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 Interstate and Transnational Politics of Access

Aprajita Verma
Assistant Professor,
Department of Law, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email Id-aprajita.verma@presidencyuniversity.in

What are the political ramifications of shifting from limited access interstate conflict settlement to unlimited access transnational dispute resolution? Our key argument is that as we move towards transnational conflict resolution, where people, organisations, and courts may appeal or refer cases to international tribunals, we will likely see a distinct politics of access. As the players engaged grow more diversified, the possibility of cases being referred rises, as does the likelihood of such lawsuits challenging national governments particularly the plaintiff's national government. There is no evident relationship between official access and genuine political influence. States may still control access to the legal process in both interstate and intrastate matters[1]–[3].

By adopting tight procedural procedures, applying political pressure on future or existing plaintiffs, or simply carving out self-serving exceptions to the agreed jurisdictional structure, transnational litigation may be avoided. Admission to traditional arbitral courts, such as those established by the Permanent Court of Arbitration, needs the agreement of both nations. Classic interstate litigation before the Permanent Court of International Justice in the 1920s and 1930s, the ICJ after 1945, and the short-lived Central American Court of Justice all had somewhat more restrictive rules. Under these systems, a single state determines whether and how to sue, even if it is suing on behalf of a citizen or group of people who have been damaged.

The state legally espouses the claim of its nationals, at which time the individual's rights unless entitled to compensation under domestic law or under the constitution cease, as does any control over or even voice in the litigation strategy. As a result, the government is free to pursue the claim forcefully or not at all, or to participate in settlement discussions for substantially less than the individual litigants would have deemed acceptable.Such discussions may resemble institutionalized interstate bargaining more than a traditional legal procedure in which the plaintiff selects whether to fight the matter or settle it[4]–[6].

The Interstate and Transnational Politics of Embeddedness

Even when claims are taken before tribunals and these tribunals issue judgements against states, the degree to which these decisions are legally effective may vary. Most international law systems impose a legal responsibility on nations to comply while leaving enforcement to interstate negotiation. Just a few legal systems allow individuals and organisations to seek domestic court enforcement of its provisions. Yet, under our ideal sort of transnational conflict resolution, international obligations are integrated in domestic legal systems, which means that governments, especially national leaders, no longer need to take proactive steps to guarantee international judgements are enforced. Instead, domestic courts and executive officers who are receptive to judicial judgements carry out enforcement directly. The politics of embedded dispute resolution systems varies significantly from the politics of solutions that are not entrenched in domestic politics.

Notwithstanding the true accomplishments of interstate dispute settlement in certain contexts, it obviously has political limits, particularly if compliance constituencies are weak. Pressures for

compliance must be channeled via governments in interstate dispute settlement. The limits of such approaches are obvious in arbitration, particularly with regard to the ICJ. The United States did not follow the ICJ's decision in the issue regarding the mining of Nicaragua's ports. To be sure, the Reagan administration did not simply ignore the ICJ judgement regarding the mining of Nicaragua's harbors, but felt compelled to withdraw its recognition of the ICJ's jurisdictional contentious act with significant domestic political consequences for a Republican administration facing a Democratic Congress. Yet, the United States ultimately followed a course counter to the ICJ's[5], [7], [8].

The politics of international dispute resolution varies greatly. Transnational conflict resolution provides an additional form of political pressure for compliance by tying direct access for domestic players to local legal enforcement, specifically favourable decisions in domestic courts. This results in the emergence of new political imperatives. It provides international courts with extra tools to persuade or influence domestic government institutions in ways that increase the possibility of their rulings being followed. It sets a stubborn administration against not just foreign countries, but also legally valid domestic opposition; a president determined to break international law must overrule his or her own legal system. Moreover, it allows international courts to build a constituency of litigants who may subsequently force government institutions to follow the international tribunal's ruling.

The Dynamics of Interstate Third-party Dispute Resolution

The potential for self-generating spillover in interstate legal systems is determined by how states conduct their gatekeeping functions. As we shall demonstrate, if governments open the gates, the outcomes of interstate conflict settlement may mirror those of transnational dispute resolution. Nonetheless, nations have been hesitant to bring issues before the two main international legal or quasi-judicial courts, the Permanent Court of Arbitration and the International Court of Justice. The vast majority of arbitration cases handled by the Permanent Court of Arbitration were heard in the early years of the court, immediately following the first case in 1902. The Iran Claims Tribunal is a rare but important exception to the court's recent usage.

