http://www.jstor.org

Worldviews in Foreign Policy: Realism, Liberalism, and External Conflict

Thomas S. Mowle
United States Air Force Academy

International relations studies have been unable to determine whether realist or liberal theories better fit state behavior in various situations, possibly because these studies have attributed motive and action to the states rather than to the decision-makers within them. This article develops a new, more direct approach to resolving this problem. Hypotheses were tested regarding conditions under which decision-makers are likely to articulate a problem representation consistent with liberal or realist elements of a worldview. This was done by content analysis of statements about 36 foreign conflicts by the governments of three "bystander" nations—the United States, Canada, and India—over a 16-year period. The findings indicate that systemic and situational factors are far more important than domestic factors. States tend to represent wars in congruence with liberalism primarily when their security is already assured by another power or when the conflict does not involve allies, rivals, or fellow democracies. Thus, most of the expectations of realism are supported at the psychological level.

Liberal and realist theories of international behavior present quite different visions of how states interact with one another. Although individual scholars differ in their presentation of these paradigms, those in each school tend to share some basic principles. For example, realists generally suggest that interstate cooperation is severely limited by each state's need to guarantee its own security in a global condition of anarchy, whereas liberals suggest that cooperation can be made more tenable through formal or informal institutions. These positions have been debated over the years—from Carr (1939) through Grieco (1988, 1990, 1993) and Keohane (1993)—but political scientists have so far been unable to show that either of these understandings of the world better explains how states actually behave.

One reason it has been difficult to choose between the two explanations is that scholars differ when interpreting the evidence: Where one scholar sees liberal institutionalism, another sees self-interest. At the broadest level of policy, Layne and Schwarz (1993, p. 5) described U.S. foreign policy since the 1950s as "liberal internationalist," whereas Mearsheimer (1995, p. 5) contrasted President Clinton's "neo-Wilsonism" with Cold War "balance of power politics." At a much narrower level of policy, Grieco (1993, p. 327) and Keohane (1993, p. 280) both examined the same states' opposition to a steel anti-dumping agreement. While Grieco wrote that the opposition showed realist concern for relative gains, Keohane wrote that the opposition showed liberal concern for absolute gains. As Keohane admitted (1993, p. 279), the problem is that "two parties that are indifferent to one another's welfare will behave, at the margin, *as if* they care about relative gains." Keohane is right: Liberalism and realism are as much qualities of motive as they are of action. A comparison of the two approaches must somehow pry open the intent behind the action. In other words, it must shift the level of analysis from the state—which has neither intent nor independent action—to the individuals within the state who direct purposive action, as suggested by Byman and Pollack (2001).

This article uses problem representations and worldviews to break through the ambiguity often found when one tries to interpret large-scale state actions. These questions are examined in the context of a common, important, and under-studied situation: A state is faced with an "external conflict"—a war or other military action to which it is not initially a party (but in which it may later intervene). This article's findings are generally consistent with the systemic and situational factors suggested by Waltz (1979), Grieco (1988), and Maoz and Russett (1993). In particular, it appears that decision-makers tend to express a problem representation consistent with a realist worldview more often in situations when the external conflict is objectively more important to that state.

Worldviews and Problem Representations

A state's behavior is not reflexive; rather, it flows from the way its foreign policy decision-makers understand what is happening. For example, members of the Reagan administration in the mid-1980s believed that cooperation with the Soviets would produce Soviet assertiveness, not further cooperation (Jervis, 1988, p. 326). Others could (and did) define the situation and the appropriate U.S. strategy differently. These assumptions—which include images of other actors in the world, causal beliefs about how they interact with one another, and prescriptions about appropriate courses of action—constitute a "worldview" (Barber, 1993, p. 131; Cottam & McCoy, 1998, p. 117; Doyle, 1997, p. 17; Young, 1998, p. 215). The worldview influences the way individuals interact with reality: "Beliefs set up expectations, and when an event occurs, we are likely to interpret the event in relation to our expectations" (Voss & Dorsey, 1992, p. 11). Related research includes Holsti's (1962) and Jervis' (1976) work with perception, Brecher's

(1972) attitudinal prism, and Wendt's (1992, p. 397) discussion of the meaning of anarchy.

The worldview is not, unfortunately, directly observable. One approach to describing an individual worldview in detail is to follow in the footsteps of Axelrod's (1977) cognitive mapping or George's (1979) operational codes, as has been done by Dille (2000), Dille and Young (2000), Schafer and Crichlow (2000), and Walker (1995). This approach is similar to Hermann's (1988) work on Hafez al-Assad. This method is difficult to apply, however, where many actors are relevant in a state. Furthermore, the results cannot easily be generalized to other individuals, even (in Hermann's case) to Assad's fellow Baathist Saddam Hussein. Hence, this approach is not well suited to addressing the debate between realism and liberalism in international relations, although it is an essential part of understanding and predicting the behavior of a specific state and its leader.

The approach used in this article is not to develop a full map of the worldview, but rather to address only those aspects of the worldview relevant to the representation of external conflicts. Further simplifying this approach, it assumes that this partial worldview could align more or less with realism or liberalism. This is a reasonable assumption if we consider where worldviews, especially the worldviews of foreign policy decision-makers, originate. The lens of academia ultimately frames their vision of international affairs. They are trained either directly in universities or by advisors with formal training. Their vision, however, will be somewhat blurred. Decision-makers are usually not theorists (Kissinger being an exception), because they must use judgment to make foreign policy decisions that affect their state (George, 1993). Therefore, what they understand of international political theory will be stripped down—a worldview lacking in the subtlety of the theories of Waltz (1979) or Russett (1993).

Most commonly, national decision-makers will see the broad outlines, dimly traced to illuminating undergraduate lectures, of assertions as to what actions are generally appropriate. In other words, worldviews do not spring randomly from each individual's unique experiences, but are learned through a combination of formal study and socialization with other policymakers. Doyle (1997, p. 36) suggested that at least in "Western" countries, these worldviews will be parallel to the major theoretical approaches. Tetlock (1993) observed that "policymakers have been found to rely heavily on theory-driven as opposed to data-driven processing of incoming evidence" (p. 323) and that "the influence tactics that policymakers adopt are profoundly colored by psychological and political assumptions they hold concerning (a) the most effective strategies for eliciting desired responses from other states and (b) the nature of other states and the probable responses of the states" (p. 326).

Theories of international politics contain assertions analogous to those of a worldview about how international actors behave. A leader may naïvely believe that a multilateral institution can lead to lasting cooperation between states; the astute theorist may conclude that the presence of orderly regimes alters the basic causal variables that would otherwise promote conflict between states (Krasner,

1983, p. 361). Another leader may simply be certain that human nature drives other leaders to lust for power; the sophisticated political scientist may deduce that states must be power-seeking, not security-seeking, because otherwise the security dilemma would have fallen apart years ago to produce harmony (Mearsheimer, 2001; Schweller, 1996, pp. 117–118). Keohane (1986), referring to the importance of developing theory from assumptions, has stated, "No one can cope with the complexities of world politics without the aid either of a theory or of implicit assumptions and propositions that substitute, however poorly, for theory. Reality has to be ordered into categories, and relationships drawn between events" (p. 4).

This method evaluates problem representations to infer a worldview that can be compared with realism and liberalism. A problem representation is a mental model of goals, constraints, preferred solutions, and expectations about the effectiveness of various tactics (Beasley, 1998, pp. 81–83; Newell & Simon, 1972; Voss, 1998, pp. 9–13). This is similar to Snyder, Bruck, and Sapin's (1962, pp. 64–65) "definition of a situation" (Voss & Dorsey, 1992, p. 6). Problem representations help decision-makers to solve complex problems by breaking them down into smaller, more manageable problems. These representations are inherently tied to elements of their belief structure, as discussed by Simon (1969, pp. 68–72), Sylvan, Majeski, and Milliken (1991, p. 328), and Sylvan and Voss (1998).

The problem representation can influence future courses of action. Allison (1971, p. 1) classically asked, "Why did the Soviet Union place strategic offensive missiles in Cuba?" By so structuring the situation, he specified that the problem facing U.S. decision-makers was "How should we respond to the strategic offensive missiles in Cuba?" Further research has shown that once ExComm interpreted the raw intelligence information as "Soviet strategic offensive missiles" (as opposed to, perhaps, "deterrent enhancements to the Cuban right to defend itself"), its members became less likely to choose the less forceful options (Sylvan & Thorson, 1992; Thorson, 1984).

