

The Politics of Punishment: Why Dictators Join the International Criminal Court*

Leslie Johns[†] and Francesca Parente[‡]

17 April 2023

Abstract

Scholars commonly argue that international law and organizations promote democracy by helping dictators to credibly commit to accountability, individual rights, and transparency. Yet dictators routinely join treaties and international organizations without transitioning to democracy. International law and organizations can generate asymmetric costs on domestic actors because international rules often apply to both governments and non-state actors, yet dictators can limit how these rules are upheld at the domestic and international level. We argue that dictators are most likely to join such treaties and international organizations when they face strong domestic political competition. We illustrate our argument using the International Criminal Court (ICC), which has extensive powers to prosecute individuals for international crimes, including crimes against humanity, genocide, and war crimes. We show that ICC investigations and prosecutions have become a tool for incumbent dictators to target their domestic opponents. We examine the implications of our theory for multiple outcome variables, including the decision to join the ICC, violence, and the survival of dictators in power. Our evidence suggests that dictators are most likely to join the ICC when they face strong political opponents and are subsequently less likely to commit violence and more likely to survive in office.

*For helpful feedback, we thank Genevieve Bates, Stephen Chaudoin, Ricky Clark, Layna Mosley, Peter Rosendorff, Alastair Smith, Jim Vreeland, Kelly Zvobgo, and multiple anonymous reviewers. We also thank participants in the 2021 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, and seminars at New York University, Princeton University, and the University of Pennsylvania. Rebecca Pol provided excellent research assistance for this project. This research was funded by a grant from the Burkle Center for International Relations at UCLA and the Niehaus Center for Globalization and Governance at Princeton University.

[†]Professor, UCLA

[‡]Assistant Professor, Christopher Newport University

1 Introduction

In January 2004, an unlikely alliance was presented to the world in a London press conference. Luis Moreno-Ocampo, the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court, announced that he was opening a preliminary examination into crimes in Uganda. Standing by his side was Yoweri Museveni, Uganda's dictator and leader of a military that committed international crimes throughout central Africa. Surprisingly, Moreno-Ocampo announced that Museveni had formally requested the Court to intervene in Uganda. Casual observers could easily have been puzzled by this press conference. Was Museveni asking for his own arrest and imprisonment? Was Museveni trying to democratize and promote human rights?

Many scholars argue that international law and organizations can promote democracy. They believe that institutions like the International Criminal Court can allow leaders to credibly commit to democratization and values like government accountability, individual rights, and transparency (Hafner-Burton, Mansfield and Pevehouse, 2015; Keck and Sikkink, 1998; Moravcsik, 2000; Simmons, 2009). Yet many dictators join and participate in international law and organizations, and decades of globalization have led to widespread democratic backsliding (Ginsburg, 2020; Waldner and Lust, 2018). This behavior has led some scholars to conclude that dictators are not meaningfully constrained by international law and organizations (Hafner-Burton and Tsutsui, 2007; Smith-Cannoy, 2012*a*; Vreeland, 2008). So why do so many leaders who commit severe atrocities against their people belong to treaties and international organizations that aim to prohibit and punish such atrocities? Might international law and organizations sometimes constrain governments, while simultaneously eroding democratic pressures and allowing dictators to preserve their hold on power?

We argue that international law and organizations often impose asymmetric costs on dictators. Many international laws and organizations establish rules that apply to both governments and non-state actors. Yet dictators can limit how these rules are upheld at the domestic and international level. By exerting control over judges, legislators, reporters, and civil society, dictators can limit how and when violations of international rules are documented, publicized, and punished. While international law and organizations create legal obligations for governments, dictators can shield themselves from accountability while simultaneously using international law and organizations to punish their opponents. In such circumstances, the act of joining a treaty and participating in an international organization will increase the political power of a dictator relative to his domestic opponents.

We construct a simple formal model to show that a dictator is most likely to join treaties and participate in international organizations that generate asymmetric costs when he faces high political competition, which makes the use of violence relatively costly. In such circumstances, a dictator has incentive to try to increase his relative political power by generating asymmetric costs for violence. In contrast, when the dictator faces low political competition, the use of violence is relatively cheap. Because the dictator is already relatively strong, he has little incentive to increase his power further using international law and organizations. This theoretical mechanism affects which dictatorships select into treaties and international organizations, how domestic actors behave after a dictator has selected into these institutions, and the likelihood that an incumbent dictator survives in power.

We test our theoretical argument in the context of the International Criminal Court (ICC) using mixed methods. First, we illustrate the plausibility of our assumptions about asymmetric costs in dictatorships by including qualitative vignettes of multiple ICC investigations, arrest warrants, and prosecutions. Second, we perform statistical analysis to examine whether the empirical implications of our theoretical model are supported by cross-national time-series data. These tests examine three distinct outcome variables that have been largely studied in isolation from each other: when dictators join the ICC; the impact of ICC membership on total violence within dictatorships; and the survival of incumbent dictators in office. While each of these empirical tests has inherent limits, we believe that the combination of these different kinds of qualitative and statistical evidence yields compelling support for our argument.

Our argument suggests that international law and organizations have important normative implications that have been under-explored by prior research. First, even if the ICC is impartial and neutral in its decision-making, asymmetric costs ensure that the observable effect of the ICC's actions will be biased in favor of incumbent dictators. Such bias can undermine a court's public support (Nalepa, 2012; Zvobgo, 2019). Continued use of the ICC by autocrats to punish their political rivals may therefore reduce the ICC's ability to survive over time. Second, our argument and evidence suggest that the overall effect of international law and organizations will sometimes be the consolidation of power by dictators and democratic backsliding, despite the best intentions and efforts of civil society and international bureaucrats and lawyers. Advocates of international cooperation must carefully consider whether such international cooperation actually benefits domestic societies.

2 Dictators and International Justice

As background for our argument, we begin by discussing why dictators use international law. We first examine general arguments about why treaties and international organizations matter, and then summarize major accounts of the domestic politics of dictatorship. We then narrow our focus to the International Criminal Court. Namely, we describe how ICC investigations and prosecutions generate asymmetric costs within dictatorships and illustrate these processes using case study vignettes.

2.1 Dictators and International Law

Many scholars have examined the creation and use of international law and organizations by strategic actors (Johns, 2015). Some prominent scholars argue that international law and organizations impose no significant constraints on dictatorships. These scholars view treaties as meaningless documents that can placate civil society organizations, domestic political opponents, and/or the international community (Smith-Cannoy, 2012*b*; Vreeland, 2008). However, most scholars believe that international law and organizations do impose meaningful constraints, even within dictatorships. Broadly speaking, these scholars emphasize three key complementary (and often overlapping) ways that treaties and international organizations influence international politics.

First, many scholars argue that treaties and international organizations serve as commitment devices. International law may allow a government to credibly commit that it will follow a particular rule by imposing costs if the government violates that rule. Law may thus constrain the choices of both incumbent and future governments (Simmons, 2009; Moravcsik, 2000). For example, Simmons and Danner (2010) argue that joining the ICC is a mechanism for self-binding, leading to reduced violence after ratification. This argument is supported by additional studies about the impact of ICC membership and prosecutions on domestic violence and prosecutions (Appel, 2018; Bates, 2021; Hillebrecht, 2016). However, experts debate whether ICC membership will shorten or prolong the rule of leaders who have already committed crimes, and hence are unwilling to step down from power (Gilligan, 2006; Krmaric, 2018; Prorok, 2017; Nalepa and Powell, 2016).

Second, many scholars argue that treaties and international organizations are tools that governments use to signal information to domestic and international audiences. This information can include a government's willingness to challenge its political opponents (Hollyer and Rosendorff, 2011) or its commitment to values like democracy and human rights (Jo, 2015; Jo and Thomson, 2014; Stanton, 2016). International organizations can play a similar role by revealing information

about a government’s behavior (Terman and Voeten, 2018). Of course, states may sometimes be insincere in the signals that they send to audiences. Scholars usually argue that insincerity will be most likely if treaties and international organizations impose relatively low costs on states (Smith-Cannoy, 2012*b*; Vreeland, 2008). For example, some scholars argue that the International Criminal Court imposes relatively low costs on dictators because these leaders can limit ICC investigations, arrests, and prosecutions (Hashimoto, 2020; Meernik, 2015).

Third, some scholars argue that international law facilitates enforcement by communities of disinterested actors. Such multilateral enforcement is most challenging in large communities of actors (Milgrom, North and Weingast, 1990). By setting clear rules about how states should behave and publicizing when states break these rules, international law can help states to craft multilateral solutions for bilateral disputes (Johns, 2012). Enforcement communities can be created by military alliances, trade agreements, and foreign capital flows (Appel and Prorok, 2019; Goodliffe et al., 2012; Prorok and Appel, 2013). For example, in his detailed study of the ICC, Ba (2020) argues that African states self-refer cases to the ICC because arrest warrants will “isolate the [political opposition] and make it an enemy of the international community” (44). Ba argues that this international condemnation of political opponents provides domestic benefits to weak governments.

The impact of these three mechanisms—credible commitment, signaling, and enforcement communities—is affected by the regime-type of states. A growing body of scholarship has examined how the International Criminal Court can affect domestic public attitudes and political outcomes (Chaudoin and Chapman, 2020; Chaudoin, 2016; Zvobgo, 2019). These studies have largely focused on democracies, in which representative governance, alternation in political power by competing groups, and independent judiciaries affect the ICC’s activities. Other studies have focused on the ICC’s relationship with the US government, which steadfastly refuses to join the ICC despite sometimes cooperating with it (Kaye, 2013; Krcmaric, 2023). However, to understand the ICC’s impact within dictatorships, we must understand the tools that dictators use to maintain their power.

While scholars debate the central meaning of democracy, they generally agree that democracies are states with well-consolidated institutions that provide representative governance, allow multiple political parties, and protect basic civil and political rights. Przeworski (1999) argues compellingly that the key unifying characteristic of democracies is competitive elections that can result in peaceful transitions of political power. We accordingly use a minimalist conception of a “dictatorship” as a political regime that preserves “power by means other than competitive elec-

tions” (Gandhi, 2008, 7).¹ This includes a broad range of institutional arrangements, including monarchies, military rulers, and civilian autocrats.

A fundamental problem faced by dictators is how to maintain their survival in power given the resources available to them (Bueno de Mesquita et al., 2003). At the domestic level, dictators often rely on the threat or use of repression and violence to maintain their power (Conrad and Ritter, 2013; Tyson and Smith, 2018). Such repression often includes violations of basic civil and political rights by government actors, including the military, police, and domestic courts (Shen-Bayh, 2018). Repression also often includes more serious violations of physical autonomy, like killings, sexual violence, and torture (Davenport, 2007; Conrad and Ritter, 2019). These tactics often qualify as serious international crimes that can be punished by the ICC.

Dictators can also use their control over information to help them survive in office (Hollyer, Rosendorff and Vreeland, 2011). This control is more easily accomplished when a dictator has less political competition, as reflected in control over state media, prohibition of opposition political parties, and weak or non-existent constraints on executive authority. Control over information limits the ability of opponents to solve collective action problems (Edmond, 2013). It also limits the knowledge of average individuals about the content and quality of government policies (Gehlbach and Sonin, 2014).

A third tool for maintaining domestic power is rents. For example, dictators may be able to buy political support by selectively taxing and redistributing wealth within their states (Acemoglu and Robinson, 2001; Bueno de Mesquita et al., 2003). Alternatively, some dictators can survive in power by distributing natural resource wealth to the governing elite (Ross, 2012). Many dictators also channel external financial assistance—like foreign aid and development assistance—to reward their political supporters and prolong their survival (Bueno de Mesquita and Smith, 2010; Smith and Vreeland, 2006).

Finally, dictators can sometimes create and use domestic institutions to help them survive in office. For example, scholars have examined how dictators build and maintain elite support by sharing power within legislatures (Gandhi, 2008). Dictators can also share power using advisory councils, cabinet positions, controlled elections, and/or multiple political parties (Arriola, Devaro and Meng, 2021; Boix and Svulik, 2013; Magaloni, 2006, 2008). Finally, economic agencies that disseminate credible economic information can help dictators to maintain elite support (Hollyer, Rosendorff and Vreeland, 2019). Such arrangements help members of the elite to solve under-

¹We discuss how we measure regime-type in Section 4.

lying strategic problems, like asymmetric information, collective action, commitment problems, guardianship dilemmas, and monitoring problems (Meng, 2020; Meng and Paine, Forthcoming; Svulik, 2012). These arrangements can also bolster a dictators power by fragmenting any possible political opposition (Arriola, Devaro and Meng, 2021).