The potential for self-generating spillover in interstate legal systems is determined by how states conduct their gatekeeping functions. As we shall demonstrate, if governments open the gates, the outcomes of interstate conflict settlement may mimic the outcomes of transnational dispute resolution. Yet, in the two largest international judicial or quasi-judicial institutions – the Permanent Court of Arbitration and the International Court of Justice – nations have been rather hesitant to file cases. The vast majority of arbitration cases handled by the Permanent Court of Arbitration were heard in the court's early years, immediately following the first case in 1902. The Iran Claims Tribunal is an exceptional albeit significant exception to the court's recent usage.

When the stakes are high, states are hesitant to surrender to the ICJ's authority. As a result, the ICJ has been restrained in producing extensive and binding law. Yet, utilization of the ICJ increased significantly during the 1960s and 1990s, reaching an all-time high of nineteen cases on the docket in 1999.While this rise does not match the exponential expansion of economic and human rights law throughout this time period, it represents a substantial change. This is due, in part, to pockets of success that have led in the growth of both the legislation and the use of it in a specific region. The ICJ has had a reasonably continuous stream of cases involving international border issues. In these situations, the claimants have often previously resorted to armed warfare, which has ended in stalemate or has judged that such battle would be too expensive. As a result, they agree to go to court. In turn, the ICJ has benefited from this readiness by establishing a large body of case law that nations and their attorneys may use to judge the strength of both sides' cases and ensure a conclusion based on universally recognized legal principles.

Access is critical to the dynamics of multinational dispute resolution. International dispute resolution reduces nations' power to exercise gatekeeping tasks, such as restricting access to tribunals and preventing their judgements from being implemented. The incentives for domestic players to organize and legitimize their claims give it the ability for endogenous growth. As we shall see with GATT and

the WTO, even a technically interstate procedure may exhibit comparable expansionary tendencies, but sustained expansion under interstate dispute resolution is contingent on governments continuing to decide to maintain access to the dispute settlement mechanism available. Moving to a set of formal norms that is closer to the ideal sort of transnational dispute resolution makes it far more difficult for governments to restrain tribunals and may provide such tribunals with both incentives and tools to grow their power by increasing their caseload. Yet, tribunals may occasionally continue to grow their influence even when strong governments reject them, especially when the institutional status quo favors tribunals and no coalition of disgruntled powers is capable of altering the existing quo[9]–[11].

Individual litigants have a far bigger pool of possible adversaries than state litigants. Independent courts have every reason to hire from that pool. Cases spawn more cases. A steady flow of cases, in turn, allows a court to become an actor on the legal and political step, raising its profile in the basic sense that other potential litigants become aware of its existence, and in the more profound sense that its interpretation and application of a particular legal rule must be reckoned with as part of what the law means in practice. Litigants who stand to profit from that interpretation will be motivated to file more lawsuits to clarify and enforce it. Moreover, the interpretation or application is likely to generate new concerns that can only be solved in following situations. Fourth, by visibly executing a necessary role, a court obtains political capital through an increasing caseload.

In this approach, a transnational tribunal might depict itself as a guardian of individual rights and benefits against the state in its judgements, when the state has accepted to these rights and advantages and the tribunal is merely keeping it to its word. This is the evident implication of the statement from Van Gend and Loos noted above, in which the ECJ said that community law... imposes responsibilities on people but is also meant to impart rights that form part of their legal inheritance.The European Court of Human Rights, for its part, has developed the doctrine of effectiveness, which states that the provisions of the European Human Rights Convention must be interpreted and applied in such a way that their safeguards are practical and effective, rather than theoretical or illusory. Furthermore, in a dissenting decision, one of its justices called the ECHR as the last resort guardian of oppressed persons.

Easy access to a tribunal may generate a virtuous circle: a regular supply of cases results in a stream of judgements that help to increase the profile of the court and therefore to attract additional cases. When the ECJ rules, the ruling is implemented not by national governments – the refractory defendants – but by national courts. Any further internal resistance is rendered far more difficult. To summaries, transnational third-party conflict settlement has resulted in a de facto alliance between some national courts, certain categories of individual litigants, and the European Court of Justice. This partnership served as the means via which the supremacy and direct impact of EC law, as well as thousands of particular substantive issues, were established as pillars of the European legal system.