Problem representations can be found in official statements issued about the state's policy and purpose. This use of public statements raises an important question about the validity of this approach, which must be addressed before proceeding. One must define foreign policy in terms of observable behavior, not unobservable "goals." Public statements, an observable behavior, can be aggregated to discover trends in policy stances (Hermann, 1978). Much of the best international relations research (Grieco, 1990, pp. 182–183; Hellman & Wolf, 1993; Mastanduno, 1991) uses policy statements to seek out liberalism or realism. This holds as well for much of the research done on problem representations (e.g., Breuning, 1998; Tetlock, 1985; Young, 1998). This article follows the approach of Cottam and McCoy (1998, pp. 129–139), who emphasized that they were not seeking private images, but rather those that represented the collective Carter administration. Because "foreign policy is a public enterprise . . . one can mean-ingfully refer to publicly-expressed problem representations" (Sylvan, 1998,

p. 340). To a certain extent, one has little choice: Internal documents are rarely available for comparison, and they will not provide very many cases to build upon. Private memoirs are open to the author's spin, and even alleged transcripts may not faithfully represent the proceedings (Gaenslen, 1992, pp. 172–176). Analyzing public statements to discern the underlying worldviews moves toward Riker's (1977, pp. 28–29) ideal of scientific progress through studying patterns in small, repeated events rather than trying to "generalize about huge events which turn out to belong to classes with very few members." With a large N, trial balloons or statements that do not accurately reflect the official problem representation can be expected to have limited impact on the overall study, and such inaccurate problem representations would tend to make the analytical results appear to be less significant than they would be if we were able to exclude such cases.

Further reducing the concern about the validity of public statements, this article is not concerned with individuals and their personal worldviews. Instead, the focus is on observable "official" problem representations that result from the policymaking process. In order to respond to an external conflict (or any other situation), the decision-makers must agree upon, or agree to accept, a "group" problem representation. Hoffman (1993) and Janis (1982) both provided examples of decision-making groups that come to accept a common representation of the problem despite their own privately held views. Billings and Hermann (1998) concluded, "Among group members there may be different problem representations initially, but it is most unlikely that the group can move to closure on a decision without tacit acceptance, if not total agreement, among most members on the problem representation" (p. 56). Rubino-Hallman (1998) and Sylvan and Haddad (1998) have both demonstrated the formation of group representations in their empirical work. Voss and Dorsey (1992), citing the work of Cottam (1977), concurred with the approach used in this article: "From the policy adopted by a given state, one can infer a prevailing worldview approximating that held by a hypothetical decision maker" (p. 16). If different worldviews would produce different problem representations, then we can infer elements of the underlying collective worldview by beginning with the problem representation.

This approach requires us to be able to isolate elements of problem representations, from which one infers a worldview to compare with realism and liberalism. We can begin by treating realism and liberalism as coherent worldviews. We can then deduce what sort of problem representation would be developed by a hypothetical person whose worldview corresponded precisely to realism or liberalism. We can identify the elements of those ideal problem representations of an external conflict that would be distinctly realist or liberal. Five such indicators are described below. We can then search for those indicators among problem representations found in official statements about external conflicts. The presence of these indicators can be used to infer the extent to which the actual worldview that shaped a particular problem representation corresponds to a purely realist or liberal worldview.

Indicators of Realist and Liberal Worldviews

Before identifying characteristic indicators of these ideal worldviews, and then moving on to develop hypotheses, we must establish the nature of realism and liberalism. This is more difficult than one might anticipate, for the terms have been used somewhat casually over time. On the other hand, this article is not the place to recreate the entire history of realism and liberalism, for which there are many existing sources in addition to those described here.[1]

Doyle (1997, pp. 93–136) followed the standard division in describing the classical realism typified by Morgenthau (1985, pp. 4–17) and the structural realism typified by Waltz (1979, pp. 105–107). Legro and Moravcsik (1999, pp. 12–17) asserted that a core assumption of all realisms is that the relevant actors are "rational unitary political units in anarchy"—in other words, states. Moreover, state goals are fundamentally conflictual, although they may be "deterred or dissuaded" from pursuing their preferences by superior power wielded by other states. Conflicts between states are resolved on the basis of material capabilities. The resulting pattern of behavior, as described by Mearsheimer (1995, pp. 11–12), is mutual fear and suspicion between states, an emphasis on short-term interests, and the pursuit of relative advantage over other states. Mearsheimer (2001) has further elaborated the view that states seek power, which has been called offensive realism, following Schweller's (1996, pp. 117–118) observation that if all states only seek security, then the basis of conflict would have dwindled away over time. This is the realism that forms the basis of both the criteria below and the later hypotheses.

Liberalism is, if anything, even less unified. Nye (1988, p. 246) described commercial, democratic, sociological, and institutional variants; these set aside the Wilsonian "liberal idealism," which is more akin to the utopianism critiqued by Carr (1939). These liberalisms tend to overlap, as described by Doyle (1997, pp. 230–300), in that each type of liberalism has at its root a phenomenon described by Krasner (1983, p. 361): An institution, broadly defined, either moderates state preferences or constrains state actions. Rather than relying directly on power to achieve narrow self-interests, "actors invoke norms as shortcuts to their decision problems" (Kratochwil, 1993, p. 471). The following criteria and the later

---

[1] For additional descriptions of the differences and commonalities between liberalism and realism, see Baldwin (1993, pp. 4–8), Kegley (1995), Mearsheimer (1995), Niou and Ordeshook (1991, p. 484), Powell (1994, pp. 340–343), and Wendt (1992, pp. 391–393). Realism is also described by Claude (1962, pp. 90–92), Grieco (1990), Hellman and Wolf (1993), and Kaplan (1957, pp. 23–29). Liberalism is described by Deutsch et al. (1957), Doyle (1986), Goldstein and Keohane (1993), Keohane (1984), Keohane and Nye (1977), Lake (1992), Maoz and Russett (1993), Martin (1992), Mitrany (1966), and Rosenau (1990). Collective security is advocated by Bennett (1988, p. 135), Cusack and Stoll (1992, p. 5), and Riggs and Plano (1994, pp. 100–101) and is seen as unworkable by Betts (1992), Claude (1962, pp. 97–110), Kupchan and Kupchan (1991), Mearsheimer (1995), and Morgenthau (1985, p. 452).

hypotheses follow this general understanding of liberalism, with some emphasis on the most relevant variants—those of democratic peace, derived from the research agenda pioneered by Russett (1993), and neoliberal institutionalism, best described by Keohane (1993).

From these idealized forms of realism and liberalism, the following five criteria can be deduced as being most likely to distinguish a problem representation of an external conflict that flows from a realist worldview from one that flows from a liberal worldview:

1. *Concern for relative versus absolute gains accruing to different actors as a result of the external conflict.* This indicator is central to the literature (see, e.g., Keohane, 1993; Niou & Ordeshook, 1991; Waltz, 1979). A realist problem representation of an external conflict would include the question "Can my state suffer a relative loss based on the outcome of this conflict?" If some other state can achieve a relative gain, then some action (external or internal) should be taken to counter it. Likewise, people with a realist worldview would be interested in exploiting any potential gains their own state could accrue from the conflict, whether it is interstate or intrastate. If a coalition exists, realists would expect to see dissension among the partners over distributing the spoils of war (see Krasner, 1991). Those with a liberal worldview, on the other hand, take positions "based on their assessments of their own welfare, not that of others" (Keohane, 1984, p. 66) and are "indifferent to the gains achieved by others" (Grieco, 1988, p. 487). A liberal problem representation would address whether one's own state can gain or lose power, without explicit concern for the differential impact on other states.

2. *A primary concern with one's own interests versus collective norms and interests.* Neither side of the debate excludes the relevance of either norms or interests, but the emphasis differs. Some realists assert that interests, beyond the basic interest of survival, are assigned by the relative distribution of national capabilities (Powell, 1994, pp. 317–318). The more precise interests, however—those likely to be found in policy statements—would be endogenous and unique to the state. Liberals, on the other hand, believe institutional norms can change state leaders' conceptions of their own interests (Keohane, 1993, p. 271). A realist problem representation would consider the effects of a conflict on the material, short-term and security-related, interests of the state. A liberal problem representation would derive longer-term "interests" from the norms of an international community, often enshrined in a formal institution. One example of this is U.S. National Security Advisor Anthony Lake's 1993 remark that "to the extent democracy and market economics hold sway in other nations, our own nation will be more secure, prosperous and influential" (cited by Layne, 1994, p. 46). Lake's remarks, and later UN involvement in several internal conflicts, suggest that these norms have evolved to cover internal as well as international conflicts. A collective security system would be the ultimate expression of a liberalism in which interests are defined in terms of a community norm of peaceful resolution of dis-

putes. In Betts' (1992) words, "community of power replaces balance of power" (p. 203).