Most scholars have argued that international institutions—including treaties and international organizations—harm the survival of dictators. For example, many scholars argue that human rights treaties fuel democratization in mixed regimes that are neither fully autocratic or democratic by either empowering domestic civil society or “locking-in” basic rights for individuals, like physical autonomy and freedoms of expression and association (Simmons, 2009; Moravcsik, 2000). Similarly, many empirical scholars have identified a robust relationship between democratic governance and participation in regional and international organizations (e.g. Pevehouse, 2005; Mansfield and Pevehouse, 2006).

Yet a small body of research—to which we contribute—shows that sometimes dictators can strategically use international law and organizations to help maintain their power. For example, Bush (2016) carefully details how dictators can manipulate nongovernmental organizations into designing democracy assistance programs that hinder democratization. Similarly, multiple recent papers have examined when dictators join the UN Convention Against Torture (CAT). Both Conrad (2014) and Vreeland (2008) argue that more political competition will result in more pressure on dictators to join the CAT in exchange for maintaining their political power. In contrast, Hollyer and Rosendorff (2011) argue that a government’s underlying willingness to use force drives decisions about whether to join the CAT. Signing the CAT, they argue, signals to political opponents that the government is so strong that it can easily afford to make violence more costly, thereby deterring political competition. However, one aspect of the CAT prevents these theories from being easily extended to other areas of international law. Namely, the CAT definition of torture only applies to acts “of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity.”² The CAT cannot be used to punish non-state actors, such as armed opposition groups (Johns, 2022, 282-286). To fully understand how dictators can use international law and organization to prolong their survival, we must therefore consider the impact of international rules that constrain both a dictator and his opponents.

²CAT (1984), Article 1(1).

2.2 Dictators and the International Criminal Court

The two central assumptions of our theory are that the International Criminal Court: (1) constrains both a dictator and his opponents; and (2) creates asymmetric costs in dictatorships. We must therefore justify these assumptions in detail.

When a state joins the ICC, it accepts the authority—or jurisdiction—of the Court to investigate and prosecute serious international crimes that are committed either on its territory or by its nationals. Most states join the ICC by ratifying the Rome Statute, which is the international treaty that defines the ICC’s powers and procedures. States can also accept the ICC’s authority to investigate and prosecute by filing a special declaration in which they accept the ICC’s jurisdiction even if they have not formally ratified the treaty.³ We describe both actions as decisions to join the ICC.

The Rome Statute also defines the serious international crimes that can be prosecuted by the Court, which are crimes against humanity, genocide, and war crimes.⁴ The precise definitions of these crimes are best addressed by specialized legal texts.⁵ However, these crimes include common outcomes of political violence, including: imprisonment without due process, killing, rape, torture, and “causing great suffering, or serious injury to body or health.”⁶ These acts become serious international crimes when they occur in specific contexts. For example, many of these acts become crimes against humanity “when committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population.”⁷ Similarly, various acts qualify as war crimes “when committed as part of a plan or policy or as part of a large-scale commission of such crimes.”⁸ Higher levels of political violence are therefore more likely to yield serious international crimes that can be prosecuted by the ICC.

The Rome Statute allows the Court to investigate and prosecute all individuals, regardless of their official status. Unlike the UN Convention Against Torture, the ICC does not require that a crime be committed by “a public official or other person acting in an official capacity.”⁹ As such, the ICC can target rebel commanders, opposition politicians, and other individuals who are not part of a sitting government. The ICC can also prosecute government officials, including political

³See Rome Statute (1998), Article 12(3). Côte d’Ivoire (2003) and Ukraine (2014) both used this tactic to accept ICC jurisdiction.

⁴The Court can also prosecute acts of aggression committed after July 2018. This has not (yet) occurred.

⁵An introduction is available in Johns (2022, 404–408).

⁶See Rome Statute (1998), Articles 6–8.

⁷See Rome Statute (1998), Article 7.

⁸See Rome Statute (1998), Article 8.

⁹CAT (1984), para. Article 1(1).

and military leaders, because the ICC does not allow such individuals to claim official immunity from prosecution.¹⁰

The ICC process begins when the Prosecutor learns about an alleged crime. She can learn about a crime through press reports, communications with individuals and NGOs, or formal referrals by the UN Security Council or member states. The Prosecutor and her staff then conduct a preliminary examination, in which they assess whether the ICC is likely to have jurisdiction over alleged crime. If a situation is referred by the UN Security Council or a member state, the Prosecutor can proceed directly to a formal investigation. However, if the Prosecutor learns about alleged crimes through other means, she must seek approval from ICC judges before opening a formal investigation. If an investigation yields sufficient evidence, the Prosecutor can then request that ICC judges issue an arrest warrant or summons to appear for an individual to face trial.¹¹ Once a wanted individual appears before the Court, prosecution begins.

This basic process gives dictators multiple opportunities to influence investigations and prosecutions. First, a dictator has the power to self-refer cases to the Court, which his opponents cannot do. These self-referrals set the agenda for what the Court investigates, and often contain geographic, temporal, or subject-matter limits.¹² Such self-referrals become formal investigations without any judicial review. In contrast, non-state actors, like rebel groups and NGOs, can send written complaints to the ICC Prosecutor, but the Prosecutor cannot open an official investigation without securing approval from ICC judges.¹³ Paradoxically, this process requires that the Prosecutor submit evidence of a crime before the Prosecutor can actually investigate.

For example, the Central African Republic (CAR) is a dictatorship that has experienced ongoing violence and atrocities since the ICC's creation in 2002. CAR has experienced three major waves of violence since 2002. The CAR government twice asked the ICC to formally investigate its political opponents (in 2004 and 2012). However, the referrals excluded atrocities committed by CAR government forces in 2005–2008, when CAR's dictator battled two rebellions in the northern territories.¹⁴ The CAR government was able to limit the scope of the ICC's investigation by excluding atrocities it did not want investigated.

¹⁰Rome Statute (1998), Article 27.

¹¹The ICC issues a summons to appear if it believes that a defendant will voluntarily appear before the Court. Otherwise, the Court issues an arrest warrant.

¹²Solomon and Zvobgo (2020) argue that autocrats can similarly manipulate a domestic truth commission by limiting the commission's authority.

¹³Rome Statute (1998), Article 15.

¹⁴See Human Rights Watch (2007) "State of Anarchy Rebellion and Abuses against Civilians" Sept. 14. Available at: <https://www.hrw.org/report/2007/09/14/state-anarchy/rebellion-and-abuses-against-civilians>. Report also on file with authors.

Second, successful investigations require that investigators identify and locate witnesses to alleged crimes. Since alleged crimes are usually initially investigated by local police and/or military forces, the government has specialized information that is not easily available to the ICC, such as who witnessed a crime. Government registries and social service offices can help the ICC to locate these witnesses. In dictatorships, governments can easily withhold such information if they wish to constrain an ICC investigation. Once witnesses are found, the ICC must then interview and prepare witnesses for trial, either directly or through intermediaries. This process usually requires the free movement of ICC staff and/or intermediaries, and access to translators who understand local languages and modes of expression. Many witnesses then require security, both before and during a trial. The ICC lacks law enforcement officers and cannot grant asylum to witnesses. The ICC therefore depends on governments to protect witnesses. Dictators can hinder these tasks by denying travel permits, restricting access to transportation and translators, refusing to provide security to witnesses, or even coaching individuals on how to provide false testimony. In contrast, political opponents do not have access to the state security apparatus.

For example, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) asked the ICC in 2004 to investigate and prosecute ongoing crimes in the eastern Congo. Because of instability and violence in the region, ICC staff could not easily travel within the eastern Congo or communicate with alleged witnesses and victims. Instead, the ICC relied on intermediaries, who were local individuals who agreed to locate and interview witnesses on behalf of the ICC. This arrangement generated immense problems during the trial of Thomas Lubanga, a rebel commander. ICC judges ruled that at least three of the seven intermediaries used by the ICC generated unreliable evidence against Lubanga.¹⁵ For example, multiple alleged victims admitted during the trial that they had lied and been coached on their testimony by an intermediary in exchange for bribes. The Court would not publicly identify the intermediaries, but the Court revealed that at least one of the intermediaries worked for the Congolese intelligence service. This same intermediary also worked on investigations against other ICC defendants, including Germain Katanga and Mathieu Ngudjolo Chui (Buisman, 2013, 39). This revelation shows the potential for dictators to manipulate ICC investigations and prosecutions.

Third, the ICC sometimes uses digital and documentary evidence to establish that high-ranking individuals, like military commanders, are responsible for acts committed by subordinates under their control. Dictators can often provide such evidence to the ICC when crimes are commit-

¹⁵ICC, *Lubanga*, Trial Judgment of 14 March 2012, pp. 90–230.

ted by rebel groups. However, dictators can also shield themselves from prosecution by withholding and/or destroying such evidence about their own activities. Rebel groups often do not have access to this kind of information, so they cannot create the same kind of costs for the government as the government creates for them.

This pattern is apparent in the trial of Dominic Ongwen, a mid-level commander in the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA), a rebel group in Uganda. In Ongwen’s trial, the ICC Prosecutor relied extensively on recordings and logbooks of LRA radio communications. These communications were intercepted, screened, recorded, and translated by the Ugandan military, intelligence agency, and local police forces.¹⁶ The Ugandan government then provided edited recordings and selected logbook entries to ICC investigators, who used these materials as evidence against Ongwen. In contrast, the LRA lacked capacity to collect evidence about the activities and communications of the Ugandan military.

Fourth, the ICC relies on its member-states to enforce arrest warrants. Even if the ICC prosecutor has sufficient evidence to prosecute an individual, a trial cannot occur *in absentia*. The ICC must have the actual suspect in custody. Many individuals who are wanted by the ICC have voluntarily appeared at the Court, either because they believe that they can prove their innocence or because they prefer an ICC trial to the prospect of punishment at home. Yet incumbent governments can also choose to enforce warrants for their political opponents while shielding themselves and their allies from arrest (Hillebrecht and Straus, 2017).

For example, Germain Katanga was a rebel fighter accused of committing atrocities during an attack on a village in the eastern Congo in 2003. As part of the power sharing agreement that ended the Great African War, Katanga—who had fought against the Congolese government—agreed to be incorporated into the new national army in late 2004. This demobilization process gave the government information about where to find Katanga. Just four months later, the Congolese government arrested Katanga and turned him over to the ICC for trial.¹⁷

One final possibility is that a dictator may be able to render a case inadmissible by launching a complementary domestic investigation and prosecution of a wanted individual.¹⁸ We are ambivalent about whether this is an effective way for dictators to shield themselves from ICC punishment. On the one hand, the principle of complementarity ensures that a case is inadmissible before the ICC if it “is being investigated or prosecuted by a State which has jurisdiction over

¹⁶ICC, *Ongwen*, Trial Judgment of 4 February 2021, section IV.3.

¹⁷ICC, *Katanga*, Trial Judgment, 7 March 2014, para. 6.

¹⁸We thank Stephen Chaudoin for suggesting this point.

it.”¹⁹ This design attribute is intended to enhance public support for international justice (Zvobgo and Chaudoin, 2022). In theory, this principle may allow dictators to create the false appearance of justice by creating domestic justice mechanisms that shield regime supporters. For example, many states respond to mass atrocities by creating weak institutions that “look something like accountability mechanisms but lack the ability to truly pursue justice for mass atrocities” (Cronin-Furman, 2022, 75). On the other hand, the Rome Statute attempts to prevent such actions by allowing the ICC Prosecutor to take action if “the State is unwilling or unable *genuinely* to carry out the investigation or prosecution.”²⁰

We cannot identify any example in which a dictator shielded a supporter from ICC prosecution by launching complementary domestic proceedings. Simply put, we cannot (yet) credibly identify individuals that were *not* pursued by the ICC because of complementarity. We can only observe arrest warrants that actually *are* filed. Additionally, qualitative research on Uganda and Sudan compellingly shows that ICC actions did not cause dictators in those states to shield their supporters from justice using domestic investigations and prosecutions (Nouwen, 2013). Indeed, the only ICC case to date involving complementarity was one in which an accused individual requested prosecution by the ICC, rather than by a domestic court in Libya.²¹ Nonetheless, complementarity may be a useful tactic that future dictators can deploy to protect themselves and their supporters.

What makes democracies different from dictatorships? Democracies can also make self-referrals, hinder investigations, withhold digital and documentary evidence, refuse to enforce arrest warrants, and launch complementary domestic proceedings. For example, the ICC Appeals Chamber ruled in March 2020 that the ICC Prosecutor could investigate war crimes committed in Afghanistan by US troops. In response, US President Trump tried to hinder this investigation by ordering sanctions ICC staffers in June 2020.²² Doesn’t this example demonstrate that democratic leaders can protect themselves and their allies from the ICC?

We certainly agree that more powerful states will be better able to protect themselves and their allies than less powerful states, all else equal. However, we also believe that democratic institutions—including mass enfranchisement, opposition political parties, competitive and free

¹⁹Rome Statute (1998), Article 17(1)(a).

²⁰*Ibid.* Emphasis added.

