To Live & Let Die? Civil War Interventions & Democratic Third-Party Government Survival

Andrew J. Enterline
Univ. of North Texas
Dept. of Political Science
1155 Union Circle #305340
Denton, Texas 76203-5017
ajenter@unt.edu

Steve R. Garrison
Midwestern State Univ.
Dept. of Political Science
3410 Taft Boulevard
Wichita Falls, TX 67308-2099
steve.garrison@mwsu.edu

Amber Aubone
St. Mary's University
Dept. of Political Science
One Camino Santa Maria
San Antonio, TX 78228
aaubone@stmarytx.edu

September 22, 2008

To Live & Let Die?
Civil War Interventions &
Democratic Third-Party Government Survival

Abstract

We argue that the proclivity of third parties to intervene in civil wars is rooted in the domestic political utility that third parties derive from interventions. We examine how said costs and benefits, such as outcome, mortality, and proximity, for example, influence executive turnover in democratic third-party intervenors during the modern state system, 1816–2000, in the context of civil and extra-systemic wars. We conclude that, despite the potential benefits of intervention, such as avoiding genocide, domestic audiences of third-party democratic states generally perceive interventions as costly ventures and punish their leaders for such involvement in foreign civil wars by not reelecting them or, in some instances, forcing them to resign. The analysis underscores the fact that the reluctance by democratic third parties to intervene into civil wars is grounded, in part, in the rational assessment of the negative consequences that accrue to chief executives for undertaking such interventions, negative consequences that must be neutralized in order for democratic third parties to respond to humanitarian crises similar to that occurring in contemporary Darfur.

Introduction

In 1994, the international community watched in horror as ethnic Rwandan Hutu extremists launched a wave of systematic genocidal killings that ultimately cost the lives of approximately $800,000$ Tutsi and moderate Hutu Rwandans. This event was tragic not only because of the number of casualties inflicted, but also because the leading democratic states in the international system failed to preempt, or limit, the bloodshed in Rwanda (Carlson, Sung-Joo & Kupolati 1999). Currently, similar questions are raised by the mounting human costs of the conflict in the Darfur region of Sudan, which according to the United Nations, has exceeded $300,000$ deaths and resulted in the displacement of 2.45 million Sudanese (Farley 2008). Why do the leading democratic states, states with the political and military capacity to influence intrastate conflicts, as well as political institutions anchored to individual rights and liberties, refrain from intervention?

Several plausible explanations suggest themselves. First, this reluctance of democratic third parties might be traced to the absence of a direct threat from said conflicts, as these contemporary intrastate conflicts generally occur in developing countries, which are typically distant from the shores of potential intervening states (Huth 1998). Second, a collective-action problem emerges among democratic states with the capacity to intervene in which no one state prefers to bear the potentially significant and open-ended costs associated with intervention, despite a consensus that civil wars are detrimental to the international system, both normatively and strategically (Dowty & Loescher 1996).

A third explanation for the absence of international intervention into civil conflicts can be found in the accountability that domestic political audiences of third-party democracies exert on their policymakers for undertaking such interventions. The nature of these conflicts is often characterized by significant length, the loss of considerable blood and treasure, the absence of decisive and stable outcomes, and perhaps most important, few direct benefits

to the domestic audiences. Taken together, this dynamic generates risk-averse behavior by political leaders in potential democratic third parties.[1]

Despite the reluctance of third parties to intervene in intrastate conflicts, historically third-party states *do* intervene into civil conflicts. We surmise that interveners are motivated by either the benefits of intervention, or the costs of non-intervention. Benefits might be derived from a number of sources, including strategic or political interests broadly defined. For example, a previous connection to the state hosting the conflict, such as a former metropole–colony relationship or a military alliance (Huth 1998, Yoon 1997), may provide significant strategic benefits to the third-party state. Intervention may also serve as a diversionary outlet for the leadership of the intervening state, an indirect way of potentially improving the popularity of the executive by simultaneously creating a "rally-'round-the-flag" effect and diverting public attention from domestic economic woes and political scandals (Ostrom & Job 1986, Howell & Pevehouse 2005). Even the decision to not intervene may bring costs in the form of international criticism and increasing instability in a neighboring state (Dowty & Loescher 1996).

We are intrigued by this tension between the seeming high cost and low payoff for intervention into civil conflicts, coupled with the observation that third parties do intervene in intrastate conflicts historically. To date, few if any studies of third parties and civil wars examine in generalizable fashion the translation of the costs and benefits emanating from an intervention into civil war to the domestic political arenas in third-party states. Influenced by the work of Bueno de Mesquita, Siverson & Woller (1992) in their examination of the costs and benefits of involvement in international war and their relation to violent regime change, we assess the costs and benefits of intervention in civil conflicts for democratic third-party governments by exploring the following research question: *What domestic costs and benefits*

[1] For example, consider the infamous "Black Hawk Down" (Bowden 2000) incident in Somalia in which deceased American Army Rangers were paraded through the streets of Mogadishu in 1993. This incident resulted in tangible domestic political costs early in President Bill Clinton's administration, and a rapid disengagement of American military forces from the United Nations peacekeeping operation, despite the fact that stabilizing the failed state of Somalia might very well have served American national security interests.

accrue to third-party executive administrations from intervention into intrastate conflicts? We argue that studying this question is important, because it might reveal causal processes that lead policymakers and advocates to understand patterns in intervention by democratic states.

The remainder of our study is laid out in the following manner. In the next section we briefly discuss the scholarship on third-party intervention into civil wars. The subsequent section addresses the cost–benefit relationship between third-party intervention into civil war and third-party domestic outcomes, and distills a set of expectations pertaining to incentives and disincentives for democratic intervention. In turn, we develop a research design suitable for testing these expectations, and execute the analysis. We close the article with a discussion of the implications of our analysis for the study of third-party intervention into intrastate conflicts, as well as issues relevant to contemporary policymaking.

Prior Research

Third Parties & Civil Wars

To date, the analysis of the relevance of third parties to intrastate conflicts broadly defined focuses on two primary, and related, research foci. First, extant research examines the conditions associated with intrastate conflicts that *stimulate* third-party involvement in these conflicts. Second, research examines the impact of third-party intervention on the *evolution* of intrastate conflicts, particularly their duration and outcome. We discuss the research associated with each thread in turn, thereby setting a context for considering the cost-benefit feedback process from civil war intervention to third-party domestic arenas.

The literature identifies a number of causal stimulants of third-party intervention into intrastate conflicts. For example, Regan (1996, 1998, 2000) reasons that continuing intrastate conflicts are generally costly to third-party states, both directly in terms of the strategic instability that these conflicts create, as well as indirectly by depriving third parties of resources that might be exerted elsewhere. Given this dynamic, third parties have a general preference

for intervening to "stop the killing" sooner rather than later (Licklider 1995). Civil conflicts are generally costly to the international community at large because of their potential contagion effects; that is, they may stimulate conflict in neighboring states by generating refugee flows and combatants seeking sanctuary (Moore & Shellman 2007). Salehyan & Gleditsch (2006), for instance, conclude that refugee flows, often the byproducts of severe civil conflict and repression, in turn stimulate militarized interstate conflict between third parties and the civil war state. Aside from these costs, the rebuilding following civil conflict also exacts significant monetary aid from the international community (Dowty & Loescher 1996), costs that intervention might limit. Research concerning the costly nature of civil wars and their stimulation of third-party intervention fits within a broader, longstanding body of research suggesting that domestic political conflicts draw intervention by external participants (e.g., Pearson 1974).

Yet, despite the costs of civil conflict for the international community, third-party states still often refrain from intervention. Regan (2000), for instance, finds no evidence that significant refugee flows encourage intervention, regardless of the link between refugee flows and interstate war found by Salehyan & Gleditsch (2006). The absence of intervention may be due to a lack of capacity, but this is not likely to be the case for major powers. A lack of major-power intervention is most often explained simply as a lack of strategic or material interest in the conflict. Even if these potential interveners are moved by the suffering of others abroad, humanitarian crises are plagued by a collective-action problem in which no state wants to bear the costs of intervention, though such intervention may provide the "public good" of preventing further loss of life, refugee flows, and the contagion of conflict (Dowty & Loescher 1996). Considering that the cost to the international community is often inadequate as a stimulus for intervention, we consider other potential factors that encourage a third party to intervene, or not to intervene, in another's civil war.

The characteristics of the conflict or target state may determine whether or not a state intervenes, either unilaterally or as part of a multilateral effort. Perhaps the most direct

analysis of the stimulants of third-party intervention into civil war is carried out by Regan (1998, 2000), wherein the author examines third-party behavior during the post-WWII period. Regan finds that the civil conflicts most likely to experience intervention are those reflecting high casualties, and those conflicts occurring during the Cold War, although it is interesting that Regan finds the intensity of the killing in a civil war to decrease the likelihood of intervention by third parties. Regan's findings square with Gilligan & Stedman's (2003) analysis of the deployment of United Nations peacekeepers, as well as with Greig & Diehl's (2005) examination of third-party mediation, wherein the studies conclude that civil wars characterized by conditions associated with a "hurting stalemate" (i.e., high casualty rates over a long period of time) stimulate mediation attempts by third parties. Greig & Diehl (2005) also identify an interesting nuance in the relationship between the ethno-religious qualities of civil wars and the likelihood of intervention: greater ethnic-religious heterogeneity in civil wars deters third-party mediation and negotiation.

Relations between the target state and the potential intervener, perhaps grounded in ethnic, military, and economic ties, might also increase the likelihood of intervention. Carment & Rowlands (1998), for example, observe that transnational linkages between the civil war state and potential third parties stimulate third-party intervention, as third parties seek to safeguard ethnic diaspora, reasoning that is indirectly corroborated by research concluding that cross-national ethnic ties stimulate interstate conflict (Davis & Moore 1997). Accordingly, Mullenbach & Matthews (2008) find a statistically significant relationship between the presence of ethnic ties in a target state and American intervention, though this relationship only seems to hold for non-military types of intervention. In addition to these ethnic linkages, military ties between the target state (or its challenger) and the intervener, the strategic location of the target state for the potential intervener, as well as a shared adversary present other motivations for intervention (Huth 1998). Relations between the target state and major powers also appears to play an important role in others' decision to intervene. For instance, Mullenbach (2005) demonstrates that United Nations peacekeeping is

less likely in civil war states that have a military alliance with a major global power, or are themselves major powers.

Related to the above discussion, dyadic relations between other states in the international system also play a major role in these states' decisions to intervene in the civil conflicts of other states. In Akcinaroglu & Radziszewski's (2005) analysis of the link between enduring interstate rivalries and civil war duration, the authors conclude that, given the target state is a rival, third-party states are more likely to intervene in a civil conflict when a rebel group presents a viable challenge to the target state government. Furthermore, rivalry between third parties may induce these states to engage in "proxy wars." For instance, in her comprehensive analysis of U.S. intervention in civil conflicts, Yoon (1997) finds that the most significant determinant of U.S. intervention in a civil conflict during the Cold War was intervention by an ally to the USSR, combined with one of the parties to the conflict being communist, conclusions that square with research findings reported by Mullenbach & Matthews (2008) and Huth (1998).