3. *Emphasis on protection of one's own state versus protection of others in an international community.* The classic arguments for balance of power (e.g., Claude, 1962, p. 127; Waltz, 1979, p. 118) rely on the ultimate fear that others who become more powerful may eventually threaten one's own state. In contrast, the liberal response is motivated more by outrage than by fear. The illegitimate use of force constitutes "cheating" against an institution of stability, which must be punished lest the institution be brought down (Axelrod & Keohane, 1993, pp. 94–105; Powell, 1991, p. 1308). This view can be traced back to Kant and especially to Grotius. In a Kantian worldview, one shares a common interest with many others against an opposing set of "oppressors" against whom any action is justified, even obligatory. The Grotian worldview emphasizes that states must follow rules so as to maintain a World International Society (Bull, 1985, pp. 30–33). Liberal problem representations would focus on "justice" and identifying the "aggressor," whereas realist problem representations would focus on "danger" and "threat." This indicator has a more narrowly military focus than the previous one.

4. *Viewing the conflict's ramifications in terms of the combatants only, versus in terms of the lessons that might be taken by other states.* Both realists and liberals concern themselves with the aftermath of a conflict, but realism once again casts these concerns more narrowly. Claude (1962, p. 127) saw states in a balance system as most concerned with the participants in the conflict. Morgenthau (1985, p. 67) saw victory in war as often leading to imperialist policies. Waltz (1979) would also focus on the potential relative gain by one of the combatants if it wins. For example, a realist in the early 1990s might have argued that if Serbia were not prevented from conquering Bosnia, it would next try to attack Macedonia or recover Croatia. There would be no reason to presume, however, that any other state would observe Serbian success and conclude that it also could use military force to resolve border grievances. The liberal worldview, on the other hand, considers the impact on other countries' behavior: "Aggression" must be punished, or "genocide" stopped, because the successful use of force could encourage other countries to follow suit. The history of the 1930s, in which all three Axis powers seem to have been encouraged by the lack of effective response to each other's military actions, provides a solid example. The policy of appeasement was not an expression of liberalism—it was a combination of "liberal" idealism as critiqued heavily by Carr (1939) and a realism of trying to divert war toward other targets (Christensen & Snyder, 1990). Returning to Serbia in the 1990s, the liberal would have been concerned that Serbian victory might undermine international norms against overrunning sovereign members of the United Nations, committing genocide against religious minorities, and using armed force to settle disputes. This might lead other countries (Russia, for example) to follow the same strategy. Layne and Schwarz (1993) cited President Clinton along these lines.

5. *Viewing alliances and multilateral institutions as a tool of the state versus as the goal of the state.* For realists, coalitions are useful tools for improving one's chances of favorably influencing the future distribution of national capabilities—"temporary marriages of convenience, where today's alliance partner might be tomorrow's enemy" (Mearsheimer, 1995, p. 11). Any coalition-building effort, however, would be independent of any initial actions taken, because the threat, if there is one, must be addressed with or without assistance. The states would also tend not to allow the alliance to direct their actions, because states have a strong interest in retaining their independence (Grieco, 1993, p. 315; see also Hellman & Wolf, 1993, pp. 9–10; Morgenthau, 1985, pp. 201–202; Walt, 1987). For liberals, on the other hand, the international community has defined the norms being violated. Institutions, which need not be organizations (Stein, 1993, p. 46), encourage states to work multilaterally even where interests do not converge. Because maintaining the institution is an important value in itself, individual states defer to the group decision on actions to be taken, even if that decision is not the state's ideal policy choice (Stein, 1993). Thus, the position taken with respect to the external conflict will follow the lead and guidance of other states in the institution.

In principle, of course, a problem representation could include both sides of some of these criteria. For example, the state could be concerned with both the immediate combatants and the lesson others would take from it. Likewise, both national and community interests could be affected by a war. If both are present, then one looks to other indicators to decide whether the problem representation seems to better fit realism or liberalism; if these are inconclusive, then one evaluates the problem representation as mixed. Nothing in this method assumes that all problem representations can be categorized, nor that all the worldviews one infers from them will be close to an ideal form of liberalism or realism.

Hypotheses

This article examines states' responses to external conflicts—"foreign" wars and military engagements in which they were not an initial participant. Such conflicts may be remote from any power interest (as in Somalia), or they may involve a military rival (as in the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan) or threaten an important economic resource (as in the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait). In some of these conflicts, the initial bystander nation eventually intervenes with diplomatic, economic, or military power.

This topic is suitable methodologically, yielding a large number of cases, because the leaders of states must consider how their state should react to an external conflict much more often than to one in which their state is an initial protagonist. Substantive reasons also guide this choice of issue area. As Levy (1989, p. 216) has noted, the field of international relations has paid too little attention

to the issue of interventions into ongoing conflicts.[2] This seems curious, considering that all major wars begin as a conflict between two states. For example, the decisions of initial "bystanders" were rather important in the Austro-Serbian war of 1914, the German-Polish war of 1939, the Korean civil war of 1950, and the Iraq-Kuwait war of 1990. This article lays a foundation for examining the conditions when intervention into an ongoing conflict is likely, and the expected nature of that intervention.

"External conflict" is defined using the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute's definition of war (Sollenberg, 1995, p. 20): "a contested incompatibility which concerns government and/or territory where armed force is used between two parties, of which at least one is the government of a state"— and for this study, neither party is the government or citizenry of the state observing the war. This does not place a lower limit on the conflict, as in the common definition used by Small and Singer (1982), in part for the sake of thoroughness and in part because the leaders of the initial bystander state under study cannot be sure of the final extent of casualties. This study does not distinguish between intrastate and interstate conflicts because that question may be wrapped up in the problem representation, as in Bosnia. Furthermore, many of these conflicts have both intrastate and interstate elements.

One difficulty with this choice of subject is that the literature on international politics is relatively sparse in terms of specific hypotheses concerning what a realist or a liberal might focus on with respect to an external conflict. Blainey (1988, pp. 57–67) noted that the combatants' expectations about bystanders' behavior are important, but did not offer a way to predict that behavior. Liberals tend to be less concerned about external conflict than realists. Morgenthau (1985) suggested that "the standard for judging . . . involvement and for determining the response of . . . policymakers was whether an important shift in the distribution of power was taking place and hence of the status quo" (p. 57). This raises the question of why the conflict was "important."

The following hypotheses are thus somewhat eclectic in their sources. They are grouped into three levels of analysis. The two systemic hypotheses, based on a state's position in the international system, must be derived primarily from realism, because liberalism does not have a fully systemic version. Situational hypotheses, based on attributes of the conflicts themselves, come from a mixture of realist and liberal sources. Three of these are derived from Grieco's (1988) assertion that "the coefficient for a state's sensitivity to gaps in payoffs . . . will be greater if a state's partner is a long-term adversary rather than a long-term ally;

[2] This question was a major focus of Blainey (1988) and has also been examined by Alteld and Bueno de Mesquita (1979), Brecher and Wilkenfeld (1982), Bueno de Mesquita (1981), Butterworth (1978), Cusack and Eberwein (1982), Eberwein (1982), Eckhardt and Azar (1978), Gochman and Long (1983), Gochman and Maoz (1984), Haas (1983), Kaw (1990), Kegley and Raymond (1986), Kim (1991), Pearson (1974a, 1974b), Raymond and Kegley (1987), and Siverson and King (1980). Alker and Christenson (1972) and Alker and Greenberg (1977) examined circumstances under which the United Nations intervenes in wars.

if the issue involves security rather than economic well-being; if the state's rela-tive power has been on the decline rather than on the rise" (p. 501). To these realist hypotheses, we add a liberal one based on whether a democracy is in the conflict. Finally, we have three domestic hypotheses. The one based on economic per-formance is enough of a state attribute to be derived from realism, whereas the other two must be derived primarily from liberalism, because realists do not look within the state.

