

Identity and Norm Diffusion in the Convention against Torture

Jay Goodliffe, Darren Hawkins, James Raymond Vreeland

November 2009

Abstract Does state identity play a role in why governments enter into international agreements? Given the centrality of identity in the definition of norms, international agreements that incorporate norms should be especially likely to attract states with the relevant identities. To operationalize identity, we use the founding charters of international organizations. Region and domestic regime type are the most common forms of self-identification. We thus test whether the behavior of states is influenced by that of states in the same region with the same regime-type. We examine participation in the Convention against Torture because it is one of the most interesting and important human rights treaties with a well-developed literature that has produced important findings for non-identity theories. We find that states are likely to follow others states with a similar regime type from the same region when it comes to the ratification. Interestingly, the finding is driven by authoritarian cohorts, not democracies. Specifically, multiparty dictatorships are more likely to ratify when similar regimes of their region do so; and non-party and single-party authoritarian regimes follow each other in not ratifying.

This paper is about identity and norms in international politics. Specifically, we ask whether state identity plays a role in why governments enter into international agreements. A number of studies claim the existence of norm diffusion: governments become more likely to join an international agreement as the total number of joiners increases (Finnemore and Sikkink 1998, Simmons 2000, Wotipka and Tsutsui 2008, Wotipka and Ramirez 2008). Norms, in turn, are defined as “as a standard of appropriate behavior for actors *with a given identity*” (Finnemore and Sikkink 1998, 891; our emphasis). The identity-groups that previous studies have considered include the international community of states as well as regional groups of states. Our study tests whether diffusion occurs among these identity groups and also conceptualizes and considers separate identity cohorts among states.

To operationalize identity, we use the founding charters of international organizations, as these documents describe the members' principles, values, and goals. Region and domestic regime type are the most common forms of self-identification in these documents. We thus test whether the behavior of states is influenced by that of states in the same region with the same regime-type using a series of region-regime cohort variables. We argue that the two identities may interact to create smaller groups of states that should identify most closely with each other: all democracies in Latin America, for example, or all states with certain trappings of democracy – like multiple political parties – in Africa during the 1990s.

Given the centrality of identity in the definition of norms, international agreements that incorporate norms should be especially likely to attract states with the relevant identities. It might thus seem likely that scholars would investigate the role of identity in state commitment to human rights treaties as they formalize and codify human rights norms. Yet scholars have largely overlooked identity in their analyses of this topic—at least in large-n studies—focusing instead

on other important causal factors. Landman's (2005) study of state commitment to six human rights treaties and two optional protocols does not mention the concept of identity, nor does Hathaway's (2007) or Neumayer's (2005) analysis of state commitment to human rights treaties, though the latter discusses norms at length (also see Koh 1998). Working papers from Simmons (2008) and Powell and Staton (2008) do not mention identity, though they survey a wide range of other factors that might contribute to state commitment to international human rights treaties. Goodliffe and Hawkins (2006) and Vreeland (2008) both speculate briefly that identity may play a role in state commitment to the Convention against Torture but do not explore the possibility systematically.

In this study, we examine the Convention against Torture (CAT) because it is one of the most interesting and important human rights treaties with a well-developed literature that has produced important findings for non-identity theories. The CAT is unique among the seven main human rights treaties in that it establishes universal jurisdiction, the principle that a state's jurisdiction is based on the nature of the crime rather than factors such as where the crime occurred or the nationality of the alleged perpetrator or victim. In effect, the treaty hands over prosecuting authority to other countries for state-sanctioned crimes. If we can show identity to play a role in the face of existing findings for an international agreement that can have serious consequences for the leaders of states that ratify it, identity arguments will have passed an important test.

Evidence suggests that a wide variety of behaviors, policies and institutions diffuse internationally from state to state (Simmons, Dobbin and Garrett 2006, Meseguer 2009). For clarity, we refer to diffusion in a generic sense as any movement of a behavior, institution or policy from state-to-state, where states influence each other in the process, regardless of the

pattern (it could diffuse to three nearby states and stop or diffuse immediately to all states).

While the fact that behaviors, institutions and policies diffuse among states is well-established, explanations of diffusion are less clear.

Identities may influence state behavior for a variety of reasons. One possibility is emulation (Simmons, Dobbin and Garrett 2006), where particular behaviors become identified as appropriate and become adopted by states in a process that does not involve rational calculation of costs and benefits but a more organic process of adopting common cognitive scripts (Meyer et al. 1997). Identities can also enter into the utility functions of states. Finnemore and Sikkink (1998: 895) identify three identity-related causal mechanisms that rely on the rational search for gains: “pressure for conformity, desire to enhance international legitimation, and the desire of state leaders to enhance their self-esteem.” Even if we cannot distinguish which mechanisms are at work, we can test whether joining international agreements occurs in ways that are related to identity. We can also test identity against other explanations of state behavior in joining international agreements.

We proceed as follows. We begin with an overview of the CAT, its significance, and the general pattern of state commitment to the CAT. We then discuss normative diffusion before surveying some theoretical arguments about the importance of identity and suggesting some operationalizations of the concept. After offering our argument about the effect that identity may have on the adoption of the CAT, we discuss alternative arguments about why states adopt the CAT. We then offer the results of our analysis. We conclude with a brief discussion of the substantive implications of our findings as well as what they may suggest for human rights policy advocates.

In particular, we find that states are likely to follow others states with a similar regime type from the same region when it comes to the ratification of the CAT. Specifically, multiparty dictatorships are more likely to ratify when similar regimes of their region do so; and non-party and single-party authoritarian regimes follow each other in *not* ratifying. The results for our region-regime identity-based cohort variables obtain when we hold constant a host of other potential common causes. We take this as evidence that identity plays a role in norm diffusion, and our findings contribute to the growing interest in the behavior of authoritarian regimes in international relations.

The Convention Against Torture

The *United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment* (CAT) is one of several human rights conventions that are “principally a legacy of World War II.”¹ The content of what “human rights” means was largely developed by the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and two international covenants, one on civil and political rights and the other on economic, social, and cultural rights (both 1966).² The CAT, which was drafted on December 10, 1984 and went into force on June 26, 1987, addresses torture specifically and in great detail. The document begins by defining torture as any act inflicted under public authority by which severe pain or suffering (physical or mental) is intentionally inflicted on a person for the purposes of obtaining information or a confession, punishment, intimidation, coercion, or discrimination. The CAT calls for the end of

¹ Beitz 2001, 270.

² Ibid., 271.

such torture, laying out three mechanisms: (1) domestic law requirements, (2) international monitoring, and (3) universal jurisdiction. We consider each in turn.³

Domestic law requirements: Regarding domestic law, the CAT requires governments to take steps to prevent torture and make the practice illegal. Article 2 calls for signatories to “take effective legislative, administrative, judicial or other measures to prevent acts of torture in any territory under its jurisdiction.” Article 4 specifically requires signatories to make torture illegal according to their domestic laws. Article 10 mandates that “persons who may be involved in the custody, interrogation or treatment of any individual subjected to any form of arrest, detention or imprisonment” be educated about the prohibition against torture and about what actions constitute illegal acts of torture. Article 14 calls for rights to be provided to victims of torture, including some form of compensation and rehabilitation.

International monitoring: The CAT established an international monitoring board called the Committee Against Torture consisting of “10 experts of high moral standing and recognized competence in the field of human rights,” who are elected by the countries participating in the CAT (Article 17). The Committee makes reports on government reports about the domestic efforts to comply with the CAT (Article 19). The Committee can also take action (in the form of filing reports) if torture is alleged against a country, but only if the accused country has ratified key parts of the CAT. For example, only if the accused country has accepted Article 21 can the Committee consider allegations of torture brought by other governments; otherwise, such allegations must be ignored. Only if the accused country has accepted Article 22 can the Committee consider allegations of torture brought by (or on behalf of) individuals; otherwise,

³ For studies of other international agreements with human rights standards, see Hafner-Burton 2005 and Moravcsik 2000.

such allegations must also be ignored. Articles 21 and 22 appear to be of concern to governments, as evidenced by low levels of acceptance (more on this below).

Universal jurisdiction: Finally, the CAT establishes universal jurisdiction, which is both rare and potentially powerful in international law. Indeed, Articles 5-8 of the CAT are unique among the seven main human rights treaties. They establish the principle that a state's jurisdiction is based on the nature of the crime rather than factors such as where the crime occurred or the nationality of the alleged perpetrator or victim (Ratner and Abrams 2001, 160-162; Boulesbaa 1999, 204-5; Rodley 1999, 48-50, 129-130). This principle allows Nigeria, for example, to prosecute a crime committed in Germany by an American against an Indonesian.