Clearly, the decision by potential third parties to intervene is conditioned by several qualities of the civil war, the target state, as well as relations between the target state and other states within the international system. Yet, it is important to consider how domestic politics influence the decision to intervene. Some scholars argue that third-party leaders are more likely to use force abroad when they are faced with economic problems or political scandals at home, a primary assertion of the longstanding diversionary theory of war, though empirical support for this claim is mixed (Ostrom & Job 1986, Howell & Pevehouse 2005, Meernik 2001). Additionally, research indicates that past intervention outcomes affect later decisions to intervene, in which past failures deter, while past successes encourage, subsequent interventions (Khong 1991, Khong 1992, Nevin 1996, Pickering 2001, Pickering 2002, Record 2002, Vertzberger 1998). Last, a domestic audience's support for intervention also plays a significant role in a third party's decision to intervene (Jentleson & Britton

1998), as does the leader's expectation of how the domestic audience's interpretation of the intervention will impact his own political survival (Bueno de Mesquita & Morrow 2003).

The second line of inquiry in the literature concerns the impact of third-party intervention on civil wars. This literature examines how intervention affects the duration of the conflict, its outcome, as well as the duration of peace following settlement. In analyzing how intervention affects conflict duration, several studies demonstrate that third-party intervention prolongs civil war. For instance, Mason (2004) and Mason & Fett (1996) use a rational choice approach to explain that parties to a conflict continue to fight as long as the benefits of fighting outweigh the costs, and they perceive a high likelihood of success. These studies argue, and Akcinaroglu & Radziszewski (2005) empirically support, that merely the expectation by a civil war rebel group that a third party may intervene on its behalf encourages rebels to continue fighting government forces in anticipation of third-party resources.

Along similar lines, Balch-Lindsay & Enterline (2000) find that third-party intervention on opposite sides of a conflict further perpetuates hostilities, as one would expect that both the government and rebel groups perceive a greater likelihood of success given the support provided by third parties to both combatants. Indeed, in a subsequent study, Regan (2002, 70-1) observes that the opposed intervention–duration link is so robust that "one can only conclude that opposing interventions exacerbate a conflict and cannot be driven by a motive of conflict management," which leads him to the sobering conclusion that any opposing intervention by third parties perpetuates civil wars. This positive relationship between the involvement of opposing third parties and civil conflict duration is neatly codified in the veto-player theory of civil wars formulated in Cunningham (2006), wherein the author finds empirical support for the expectation that the number of veto players influences positively the duration of civil war.[2] Pessimism regarding the impact of third parties aside, Regan & Aydin (2006) suggest that the well-documented, positive relationship between third-party

[2]This said, it is interesting to note that Cunningham's (2006) analysis suggests that the positive link between veto players and civil war duration is absent when one considers the contributions of third-party states.

intervention and civil war duration is a function of an over-emphasis on military and economic interventions. Indeed, Regan & Aydin (2006) report that well-timed interventions, particularly those that are diplomatic or combine a variety of approaches, can exert a dramatic, negative impact on the duration of civil wars. Interventions, however, are inherently linked to the volatile escalatory dynamics of civil war, adding to the uncertainty of success in such ventures (Garrison 2008).

Concerning how intervention impacts the outcome of conflict, Mason, Fett & Weingarten Jr. (1999) demonstrate that neutral third-party interventions decrease the likelihood that civil war governments will prevail, though the negative impact of neutral interventions appears to attenuate across time. Mason, Fett & Weingarten Jr. (1999) also demonstrate that biased interventions eventually increase the likelihood that a civil war government prevails. Aside from who wins, scholars are equally concerned with how a conflict is resolved. Although early research by Mason & Fett (1996) located little evidence that intervention by third parties influenced the settlement of civil wars, subsequent work reveals that third-party intervention has tangible influences on civil war dynamics. DeRouen Jr. & Sobek (2004), for instance, find that intervention by the United Nations enhances the likelihood of attaining a civil war truce or treaty, yet Greig & Diehl's (2005) analysis of the impact of peacekeeping on the probability that combatants will reach a negotiated settlement suggests little evidence that this relationship obtains during the post-WWII period.

Other scholars point to the effects that intervention may have on the duration of peace following the cessation of hostilities. Walter's (1997, 1999) analysis of post-WWII civil wars leads her to conclude that post-civil war peace is best achieved when: third parties display a willingness to use force to guarantee peace; electoral democracy is delayed for the sake of avoiding the revival of issues at the heart of a recently terminated civil war; military components of former civil war combatants are demobilized; and the groundwork is laid for long-term institutional development. Walter's reasoning and results square nicely with the theoretical and empirical work of Hartzell (1999), Hartzell, Hoddie & Rothchild

(2001), and Hartzell & Hoddie (2003), wherein the authors demonstrate empirically that strong predictors of post-civil war peace are the degree to which the peace agreement is characterized by institutionalized power-sharing between former combatants, as well as the presence of a third-party enforcer. These findings lead one to conclude that third-party intervention may have a positive impact on the cessation of hostilities following settlement. Furthermore, Fortna (2004) finds ample evidence that peacekeeping missions, be they of the observer, traditional, or multidimensional variety, reduce the likelihood that civil war combatants will resume fighting.

As we note at the outset, the primary dilemma for contemporary policymakers concerns convincing third parties to intervene into intrastate conflicts and assist in the peacemaking process. At the same time, sufficient evidence suggests that third parties can exacerbate civil conflicts.[3] One puzzle is whether this exacerbation is a function of the motives of third parties, with mischievous third parties making matters worse (Regan 2000, Regan 2002), or whether the dynamics of conflicts involving multiple actors stimulate collective-action dilemmas and costly gridlock (Cunningham 2006), such that even well-intentioned third parties are undone by group dynamics. Furthermore, even if one sets aside the possible motives of third parties for intervening in civil wars, the likelihood of success via intervention remains daunting given the potential risks associated with intervention, risks that might very well be a prime deterrent to third-party intervention.

The literature presented above highlights factors that help us understand both the decision to intervene as well as the effects of intervention, and their interrelationships. To date, one causal effect of third party intervention into civil wars has received scant attention—the causal link between intervention into civil wars and domestic political audiences in the intervening states. In the next section, we explore the domestic implications of third-party interventions into civil wars as a way of understanding patterns of third party intervention into intrastate conflicts.

[3]Regan (1996, 345) observes that "[o]f the 196 cases of intervention, only about 30% were considered successful."

War & Domestic Audiences

Our inquiry into the feedback of domestic costs and benefits to third parties that intervene into intrastate conflicts parallels a relationship that is of longstanding interest—the impact of interstate war involvement on domestic politics. Although the exact linkage between international politics and domestic outcomes is a major source of debate in international relations, war involvement has long been included in studies of political revolutions (Brinton 1965, Johnson 1966, Skocpol 1979). Regimes involved in wars, face a collective action problem similar to the opposition that can reduce a state's repressive capacity, magnifying the feedback of domestic costs (Lichbach 1995). Reduced resources combined with decreasing legitimacy following military defeat can significantly increase regime mobilization costs while decreasing that of the opposition, thereby increasing the likelihood of political overthrow (Dunn 1972, Francisco 2000, Lichbach 1995). This impact is especially pronounced in regimes that rely solely on repressive capacity to retain power (Francisco 2000).

Thus, studies of the domestic costs of war involvement emphasize domestic regime type, principally the role of democratic institutions in mediating feedback costs. For example, Bueno de Mesquita, Siverson & Woller (1992) examine the consequences of international war involvement for domestic regimes. Scrutinizing international wars for the period 1815–1975, Bueno de Mesquita, Siverson & Woller (1992) conclude that defeat in international war significantly increases the probability that a regime will experience violent overthrow. Costly war involvement, therefore, increases the probability of violent overthrow, and the act of war initiation magnifies the impact of defeat, as initiating states are found to be the most likely to experience violent overthrows, while winning initiators were the least likely to experience overthrows.

Aside from its potentially costly effects for regimes, war may also have significant domestic costs for individual political leaders, including both violent and non-violent removal from power. Studies examining the impact of international wars and crises on the prospects of leaders retaining power demonstrate that political survival following such events is best

guaranteed when the leader is perceived by the domestic audience to have exhibited leadership prowess and experience during the international war or crisis. Therefore, international wars and crises provide opportunities for leaders to demonstrate their leadership ability and thus increase their audience appeal (Bienen & van de Walle 1991, Bueno de Mesquita & Siverson 1995, Chiozza & Goemans 2004, Smith 1998). While success brings benefits, defeat entails significant audience costs, as it demonstrates an inability to manage the reins of power, which in turn signals weakness. Such weakness invites opposition and leads to punishment by the domestic audience. Given this dynamic, political leaders vulnerable to audience costs select conflicts they are more likely to win in order to maximize the benefits of war and retain power (Bueno de Mesquita & Siverson 1995, Gelpi & Griesdorf 2001). This selection effect, therefore, suggests that democratic leaders who fail in such foreign policy endeavors will be the most likely to lose power.

These studies illustrate the stark reality of war involvement. War brings negative consequences for both regimes and leaders (Bueno de Mesquita, Siverson & Woller 1992, Bueno de Mesquita & Siverson 1995, Chiozza & Goemans 2004). The single greatest threat to either leaders or regimes is defeat. Defeat in war threatens the survival of democratic leaders more than that of autocrats, suggesting that regime type mediates the costs of foreign policy failures. These results indicate that the costs of war entail consequences far beyond the systemic or strategic losses that are the primary focus of realist and neo-realists theories of international politics (Morgenthau 1973, Waltz 1979). At the same time, involvement in foreign war also accrues benefits to domestic political regimes and leaders, with victory in foreign wars bolstering their durability. Winning a foreign war, then, can generate tangible domestic political benefits. Does third-party intervention into foreign internal conflicts reflect the same linkage between policy success and failure—that is, winning or losing—and the fate of third-party regimes? We explore the causal reasoning of this relationship in the subsequent section.

Domestic Feedback from Intervention

The core of the aforementioned cost–benefit relationship involving interstate wars is straightforward: Domestic audiences punish leaders for failed foreign policies, such as defeat in war, a relationship that is more pronounced in democratic regimes, wherein domestic audiences are large, political opponents present, and political discourse free. Interstate wars also have the quality of being extremely visible events. As such, a state's involvement in an interstate war is central to the security of a nation, and often requires strong, centralized mobilization of resources to execute such involvement. The benefit to political leaders is manifold, including control over policy, the rally of domestic political forces around an issue of exceptional clarity given its embedment in national security, and the minimization of domestic political threats. Thus, while the costs of foreign war might be dear to domestic regimes and leaders, the benefits are clear in the sense that defending the national interest against threats is relatively easy for political leaders to convey, domestic audiences to identify and interpret, and in turn, translate into rewards and punishments for their political leaders.

Alternatively, intrastate conflicts, such as colonial and civil wars, present political leaders in potential third party states with a much more complex issue relative to that of interstate threats, particularly in terms of clarity. Indeed, one might reason that while the political costs of involvement in intrastate conflicts, much like interstate conflicts, might very well be dear to domestic political leaders, the benefits that accrue from involvement in intrastate conflicts vary with respect to relevance for domestic political audiences. Therefore, central to this difference between interstate and intrastate wars is the potential range of clarity of the rationale for a state's involvement from the perspective of domestic audiences.

As noted, interstate threats are more easily identifiable. Certainly, there is likely a range in the clarity of an interstate threat, and in turn the ability of a political leader to explain the necessity of involvement, with a direct foreign attack on a state facilitating greater clarity, and distant interstate crises less. However, regardless of the clarity of interstate threats, we argue that political leaders can more easily explain to domestic audiences the necessity

for involvement in interstate crises, given convenient historical touchstones, such as long-term enemies, past victories and defeats, colonial ties, as well as issues central to interstate conflicts, such as territorial disputes.

