The American Journal of Political Science Law and Criminology
ISSN 2693-0803 | Open Access

TYPE Original Research
PAGE NO. 14-21
DOI 10.37547/tajpslc/Volume07Issue03-03

Legal Aspects of Structuring Cross-Border Transactions in The Context of Changing International Regulation

Miraziz Khidoyatov

Founding Member and CEO at Enexpan Wyoming, USA

OPEN ACCESS

SUBMITED 11 January 2025
ACCEPTED 05 February 2025
PUBLISHED 18 March 2025
VOLUME Vol.07 Issue03 2025

CITATION

Khidoyatov, M. . (2025). Legal Aspects of Structuring Cross-Border Transactions in The Context of Changing International Regulation. The American Journal of Political Science Law and Criminology, 7(03), 14–21. https://doi.org/10.37547/tajpslc/Volume07Issue03-03.

Abstract: This article examines the evolving legal framework of cross-border transactions against the backdrop of shifting international regulations and diminishing traditional notions of state sovereignty. Drawing upon doctrinal analysis and a comparative perspective, it explores how emerging global governance structures, regional integration mechanisms, and soft-law instruments influence the design and implementation of transnational deals. Key areas of focus include the choice of corporate structures (holdings, SPVs, joint ventures), compliance with anti-corruption and tax regulations, and the strategic use of dispute resolution clauses, particularly in a context where national, supranational, and private regulatory regimes increasingly overlap. Empirical illustrations from Europe, North America, and Asia underscore the growing role of borderland cooperation and subnational initiatives in shaping cross-border transactions. The analysis highlights the need for practitioners to adapt contractual mechanisms in light of complex global norms and offers a multi-level approach to legal and regulatory compliance. Ultimately, the article argues that success in cross-border endeavors depends on integrating national law with transnational standards, leveraging innovative dispute resolution processes, and proactively engaging with local/regional stakeholders to foster legal certainty and minimize risk.

Keywords: Cross-Border Transactions, Sovereignty, Global Governance, Compliance, Regional Integration, Transnational Law, Dispute Resolution.

Introduction: The modern economy increasingly relies on cross-border transactions, reflected in the growing volume of international trade, foreign direct investment, and the formation of global production and distribution chains. Simultaneously, regulatory frameworks are undergoing transformation at both supranational and national levels, with the emergence of new institutions, specialized regimes, international agreements, and expanded powers of multinational corporations, all of which contribute to a more complex legal environment [1]; Brunet-Jailly E. [2]. At the same time, competition among states to attract capital and technology is intensifying, creating demand for effective legal mechanisms to support transactions [11, 58].

However, the interaction between different legal systems—national, regional, and transnational—is not always harmonized, leading to conflicts of norms, regulatory gaps, and the increasing role of "soft law" and private regulators, such as multinational corporations and industry associations [3]; Tamanaha B.Z. [4]. Under these conditions, the question of optimal strategies for structuring cross-border transactions, balancing the interests of businesses, public authorities, and supranational institutions, becomes increasingly pressing.

In recent years, extensive research has explored the impact of globalization on state sovereignty and the evolution of international law [9, 12]. E. Ip [1] emphasizes that globalization is reshaping traditional notions of state sovereignty, leading to the development of specialized international legal regimes in areas such as human rights, trade, and environmental protection, as well as the emergence of new forms of supranational and transnational norms.

In the field of cross-border cooperation, several authors, including E. Brunet-Jailly [2] and M. Perkmann [5], highlight that trade relations and joint infrastructure projects create specific regional "cluster" zones where national regulations are integrated with multilateral agreements. Similar trends are observed in studies of cross-border regions within the EU (Diez T. et al. [6]) and North America (Anderson B. et al. [7]), underscoring the decisive role of local and regional structures in shaping a favorable legal environment.

At the same time, as noted by H.H. Koh [3], alongside classical public international law, "transnational law" is actively developing, incorporating norms from various legal systems. The legal force and enforceability of such norms remain a subject of debate [4], prompting new methodologies for structuring transactions, including the use of offshore instruments, arbitration, and multilateral framework agreements.