The principle of universal jurisdiction has been implemented in a limited number of other areas of international law outside of human rights. It was applied historically, for example, by some states to repudiate crimes such as piracy that occurred outside any state's formal territorial jurisdiction (Boulesbaa 1999, 204-5, also see Joyner 1996). More recently, some states have endorsed universal jurisdiction for the crimes of hijacking, hostage taking, and crimes against diplomats (Lippman 1994, 316). It is important to note that international treaties grant extraterritorial jurisdiction only to states ratifying the treaties. As a result, jurisdiction over such crimes is not truly "universal" in the sense of applying to all states. While the term "universal" may not be precisely accurate, it is conventionally and widely used to refer to broad extraterritorial jurisdictional grants based on the nature of the crime (Ratner and Abrams 2001), and we apply it in this way.

Prior to the CAT, universal jurisdiction covered crimes that had some transnational character or crimes that were not sponsored by the state, or both (Randall 1988). The Geneva Conventions, for example, adopted universal jurisdiction for war crimes—but these crimes were

generally committed by one state's armed forces against foreign nationals and thus had a clear transnational character. As the first international treaty to apply the principle to human rights abuses (Boulesbaa 1999, 204-5; Rodley 1999, 48-50, 120-132; Randall 1988, 819), the CAT requires states to establish jurisdiction over crimes involving torture not only when the crime occurs within its territory, but also (1) when the alleged offender is a national of that state, (2) when the victim is a national of that state, or (3) when the alleged offender is present in its territory and the state decides not to extradite the accused.⁴ Recall that torture is defined as a crime committed or sanctioned by public officials. In approving the CAT, states thus explicitly open their own public officials to prosecution by other states. So the CAT does something really radical: governments essentially hand over prosecuting authority to third-parties for crimes that are both state-sanctioned and targeted against a state's own citizens!

Skeptics might suggest that none of this really matters since states are unlikely to utilize universal jurisdiction. Yet one recent study found that 109 states had incorporated universal jurisdiction into their domestic legislation (Hawkins 2003). Of those, 14 have actually tried court cases based on the principle, and courts have upheld the law in 12 of them. Virtually all of this activity has occurred since the early 1990s. The principle is not widely practiced, but it is widely recognized in domestic law and occasionally practiced. For example, former Chilean president and dictator Augusto Pinochet's decision to sign and ratify the torture convention eventually led to his political demise. Ten years after he signed the treaty, he was himself held to its provisions when British and Spanish courts exercised universal jurisdiction for the crime of torture. British and Spanish efforts against Pinochet helped trigger a flood of court cases in Argentina and Chile prosecuting individuals accused of human rights abuses and have prompted other Latin

⁴ See Articles 5 and 7.

American governments to move toward such prosecutions and to otherwise penalize responsible individuals (Lutz and Sikkink 2001). Pinochet may never have been convicted of crimes of torture, but the principle of universal jurisdiction prevailed at the end of years of legal argumentation when he was held under house arrest in London from 1998 until 2000, having been indicted by a Spanish court for crimes of torture.

Signature of the CAT thus constitutes a signal that states intend to delegate authority and abide by the norms. Ratification of the CAT generates legally obligatory commitments to abide by the treaty's anti-torture norms, and acceptance of Articles 21 and 22 constitute delegation to third party institutions (Hawkins, Lake, Nielson and Tierney 2006). We seek to explain state behavior in signing and ratifying CAT and in accepting Articles 21 and 22. Table 1 presents the basic data, which includes 199 countries (some countries have ceased to exist; some have been reconstituted as new states). As of 1999, 66 of these countries had not signed the CAT; 75 had not ratified (no country has signed/ratified since 1999). As for the other countries, they signed/ratified at various points in time from 1985 onward – importantly, some sooner, others later. The trend for Articles 21 and 22 has moved much more slowly. Only a total of 49 and 48 countries have accepted these articles, respectively. The question for our study is whether state-identity plays a role in explaining part of this variation.

Table 1: The number of countries that signed/ratified the CAT by year

Year	Number of countries that signed	Number of countries that ratified	Number of countries that accepted Article 21	Number of countries that accepted Article 22
1985	40	0	1	1
1986	19	14	3	3
1987	3	12	5	5
1988	4	11	9	8
1989	3	10	7	7
1990	4	8	2	2
1991	4	8	0	0
1992	8	7	1	1
1993	8	9	5	5
1994	6	7	2	1
1995	6	7	1	1
1996	7	8	3	3
1997	4	3	0	0
1998	5	7	1	1
1999	5	7	2	1
2000	0	0	2	2
2001	0	0	2	2
2002	0	0	3	5
Total:	126	118	49	48

Diffusion, Cascades, and Identity

Diffusion comprises one set of explanations for state acceptance of the CAT. Diffusion can be conceptualized as a group of theories postulating that state behavior is influenced by other states (see, for example, Busch, Jörgens, and Tews 2005; Elkins and Simmons 2005; Gilardi 2005; Lazer 2005; Levi-Faur 2005; Levi-Faur and Jordana 2005a,b,c; Meseguer 2005, 2009; Jordana and Levi-Faur 2005; Post 2005; Way 2005). Diffusion explanations stand in contrast to domestic politics explanations that focus on the independent choices made by states due to their characteristics. Because some states share common characteristics, they may act similarly, but this common behavior does not mean they are influencing each other. Hence, observing many states undertaking the same behavior at the same time is not the same as observing diffusion. To

demonstrate diffusion hypotheses, scholars must search for evidence that states are influencing each other's choices.

A “cascade” refers to a relatively rapid diffusion of behavior among a large number of states. It is a particular diffusion pattern that some scholars assert to be quite common in the international arena. A typical cascade follows an S-shaped curve where a few states gradually adopt a new behavior over some years and then a large number of states, influenced by the early movers and by each other, adopt the same behavior in a short period of time. In subsequent years, a few laggards adopt the behavior but some remaining states refuse to do so.

Previous diffusion studies have tended to emphasize state behavior that follows the classic S-shaped pattern (Simmons, Dobbin and Garrett 2005, 783-785). Finnemore and Sikkink's (1998) well-known argument about norm cascades is explicitly built on this pattern. At the first stage, norm emergence, a critical mass of states—estimated to be around one-third of the total number of states—gradually adopts a particular behavior. Finnemore and Sikkink theorize that the main mechanism at this stage is persuasion (Checkel 2001). In this persuasive process, norm entrepreneurs (individuals who hold principled beliefs in the value of a particular behavior) engage in discussions of appropriate behavior, drawing on both reason and emotion, with key decision-makers in particular states. As those states adopt a new standard of behavior, we can speak of the emergence of a new norm. Norms often emerge gradually because many states are naturally resistant to new ways of conceptualizing their circumstances and appropriate behaviors.

At the second stage, this behavior becomes rapidly adopted by a wide variety of states, a process labeled a norm cascade. A tipping point occurs as the gradual adoption of a particular behavior by a subset of leading states is replaced by the rapid diffusion of that behavior to a large number of states. Three identity-related factors facilitate cascades (Finnemore and Sikkink 1998,

895): “pressure for conformity, desire to enhance international legitimation, and the desire of state leaders to enhance their self-esteem.” States and norm entrepreneurs pressure each other to conform by calling into question a state’s membership in a given social group if it does not conform. States desire the approval of others because they need good reputations and because they desire the approval of their perceived peers in other states for reasons related to self-esteem. The reasons that Finnemore and Sikkink provide for norm cascades are thus fairly instrumental yet they are also closely related to state identity. Other scholars have argued that identity produces norm cascades in non-instrumental fashion, often referred to as a logic of appropriateness because state elites focus on questions of what is right or appropriate given their understanding of themselves and the situation around them (Finnemore 1996; Meyer et al. 1997; Simmons, Dobbin and Garrett 2006).

While fairly well-known, the term “norm cascade” can be confusing and needs clarification. First, norm refers to an expected behavior, not actual behavior, but unfortunately, a norm cascade could refer to either the rapid diffusion of normative *ideas* or to the diffusion of norm-oriented or norm-consistent *behavior*. Because we are interested in commitments to human rights treaties, we are studying behavioral norm cascades. It is also useful to recall that a cascade is particular type of diffusion pattern.

It is also important to distinguish identity as part of the definition of a norm from identity as a cause. While norms refer to expected standards of behavior for actors of a given identity, this does not mean that we define the identity group according to their normative behavior. Such a conceptualization would produce a tautological argument. Finnemore and Sikkink *hypothesize* that states adopt norm-consistent behaviors for identity-related reasons. A valid test of this hypothesis must show that an identity-group – defined without regard to the normative behavior

in question – engages in the normative behavior. We test this hypothesis against alternatives—that states adopt norm-consistent behaviors for other reasons and the null—that states share an identity without adopting the same norm-consistent behaviors. To summarize, a norm cascade refers to the rapid diffusion of norm-consistent behavior among a relatively large number of states around the world. A leading hypothesis is that identity is responsible for such cascades.

