the sake of greater compliance. Secondly, governments loyal to the treaty system may perceive that a tipping point is approaching, necessitating more compliance in order to preserve the regime. As previously stated, the measures taken against Japan in response to the ivory import restriction may have been of this kind. If Japan had been allowed to import with impunity after the tremendous exposure given to CITES measures to outlaw the ivory trade, there might not have been much left of the system.

Public Law

Criminal Procedure The government as a whole plays a role in public law. There are four major branches to consider. Criminal law is often the most well-known branch. This is a branch of public law

since the government performs the tracking, prosecution, and punishment of offenders.Law of the Constitution The legislation that structures the state and the government is a second major part of public law. This field of law is known as constitutional law, and it is concerned with the distribution of government powers Trias Politica, the operation of democracy, the formulation of laws, and the connection between central and local government agencies. It traditionally deals with human rights, however that topic is also covered by public international law.

Administration of Justice The third branch of public law, which perhaps covers the greatest ground today, deals with the many contacts between government agents and individuals or private entities. Administrative law refers to this section.Administrative law has various subfields, such as social security law, environmental law, and tax law.International Regulations International law, which governs interactions between nations and international organisations, is also a part of public law and is hence also referred to as international public law.

Second, nations committed to a greater degree of compliance than that acceptable to the majority of the parties may attempt to raise the bar. The Netherlands often seems to be the leader in European environmental concerns, both in the North Sea and Baltic Sea regimes, as well as in LRTAP. Similarly, the US may be a leader in strengthening NPT compliance, where it has a significantly stronger position than its partners.Lastly, advocating to enhance a level of compliance that the nations involved would like to ignore is a common activity for non-governmental organisations NGOs, particularly in the sectors of the environment and human rights. NGOs are rapidly gaining direct access to the political process, both inside treaty organisations and within the society to which they belong. Their technical, organisational, and lobbying abilities serve as an independent resource for increased compliance at both levels of the two-tiered game.

These tactics converge in the process of jawboning, an attempt to convince the offender to alter its ways, which is typical of international enforcement activities. This procedure takes advantage of the practical need for the alleged offender to provide explanations and justifications for his or her actions. These explanations and justifications are examined and criticised in a number of different, formal and informal settings. The trend is to weed out generally defensible or unintentional failures to meet obligations that conform to a good-faith compliance standard, while identifying and isolating the rare incidents of severe and malicious noncompliance. This procedure may finally establish that what may have seemed to be confusing behaviour is a black-and-white case of willful violation by thoroughly addressing and removing any mitigating factors that may have been raised. The offending authority is forced to choose between adhering to the norm as formulated and implemented in the specific circumstances and openly violating its commitment. Even a strong state finds itself in this difficult situation. One example is Iraq's recent retreat in confrontations with UN-IAEA inspection teams.

Several social scientists interested in cooperation have focused their attention in recent years on the issue of compliance under multinational regulatory frameworks. A group mostly formed of qualitative political scientists and academics interested in international law has undertaken much of empirical research in this field. Its message is that 1 compliance is generally quite good; 2 this high level of compliance was achieved with little attention to enforcement; 3 those compliance problems that do exist were also best addressed as management rather than enforcement issues; and 4 the management rather than enforcement approach holds the key to the evolution of future regulatory cooperation in the international system. A new understanding of the underpinnings of compliance one that regards compliance as a management challenge rather than an enforcement one and has substantial practical as well as theoretical consequences is making itself known among scholars of international relations,

Substantive and Procedural Laws

The distinction between substantive and procedural law is a second, two-fold division of the law that runs orthogonal to the division between public and private law. Substantive legislation is made up of laws that govern what individuals should do and provide them rights.Not everyone always follows all duty-imposing norms, and not all people's rights are always honoured. As a result, for law to work well,

it must offer mechanisms for enforcing compliance with obligations and respect for rights.These options are provided under procedural law. This branch of law establishes the rules governing court proceedings and the structure of the judiciary. It also contains regulations outlining how court orders may be executed.Each of the main fields of substantive law has its own branch of procedural law. This implies that there are civil procedural regulations that deal with the execution of private law. There are additional criminal procedural regulations that govern how criminal suspects are identified, prosecuted, and punished after conviction. There are also administrative procedural regulations, which specify how, for example, environmental or tax legislation may be enforced.