Despite the extensive body of research, key questions remain regarding how transnational law and supranational institutions influence specific legal structures and mechanisms employed in cross-border transactions. Most studies focus on isolated aspects, such as tax or corporate law, while a comprehensive analysis of the full legal toolkit involved in cross-border deals—ranging from anti-corruption requirements to risk allocation mechanisms—remains insufficiently systematized. Furthermore, there is a lack of comparative analysis of regional legal frameworks governing such transactions, particularly in the context of evolving global and local regulations.

In this context, the present study aims to elucidate key legal strategies that multinational actors can adopt when structuring cross-border transactions under shifting international regulations. By exploring both institutional changes at the global or regional level and practical contractual devices—ranging from double taxation treaties to advanced arbitration clauses—the work endeavors to provide a comprehensive framework for understanding and managing cross-border deals. Specifically, the research seeks to answer how emerging governance regimes, including novel forms of public-private collaboration in border regions, influence risk allocation and dispute resolution across different sectors. A further objective is to highlight the role of compliance obligations, such as anti-corruption measures, and their increasing prominence in shaping contract design.

PART I. THE TRANSFORMATION OF INTERNATIONAL REGULATION AND THE SPECIFICS OF SOVEREIGNTY IN CROSS-BORDER TRANSACTIONS

1. Evolution of sovereignty in the era of globalization

Since the seventeenth century, the “Westphalian” notion of state sovereignty has served as a foundation for international relations, treating each state’s territory and governance as inviolable and absolute [1, 4]. In recent decades, however, global economic interdependence, rapid technological development, and increased mobility of capital have accelerated the transition toward a multi-level governance model. Under this model, states no longer possess a monopoly on rule-making [13, 59]. Instead, decision-making is shared among international organizations, private actors, and overlapping regulatory networks.

International institutions such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank have taken on broader mandates, influencing national monetary and fiscal policies and setting trade norms that member states must adopt [1, 10, 48]. Meanwhile, transnational corporations (TNCs) exert substantial economic clout; through supply-chain standards, private certification schemes, and self-regulatory agreements, they shape legal expectations across borders [26, 57]. Various network-based forms of self-regulation further dilute the exclusivity of state sovereignty, as seen in global finance, environmental management, and digital services [2].

Overall, states remain indispensable actors, especially in areas requiring coercive power—like national defense or law enforcement—but the concept of sovereignty has evolved. Governments are forced to accommodate supranational and non-state influences, thus revealing sovereignty to be more adaptive and contingent than the classic Westphalian doctrine suggests [11, 58]. Private regulatory frameworks and intergovernmental cooperation increasingly coexist with formal state law, blurring the boundaries between the purely national and the genuinely global [2, 49, 55].

2. Proliferation of specialized legal regimes

Globalization has spawned new regimes of public international law encompassing human rights, environmental standards, trade, and cross-border investment [14, 16]. Human rights agreements—such as the UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights—reach deep into domestic affairs, while trade-related treaties often impose obligations that limit tariff autonomy [15, 50]. Environmental norms, from the Paris Agreement on climate change to regional pollution-control accords, also illustrate this expansion [1, 17, 60]. These instruments can constrain states' traditional authority, compelling them to align with internationally agreed-upon targets.

Regional blocs like the European Union (EU), the United States–Mexico–Canada Agreement (USMCA), the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and the Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR) function as "locomotives" of legal change, harmonizing rules among member states [2, 18, 51]. Within the EU, for instance, supranational regulations—on competition policy or data protection—override conflicting national laws. North America's former NAFTA (now USMCA) coordinates industrial standards, while ASEAN's agreements on trade facilitation reduce regulatory divergence [6]. Such processes can streamline cross-border transactions by providing more predictable frameworks, though they also create new compliance burdens when states must adopt region-wide directives.

Another hallmark of contemporary regulation is the rise of soft-law mechanisms and private codes of conduct [3, 53]. Transnational corporations, industry associations, and even local entities forge codes that govern labor practices, environmental protections, and commercial conduct [2]. These rules are typically voluntary but gain de facto enforceability through reputational pressures or supply-chain requirements [26, 54]. Consequently, the classic distinction between "public" and "private" law erodes, as cross-border deals might be governed not only by treaties or national statutes but also by private standard-setting bodies. This multiplicity of norms reflects what Ip [1] calls the "new global law," wherein public and private elements converge.