These national courts have a variety of motivations. Among them is a yearning for empowerment. competition with other courts for relative prestige and power, a specific view of the law that could be achieved by following EC precedents over national precedents,39 recognition of the ECJ's greater expertise in European law, and the desire to benefit or at least not disadvantage a specific constituency of litigants Similar intracity rivalry dynamics may be found in relationships between national courts and the ECHR. National courts seem to have been more inclined to question the perceived interests of other domestic agencies once other national courts took the initial moves. Weiler has chronicled the cross-citation of foreign supreme court judgements by national supreme courts for the first time recognising the supremacy of EU law. He observes that, although they may have been hesitant to limit national sovereignty in a manner that would disadvantage their states in comparison to other states, they are more inclined to impose such limits when they are assured that they are part of a trend. Another possible reason for this tendency is that judges believe such a move is more legitimate.

But, as we highlighted in the first section, the ties between civil society actors and state officials are substantially different under GATT/WTO than in the ICJ. The main civil society participants in GATT/WTO procedures are corporations or industry groupings, which are often affluent enough to fund protracted litigation and frequently have significant political constituencies. Industry organisations

and corporations have been ready to complain about supposedly unfair and discriminatory activities by their international rivals, and governments have often been prepared to take up their concerns. Indeed, it has frequently been easy for governments to do so, since in a system regulated by reciprocity, the strongest defence against others' complaints is often the prospect or actuality of bringing one's own case against their discriminatory behavior. It is beneficial to have an army of well-documented complaints up one's sleeve in a tit-for-tat game to prevent others from filing complaints or as retaliatory answers to such complaints. As a result, although governments have legal gatekeeping power in the GATT/WTO system, they often have incentive to open the gates, allowing civil society actors to define much of the agenda.

At this time, the official proceedings were fully voluntary: defendants had the ability to reject any stage in the process. Its procedural flimsiness, as Robert E. Hudec puts it, is often cited as a significant shortcoming of GATT; nonetheless, Hudec has shown that it did not prevent GATT from being fairly successful. By the late 1980s, 80 percent of GATT issues had been resolved efficiently, owing to political choices made by governments rather than legal embeddedness. This is a respectable degree of compliance, albeit not as high as the EU and ECHR. Rather than being a reaction to failure, the WTO was established on the success of GATT, notably in recent years. The GATT/WTO experience teaches us that, although the formal arrangements we've highlighted are significant, their dynamic impacts are dependent on the larger political situation. Our ideal-type argument should not be reified into a legalistic, one-factor account of conflict resolution dynamics.

Even though nations control the gates, they may be encouraged to open them under certain situations, or even to invite civil society actors to join the conflict settlement arena. The true dynamics of conflict resolution are usually found in the interplay of law and politics, rather than in the functioning of either law or ideology alone.Governments continue to serve as formal legal gatekeepers in these systems, although they have often refrained from severely restricting access to dispute resolution processes. As a consequence, with or without high formal levels of access or embeddedness, the caseload of the GATT procedures expanded, as did the impact of their judgements. As a result, GATT and the WTO serve as reminders that legal form does not always influence political process. The combination of law and politics, rather than each acting alone, creates choices and determines their efficacy.

Transnational dispute resolution insulates conflict settlement from the day-to-day political needs of governments to some degree. Individual court judgements and nations' reactions to them become increasingly difficult to trace back to any simple, short-term matrix involving state or societal preferences, power capacities, and cross-issues as we approach towards international conflict resolution. Political limitations, of course, remain, although they are less tightly bound than in interstate conflict settlement. Legalization places genuine limitations on state action; the closer we go to global third-party dispute resolution, the tighter those constraints will be. Transnational conflict resolution mechanisms aid in the mobilization and representation of certain groups that benefit from regime norms. This raises the costs of reversal for member states and domestic constituencies, who may then contribute significantly to the enforcement and expansion of international rules. As a result, international dispute resolution institutions have grown in importance as a source of increasing legality and a force in both interstate and intrastate politics.