Note that this article does not hypothesize that any individual worldview is changing so readily from liberalism to idealism. Although realist and liberal the-ories can be viewed as distinct "ideal" worldviews, this is not to say that any indi-vidual, or any group of individuals, holds such a "pure" liberal or realist worldview (Doyle, 1997, pp. 17–37). Real worldviews would almost certainly be more complex, along the lines suggested by Russett (1993, pp. 31–34) in his nor-mative explanation of the democracy-peace puzzle. Decision-makers in a market democracy may tend to have one set of beliefs about how other market democ-racies will behave or react, and a very different set of beliefs about how the leaders of less developed states will behave or react, yet these sets of beliefs could easily coexist within a single coherent worldview. In this case, the hypotheses will suggest scripts that are likely to trigger the more realist or liberal dimensions of the complex actual worldview (Larson, 1994; Shank & Abelson, 1977). Further-more, this article does not define any individual worldview, but infers a "group worldview" that has been expressed in the group's problem representation. Changes in the problem representation may reflect competition among members of the decision group, as seen in the Carter administration (Campbell, 2001; Lebow & Stein, 1993) or in debate within the first Bush administration over whether the war in Bosnia was an internal or international conflict (Baker, 1995, p. 637; Bert, 1997, p. 97; Woodward, 2000, pp. 217–231). This article does not address the process by which a single problem representation is developed from each decision-maker's individual representation.[3]

Systemic Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: *If a state has its security guaranteed by another state, then it will be more likely to express a liberal problem representation of external con-*

---

[3] Axelrod (1977) argued that interests in complex situations are discovered through the decision process, not separately from it. Shapiro and Bonham (1982) argued that the power and interests of the individuals in the group strongly influence the final problem representation. The best recent work on the subject is by Sylvan and Voss (1998). Within that text, Beasley (1998) found approaches that emphasize "competing preferences" inadequate. Voss (1998) indicated that once individuals form their problem representations, they only change them with reluctance: They tend to tinker with the solution or search for scapegoats before redeveloping a representation. He believed that change is more likely in a group context. Sylvan and Haddad (1998), in a manner similar to the story model of jury deliberation set forth by Pennington and Hastie (1987), suggested that groups select from among competing problem representations on the basis of which one creates the more compelling narrative.

flicts than states that must provide their own security. Waltz (1979) suggested that realism may be less common among states whose "preservation were provided by others" (pp. 70–71). This protection reduces their concern over relative gains and losses. (See Table 1 for the operationalization of this and all other independent variables.) Liberal theory would not expect this to be a significant factor.

Hypothesis 2: *If a state has its security guaranteed by another state, then it will be more likely to express a liberal problem representation of external conflicts when the distribution of capabilities in the international system is bipolar than when it is not bipolar.* Both Waltz (1964; 1979, pp. 161–193) and James and Brecher (1988), following realist theory, have asserted that a multipolar system is less stable, in the sense of preventing war, than a bipolar distribution of capabilities. A "protected" state should be less ready to pursue liberal policies when the international system is not bipolar, because war and shifting alliances could change its protected status. Although today's system might be unipolar as opposed to multipolar, Layne (1993, p. 7) and Mearsheimer (2001) illustrated why realists would expect other states in a unipolar system to behave as if the system were multipolar. Because states must balance to get security, they will balance against even an apparently benevolent unipole. Kegley and Raymond (1994), working from liberal theory, suggested the opposite—that a future multipolar world could be peaceful and stable.

Situational Hypotheses

Hypothesis 3: *If no long-term adversary is involved in the external conflict, either as an initial participant or as a bystander that has chosen to intervene, then an initially bystanding state will be more likely to express a liberal problem representation than it would in conflicts where such an adversary is involved.* Grieco (1988, p. 501), writing from realist theory, suggested that the presence of an adversary is one of the situations that would increase "a state's sensitivity to gaps in payoffs."

Hypothesis 4: *If no formal military allies of the observing state were initial parties to the conflict, then the bystander state would be more likely to express a liberal problem representation than it would toward conflicts in which such allies were initial parties.* This hypothesis also flows from realist theory, seen in Grieco (1988, p. 501), and has been supported by Reiter (1994, p. 496) and Moul (1988). Although the mere current involvement of a rival is enough to trigger the preceding hypothesis, for this one the ally must be an initial party, not a later participant.

Hypothesis 5: *If one of the initial combatants is perceived to be a procedural democracy, then bystanding procedural democracies are more likely to express a realist problem representation of the conflict than they would toward conflicts in which no procedural democracy is an initial combatant.* Realist theorists would not expect the regime type to affect problem representations, but liberal theorists

Table 1. Variable Operationalization

Hypothesis	Variable	Value
1	Guaranteed security	= 1 if the state has its security guaranteed by a pole, = 0 if the state takes responsibility for its own security.
2	Bipolar security	= 1 if the security guarantee is from a bipole (pre–31 December 1991), = 0 otherwise.
3	Current rival	= 1 if one of the military participants in the conflict is a current rival of the observing state, as defined by Diehl (1985); = 0 otherwise.
3	Long-term rival	= 1 if at least one of the military participants in the conflict is a long-term rival of the observing state, as defined by Geller (1993, pp. 180–181), based in turn on Wayman and Jones (1991, pp. 5–6); = 0 otherwise.
4	Ally	= 1 if at least one of the initial participants in the conflict is a formal military ally of the observing state, as defined by Kegley and Raymond (1990, p. 52) and Sorokin (1994, p. 425) [Walt's (1987, p. 12) definition of alliance is too vague and Reiter's (1994, p. 495) is too restrictive]; = 0 otherwise.
5	Democracy	= 1 if one or more of the principal parties in the conflict receives a score of 7 or greater on democracy in the POLITY III index (Jaggers & Gurr, 1995), which updates POLITY II (Gurr, 1990) [Lake (1992, p. 35) and Maoz & Russett (1993, pp. 628–629) also use this definition, which is similar to the standard definitions used in comparative politics, such as Linz (1975, pp. 182–183)]; = 0 otherwise.
6	Distance	= 1 if the conflict is outside the sphere of interests, = 0 if it is within it.
7	Absolute recession	= 1 if economic growth is negative for two consecutive quarters, = 0 otherwise.
7	Relative recession	= 1 if the economy is growing at a slower rate than the G-7 [using the OECD as an alternative comparison group would produce the same results; no comparison group was found for India], = 0 otherwise.
8	Popularity	= the percentage saying they "approve" of the American president's "job performance" (in *The Gallup Poll Monthly* and its predecessors, *The Gallup Report* and the *Gallup Opinion Index*) or who would vote for the prime minister's party in Canada (as reported in Hastings & Hastings, 1978–1994). Poll answers are assumed to be valid for 1 month or until the next poll is taken, whichever is shorter. Insufficient data were found to include this variable for India. A small amount of data are missing for Canada and the United States when the gap between consecutive polls exceeded 1 month.
9	Approaching election	= 1 if an election will occur in the next 3 months (Meernik, 1994, p. 131), = 0 otherwise.

would. This hypothesis may seem counterintuitive, but note that all interstate external conflicts (so far) involve at least one non-democracy. Thus, they either are between non-democracies or between democracies and non-democracies. Lake (1992) has shown that democracies tend to form coalitions in support of other democracies under attack. This immediate mutual support among democracies should apply even if the democracy "starts" the war, in which case the initial assumption would be that the war is being fought for a legitimate reason (Doyle, 1986, pp. 1160–1162). Although lasting alliances are features of liberalism, such tactical coalitions against a current or imminent threat are more consistent with realism. As with the prior two situational hypotheses, the value of this variable can change during the course of the conflict: Democratic nations may cease to be such, or non-democratic ones may adopt a democratic regime.

Hypothesis 6: *As the distance from a conflict to the bystander state increases, a liberal problem representation becomes more likely to be expressed.* Walt (1987) used geographic proximity as one of the leading reasons why a state will perceive a threat from another. Realist theory would expect the representation of an external conflict to be based in part on the extent of a military threat, so conflicts that occur close to a state's borders would be viewed through a realist lens. Such conflicts are more likely to spill over into one's own state, and they are also more likely than distant conflicts to result in an increased military threat. More distant conflicts, on the other hand, would be more likely than nearby ones to be represented in terms of liberalism. Morgenthau (1985) used the Monroe Doctrine as an example of a state's heightened concern over conflicts in its immediate neighborhood (pp. 55–57). Blainey (1988, pp. 228–242) saw proximity as a leading cause of wars widening to include other powers; his assessment fits what realists would find important. Proximity means more than sharing a border. Bremer (1993, p. 236) defined "contiguous" to include states less than 150 miles distant. A somewhat less arbitrary method measures proximity on the basis of a broader geographic region, similar to the old realist notion of "spheres of influence" or the American phrase "in our own backyard." For the United States, this region includes the Caribbean basin: the Caribbean Islands, Central America, Panama, Colombia, and Venezuela. Nearly all of the U.S. interventions in Latin America occurred in this region; it has special trade and strategic relevance to the United States (see Pastor, 1992, pp. 22–25). President Reagan's development scheme for Latin America, the Caribbean Basin Initiative, limited itself to this region.