Returning to Table 1, none of the four behaviors in question (signing, ratifying, or accepting Articles 21 or 22) really follow the “typical” S-shaped pattern. Both signing and ratification suggest the possibility of a very rapid cascade that did not require early adopters. A lot of states jumped more or less at the same time. The data on accepting Articles 21 and 22 suggest a bit of an S-shaped pattern among some states from 1985-92, but the cascade is clearly not global. That early pattern is followed by uneven but gradual growth in subsequent years. A simple examination of these patterns does not provide much evidence for or against diffusion hypotheses. Previous studies have found mixed results on whether there is a global diffusion effect. Goodliffe and Hawkins (2006) and Cole (2005) find that the probability of a state ratifying the CAT increases as more states ratify. At the same time, Cole found this effect tapers off after 65-85 states have ratified. Vreeland (2008) finds no global trend. These patterns and results suggest scholars use caution in asserting the existence of diffusion or cascades and the nature of the diffusion pattern.

While the S-curve does not appear with respect to the CAT, arguments about identity still merit investigation. Where a number of states adopt similar behaviors in a relatively short time span, diffusion is a possibility. Where those behaviors are oriented toward norms, identity explanations should especially be included in the analysis.

We wish to investigate whether behavior diffuses among states with similar identities while controlling for other important characteristics of states. We do not try to sort out the causal mechanism related to identity and thus do not address whether states respond to others with similar identities due to instrumental or non-instrumental reason. Large observational problems make it difficult to sort through instrumental and non-instrumental causal logics in practice. These difficulties, however, do not mean that we should leave identity hypotheses unexplored. One can still observe whether particular identities correlate with a given behavior in the presence of other causal influences. Such observations would constitute a first step in the analysis of identity, one that has not been undertaken. We suggest a parallel with the democratic peace literature. At an early stage, research necessarily focused on the question of correlations between democratic dyads and war, demonstrating that the correlation withstood the presence of competing explanations. Scholars then hypothesized a large number of causal logics for these correlations and have been sorting through them ever since. On identity and state behavior, we do not even have the answer to the first-stage question: Is there some evidence that identities correlate to state behavior in the presence of other important explanations?

While analysts focusing on widespread similarities among states tend to emphasize state identities as states, Finnemore and Sikkink (1998, 902) and others clearly recognize that the most important identities might be found among subsets of states. State identities have been an important part of international relations theories since the early 1990s (Wendt 1994), but we still lack good answers to basic questions such as: How do states identify themselves? Which identities are likely to be the most important? How should scholars sort states into identity categories? How do we know an identity when we see one?

Abdelal, Herrera, Johnston and McDermott (2006) have made an important contribution in sorting through the confusion by suggesting that identity comprises two dimensions: content and contestation. Content refers to the substantive meanings associated with a particular identity and itself comprises four non-mutually exclusive categories: constitutive norms, social purpose, relational comparisons, and cognitive models. Contestation concerns the extent to which a particular content is accepted by the members of the collective. While a wide variety of substantive contents might be relevant to a state's identity, we focus on those that states themselves seem to rely on when they interact with each other. We also prioritize those that are more likely to shape behavior in multiple ways, consistent with the definition's emphasis on constitutive norms, fundamental social purposes, and basic worldviews.

Region, Regime type, and Identity

Governments are presumably aware of the identities they assign their own states in contrast to other states, and they articulate them at important moments. We should be able to use important state documents to operationalize identity. We use the founding charters of international organizations (IOs) to do so. Those charters set up important international clubs for states, laying out criteria for membership. In doing so, states describe their most important principles, values and goals and distinguish themselves from one another (see, e.g., Pevehouse 2005, Bearce and Bondanella 2007). Many IOs solve specific functional problems and thus their descriptions of principles do not rise to the level of constitutive norms and social purpose associated with identity. Other IOs, however, are general-purpose groups that attempt to link states who share these norms and purposes and thus articulate state identities.

We use a functional categorization scheme from Ingram, Robinson and Busch (2005) to identify general-purpose IOs, corresponding to their categories of "general" and

“political/military,” that are likely to articulate state identities. We thus exclude IOs focusing more narrowly on specific economic, social and cultural issues. From the two selected categories we exclude IOs with low levels of institutionalization because states have put much less effort into them. More highly institutionalized IOs have budgets and secretariats with some delegated authority. We also exclude IOs that no longer exist or that do not have an active web page, a sign that they are not functioning or do not pass a test of importance. From an initial list of 497 IOs, we retain 34 that meet these criteria. The list includes many of the most recognizable IOs in the world, including the Organization of American States, the Council of Europe, the African Union, and the League of Arab States, among others. We then gathered the foundational documents for each of these organizations and identified the portion defining the group’s membership and fundamental characteristics.

Region is the most common form of self-identification. Sixty-eight percent (23 of 34) of the IOs whose purposes are general, political or military include regional membership criteria. States readily declare that as members of a geographic region they share a “common heritage” (Statute for the Council of Europe) or “ties of history and culture” (ASEAN Declaration). States do not spend much time articulating the nature of those ties, but they do identify social purposes associated with their region. In many cases those social purposes are fairly generic and held widely by all states (e.g., economic prosperity, peaceful relations). Yet states repeatedly express their belief that such social purposes are better achieved within their region and their particular political and economic systems are different than those of others, which is why an organization is required to deal with them.

Some might object that region is capturing functional need rather than identity, but such an assertion creates a misleading dichotomy between function and identity. All identities offer

functional advantages; identities provide one way of grouping actors so they can carry out those functions. Nothing in the definition of identity denies functional advantages or services to an identity group. Identities serve to group actors in particular ways and assert important commonalities among those actors. In the international arena, states frequently articulate regional identities. This does leave open the possibility that functional need shapes malleable identity groups. Thus, in our empirical work below, we endeavor to hold constant various measures of functional need, such as level of development, when testing to see if the behavior of other identity-group members have an independent effect.

Note that while regions form part of a state's identity, a region is not *just* an identity. Regions are also geographic locations that help structure interactions between states by creating incentives for trade and other interactions. To suggest regions form part of a state's identity is not to deny they influence states in other ways. In the empirical analysis below we test for the independent effect of region on state commitment to human rights treaties (without examining behavioral trends in those regions). Indeed, Landman (2005) finds that region affects state human rights commitments. Our identity argument is that states will *also* be influenced by the particular behavior of others within their regional cohort.

Scholars have found some evidence for a regional identity hypothesis. Goodliffe and Hawkins (2006) find that states are more likely to sign and to ratify CAT if other states in their region also did so. Hathaway (2007) also found a similar regional effect for ratifying the CAT and for accepting Articles 21 and 22. Vreeland (2008) confirmed the strong effect. Simmons (2000) found similar regional effects in state commitment to the IMF. While finding important effects, these scholars did not test other forms of identity among which norms may diffuse and their articles were focused on other kinds of costs and benefits.

The second most-frequent form of identification concerns domestic regime type. Of the various possible types, states really only discuss democracy. Their self-identification tends to fall into three groups: those who strongly affirm that they are democracies (six IOs), those who offer some praise for democratic principles (seven IOs), and those who do not mention regime type (twenty-one IOs).

The Charter of the Organization of American States offers an example of the first group, speaking of democracy as a requirement for membership. Article 3(d) affirms: “The solidarity of the American States and the high aims which are sought through it require the political organization of those States on the basis of the effective exercise of representative democracy.”

In contrast, the Constitutive Act of the African Union falls in the second category by suggesting democracy as a desired goal but not explicitly identifying themselves as democratic regimes. Article 3(g) calls on the Union to: “Promote democratic principles and institutions, popular participation and good governance.”

In the third category are states who do not mention anything at all about regime type, as with the Pact of the Arab League of States. States do not explicitly adopt nondemocratic identities of any sort. At the same time, nondemocratic groups of states do not openly and plainly proclaim themselves to be democracies.

This tripartite grouping of states’ democratic identities roughly corresponds to scholarly efforts to sort states by regime type. To the traditional groups of democracies and autocracies scholars have added hybrid regimes that stake some claim to democratic principles but remain authoritarian in other ways (Levitsky and Way 2002; Mainwaring and Hagopian 2005). “One of the most striking features of the ‘late period’ of the third wave has been the unprecedented

growth in the number of regimes that are neither clearly democratic nor conventionally authoritarian” (Diamond 2002, 25).