Legalization, Trade Liberalization, and Domestic Politics

Although legalisation may lower incentives for particular countries to cheat, we highlight ways in which the unanticipated consequences of legalisation on domestic economic actors' actions may interfere with the objective of gradual liberalisation of international commerce.Domestic politics must be seen as superfluous or as an unreasonable source of mistake that obstructs legalization's goals. Politics, on the other hand, works in a methodical manner and is the mechanism by which legalisation works. These benefits go far beyond diminishing unitary state opportunism.The international trade system has grown from its roots as a decentralized and largely weak organisation to a legal body via gradual development in the postwar years. The number of nations and the quantity of commerce covered by the 1947 regulations have grown dramatically. With the establishment of the World Trade Organization WTO in

1995, the regime intensified its obligations on members by developing and extending commercial rules and processes, particularly those relating to the dispute-resolution system. In reality, the regime's growth in the post-World War II era made trade restrictions more specific and obligatory.

Secondly, we look at how legalisation affects domestic groups' motivations to organize and urge their countries to adopt policies that benefit them. We think that improved information will strengthen protectionists over free traders on problems pertaining to the signing of new agreements, and free traders over protectionists on matters relating to compliance with current accords. Second, we investigate the consequences for member countries of a more binding GATT/WTO. While GATT standards were always legally binding, the mechanisms for employing escape clauses and some other loopholes combined with domestic political circumstances in such a manner that their application became more uncommon. This reality, along with a reinforced WTO dispute-resolution process, has enhanced the degree to which nations are politically obligated to keep their liberal pledges. Limiting governments' capacity to opt out of obligations has the good impact of decreasing the likelihood that governments would act opportunistically by employing bogus criteria to preserve their sectors. Tightly binding, harsh laws, on the other hand, might have a detrimental impact in the unpredictable context of international commerce. Given the reality of imprecise knowledge about future economic conditions.

Precision, delegation, duty, and improved openness were all important factors in the discussions to change the GATT into the WTO. The goal of these WTO changes was to broaden the scope of the trade system and improve compliance, hence increasing the advantages of membership. The flaw with this approach is that it ignores domestic politics. Maintaining free trade is politically challenging because of the disparities in mobilization between those who want liberalisation and those who oppose further openness of the market to foreign goods. Mobilization is influenced by a variety of variables, including the cost of mobilization and the possible rewards from collective action. The legalisation of the trade system has resulted in increased openness and predictability concerning the impacts of trade agreements. Increasing knowledge of this kind has conflicting consequences on mobilizing domestic interests and, as a result, governments' capacity to sustain support for free trade policies.

The Logic of Mobilization

Assess the influence of improved accuracy in trade regulations throughout the trade negotiating process initially. The capacity of leaders to sign an agreement will be determined by the organisations organised in support or opposition to the agreement. Mobilization patterns are not always predictable; mobilising interest groups requires. resolving collective-action challenges that may be rather severe. Actors in these groupings must first recognise that they have a similar interest in government policy. People must then come to feel that the expenses of collective action are justified. A variety of variables may work against mobilisation. The most important factors influencing international trade are the large and diffuse nature of some economic interests, a lack of information that actors' interests are at stake in specific international negotiations, and possible estimations that the costs of influencing government policy outweigh the anticipated benefits.

From the standpoint of fostering international trade liberalisation, the fact that parties that desire economic closure may face collective-action issues is a gift. The chances for liberalisation would be bleak if the anti-trade factions were effectively organized and able to apply significant pressure on its political representatives. At this time, the interaction with legalisation enters the picture. Since legalisation implies a process of greater rule precision and agreement transparency, it influences domestic group behaviour by enhancing the knowledge accessible to actors about the distributional consequences of trade agreements. Legalization may impede liberalisation to the degree that such information increases the mobilizations of antitrade forces compared to already well-organized protrude parties. Information is important for both nationalist and liberal. Objectives.

Yet, if these groups are differently mobilized before to the legalising process, information will have a greater marginal influence on the less well-organized groups. During the post-1950 period, the framework of the multilateral trade system, based on the concept of reciprocity, offered substantial

incentives for exporters to organize. Increasing reliance on exports, as well as the transnational nature of economic interests, has resulted in strong and successful lobbying efforts by proponents of free trade. As a result, we focus on the potential influence of more knowledge on the incentives confronting protectionist parties.knowledge has an impact on organisations that may be injured as well as benefited by talks. Our goal here is not to make specific predictions about the policy effects of relative mobilizations of exporters and protectionists, but rather to call attention to the political issues raised by increased mobilisation of antitrade forces. Certainly, increasing confidence about how interests would fair under an agreement will cause both parties to organize. Nonetheless, a variety of variables point to enhanced knowledge favoring PR protectionist mobilizations. This viewpoint goes beyond the traditional argument, such as Schattschneider's, that protectionist interests are concentrated but free-trade interests are widespread, which still has some validity.