²¹See ICC, *Al-Senussi*, Decisions of 11 October 2013 and 24 July 2014.

²²US Executive Office of the President, “Blocking Property of Certain Persons Associated With the International Criminal Court,” Executive Order 13928 of June 11, 2020. Available at: <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2020/06/15/2020-12953/blocking-property-of-certain-persons-associated-with-the-international-criminal-court>. Last accessed: 22 June 2022.

elections, independent domestic courts, transparency laws, and freedoms of speech and the press—make these ineffective tools for manipulating ICC investigations and prosecutions. For example, the decision by the ICC Appeals Chamber to allow an investigation of US war crimes in Afghanistan was based almost entirely on documentary evidence that was publicly disseminated in 2014 by the US Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.²³ These documents were published worldwide in newspapers and available on US government websites. Simply put, the US Senate provided the evidence necessary for the ICC to conduct a formal investigation of US activities in Afghanistan. Similarly, Trump’s executive order imposing sanctions was publicly disseminated in accordance with US transparency laws. It was then widely reported and condemned by diverse political actors in domestic and international news media. The American Civil Liberties Union quickly filed a legal challenge to the executive order in US federal courts.²⁴ When political power shifted to newly-elected President Biden in early 2021, the executive order was completely rescinded.²⁵ We do not yet know how the US government will respond if the ICC issues an arrest warrant for a US national. However, Trump’s executive order was temporary, ineffective, and primarily political theater, rather than a genuine obstruction. This example suggests that democracies are fundamentally different from dictatorships when it comes to manipulating ICC investigations and prosecutions.

In sum, dictators can use their political power to shield themselves from the ICC while simultaneously making their political opponents vulnerable.²⁶ This difference is reflected in the kinds of individuals who are targeted by the ICC for trial. As shown in Table 1, the ICC has issued (as of the end of 2021) 37 warrants or summons to appear before the Court for alleged international crimes.²⁷ About 43 percent of these individuals were government officials or supporters at the time that the alleged crime took place. Many of these individuals were targeted in investigations that began as referrals by the UN Security Council or the Prosecutor. These investigations focused on both democracies and dictatorships. Among the self-referred investigations—all of which involve

²³See ICC, “Judgment on the appeal against the decision on the authorisation of an investigation into the situation in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan,” 5 March 2020.

²⁴See American Civil Liberties Union, “ACLU Clients Challenge Trump’s Sanction Order Against International Criminal Court,” Press release of 15 January 2021. Available at: <https://www.aclu.org/press-releases/aclu-clients-challenge-trumps-sanctions-order-against-international-criminal-court>. Last accessed: 22 June 2022.

²⁵US State Department, “Ending Sanctions and Visa Restrictions against Personnel of the International Criminal Court,” Press Statement of 2 April 2021. Available at: <https://www.state.gov/ending-sanctions-and-visa-restrictions-against-personnel-of-the-international-criminal-court/>. Last accessed: 22 June 2022.

²⁶We thank an anonymous referee for noting that Tom Ginsburg made a similar comment in a legal commentary: “The reason states sign the Rome Statute may be to ensure prosecution of their opponents, not themselves.” (Ginsburg, 2009, 506). This comment was mentioned in Chapman and Chaudoin (2013).

²⁷This count excludes administration of justice cases, which involve matters like witness tampering, rather than core international crimes.

dictatorships—only 1 of the 17 individuals who were targeted by the Court was a government supporter when the alleged crimes were committed. All the remaining targeted individuals committed their alleged crimes while challenging the government.

[Table 1 goes here.]

The exception to the rule is Jean-Pierre Bemba Gomba, a prominent Congolese politician and military leader. Bemba rose to power as leader of the *Mouvement de Libération du Congo* (MLC) in the final years of the Great African War. While fighting the government of Joseph Kabila, Bemba took control over Equateur Province in the northern DRC. Gaining and keeping this territory required that Bemba maintain a friendly relationship with Ange-Felix Patassé, the dictator of the neighboring Central African Republic (Gérard, 2009, 233). Patassé was struggling with repeated coup attempts by his political opponents and ratified the Rome Statute in 2001. In late 2002, Patassé asked Bemba to send some MLC troops to help him secure the capital of Bangui (Stearns, 2011, 230). A few months later, Patassé was deposed in a coup led by General Francois Bozizé that caused massive civilian suffering. Bozizé then asked the ICC in 2004 to investigate Patassé and Bemba for international crimes. The ICC obliged by opening its first investigation of the CAR.

Throughout the fighting in CAR and the subsequent ICC investigation, Bemba lived in the northern DRC. From there, he participated in the Congolese power sharing agreement by incorporating his troops into the new national army and shifting the MLC into a political organization. In 2006, he competed in the DRC's presidential election, challenging incumbent dictator Joseph Kabila. Bemba garnered enough votes to force a run-off election, ultimately securing 48 percent of the national vote. Bemba had clearly established himself as the main political rival to Joseph Kabila, who was the preferred candidate of France and the US. Only 18 months after the DRC runoff election, the ICC issued an arrest warrant for Bemba, who was arrested a day later while traveling in Belgium and sent to the ICC for trial.

The point of this story is not that Bemba was unjustly accused. Like all rebel groups that fought in the DRC, the MLC committed crimes against humanity and war crimes, albeit at lower levels than many other rebel groups in the DRC (Carayannis, 2015, 260). What made Bemba different from other rebel leaders—who were *not* prosecuted by the ICC—was that he was popular, and so posed a unique political threat to Joseph Kabila, a dictator who was struggling to keep his hold on power.

How do the ICC staff view this situation? Like any international organization, the ICC employs individuals with their own viewpoints and preferences (Johns, 2007). To our knowledge, no ICC staff member has (yet) written a memoir that details their time at the ICC. However, ICC prosecutors often give interviews and make speeches about the ICC. During these communications, ICC prosecutors routinely emphasize both their commitment to punishing atrocities, and their reliance on state cooperation to collect evidence and arrest wanted individuals.²⁸ The ICC thus closely resembles many civil society organizations that operate in repressive dictatorships: ICC staff likely cooperate with dictators because they believe that achieving something is better than achieving nothing (Bush, 2016).

Indeed, academics, activists, and lawyers frequently invoke the cautionary tale of Carla Del Ponte, the former prosecutor for the International Criminal Tribunal of Rwanda (ICTR). For security reasons, ICTR trials were held in Tanzania, meaning that Del Ponte relied upon the Rwandan government to access both defendants and witnesses. During its early years, the ICTR prosecuted only Hutu extremists who supported the deposed government and participated in the slaughter of Tutsi and moderate Hutu individuals. In these years, Del Ponte successfully cooperated with the Tutsi-led government of Paul Kagame, who rose to power in the aftermath of the Rwandan genocide.²⁹ However, Del Ponte's relationship with the Rwandan government soured when she announced that she was investigating crimes allegedly committed by Tutsi soldiers, who supported the Kagame government (Combs, 2010, 226-227). In her memoir, Del Ponte catalogued how her investigation of Tutsi crimes led to retaliation by Rwanda, which prohibited witnesses from traveling to Tanzania for ICTR trials and pressured the UN Security Council to fire her (Del Ponte, 2009, 223-241). Future international prosecutors learned that they faced political limits in who they could prosecute.

We are not the first scholars to note that the ICC imposes asymmetric costs within dictatorships. Many scholars have examined the details of specific ICC investigations. These scholars often note that economic, legal, and political constraints affect both arrest warrants and prosecutions (e.g. Hillebrecht and Straus, 2017; Peskin, 2009; Rosenberg, 2017). Similarly, many scholars have

²⁸For example, see: ICC, "Building a Future on Peace and Justice, Address by Mr. Luis Moreno-Ocampo, Prosecutor of the ICC," Statement of 24 June 2007. Available at: <https://www.icc-cpi.int/news/building-future-peace-and-justice-address-mr-luis-moreno-ocampo-prosecutor-icc>. Last accessed 27 June 2022. See also: ICC "Statement of the ICC Prosecutor to the United Nations Security Council on the Situation in Libya, pursuant to UNSCR 1970 (2011)," Statement of 17 May 2021. Available at: <https://www.icc-cpi.int/news/statement-icc-prosecutor-united-nations-security-council-situation-libya-pursuant-uns-cr-1970-0>. Last accessed 27 June 2022.

²⁹Cooperation paused briefly following a controversial ICTR ruling in the *Barayagwiza* case. Once the ruling was successfully overturned, cooperation resumed. See Del Ponte (2009, 71-86).

noted that dictators can often shield themselves and punish their enemies by limiting the access of ICC staff to evidence and witnesses (e.g. Hashimoto, 2020; Tiemessen, 2014, 2016). We build on these insights by examining the consequences of these asymmetric costs for: whether leaders select into the ICC; the impact of the ICC on total violence; and the impact of the ICC on leader survival in office.

3 Theory

We now present a simple formal model of how asymmetric costs for treaty violations affect selection, violence, and survival for dictators. We begin by describing the basic assumptions of our argument. We then describe the model’s equilibrium behavior and empirical implications. Finally, we discuss the robustness of our argument to alternative assumptions.

3.1 Assumptions

We begin by assuming that the dictator (D) is a unitary actor whose goal is to survive in power. All dictators have potential political opponents. These potential political opponents include members of the governing elite, such as military commanders who currently support the dictator but could defect to become the next leader. They also include individuals who are not part of the governing elite, like repressed groups within the state. These potential political opponents may already belong to armed opposition groups or they may have the potential to join such groups if they believe that violence can yield leadership change. We focus here on the interactions between the dictator and a single political opponent (P). We assume that both the dictator and his political opponent seek power over the state, which yields a common payoff of $W > 0$. We additionally assume that both the dictator and his political opponent have complete information about their strategic environment.

Strategic interactions begin when the dictator decides whether to join the ICC. We assume that the only impact of this publicly-observed decision is to raise the expected cost of violence to both players. This occurs because both players know that it will be possible in the future for the ICC to investigate and prosecute serious international crimes that result from the violence. We do not model ICC investigations and prosecutions because we believe that the ICC does its best to prosecute crimes fairly and objectively given the constraints it faces.³⁰ Our substantive interest is how ICC membership affects domestic politics within dictatorships.

³⁰We thank Peter Rosendorff for urging us to explicitly address this point.

After the dictator makes his decision about whether to join the ICC, each player simultaneously chooses how much effort to invest in violence, $e_i \geq 0$. These effort levels have two major effects. First, they determine the likelihood that each player gains power over the state. For simplicity, we assume that the probability that the dictator survives in power is:

$$\pi = \frac{e_D}{e_D + e_P}$$

The probability that the political opponent gains power over the state is therefore: $1 - \pi$.

Second, we assume that effort has the potential to generate serious international crimes. We need not assume that the dictator and the political opponent knowingly choose to commit crimes against humanity, genocide, and/or war crimes when they invest in effort. Rather, we have in mind the more common phenomenon in which heightened political contestation leads to more dramatic repression and resistance, both of which increase the risk that each side will lose control and restraint over individual fighters. When little effort is invested in political contestation by either side, the risk of a serious international crime is low. However, as effort escalates, the likelihood of a serious international crime grows.

We can now consider the preferences of players. We assume that violence always generates *domestic costs*, which must be paid regardless of whether the dictator joins the ICC. We assume that the relative magnitude of domestic costs of violence is affected by political competition. Namely, we assume that if the dictator is relatively strong and faces weak political competition, he can use violence at little domestic cost so the corresponding domestic unit cost of violence for the dictator, $c > 0$, is very small.³¹ In contrast, if the dictator is relatively weak and faces strong political competition, then the domestic unit cost of violence, $c > 0$, for the dictator is very large. For example, the presence of multiple political parties should allow opponents to more easily publicize and shame a dictator for atrocities. Similarly, a free press, opposition political parties, active civil society, and/or independent bureaucracies increase transparency about a dictator's policies and make it harder for a dictator to hide his actions from view. Finally, semi-independent political institutions—like legislatures and domestic courts—can have limited powers to sanction a dictator for violence. We expect that all of these elements of political competition make it more costly for a dictator to use violence. To reduce the number of parameters in our model, we normalize the political opponent's domestic unit cost of violence to 1.³² Expected payoffs if the dictator has not

³¹We discuss how we measure political competition in section 4.

³²This normalizing assumption does not affect any of our results. It simply reduces the number of parameters in the model. Note that we make no assumptions about the relationship between c and 1. So the dictator can face

joined the ICC are shown in the middle column of Table 2.

[Table 2 goes here.]

We assume that the ICC generates additional *international costs* for violence if the dictator joins the ICC. These costs are the asymmetric expected punishments for serious international crimes that can be generated by violence. As stated earlier, we expect that lower effort levels are less likely to generate serious international crimes that are punishable by the ICC, like crimes against humanity, genocide, and war crimes. In contrast, we assume that higher effort levels are more likely to generate such crimes. Because we believe that the dictator can try to limit how the ICC conducts investigations, we assume that the international unit cost for effort for the dictator is κ_L and the international unit cost for the political opponent is κ_H , where $0 < \kappa_L < \kappa_H$. Expected payoffs if the dictator has joined the ICC are shown in the right column of Table 2.