We reason that the range in clarity in intrastate conflicts is much greater than that associated with interstate conflicts. Thus, while a political leader can cast an interstate threat as one involving national survival, intrastate conflicts are less likely to exhibit such decisive clarity in terms of the costs and benefits of policies of involvement versus non-involvement. Certainly, some intrastate conflicts present direct costs and threats to a state, such as a neighboring state absorbing refugee flows from the intrastate conflict. In turn, refugees might increase the economic costs to the neighboring state's domestic audience, thereby furnishing political leaders with a clear basis for intervention. Or, one might reason that colonial wars, conflicts in which national honor and dreams of empire, and perhaps the territorial integrity of the metropole state, are at stake, will stimulate domestic support for involvement, support that might rival the intensity of national security threats emanating from the realm of interstate politics.

Even with the presence of such stakes, we reason that intrastate conflicts are less likely to have clear, easily translatable threats upon which political leaders can base, and mobilize support for, their foreign policies. Indeed, the complexities and subtleties of intrastate conflicts make it such that even the telltale signs of policy success, such as supporting the victorious side in an intrastate conflict, might not translate to greater political capital grounded in domestic audience approval. Thus, even under conditions when benefits from intervention are possible (e.g., stabilizing the state experiencing an intrastate conflict will result in a more stable business environment that will generate economic benefits for the third party, neutralizing advantages that might accrue to a rival third-party state), the political explanation of the diffuse benefits and the translation of this into publicly supported policy by the domestic audience is difficult to accomplish.

Absent a clear threat to national survival, which we reason often characterizes intrastate conflicts, we argue that a stark imbalance obtains between the costs of involvement in an intrastate conflict and the benefits that are likely to accrue to political leaders via their domestic audiences. That is, the investment of blood and treasure in an intrastate conflict, such as in the form of casualties and battles lost, is likely to be more visible to a domestic audience than the diffuse economic or strategic benefits that might accrue to the third-party state. Even the symbols of policy accomplishments that facilitate the generation of domestic political benefits from involvement in interstate conflicts, such as victory, are likely to be absent or difficult to manufacture in intrastate conflicts. For example, the public displays of victory that accompany the conclusion of interstate wars (e.g., the public surrender of the defeated state, the national celebration of returning soldiers), are often absent at the conclusion of intrastate conflicts.

Conversely, the costs that are associated with involvement in intrastate conflicts, such as military casualties and the public financing of involvement, are likely visible and tangible to domestic audiences. This creates a dynamic in which domestic audience costs accrue to political leaders early and throughout a state's involvement in an intrastate conflict, while the benefits of such involvement are likely extremely diffuse and are delayed until the involvement's conclusion, if at all.

How such cost-benefit structures impact the political survivability of democratic third parties, however, remains uncertain. Given the larger range of clarity in terms of the stakes of such conflicts, we proceed by identifying a series of various cost-benefit structures in order to explore their impact on political survivability. First, we reason that said costs and benefits are entwined, such that minimizing the cost of some process generated by intrastate conflicts (e.g., a neighboring civil war generating costly refugees) increases the benefit to a third party from intervention.

Second, we reason that the costs and benefits of third-party intervention into civil wars can be subdivided into three general types: (1) strategic, (2) material, and (3) symbolic.

Strategic costs and benefits are related to the geo-strategic relationship between a potential third party and an intrastate conflict, such as the proximity of an intrastate conflict or the relevance of an intrastate conflict for third-party rivalries (e.g., Cold War proxy wars). Material costs and benefits such as the loss of blood and treasure, as well as resulting economic hardships, may also constitute a significant factor in the cost-benefit structure of third-party interveners.

Last, interventions may also contain symbolic costs and benefits, since the motivations for, and outcome of, such policy endeavors could impact the likelihood of a government retaining power during and following an intervention. For example, third parties that are on the winning side of an intrastate conflict enjoy the benefits of triumph that might accrue from domestic as well as international sources. Furthermore, third parties that intervene into civil wars marked by atrocity, such as genocide, might gain benefits from carrying out punitive actions against the perpetrators. Thus, intrastate conflicts present different cost-benefit structures for third parties, relative to those presented by interstate conflicts.

In the remainder of this article, we investigate the impact of strategic, material, and symbolic costs and benefits on domestic political outcomes in third-party states. Our analysis is exploratory in the sense that we investigate the performance of variables central to investigations of the relationship between interstate war and domestic politics. By doing so, we aim to determine whether and how interventions into intrastate conflicts, and the costs and benefits that accrue to the domestic political arenas in third parties, condition the decision to intervene into these conflicts.

Research Design

Sample

Key to our research design and sample identification is our adoption of the core research design formulated in Bueno de Mesquita, Siverson & Woller (1992), in which the authors examine the incidence of violent regime changes in each interstate war participant during

an interval following the conclusion of a given war. Bueno de Mesquita, Siverson & Woller (1992) examine two-, five-, and ten-year post-war windows to determine the incidence of violent overthrow of a domestic regime. Given the mean length of electoral cycles in the third parties that are central to our study, i.e., democratic regimes, we begin with a ten-year post-intrastate war intervention window.[4] We rely upon the Correlates of War (*COW*) data on extra-systemic (i.e., colonial and territorial) and intrastate (i.e., civil) wars (Sarkees 2000) to identify 185 instances of third-party involvement in these conflicts (121 extra-systemic and 64 intrastate interventions) during the period 1816–1997 (Sarkees 2000). Those conflicts ending in 1997 were then excluded to avoid including right censored conflict intervals, leaving a sample of 181 conflicts, 60 of which were civil wars.

Next, we differentiate between interventions by democratic and non-democratic third parties, and we do so by relying on a series of variables from the Banks (1996). We adopt a liberal coding rule that codes democratic third parties as those third-party states that were identified by Banks (1996) as civilian regimes, with an elected president or prime minister system of government during the observation interval.[5] Doing so reduces the sample to 133 cases of democratic third party intervention (97 extra-systemic and 36 intrastate.) The sub-samples of democratic third party interventions into civil and extra-systemic wars are reported in Tables 1 and 2, respectively.

(Tables 1 & 2 About Here.)

Finally, we use the COW data to identify the end year of a democratic third party's intervention into an extra-systemic or intrastate war in our sample, and then specify an additional ten-year window following this end year. This observation period (i.e., the period of democratic third party intervention plus a post-intervention window of ten years) is illustrated in Figure 1.

[4]Subsequent analysis with a five-year post-intrastate war intervention window produced substantively identical results.

[5]These variables were "type of regime" (1=civilian), "type of effective executive" (2=president or 3=premier) and "method of selection of effective executives" (1=direct election or 2=indirect election).

(Figure 1 About Here.)

Dependent Variable

We operationalize institutional executive change as an instance in which executive power changes hands between two or more competing political parties via an institutionalized procedure in a democratic third party during the observation period. In turn, we identify the total frequency of these executive changes for each democratic third party during an observation period, a procedure that results in 552 instances of peaceful changes in power. The regime changes coded for democratic third parties in civil and extra-systemic wars are reported in Tables 3 & 4, respectively.

(Tables 3 & 4 About Here.)

Last, the distribution of the frequency of executive changes in democratic third parties, as well as their representation in the extra-systemic and civil war samples, are reported in Tables 5 and 6, respectively.

(Tables 5 & 6 About Here.)

Independent Variables

Victory

To operationalize whether a democratic third party was on the victorious side in an intervention, we rely on two variables from the *COW* extra-systemic and intrastate war data (Sarkees 2000). First, we rely on the variable *intside* to determine on which side of a conflict a democratic third party intervened. Second, we rely on the variable "winner" to determine whether the democratic third-party intervenor joins the side that is either victorious or defeated in the internal war.[6] We code a dichotomous variable, *Victory*, a value of 1 if the

[6] The variable "winner" relies on the following coding scheme, as stated in the online codebook: "1 =state, 2 =nonstate, 3 =state post Iwar, 4 =nonstate post Iwar, 5 =none, 6 =stalemt". We rely solely on coding values of 1 and 2 to determine the side joined by third party.

democratic third party is on the victorious side in an internal war, and zero otherwise. In 20 of the 133 observations (15 percent), the democratic third party is on the winning side in an intrastate conflict.

Casualties

To operationalize casualties incurred by the democratic third party for intervening in extra-systemic and intrastate wars, we collected information on third-party armed force members that were wounded, killed, or lost to disease during the duration of the intervention. We relied primarily on Clodfelter (2002), as well as country monographs to collect this information. These total casualty values were then divided by the democratic third party's total pre-intervention armed forces and the natural log computed to measure third-party casuality levels. This variable, *Casualties*, exhibits a minimum value of 0, a maximum value of 6.72, a mean value of 1.94, and a standard deviation of 1.66 for the extra-systemic sample, and a minimum value of 0, a maximum value of 7.59, a mean value of 1.27, and a standard deviation of 1.93 for the intrastate war sample.

Retribution

We rely on Clodfelter (2002) and various monographs to code a dichotomous variable, *Retribution*, a value of 1 if historical accounts indicate that a democratic third-party intervention was undertaken to avenge some egregious action by the opposition and zero otherwise. Previous attacks on civilians or foreigners that precipitate such interventions, as well as a previous policy failure were used to identify these cases. In our two sub-samples, 47 of the democratic third-party interventions into extra-systemic wars and 8 of the interventions into civil wars were undertaken for the sake of retribution.

Opposition Mass Killing

We anticipate that interventions by democratic third parties into extra-systemic and intrastate conflicts reflecting the intentional mass killing of civilians could possibly influence the domestic audience's evaluation of the overall costs and benefits of a conflict. To measure

this we code a dichotomous variable, *Opposition Mass Killing*, that measures the presence of intentional killings of civilians during a conflict by the opposition. A threshold of 1,000 deaths was selected to represent large-scale attacks on civilians. The opposition side represents those actors opposing the intervener and thus this variable identifies mass killing of supporters of both the intervener and the intervention target by the opposition. Clodfelter (2002) and various country monographs were used to construct this variable. There were 16 instances of mass killings perpetrated by the opposition in intrastate wars, and 18 in extra-systemic wars.

Simultaneous Interventions

Each foreign intervention that a democratic third party undertakes requires material costs in the form of personnel and material. We expect that simultaneous interventions by a democratic third party magnify these intervention-related costs to the third party. To measure the impact of multiple interventions on a third-party state, we create a dichotomous variable, *Simultaneous Interventions*, that is coded a value of 1 if the democratic third-party state is involved in more than one intervention into internal conflicts at time t. Forty-five of the 97 extra-systemic interventions reflect a democratic third party engaged in simultaneous interventions, while 13 of the 36 civil conflicts reflect a third party involved in simultaneous interventions.

Distance to Intervention

Geographic distance is central to the cost that a democratic third party bears to intervene abroad, and it also provides insight into the influence of strategic interest, such that proximate internal conflicts are of potentially greater threat than are distant internal conflicts. We rely on the geographic distance between the third-party state and the state in which the extra-systemic or intrastate conflict occurs by relying on inter-capital distance data from the *EUGene* software package (Bennett & Stam 2000). We add a value of 1 to this value, and compute the natural log of this sum to create the variable, *Distance*. This variable exhibits

a minimum of 0, a maximum of 9.37, a mean of 7.55, and a standard deviation of 2.22, for extra-systemic wars, and a minimum of 0, a maximum of 8.97, and a mean of 6.74 and a standard deviation of 2.55 for intrastate wars.