While scholars have devised a great number of classification schemes and labels for these hybrid regimes, we consider “multiparty dictatorships” because that label is consistent with our operationalization and accurately describes a large number of such regimes. Scholars have begun to accumulate evidence that multiparty dictatorships behave differently than authoritarian regimes in systematic ways (Gandhi and Przeworski 2007; Lust-Okar 2005).⁵ By and large, these authoritarian regimes hold elections in which these parties compete, and they fill legislatures that often have jurisdiction over limited policy areas. So while these authoritarian governments do not subject themselves to fully contested elections, they adopt many of the trappings and norms of democracy.

Regime type may have a direct impact on the decision of political leaders to adopt the CAT due to the values, practices and institutions associated with those regimes. Hathaway (2002, 2003, 2008), for example, shows that democracies are more likely to participate than dictatorships in part because they are de facto compliant and thus the costs of commitment are low.

Vreeland (2008) shows that multiparty dictatorships are more likely than fully authoritarian regimes but less likely than democracies to commit to CAT, arguing that such regimes face some pressure from society to practice good governance compared to fully authoritarian regimes.⁶ Alternatively, however, authoritarian regimes with multiple political

⁵ For work on other forms decentralization under authoritarianism, see Landry (2008). For an alternative codification of authoritarian regimes, see Geddes (1999), and Davenport (2007) for an application.

⁶ For an alternative explanation of authoritarian government commitment to the CAT that is also rooted in domestic politics, see Hollyer and Rosendorff (2009), who tell a story of signaling resolve. Weeks (2008) presents a related argument on authoritarian governments signaling resolve, though not about the CAT in particular.

parties may constitute a group of states that seek to appear Western, adopting certain key norms of democracy, while maintaining forms of authoritarianism, rather than subjecting themselves to fully contested elections.

We thus expect that a diffusion or cascade effect exists over and above these institutional dynamics, as elites observe and respond to the behavior of others in their regime identity cohort. Elites in democratic regimes, observing other democracies signing and ratifying the CAT, recognize that this behavior is considered important for them to be viewed as democratic by other countries and their own citizens. Elites in multiparty dictatorships who observe other such regimes ratifying CAT are likely to worry about their reputations with respect to their commitment to democratic principles and hence will be more likely to ratify. Authoritarian elites who observe other authoritarian regimes failing to commit to CAT will behave similarly because they will not want to create unnecessary problems for themselves or others who share their governing institutions.

In short, we expect the behavior of other states of the same regime-cohort exerts an influence. In this fashion, we can distinguish the effects of norm diffusion (which occur among states of a given identity and are motivated by others' behaviors) from the effects of the underlying identity or institution on its own. This is an important distinction with all the identity-oriented variables that we discuss. It is possible that states with some particular identity (e.g., Western) are predisposed by that identity to ratify CAT or other human rights agreements. But it is also possible that state identity only has an effect once others with that identity begin behaving that way. This is what we label the norm diffusion effect.

For our measure of democratic states, we follow the Przeworski et al. 2000 regime classification, which defines democracies as regimes where incumbent executives and legislators

cede power when they lose contested elections. Our measure of multiparty dictatorships consists of authoritarian states with more than one political party (Gandhi 2008). Our measure of authoritarian states includes both one party and non-party regimes.

Compared to region and regime type, other state-professed identities were relatively rare in our examination of IO founding documents. Previous scholars, however, have suggested that states identify themselves by colonial ties and language (Elkins, Guzman and Simmons 2006; Goldstein, Rivers and Tomz 2007). We find some evidence for these forms of identity in foundational IO documents and hence test them below, but they act more as control variables for us suggested by other scholars than as the principal variables of interest given our assessment of the primary source data on state identity.

We thus suggest as our principal hypothesis that region-regime identity-based variables should predict patterns of participation in the CAT, even when we account for other common causes these countries may face, as suggested by previous studies.

Previous Studies and Control Variables

Given the potentially severe consequences of entering into the CAT, it stands to reason that scholars have developed a robust literature on this treaty. Above we discuss the importance of accounting for region and regime type. Here we detail some of the other variables that have been shown to be important determinants of CAT participation.

Hathaway, whose early studies helped pioneer this question (2003), has recently argued (2008) that commitment to human rights treaties depends primarily on the likelihood of domestic enforcement. Poor human rights records make democracies less likely to commit to human rights treaties, including CAT, but have no effect on authoritarian regimes because such treaties are unlikely to be enforced anyway. Thus, the impact of political regime depends on a country's

human rights record. She finds fairly robust evidence for this argument and so we include this interaction as an important control variable. Hathaway (2009) also found that the number of domestic human rights Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) affected state commitment to human rights treaties, and we include it as well.

Goodliffe and Hawkins (2006) examine three types of domestic costs that states possibly face when they ratify international human rights treaties, finding some evidence for all three.

The first is the cost of changing policy. States that already respect rights do not need to change policy and so are more likely to commit to the CAT. Although he does not examine the CAT, Cole (2005) finds that states commit to other human rights treaties when it is relatively low cost because they are democracies or because they already respect human rights. We measure democracies with the three categories mentioned above: democracy, multiparty dictatorship, and single party dictatorship (omitted/baseline category). We measure respect for rights by using two human rights indices, one focusing on empowerment rights such as free speech and assembly and the other focusing on physical integrity rights. We also measure whether states have accepted the European Convention for Human Rights (ECHR) before they commit to the CAT. Because the ECHR outlaws torture and sets up a robust third-party enforcement mechanism, the additional costs imposed by CAT are relatively small. We lag the human rights measures by one year to avoid reverse causation.

Unintended consequences pose the second cost for states. Common law judicial systems raise the probability of unintended consequences from treaty ratification and delay state commitment because judges can easily apply international treaties to create law through rulings. Thus we include a variable that indicates whether a country has a common law judicial system. Unintended consequences may be less troublesome for powerful states, which are less likely to

be subjected to punishment for violating CAT than weak states. Thus, they may be more willing to participate in the CAT because costs of commitment are effectively low. We measure the overall strength of a state using real gross domestic product (GDP). We also include GDP per capita as rich countries may be less worried that an outside entity could enforce penalties against them.

Third, committing to human rights treaties creates flexibility costs by removing some policy options from the table. The greater the level of hostility faced by a state, the less likely it is to commit to the CAT, presumably because states engaged in international hostility want to maintain the policy option of torture if necessary. Thus, we include a variable for hostility level drawn from the Militarized Interstate Dispute Dataset, coded from 0 (for no hostilities) to 5 (for war).

Evidence

Our principal variables of interest include a number of identity-based variables. All of these variables are constructed in the same manner. They measure the lagged proportion of other states of the same identity group that have signed/ratified the CAT and Articles 21 and 22. When our dependent variable is signing the CAT, we consider the proportion of the group that has signed; when ratification is the dependent variable, we consider the proportion that has ratified, and so on for acceptance of Articles 21 and 22. Note that if a country is not a member of a given identity-group, the variable takes on a value of 0. We lag these measures by one year to avoid any problems with reverse causation.

We principally examine regime-region identity cohorts, such as all multiparty dictatorships in Asia. Not reported, but available on request, are language cohorts⁷ and cohorts of the same colonial background.⁸ They are not statistically significant (or occasionally have the unexpected sign). We also specify the model with the identity variable first proposed by Goodliffe and Hawkins (2006) – region – instead of regime-cohort in a region. The regime-cohort in a region fits the data better than the approach with these fixed effects for region.⁹

We control for variables that account for domestic institutional systems and cost/benefit theories of state commitment. We report results for political regime, ECHR ratification, respect for physical integrity and empowerment rights, the number of domestic human rights NGOs, , the type of legal system (common law or not), interstate hostility level, GDP, and GDP/capita. Hathaway’s interactive variables of regime and human rights record were not significant, and we do not include them in the specifications that follow (available on request). A data appendix is available that provides the sources and descriptive statistics of these variables.

Our dependent variable can be thought of as the amount of time that passes before a country signs/ratifies/accepts articles in the CAT. The onset of “risk” – or the possibility of signing – is 1984, the year that the CAT was adopted, or a country’s year of independence, whichever is later. This framework is thus most appropriate for survival analysis. The statistical model we use is the discrete-time version of the Cox model suggested by Beck, Katz, and Tucker (1998) – the complementary log-log model, which places no constraints on whether duration

⁷ Mandarin, Spanish, English, Arabic, Portuguese, Russian, German, Korean, French, Farsi, Romanian, Swedish, or multi. Data from Goldstein, Rivers, Tomz (2007).