The first reason is that the current status quo benefits protected groups rather than prospective new exporters. Since changes to the status quo need formal affirmation, such as treaty ratification, individuals who profit from the status quo obtain veto power. As a result, traditional institutional practises that support the status quo will tend to favor protectionist over liberalizing interests. Another aspect pointing in the same way is the unpredictability of exporter benefits. Exporters only know that a market will open up, not whether they will be able to benefit on it in the face of worldwide competition. Protectionists, on the other hand, know exactly what protection they would lose as a consequence of liberalisation, increasing their incentives to organize compared to exporters. Going beyond a purely rationalist paradigm, experimental data suggests that actors respond more strongly to loses than to benefits, favoring protectionist groupings in this mobilizations dynamic.

When we maintain rather than create a trade commitment, we receive the reverse consequence. While information may mobilize import competitors before to the signing of an agreement, a more legalised system may motivate exporters ex post in circumstances of particular market losses. Precision regarding which exporters would incur the costs of retaliation in a trade dispute helps in this situation to activate exporting groups that would otherwise be uninterested in the trade conflict.With the risk of market loss, they will put pressure on governments to enforce trade laws. The greater the likelihood that retaliatory action would harm them, the greater their interest in spending resources to protect free trade at home.As a result, logic implies that increased rule clarity will have two opposing consequences on trade liberalisation. Increasing determinacy may jeopardise trade agreements by empowering import-competing organisations with veto power. Exact regulations for responding to rule violations, on the other hand, will result in further trade liberalisation by energizing export groups in the offending nation. If retaliation plans are well constructed, we should see not just more anti-trade organisations forming, but also increasing political action by export groups over time.

Mobilizing Antitrade Groups

Empirical research reveals that trade policy impacted groups are often highly organized and eloquent. Whether it's farmers in France, automakers in America, or computer businesses in Japan, those whose interests would be harmed by ongoing or increased access to foreign products, services, and markets are vociferous advocates for certain policies. These organisations often function as veto players, and presidents who want to negotiate the opening of global markets discover that domestic fear of competition hinders support for their free trade coalition. The readiness of PR liberalization organisations, those who profit from liberalised trade, to organize and be equally active in their support, underpins leaders' capacity to disregard protectionist demands. 6Governments find it difficult to sustain a free-trade policy in the absence of exporters or other interested groups that explain their free-trade stance.

Proof of the impacts of this challenge of Organising and sustaining a free-trade coalition can be seen in all democracies, and it stems partly from the concentrated advantages and distributed costs of trade restrictions. 8 Consumers are seldom represented in political discourse; rather, trade politics is defined by the balance of organisations with special interests in either openness or closure. In certain nations, structural issues have an impact on this equilibrium. For example, groups may be overrepresented in

government because of the election process, as in the case of agricultural producers in Japan, or because they have bureaucratic or corporatist backing.

Protectionist impulses from such organisations have been reduced by changes in the trade policymaking process, both domestic and international, after World War II.Reciprocal trade agreements, delegation to executive agencies, electoral reform, and altering legislative voting rules all contribute to understanding why nations accept liberal trade policies that were difficult to justify before to World War II. The reality of liberalisation and the particulars of the process are in balance. The process may alter due to changes in underlying interests or for external factors. Regardless of the rationale for the change, changes in the process have far-reaching policy implications. By increasing the mobilizations of exporter interests, process modifications have made it more difficult for import-competing organisations to obtain a majority to support their views.

The success of pro-liberalization organisations, however, should not be seen as proof that policymakers no longer need to be concerned about veto groups undermining trade policy. While liberalisation has transformed the face of the protection lobby, it has not destroyed its potential influence. Even in the United States, a long-time supporter of the free trade system, political leaders confront anti-trade lobbying on a regular basis. As a result of these societal forces, strategic trade negotiators have bundled the advantages to exporters from access to new markets with the losses to import-competing industries from new foreign competition.Whatever the details of this trade-off are at the negotiation table, the end outcome must be a domestic accord that can gain majority support. If knowledge about the distributional implications of agreements impacts the proclivity of groups to organism during talks, reaching that ideal bundle may be simpler in cases where there is some ambiguity about who is and who is not impacted by the trade deal. A major purpose of the modern trade regime is to provide this knowledge regarding the impact of a proposed commercial agreement, the conduct of a trading partner, or the dissolution of a trading pact. In preparation for trade discussions, the WTO gathers and disseminates trade data; it checks compliance and catalogues national practises that impede the free flow of goods and services.