Our model has complete information, so we solve for a subgame perfect Nash equilibrium.

3.2 Equilibrium Behavior and Empirical Implications

We are interested in three outcomes that connect to empirical implications. First, we care about: when do dictators join the ICC? A dictator must carefully consider the likely effects of joining the ICC on subsequent choices about violence and the likelihood that he can survive in power. On the one hand, joining the ICC raises the dictator’s own cost of violence. This added international cost will have the direct effect of reducing the amount of violence that the dictator will subsequently choose, thereby lowering the likelihood that the dictator will survive in power. On the other hand, joining the ICC also indirectly affects the dictator by raising the cost of violence for his political opponent. This added international cost will lower the amount of violence deployed by his political opponent, thereby increasing the likelihood that the dictator survives in power.

The relative magnitude of these direct and indirect effects will depend on the level of political competition. When political competition is low, the dictator can easily deploy violence at little domestic cost. In the absence of ICC membership, the dictator’s strength deters opposition violence, allowing the dictator to have confidence that he will retain his hold on power. Joining the ICC—and raising the international costs of violence for both players—provides little added benefit to the dictator because his political opponent is already deterred from seriously challenging him. Overall, joining the ICC provides little benefit to a dictator when he faces little political competition.

higher costs from violence than the political opposition (i.e. $1 < c$), and vice versa (i.e. $0 < c < 1$).

In contrast, when political competition is high, the dictator finds violence more costly. In the absence of ICC membership, the dictator's weakness encourages opposition violence, reducing the dictator's confidence that he can remain in power. While joining the ICC will further constrain the government, it will also constrain the political opposition even more. This imbalance in expected costs imposed by the ICC hurts the opposition more than it hurts the dictator. Overall, joining the ICC will therefore benefit a dictator when political competition is high. This logic underlies Proposition 1, which generates an empirical implication of our theory:

Proposition 1. *In equilibrium, dictators with more political competition join the ICC, while dictators with less political competition do not join.*

Second, we want to know: how does joining the ICC affect overall violence within a dictatorship? Because joining the ICC raises the expected cost of violence for each player, the direct effect of ICC membership is to lower the amount of violence chosen by each player. These direct effects reinforce each other via indirect strategic effects. For example, if the dictator expects that the political opposition will use less violence, then the dictator will also want to use less violence himself to reduce his own costs. These reinforcing direct and indirect effects lead to Proposition 2 and generate a second empirical implication of our theory:

Proposition 2. *Joining the ICC lowers the total violence in the state.*

Finally, we ask: how does joining the ICC affect the likelihood that the dictator survives in power? While ICC membership reduces total violence, the impact of this change on dictator survival is mixed. Sometimes joining the ICC increases the probability that the dictator survives in power, and sometimes it reduces this probability. Perhaps not surprisingly, this effect of ICC membership determines whether a dictator will want to join the ICC. That is, if joining the ICC is expected to reduce the likelihood that the dictator survives in office, then membership provides the dictator with no benefit. In such circumstances, the dictator will not join. The dictator will only join the ICC if membership provides an expected benefit. These incentives ensure that selection into the ICC must correspond (in expectation) to a higher probability that the dictator survives in power. This yields Proposition 3 and a final empirical implication of our theory:

Proposition 3. *For dictators that select into the ICC, joining the ICC increases the probability of surviving in office.*

Note that this final implication is a conditional effect. It only holds for situations in which the government chooses to join the ICC. The impact of the ICC on dictator survival is thus driven by

selection effects. These selection effects must be carefully considered when we assess the empirical evidence and the normative implications of our theory. All three of our implications are summarized in Table 3.

[Table 3 goes here.]

Previous scholars have generated some of these theoretical arguments in isolation from each other. However, none of these scholars can explain the combination of these three distinct relationships. As discussed above, many scholars believe that international law is a tool that allows a dictator to make a credible commitment to democratization and human rights. For example, Simmons and Danner (2010) argue that joining the ICC allows leaders to self-bind and reduce violence. One implication of their theory is that joining the ICC should facilitate a transition to democracy, thereby reducing the survival of dictators in office. The implications of Simmons and Danner (2010) thus match Proposition 2, but contradict Proposition 3.³³ In contrast, Hollyer and Rosendorff (2011) argue that dictators sign the UN Convention Against Torture to credibly signal their political strength and willingness to violate human rights. Like us, they show that signing a treaty should reduce violence and increase leader survival. The implications of Hollyer and Rosendorff (2011) accordingly match Propositions 2 and 3, while contradicting Proposition 1. Finally, Vreeland (2008) argues that joining the ICC allows dictators who are threatened by political competition to win support from their opponents without imposing significant costs on themselves. The implications of Vreeland (2008) thus match Propositions 1 and 3, while contradicting Proposition 2 because this theory implies that joining the ICC will have a negligible effect on actual violence. The combination of our three implications—about different political outcomes—thus offers a novel perspective on why dictators use international law.

3.3 Alternative Assumptions and Explanations

How robust is our argument? Do changes to our basic assumptions affect our causal mechanism and observable implications?³⁴ Skeptics of the ICC might argue that the ICC imposes no costs whatsoever on dictators (i.e. $\kappa_L = 0$). After all, President Museveni of Uganda never seemed concerned that the ICC might investigate him or his political allies, despite the serious international crimes committed by the Ugandan army since 2002. If $\kappa_L = 0$, then our model would suggest

³³Simmons and Danner (2010) do not provide a clear expectation regarding the impact of political competition on joining the ICC (Proposition 1).

³⁴The extensions discussed in this section are included in an Online Appendix.

that dictators should *always* join the ICC because it can always help, and never harm, them. Our findings about total violence and dictator survival would still hold. However, we find this alternative assumption substantively implausible and note that the ICC has issued many arrest warrants for government officials and many dictators refuse to join the ICC.

Second, our theoretical argument did not include external pressure to join the ICC. If joining the ICC gives the dictator an external benefit from other states or the international community, like enhanced foreign aid, then we should expect that dictators with weaker economies or higher reliance on foreign aid will be more likely to join the ICC, all else equal. Incorporating such benefits into our argument would not change the selection and violence propositions above. However, external benefits could invalidate the survival effect because dictators would sometimes be selecting into the ICC for external benefits and not to boost their survival in office.³⁵ We are careful to control for this possible alternative explanation of ICC membership in our statistical analysis.

Third, we assumed that the ICC generated expected costs that were internalized by players based on their identity (as an incumbent dictator or political opponent) at the beginning of the strategic interaction. That is, we assumed that the cost of violence was “paid” before any possible transfer of power. An alternative way to model this strategic interaction would be to assume that the cost of violence is “paid” after the possible transfer of power. This alternative assumption leads to more complex analysis because it introduces non-linear forms into the utility calculations, which can generate multiple equilibria. In the Online Appendix, we show that our formal results continue to hold provided that the common payoff from power over the state, $W > 0$, is sufficiently large.

Fourth, careful readers will note that our argument differs from a more conventional self-binding theory, in which a government binds only itself and not other actors. The assumption that international law binds all actors is necessary for our argument to work. This assumption clearly differentiates our argument from prior research on the UN Convention Against Torture (Vreeland, 2008; Hollyer and Rosendorff, 2011). We therefore believe that our framework is most appropriate for understanding international laws and organizations—like the laws of armed conflict and international criminal law—that constrain all actors within a state, not just government officials.

³⁵Of course, such external benefits might be redirected toward purchasing domestic support, making the overall impact of ICC membership on survival indeterminate.

4 Statistical Evidence

To test our argument, we examine the behavior of dictatorships over the period 1998–2018. Our observations begin in 1998, the year the Rome Statute opened for signature, as this is the earliest possible year in which a state could join the ICC. The data end in 2018 due to covariate availability.

As our argument is about the behavior of dictators, we first must define which states are dictatorships. To ensure our result is not driven by our choice of dataset, we adopt three different quantitative definitions of dictatorship, as summarized in Table 4.

The first definition uses scores from the Polity dataset, where we define a dictatorship as any state with a POLITY2 score of 5 or less.³⁶ Note that our unit of observation is always a state-year, so the relevant question is whether a state’s score met the dictatorship definition in a given year. Since scholars consider any state with a score of 6 or higher to be a democracy, we set the upper limit for dictatorship at 5. This ensures our dataset includes all state-years with states that are autocratic or anocratic.³⁷ We call this our POLITY-5 dataset.

Our second and third definitions use the POLYARCHY score from the Varieties of Democracy (“V-Dem”) dataset (Coppedge et al., 2021). There is no standard cut-off on this variable to separate democracies from dictatorships (Boese, 2019). We thus employ two cut-offs for our state-year observations: a POLYARCHY score of 0.4 in one set of models and a score of 0.5 in a different set of models. We call these datasets V-DEM-0.4 and V-DEM-0.5, respectively.

There is, of course, significant overlap in these definitions, so many of the same states appear across each model. For example, 80 of the 83 states (96%) in the V-DEM-0.4 dataset also appear among the 93 dictatorships in the POLITY-5 dataset. Likewise, 88 of the 98 states (90%) in the V-DEM-0.5 dataset also appear among the 93 dictatorships in the POLITY-5 dataset. As the unit of analysis is a state-year, states that do not meet the definition of dictatorship in a given year are excluded for that year. They may, however, re-enter the dataset in subsequent years if their POLITY2 or POLYARCHY score drops below the relevant threshold.³⁸

A common variable across all three tests is joining the ICC.³⁹ In our first test, the dependent variable is YEARS TO JOIN. The earliest possible year to join the ICC is 1998, which is when the

³⁶States with POLITY2 scores of -66 (interregnum) are re-coded as “NA”.

³⁷Researchers usually assume that dictatorships are states with POLITY2 scores from -10 to -6 and anocracies have POLITY2 scores from -5 to 5 .

³⁸We consider alternate treatments of exposure time (i.e., how many years a state was “at risk” of joining the ICC) in the Online Appendix that account for the exiting and re-entering states.

³⁹In most cases, this is the year the state ratified the Rome Statute. However, in rare cases, a state may accept ICC jurisdiction without ratifying the Rome Statute, as occurred with Côte d’Ivoire (2003) and Ukraine (2014).

Rome Statute opened for signature. We model the probability of joining the ICC up to 2018, after which we lack data on control variables. In the subsequent two tests, the key explanatory variable is POST-JOIN, which is a binary variable indicating whether the dictatorship has joined the ICC in a prior year. Note that because the sample in the second and third tests is restricted to dictatorships that join, POST-JOIN will take the value of 1 at least once for each state in the dataset.

4.1 Does Political Competition Increase Ratification?

We begin by assessing the first implication of our model: political competition will be positively associated with an increase in the probability of that a dictator joins the ICC. We consider all dictatorships to be “at risk” of ratifying the Rome Statute. Again, the unit of analysis is a state-year, so a state is included if it meets the definition of dictatorship in a given year; if a state is coded as democratic in a particular year, that state-year observation is dropped.⁴⁰

Our dependent variable is the number of YEARS TO JOIN. Joining the ICC is generally a one-time event: once a state joins the Court, it must go through difficult processes to leave. Thus, a state exits the risk set once it joins the Court.⁴¹

Because we are modeling time to joining, we use a discrete-time survival model. Namely, we use a logistic regression with dummy variables for each year, which allows the baseline hazard (i.e. the underlying probability of joining) to vary by year. The model is right-censored in 2018 because of control variable availability. However, we note that the most recent dictatorships to join the ICC were Tunisia (by Polity score) in 2011 and Ukraine (by V-Dem score) in 2014. The two most recent states to join, El Salvador in 2016 and Kiribati in 2020, did so as democracies, and are thus excluded from our analysis. Thus, our dataset has good coverage of the relevant risk period for dictatorships joining the ICC.

The explanatory variable for our first test is POLITICAL COMPETITION. We measure this concept using Polity’s “competitiveness of participation” variable, which is “the extent to which alternative preferences for policy and leadership can be pursued in the political arena.”⁴² This variable ranges from 1 to 5, where 1 indicates that political competition is repressed and 5 indicates

⁴⁰This is conventional practice in duration analyses of this type. See, e.g., Conrad (2014).

⁴¹Recently, backlash against the ICC by African states has led to several threats of withdrawal. To date, only two states have formally withdrawn from the ICC: Burundi (2016) and the Philippines (2019). Several other states, including The Gambia and South Africa threatened to withdraw, but ultimately remained members of the ICC. Burundi re-enters the risk set in 2017, to account for the fact that it could rejoin the ICC.