⁸ French, British, Portuguese, and Dutch. Data from Goldstein, Rivers, Tomz (2007).

⁹ We use the Bayesian Information Criterion in a non-nested test.

dependence is positive, negative, constant, or nonlinear.¹⁰ However, following Singer and Willett (2003), we use a (cubic) time polynomial to control for the possibility of a time trend in the data on top of any possible cascades among countries.¹¹ Countries may be more or less likely to enter into the CAT as time goes on independent of what other countries are doing and survival analysis allows us to explicitly account for this possibility in our analysis. It also picks up any global trends (changes in the hazard rate) in the data. Table 2 presents our results.¹²

TABLE 2 HERE

Consider first the effects of our principal variables of interest, the regime-region identity variables. We find that democracies do not appear to follow other democracies in their region in signing or ratifying the CAT, or accepting Articles 21 and 22. The coefficient for ratification is suggestive, but is not statistically significant. At the same time, we find that multiparty dictatorships are likely to follow other multiparty dictatorships in their region in ratifying the CAT. Along these same lines, single and non-party dictatorships are likely to follow similar dictatorships in their region in both signing and ratifying – generally not engaging in either behavior. This evidence provides some support for an identity-based norm diffusion story. Different types of dictatorships within a given region follow each other in ratifying the convention.

¹⁰ We use robust standard errors, clustered by country. Other standard errors yielded similar results.

¹¹ Carter and Signorino (2009) show that a cubic polynomial performs as well as the cubic spline suggested in Beck, Katz, and Tucker (1998).

¹² We do not have as many countries in Table 2 as Table 1 because we have missing data in some independent variables for some countries.

Turning to our control variables, democracies are more likely to sign the CAT, compared to both multiparty and single party dictatorships. Multiparty dictatorships are also more likely to sign the CAT compared to single party dictatorships. This is consistent with the idea that such dictatorships face pressure from organized domestic political groups to push forward a human rights agenda. Democracies and multiparty dictatorships are no different than single and non-party dictatorships in accepting the articles. Articles 21 and 22 entail the greatest delegation to the international Committee Against Torture and open countries up to external review.

Countries that have ratified the ECHR are more likely to sign CAT and accept Articles 21 and 22. Common law systems are less likely to sign or ratify CAT. This is consistent with Hathaway's cost of commitment story of CAT participation because signing the ECHR already shows commitment to human rights, and common law systems allow judges to apply international treaties to create new (unintended) law.

Increased hostility levels deter signing and ratifying CAT. This generally follows a cost of commitment story, in that countries at war may consider it advantageous to use torture. Richer countries (as measured by GDP/capita) are more likely to accept the articles. Again, perhaps rich countries are less worried that an outside entity could enforce penalties against them.

The duration dependence variables pick up any global trends in the data. The results show that there is a trend in signing the CAT, but not in ratifying or accepting the articles. If there were an S-shaped cascade, then the global trend (hazard shape) would start low, increase, and then decrease. The signing trend is decreasing and the other trends are flat.

To assess the substantive significance of different variables, we compare the mean probability of committing in Tables 3A and 3B, changing one independent variable at a time. As the mean probability changes over time, we make our comparisons at the end of our observation

period: 2001. Although some countries will have signed or ratified or accepted much earlier, choosing an earlier time yields qualitatively similar results. Starting with a baseline case, we use the coefficients estimated from the event history models to calculate how the mean probability of commitment changes as we increase an independent variable. By comparing changes in the mean probability within a type of commitment, we can assess the relative substantive significance of the variables.

As a baseline, we set each binary independent variable to 0, and each non-binary independent variable to its mean. We then change each binary variable to 1 one at a time and recalculate the mean probability. For non-binary variables, we move from one standard deviation below the mean to one standard deviation above the mean.¹³ We report the change in the mean probability and the 95% confidence interval for that change. For ease of comparison, we order the independent variables from the strongest at the top to weakest at the bottom. In addition, for ease of interpretation, we convert logged values back to their original values. Signing and ratifying are in Table 3A; accepting Articles 21 and 22 are in Table 3B. In most cases, the statistically significant variables are have the strongest substantive effect.

For signing (top half of Table 3A), costs of commitment have the strongest effect. For example, moving from a single party dictatorship (the baseline category) to a democracy increases the probability of signing by 0.37. Given that the baseline probability is 0.58, this is about as large an increase as is possible (moving to 0.96). Moving to a multiparty dictatorship instead increases the probability by a still substantial 0.30. Common Law Judicial Systems and ECHR ratification also increase the probability of signing by 0.30. Increasing the hostility levels

¹³ Following Gelman (2008), moving from 0 to 1 in a relatively balanced binary variable is about the same as moving 2 standard deviations. For unbalanced binary variables (say, 90% zeros), moving from 0 to 1 is more than 2 standard deviations. This is the case for ECHR and Common Law.

decreases the probability of signing by 0.21. And increasing one of our principal variables—Regional Single Party Dictatorship—increases the probability of signing by 0.16.

For ratifying (bottom half of Table 3A), the Common Law Judicial System is still the strongest variable. But two of our principal variables—Regional Single Party and Multiparty Dictatorship—have strong effects, increasing the probability of ratifying by 0.22 and 0.20, respectively. Hostility levels, Democracy, and ECHR ratification are also strong. But in contrast to signing, GDP and Empowerment Rights are also strong substantive variables.

The substantive effects for Accepting Article 21 (upper half of Table 3B) and Article 22 (bottom half of Table 3B) are similar. The strongest variables are ECHR ratification and GDP/capita, with Empowerment Rights also showing relative strength. The effects of the regime-region cohort variables are not as strong (and have the wrong sign).

Discussion

Unlike ratification, the mere signing of a human rights agreement may simply be a symbolic gesture. It might signal to others the importance of human rights, but it is not consequential in legal or material terms. Ratification, however, is more than just a statement. Particularly with respect to the CAT, ratification involves real delegation of prosecuting authority to other states through universal jurisdiction. Acceptance of Articles 21 and 22 delegates surveillance authority to an international Committee Against Torture and is a step that countries are relatively reluctant to take.

The fact that we detect little evidence of peer group diffusion of the symbolic gesture of signing is somewhat surprising. It appears that the symbolic gesture is transparent and does not provoke others to follow suit. We find it only among single-party dictatorships.

What is impressive is that we detect norm diffusion when it comes to ratification. Real delegation of authority by states appears to put pressure on peer-group countries to do the same. The nature of that peer group is one of our most important contributions. We tested whether states follow others in their geographic regions or in the world as a whole, or whether they follow others with similar languages, or with similar colonial cohorts. Yet the strongest results are for states who share the same regime type within the same region. This result makes some intuitive sense but we did not a priori expect it to be the strongest. Our results differ from all previous studies, which found some support for both regional and global diffusion. We find that regime-region is more important than geographic regional patterns or global patterns.

More concretely, we detect identity-related diffusion not when it comes to symbolic gestures (signing) but rather when moderately costly action is involved (ratification). The normative trends hold for multiparty dictatorships and single- and non-party dictatorships who share the same geographical region when ratifying (or not) the CAT.

Interestingly, we do not find such diffusion among democracies. It is well known that democracies are the most likely regimes to sign and ratify human rights treaties. The pressures to do so, whether normative or otherwise, appear to come from domestic sources. At least the tests we perform indicate no reason to reject the null hypothesis of no regional diffusion among democracies. We also tested for global trends among the regime cohorts and obtained no robustly significant results.¹⁴ This is why we find the evidence of diffusion among the

¹⁴ For signing, the global regime cohorts do not matter in either specification. For ratifying, the global regime cohorts are insignificant when the regional regime cohorts are included (and the regional regime cohorts stay significant). When the regional regime cohorts are dropped, the global dictatorship cohorts are significant; the global democracy cohort is the right sign, and looks substantively large, but not statistically significant. For both Article 21 and 22, the global multiparty dictatorship cohort has some multicollinearity interaction with regional multiparty dictatorships cohort. Including only one or the other shows no effect, but when they are included together, one is highly negative the other highly positive. The other cohorts do not matter either way. We conclude from this analysis that the

authoritarian regime-region cohorts so striking. Multiparty dictatorships are more likely to ratify when similar regimes of their region do so; and non-party and single-party authoritarian regimes follow each other in not ratifying.

With respect to accepting Articles 21 and 22, the normative trends do not hold for any of the identity groups we examine. If a norm is to develop around the delegation of authority to an international body such as the Committee against Torture, it seems that so far we are observing only the initial stage. In the meantime, only the domestic politics arguments regarding the costs of changing policy, potential unintended consequences, as suggested by Goodliffe and Hawkins (2006), are supported by the data. The best predictors of accepting Articles 21 and 22 are ECHR ratification and wealth. The amount of delegation involved appears to be too costly for most states and—consistent with our other findings about regime-region cohorts—the behavior of European states in accepting Articles 21 and 22 has not influenced other countries.