The European Union has its own set of procedural rules that regulate, among other things, the functioning of the European Union's Court of Justice.In this article, we will argue that although the empirical results of this group, which we will refer to as the managerial school, are intriguing and significant, their policy implications are fatally polluted by selection issues. If we focus on regulatory treaties that prescribe reductions in collectively dysfunctional behaviour e.g., tariffs, arms increase, evidence suggests that the high level of compliance and the marginality of enforcement result from the truth that most treaties require states to make only minor deviations from what they would have done in the absence of an agreement. As a result, nations are often offered with marginal rewards for even unpunished defections, and the amount of enforcement required to preserve cooperation is low. Nothing is wrong with this arrangement in and of itself, but it is far from being the future model that the managers predict.

Although the absolute value of the benefits generated by this small amount of regulation is relatively high, further progress in international regulatory cooperation will almost certainly necessitate the establishment of agreements that provide far greater incentives to revolt than those currently in place e.g., more demanding environmental standards, fewer nontariff barriers, steeper arms reductions. We have very little evidence that such development is possible in the absence of improved enforcement.After analysing the issues raised by endogeneity and selection, we offer the theoretical justification for relating the amount of enforcement to what we term depth of cooperation, and assess the extent to that which deep cooperation has been accomplished in the absence of enforcement. Next, we provide a number of notable exceptions to the management school's unqualified generalisations regarding the reasons and remedies for noncompliance. Lastly, we analyse the strategic consequences of more cooperative regime development.

Functional Fields of Law

Although the absolute value of the benefits generated by this small amount of regulation is relatively high, further progress in international regulatory cooperation will almost certainly necessitate the establishment of agreements that provide far greater incentives to revolt than those currently in place e.g., more demanding environmental standards, fewer nontariff barriers, steeper arms reductions. We have very little evidence that such development is possible in the absence of improved enforcement[10].After analysing the issues raised by endogeneity and selection, we offer the theoretical justification for relating the amount of enforcement to what we term depth of cooperation, and assess the extent to that which deep cooperation has been accomplished in the absence of enforcement. Next, we provide a number of notable exceptions to the management school's unqualified generalisations regarding the reasons and remedies for noncompliance. Lastly, we analyse the strategic consequences of more cooperative regime development.

REFERENCES

[1] N. Chebaeva *et al.*, Dealing with the eco-design paradox in research and development projects: The concept of sustainability assessment levels, *J. Clean. Prod.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.125232.

[2] D. A. Cohen, Quality of Financial Reporting Choice: Determinants and Economic Consequences, *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2005, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.422581.

[3] A.-K. Mahlein, Precision agriculture and plant phenotyping are information- and technology-based domains with specific demands and challenges for, *Plant Dis.*, 2016.

[4] A. Erickson, Introducing Information Literacy to Mathematics Classrooms: A Cross-Case Analysis, *Numeracy*, 2019, doi: 10.5038/1936-4660.12.1.7.

[5] C. Pahl *et al.*, Role of OpenEHR as an open source solution for the regional modelling of patient data in obstetrics, *J. Biomed. Inform.*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2015.04.004.

[6] A. Aouadi, M. Arouri, and D. Roubaud, Information demand and stock market liquidity: International evidence, *Econ. Model.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.econmod.2017.11.005.

[7] C. Ranganath, M. K. Johnson, and M. D'Esposito, Left anterior prefrontal activation increases with demands to recall specific perceptual information., *J. Neurosci.*, 2000, doi: 10.1523/jneurosci.20-22-j0005.2000.

[8] World population Review, Zimbabwe Population, *World Popul. Rev.*, 2019.

[9] S. Schroff, S. Meyer, and H. P. Burghof, Retail investor information demand – speculating and investing in structured products, *Eur. J. Financ.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/1351847X.2015.1020392.

[10] P. T. Gonzalez-Bellido, T. J. Wardill, and M. Juusola, Compound eyes and retinal information processing in miniature dipteran species match their specific ecological demands, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2011, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1014438108.