⁴²See the Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-2018 Dataset Users’ Manual.

open competition. Within dictatorships, the maximum level we observe is 4.⁴³

We include several control variables to account for possible alternative explanations. First, many scholars argue that states that are poorer or more dependent on foreign aid are more likely to join the ICC because they are coerced into doing so by richer and more powerful states (Spence, 2014).⁴⁴ To control for this alternative argument, we include GDP PER CAPITA, LOGGED and FOREIGN AID from the Worldwide Development Indicators dataset.⁴⁵

Second, several scholars argue that states with a stronger domestic rule of law may be more likely to join the ICC (Simmons and Danner, 2010; Chapman and Chaudoin, 2013). They hypothesize that this relationship occurs because actors are less likely to commit severe international crimes in states with a strong rule of law. Additionally, the ICC should be less likely to file prosecutions involving these states because of the principle of complementarity, which ensures that the ICC only files cases if a state is unable or unwilling to prosecute offenders. These two factors imply that the ICC will impose fewer costs on states with strong domestic legal institutions. Our measure of RULE OF LAW comes from the Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) dataset at the World Bank.

Third, because the ICC specifically punishes war crimes, which (by definition) can only occur during armed conflicts, we include various measures of armed conflict. First, we include VIOLENCE: TOTAL from the Major Episodes of Political Violence and Conflict Regions dataset, which measures all episodes of inter- and intra-state violence. Higher values indicate greater levels of violence. Second, we disaggregate this measure into VIOLENCE: INTRA-STATE and VIOLENCE: INTER-STATE in alternate specifications as a robustness check in case the two kinds of violence have differing effects (Simmons and Danner, 2010).

Finally, many scholars of international justice argue that norms can spread across states through a process of diffusion, emulation, and/or learning (Simmons and Danner, 2010; Sikink, 2011). To control for this alternative explanation, we include regional control variables.

The results of our analysis appear in Table 5. As expected based on our theory, the coefficient on POLITICAL COMPETITION is positive and statistically significant across all six models. Substantively, Model (1) tells us that for states in our Polity-5 dataset, a one-unit increase in political competition translates into about a 2-fold increase in the probability of joining the ICC. For example, Malawi (with a competitiveness score of 4) is about 1.93 times likelier to join the ICC

⁴³See the Online Appendix for descriptive statistics of all variables.

⁴⁴Alternatively, foreign aid might create a security effect for autocrats, allowing them to fend off domestic political rivals (Hashimoto, 2020).

⁴⁵As in Hashimoto (2020), the FOREIGN AID measure is transformed using the inverse hyperbolic sine function.

than Zambia (with a competitiveness score of 3). Model (3) tells us that for states in our V-DEM-0.4 dataset, a one-unit increase in political competition corresponds to a 2.14-fold increase in the probability of joining the ICC, while Model (5) tells us that it translates to a 1.71-fold increase for states in our V-DEM-0.5 dataset. The findings suggest that dictatorships with higher levels of political competition are significantly more likely to join the ICC. None of the control variables are statistically significant. Moreover, we do not find any effect for violence, measured as total or disaggregated by inter- and intra-state, on the probability of joining.

[Table 5 goes here.]

We performed numerous robustness checks of this analysis, which are available in the Online Appendix. First, we ran each model using various permutations of the control variables, showing that the effect of political competition does not depend on the inclusion (or exclusion) of certain covariates. Second, we considered the multiparty elections measure from V-Dem as our independent variable, instead of the competitiveness of participation variable from Polity; the substantive effect does not change. Third, we used leader tenure, or the number of years the executive had been in office, from Bell, Besaw and Frank (2021) as an alternative measure of political competition, as Bueno de Mesquita and Smith (2018) suggest that leaders are more vulnerable to removal the earlier they are in their tenure. Again, the substantive effect does not change: leaders who have been in power longer (face less competition) are less likely to join the ICC. Fourth, we considered an alternative definition of the risk set, in which we treated states that became autocratic after 1998 (including those that cycled between democracy and dictatorship between 1998–2018) as “newly exposed” to joining the ICC each time they slide back below the dictatorship cutpoint. Again, our results hold. Given the robustness of the results to alternative specifications, the evidence overall demonstrate support for the first observable implication of our theory.

As an ancillary test of our theory, we examined rebel group competition as an alternative measure of our explanatory variable. Unfortunately, existing data for this concept do not provide enough coverage to run a time-series, cross-national model. However, they do provide some suggestive, albeit limited, evidence in favor of our theory. In Figure 1, we use a measure of the relative strength of rebel groups from Cunningham, Gleditsch and Salehyan (2013). These data include 42 of the dictatorships in our larger dataset, which are coded for a maximum of 14 years.⁴⁶ Each observation corresponds to one state-year in which the state was fighting against at least one

⁴⁶The dataset covers 1998-2011 only.

rebel group; thus, the number of observations per state is not consistent.⁴⁷ This generates 208 state-year observations.⁴⁸ For each observation, we plot the frequency of states facing rebel groups of various strengths, disaggregated by whether that state eventually joined the ICC. Our coding of rebel group competition corresponds to Cunningham, Gleditsch and Salehyan (2013)’s classification of rebel group strength as much weaker (low competition), weaker (moderate competition), and parity/stronger (high competition). A state-year unit is colored black in Figure 1 if the state joined the ICC at some point in time and grey if the state never joined the ICC.

[Figure 1 about here.]

Figure 1 provides additional evidence for our theory. The data include 92 state-year observations in which the rebel group is “much weaker” than the government, meaning that the government faces low levels of political competition. In 9 (or 9.8%) of these observations, the government joined the ICC at some point in time.⁴⁹ Overall, the data show that governments facing low rebel group competition are unlikely to join the ICC.

Next, the data include 99 state-year observations in which the rebel group is “weaker” than the government, meaning that the government faces moderate rebel group competition. In 38 (or 38.4%) of these observations, the state joined the ICC at some point in time. This statistic suggests that a government facing moderate rebel group competition receives more benefit from being an ICC member than a government facing low competition.

Finally, it is very rare for a rebel group to be at “parity or stronger” than the government (meaning that the rebel group is of equal or greater strength). Only 17 of the 208 observations fall into this category. In such circumstances, a government faces high rebel group competition. In 8 (or 47%) of the observations in this category, the government joined the ICC at some point in time. So governments that face high rebel group competition appear to receive a higher benefit from being an ICC member than governments that face moderate or low rebel group competition. Overall, the evidence from Figure 1 supports the first observable implication of our theory: political competition increases the likelihood of joining the ICC.

⁴⁷Additionally, states that join the ICC are only included for years prior to joining. For example, Afghanistan generates five observations (1998-2001 and 2003), Guinea generates two (1998-1999), and Myanmar generates 14 (1998-2011).

⁴⁸We use state-years as the unit because rebel groups change strength over time and aggregating to the level of the state would obscure these differences.

⁴⁹There is only one observation in which a state facing a much weaker rebel group joined the ICC in the same year: Afghanistan in 2003. Obviously, the extensive US government support for the Afghan government in 2003 makes this an idiosyncratic case. Had the US military not been deployed on Afghan soil, the true level of political competition within Afghanistan would have been very high.

4.2 Does Joining the ICC Reduce Violence?

We can now assess the second empirical implication of our model: joining the ICC will be associated with a decrease in overall violence within a state. Prior scholars have noted that violence in dictatorships suffers from endogeneity problems: political dissent influences government oppression, and vice versa (Ritter and Conrad, 2016). Our theoretical account controls for this endogeneity in government and opposition group behavior by focusing on total violence.

However, our theory does not provide us with an elegant solution to possible selection effects. Namely, variables that influence the decision to select into the ICC may also influence subsequent decisions about violence. In theory, such problems can be solved by “Heckman” selection models. However, the limited number of observations in our sample, and the lack of a compelling exclusion restriction, rule out this technique. As an alternative approach, we restrict our sample to ensure that we are assessing the impact of joining the ICC only on those dictatorships that actually join. States are included if they were a dictatorship *in the year of ratification*, with dictatorship following one of the three coding rules outlined above. We believe that this partly controls for time-invariant factors that might cause some states to select into the ICC, while other states do not. However, we recognize that the nature of our data and our research question limit our ability to identify the causal effect of ICC membership on violence. Our results should instead be interpreted as consistent with our hypothesis, but not as probative.

Our main dependent variable is TOTAL VIOLENCE, which combines inter- and intra-state violence. In alternate specifications, we use INTRA-STATE VIOLENCE only. Higher values indicate greater levels of violence. Per H2, we expect a lower level of violence after the state joins the ICC. Because we are only interested in the behavior of dictatorships that join the ICC, before and after joining, in each model, we restrict the dataset to states that joined as dictatorships. Our dependent variable is ordinal, so we model violence using an ordinal logistic regression in the main models.

Our explanatory variable is the binary measure called POST-JOIN, which is coded as 1 if the state is being observed in the year of joining or later. The variable is coded as 0 if the state has not yet joined.⁵⁰

As before, we include GDP PER CAPITA, LOGGED and FOREIGN AID as control variables because levels of development and economic growth might affect violence (Gleditsch, 2007).⁵¹ We

⁵⁰Descriptive statistics for all variables in this analysis can be found in the Online Appendix.

⁵¹Foreign aid might also affect violence through a different mechanism, namely that governments depending on foreign aid might be less likely to commit violence to avoid risking their aid allocations from pro-human rights democracies (Kim and Menninga, 2020).

also include RULE OF LAW as a control variable because strong domestic institutions might limit the government’s ability to use violence. Then, we add either POLITY (Models 7 and 8) or POLYARCHY (Models 9–12) to account for the state’s domestic characteristics that might affect its use of violence, particularly for those states that ratify as autocracies but transition to democracy in subsequent years.⁵² Finally, we include regional control variables because violence may have spillover effects.

[Table 6 goes here.]

The results of the ordinal logistic regressions appear in Table 6. Across all models for TOTAL VIOLENCE, the coefficient on POST-JOIN is negative and statistically significant. To more easily interpret the ordinal logistic regression results, we plotted the predicted probability of a state being at various levels of violence both before and after joining using coefficients from Model (7).⁵³ The dashed line in Figure 2 indicates the probability of a dictatorship being observed committing each level of violence before joining the ICC.⁵⁴ The solid line is the probability that a dictatorship is observed committing that level of violence after joining the ICC. As Figure 2 illustrates, joining the ICC is associated with a lower level of violence in all dictatorships.

[Figure 2 goes here.]

The coefficient on FOREIGN AID is positive and statistically significant. We believe that this relationship may indicate that states with significant armed violence are more likely to require significant external humanitarian aid. Additionally, ample foreign aid may allow governments to shift more of their own resources to military and police activities, although this lies outside the scope of our theory (Branch, 2011). However, RULE OF LAW is negative and statistically significant in all models, indicating that states with stronger domestic institutions are less likely to commit violence.

To better illustrate the relationship between joining and violence in a specific case, Figure 3 shows the violence trend in Uganda between 1992 and 2012, ten years before and after ratification, respectively. Prior to ratification, Uganda’s level of violence was steady at 3 for about seven years. A score of 3 corresponds to “serious political violence” resulting in 10,000-50,000 deaths. Between 2002 (year of joining) and 2004 (year of referral), the violence level drops to 2, or “limited political violence” resulting in 3,000-10,000 deaths. Uganda’s level of violence drops to 0 in 2006, indicating minimal to no violence, where it remains for the rest of the period.

⁵²The control variables match the dataset used to determine which states are dictatorships.

⁵³We set Africa=1, as this is the most common region, and hold all other covariates fixed at their mean levels.

⁵⁴The 0 category is excluded, which is why the probabilities do not sum to 1.

[Figure 3 goes here.]

Once again, we recognize that these results must be treated with caution because we cannot fully control for possible selection effects in the data. These results should therefore not be interpreted as causal, but rather as providing evidence consistent with our theory.

We also performed numerous robustness checks, which are available in an Online Appendix. First, we again ran the models using permutations of the control variables; our results are not dependent on the choice of model specification. Second, we measured our dependent variable using violence as measured by data from the Peace Research Institute Oslo. Again, our results do not depend on our choice of measurement. Additionally, we checked whether the results held when subsetting the data to observations from 2002 and later, as the Rome Statute did not enter into force until July 2002, and therefore may not have had any effect on behavior until then. While the variable is signed consistently negative, the results fall short of statistical significance. We explain this result further in the Online Appendix.

4.3 Does Joining the ICC Increase a Dictator’s Survival in Office?

Finally, we consider the third implication of our theoretical model: that joining the ICC will allow dictators to stay in power for longer periods of time. Once again, we are faced with the possible selection effects discussed above. And once again, our empirical strategy for confronting this challenge is to restrict our sample to the dictatorships that joined the ICC during the period being observed (1998–2018).⁵⁵ We believe that this approach helps to control for possible time-invariant factors that influence selection. Additionally, we believe that any selection bias would attenuate our results, as our theory predicts that dictators who join the ICC are already in weaker positions than those that do not. Thus, restricting the sample this way actually biases against us finding any significant effect of joining the ICC on a dictator’s survival in office.