Conclusion

We find that when it comes to the ratification of the Convention against Torture, states are likely to follow states with a similar regime type from the same region. Specifically, autocratic regimes with multiple parties are likely to follow similar regimes of their region; and non-party and single-party authoritarian regimes follow each other in their region in not ratifying. The results hold when we account for a host of other potential common causes. We interpret our findings as plausible evidence of normative diffusion for specific identity groups, especially states who share both region and regime type. The substantive effect of a strong increase in

global regime cohorts do not matter. The one place they may make sense is in ratifying, but when regional regime cohorts are also included, they are not statistically significant. When we leave out the regional regime cohorts, the global regime cohorts are probably significant simply because are proxying for the regional regime cohorts.

ratification by members of a state's cohort is similar to that of other variables that affect ratification. In particular, it is as important as a large increase in GDP or a large increase in international hostility levels.

Interestingly, we do not find similar diffusion processes for the act of delegating authority to an international body. It is possible that accepting Articles 21 and 22 are less visible acts than ratifying the entire convention and thus less subject to influence from others. It is also possible that the level of delegation is costlier and hence less subject to the influence of others. There is also no strong evidence of diffusions among democracies. Our most striking evidence is of normative diffusion among specific types of authoritarian regimes within the same region. Multiparty dictatorships follow each other in ratifying; non-party and single-party authoritarian regimes follow each other in not ratifying.

We do not find much evidence of cascades, but we do find evidence of diffusion and have worked to sort out possible confusion between the terms. Cascades are one particular form of diffusion where the practice spreads rapidly among a fairly large number of states. Still, the identity-oriented hypotheses associated with the concept of a norm cascade can be applied to the broader processes of diffusion. Our study suggests that identity-based diffusion does indeed occur, but not in the way that scholars have suspected, at least in the case of the CAT. No cascade occurred and states were not influenced primarily by global or regional trends.

The growing literature on diffusion has identified several possible causal mechanisms – such as adaptation and learning – to explain regional patterns of the adoption of various policies (Elkins and Simmons 2005, Meseguer 2005). An alternative explanation is normative: actors adopt policies that are considered standards of appropriate behavior. The theory stresses that such standards apply to actors of a given identity, yet much of the empirical literature has not

distinguished among various identities that different states may have when testing for the presence of normative diffusion in the adoption of policy. In our paper, we focus precisely on normative diffusion that may permeate states of a specific identity. We propose that states may not just follow worldwide normative trends, but rather look to states from within their own peer group. In particular, we have found evidence that governments are likely to follow states from their geographic region that share the same political regime.

Considering that ratification of the CAT subjects governments to potential prosecution of torture through the universal jurisdiction, our findings have important implications for international law. Whether states ratify a treaty is more open to policy manipulation and persuasion than either GDP or hostility, or any other variable we tested. The policy implication for governments or NGOs who support a given international treaty is that they should target a few states to get the ball rolling and those states will naturally place pressure on others to mimic their behavior. This is not really news to government officials and activists who already adopt such tactics. What our study adds is information about *which kinds* of states to target. Those with common law judicial systems and high hostility levels are less likely to ratify. Advocates should choose states without those characteristics. Most importantly, they should choose a smattering of states from all regions of the world and ensure they have states with different regime types within those regions. States do not necessarily follow global trends or even regional trends. They more consistently follow regime-region trends.

The policy area we consider is one that involves the delegation of prosecuting authority to other states for crimes of torture. Historically, democracies have been the leaders in adopting human rights treaties; the laggards have been the authoritarian regimes. There is a strong body of literature providing various instrumental explanations of this pattern, focusing mainly on

domestic politics. Our work suggests that authoritarian regimes may also be subject to international normative trends. We believe that policies involving human rights may be particularly influenced by normative trends, as standards of what is considered to be appropriate behavior may be historically contingent. Yet the UN Convention Against Torture is unique among human rights agreements in that it involves the delegation of real authority to other states for crimes that the ratifying government itself could commit. The fact that such delegation for authoritarian regimes is determined in part by peer group behavior is somewhat surprising and speaks to the real power that norms may have in the international arena.

Table 2: Commitment to the Convention against Torture

Independent Variables	Signature	Ratification	Article 21	Article 22
	Coefficient (s.e.)	/Accession Coefficient (s.e.)	Coefficient (s.e.)	Coefficient (s.e.)
Regional Democracy Cohort (lagged)	-0.464 (0.558)	0.748 (0.700)	-0.560 (0.853)	-1.147 (1.050)
Regional Multiparty Dictatorship Cohort (lagged)	0.545 (0.814)	1.908** (0.590)	-1.355 (1.362)	-1.082 (1.384)
Regional Single Party Dictatorship Cohort (lagged)	1.656* (0.736)	2.169** (0.583)	-8.994 (13.597)	-6.921 (12.394)
Democracy	1.374** (0.446)	0.590 (0.456)	-0.471 (0.775)	-0.011 (0.821)
Multiparty Dictatorship	0.939* (0.405)	0.346 (0.462)	-1.420 (0.847)	-1.088 (0.868)
ECHR Ratification (lagged)	1.033* (0.419)	0.545 (0.440)	1.151* (0.469)	1.114* (0.556)
Physical Integrity Rights (lagged)	-0.018 (0.060)	-0.075 (0.063)	0.002 (0.101)	0.003 (0.109)
Empowerment Rights (lagged)	0.061 (0.053)	0.095 (0.059)	0.154 (0.099)	0.132 (0.108)
Human Rights NGOs (in 100s)	0.090 (0.094)	0.057 (0.106)	0.090 (0.108)	-0.149 (0.228)
Common Law Judicial System	-1.011** (0.267)	-1.007** (0.297)	-0.520 (0.399)	-0.874 (0.457)
Hostility Levels	-0.170* (0.076)	-0.173* (0.076)	-0.115 (0.118)	-0.175 (0.124)
GDP (log)	0.083 (0.113)	0.178 (0.094)	0.146 (0.095)	0.116 (0.105)
GDP/capita (log)	0.202 (0.163)	0.033 (0.174)	0.601* (0.258)	0.690* (0.280)
Duration Dependence ^a	—** ^a	— ^a	— ^a	— ^a
Number of Commitments	100	91	43	39
Number of Countries	132	132	143	143
Number of Observations	920	1215	1704	1726
Log-likelihood	-238.3	-283.3	-157.5	-144.5
χ^2	141.1**	90.1**	113.8**	100.4**

Notes: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$ (two tails). Dependent variables are signing the Convention Against Torture, ratifying/acceding the Convention, accepting Article 21 of the Convention, and accepting Article 22 of the Convention. Coefficients are complementary log-log regression estimates; robust standard errors in parentheses, clustered by country. A constant is included, but not reported.

^a Duration Dependence represents the Years at Risk variable and its square and cubes; the p -value is for a joint significance test.

Table 3A: Change in Probability of Commitment to the Convention against Torture

Independent Variable	Change in Independent Variable	Change in Mean Probability	95% Confidence Interval of Change
Signing			
Democracy	+1	+0.37	(0.14, 0.58)
Common Law Judicial System	+1	-0.30	(-0.45, -0.15)
Multiparty Dictatorship	+1	+0.30	(0.04, 0.52)
ECHR Ratification	+1	+0.30	(0.07, 0.48)
Hostility Levels	+3.6	-0.21	(-0.38, -0.03)
Regional Single Party Dictatorship Cohort	+0.33	+0.16	(0.02, 0.30)
GDP/capita (in \$1000)	+7.5	+0.15	(-0.09, 0.39)
Empowerment Rights	+6.0	+0.13	(-0.08, 0.33)
GDP (in \$100 billion)	+1.3	+0.10	(-0.17, 0.35)
Regional Multiparty Dictatorship Cohort	+0.44	+0.07	(-0.12, 0.27)
Regional Democracy Cohort	+0.47	-0.07	(-0.22, 0.09)
Human Rights NGOs (in 100s)	+1.2	+0.04	(-0.04, 0.11)
Physical Integrity Rights	+4.5	-0.03	(-0.21, 0.15)
Ratifying			
Common Law Judicial System	+1	-0.31	(-0.48, -0.14)
Regional Multiparty Dictatorship Cohort	+0.33	+0.22	(0.09, 0.36)
GDP (in \$100 billion)	+1.7	+0.22	(-0.00, 0.43)
Hostility Levels	+3.5	-0.21	(-0.39, -0.03)
Empowerment Rights	+6.3	+0.20	(-0.05, 0.43)
Regional Single Party Dictatorship Cohort	+0.26	+0.20	(0.09, 0.30)
Democracy	+1	+0.20	(-0.10, 0.47)
ECHR Ratification	+1	+0.16	(-0.11, 0.40)
Physical Integrity Rights	+4.7	-0.12	(-0.32, 0.08)
Regional Democracy Cohort	+0.45	+0.12	(-0.11, 0.33)
Multiparty Dictatorship	+1	+0.12	(-0.19, 0.42)
Human Rights NGOs (in 100s)	+1.5	+0.03	(-0.08, 0.14)
GDP/capita (in \$1000)	+9.2	+0.03	(-0.24, 0.29)

Notes: Mean probability of commitment to the Convention Against Torture is calculated at 2001 from the coefficients in Table 2. The baseline case sets each non-binary independent variable to its mean value and each binary independent variable to 0. The probability of signing in the baseline case is 0.58; the probability of ratifying in the baseline case is 0.63. For non-binary variables, the change in the independent variable moves from one standard deviation below the mean to one standard deviation above the mean. For binary variables, the change in the independent variable moves from 0 to 1. For network variables, the mean value changes across time, and we report the average change. We convert logged values back to their original values.