Domestic Hypotheses

Hypothesis 7: *If a state's economy is in decline, then it is more likely to express a realist problem representation than when its economy is growing.* A number of scholars involved in this debate have suggested that links should be sought between the domestic level and the prevalence of realism or liberalism

(Axelrod & Keohane, 1993, pp. 101–102; Baldwin, 1993, p. 23; Grieco, 1993, p. 328; Keohane, 1993, p. 294). Grieco (1988, p. 501) argued from realism that states experiencing economic decline are more sensitive to relative gains than states whose power is increasing—that is, they will be more realist. This could be seen as a corollary of Wolfers' (1962) "security rich" idea: A state in a recession or depression will adopt a more self-interested view of the world because it can see more potential threats. Although the state might also seek to enhance its economy by adhering to economic institutions, such liberalism in that issue area would not tend to be mirrored by liberalism on security issues.[4]

Hypothesis 8: *As a leader's popularity among his or her constituency increases, so does the probability that his or her government will express a liberal perspective.* The final two hypotheses derive from liberal interest in domestic politics. Hagan (1993) argued that opposition can make it more difficult for leaders to maintain a foreign policy commitment unless broad national interests are involved. It would follow that leaders who perceive a greater threat to their own hold on power would be more likely to represent problems in terms of realist indicators. One measure of this in a democracy is the popularity of the head of government. Another measure would need to be found if this study were to include non-democracies.

Hypothesis 9: *If no election in which a leader could lose office is scheduled or required to be held within the following 3 months, then the state is more likely to express a liberal perspective than at times when such an election is approaching.* Regardless of current popularity, a leader would be more sensitive to losing office as an election approaches (in procedural democracies), as discussed by Meernik (1994). To some extent, acceptance of either this hypothesis or the preceding one would tend to negate the relevance of worldviews as a strongly held belief system. One could argue, however, that the decision-makers' full worldview includes a value on retaining personal power that overrides the value they place on the national interest.

Methodology

This study focuses on the period 1978–1994. Reasonable people can always argue for an extension of any time period under study. There is no obvious temporal boundary for this study. The goal is to select a period that features a variety of conditions in the international system, to avoid limiting the findings' generalizability while keeping the research manageable. During these years, relations among the major powers moved from the end of détente to a renewed Cold War,

---

[4] The "diversionary theory of war" (Blainey, 1988, pp. 72–86) does not directly apply because we are looking at bystanders, not initial combatants. Furthermore, Blainey found little evidence to support the idea that states start wars to divert their public from their own internal problems.

followed by the end of the Cold War and the end of bipolarity itself. Moving much earlier would enmesh the research in the Vietnam war, adding difficult questions about coding that conflict without a compensatory gain in explanatory power. Moving much later in time takes the study further into the post–Cold War era, during which one finds a remarkable lack of variance in the independent variables. Once again, the extension would not add immediate substance. Later research, however, should certainly expand the time period under study.

Using Sollenberg (1995) and the earlier *SIPRI Yearbooks*, as well as Tillema (forthcoming) and Sivard (1993), one finds 140 military conflicts during that time. Eight of these 140 conflicts experienced a change in an independent variable during the conflict, generally because of a change to or from democracy or the insertion or withdrawal of a rival's military forces, so for purposes of this study one could consider there to be 148 conflicts from which to choose. Table 2 lists the 36 conflicts selected from the original 140 (about 26% of the total). Three of the 36 conflicts experienced a change in an independent variable, so one could argue that 39 of 148 conflicts (still about 26%) were selected; these latter numbers are reflected in Table 2. The conflicts were selected in order to achieve a representative distribution of the independent variables. For example, 12 (26%) of the 47 conflicts that involved a democracy were included in the sample, and 27 (27%) of the 101 conflicts that did not involve a democracy were included in the sample. Table 2 describes the distribution of conflicts in the sample versus the full set of conflicts.

To ensure variation at the system level, this study uses the United States as a great power, Canada as a lesser power ally of a great power, and India as a lesser power that is not an ally of a great power. Among allies of the United States, the choice of Canada best minimizes the effect of geography, historic memories of conflict, and extreme cultural differences. India is a regional power with aspirations to international leadership; choosing a less ambitious non-aligned state would reduce the frequency of problem representations being stated. Other "independent" medium or great powers, such as China, the Soviet Union/Russia, Iran, Nigeria, or South Africa, are poorer selections for initial study, because they either adopt a predominantly internal focus or are more likely to have leaders with worldviews culturally alien to realism and liberalism. India's leadership has links to the British tradition of politics, its own historical experience with balancing among kingdoms, and its more recent promotion of international institutions as a means of promoting peace.

Coding Problem Representations

This study used a nearly complete set of statements on the 36 conflicts by the United States, Canada, and India.[5] The Canadian Ministry of External Affairs and

---

[5] Most Indian texts for 1993 and 1994 were missing.

Table 2. Conflicts Selected for This Study

Algeria intrastate (1992–94)	Kagara war (1978–79)	South Africa intrastate (1983–92)
Argentine intrastate (1978–79)	Liberia intrastate I (1985–88)	South Atlantic war (1982)
Burma intrastate (1978–94)	Liberia intrastate II (1989–94)	Sri Lanka intrastate (1983–94)
Contra-Sandinista war (1980–90)	Mexico intrastate (1994)	Sudan intrastate (1983–94)*
Former Yugoslavia (1991–94)	Osirak reactor raid (1981)	Third Indochina war (1978–89)
Ghana intrastate (1981)	Pakistan intrastate (1978–87)	U.S.-Libya clashes (1981–86)
Granada occupation (1983)	Panama occupation (1989–90)	Uganda intrastate (1981–91)
India-Pakistan (1982–92)	Peru intrastate (1981–94)*	Western Saharan war (1978–91)
Intifada (1987–94)	Philippines intrastate (1978–94)*	Yemen intrastate (1986–87)
Iran-Iraq war (1980–88)	Russo-Afghan war (1979–89)	Yemen intrastate (1994)
Iranian hostage crisis (1979–81)	Shaba crisis (1978–79)	North-South Yemen war (1979)
Iraq-Kuwait war (1990–91)	Somalia intrastate (1991–94)	Zaire-Zambia (1982)

Conflicts	Total	Sampled	Percentage
Involving a long-term rival	9	3	33%
Involving a current rival	15	3	20%
Not involving a rival	124	33	27%
Involving a democracy	47	12	26%
Not involving a democracy	101	27	27%
Involving an ally	40	12	30%
Not involving an ally	108	27	25%
Within a sphere of interest	25	6	24%
Outside a sphere of interest	123	33	27%

*Peru is coded as a democracy through 1991. The Philippines are coded as a democracy beginning in 1987. Sudan is coded as a democracy from 1986 to 1988. Thus, 36 conflicts are listed above, but the numbers below represent 39 conflicts selected. The five unselected conflicts during this period for which an independent variable changed were Rhodesia/Zimbabwe intrastate, coded as a democracy in 1978 only; El Salvador intrastate, coded as a democracy after 1983; Bangladesh intrastate, coded as a democracy after 1990; the Ogaden war, which included forces of a U.S. rival until August 1979; and Angola intrastate, which included forces of a U.S. rival until August 1988.

International Trade publishes speeches and press releases in several collections. These speeches, and some issued by the Canadian Mission to the United Nations and the Office of the Prime Minister, are indexed in Barrett (1982, 1987, 1994). The United States publishes relevant documents in two collections. *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* includes all statements issued by the president or his office. *Department of State Bulletin* and its successor, *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*, include selected statements on foreign policy, primarily by officials in the State Department. India's Ministry of External Affairs publishes a monthly collection of statements, *Foreign Affairs Record*, which includes ministry press releases and statements of government officials. A search of these sources, and a supplemental Lexis/Nexis search, identified 2,249 codable cases,

where a "case" is a representation of a particular conflict in a text.[6] Each of these texts forms a sampling unit (Krippendorff, 1980, pp. 57–61). If the text referred to more than one of the selected conflicts, then it was evaluated repeatedly, once for each of the conflicts addressed in it.