Third-Party Competition

If a third-party state is intervening into an internal conflict in which an additional third-party state is participating on the opposing side in the internal war, a strategic competition between the third parties is likely occurring. Such a competition might underscore the strategic benefits of intervening, as well as facilitate a democratic third party regime's capacity to translate this competition into domestic benefits associated with public rallies in the face of notable threats. We code a dichotomous variable, *Third-Party Competition*, a value of 1 when a democratic third-party intervention occurs under conditions when another third party intervenes on the opposite side of the internal conflict. Third-party competition only occurs in civil, not extra-systemic, wars. As such, of the 36 democratic third-party interventions into civil wars, 6 reflect conditions of third-party competition.

Economic Crisis

Domestic economic crises and government reactions to these hardships have long been identified as major causes in both institutionalized (Lewis-Beck 1990) and non-institutionalized (Brinton 1965) regime changes. To control for the presence of economic crisis in a democratic third party during intervention into an internal war, we first rely on the COW Composite Index of National Capabilities (CINC) to identify the sum of a democratic third party's iron production and energy consumption during each year of an intervention, as well as the 10-year post-intervention period, values that are accessible during the 1816–2000 period. In turn, we compute the natural log of this value plus 1 (to avoid computing the log of zero.) Next, we compute the inter-year change in this value. Last, we create a dichotomous variable, *Economic Crisis*, that is coded a value of 1 in years when a democratic third-party experiences a negative value of this inter-year change computation. Eighty-four of the extra-

systemic interventions were characterized by economic crises, while 31 of the interventions in civil wars reflect conditions of economic crisis.

Democracy Type

The nature of the democratic regime—i.e., presidential versus prime ministerial—may also impact the likelihood of institutional executive change. To control for differences across regime type, a variable measuring the presence of a prime ministerial system was coded. This dichotomous variable, *Prime Ministerial System*, was coded as 1 if the democratic executive was organized along a prime ministerial system, and zero otherwise. This variable was primarily coded from Banks (1996). In our sample 85 of the 97 extra-systemic interventions were undertaken by prime ministerial systems and 22 of the 36 civil interventions were characterized by prime ministerial systems.

Method

Examination of the frequency distributions of executive changes during each observation interval in both the extra-systemic and civil war samples displayed in Tables 5 and 6 indicates that the dependent variable is not normally distributed. These distributions suggest that institutional executive changes are Poisson-distributed, and thus an event-count regression approach is employed to examine the impact of third-party involvement in intrastate wars. A Poisson distribution, however, assumes equi-dispersion in that the mean and the variance are roughly equal and that each event is independent. Here, we anticipate that intervention in a previously occurring extra-systemic or civil war is unlikely to be independent of a subsequent intervention. Such a dependence between events typically produces over-dispersion, in which the variance exceeds the mean. One method to compensate for over-dispersion is to model the phenomenon of interest with a negative binomial distribution, a distribution in which the variance is often assumed to exceed the mean and thus can accommodate over-dispersion.

To estimate the event-count regression models, a Generalized Linear Model (GLM) approach is used. In contrast to traditional regression procedures, the GLM approach allows

the researcher to specify the variance and link functions of the model. Utilizing this approach developed by Nelder & Wedderburn (1972), one may specify the relationship between the mean and the variance of the dependent variables in situations in which the variance must be calculated under conditions of non-normality (Gill 2001). Additionally, the link function in GLM models allows the researcher to specify the non-linear relationship between the mean of the dependent variable and the linear right-hand side of the equation. Thus, no transformation of the dependent variable is required and the variance can be properly calculated. This enables a greater degree of freedom not only in specifying the model but also in the employment of regression diagnostics.

To model institutional executive changes, the log link function was selected to link the mean of the dependent variable with our independent variables and the variance function was selected after estimating a series of models. In the GLM context, the ratio of the deviance statistic to the degrees of freedom is used to evaluate over-dispersion. Our analysis indicated that over-dispersion was present in the sample of democratic interventions into extra-systemic wars, but absent in the civil war sample. Therefore, we employ the negative binomial variance function for the sample of interventions into extra-systemic wars and the Poisson variance function for analysis of the democratic interventions into civil wars.[7] All models were estimated with *STATA* 10.0.

Analysis

We examine the cost-benefit feedback of third-party intervention into extra-systemic and civil wars, in turn. The results for the negative binomial regression analysis of the costs and benefits to democratic third parties for intervening into extra-systemic wars are reported in Table 7. Model 1 presents the negative binomial regression estimates for the full sample containing 97 observations. The analysis suggests a rather weak fit of the model to the data

[7] The length of democratic third-party interventions into internal conflicts, as well as the post-intervention period, are not uniform across the sample. As such, we anticipate that longer conflicts exert a different impact on the third-party executive than shorter conflicts. To accommodate this variability, we control for the length of time that a democratic third party was observed in our sample, information that is specified in the count models via the option `-exposure-` in the STATA statistical package.

as indicated by the pseudo R^2 value of .06. This weak fit notwithstanding, our analysis of interventions into extra-systemic wars provides some insight into the cost-benefit feedback of intervention to the survival of democratic third-party leaders.

(Table 7 About Here.)

First, consider the performance of the variable *Distance*, one in which the coefficient is positively signed and statistically significant. The performance of *Distance* indicates that the greater geographic distance to an extra-systemic war, the greater the material cost of intervention to the democratic third party, and the greater the expected frequency of institutional executive change in a democratic third party during the observation period. The symbolic value of a third-party intervention in the form of conflict outcome, i.e., victory versus defeat, also exerts a significant, positive, influence on the expected frequency of institutional executive changes during and following third-party interventions into extra-systemic conflicts, suggesting that interventions do not mimic the impact of interstate wars in terms of domestic payoffs as the electorate punishes leaders even for successful outcomes. Finally, our control for the presence of the occurrence of economic crises in third-party interveners, as reflected in the variable *Economic Crisis*, corresponds to the anticipated positive influence, with economic crises stimulating institutionalized executive changes in democratic third parties. Conversely, the variables *Simultaneous Interventions*, *Casualties*, *Retribution*, and *Opposition Mass Killing*, each register as statistically insignificant. Further analysis utilizing studentized Pearson residuals for small samples revealed three cases which produced values exceeding an absolute value of 2.5, and these cases were identified as outliers.[8] Therefore, we exclude these observations from the sample of democratic interventions into extra-systemic wars, re-estimate the negative binomial model, and report the results of this re-estimation in Table 7, Model 2.

[8]These cases are the French interventions in the Franco-Syrian, the Franco-Druze, and the Franco-Indochinese of 1945 extra-systemic wars.

The re-analysis yields a slightly better fit to the sample. Specifically, the magnitude corresponding to the variable *Distance* increases. Furthermore, the performance of the variable *Victory* remains statistically significant and positively signed, a finding that challenges the expectation that foreign policy success translate into domestic dividends for third-party regimes. We observe that the variable *Simultaneous Interventions* is, somewhat surprisingly, inversely related to executive changes, indicating that the electorate does not punish policy leaders for multiple ongoing interventions. This may be a function of nationalism with regard towards colonial policies at the time. In contrast to the full model, the performance of the variable *Retribution* suggests that extra-systemic interventions undertaken for retribution purposes are inversely related to institutionalized executive changes, indicating that such policy endeavors are rewarded by the electorate. Finally, the performance of the variables *Opposition Mass Killing* and *Casualties* suggests that neither the presence of opposition mass killing nor the number of casualties conditions the frequency of institutional executive changes in democratic third parties.

We turn now to our analysis of the frequency of executive changes in the civil war sample of third-party interventions. In contrast to our negative binomial analysis of extra-systemic wars, in our analysis of civil wars we control for the type of democratic executive in the third parties, given that a third of our civil war intervention sample was comprised of presidential systems. Additionally, since only intrastate conflicts experience competitive interventions, a variable reflecting the presence of competitive third-party interventions is specified in the Poisson model.

The results of our Poisson analysis are reported in Table 8. The analysis indicates an overall better fit of the model to the data than was observed for extra-systemic conflicts, yielding a pseudo R^2 statistic of .45. Although this sample is relatively small (36 observations, as to 97 cases in our full extra-systemic war sample), the specified model better accounts for the impact of third-party interventions on the frequency of executive changes in third parties.

(Table 8 About Here.)

Comparing the results in our Poisson analysis of institutionalized executive changes in democratic third parties reported in Table 8 to those of the negative binomial analysis reported in Table 7, we observe some similarities and differences. Perhaps somewhat puzzling are the performances of the variables *Distance* and *Casualties*, in which the significant and negative coefficients corresponding to these variables suggest that the greater the distance traveled by the third party, as well as the greater the cost to third parties in terms of casualties, the lower the expected frequency of institutional executive changes. Additionally, competitive interventions are also associated with a lower expected frequency of regime change.

In terms of the geographic distance from a democratic third party to an intervention, we can only surmise that distant civil wars have an a priori anticipation of value by political leaders and their constituencies, that is, a selection effect of sorts, in which third-party interventions into distant civil wars that are observed in the historical record are valued. Similarly, interventions in opposition of a rival also appear to be rewarded by the electorate. With regard to the performance of *Casualties*, this finding might reflect sunk costs, such that investments of material and personnel improve support for a democratic regime.

Conversely, symbolic costs appear to exert significant impact on the political survivability of regimes. The performance of the variable *Opposition Mass Killings* suggests that the existence of mass killings by the opposition is positively related to institutional executive changes. This finding indicates that the electorate will punish governments that become embroiled in civil wars containing significant killing of civilians by the opposition. Additionally, the coefficient for the variable *Retribution* is positively associated with an increased expected frequency of institutionalized regime change, suggesting that the electorate punishes political leaders who engage in policies based on retaliation.

Outlier analysis indicates that two cases were exerting undue influence on the estimates reported in Model 1.[9] As in the previous analysis, these cases produced a studentized Pearson residual with an absolute value greater than 2.5. Thus, we removed these cases from the sample of democratic third-party interventions into civil wars and re-estimated the Poisson model, reporting the results of this specification in Table 8, Model 2. This analysis indicates that the model does not fit the data as nicely as the full model. Furthermore, removal of the outlying cases results in minor performance differences; specifically, the coefficient corresponding to the variable *Distance* becomes statistically insignificant.

The previous analysis provides some insight into the cost-benefit structures of third parties considering intervention in extra-systemic and civil wars. These structures appear to be different across war type. For instance, the outcome of civil wars appears to exert less of an effect on political survivability than the characteristics of the conflict, such as the motives for intervention or the presence of mass killings by the opposition, both of which significantly increase the probability of an institutionalized executive change. Conversely, both symbolic and material costs exert a significant impact on political survivability for democratic states involved in extra-systemic wars as successful, distant interventions, and economic crises all increase the risk of institutionalized executive change. Surprisingly, the costs of the conflict, as measured in casualties, are inversely associated with institutionalized executive changes in civil wars, perhaps resulting from public perception of sunk costs.