For ease of interpretation, we order the variables from the substantively strongest at the top to the weakest at the bottom. Where the 95% confidence interval includes zero, the variable is not statistically significant at a 0.05 level.

Example: The baseline country that moved from a single party dictatorship to a democracy increased the probability by 0.37 of signing the CAT by 2001 (changing from 0.58 to 0.96), with a 95% confidence interval of the increase of (0.14, 0.58).

Table 3B: Change in Probability of Commitment to the Convention against Torture

Independent Variable	Change in Independent Variable	Change in Mean Probability	95% Confidence Interval of Change
Accepting Article 21			
ECHR Ratification	+1	+0.33	(0.05, 0.61)
GDP/capita (in \$1000)	+8.8	+0.29	(0.05, 0.58)
Empowerment Rights	+6.2	+0.24	(-0.04, 0.63)
Multiparty Dictatorship	+1	-0.21	(-0.52, 0.04)
GDP (in \$100 billion)	+2.0	+0.13	(-0.03, 0.35)
Regional Single Party Dictatorship Cohort	+0.06	-0.13	(-0.62, 0.33)
Democracy	+1	-0.11	(-0.48, 0.20)
Common Law Judicial System	+1	-0.10	(-0.29, 0.06)
Hostility Levels	+3.6	-0.09	(-0.32, 0.10)
Regional Democracy Cohort	+0.37	-0.05	(-0.23, 0.09)
Regional Multiparty Dictatorship Cohort	+0.13	-0.05	(-0.17, 0.04)
Human Rights NGOs (in 100s)	+1.3	+0.03	(-0.04, 0.11)
Physical Integrity Rights	+4.6	+0.00	(-0.23, 0.24)
Accepting Article 22			
ECHR Ratification	+1	+0.29	(0.00, 0.64)
GDP/capita (in \$1000)	+9.2	+0.28	(0.06, 0.60)
Empowerment Rights	+6.2	+0.18	(-0.06, 0.59)
Multiparty Dictatorship	+1	-0.13	(-0.42, 0.09)
Hostility Levels	+3.6	-0.13	(-0.38, 0.04)
Common Law Judicial System	+1	-0.12	(-0.33, 0.00)
Regional Single Party Dictatorship Cohort	+0.06	-0.09	(-0.54, 0.26)
Regional Democracy Cohort	+0.38	-0.09	(-0.32, 0.06)
GDP (in \$100 billion)	+2.3	+0.09	(-0.05, 0.31)
Human Rights NGOs (in 100s)	+1.9	-0.05	(-0.25, 0.12)
Regional Multiparty Dictatorship Cohort	+0.13	-0.03	(-0.13, 0.03)
Democracy	+1	-0.01	(-0.36, 0.29)
Physical Integrity Rights	+4.6	+0.00	(-0.21, 0.23)

Notes: Mean probability of commitment to the Convention Against Torture is calculated at 2001 from the coefficients in Table 2. The baseline case sets each non-binary independent variable to its mean value and each binary independent variable to 0. The probability of accepting article 21 in the baseline case is 0.31; the probability of accepting article 22 in the baseline case is 0.23. For non-binary variables, the change in the independent variable moves from one standard deviation below the mean to one standard deviation above the mean. For binary variables, the change in the independent variable moves from 0 to 1. For network variables, the mean value changes across time, and we report the average change. We convert logged values back to their original values.

For ease of interpretation, we order the variables from the substantively strongest at the top to the weakest at the bottom. Where the 95% confidence interval includes zero, the variable is not statistically significant at a 0.05 level.

Example: The baseline country that moved from not ratifying to ratifying the ECHR increased the probability by 0.33 of accepting article 21 of the CAT by 2001 (changing from 0.31 to 0.64), with a 95% confidence interval of the increase of (0.05, 0.61).

Bibliography

- Abdelal, Rawi, Yoshiko M. Herrera, Alastair Iain Johnston, and Rose McDermott. 2006. Identity as a variable. *Perspectives on Politics* 4 (4):695-711.
- Bearce, David H., and Stacy Bondanella. 2007. Intergovernmental Organizations, Socialization, and Member-State Interest Convergence. *International Organization* 61 (4): 703-33.
- Beck, Nathaniel, Jonathan N. Katz and Richard Tucker, 1998, Taking Time Seriously: Time-Series-Cross-Section Analysis with a Binary Dependent Variable, *American Journal of Political Science* 42: 1260-88.
- Busch, Per-Olof, Helge Jörgens, and Kerstin Tews. 2005. The Global Diffusion of Regulatory Instruments: The Making of a New International Environmental Regime. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 598 (1):146-167.
- Boulesbaa, Achene. 1999. *The U.N. Convention on Torture and the Prospects for Enforcement*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
- Carter, David B. and Curtis S. Signorino. 2009. Back to the Future: Modeling Time Dependence in Binary Data. Working Paper.
- Checkel, Jeffrey T. 2001. Why comply? Social learning and European identity change. *International Organization* 55 (3):553-588.
- Cheibub, Jose Antonio, Jennifer Gandhi, and James Raymond Vreeland. 2009. Democracy and Dictatorship Revisited. *Public Choice* DOI 10.1007/s11127-009-9491-2.
- Cingranelli, David L. and David L. Richards. 2008. The Cingranelli-Richards (CIRI) Human Rights Dataset. <http://www.humanrightsdata.org>.
- Cole, Wade. 2005. Sovereignty Relinquished? Explaining Commitment to the International Human Rights Covenants, 1966–1999. *American Sociological Review* 70 (3):472-495.
- Davenport, Christian. 2007. State Repression and the Tyrannical Peace. *Journal of Peace Research* 44 (4): 485–504.
- Diamond, L. (2002). Thinking about hybrid regimes. *Journal of Democracy* 13(2): 21-35.
- Elkins, Zachary and Beth Simmons. 2005. On Waves, Clusters, and Diffusion: A Conceptual Framework. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 598 (1):33-51.

- Elkins, Zachary, Andrew T. Guzman, and Beth A. Simmons. 2006. Competing for capital: the diffusion of bilateral investment treaties, 1960-2000. *International Organization* 60 (4):811-46.
- Finnemore, M. (1996). *National Interests in International Society*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. International norm dynamics and political change. *International Organization* 52 (4):887-917.
- Gandhi, J. and A. Przeworski (2007). Authoritarian institutions and the survival of autocrats. *Comparative Political Studies* 40 (11): 1279-1301.
- Gandhi, J. (2008). *Political Institutions under Dictatorship*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Geddes, Barbara. 1999. The Effect of Regime Type on Authoritarian Breakdown: Empirical Test of a Game Theoretic Argument. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, August, Atlanta, GA.
- Gelman, Andrew. 2008. Scaling regression inputs by dividing by two standard deviations. *Statistics in Medicine* 27(15): 2865-2873.
- Ghosn, Faten, and Scott Bennett. 2003. Codebook for the Dyadic Militarized Interstate Incident Data, Version 3.10. Online: <http://correlatesofwar.org>.
- Gilardi, Fabrizio. 2005. The Institutional Foundations of Regulatory Capitalism: The Diffusion of Independent Regulatory Agencies in Western Europe. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 598 (1):84-101.
- Goldstein, Judith L., Douglas Rivers, and Michael Tomz. 2007. Institutions in International Relations: Understanding the Effects of the GATT and the WTO on World Trade. *International Organization* 61(1): 37-67.
- Goodliffe, Jay and Darren Hawkins. 2006. Explaining commitment: States and the Convention Against Torture. *Journal of Politics* 68 (2): 358-371.
- Hafner-Burton, Emilie. 2005. Trading human rights: How preferential trade agreements influence government repression. *International Organization* 59 (3):593-629.
- Hathaway, Oona A. 2002. Do Human Rights Treaties Make a Difference? *The Yale Law Journal* 111 (8): 1935–2042
- Hathaway, Oona. 2003. The cost of commitment. *Stanford Law Review* 55 (5):1821-1862.