3. The influence of transnational actors and local institutions on cross-border deals

National governments are not the sole regulators shaping cross-border transactions [8, 20]. In many frontier regions—such as parts of Europe, North America, and Southeast Asia—local governments and business associations play a pivotal role [2, 6]. They establish free trade zones or enter into "sister city" agreements that facilitate the movement of goods and workers [19, 21]. These local innovations often complement national policies, bridging gaps where central authorities lack capacity or inclination to act. By forging regional clusters or cross-border economic corridors, local stakeholders create flexible spaces in which business can flourish under more tailored rules [5, 22].

Scholars observe a gradual judicial and administrative assimilation of transnational norms into domestic legal orders [1, 56]. Courts in many jurisdictions, for instance, now reference foreign and international precedents on matters such as corporate liability or human rights compliance. Administrative agencies adopt global best practices—e.g., the Basel Committee's banking regulations or the OECD's transfer pricing guidelines—effectively elevating them to quasi-binding status. While these norms may lack formal legislative origin, their acceptance by national institutions cements them as practical standards in cross-border transactions [2].

When conflicts arise over which national court has the power to hear a case, parties often turn to international arbitration (ICC, LCIA, ICSID) or quasi-judicial bodies to circumvent lengthy litigation and conflicting rules [1, 3, 38, 52]. Choice-of-law clauses are commonly used in cross-border contracts to preselect a favorable legal system—be it English law, New York law, or another well-established venue—offering predictability. However, these clauses can be challenged if they violate overriding mandatory provisions of a relevant jurisdiction. Table 1 below summarizes key global regulatory developments and their ramifications for cross-border transactions.

Table 1. Key global developments and their implications for cross-border deals [1, 2]

Development	Implications
Rise of supranational organizations	States must comply with WTO rulings, IMF guidelines; sovereignty adjusted.
Regional integration	Harmonized rules (EU, USMCA) streamline trade but add new compliance layers.
Soft-law and private codes	Corporate and NGO standards shape contract terms (labor, environment) beyond formal treaties.
Local–central collaboration	Border regions create custom policies (e.g., special zones, local alliances) enhancing trade networks.
Global law in domestic courts	Transnational principles (human rights, investment protection) integrated into national judgments.
Arbitration and forum selection	Cross-border deals often prefer arbitration, enabling predictable outcomes despite diverse jurisdictions.

By acknowledging these shifts—toward multi-level governance, specialized regimes, and hybrid forms of regulation—participants in cross-border transactions can better navigate complex legal frameworks. Sovereignty, while still integral, now adapts to the interplay of public and private regulatory power, allowing states, transnational bodies, and local actors to collaboratively shape the norms governing international commerce.

PART II. KEY LEGAL ASPECTS OF STRUCTURING CROSS-BORDER DEALS

1. Legal forms and mechanisms for protecting parties' interests

A primary consideration in structuring cross-border transactions is the choice of legal vehicles through which parties will organize their commercial activities [23, 25]. Commonly, multinational entities employ holding companies, special purpose vehicles (SPVs), or joint ventures (JVs), each offering distinct advantages in terms of risk allocation, tax optimization, and governance [1, 8].

- Holding Companies. Frequently established in jurisdictions with extensive tax treaty networks, holding companies can centralize share ownership of multiple subsidiaries, streamline dividend flows, and minimize withholding taxes [24, 27]. They are particularly effective if located in a country that has bilateral tax treaties to reduce double taxation on inbound or outbound investments [4, 8].
- Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs). Often formed to isolate project-specific liabilities and assets, SPVs enable sponsors to ring-fence financial risks and secure project financing without exposing the entire corporate group [2, 3, 28, 33]. This structure is popular in large-scale infrastructure, energy, or real-estate deals.
- Joint Ventures (JVs). JVs encourage collaboration between local and foreign partners, facilitating access to proprietary technologies or local market knowledge [25, 26]. Equity-based JVs typically require a detailed shareholders' agreement specifying profit-sharing, governance, and dispute resolution. Contractual JVs, by contrast, may be preferred when the parties wish to avoid creating a separate legal entity [1].