The unit of analysis is a leader-year. Our dependent variable is YEARS TO REMOVAL, where “Removal” indicates that the dictator is no longer in office. We took our data on leader tenure from the Rulers, Elections, and Irregular Governance Dataset (Bell, Besaw and Frank, 2021).

Our explanatory variable is POST-JOIN. Again, as we are modeling time to removal, we use a discrete-time survival model and dummy variables to indicate the leader’s tenure in office. The

⁵⁵Again, the restriction depends on the definition of dictatorship. We thus include all states that joined while dictatorships, as defined by polity or polyarchy scores. Because the unit of analysis is a leader-year and not state-year, the number of observations is not equal across our tests for H2 and H3 (a state can have more than one leader in each year).

data begin in 1998, as this is the earliest year that a dictator could theoretically have joined the ICC. Leaders who had been in power before 1998 are coded as starting in the year of their tenure in 1998, rather than 0. For example, Museveni is coded as beginning in tenure year 13 in 1998, as he had been in power since 1986.

As control variables, we include GDP PER CAPITA, LOGGED as a control variable because poorer states are more likely to suffer coups, which would irregularly remove a leader from office. We also include FOREIGN AID, as this may affect leaders' ability to remain in power (Licht, 2010; Yuichi Kono and Montinola, 2009). We next include our various violence measures as control variables because violence may make a coup more likely (Wood, 2010; Sudduth, 2017; Kim, 2016). Next, we include either POLITY or POLYARCHY because states with more democratic characteristics may be more susceptible to leader removal, as they hold elections.⁵⁶ Finally, we include regional control variables to capture potential spillover effects.

The results of our models appear in Table 7. POST-JOIN is negative and statistically significant the models using the POLITY-5 dataset (Models 13–14) and the V-DEM-0.5 dataset (Model 17–18), but not the V-DEM-0.4 dataset. We attribute this difference to the 0.4 cutoff being more restrictive and thus indicating states that are most likely very autocratic. Notably, the average turnover in each state is quite low when defining dictatorships in the V-DEM-0.4 dataset. Over the 20 year period, states in the POLITY-5 dataset average 2.13 leaders, while states in the V-DEM-0.5 dataset average 1.89 leaders. States in the V-DEM-0.4 dataset average only 1.3 leaders over the same period.

Across all models, higher levels of violence indicate a greater probability of losing office, as do higher POLITY or POLYARCHY scores. Increased foreign aid only seems to decrease the probability of removal (increase probability of survival) in highly autocratic states. In general, these results mostly comport with our theoretical expectation: leaders of states that are ICC members are less likely to be removed from office, meaning that they are more likely to survive. The substantive interpretation of the coefficient in Model (13) is that dictators who join the ICC are about half as likely to lose office after joining as before joining.

[Table 7 goes here.]

To visualize this relationship, Figure 4 plots the probability of losing office for the dictators in three different states, beginning four years prior to ratification and ending four years after ratification: Uganda (Museveni), Cambodia (Hun Sen), and Gambia (Jammeh). We use the coefficients

⁵⁶The control variables match the dataset used to determine which states are dictatorships.

from Model (13) to generate these predicted probabilities with all covariate values taking on the relevant values for that state. The probability of losing office decreases in the years following ratification, although in all three cases, it subsequently increases later in the leader's tenure. However, in all three cases the mean probability of losing office decreases after ratification. For example, in Guinea, the mean probability of losing office four years prior to ratification is about 3.8%; it decreases to 2% after ratification.

[Figure 4 about here.]

As with our analysis of H2 (on total violence), these results must be treated with caution. Yet they are consistent with our broader claim that dictators can use international law and organizations to target their political opponents and bolster their survival in office. We again report the results of robustness checks involving permutation of the control variables in the Online Appendix. Additionally, we subset the data to post-2002 only, to coincide with the start of the ICC's operations. Our results remain consistently signed and statistically significant.⁵⁷

In sum, our statistical evidence supports our theoretical argument. Our statistical tests show that political competition greatly affects the probability of joining the ICC. When governments face higher levels of political competition, they are more likely to join. We also show that among dictatorships that join, joining has significant effects on the level of violence and probability of leader survival. We show an association between joining and a decrease in violence, reflecting the increased cost of committing violence for ICC members. Finally, our statistical evidence suggests that joining the ICC has a negative and statistically significant effect on leader removal from office, indicating that the leader has a greater probability of survival in office after joining the ICC.

Of course, this analysis comes with important caveats. First, given the relatively small number of dictatorships in general and dictatorships that ratify, any statistical test that relies on cross-sectional variation will be limited. Second, given that the earliest possible date for ratification of the Rome Statute was 1998, we are also limited by the amount of time (20 years) over which we can measure and observe government behavior and control variables. Finally, possible selection effects limit our ability to systematically test H2 and H3. These three constraints all hinder valid

⁵⁷Note that the samples used in H2 and H3 are different: H3 uses leader-year, while H2 uses state-year. Thus, there are more observations for H3 and we do not run into the small sample size issue that we had when doing this test for H2.

statistical inferences of causal effects. However, we believe that the breadth and diversity of our qualitative and quantitative evidence provide compelling support for our theoretical arguments about a substantively important topic.

5 Conclusion

We began our paper by describing the January 2004 press conference at which Luis Moreno-Ocampo, the prosecutor of the International Criminal Court, announced that he was opening a preliminary examination into crimes in Uganda. He was accompanied by Yoweri Museveni, the president of Uganda. While some naive observers may have believed that Museveni was signaling his commitment to democratization, most seasoned Uganda observers believed that Museveni was using the ICC to crack down on his most troublesome political opponent: the Lord's Resistance Army, a violent rebel group (Allen, 2006; Branch, 2011). The ICC's own press release was titled "President of Uganda refers situation concerning the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) to the ICC."⁵⁸ Advocacy groups like Human Rights Watch were alarmed that the ICC seemed to be taking sides in an ongoing political conflict, declaring that "The prosecutor should operate independently and has the authority to look at all ICC crimes committed in Uganda."⁵⁹ Moreno-Ocampo tried to undo the damage in his subsequent statements, declaring that the ICC would investigate crimes committed by all actors in Uganda. However, the initial reactions of advocacy groups were confirmed in October 2005 when the ICC announced that it had issued five arrest warrants for crimes in Uganda: all five of the individuals wanted by the Court were members of the Lord's Resistance Army.⁶⁰ No government or military official was charged with a crime.

We argue that these dynamics are not unique to Uganda. Dictators can often shape ICC investigations and prosecutions, shielding themselves while making their political opponents vulnerable. Dictators can wield their authority to selectively self-refer crimes to the Court, manipulate access to witnesses, selectively provide digital and documentary evidence, enforce arrest warrants against political opponents, and even initiate complementary domestic investigations and prosecutions that make ICC charges inadmissible. Overall, the ICC creates asymmetric costs within dictatorships. Joining the ICC therefore imposes small costs on dictators for committing serious

⁵⁸ICC Press Release, 29 January 2004. Document ICC-20040129-44.

⁵⁹Human Rights Watch Press Release, 4 February 2004. Available at: <https://www.hrw.org/news/2004/02/04/icc-investigate-all-sides-uganda>.

⁶⁰The arrest warrants were secretly issued by the ICC in July. The ICC did not publicly confirm the warrants existed until October.

international crimes, but much larger costs on the political opponents of dictators.

Our formal model identified how asymmetric costs for treaty violations affect three distinct outcome variables: selection into the treaty by dictators; the impact of treaty membership on violence; and the survival of dictators in office. While previous scholars have written extensively on the ICC, these outcome variables have been largely studied in isolation for each other, rather than treated as interdependent outcomes. Our model shows that when a dictator has little political competition, he can use violence at a relatively low domestic cost. In such circumstances, the dictator has little incentive to boost his political power further by increasing the international costs of violence for his political opponent. However, if the dictator faces high political competition, his domestic cost of violence is relatively high. Because such a dictator is in a relatively weak position *vis-à-vis* his political opponents, the dictator will be more likely to bolster his power by joining the ICC. This causal mechanism suggests that political competition will increase the likelihood the dictators join the ICC. Additionally, it suggests that joining the ICC should decrease total violence since it increases the cost of violence for both the dictators and his political opponent. Finally, for those dictations that select into joining the ICC, we should expect to see enhanced survival in power.

These multiple hypotheses are supported by our statistical analysis of the available data. Of course, data limitations abound, particularly when studying dictatorships. There are a limited number of dictatorships in the world, and the immense public attention given to the creation of the ICC meant that a large number of states joined the ICC relatively quickly when compared to other major international treaties and organizations. We are further limited by common statistical challenges present in observational data, like selection effects. We cannot (and would not) therefore make precise causal claims about the impact of the ICC, because joining is not a randomly assigned “treatment.” Nevertheless, we hope that the abundance and diversity of our statistical evidence across multiple outcome variables, all of which are calibrated to conform to the logic of a formal model and are consistent with our hypotheses, are compelling.

Our argument has mixed normative implications for advocates of international justice. On the one hand, our argument and evidence further bolster the claim that international law generally, and the ICC specifically, can reduce violence and severe atrocities (Jo and Simmons, 2016; Simmons and Danner, 2010). On the other hand, asymmetric costs suggest that the ICC does not have an impartial effect on domestic governance, which may (in the long run) erode public support for the Court (Nalepa, 2012; Zvobgo, 2019). Additionally, our argument and evidence

suggest that international law and organizations can have pernicious effects by prolonging the survival of dictators (Ginsburg, 2020; Hollyer and Rosendorff, 2011; Vreeland, 2008). International cooperation may therefore have a negative impact on domestic societies. Unfortunately, such a tradeoff is probably inescapable in laws and organizations that are created by men, not angels.

References

- Acemoglu, Daron and James A. Robinson. 2001. "A Theory of Political Transitions." *American Economic Review* 91:938–963.
- Allen, Tim. 2006. *Trial Justice: the International Criminal Court and the Lord's Resistance Army*. Zed Books.
- Appel, Benjamin J. 2018. "In the Shadow of the International Criminal Court: Does the ICC Deter Human Rights Violations?" *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 62:3–28.
- Appel, Benjamin J. and Alyssa K Prorok. 2019. "Third-Party Actors and the Intentional Targeting of Civilians in War." *British Journal of Political Science* 49:1453–1474.
- Arriola, Leonardo R., Jed Devaro and Anne Meng. 2021. "Democratic Subversion: Elite Cooptation and Opposition Fragmentation." *American Political Science Review* 115(4):1358–1372.
- Ba, Oumar. 2020. *States of Justice: The Politics of the International Criminal Court*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bates, Genevieve. 2021. "Threats and Commitments: International Tribunals and Domestic Trials in Peace Negotiations." Unpublished working paper. Available at: <https://www.genevievebates.com>.
- Bell, Curtis, Clayton Besaw and Matthew Frank. 2021. "The Rulers, Elections, and Irregular Governance (REIGN) Dataset." Available at <https://oefdatascience.github.io/REIGN.github.io/>.
- Boese, Vanessa A. 2019. "How (Not) to Measure Democracy." *International Area Studies Review* 22(2):95–127.
- Boix, Carles and Milan W. Svobik. 2013. "The Foundations of Limited Authoritarian Government: Institutions, Commitment, and Power-Sharing in Dictatorships." *The Journal of Politics* 75:300–316.
- Branch, Adam. 2011. *Displacing Human Rights: War and Intervention in Northern Uganda*. Oxford University Press.
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce and Alastair Smith. 2010. "The Pernicious Consequences of UN Security Council Membership." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 54(5):667–686.

- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce and Alastair Smith. 2018. "Political Loyalty and Leader Health." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 13(4):333–361.
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, Alastair Smith, Randolph M. Siverson and James D. Morrow. 2003. *The Logic of Political Survival*. MIT Press.
- Buisman, Caroline. 2013. "Delegating Investigations: Lessons to be Learned from the Lubanga Judgment." *Northwestern Journal of International Human Rights* 11:30–82.
- Bush, Sarah Sunn. 2016. *The Taming of Democracy Assistance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Carayannis, Tatiana. 2015. CAR's Southern Identity: Congo, CAR, and International Justice. In *Making Sense of the Central African Republic*, ed. Tatiana Carayannis and Louisa Lombard. Zed Books pp. 244–266.
- Chapman, Terrence L. and Stephen Chaudoin. 2013. "Ratification Patterns and the International Criminal Court." *International Studies Quarterly* 57(2):400–409.
- Chaudoin, Stephen. 2016. "How Contestation Moderates the Effects of International Institutions: the International Criminal Court and Kenya." *Journal of Politics* 78:557–571.
- Chaudoin, Stephen and Terrence Chapman. 2020. "Public Reactions to International Legal Institutions: The ICC in a Developing Democracy." *Journal of Politics* 82:1305–1320.
- Combs, Nancy Amoury. 2010. *Fact-Finding without Facts*. Cambridge University Press.
- Conrad, Courtenay R. 2014. "Divergent Incentives for Dictators: Domestic Institutions and (International Promises not to) Torture." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 58(1):34–67.
- Conrad, Courtenay R. and Emily Hencken Ritter. 2013. "Treaties, Tenure, and Torture: The Conflicting Domestic Effects of International Law." *The Journal of Politics* 75(2):397–409.
- Conrad, Courtenay R. and Emily Hencken Ritter. 2019. *Contentious Compliance: Dissent and Repression under International Human Rights Law*. Oxford University Press.
- Coppedge, Michael, John Gerring, Carl Henrik Knutsen, Staffan I. Lindberg, Jan Teorell, David Altman, Michael Bernhard, A. Cornell, M.S. Fish, L. Gastaldi et al. 2021. "V-Dem codebook v11. Varieties of Democracy (V-dem) Project."

- Cronin-Furman, Kate. 2022. *Hypocrisy and Human Rights: Resisting Accountability for Mass Atrocities*. Cornell University Press.
- Cunningham, David E., Kristian Skrede Gleditsch and Idean Salehyan. 2013. “Non-State Actors in Civil Wars: A New Dataset.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 30(5):516–531.
- Davenport, Christian. 2007. “State Repression and Political Order.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 10:1–23.
- Del Ponte, Carla. 2009. *Madame Prosecutor: Confrontations with Humanity’s Worst Criminals and the Culture of Impunity*. Other Press.
- Edmond, Chris. 2013. “Information Manipulation, Coordination, and Regime Change.” *Review of Economic Studies* 80:1422–1458.
- Gandhi, Jennifer. 2008. *Political Institutions under Dictatorship*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gehlbach, Scott and Konstantin Sonin. 2014. “Government Control of the Media.” *Journal of Public Economics* 118:163–171.
- Gérard, Prunier. 2009. *Africa’s World War*. Oxford University Press.
- Gilligan, Michael J. 2006. “Is Enforcement Necessary for Effectiveness? A Model of the International Criminal Regime.” *International Organization* 60:935–967.
- Ginsburg, Tom. 2009. “The Clash of Commitments at the International Criminal Court.” *Chicago Journal of International Law* 9(2):499–514.
- Ginsburg, Tom. 2020. “Authoritarian International Law.” *American Journal of International Law* 114(2):221–260.
- Gleditsch, Kristian Skrede. 2007. “Transnational Dimensions of Civil War.” *Journal of Peace Research* 44(3):293–309.
- Goodliffe, Jay, Darren Hawkins, Christine Horne and Daniel L Nielson. 2012. “Dependence Networks and the International Criminal Court.” *International Studies Quarterly* 56(1):131–147.
- Hafner-Burton, Emilie and Kiyoteru Tsutsui. 2007. “Justice Lost! The Failure of International Human Rights Law to Matter Where Needed Most.” *Journal of Peace Research* 44(4):407–442.

- Hafner-Burton, Emilie M., Edward D. Mansfield and Jon C.W. Pevehouse. 2015. "Human Rights Institutions, Sovereignty Costs and Democratization." *British Journal of Political Science* 45(1):1–27.
- Hashimoto, Barry. 2020. "Autocratic Consent to International Law: The Case of the International Criminal Court's Jurisdiction, 1998–2017." *International Organization* 74(2):331–362.
- Hillebrecht, Courtney. 2016. "The Deterrent Effects of the International Criminal Court: Evidence from Libya." *International Interactions* 42(4):616–643.
- Hillebrecht, Courtney and Scott Straus. 2017. "Who Pursues the Perpetrators?: State Cooperation with the ICC." *Human Rights Quarterly* 39(x):162–188.
- Hollyer, James R. and B. Peter Rosendorff. 2011. "Why Do Authoritarian Regimes Sign the Convention Against Torture? Signaling, Domestic Politics, and Non-Compliance." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 6:275–327.
- Hollyer, James R., B. Peter Rosendorff and James Raymond Vreeland. 2011. "Democracy and Transparency." *Journal of Politics* 73(4):1191–1205.
- Hollyer, James R., B. Peter Rosendorff and James Raymond Vreeland. 2019. "Why Do Autocrats Disclose? Economic Transparency and Inter-elite Politics in the Shadow of Mass Unrest." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 63(6):1488–1516.
- Jo, Hyeran. 2015. *Compliant Rebels*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jo, Hyeran and Beth A Simmons. 2016. "Can the International Criminal Court Deter Atrocity?" *International Organization* 70(3):443–475.
- Jo, Hyeran and Catarina P Thomson. 2014. "Legitimacy and Compliance with International Law: Access to Detainees in Civil Conflicts, 1991–2006." *British Journal of Political Science* 44:323–355.
- Johns, Leslie. 2007. "A Servant of Two Masters: Communication and the Selection of International Bureaucrats." *International Organization* 61(1):245–275.
- Johns, Leslie. 2012. "Courts as Coordinators: Endogenous Enforcement and Jurisdiction in International Adjudication." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 56(2):257–289.

- Johns, Leslie. 2015. *Strengthening International Courts: The Hidden Costs of Legalization*. University of Michigan Press.
- Johns, Leslie. 2022. *Politics and International Law: Making, Breaking, and Upholding Global Rules*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kaye, David A. 2013. "Stealth Multilateralism: U.S. Foreign Policy Without Treaties—or the Senate." *Foreign Affairs* 92(5):113–124.
- Keck, Margaret E. and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Cornell University Press.
- Kim, Nam Kyu. 2016. "Revisiting Economic Shocks and Coups." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 60(1):3–31.
- Kim, Yooneui and Elizabeth J Menninga. 2020. "Competition, Aid, and Violence against Civilians." *International Interactions* 46(5):696–723.
- Krcmaric, Daniel. 2018. "Should I Stay or Should I Go? Leaders, Exile, and the Dilemmas of International Justice." *American Journal of Political Science* 62(2):486–498.
- Krcmaric, Daniel. 2023. "Does the International Criminal Court Target the American Military?" *American Political Science Review* 117(1):325–331.
- Licht, Amanda A. 2010. "Coming into Money: The Impact of Foreign Aid on Leader Survival." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 54(1):58–87.
- Magaloni, Beatriz. 2006. *Voting for Autocracy: Hegemonic Party Survival and Its Demise in Mexico*. Cambridge University Press.
- Magaloni, Beatriz. 2008. "Credible Power-Sharing and the Longevity of Authoritarian Rule." *Comparative Political Studies* 41:715–741.
- Mansfield, Edward D. and Jon C. Pevehouse. 2006. "Democratization and International Organizations." *International Organization* 60:137–167.
- Meernik, James. 2015. "The International Criminal Court and the Deterrence of Human Rights Atrocities." *Civil Wars* 17(3):318–339.

- Meng, Anne. 2020. *Constraining Dictatorship: From Personalized Rule to Institutionalized Regime*. Cambridge University Press.
- Meng, Anne and Jack Paine. Forthcoming. "Power Sharing and Authoritarian Stability: How Rebel Regimes Solve the Guardianship Dilemma." *American Political Science Review* xx(xx):xx-xx.
- Milgrom, Paul R., Douglass C. North and Barry R. Weingast. 1990. "The Role of Institutions in the Revival of Trade: The Law Merchant, Private Judges, and the Champagne Fairs." *Economics and Politics* 2(1):1-23.
- Moravcsik, Andrew. 2000. "The Origins of Human Rights Regimes: Democratic Delegation in Postwar Europe." *International Organization* 54:217-252.
- Nalepa, Monika. 2012. "Tolerating Mistakes: How Do Popular Perceptions of Procedural Fairness Affect Demand for Transitional Justice?" *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 56:490-515.
- Nalepa, Monika and Emilia Justyna Powell. 2016. "The Role of Domestic Opposition and International Justice Regimes in Peaceful Transitions of Power." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 60:1191-1218.
- Nouwen, Sarah M.H. 2013. *Complementarity in the Line of Fire: The Catalysing Effect of the International Criminal Court in Uganda and Sudan*. Cambridge University Press.
- Peskin, Victor. 2009. "Caution and Confrontation in the International Criminal Court's Pursuit of Accountability in Uganda and Sudan." *Human Rights Quarterly* 31:655-691.
- Pevehouse, Jon C. 2005. *Democracy from Above: Regional Organizations and Democratization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Prorok, Alyssa K. 2017. "The (In)compatibility of Peace and Justice? The International Criminal Court and Civil Conflict Termination." *International organization* 71(2):213-243.
- Prorok, Alyssa K. and Benjamin J. Appel. 2013. "Compliance with International Humanitarian Law: Democratic Third Parties and Civilian Targeting in Interstate War." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 58:713-740.
- Przeworski, Adam. 1999. Minimalist Conception of Democracy: A Defense. In *Democracy's Value*, ed. Ian Shapiro and Casiano Hacker-Cord. Cambridge University Press pp. 23-55.

- Ritter, Emily Hencken and Courtenay R. Conrad. 2016. "Preventing and Responding to Dissent: The Observational Challenges of Explaining Strategic Repression." *American Political Science Review* 110(1):85–99.
- Rosenberg, Sophie T. 2017. "The International Criminal Court in Côte d'Ivoire: Impartiality at Stake?" *Journal of International Criminal Justice* 15(3):471–490.
- Ross, Michael L. 2012. *The Oil Curse: How Petroleum Wealth Shapes the Development of Nations*. Princeton University Press.
- Shen-Bayh, Fiona. 2018. "Strategies of Repression: Judicial and Extrajudicial Methods of Autocratic Survival." *World Politics* 70(3):321–357.
- Sikkink, Kathryn. 2011. *The Justice Cascade: How Human Rights Prosecutions are Changing World Politics*. W.W. Norton & Co.
- Simmons, Beth. 2009. *Mobilizing for Human Rights: International Law in Domestic Politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Simmons, Beth A. and Allison Danner. 2010. "Credible Commitments and the International Criminal Court." *International Organization* 64:225–256.
- Smith, Alastair and James Raymond Vreeland. 2006. The Survival of Political Leaders and IMF Programs. In *Globalization and the Nation State: The Impact of the IMF and the World Bank*, ed. Gustav Ranis, James Raymond Vreeland and Stephen Kosack. Routledge pp. 263–289.
- Smith-Cannoy, Heather. 2012a. *Insincere Commitments: Human Rights Treaties, Abusive States, and Citizen Activism*. Georgetown University Press.
- Smith-Cannoy, Heather. 2012b. *Insincere Commitments: Human Rights Treaties, Abusive States, and Citizen Activism*. Georgetown University Press.
- Solomon, Daniel and Kelebogile Zvobgo. 2020. "Co-Opting Truth: Explaining Quasi-Judicial Institutions in Authoritarian Regimes." Unpublished working paper. Available at: <https://www.zvobgo.com/research>.
- Spence, Douglas Hamilton. 2014. "Foreign Aid and Human Rights Treaty Ratification: Moving Beyond the Rewards Thesis." *The International Journal of Human Rights* 18(4-5):414–432.

- Stanton, Jessica A. 2016. *Violence and Restraint in Civil War: Civilian Targeting in the Shadow of International Law*. Cambridge University Press.
- Stearns, Jason K. 2011. *Dancing in the Glory of Monsters*. Public Affairs.
- Sudduth, Jun Koga. 2017. "Coups Risk, Coups-Proofing and Leader Survival." *Journal of Peace Research* 54(1):3–15.
- Svolik, Milan W. 2012. *The Politics of Authoritarian Rule*. Cambridge University Press.
- Terman, Rochelle and Erik Voeten. 2018. "The Relational Politics of Shame: Evidence from the Universal Periodic Review." *Review of International Organizations* 13:1–23.
- Tiemessen, Alana. 2014. "The International Criminal Court and the Politics of Prosecutions." *The International Journal of Human Rights* 18(4-5):444–461.
- Tiemessen, Alana. 2016. "The International Criminal Court and the Lawfare of Judicial Intervention." *International Relations* 30(4):409–431.
- Tyson, Scott and Alastair Smith. 2018. "Dual-Layered Coordination and Political Instability: Repression, Co-optation, and the Role of Information." *Journal of Politics* 8:44–58.
- Vreeland, James Raymond. 2008. "Political Institutions and Human Rights: Why Dictatorships Enter into the United Nations Convention Against Torture." *International Organization* 62:65–101.
- Waldner, David and Ellen Lust. 2018. "Unwelcome Change: Coming to Terms with Democratic Backsliding." *Annual Review of Political Science* 21:93–113.
- Wood, Reed M. 2010. "Rebel Capability and Strategic Violence Against Civilians." *Journal of Peace Research* 47(5):601–614.
- Yuichi Kono, Daniel and Gabriella R. Montinola. 2009. "Does Foreign Aid Support Autocrats, Democrats, or Both?" *The Journal of Politics* 71(2):704–718.
- Zvobgo, Kelebogile. 2019. "Human Rights versus National Interests: Shifting US Public Attitudes on the International Criminal Court." *International Studies Quarterly* 63:1065–1078.
- Zvobgo, Kelebogile and Stephen Chaudoin. 2022. "Complementarity and Public Views on Overlapping Domestic and International Courts." Unpublished working paper. Available at: <http://www.stephenchaudoin.com/complementarity.pdf>.