These findings suggest, in contrast to extra-systemic wars, intervention in civil war contains little if any reward in terms of political survival, for leaders of democratic states, but may contain higher risks, a conclusion that illuminates the stark reality of a third-party democratic leader's decision to intervene in civil wars. Thus, despite the humanitarian atrocities taking place in civil conflicts abroad, and the seeming capacity of some democratic third parties to mitigate such loss of life and property, democratic political leaders are deterred by the risk to political survival associated with intervention and are in fact exhibiting

[9] These two cases are the Finish intervention in the Russia vs. Anti-Bolsheviks and the U.S. intervention in the Laos vs. Pathet Lao civil wars.

political prudence. We consider in the next section whether such prudence might explain the reluctance of third parties to intervene in Darfur.

Application to Darfur

In contemporary international politics, the continuing atrocities in the Darfur region of Sudan represent a civil conflict that would seem most appropriate for democratic third-party intervention. Yet, repeated calls by the international community to respond to events in Sudan have met with a muted response, despite acknowledgement of genocidal policies by the combatants. Typically, the United States, United Kingdom, and France are the most widely mentioned democratic states with the capacity to intervene in Sudan. To assess the implications of our analysis for the cost-benefit feedback of third-party intervention into the Darfur conflict, we simulate the impact that American, British, and French intervention would have on the frequency of institutionalized executive changes in these respective democratic third parties.

After calculating the inter-capital distance between the United States, Britain, and France and Sudan, expected frequencies of executive change were simulated for a scenario in which retribution, casualties, economic decline, victory, opposition mass killing, and competition were not present. The length of the conflict was set at the value for the American intervention in Somalia, which was 290 days in duration. Therefore, as per the design of our statistical analysis reported in Table 8, Model 1, we simulate the frequency of institutionalized executive changes likely to occur during an intervention of 290 days, in addition to the 10-year post-intervention observation period, as our baseline model. The results of these simulations are reported in Table 9.

(Table 9 About Here.)

Our baseline simulation suggests that during the 10-year post-intervention period following an intervention of 290 days, nearly one executive change occurs in the American, British and French political systems. Next, we vary the values of several parameters from the Pois-

son model, and in turn examine changes in the expected frequency of institutional executive changes in these three potential democratic interveners. For example, if the baseline scenario resulted in a victory of the third-party side of the conflict, the expected frequency of executive changes in the United States, Britain, or France decreases to roughly one-half of an institutional regime change for the presidential systems and to over one change for the parliamentary system. Contrast this with the presence of mass killing of civilians by the opposition, as is ongoing in contemporary Darfur, and the expected frequency of institutionalized executive changes increases to over two changes for the United States and France, and exceeds four changes for the British system.

If the Darfur intervention was undertaken in the name of retribution, this would not only result in increased costs to the incumbent government in a democratic third party; this increase in symbolic costs would also exceed the simulated impact of the presence of opposition mass killings as the British system nears six changes. Although higher casualty rates are inversely associated with institutionalized executive changes, this impact is relatively small in magnitude in comparison to the presence of an intervention grounded in retribution. Increasing casualty rates to the maximum value in the sample only reduces the number of expected executive changes from roughly one to less than .10, in contrast to the threefold increase in the expected number of changes resulting from the presence of an intervention undertaken for retribution purposes. Thus, intervention into civil wars produces little material and symbolic benefits for a democratic third-party government in terms of remaining in office; indeed, the simulation analysis suggests that such interventions result in significant symbolic costs.

Last, to underscore this dynamic, consider Darfur from the perspective of a democratic third party. Given that opposition mass killing of civilians is present in this civil war, and if the United States, Britain, and France are experiencing some form of economic crisis, such as a recession, then significant risks to the incumbent government are stimulated by intervention. Consider a scenario in which an intervention is undertaken in the absence of

retribution, yet it results in the defeat of the third party and casualties amount to the first quartile in the sample. For the United States we expect that greater than one institutionalized executive changes will occur in the the subsequent 10-year observation period, the United Kingdom almost three changes, and the French system over one changes.

Considering the potential risk to political survival faced by democratic third-party leaders, one is left to wonder how the benefits of intervention affect political survival of the third-party government. For instance, one might expect that competitive intervention could provide the strategic benefit of enhancing national security and that this might be a motivation strongly supported by the public in the intervening state. The simulation in fact reveals that competitive interventions appear to reduce the expected number of institutionalized executive changes to roughly a fourth of an executive change for the presidential systems, and slightly more for the British system. This said, the substantive impact of competitive intervention on political survival is much less than that of the costs affecting political survival, such as those imposed by conflicts involving opposition mass killings. Clearly, these findings suggest that intervention under reasonable conditions is risky for incumbent governments, even when intervention is linked to national security interests, and this by extension sheds light on why third parties are reluctant to undertake such endeavors.

Conclusion

We began this study by observing the reluctance of democratic third parties to intervene in Darfur, given the atrocities taking place and the general capacity of the international system's leading democratic states to intervene into the Sudan. We find that despite the potential benefits of intervention, such as the preservation of life, mitigation of refugee flows, and, thus, perhaps the mitigation of the spread of conflict, the risk to the political survival of democratic third-party leaders provides some indication of why democratic third parties rationally refrain from intervention, on average.

This leads us to the primary question posed in this study: How does intervention in another country's civil war affect the political survival of a third-party democratic government? That is, how do the costs and benefits of intervention, taken together, translate politically? We find that third-party democracies have some reason to be prudent in their decision to intervene, as our analysis reveals that the costs to democratic third-party governments for intervention seem to outweigh the potential benefits, regardless of a victorious outcome, at least politically speaking. In fact, it seems that intervention either for the sake of alleviating humanitarian crises or for the sake of retribution may be enough to instigate executive change, without consideration of the number of casualties or other material costs. That is, the motivation behind the intervention is just as important, if not more important, than other factors related to intervention that one would expect to affect the political survival of a third-party democratic government.

This is an interesting finding considering the commonly held belief that politicians are often driven to intervene in foreign humanitarian crises by their own publics, who themselves are moved by horrific images of the atrocities taking place abroad (Dowty & Loescher 1996, Jentleson & Britton 1998). Jentleson & Britton (1998), in fact, find that public support, determined by polling U.S. citizens, of the U.S. use of force abroad is significantly driven by the purpose behind the use of force, and they find that humanitarian interventions receive the greatest public support. Why would the citizens of a democratic state encourage their leaders to intervene in a humanitarian crisis, either explicitly or in polls, only to punish them for intervening in such situations come the next election? This is a question that could have important implications for our understanding of the relationship between the dynamics of domestics politics and foreign policy. For now, we understand the dilemma faced by democratic political leaders when considering whether or not to intervene in civil conflicts taking place abroad, and that prudence seems to be warranted, at least when considering the expected utility of intervention from a rational-choice perspective. Until the cost-benefit structure for third parties of intervening in humanitarian crises such as Darfur

changes, political leaders of democratic states have little if any incentive to intervene into these conflicts.

References

Akcinaroglu, Seden, & Elizabeth Radziszewski. 2005. "Expectations, Rivalry and Civil War Duration." *International Interactions* 31:349–374.

Balch-Lindsay, Dylan, & Andrew J. Enterline. 2000. "Killing Time: The World Politics of Civil War Duration, 1820-1992." *International Studies Quarterly* 44(4):615–642.

Banks, Arthur S. 1996. *Cross-National–Time-Series Data Archive.* 1997 ed. Binghamton, NY: Center for Social Analysis.

Bennett, D. Scott, & Allan Stam. 2000. "EUGene: A Conceptual Manual." *International Interactions* 26:179–204.

Bienen, Henry, & Nicholas van de Walle. 1991. *Of Time and Power.* Stanford California: Stanford University Pess.

Bowden, Mark. 2000. *Black Hawk Down: A Story of Modern War.* New York: Penguin.

Brinton, Crane. 1965. *Anatomy of a Revolution.* New York, New York: Harper and Row.

Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, Randolph A. Siverson, & Gary Woller. 1992. "War and the Fate of Regimes: A Comparative Analysis." *American Political Science Review* 86:638–646.

Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, & Randolph Siverson. 1995. "War and the Survival of Political Leaders: A Comparative Study of Regime Types and Political Accountability." *American Political Science Review* 89:841–855.

Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, Smith Siverson, & James Morrow. 2003. *The Logic of Political Survival.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cahoon, Benjamin. 2008. "World Statesmen." Internet.

Carlson, Ingvarr, Han Sung-Joo, & Rufus M. Kupolati. 1999. Report of the Independent Inquiry into the Actions of the United Nations During the 1994 Genocide in Rwanda. Technical Report S/1999/1257 United Nations.

Carment, David, & Dane Rowlands. 1998. “Threes Company: Evaluating Third-Party Intevention in Intrastate Conflict.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42(5):572–599.

Chiozza, Giacomo, & H.E. Goemans. 2004. “International Conflict and the Tenure of Leaders: Is War Still Ex Post Inefficient?” *American Journal of Political Science* 48(3):604–619.

Clodfelter, Michael. 2002. *Warfare and Armed Conflicts: A Statistical Reference to Casualty and Other Figures, 1500-2000.* Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland.

Cunningham, David E. 2006. “Veto Players and Civil War Duration.” *American Journal of Political Science* 50(4):875–892.

Davis, David R., & Will H. Moore. 1997. “Ethnicity Matters: Transnational Ethnic Alliances and Foreign Policy Behavior.” *International Studies Quarterly* 41(1):171–184.

DeRouen Jr., Karl, & David Sobek. 2004. “The Dynamics of Civil War Duration and Outcome.” *Journal of Peace Research* 41(3):303–320.

Dowty, Alan, & Gil Loescher. 1996. “Refugee Flows as Grounds for International Action.” *International Security* 21(1):43–71.

Dunn, John. 1972. *Modern Revolutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Farley, Maggie. 2008. “U.N. puts Darfur Death Toll at 300,000.” *Los Angeles Times* April 23.

Fortna, Virginia Page. 2004. “Does Peacekeeping Keep Peace? International Intervention and the Duration of Peace After Civil War.” *International Studies Quarterly* 48:269292.

Francisco, Ronald. 2000. *Paths to State Repression: Human Rights Violations and Contentious Politics*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc. chapter Why are Collective Conflicts "Stable"?

Garrison, Steve. 2008. "The Road to Civil War: An Interactive Theory of Internal Political Violence." *Journal of Defence and Peace Economics* 19(2):127–152.

Gelpi, Christopher F., & Michael Griesdorf. 2001. "Winners or Loser? Democracies in International Crisis, 1918-94." *American Poltiical Science Review* 95(3):663–647.

Gill, Jeff. 2001. *Generalized Linear Models: A Unified Approach*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Gilligan, Michael, & Stephen John Stedman. 2003. "Where Do Peacekeepere Go?" *International Studies Review* 5(4):37–54.

Greig, J. Michael, & Paul F. Diehl. 2005. "The Peacekeeping–Peacemaking Dilemma." *International Studies Quarterly* 49:621645.

Hartzell, Caroline A. 1999. "Explaining the Stability of Negotiated Settlements to Intrastate Wars." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 43(1):3–22.

Hartzell, Caroline, & Matthew Hoddie. 2003. "Institutionalizing Peace: Power Sharing and Post-Civil War Management." *American Journal of Political Science* 47(2):318–332.

Hartzell, Caroline, Matthew Hoddie, & Donald Rothchild. 2001. "Stabilizing the Peace After Civil War: An Investigation of Some Key Variables." *International Organization* 55(1):183–208.

Howell, William, & Jon Pevehouse. 2005. "Presidents, Congress, and the Use of Force." *International Organization* 59(1):209–232.