The choice between offshore and onshore jurisdictions depends on tax stability, the robustness of legal enforcement, and reputational factors. While "offshore" hubs can offer confidentiality and reduced tax burdens, heightened global scrutiny and evolving anti-avoidance measures—such as the Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) project—may limit their attractiveness [8].

Cross-border deals commonly leverage double taxation treaties (DTTs) to mitigate tax liabilities on dividends, interest, or royalties [24, 28]. These treaties, often modeled on the OECD or UN frameworks, allocate taxing rights between contracting states [1]. In practice, investors may structure deals to take advantage of "treaty shopping," although many jurisdictions have introduced anti-abuse provisions that prohibit purely artificial arrangements.

Increasingly, transfer pricing rules—particularly under the OECD Transfer Pricing Guidelines—play a critical role. Where related parties transact across borders, tax authorities require documentary evidence that intercompany pricing aligns with arm's length standards. Noncompliance may trigger audits or penalties, prompting multinational groups to adopt robust internal policies and maintain contemporaneous transfer pricing documentation [2].

Compliance obligations extend beyond tax considerations. Regulatory frameworks such as the U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA), the UK Bribery Act, and analogous local statutes impose stringent anti-bribery requirements on companies engaging in international business [29, 30]. Cross-border contracts often incorporate representations and warranties regarding bribery and corruption to allocate risk should a violation occur [2].

Similarly, AML/KYC protocols (Anti-Money Laundering / Know Your Customer) ensure financial transparency, requiring parties to verify beneficial ownership and flag suspicious transactions. Such obligations not only shape the legal drafting of cross-border agreements but can influence the actual transaction flow—for instance, the selection of correspondent banks or escrow arrangements [1].

2. The role of regional and local factors in shaping deals

In addition to national legal regimes, border regions and intergovernmental accords can crucially affect deal structures. Many countries establish special economic zones (SEZs), export processing zones, or customs unions to reduce tariff barriers and streamline administrative procedures [2, 3, 31, 32]. For instance, the European Union's customs union harmonizes external tariffs, simplifying intra-EU trade, while the USMCA (formerly NAFTA) offers a free trade arrangement in North America [35, 34]. Such initiatives can significantly reduce friction in cross-border goods and capital movement, thus shaping corporate preferences for where to locate production facilities or distribution hubs [36, 37].

Global digital commerce introduces distinct legal complexities, including data privacy, intellectual property (IP) rights, and questions of cross-border internet jurisdiction [1, 23, 49]. Regulations such as the EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and similar laws in other regions impose stringent rules on data handling and international data transfers. IP considerations—particularly software licensing, patent protections, and online content rights—also drive contract drafting for technology-driven deals [2].

In parallel, the extraterritorial application of certain regulatory regimes, such as the U.S. Clarifying Lawful Overseas Use of Data (CLOUD) Act or sector-specific cybersecurity requirements, raises questions about which forum's laws apply to disputes arising from cross-border data flows. Companies must navigate overlapping obligations to ensure compliance and minimize litigation risk.

In many border regions—whether in Europe (through INTERREG programs), North America (U.S.–Canada bilateral accords), or Asia (cross-province agreements in China and ASEAN states)—local governments and business associations cooperate with national regulators to customize regulatory frameworks [2, 19]. This multi-level approach can lead to preferential policies, tax incentives, or expedited licensing for cross-border projects, reflecting local economic priorities while respecting overarching national legislation [1].

3. Risks and dispute resolution strategies

Cross-border transactions often rely on international commercial arbitration (e.g., ICC, LCIA) to resolve contract disputes [38, 41]. Arbitration clauses typically specify the seat of arbitration, applicable rules, and language. Because awards under major arbitral institutions are widely enforceable under the New York Convention, parties can avoid the uncertainties of litigating in unfamiliar courts [2, 39, 42].