The texts were evaluated with a thematic content analysis similar to that of Winter and Stewart (1977). Each discussion of the conflict in each text was coded twice with respect to the five indicators of realist and liberal worldviews discussed above: once for evidence of each of the liberal indicators, and again for evidence of each of the realist indicators. Each indicator was scored in the range 0–2, where 0 indicates the trait was not observed, 2 indicates clear evidence for the trait, and 1 indicates weaker or unclear evidence. Thus, each case has both a liberal and a realist aggregate score, each ranging in value from 0 to 10.

Neither these problem representations nor the worldviews inferred from them should be expected to correspond perfectly to either realism or liberalism. Pure realism and pure liberalism are located within a large N-dimensional space within which possible worldviews can be located. A line segment drawn between those two points can be an axis within that space. Like all such line segments, this realist-liberal axis can be bisected by an $(n - 1)$-dimensional surface; the intersection of that surface with the line segment can be assigned the value 0. Evaluating worldviews as if they were on a continuum between realism and liberalism is in effect to project the observed problem representation (from which one infers the worldview) onto that line and measure its distance from the neutral point. When we hypothesize that a state would be more likely to express a realist problem representation of the conflict, we do not mean that in this situation it shifts from fully liberal to fully realist. Rather, the impact of the variable is to move the projection of the problem representation along that line segment in the direction of realism, perhaps because now indicators of realism are mixed in with indicators of liberalism.

To project the problem representation onto that axis, one combines the aggregate coding results into a single value:

$$y = \ln[(1 + \Sigma \text{ Liberal Indicators}) / (1 + \Sigma \text{ Realist Indicators})]$$

The ratio is used to locate the inferred worldview relative to a "pure" realist or liberal worldview. The "1" is added to avoid division by zero. The natural log

---

[6] The initial set of texts included an additional 217 cases (<10% extra). Many of these cases never should have been included in the set, such as duplicate texts, statements by non-governmental figures, the joint statements of international groupings, and statements that fell outside the timespan of the war itself. Others included only "factual" information that could not be coded, and some references were too brief or vague to be coded as realist or liberal. Fifty-five of these excluded tests included more elaborate references to a war, but not references that could be linked to either realism or liberalism. Some of these texts, with references mainly to immediate humanitarian consequences and wishes for peace, may be evidence of a third worldview, the "paxian" (discussed below).

transforms this expression into a linear form: This model assumes that a distribution (realist, liberal) of (7,0) is exactly as "distant" from an indeterminate worldview as the distribution (0,7). By using the ratio alone, however, where "1" would indicate a neutral value, the first distribution would have the value .125 and the latter the value 8.0. The linear distances from 1 are not the same. The logarithmic transformation, on the other hand, yields values of −2.079 and 2.079, equidistant from the neutral point, 0 (ln of 1).[7]

With the possibly subjective nature of thematic content analysis, coding reliability is important. A senior graduate student independently coded 2% of the texts; agreement was reached on more than 80% of the indicators and close agreement on more than 80% of the final worldview inferences. The indicator match rate reached 85% as the second coder became more proficient in the later-coded texts. These results, and in particular the evidence of a learning curve, indicate that these findings would be replicable.

Because the nine hypotheses all address the same dependent variable—the degree of liberalism or realism inferred from the observed problem representation—the effects of the various independent variables are evaluated using a multiple regression. The multiple regression produces signed coefficients, which are needed to support the hypotheses. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) would not yield signed coefficients. Moreover, although most of the independent variables are dichotomous, an ANOVA is not appropriate because one of the independent variables (leader popularity) is roughly continuous.[8]

Linear regression assumes that the dependent variable is continuous. The dependent variable, the projection of the observed problem representation onto the realist/liberal line, technically is not continuous, but the value of y, where the two sums vary between 0 and 10, can assume many values. Normalized β values were compared, rather than the Bs, because the effect of each of these independent variables can only be evaluated relative to that of the other independent variables. (An absolute effect, such as "All other things being equal, the presence of a long-term rival of the observing state in the conflict causes the natural log of the incremented sum of the liberal indicators divided by the incremented sum of the realist indicators to move .6168 units in the direction of realism," is clearly

---

[7] In general terms, $\ln(A/B) = \ln(A) − \ln(B)$. Thus, $\ln(B/A) = \ln(B) − \ln(A) = −1 \times [\ln(A) − \ln(B)] = −1 \times [\ln(A/B)]$, which is the desired property. One aberration in this formula is that it would assign a high value to a 1–0 score (worldview ratio = 2/1 = 2). This score would thus carry the same weight as scores of 3–1 or 5–2, despite being a distribution in which the author has very little confidence. All 1–0 distributions were reassigned to the same ratio as a 4–3 distribution.

[8] The latter problem can be resolved by grouping popularity into interval "bins." An ANOVA run in support of the regression found all the Fs to be significant at .001, except the approach of an election. These results are "stronger" than those of the regression, but they obscure the fact that two variables would be significant in the "wrong" direction. The loss of data involved in recoding "popularity" probably contributed to its being significant in the ANOVA and very insignificant in the regression.

beyond interpretation.) The hypotheses predict whether each β will be >0 (indicating a tendency toward liberalism) or <0 (indicating a tendency toward realism). β values were considered significant at .05. Table 3 presents the results.

Findings

Table 4 summarizes the evaluation of the hypotheses resulting from the regression reported in Table 3. One of the two systemic hypotheses is supported, three of the four situational hypotheses are supported, and none of the three domestic hypotheses are supported. This suggests that systemic and situational factors influence the inferred worldview more than domestic factors do. This research usually finds realist problem representations where realist theories would expect them to be found: Three of the five more realist hypotheses were supported, but only one of the four liberal hypotheses was supported (democracy). Waltz (1979, pp. 70–71) seems to have been correct about the policies of states with "guaranteed security," at least when the states are Western democracies as in the sample studied here. Grieco's (1988) comment seems especially prophetic: "The coefficient for a state's sensitivity to gaps in payoffs . . . will be greater if a state's partner is a long-term adversary rather than a long-term ally; if the issue involves security rather than economic well-being; if the state's relative power has been on the decline rather than on the rise" (p. 501). His statement has been supported, even down to the relative weights of the βs for rivals and allies.

During the period under study, a trend toward liberalism could be inferred from the data. Each U.S. administration from Carter through Clinton more frequently represented problems in a manner consistent with liberalism than the one before. This trend is not necessarily a lasting one, and not necessarily one that extends into issue areas other than external conflict. The trend might best be explained by the absence of the situational variables that would trigger realism: Conflicts in the 1990s less often involved American allies or rivals, or even other democracies, so a response consistent with liberalism could be anticipated. American reaction to the direct attack by al-Qaeda on 11 September 2001 is outside the scope of this study, because the United States was not a bystander. American representations of going to war in Iraq after that attack would also lie outside the scope of this study, for the same reason: Although there is continuity from Desert Storm, the Iraq-Kuwait war ended in 1991, and the 2003 U.S.-led war in Iraq constitutes a separate conflict. Once again, the United States is not a bystander. Both of these situations are worthy of further study using this approach.

Validity

Validity of liberalism and realism as concepts. This study assumes that liberalism and realism are reasonable categories for the worldviews. Typologies such as decision-making versus realist (Ripley, 1993), many-headed eagle (Rosati

Table 3. Regression Results

Hyp.	Variable	Expected sign	United States, Canada, India		United States and Canada		United States		Canada		India	
			β	Sig T	β	Sig T	β	Sig T	β	Sig T	β	Sig T
1	Guaranteed security	>0	.208	.0000	.265	.0000	*	*	*	*	*	*
2	Bipolar security	>0	-.149	.0000	-.153	.0002	*	*	-.249	.0024	*	*
3	Current rival	<0	-.228	.0000	-.177	.0000	-.207	.0000	*	*	-.373	.0013
3	Long-term rival	<0	-.255	.0000	-.252	.0000	-.267	.0000	*	*	-.280	.1722
4	Ally	<0	-.204	.0000	-.134	.0099	-.174	.0023	.134	.0844	*	*
5	Democracy	<0	-.129	.0000	-.176	.0000	-.173	.0000	-.324	.0001	.062	.3748
6	Distance	>0	.049	.1297	.105	.0503	.077	.1923	*	*	.037	.7242
7	Absolute recession	<0	.240	.0000	.249	.0000	.277	.0000	.105	.2283	.056	.3476
7	Relative recession	<0	†	†	-.080	.0009	-.087	.0007	-.004	.9703	†	†
8	Popularity	>0	†	†	.039	.2101	.030	.2524	.000	.9983	†	†
9	Approaching election	<0	.030	.1287	.031	.1578	.042	.0776	-.039	.6119	.013	.8102
Adjusted R^2			**.156**		**.180**		**.145**		**.146**		**.157**	
F			47.147		36.144		31.052		5.115		9.563	
Sig *F* (df)			**.0000 (2,239)**		**.0000 (1,745)**		**.0000 (1,578)**		**.0000 (161)**		**.0000 (268)**	

*These variables could not be evaluated because they were constant for this state over the data set.