- Hathaway, Oona. 2008. Why do countries commit to human rights treaties? *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 51 (4):588-621.
- Hawkins, Darren. 2003. Universal jurisdiction for human rights: From legal principle to limited reality. *Global Governance* 9 (3): 347-365.
- Hawkins, Darren. 2008. Protecting Democracy in Europe and the Americas. *International Organization* 62(3): 373-403.
- Hawkins, Darren G., David A. Lake, Daniel L. Nielson, and Michael J. Tierney. 2006. Delegation under anarchy: States, international organizations and principal-agent theory. In *Delegation and Agency in International Organizations*, edited by D. G. Hawkins, D. A. Lake, D. L. Nielson and M. J. Tierney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heston, Alan, Robert Summers, and Bettina Aten. 2002. Penn World Table Version 6.1, Center for International Comparisons at the University of Pennsylvania (CICUP), Philadelphia, Pa.
- Hollyer, James R. and B. Peter Rosendorff. 2009. Domestic Politics and the Accession of Authoritarian Regimes to Human Rights Treaties. Ms.
- Huntington, Samuel. 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations: Remaking the World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Ingram, Paul, Jeffrey Robinson, and Marc L. Busch. 2005. The Intergovernmental Network of World Trade: IGO Connectedness, Governance, and Embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology* 111 (3): 824–58.
- Jordana, Jacint and David Levi-Faur. 2005. The Diffusion of Regulatory Capitalism in Latin America: Sectoral and National Channels in the Making of a New Order. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 598 (1):102-124.
- Joyner, Christopher C. 1996. Arresting Impunity: The Case for Universal Jurisdiction in Bringing War Criminals to Accountability. *Law and Contemporary Problems* 59 (4):153-172.
- Koh, Harold Hongju. 1996. Why do nations obey international law? Review essay. *Yale Law Journal* 106:2599-659.
- Landman, Todd. 2005. *Protecting Human Rights: A Comparative Study*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Landry, Pierre F. 2008. *Decentralized Authoritarianism in China: The Communist Party's Control of Local Elites in the Post-Mao Era*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Lazer, David. 2005. Regulatory Capitalism as a Networked Order: The International System as an Informational Network. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 598 (1):52-66.
- Levitsky, Steven and Lucan Way (2002). The rise of competitive authoritarianism. *Journal of Democracy* 13 (2): 51-65.
- Levi-Faur, David. 2005. The Global Diffusion of Regulatory Capitalism. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 598 (1):12-32.
- Levi-Faur, David and Jacint Jordana. 2005a. Globalizing Regulatory Capitalism. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 598 (1):6-9.
- Levi-Faur, David and Jacint Jordana. 2005b. Regulatory Capitalism: Policy Irritants and Convergent Divergence. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 598 (1):191-197.
- Levi-Faur, David and Jacint Jordana. 2005c. The Rise of Regulatory Capitalism: The Global Diffusion of a New Order. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 598 (1):200-217.
- Lippman, Matthew. 1994. The development and drafting of the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. *Boston College International and Comparative Law Review* 17 (Summer):275-335.
- Lust-Okar, E. (2005). *Structuring Conflict in the Arab World: Incumbents, Opponents, and Institutions*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Lutz, Ellen, and Kathryn Sikkink. 2001. The justice cascade: The evolution and impact of foreign human rights trials in Latin America. *Chicago Journal of International Law* 2 (1):1-33.
- Meseguer, Covadonga. 2005. Policy Learning, Policy Diffusion, and the Making of a New Order. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 598 (1):67-82.
- Meseguer, Covadonga. 2009. *Learning, Policy Making, and Market Reforms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Meyer, John W., John Boli, George M. Thomas, and Francisco O. Ramirez. 1997. World society and the nation-state. *American Journal of Sociology* 103:144-181.
- Moravcsik, Andrew. 2000. The origins of human rights regimes: Democratic delegation in postwar Europe. *International Organization* 54 (2):217-252.
- Neumayer, Eric. 2005. Do International Human Rights Treaties Improve Respect for Human Rights? *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49 (6): 925-53.

- Pevehouse, Jon C. 2005. *Democracy from Above: Regional Organizations and Democratization*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Post, Diahanna L. 2005. Standards and Regulatory Capitalism: The Diffusion of Food Safety Standards in Developing Countries. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 598 (1):168-183.
- Randall, Kenneth C. 1988. Universal jurisdiction under international law. *Texas Law Review* 66:785-837.
- Ratner, Steven R., and Jason S. Abrams. 2001. *Accountability for Human Rights in International Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Risse-Kappen, Thomas. 1996. Collective identity in a democratic community: The case of NATO. In *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, ed. Peter Katzenstein. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rodley, Nigel. 1999. *The Treatment of Prisoners under International Law*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Simmons, Beth A. 2000. International law and state behavior: Commitment and compliance in international monetary affairs. *American Political Science Review* 94 (4):819-836.
- Simmons, Beth A., Frank Dobbin, and Geoffrey Garrett. 2006. Introduction: The international diffusion of liberalism. *International Organization* 60 (4):781-810.
- Singer, Judith D. and John B. Willett. 2003. *Applied Longitudinal Data Analysis: Modeling Change and Event Occurrence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vreeland, James Raymond. 2008. Political institutions and human rights: Why dictatorships enter into the United Nations Convention against Torture. *International Organization* 62 (Winter):65-101.
- Way, Christopher R. 2005. Political Insecurity and the Diffusion of Financial Market Regulation. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 598 (1):125-144.
- Weeks, Jessica L. 2008. Autocratic Audience Costs: Regime Type and Signaling Resolve. *International Organization* 62, (1): 35-64.
- Wendt, Alexander. 1994. Collective identity formation and the international state. *American Political Science Review* 88 (2):384-396.
- Wotipka, Christine Min and Kiyoteru Tsutsui. 2008. Global Human Rights and State Sovereignty: State Ratification of International Human Rights Treaties, 1965–2001. *Sociological Forum* 23 (4):724-754.

Wotipka, Christine Min, and Francisco O. Ramirez. 2008. World Society and Human Rights: An Event History Analysis of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. In Beth A. Simmons, Frank Dobbin and Geoffrey Garrett (eds.), *The Global Diffusion of Markets and Democracy*: pp. 303–343. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix: Descriptive data

Variable label	Mean	Standard deviation	Min	Max	Source
Signing the Convention against Torture	0.33	0.47	0	1	United Nations
Ratifying the Convention against Torture	0.07	0.26	0	1	United Nations
Accepting Article 21	0.02	0.16	0	1	United Nations
Accepting Article 22	0.02	0.15	0	1	United Nations
Regional Multiparty Dictatorship Cohort (lagged)	0.07	0.17	0	1	Author calculation
Regional Single Party Dictatorship Cohort (lagged)	0.06	0.13	0	1	Author calculation
Regional Democracy Cohort (lagged)	0.12	0.23	0	1	Author calculation
Multiparty Dictatorship	0.23	0.42	0	1	Gandhi (2008) Cheibub, Gandhi, & Vreeland (2009)
Democracy	0.39	0.49	0	1	Goodliffe & Hawkins (2006)
ECHR Ratification (lagged)	0.08	0.27	0	1	Goodliffe & Hawkins (2006)
Human Rights NGOs (in 100s)	2.17	7.36	0	83.24	Hathaway (2009)
Physical Integrity Rights (lagged)	4.62	2.34	0	8	Cingranelli & Richards (2008)
Empowerment Rights (lagged)	5.44	3.16	0	10	Cingranelli & Richards (2008)
GDP/capita (in \$1000, natural log)	8.10	1.14	5.81	10.40	Heston et al. (2002)
GDP (in \$100 billion, natural log)	17.20	1.80	13.10	22.76	Heston et al. 2002
Common Law Judicial System	0.40	0.49	0	1	Goodliffe & Hawkins (2006)
Hostility Levels	1.22	1.77	0	5	Ghosn and Bennett (2003)

Note: Number of observations is 1,215, which is the sample used in the analysis of CAT Ratification/Accession (table 2, second model). Descriptive data for other samples are available on request.