For investment disputes, the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) provides a forum under bilateral or multilateral investment treaties. Disputes alleging expropriation, discriminatory regulation, or unfair treatment frequently appear before ICSID, where investors seek compensation from host states [4, 6, 40, 45].

Most international contracts contain choice-of-law clauses designating a single legal system (often English or New York law) to reduce unpredictability [40, 45]. Forum selection clauses similarly identify a specific arbitral institution or court. However, certain mandatory rules—such as competition laws or consumer protection regulations—may override these choices if they conflict with fundamental public policy [2].

Increasingly, parties also experiment with alternative dispute resolution (ADR) methods like mediation or neutral evaluation to preserve commercial relationships and reduce legal expenses [46, 47]. Hybrid ADR procedures, incorporating elements of mediation followed by binding arbitration ("med-arb"), can further expedite conflict resolution while maintaining some flexibility in negotiation.

Global jurisprudence in cross-border transactions evolves through multi-polar influences, with domestic courts referencing decisions from foreign jurisdictions or international tribunals [1]. For instance, a landmark U.S. judgment on cross-border corporate liability might later inform a similar case in Canada or Singapore, particularly where statutory language or treaty obligations align. Such cross-fertilization underscores the importance of tracking relevant judicial precedents beyond a single jurisdiction and indicates how "global law" penetrates local forums [2].

The choice of corporate vehicles also plays a significant role in structuring cross-border transactions, influencing liability, tax treatment, and regulatory compliance (Table 2).

Table 2. Illustrative corporate vehicles and their impact on cross-border transactions [1, 2]

Vehicle	Key Purpose	Main Legal/Tax Benefits	Potential Drawbacks
Holding Company	Consolidate ownership of subsidiaries; optimize dividends	Access to treaty network, reduced withholding taxes (OECD, 2020)	Risk of "treaty shopping" scrutiny by tax authorities
SPV	Isolate specific project risks/assets (infrastructure)	Ring-fence liabilities, facilitate project financing	May require guarantees from parent entity; complex structuring
Equity JV	Partner with local investor for resource/market access	Shared risk/reward, local market expertise	Governance issues, potential deadlock, cultural conflicts
Contractual JV	Collaborative projects without creating new entity	Flexibility, simpler dissolution	Less formal structure, uncertain legal personality

In conclusion, the successful structuring of cross-border transactions depends on an integrated approach that addresses corporate form, tax efficiency, regulatory compliance, local and regional institutional factors, and robust dispute resolution strategies. By recognizing the interplay of international treaties, soft-law standards, and local practices, businesses and governments alike can craft legal frameworks that safeguard interests while fostering the economic potential of transnational collaboration.

CONCLUSION

Recent decades have witnessed a profound transformation in the legal environment surrounding cross-border transactions [9, 48]. As global and regional institutions proliferate, traditional Westphalian concepts of state sovereignty continue to evolve, adapting to the demands of transnational commerce and multi-layered governance structures. States retain considerable influence but must increasingly share regulatory space with intergovernmental organizations, private standard-setting bodies, and local or regional authorities [12, 57]. This complex overlay of norms has redefined how parties negotiate, structure, and enforce cross-border contracts.

The findings underscore that legal adaptability is paramount. Practitioners must navigate a wide array of instruments—from double taxation treaties to specialized arbitration rules—while simultaneously managing compliance obligations such as anti-corruption and data protection. Furthermore, the rise of specialized economic zones and cross-border cooperation initiatives exemplifies how local contexts can either streamline or complicate transactional frameworks [31, 33]. This multi-level interplay fosters opportunities for more tailored, efficient deal structures but also magnifies the intricacy of risk allocation and conflict resolution.

Ultimately, success in cross-border ventures relies on embracing an integrated approach that considers the interplay of national laws, regional agreements, and soft-law standards. The evolution of dispute resolution, including more widespread reliance on arbitration and hybrid ADR methods, also reinforces the need for flexible contractual arrangements capable of operating across jurisdictions [38, 46]. By synthesizing diverse regulatory regimes and focusing on institutional cooperation, transnational transactions can balance the pursuit of global market advantages with the need for robust legal safeguards. In doing so, they illuminate the ongoing reconfiguration of law in a globalizing world—one where the adaptive power of national legal systems and the emergence of transnational norms continue to redefine the boundaries of commercial activity.