†These variables could not be evaluated because data were missing.

Table 4. Hypothesis Evaluation

Hypothesis	Variable	Evaluation
1	Guaranteed security	Supported. States are more likely to represent external conflict in a manner consistent with a liberal worldview if they are protected by other states.
2	Bipolar security	Rejected. States protected by others remained likely to represent external conflict consistent with a liberal worldview after bipolarity ended.
3	Rival involved	Supported. States are more likely to represent external conflict in a manner consistent with a realist worldview if a current or long-term rival is participating in the conflict.
4	Ally	Supported. States are more likely to represent external conflict in a manner consistent with a realist worldview if an ally is an initial party to the conflict.
5	Democracy	Supported. States are more likely to represent external conflict in a manner consistent with a realist worldview if a democracy is participating in the conflict.
6	Distance	Rejected. States are not more likely to represent external conflict in a manner consistent with a realist worldview when the conflict is within their sphere of influence.
7	Recession	Rejected. States are not more likely to represent external conflict in a manner consistent with a realist worldview when their economy is in recession.
8	Popularity	Rejected. States are not more likely to represent external conflict in a manner consistent with a realist worldview when the leader is unpopular.
9	Approaching election	Rejected. States are not more likely to represent external conflict in a manner consistent with a realist worldview when an election is near.

& Creed, 1997), hard-liner versus accommodationist (Vasquez, 1987), or isola-tionist versus internationalist (Wittkopf, 1986) do not ultimately present distinct alternatives to realism versus liberalism. A problem with the categories would likely lead to a lack of variation in the coding results or an inability to code cases. Neither of these problems developed: There is sufficient variation in the coding results, and the "strong" inferences for a worldview in each state were at least double the "weak" inferences. Seventy percent of the texts revealed a clear tilt toward one worldview or the other, with an absolute value of y greater than .5, and less than 15% of the texts were coded as "neutral" between realism and lib-eralism. This is not surprising, because realism and/or liberalism are part of the

standard education of the foreign policy advisors, if not the leaders themselves, in these countries and in many others.

Some of the uncodable or neutral texts suggested a perspective consistent with the peace studies literature (Barash, 1991; Vayrynen, 1987). These texts indicate a concern for individual rights (Clark, 1988; Marks, 1980), moral judgments, and peace processes. This may be the core of another worldview, "paxism," that bears some similarity to Carr's (1939, p. 6) "utopianism." Further research should develop the paxian and perhaps other worldviews and search for them systematically; nonetheless, the realist-liberal distinction seems to remain valid—paxism is a rare pattern in these texts.

Validity and probity of using official statements. As discussed earlier, official statements are a common and appropriate location for finding "official" problem representations. As a spot check, however, let us look at National Security Directives issued during the Persian Gulf war of 1991 and obtained via the National Security Archive. The American perspective on the Gulf war remains open to debate: Was U.S. intervention based on material factors (oil and fear of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction) or norms (Kuwaiti sovereignty and anti-aggression)? In general, the coding of public statements reflects this ambiguity. In those statements, however, there was a clear tendency to present a more realist problem representation early in the conflict, and a more liberal one later. This tendency is mirrored in formerly classified documents. National Security Directive 45, 20 August 1990, is clearly realist ($y = -.811$) in its focus on the continued threat to Saudi Arabia and the potential damage to the U.S. economy if oil is cut off, and especially in its position that the U.S. is acting and the United Nations joining in. National Security Directive 54, 15 January 1991, tends toward liberalism ($y = .336$) in its reduced focus on the threat to the United States as compared to following the long list of UN resolutions and acting in concert with a broad coalition.

In some cases, of course, the assumption that policy statements reflect policy intent can be checked against large-scale behavior. Although overt policy actions are very often ambiguous, some situations are unambiguous. For example, Canadian policy toward civil unrest in South Africa was to work toward multilateral mandatory sanctions—a tactic strongly in the liberal tradition. Their problem representations on this issue were strongly consistent with a liberal worldview. On the other hand, the unilateral mining of harbors in Nicaragua, in defiance of international law, is strongly in a realist tradition. In this case, one finds that American problem representations from the 1980s do reflect a realist worldview regarding the conflict in Central America. U.S. actions even corresponded to changes in perspective over time during the Soviet-Afghan and Iran-Iraq wars.

Finally, this approach assumes that official statements on external conflicts reflect a single underlying "official" problem representation. A deeper look at the cases supports this assumption. This research examined whether or not the expressed problem representation was affected by the identity of the speaker, the

composition of the audience, whether it was delivered in a foreign or domestic setting, or what foreign leaders were present. After controlling for the different conflicts, leadership styles, and international contexts over the 17 years, we see little evidence of such variation. The greatest such evidence would be a tendency for American speakers to present a more liberal problem representation when delivering a statement to an overseas audience. Even this, however, may be an artifact of the type of conflicts that one mentions to such an audience. If these factors systematically altered the expressed problem representations, then one would not expect to have the significant findings that were produced.

Does the worldview matter? Finally, one is left wondering if it matters that a state expresses a realist or liberal problem representation of an external conflict. A preliminary look suggests that a liberal problem representation corresponds, as Betts (1992) anticipated, to a higher likelihood of eventual involvement. Because the conflicts were not selected with an eye to this issue, there are many questions that could be raised regarding this finding. It seems worth further investigation, however, if only to show that the academic debate has real policy ramifications.

Conclusions

This article has developed a new approach for assessing the worldviews that motivate the decisions of state leaders. Problem representations found in official statements give us the information we need to be able to infer worldviews in a wide number of cases. This method can yield useful information across a larger number of states and decision-makers than would be provided by constructing a full cognitive map of all relevant persons and assessing how they interact as a group—although the infrequent situations where we have such full models should be used to supplement studies conducted with this approach. One could extend this approach to other issue areas and other worldviews. Such research, however, must be careful in two areas. First, it must be possible to define criteria that would be observable in problem representations in the issue area. Second, it must be reasonable to assume that the ideal worldviews setting a baseline for inference bear some resemblance to elements of the actual worldview.

This article uses this approach to illuminate a debate within the study of international relations. This research indicates that the Western democracies included in the sample express problem representations consistent with liberalism and realism under the situational and systemic circumstances predicted in international relations literature. Such states will be more likely to express problem representations consistent with a liberal worldview when their security is guaranteed by another power, regardless of the overall distribution of power in the system. These states are also more likely to express problem representations consistent with a realist worldview when a rival, ally, or fellow democracy is involved in the conflict.

There should be room for analysis conducted at the individual or decision group level within such a study. One can move beyond trying to interpret the often ambiguous large-scale policy actions of states by focusing attention on the less ambiguous small-scale policy actions—official statements of policy. In a larger sense, this theory and analysis attempts to bridge the gap between two major schools in the study of international politics: one centered on the state within a system, and the other oriented toward the decision-maker within the state. It reminds the former school—to which liberals, realists, structuralists, and peace scientists all seem to belong—that "states" do not respond to universal forces in the way that matter responds to the laws of physics or ideal rational beings respond to the laws of logic. The reaction of states cannot be finally separated from the perceptions of individuals who help shape those reactions.

This research also challenges the decision-making school to apply its discoveries about individual psychology and group decision-making to larger patterns of activity. Much of the work in this area focuses on a few case studies, sometimes only one. Such an approach has deepened our understanding of human and bureaucratic reasoning and the politics of policymaking. It is now appropriate to apply this knowledge to some of the larger questions of interstate interactions. This worldview approach offers a way out of the deadlock revealed in Baldwin (1993). Other models, grounded in an understanding of the process by which foreign policy is developed and implemented, could inform other puzzles where the state and system levels of analysis have proven inconclusive.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Alker, H. R., Jr., & Christenson, C. (1972). From causal modeling to artificial intelligence: The evolution of a UN peace-making simulation. In J. LaPonce & P. Smoker (Eds.), *Experimentation and simulation in political science* (pp. 177–224). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Alker, H. R., Jr., & Greenberg, W. J. (1977). On simulating collective security regime alternatives. In G. M. Bonham & M. J. Shapiro (Eds.), *Thought and action in foreign policy* (pp. 263–306). Basel, Switzerland: Birkhäuser.