Huth, Paul K. 1998. "Major Power Intervention in International Crises, 1918-1988." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42(6):744–770.

Jentleson, Bruce, & Rebecca Britton. 1998. "Still Pretty Prudent: Post-Cold War American Public Opinion on the Use of Military Force." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42(4):395–417.

Johnson, Chalmers. 1966. *Revolutionary Change*. Boston Massachusetts: Little, Brown.

Khong, Yuen. 1991. *Learning in U.S. and Soviet Foreign Policy*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press chapter The Lessons of Korea and the Vietnam Decisions of 1965, pp. 302–349.

Khong, Yuen. 1992. *Analogies at War: Korea, Munich, Dien Bien Phu, and the Vietnam Decision of 1965*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lewis-Beck, Michael. 1990. *Economics and Elections: The Major Western Democracies*. Ann Arbor: University of Michighan Press.

Lichbach, Mark I. 1995. *The Rebel's Dilemma*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Licklider, Roy. 1995. "The Consequences of Negotiated Settlements in Civil Wars, 1945-1993." *American Political Science Review* 89:681–90.

Mason, T. David. 2004. *Caught in the Crossfire: Revolution, Repression, and the Rational Peasant*. Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Mason, T. David, & Patrick Fett. 1996. "How Civil Wars End: A Rational Choice Approach." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 40(4):546–568.

Mason, T. David, Patrick J. Fett, & Joseph P. Weingarten Jr. 1999. "Win, Lose, or Draw: Predicting the Outcome of Civil Wars." *Political Research Quarterly* 52:239–68.

Meernik, James. 2001. "Domestic Politics and the Political Use of Miltiary Force by the United States." *Political Research Quarterly* 54(4):889–904.

Moore, Will H., & Stephen Shellman. 2007. "Whither Will They Go? A Global Study of Refugees -Destinations, 1965-1995." *International Studies Quarterly* 51(4):811–834.

Morgenthau, Hans J. 1973. *Politics Among Nations.* New York, New York: Alfred Knopf.

Mullenbach, Mark, & Gerard Matthews. 2008. "Deciding to Intervene: An Analysis of International and Domestic Influences on United States Interventions in Intrastate Disputes." *International Interactions* 34(1):25–52.

Mullenbach, Mark J. 2005. "Deciding to Keep the Peace: An Analysis of International Influences on the Establishment of Third-Party Peacekeeping Missions." *International Studies Quarterly* 49:529–555.

Nelder, John, & Robert Wedderburn. 1972. "Generalized Linear Models." *Journal of Royal Statistical Society* Series A(135):370–385.

Nevin, John. 1996. "War, Initiation and Selection by Consequences." *Journal of Peace Research* 33(1):99–108.

Ostrom, Charles, & Brian Job. 1986. "The President and the Political Use of Force." *The American Political Science Review* 80(2):541–566.

Pearson, Frederick S. 1974. "Foreign Military Intervention and Domestic Disputes." *International Studies Quarterly* 18(3):259–290.

Pickering, Jeffery. 2001. "The Conflict-prone and the Conflict-weary: War Outcomes and Types of Military Intervention." *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 29(2):221–239.

Pickering, Jeffery. 2002. "War-Weariness and Cumulative Effects: Victors, Vanquished, and Subsequent Interstate Intervention." *Journal of Peace Research* 39(3):313–337.

Record, Jeffery. 2002. *Making War, Thinking History: Munich, Vietnam, and Presidential Uses of Force from Korea to Kosovo.* Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press.

Regan, Patrick. 1996. "Conditions of Successful Third-Party Intervention in Intrastate Conflicts." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 40(2):336–359.

Regan, Patrick. 1998. “Choosing to Intervene: Outside Interventions in Internal Conflicts.” *Journal of Politics* 60(3):754–779.

Regan, Patrick. 2002. “Third-Party Interventions and the Duration of Intrastate Conflicts.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46(1):55–73.

Regan, Patrick, & Asegul Aydin. 2006. “Diplomacy and Other Forms of Intervention Into Civil Wars.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50(5):736–756.

Regan, Patrick M. 2000. *Civil Wars and Foreign Powers: Outside Intervention in Intrastate Conflict*. Ann Arbor,MI: Michigan.

Salehyan, Idean, & Kristian S. Gleditsch. 2006. “Refugees and the Spread of Civil War.” *International Organization* 60:335–366.

Sarkees, Meredith. 2000. “The Correlates of War Data on War: An Update to 1997.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 18(2):123–144.

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolution: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, Alastair. 1998. “International Crises and Domestic Politics.” *American Political Science Review* 92:623–38.

Stearns, Peter N., ed. 2001. *The Encyclopedia of World History*. Sixth ed. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Vertzberger, Yaacov. 1998. *Risk Taking and Decisionmaking: Foreign Military Intervention Decisions*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Walter, Barbara F. 1997. “The Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement.” *International Organization* 51(3):335–364.

Walter, Barbara F. 1999. "Designing Transitions from Civil War: Demobilization, Democratization, and Commitments to Peace." *International Organization* 24(1):127–155.

Waltz, Kenneth. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. New York: Random House.

Yoon, Mi. 1997. "Explaining U.S. Intervention in Third World Internal Wars, 1945-1989." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41(4):580–602.

Table 1: Civil Wars with Democratic Third Party Interventions.

Civil War	Date	Intervenor
Portugal vs. Conservatives (507)	1829–1834	United Kingdom
Netherlands vs. Belgians (509)	1830–1831	United Kingdom
Spain vs. Carlists of 1834 (515)	1834–1840	United Kingdom
Ottoman Empire vs. Mehmet Ali (519)	1839–1840	United Kingdom
China vs. Taipings (540)	1860–1864	United Kingdom
Morocco vs. Fez Caids of 1907 (590)	1907–1908	France
Iran vs. Constitutionalists (591)	1908–1909	Russia
Morocco vs. Fez Caids of 1911 (593)	1911–1911	France
Russia vs. anti–Bolsheviks (600)	1917–1921	France
		Japan
		United States
		United Kingdom
		Finland
China vs. Koumintang (612)	1926–1928	Japan
Spain vs. Fascists (629)	1936–1939	Italy
		Germany
Greece v Communists (630)	1944–1945	United Kingdom
Lebanon vs. Leftists of 1958 (650)	1958–1958	United States
Republic of Vietnam vs. NLF (654)	1961–1965	United States
Zaire vs. Katanga Leftists (655)	1960–1965	Belgium
Laos vs. Pathet Lao of 1963 (662)	1963–1973	United States
		Democratic Republic of Vietnam
Dominican Republic vs. Leftists (665)	1965–1965	United States
Chad vs. Frolinat of 1966 (669)	1966-1971	France
Cambodia vs. Khmer Rouge of 1970 (675)	1970–1975	United States
Lebanon vs. Leftists of 1975 (691)	1975–1990	Israel
Angola vs. UNITA of 1975 (693)	1975–1991	South Africa
Chad vs. Frolinat of 1980 (705)	1966-1971	France
Somalia vs. Clan Factions (713)	1982–1997	United States
		France
		Nigeria
		Italy
Sri Lanka vs. Tamils (715)	1987–1990	India
Liberia vs. Anti–Doe Rebels (727)	1989–1990	Nigeria
Azerbaijan vs. Nagorno–Karabakh (737)	1991–1994	Armenia
Liberia vs. NPFL and ULIMO (742)	1992–1995	Nigeria

Note: COW war number in parentheses.

Table 2: Extra-Systemic Wars with Democratic Third Party Interventions.

Extra-Systemic War	Date	Intervenor
British–Mahrattan (301)	1817–1818	United Kingdom
British–Kandyan (302)	1817–1818	United Kingdom
British–Burmese of 1823 (305)	1823–1826	United Kingdom
British–Ashanti of 1824 (306)	1824–1826	United Kingdom
British–Bharatpuran (309)	1825–1826	United Kingdom
British–Zulu of 1838 (311)	1838–1840	United Kingdom
British–Afghan of 1838 (313)	1838–1842	United Kingdom
First Opium (315)	1839–1842	United Kingdom
Franco–Algerian of 1839 (317)	1839–1947	France
Peruvian–Bolivian (318)	1841–1841	Peru
British–Baluchi (319)	1843–1843	United Kingdom
Uruguyan Dispute (320)	1843–1843	Argentina
		France
		United Kingdom
Franco–Moroccan (321)	1844–1844	France
British–Sikh of 1845 (322)	1845–1846	United Kingdom
British–Kaffir of 1846 (323)	1846–1847	United Kingdom
British–Sikh of 1848 (326)	1848–1849	United Kingdom
British–Kaffir of 1850 (327)	1850–1853	United Kingdom
British–Burmese of 1852 (329)	1852–1853	United Kingdom
British–Santal (330)	1855–1856	United Kingdom
Second Opium (331)	1856–1860	United Kingdom
Indian Mutiny (335)	1857–1859	United Kingdom
Franco–Indochinese of 1858 (337)	1858–1862	France
Argentine–Buenos Aries (338)	1859–1859	Argentina
British–Maorin (339)	1860–1870	United Kingdom
Spanish–Santo Dominican (341)	1863–1865	Spain
British–Bhutanese (342)	1865–1865	United Kingdom
British–Ethiopian (343)	1867–1868	United Kingdom
Spanish–Cuban of 1868 (345)	1868–1878	Spain
Franco–Algerian of 1871 (346)	1871–1872	France
British–Ashanti of 1873 (347)	1873–1874	United Kingdom
Franco–Tonkin (349)	1873–1885	France
Dutch–Achinese (350)	1873–1878	Netherlands
British–Kaffir of 1877 (353)	1877–1878	United Kingdom
British–Afghan of 1878 (356)	1878–1879	United Kingdom
British–Zulu of 1879 (358)	1879–1879	United Kingdom
Gun War (359)	1880–1881	United Kingdom
Boer War of 1880 (360)	1880–1881	United Kingdom
Franco–Tunisian of 1881 (362)	1882–1882	France
Franco–indochinese of 1882 (363)	1882–1884	France

Table 2 continued on next page.

Table 2 —continued

Extra-Systemic War	Date	Intervenor
British–Mahdi (364)	1882–1885	United Kingdom
Franco–Madagascan of 1883 (366)	1883–1885	France
British Burmese of 1885 (367)	1885–1886	United Kingdom
Mandingo (368)	1885–1886	France
Italo–Ethiopian of 1887 (372)	1887–1887	Italy
Franco–Dahomeyan (373)	1889–1892	France
Franco–Senegalese of 1890 (375)	1890–1891	France
British–Ashanti of 1893 (377)	1893–1894	United Kingdom
Dutch–Balian (379)	1894–1894	Netherlands
Franco–Madagascan of 1894 (380)	1894–1895	France
Spanish–Cuban of 1895 (381)	1895–1898	Spain
Italo–Ethiopian of 1895 (384)	1895–1896	Italy
Spanish–Philippino of 1896 (385)	1896–1898	Spain
Mahdi Uprising (387)	1886–1899	France
		United Kingdom
United Kingdom British–Nigerian (388)	1897–1897	United Kingdom
Indian Muslim (389)	1897–1898	United Kingdom
Hut Tax (391)	1898–1898	United Kingdom
American–Philippino (392)	1899–1902	United States
Somali Rebellion (393)	1899–1905	United Kingdom
Boer War of 1899 (395)	1899–1902	United Kingdom
British Conquest of Kano and Sokoto (396)	1903–1903	United Kingdom
British–Zulu of 1906 (400)	1906–1906	United Kingdom
First Moroccan (401)	1911–1912	France
		Spain
Sino–Tibertan of 1921 (402)	1912–1913	China
Second Moroccan (404)	1916–1917	France
		Spain
Sino–Tibetan of 1918 (405)	1918–1918	China
Caco Revolt (406)	1918–1920	United States
British–Afghan of 1919 (408)	1919–1919	United Kingdom
Franco–Syrian (409)	1920–1920	France
Iraqi–British (410)	1920–1921	United Kingdom
Italo–Ethiopian (412)	1920–1932	Italy
Riff Rebellion (413)	1921–1926	France
		Spain
Moplah Rebellion (414)	1921–1922	United Kingdom
Franco–Druze (416)	1925–1927	France
Saya san's Rebellion (417)	1930–1932	United Kingdom
British Palestine (418)	1936–1936	United Kingdom
Indonesian (420)	1945–1946	Netherlands
		United Kingdom

Table 2 continued on next page.