REFERENCES

Eric C. Ip, Globalization and the Future of the Law of the Sovereign State, 8 Int'l J. Const. L. 636 (2010).

Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly, Cross-Border Cooperation: A Global Overview, 47 Alternatives 3 (2022).

Harold Hongju Koh, Why Transnational Law Matters, 24 Penn St. Int'l L. Rev. 745 (2006), https://elibrary.law.psu.edu/psilr/vol24/iss4/4.

Brian Z. Tamanaha, Understanding Legal Pluralism: Past to Present, Local to Global, in Legal Theory and the Social Sciences 447 (Routledge 2017).

Markus Perkmann, Cross-Border Regions in Europe: Significance and Drivers of Regional Cross-Border Cooperation, 10 Eur. Urb. & Reg'l Stud. 153 (2003).

The European Union and Border Conflicts: The Power of Integration and Association (Thomas Diez, Mathias Albert & Stephan Stetter eds., Cambridge Univ. Press 2008).

Barry Anderson, The Border and the Ontario Economy (Cross-Border Transp. Ctr., Univ. of Windsor 2012), https://cbinstitute.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/The-Border-and-the-Ontario-Economy.pdf.

OECD/SWAC, Cross-Border Cooperation and Policy Networks in West Africa (OECD Publishing 2017), https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2017/01/cross-border-co-operation-and-policy-networks-in-west-africa_g1g71c6a/9789264265875-en.pdf.

M. A. Ganaie, Globalization and State Sovereignty, 5 Int'l J. Hum. & Soc. Sci. Invention 1 (2016).

Jacalyn Goldzweig Panitz, Globalisation and State Sovereignty: A Mixed Bag, LSE Undergraduate Pol. Rev., Jan. 10, 2019, https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/lseupr/2019/01/10/globalisation-and-state-sovereignty-a-mixed-bag/.

David Held, Globalization/Anti-Globalization (Polity Press 2003).

Saskia Sassen, Losing Control? Sovereignty in an Age of Globalization (Columbia Univ. Press 1996).

John Agnew, Sovereignty Regimes: Territoriality and State Authority in Contemporary World Politics, 95 Annals Ass'n Am. Geographers 437 (2005).

Joost Pauwelyn, The Proliferation of International Tribunals and the Interaction of Regimes: Implications for the WTO, 103 Am. J. Int'l L. 201 (2009).

Benedict Kingsbury, The Concept of 'Law' in Global Administrative Law, 20 Eur. J. Int'l L. 23 (2009).

Anne-Marie Slaughter, A New World Order (Princeton Univ. Press 2004).

Martti Koskenniemi, The Politics of International Law, 1 Eur. J. Int'l L. 4 (1990).

Karen J. Alter, The New Terrain of International Law: Courts, Politics, Rights (Princeton Univ. Press 2014).

UNDP, Border Area Development in the Greater Mekong Subregion (2014), https://www.undp.org/publications/border-area-development-greater-mekong-subregion.

Thomas Risse, Governance Without a State? Policies and Politics in Areas of Limited Statehood (Columbia Univ. Press 2011).

James N. Rosenau, Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier: Exploring Governance in a Turbulent World (Cambridge Univ. Press 1997).

Michael Zürn, Global Governance as Multi-level Governance, in The Oxford Handbook of Governance 730 (David Levi-Faur ed., Oxford Univ. Press 2012).

Peter Muchlinski, Multinational Enterprises and the Law (2d ed., Oxford Univ. Press 2007).

Reuven S. Avi-Yonah, Tax Competition, Tax Havens, and the European Union, 24 Fordham Int'l L.J. 255 (2000).

John H. Dunning, Multinational Enterprises and the Global Economy (2d ed., Edward Elgar Publishing 2008).

Claire Cutler, Private Power and Global Authority: Transnational Merchant Law in the Global Political Economy (Cambridge Univ. Press 2003).

Sol Picciotto, International Business Taxation: A Study in the Internationalization of Business Regulation (Weidenfeld & Nicolson 1992).