The GATT/WTO regime's capacity to convey this information to member nations has grown considerably over time. 10 Tariff information was not systematically gathered during the earliest rounds of discussions. Countries depended on data given by their negotiation partners, hence the calculation of offers and counteroffers for balance was done using sometimes inadequate facts. The Trade Policy Review Mechanism was established in 1989 during the Montreal midterm assessment of Uruguay Round progress. This started a series of periodical nation studies, offering sector and product information on GATT members' practises. Canada, the European Union EU, Japan, and the United States are examined every two years; the sixteen member nations that rank second in terms of trade value are reviewed every four years; and the majority of those other members are reviewed every six years. As a consequence, the information environment has become more symmetric.

This enhanced monitoring effort is not, by itself, a consequence of legalisation, according to the definition used. Yet, it has been inextricably linked with greater formalization and specificity of obligations both at the time of and during the life of an agreement. As a consequence, the information environment is considerably richer than at any prior period. The ministerial meeting, for example, is a more public component of WTO operations than in the past. Coupled with improvements in WTO rules, reduced confidentiality in WTO procedures has been a fundamental demand of antitrade organizations.

Although Western nations, particularly the United States, have maintained the idea of openness, most WTO delegates have been staunchly opposed to this demand. 13 Yet, transparency has grown over time. Early rounds resembled clubs. Behind closed doors, deals were negotiated among a small number of like-minded officials. Subsequent rounds abandoned this overall negotiation strategy. While informal conversations were place and were generally the most fruitful, delegates spent more time in formal settings, making prepared remarks that made few, if any, genuine trade concessions. Thus, the demand for greater transparency has been met by more open meetings and increased press coverage, but the

impact of these specific changes has been muted; attendees continue to be concerned about domestic constituencies and are wary of saying anything that might land them in hot water at home.

REFERENCES

[1] K. Matsuzato, Transnational minorities challenging the interstate system: Mingrelians, armenians, and muslims in and around Abkhazia, *Natl. Pap.*, 2011, doi: 10.1080/00905992.2011.599376.

[2] T. Lemke en M. W. Habegger, A master institution of world society? Digital communications networks and the changing dynamics of transnational contention, *Int. Relations*, 2018, doi: 10.1177/0047117817747666.

[3] J. G. Ruggie, Reconstituting the global public domainIssues, actors, and practices, *European Journal of International Relations*. 2004. doi: 10.1177/1354066104047847.

[4] J. Green en J. Gruin, RMB transnationalization and the infrastructural power of international financial centres, *Rev. Int. Polit. Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/09692290.2020.1748682.

[5] F. Gress, Interstate cooperation and territorial representation in intermestic politics, *Publius J. Fed.*, 1996, doi: 10.1093/oxfordjournals.pubjof.a029840.

[6] B. Kingsbury, 'Indigenous Peoples' In International Law: A Constructivist Approach To The Asian Controversy, in *Indigenous Rights*, 2017. doi: 10.4324/9781315252391-1.

[7] G. J. Adler, Review Essay: Empathy Beyond US Borders: The Challenges of Transnational Civic Engagement, *Soc. Forces*, 2020, doi: 10.1093/sf/soz150.

[8] N. Piper, Rights of foreign workers and the politics of migration in South-East and East Asia, *Int. Migr.*, 2004, doi: 10.1111/j.0020-7985.2004.00302.x.

[9] S. W. Hook en J. G. Rumsey, The development aid regime at fifty: Policy challenges inside and out, *Int. Stud. Perspect.*, 2016, doi: 10.1111/insp.12101.

[10] P. S. Henne, The two swords, *J. Peace Res.*, 2012, doi: 10.1177/0022343312456225.

[11] M. Lincicome, Globalization, education, and the politics of identity in the Asia-Pacific, *Crit. Asian Stud.*, 2005, doi: 10.1080/14672710500106242.