

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 11 January 2021
Accepted 27 June 2021

KEYWORDS
Free trade agreements; third-
party trade; interstate
conflict; arming; optimal
tariffs

JEL

In regions where enemy countries do not trade with each other, would the institutional settings of free trade

hostilities. Siqueira (2003) presents a theoretical analysis of third-party intervention in which the third party acts as a peacemaker in reducing conflict, irrespective of the

1999). We extend the two-country

state, the

of arming. Nevertheless, arming generates an output-distortion effect that reduces welfare since allocating more resources to fighting lowers civilian goods production for domestic consumption. This third effect constitutes the marginal cost (MC) of arming. These three effects interact simultaneously in

... $\frac{A}{C} \sim \frac{C}{a} \sim 0$ † on their imports from each other and, in the meanwhile, country C sets an optimal tari

These results imply that

$$C^S > C^M: \tag{24}$$

We thus have:

PROPOSITION 3. *Relative to the multiple FTAs between a third-party state with*

nations help reduce the political hostility bevc&mL[vthe ']'3 V8

time-consistency issues. In the 'worst-case scenario' where there is a reneging problem, the outcome would be a trade war with Nash tariffs. The analysis of this paper is static and hence ignores the dynamic aspects of conflicting interactions over time. Finally, it should also be mentioned that our

Appendix A-3 that the partial equilibrium analysis can be closed by introducing a traded numeraire good and that the trade balance conditions will not qualitatively alter this paper's primary results.

14. See X_a^A in (2a) for country A and

Chang, Y.-M.,

$$P_b^B \hat{=} \frac{1}{2} f^2 \quad \frac{C}{b} \%.$$

$$\frac{APR}{c} \sim \frac{3}{T}, \quad \frac{BPR}{c} \sim$$

$$ED_z^C \sim \frac{1}{3} \dots \frac{1}{3} \frac{A}{c} \pm \frac{1}{3} \frac{B}{c} \frac{2}{3} R \dots \frac{A}{c} \quad 3 \pm \frac{B}{c} \pm R \pm \frac{1}{4} \dots$$