Table 2 —continued

Extra-Systemic War	Date	Intervenor
Franco–Indochinese of 1945 (421)	1945–1954	France
Franco–Madagascan of 1947 (422)	1947–1948	France
Malayan Rebellion (424)	1948/–1957	United Kingdom
Indo–Hyderbad (425)	1948–1948	India
Franco–Tunisian of 1952 (428)	1952–1954	France
British Mau Mau (429)	1952–1952	United Kingdom
Moroccan Independence (430)	1953–1956	France
Franco–Algerian of 1954 (432)	1954–1962	France
Cameron (433)	1955–1960	France
		United Kingdom
Angolan-Portugese (434)	1961-1975	Portugal
Guinean-Portugese (436)	1962-1974	Portugal
Mozambique-Portugese (437)	1964-1974	Portugal
Nambian (440)	1975–1988	South Africa

Note: COW war number in parentheses.

Table 3: Institutional Regime Changes (Civil Wars).

Civil War	Country	Incoming Regime (Year)
Portugal vs. Conservatives	United Kingdom	Tory (1841)
Netherlands vs. Belgians	United Kingdom	Whig (1830), Tory (1841)
Spain vs. Carlists of 1834	United Kingdom	Tory (1841), Liberal (1846)
Ottoman Empire vs. Mehmet Ali	United Kingdom	Tory (1841), Liberal (1846)
China vs. Taipings	United Kingdom	Liberal (1868), Conservative (1874)
Morocco vs. Fez Caids of 1907	France	SFIO (1909), RRRS (1911), RAD (1911), PRP (1912), SFIO (1913), GR (1913), RRRS (1913), RM (1914), PSR (1914), RM (1917), PSR (1917), RAD (1917)
Morocco vs. Fez Caids of 1911	France	RAD (1911), PRP (1912), SFIO (1913), GR (1913), RRRS (1913), RM (1914), PSR (1914), RM (1917), PSR (1917), RAD (1917), PSR (1920), GR (1920), PSR (1921)
Russia vs. anti-Bolsheviks	France	PSR (1920), GR (1920), PSR (1921), PRP (1922), PRN (1924), RAD (1924), PSR (1925), RAD (1926), PRP (1926), PSR (1929), GR (1929)
	Finland	NPP (1918), KOK (1920), NPP (1921), None (1922), ML (1922), ED (1924), KOK (1924), ML (1925), SDP (1926), ML (1927), NPP (1928)
	Japan	FC (1918), Military (1922), None (1923), Conservative (1924), FC (1927), CD (1929)
	United Kingdom	Conservative (1922), Labor (1924), Conservative (1924), Labor (1929)
	United States	Republican (1921)
China vs. Koumintang	Japan	CD (1929), FC (1931), Military (1932), None (1936), Military (1937), None (1937)
Spain vs. Fascists	Italy	AP (1945), DC (1945)
Greece v Communists	United Kingdom	Labor (1945), Conservative (1951)
Lebanon vs. Leftists of 1958	United States	Democrat (1961)
Republic of Vietnam vs. NLF	United States	Democrat (1961), Republican (1969)

Table 3 continued on next page.

Table 3 —continued

Civil War	Country	Incoming Regime (Year)
Zaire vs. Katanga Leftists	Belgium	BSP (1973)
Laos vs. Pathet Lao of 1963	United States	Republican (1969), Democrat (1977), Republican (1981)
Dominican Republic vs. Leftists	United States	Republican (1969)
Chad vs. Frolinat 1966	France	RI (1974), PS (1981)
Cambodia vs. Khmer Rouge of 1970	United States	Democrat (1977), Republican (1981)
Lebanon vs. Leftists of 1975	Israel	HER (1977), AVODA (1984), LIK (1986), AVODA (1992), LIK (1996),
Angola vs. UNITA of 1975	South Africa	ANC (1994)
Chad vs. Frolinat of 1980	France	RPR (1995)
Somalia vs. Clan Factions	United States	Democrat (1993)
	France	RPR (1995)
	Italy	None (1993), FI (1994), None (1995), PDS (1998), None (2000)
Sri Lanka vs. Tamils	India	JD (1989), INC (1991), BJP (1996), NF (1996), BJP (1996)
Azerbaijan vs. Nagorno-Karabakh	Armenia	None (1998)

Table 3 continued on next page.

Table 3 —continued

Civil War	Country	Incoming Regime (Year)

Sources: (Banks 1996, Cahoon 2008, Stearns 2001).

Key:

AP=Action Party; AVODA=Mifleget Avoda Hayisraelit;
BJP=Bharatiya Janata; BN=Bloc National;
BSP=Parti Socialiste Belge-Belgische Socialistische Partij; CD=Rikken Minseito;
DC=Partito Democratico del Cristiano;FC=Rikken Seiyukai;
FI=Forza Italia; GR=Gauche Républicaine;
HER=Herut; INC=Indian National Congress;
JD=Janata Dal; Lik=Likud; NF=National Front;
PDS=Democratici di Sinistra; PRN=Parti Républicain National;
PRP=Parti Républicaine Progressiste;
PS=Parti Socialiste; PSR=Parti Socialiste Républicain;
RI= Fédération Nationale des Républicains Indépendants;
RPR= Parti Républicaine Progressiste;
RRRS=Républicains Radicaux et Radicaux-Socialistes;
SFIO=Section Franaise del'Internationale Ouvrière.

Table 4: Institutional Regime Changes (Extra-Systemic Wars).

Extra-Systemic War	Country	Intervenors
British-Burmese of 1823	UKG	Whig (1830)
British-Ashanti of 1924	UKG	Whig (1830)
British-Bharatpuran	UKG	Whig (1830)
British-Zulu of 1838	UKG	Tory (1841), Liberal (1846)
British-Afghan of 1838	UKG	Tory (1841), Liberal (1846), Conservative (1852)
First Opium	UKG	Tory (1841), Liberal (1846), Conservative (1852)
British-Baluchi	UKG	Liberal (1846), Conservative (1852)
Uruguyan Dispute	UKG	Liberal (1846), Conservative (1852), Liberal (1955)
British-Sikh of 1845	UKG	Liberal (1846), Conservative (1852), Liberal (1855)
British-Kaffir of 1846	UKG	Liberal (1846), Conservative (1852), Liberal (1855)
British-Sikh of 1848	UKG	Conservative (1852), Liberal (1855), Conservative (1858)
British-Kaffir of 1850	UKG	Conservative (1852), Liberal (1855), Conservative (1858), Liberal (1859)
British-Burmese of 1852	UKG	Liberal (1855), Conservative (1858), Liberal (1859)
British-Santal	UKG	Liberal (1855), Conservative (1858), Liberal (1859), Conservative (1866)
Second Opium	UKG	Conservative (1858), Liberal (1859), Conservative (1866), Liberal (1868)
Indian Mutiny	UKG	Conservative (1858), Liberal (1859), Conservative (1866), Liberal (1868)
British-Maorin	UKG	Conservative (1866), Liberal (1868), Conservative (1874)
Spanish-Santo Dominican	Spain	PPG (1871), PL (1871), PM (1872), PPG (1872), PR (1873)
British-Bhutanese	UKG	Conservative (1866), Liberal (1868), Conservative (1874)
British-Ethiopian	UKG	Liberal (1868), Conservative (1874)
Spanish-Cuban of 1868	Spain	PPG (1871), PL (1871), PPG (1872), PRF (1873), PR (1873), PPG (1883), PL (1884)
Franco-Algerian of 1871	France	MacMahon (1873), RC (1879), RO (1879), GR (1880), RO (1881)
British-Ashanti of 1873	UKG	Conservative (1874), Liberal (1880)

Table 4 continued on next page.

Table 4 —continued

Extra-Systemic War	Country	Intervenors
Franco-Tonkin	France	MacMahon (1873), RC (1879), RO (1879), GR (1880), RO (1881), GR (1882), RAD (1883) GR (1883), RRRS(1885), RO (1886), RAD (1886), RO (1887), GR (1887), RAD (1888), GR (1889), RO (1890), GR (1892), RM (1892), GR (1893), RM (1895), RAD (1895)
Dutch-Achinese	Netherlands	Conservative (1874), Liberal (1877), Conservative (1879), ARP (1888)
British-Kaffir of 1877	UKG	Liberal (1880), Conservative (1885), Liberal-Conservative (1886), Conservative (1886)
British-Afghan of 1878	UKG	Liberal (1880), Conservative (1885), Liberal-Conservative (1886), Conservative (1886)
British-Zulu of 1879	UKG	Liberal (1880), Conservative (1885), Liberal-Conservative (1886), Conservative (1886)
Gun War	UKG	Conservative (1885), Liberal-Conservative (1886), Conservative (1886)
Boer War of 1880	UKG	Conservative (1885), Liberal-Conservative (1886), Conservative (1886)
Franco-Tunisian of 1881	France	RO (1881), GR (1882), RAD (1883) GR (1883), RRRS(1885), RO (1886), RAD (1886), RO (1887), GR (1887), RAD (1888), GR (1889), RO (1890), GR (1892)
Franco-indochinese of 1882	France	GR (1882), RAD (1883) GR (1883), RRRS(1885), RO (1886), RAD (1886), RO (1887), GR (1887), RAD (1888), GR (1889), RO (1890), GR (1892), RM (1892), GR (1893)
British-Mahdi	UKG	Conservative (1885), Liberal-Conservative (1886), Conservative (1886), Liberal (1892), Conservative (1895)
Franco-Madagascan of 1883	France	RRRS(1885), RO (1886), RAD (1886), RO (1887), GR (1887), RAD (1888), GR (1889), RO (1890), GR (1892), RM (1892), GR (1893), RM (1895), RAD (1895)
British Burmese of 1885	UKG	Conservative (1885), Liberal-Conservative (1886), Conservative (1886), Liberal (1892), Conservative (1895)

Table 4 continued on next page.