Appendix

Proof of Proposition 1. To solve the model generally, let c_i denote the cost of effort to actor i , and $\pi_i = \frac{e_i}{e_i + e_j}$ denote the probability that actor i gains power over the state. Then the generic utility function for player i is:

$$U_i(e_i, e_j) = W\pi_i - c_i e_i$$

Maximizing the utility function with respect to the choice variable e_i yields the best response function:

$$e_i(e_j) = \left(\frac{e_j W}{c_i} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - e_j$$

Taking the intersection of the best response functions yields the equilibrium effort level:

$$e_i^* = \frac{W c_j}{(c_i + c_j)^2}$$

For the two different subgames, this yields the following equilibrium behavior and outcomes:

	Don't Join	Join
Dictator effort (e_D^*)	$\frac{W}{(1+c)^2}$	$\frac{W(1+\kappa_H)}{(1+c+\kappa_L+\kappa_H)^2}$
Political opposition effort (e_P^*)	$\frac{Wc}{(1+c)^2}$	$\frac{W(c+\kappa_L)}{(1+c+\kappa_L+\kappa_H)^2}$
Dictator survival probability (π^*)	$\frac{1}{1+c}$	$\frac{1+\kappa_H}{1+c+\kappa_L+\kappa_H}$

So the dictator's expected utility from his two choices is:

$$EU_D(\text{Don't Join}) = W \left[\frac{1}{1+c} \right] - c \left[\frac{W}{(1+c)^2} \right] = \frac{W}{(1+c)^2}$$

$$EU_D(\text{Join}) = W \left[\frac{1+\kappa_H}{1+c+\kappa_L+\kappa_H} \right] - (c+\kappa_L) \left[\frac{W(1+\kappa_H)}{(1+c+\kappa_L+\kappa_H)^2} \right] = \frac{W(1+\kappa_H)^2}{(1+c+\kappa_L+\kappa_H)^2}$$

The dictator will thus be willing to join iff:

$$\Psi \equiv (1+\kappa_H)^2 (1+c)^2 - (1+c+\kappa_L+\kappa_H)^2 \geq 0$$

Note that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi(c=0) &= (1 + \kappa_H)^2 - (1 + \kappa_H + \kappa_L)^2 < 0 \\
\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial c} &= 2(1 + \kappa_H)^2(1 + c) - 2(c + \kappa_L + \kappa_H + 1) \\
&= 2[\kappa_H - \kappa_L + \kappa_H^2 + c(2\kappa_H + \kappa_H^2)] > 0 \\
\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \Psi &= \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ (1 + 2\kappa_H + \kappa_H^2)(1 + c)^2 - \left[(1 + c)^2 + 2(1 + c)(\kappa_L + \kappa_H) + (\kappa_L + \kappa_H)^2 \right] \right\} \\
&= \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ (2\kappa_H + \kappa_H^2)(1 + c)^2 - 2(1 + c)(\kappa_L + \kappa_H) - (\kappa_L + \kappa_H)^2 \right\} \\
&= \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} (1 + c) \times \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \left[(2\kappa_H + \kappa_H^2)(1 + c) - 2(\kappa_L + \kappa_H) \right] - (\kappa_L + \kappa_H)^2 = \infty
\end{aligned}$$

So by the intermediate value theorem, there exists a unique $\bar{c} > 0$ such that $\Psi(c) < 0$ for all $c < \bar{c}$ and $\Psi(c) > 0$ for all $c > \bar{c}$. So higher values of c are (weakly) more likely to join than lower values of c . \square

Proof of Proposition 2. Total violence if the dictator does not join the ICC is:

$$\frac{W}{(1 + c)^2} + \frac{Wc}{(1 + c)^2} = \frac{W}{1 + c}$$

Total violence if the dictator joins the ICC is:

$$\frac{W(1 + \kappa_H)}{(1 + c + \kappa_L + \kappa_H)^2} + \frac{W(c + \kappa_L)}{(1 + c + \kappa_L + \kappa_H)^2} = \frac{W}{1 + c + \kappa_L + \kappa_H}$$


Note that the latter quantity is always less than the former quantity because $0 < \kappa_L + \kappa_H$ always. \square

Proof of Proposition 3. The probability that the dictator survives in office if he joins (weakly) increases (relative to not joining) iff:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{1 + c} &\leq \frac{1 + \kappa_H}{1 + c + \kappa_L + \kappa_H} \Leftrightarrow 1 + c + \kappa_L + \kappa_H \leq (1 + \kappa_H)(1 + c) \\
&\Leftrightarrow (1 + c + \kappa_L + \kappa_H)^2 \leq (1 + \kappa_H)^2(1 + c)^2
\end{aligned}$$


Note that this is equivalent to the selection constraint $\Psi \geq 0$. So for dictators that select into the ICC ($c > \bar{c}$), joining the ICC increases the probability of surviving in office. \square

Figure 1: Rebel Group Competition and Joining the ICC




Note: Level of competition corresponds to rebel group strength relative to government as coded by Cunningham, Gleditsch and Salehyan (2013): low competition (“much weaker”), moderate competition (“weaker”), or high competition (“parity” or “stronger”). The unit of analysis is a state-year.

Figure 2: Ratification Decreases Predicted Probability of Violence




Note: Predicted probabilities generated using results from Model (7) for a state in Africa with all other covariates held fixed at their mean. Violence of level 0 is excluded from the figure, which is why probabilities do not sum to 1.

Figure 3: Violence in Uganda, 1992–2012



Note: Level of violence measured as summed magnitude of all societal and interstate episodes of political violence from Major Episodes of Political Violence dataset. Figure shows the trend in violence over 1992–2012, starting 10 years prior to Uganda joining the ICC in 2002.

Figure 4: Ratification Decreases Predicted Probability of Losing Office



Note: Predicted probability of leader losing office from four years before ratification to four years afterward, based on coefficients in Model (11). Covariate values are used for the relevant nine years for each state (Uganda, Cambodia, and Guinea).

Table 1: Who was Targeted by the ICC (2002–2021)?

State	Regime-Type*	Referral-Mode	Individual Affiliation During Crime	
			Pro-Government	Anti-Government
Ivory Coast	Democracy	Prosecutor	3	0
Kenya	Democracy	Prosecutor	3	3
Libya	Dictatorship	UN Security Council	5	0
Sudan	Dictatorship	UN Security Council	4	2
Central African Republic (I)	Dictatorship	Self-Referral	1**	0
Central African Republic (II)	Dictatorship	Self-Referral	0	3
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Dictatorship	Self-Referral	0	6
Mali	Dictatorship	Self-Referral	0	2
Uganda	Dictatorship	Self-Referral	0	5
Total			16	21

Data coded by authors from public records of the ICC. Includes all arrest warrants and summons to appear as of January 2022, excluding administration of justice cases.

* Regime-type coded for year in which the ICC's preliminary examination began.

** Alleged crimes were committed during the final months of an incumbent government. The next government asked for investigation of the prior government's activities.

Table 2: Expected Utility from Outcomes in the Theoretical Model

Actor	Don't Join	Join
Dictator	$W\pi - ce_D$	$W\pi - (c + \kappa_L) e_D$
Political Opponent	$W(1 - \pi) - e_P$	$W(1 - \pi) - (1 + \kappa_H) e_P$

Table 3: Observable Implications of the Theory

Hypothesis Number	Explanatory Variable	Outcome Variable	Data Sample	Expected Relationship	Empirical Test
1	Political competition	Join	All dictatorships	Positive	Table 5
2	Join	Violence	Dictatorships that ratify	Negative	Table 6
3	Join	Leader survival	Dictatorships that ratify	Positive	Table 7

Table 4: Quantitative Definitions of Dictatorships

Source	Variable Name	Cut-off	N Dictatorships	N Joiners
Polity	Polity2	5	93	31
V-Dem	v2x_polyarchy	0.4	83	19
V-Dem	v2x_polyarchy	0.5	98	27

Table 5: Political Competition Increases Probability of Joining the ICC

	Dependent Variable: Years to Join					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>Explanatory Variable</i>						
Political competition	0.66** (0.29)	0.62** (0.29)	0.76* (0.40)	0.74* (0.41)	0.54* (0.29)	0.53* (0.29)
<i>Control Variables</i>						
GDP per capita, logged	-0.46 (0.30)	-0.51 (0.32)	-0.60 (0.37)	-0.62 (0.39)	-0.41 (0.28)	-0.43 (0.29)
Foreign aid	0.01 (0.10)	0.01 (0.10)	-0.06 (0.08)	-0.06 (0.08)	-0.03 (0.07)	-0.03 (0.07)
Rule of law	0.71 (0.50)	0.77 (0.51)	0.32 (0.62)	0.34 (0.63)	0.44 (0.52)	0.46 (0.53)
Violence: total	0.00 (0.16)		-0.11 (0.23)		-0.03 (0.18)	
Violence: intra-state		0.05 (0.18)		-0.09 (0.26)		0.00 (0.19)
Violence: inter-state		-0.30 (0.61)		-0.19 (0.60)		-0.18 (0.61)
Region controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dataset	Polity-5	Polity-5	V-Dem-0.4	V-Dem-0.4	V-Dem-0.5	V-Dem-0.5
Events	22	22	12	12	19	19
States	83	83	74	74	91	91
Observations (state-year)	932	932	809	809	1,016	1,016

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 6: Joining the ICC Decreases Violence

Type of Violence	Dependent Variable: Violence					
	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
	Total	Intra-state	Total	Intra-state	Total	Intra-state
<i>Explanatory Variable</i>						
Post-join	-0.81*** (0.31)	-0.84*** (0.31)	-1.20*** (0.38)	-1.17*** (0.38)	-0.56* (0.31)	-0.60* (0.31)
<i>Control Variables</i>						
GDP per capita, logged	-0.31 (0.21)	-0.31 (0.21)	0.06 (0.03)	0.06 (0.03)	0.02 (0.02)	0.02 (0.02)
Foreign aid	1.30*** (0.16)	1.31*** (0.16)	1.71*** (0.20)	1.70*** (0.20)	1.35*** (0.16)	1.35*** (0.16)
Rule of law	-4.54*** (0.37)	-4.67*** (0.38)	-4.19*** (0.45)	-4.42*** (0.47)	-4.67*** (0.42)	-4.83*** (0.43)
Polity	-0.04 (0.04)	-0.04 (0.04)				
Polyarchy			-5.76*** (1.91)	-6.15*** (2.00)	-3.45*** (1.40)	-3.39*** (1.42)
Region controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dataset	Polity-5	Polity-5	V-Dem-0.4	V-Dem-0.4	VDem-0.5	VDem-0.5
States	30	30	19	19	27	27
Observations (state-year)	592	592	373	373	533	533

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 7: Joining the ICC Increases Leader Survival in Office

	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)
Dependent Variable: Years to Losing Office (Event: Removal from Office)						
<u>Explanatory Variable</u>						
Post-join	-0.74* (0.40)	-0.76* (0.40)	-0.38 (0.79)	-0.33 (0.80)	-1.25*** (0.40)	-1.24*** (0.40)
<u>Control Variables</u>						
GDP per capita, logged	0.07 (0.21)	0.07 (0.21)	-0.08 (0.06)	-0.07 (0.06)	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.03)
Foreign aid	-0.19 (0.20)	-0.20 (0.20)	-0.85** (0.37)	-0.88** (0.37)	-0.28 (0.18)	-0.28 (0.18)
Violence: total	0.27** (0.11)		0.74*** (0.25)		0.26** (0.13)	
Violence: intra-state		0.27** (0.11)		0.73*** (0.26)		0.25* (0.13)
Violence: inter-state		2.28 (1.68)		2.12 (1.66)		1.51 (1.41)
Polity	0.25*** (0.06)	0.25*** (0.06)				
Polyarchy			7.09*** (2.52)	7.05*** (2.55)	4.97*** (1.63)	4.94*** (1.64)
Region controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dataset	Polity-5	Polity-5	V-Dem-0.4	V-Dem-0.4	V-Dem-0.5	V-Dem-0.5
Events	64	64	25	25	51	51
States	30	30	19	19	27	27
Observations (leader-year)	665	665	382	373	573	573

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$