OECD, OECD Transfer Pricing Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and Tax Administrations

(2022), https://www.oecd.org/tax/transfer-pricing/oecd-transfer-pricing-guidelines-for-multinational-enterprises-and-tax-administrations-20769717.htm.

U.S. Dep't of Justice, Foreign Corrupt Practices Act: An Overview, https://www.justice.gov/criminal-fraud/foreign-corrupt-practices-act.

United Nations, United Nations Convention Against Corruption (2004), https://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/UNCAC/Publications/Convention/08-50026_E.pdf.

World Bank, Special Economic Zones: An Overview (2011), https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/2264.

UNCTAD, Transnational Corporations Journal, Special Issue on Special Economic Zones: Progress, Emerging Challenges, and Future Directions, Vol. 26, No. 2 (2019), https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/diaeia2019d2_en.pdf.

Farok J. Contractor, Special Economic Zones and International Business, 49 J. Int'l Bus. Stud. 197 (2018).

Deborah Brautigam & Xiaoyang Tang, China's Investment in African Special Economic Zones, 36 World Dev. 217 (2012).

European Commission, The EU Customs Union, https://taxation-customs.ec.europa.eu/customs-4_en.

USMCA Secretariat, United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, https://www.trade.gov/usmca.

ASEAN, ASEAN Economic Community Blueprint 2025 (2015), https://asean.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/AEC-Blueprint-2025-FINAL.pdf.

Gary B. Born, International Commercial Arbitration (2d ed., Kluwer Law Int'l 2014).

William W. Park, Dispute Resolution in International Business Transactions, 27 Colum. J. Transnat'l L. 1 (1989).

Jeswald W. Salacuse, The Law of International Business Transactions, 35 Harv. Int'l L.J. 1 (1994).

Nigel Blackaby et al., Redfern and Hunter on International Arbitration (6th ed., Oxford Univ. Press 2015).

United Nations, Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (New York Convention) (1958), https://www.uncitral.org/pdf/english/texts/arbitration/NY-conv/XXII_1_e.pdf.

ICSID, ICSID Convention, Regulations and Rules, https://icsid.worldbank.org/resources/publications/icsid-convention-regulations-and-rules.

Susan D. Franck, The Legitimacy Crisis in Investment Treaty Arbitration, 73 Fordham L. Rev. 1521 (2005).

Thomas W. Wälde, The Future of International Investment Law, 5 J. World Inv. & Trade 507 (2004).

Margaret Moses, The Principles and Practice of International Commercial Arbitration (3d ed., Cambridge Univ. Press 2017).

Catherine A. Rogers, Ethics in International Arbitration (Oxford Univ. Press 2014).

Robert O. Keohane & Joseph S. Nye, Power and Interdependence (4th ed., Longman 2012).

Jan Klabbers, International Law (2d ed., Cambridge Univ. Press 2017).

Beth Simmons, Mobilizing for Human Rights: International Law in Domestic Politics (Cambridge Univ. Press 2009).

Andrew Guzman, How International Law Works: A Rational Choice Theory (Oxford Univ. Press 2008).

Laurence R. Helfer, Overlegalizing Human Rights: International Relations Theory and the Commonwealth Caribbean Backlash Against Human Rights Regimes, 102 Colum. L. Rev. 1832 (2002).

Philip C. Jessup, Transnational Law (Yale Univ. Press 1956).

Harold Hongju Koh, Transnational Legal Process, 75 Neb. L. Rev. 181 (1996).

Günther Handl, The Legal Mandate of Multilateral Development Banks as Agents of Change, 92 Am. J. Int'l L. 168 (1998).

David Kennedy, The Dark Sides of Virtue: Reassessing International Humanitarianism (Princeton Univ. Press 2004).

Saskia Sassen, Globalization and Its Discontents: Essays on the New Mobility of People and Money (The New Press 1998).

Stephen Krasner, Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy (Princeton Univ. Press 1999).

Michael Byers, Custom, Power and the Power of Rules: International Relations and Customary International Law (Cambridge Univ. Press 1999).

Dinah Shelton, International Human Rights Law: A Practical Approach (2d ed., Oxford Univ. Press 2011).