Table 4 —continued

Extra-Systemic War	Country	Intervenors
Mandingo	France	RRRS(1885), RO (1886), RAD (1886), RO (1887), GR (1887), RAD (1888), GR (1889), RO (1890), GR (1892), RM (1892), GR (1893), RM (1895), RAD (1895), RM (1896)
Italo-Ethiopian of 1887	Italy	DES (1891), PLI (1892), SIN (1893), DES (1896)
Franco-Dahomeyan	France	GR (1889), RO (1890), GR (1892), RM (1892), GR (1893), RM (1895), RAD (1895), RM (1896), RAD (1898), GR (1898), UR (1899), RAD (1902)
Franco-Senegalese of 1890	France	RO (1890), GR (1892), RM (1892), GR (1893), RM (1895), RAD (1895), RM (1896), RAD (1898), GR (1898), UR (1899)
British-Ashanti of 1893	UKG	Conservative (1895)
Dutch-Balian	Netherlands	OFL (1894), LU (1897), ARP (1901);
Franco-Madagascan of 1894	France	RM (1895), RAD (1895), RM (1896), RAD (1898), GR (1898), UR (1899), RAD (1902), RO (1905)
Spanish-Cuban of 1895	Spain	PC (1899), PL (1901), PC (1902), ID (1905), PL (1905), PC (1907)
Italo-Ethiopian of 1895	Italy	DES (1896), CS (1900), SIN (1901), PL (1903), CS (1905), CD (1906), PLI (1906)
Spanish-Philippino of 1896	Spain	PC (1899) PL (1901), PC (1902), ID (1905), PL (1905), PC (1907)
Mahdi Uprising	France	RAD (1898), GR (1898), UR (1899), RAD (1902), RO (1905), Radical (1906), SFIO (1909)
	UKG	Liberal (1905)
British-Nigerian	UKG	Liberal (1905)
Indian Muslim	UKG	Liberal (1905)
Hut Tax	UKG	Liberal (1905)
Somali Rebellion	UKG	Liberal (1905)
Boer War of 1899	UKG	Liberal (1905)
British Conquest of Kano and Sokoto	UKG	Liberal (1905)
First Moroccan	France	RRRS (1911), RAD (1911), PRP (1912), SFIO (1913), GR (1913), RRRS (1913), RM (1914), PSR (1914), RM (1917), PSR (1917),

Table 4 continued on next page.

Table 4 —continued

Extra-Systemic War	Country	Intervenors
		RAD (1917), PSR (1920), GR (1920), PSR (1921), PRP (1922)
	Spain	PC (1913), PL (1915), PC (1917), PL (1917), PC (1918), PL (1918), PC (1919)
Second Moroccan	France	RM (1917), PSR (1917), RAD (1917), PSR (1920), GR (1920), PSR (1921), PRP (1922), PRN (1924), RAD 91924), PSR (1925), RAD (1926), PRP (1926)
	Spain	PC (1917), PL (1917), PC (1918), PL (1918), PC (1919), PL (1922)
Caco Revolt	USA	Republican (1921)
British-Afghan of 1919	UKG	Conservative (1922), Labor (1924), Conservative (1924), Labor (1929)
Franco-Syrian	France	PSR (1920), GR (1920), PSR (1921), PRP (1922), PRN (1924), RAD (1924), PSR (1925), RAD (1926) PRP (1926), PSR (1929), GR (1929), RRRS (1930), GR (1930), RRRS (1930)
Iraqi-British	UKG	Conservative (1922), Labor (1924), Conservative (1924), Labor (1929)
Italo Ethiopian	Italy	PSRI (1921), PLI (1922), PNF (1922);
Riff Rebellion	France	PSR (1925), RAD (1926) PRP (1926), PSR (1929), GR (1929), RRRS (1930), GR (1930), RRRS (1930), BN (1931), GR (1932), RAD(1932), SFIO (1932), RRRS (1933), ARD (1934), IND (1935), BN (1935), RRRS (1936)
	Spain	PL (1922), PRC (1931), AR (1931), PRR (1933), PC (1935), IR (1935)
Moplah Rebellion	UKG	Conservative (1922), Labor (1924), Conservative (1924), Labor (1929)
Franco-Druze	France	RAD (1926), PRP (1926), PSR (1929), GR (1929), RRRS (1930), GR (1930), RRRS (1930), BN (1931), GR (1932), RAD(1932), SFIO (1932), RRRS (1933), ARD (1934), IND (1935), BN (1935), RRRS (1936), SFIO (1936)
Saya san's Rebellion	UKG	Conservative (1935)
British Palestine	UKG	Labor (1945)
Indonesian	Netherlands	KVP (1946), PVDA (1948)

Table 4 continued on next page.

Table 4 —continued

Extra-Systemic War	Country	Intervenors
	UKG	Conservative (1950)
Franco-Indochinese of 1945	France	MRP (1946), SFIO (1946), MRP (1947), RRRS (1948), MRP (1948), RRRS (1948), MRP (1949), RRRS (1950), UDSR (1950), RRRS (1951), UDSR (1951), RRRS (1952), CNIP (1952), RAD (1953), CNIP (1953), RRRS (1954), SFIO (1956), RRRS (1957), MRP (1958), UNR (1959)
Franco-Madagascan of 1947	France	RRRS (1948), MRP (1948), RRRS (1948), MRP (1949), RRRS (1950), UDSR (1950), RRRS (1951), UDSR (1951), RRRS (1952), CNIP (1952), CNIP (1952), RAD (1953), CNIP (1953), RRRS (1954), SFIO (1956), RRRS (1957), MRP (1958)
Malayan Rebellion	UKG	Conservative (1950), Labor (1964)
Franco-Tunisian of 1952	France	RRRS (1952), CNIP (1952), RAD (1953), CNIP (1953), RRRS (1954), SFIO (1956), RRRS (1957), MRP (1958), UNR (1959)
British Mau Mau	UKG	Labor (1964)
Moroccan Independence	France	RAD (1953), CNIP (1953), RRRS (1954), SFIO (1956), RRRS (1957), MRP (1958), UNR (1959)
Franco-Algerian of 1954	France	SFIO (1956), RRRS (1957), MRP (1958), UNR (1959)
Cameron	France	SFIO (1956), RRRS (1957), MRP (1958), UNR (1959)
	UKG	Labor (1964), Conservative (1970)
Angolan-Portugese	Portugal	none (1978), CDS (1980), PSD (1981), PS (1983), PSD (1985)
Guinean-Portugese	Portugal	none (1978), CDS (1980), PSD (1981), PS (1983)
Mozambique-Portugese	Portugal	none (1978), CDS (1980), PSD (1981), PS (1983), PSD (1985)

Table 4 continued on next page.

Table 4 —continued

Extra-Systemic War	Country	Intervenors

Sources: (Banks 1996, Cahoon 2008, Stearns 2001).

Key:

ARP=Anti-Revolutionaire Partij; AR=Agrario;ARD=Alliance Républicaine Démocratique;
BN=Bloc National;CD=Centro-Destra; CDS=Centro Democrático Social;
CNIP=Centre National des Indépendants et Paysans;CS=Centro-Sinistra; DES= Destra;
GR=Gauche Républicaine;ID=Izquierda Democratico; IND=Indépendant;
IR=Izquierda Republicana; KVP=Katholieke Volkspartij; LU=Liberale Unie;
MRP=Mouvement Républicain Populaire; OFL =Old or Free Liberals;
PC=Partido Liberal Conservador; PL=Partido Liberal (Spain);PLI=Partito Liberale (Italy);
PM=Partido Monárquico Constitutional;PNF=Partito Nazionale Fascista; PPG=Partido Progresista;
PR=Partido Republicano; PRC=Partido Republicano Conservador;PRF=Partido Republicano Federalista;
PRN=Parti Républicain National;PRP=Parti Républicaine Progressiste;
PRR=Partido Republicano Radical; PS=Partido Socialista; PSD= Partido Social Democrata;
PSR=Parti Socialiste Républicain; PSRI=Partito Socialista Reformista Italiano;
PVDA=Partij van de Arbeid; RAD=Parti Radical;
RC =Républicain Conservateur; RM=Républicain Modéré; RO=Républicain Opportuniste;
RRRS=Républicains Radicaux et Radicaux-Socialistes; SFIO=Section Franaise de l'Internationale Ouvrière;
SIN=Sinistra; UDSR=Union Démocratique et Socialiste de la Résistance; UNR=Union pour la Nouvelle République.

Table 5: Institutionalized Executive Changes in Democratic Third Parties During & Following Intervention in Civil Wars (1816–2000).

Executive Changes	Frequency in Sample
0	7
1	9
2	9
3	1
4	2
5	2
6	2
11	1
12	2
13	1

Note: Includes executive changes occurring during, and ten years following, and intervention into a civil war.

Table 6: Institutionalized Executive Changes in Democratic Third Parties During & Following Intervention in Extra-Systemic Wars (1816–2000).

Executive Changes	Frequency in Sample
0	15
1	16
2	7
3	13
4	15
5	6
6	4
7	5
8	1
9	1
10	1
12	2
13	2
14	3
15	1
17	3
20	1
21	1

Note: Includes executive changes occurring during, and ten years following, an intervention into an extra-systemic war.

Table 7: Democratic Third-Party Institutional Executive Changes During & Following Intervention, Extra-systemic Conflicts (Negative Binomial Models.)

Variable	(1)	(2)
Distance	0.295***	0.358***
	(0.070)	(0.065)
Victory	0.832**	0.99***
	(0.35)	(0.38)
Casualties	-0.013	0.158
	(0.057)	(0.22)
Simultaneous Interventions	-0.333	-0.463**
	(0.23)	(0.19)
Retribution	-0.181	-0.328*
	(0.22)	(0.18)
Opposition Mass Killing	-0.262	-0.263
	(0.26)	(0.20)
Economic Crisis	0.888***	0.646***
	(0.26)	(0.24)
Constant	-3.236***	-3.582***
	(0.61)	(0.59)
N	97	94
R^2	.06	.08
p	4.67e-09	0
χ^2	52.06	64.65

Note: Coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses.
Two-tailed significance: $***p< .01$, $**p< .05$, $*p< .10$

Table 8: Democratic Third-Party Institutional Executive Changes During and Following Intervention, Civil Wars (Poisson Models).

Variable	(1)	(2)
Distance	-0.104*	-0.0018
	(0.058)	(0.069)
Victory	-0.477	-0.394
	(0.30)	(0.33)
Casualties	-0.432***	-0.351***
	(0.085)	(0.085)
Third-Party Competition	-1.514***	-1.233***
	(0.55)	(0.63)
Retribution	1.206***	1.340***
	(0.27)	(0.26)
Opposition Mass Killing	0.905***	0.723***
	(0.26)	(0.27)
Prime Ministerial System	0.620*	0.940***
	(0.35)	(0.31)
Economic Crisis	-0.212	-0.157
	(0.49)	(0.46)
Constant	-0.361	-1.494*
	(0.73)	(0.78)
N	36	34
R^2	.45	.44
p	0	0
χ^2	67.52	104.6

Note: Coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses.
Two-tailed significance: $***$p< .01, $**$p< .05, $*$p< .10

Table 9: Simulated Institutional Executive Changes for the United States, United Kingdom & France, Simulated Intervention into Darfur (from Table 8, Model 1).

Variable	United States	United Kingdom	France
Baseline	.91	1.7	.99
Victory	.52	1.1	.56
Opposition Mass Killing	2.6	4.5	2.6
Retribution	3.4	6.2	3.7
Competition	.24	.42	.24
Casualties (1st quartile)	.93	1.7	1.0
Casualties (Median)	.73	1.4	.81
Casualties (3rd Quartile)	.48	.94	.51
Casualties (Max)	.05	.07	.04
Darfur Intervention	1.3	2.7	1.4

Figure 1: Observation Period for Identifying Democratic Third Party Intervenor Institutional Regime Changes.