Allison, G. T. (1971). *Essence of decision*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Alteld, M., & Bueno de Mesquita, B. (1979). Choosing sides in war. *International Studies Quarterly, 23*, 87–112.

Axelrod, R. (1977). Argumentation in foreign policy settings. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 21*, 727–756.

Axelrod, R., & Keohane, R. O. (1993). Achieving cooperation under anarchy: Strategies and institutions. In D. A. Baldwin (Ed.), *Neorealism and neoliberalism: The contemporary debate* (pp. 85–115). New York: Columbia University Press.

Baker, J. A. (1995). *The politics of diplomacy*. New York: Putnam.

Baldwin, D. A. (1993). Neoliberalism, neorealism, and world politics. In D. A. Baldwin (Ed.), *Neorealism and neoliberalism: The contemporary debate* (pp. 3–25). New York: Columbia University Press.

Barash, D. P. (1991). *Introduction to peace studies*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Barber, J. D. (1993). The presidential character. In N. J. Kressel (Ed.), *Political psychology: Classic and contemporary readings* (pp. 127–137). New York: Paragon.

Barrett, J. R. (1982). *A bibliography of works on Canadian foreign relations, 1976–1980*. Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs.

Barrett, J. R. (1987). *A bibliography of works on Canadian foreign relations, 1981–1985*. Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs.

Barrett, J. R. (1994). *A bibliography of works on Canadian foreign relations, 1986–1990*. Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs.

Beasley, R. (1998). Collective interpretations: How problem representations aggregate in foreign policy groups. In D. A. Sylvan & J. F. Voss (Eds.), *Problem representation in political decision making* (pp. 80–115). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bennett, A. L. (1988). *International organizations: Principles and issues* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bert, W. (1997). *The reluctant superpower: United States policy in Bosnia, 1991–95*. London: Macmillan.

Betts, R. K. (1992). Systems for peace or causes of war? Collective security, arms control, and the new Europe. *International Security, 17*, 199–237.

Billings, R. S., & Hermann, C. F. (1998). Problem identification in sequential policy decision making: The re-representation of problems. In D. A. Sylvan & J. F. Voss (Eds.), *Problem representation in political decision making* (pp. 53–79). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blainey, G. (1988). *The causes of war* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Brecher, M. (1972). *The foreign policy system of Israel*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Brecher, M., & Wilkenfeld, J. (1982). Crises in world politics. *World Politics, 34*, 380–417.

Bremer, S. A. (1993). Democracy and militarized interstate conflict, 1816–1965. *International Interactions, 18*, 231–249.

Breuning, M. (1998). Configuring issue areas: Belgian and Dutch representations of the role of foreign assistance in foreign policy. In D. A. Sylvan & J. F. Voss (Eds.), *Problem representation in political decision making* (pp. 303–330). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bueno de Mesquita, B. (1981). *The war trap*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Bull, H. (1985). Does order exist in world politics? In R. J. Art & R. Jervis (Eds.), *International politics* (2nd ed., pp. 29–41). Boston: Little, Brown.

Butterworth, R. (1978). Do conflict managers matter? An empirical assessment of interstate security disputes and resolution efforts, 1945–1974. *International Studies Quarterly, 22*, 195–214.

Byman, D. L., & Pollack, K. M. (2001). Let us now praise great men: Bringing the statesman back in. *International Security, 25*, 107–146.

Campbell, S. J. (2001, September). *Worldview formation and evolution of U.S. foreign policymakers: Assessing the controversy over Brzezinski's worldview and implications for policymaking in the Carter administration.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco.

Carr, E. H. (1939). *The twenty years' crisis, 1919–1939*. New York: Harper & Row.

Christensen, T. J., & Snyder, J. (1990). Chain gangs and passed bucks: Predicting alliance patterns in multipolarity. *International Organization, 44*, 137–168.

Clark, L. (1988). Internal refugees—The hidden half. *World Refugee Survey, 1988 in Review*, 18–24.

Claude, I. (1962). *Power and international relations*. New York: Random House.

Cottam, R. (1977). *Foreign policy motivation: A general theory and a case study*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Cottam, M., & McCoy, D. E. (1998). Image change and problem representation after the Cold War. In D. A. Sylvan & J. F. Voss (Eds.), *Problem representation in political decision making* (pp. 116–144). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cusack, T. R., & Eberwein, W. D. (1982). Prelude to war: Incidence, escalation and intervention in international disputes, 1900–1976. *International Interactions, 9*, 9–28.

Cusack, T. R., & Stoll, R. J. (1992). The security predicament: Assessing the effectiveness of realist and idealist principles in interstate politics. *FIB Papers*. Berlin: Publication Series of the International Relations Research Group.

Department of State Bulletin (1978–1989). Collected statements of the U. S. Department of State.

Deutsch, K., et al. (1957). *Political community and the North Atlantic area*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Diehl, P. (1985). Arms races to war: Testing some empirical linkages. *Sociological Quarterly, 26*, 331–349.

Dille, B. (2000). The prepared and spontaneous remarks of presidents Reagan and Bush: A validity comparison for at-a-distance measurements. *Political Psychology, 21*, 573–585.

Dille, B., & Young, M. D. (2000). The conceptual complexity of presidents Carter and Clinton: An automated content analysis of temporal stability and source bias. *Political Psychology, 21*, 587–596.

Doyle, M. W. (1986). Liberalism and world politics. *American Political Science Review, 80*, 1151–1169.

Doyle, M. W. (1997). *Ways of war and peace*. New York: Norton.

Eberwein, W. D. (1982). The seduction of power: Serious international disputes and the power status of nations 1900–1976. *International Interactions, 9*, 57–74.

Eckhardt, W., & Azar, E. (1978). Major world conflicts and interventions, 1945–1975. *International Interactions, 5*, 75–110.

Foreign Affairs Record (1978–1994). Collected statements of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs.

Gaenslen, F. (1992). Decision-making groups. In E. Singer & V. Hudson (Eds.), *Political psychology and foreign policy* (pp. 165–193). Boulder, CO: Westview.

The Gallup Poll Monthly (1978–1994).

Geller, D. S. (1993). Power differentials and war in rival dyads. *International Studies Quarterly, 3*, 173–193.

George, A. L. (1979). The causal nexus between cognitive beliefs and decision-making behavior: The "operational code" belief system. In L. Falkowski (Ed.), *Psychological models in international politics* (pp. 95–124). Boulder, CO: Westview.

George, A. L. (1993). *Bridging the gap: Theory and practice in foreign policy.* Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace Press.

Gochman, C., & Long, R. (1983). *Realpolitik* and the road to war. *International Studies Quarterly, 27,* 97–120.

Gochman, C., & Maoz, Z. (1984). Militarized interstate disputes, 1816–1976: Procedures, patterns, and insights. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 28,* 586–615.

Goldstein, J., & Keohane, R. O. (1993). Ideas and foreign policy: An analytical framework. In J. Goldstein & R. O. Keohane (Eds.), *Ideas and foreign policy: Beliefs, institutions and political change* (pp. 3–30). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Grieco, J. M. (1988). Anarchy and the limits of cooperation: A realist critique of the newest liberal institutionalism. *International Organization, 42,* 485–507.

Grieco, J. M. (1990). *Cooperation among nations: Europe, America, and non-tariff barriers to trade.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Grieco, J. M. (1993). Understanding the problem of international cooperation: The limits of neoliberal institutionalism and the future of realist theory. In D. A. Baldwin (Ed.), *Neorealism and neoliberalism: The contemporary debate* (pp. 301–338). New York: Columbia University Press.

Gurr, T. R. (1990). *POLITY II: Political structures and regime change, 1800–1986* (ICPSR Computer file no. 9263). Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research.

Haas, E. B. (1983). Regime decay, conflict management, and international organizations 1945–1981. *International Organization, 37,* 189–256.

Hagan, J. D. (1993). *Political opposition and foreign policy in comparative perspective.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Hastings, E. H., & Hastings, P. K. (Eds.) (1978–1994). *Index to international public opinion.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Hellman, G., & Wolf, R. (1993). Neorealism, neoliberal institutionalism, and the future of NATO. *Security Studies, 3,* 3–43.

Hermann, C. F. (1978). Foreign policy behavior: That which is to be explained. In M. A. East, S. A. Salmore, & C. F. Hermann (Eds.), *Why nations act* (pp. 25–47). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hermann, M. G. (1988). Hafez al-Assad. In B. Kellerman & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Leadership and negotiation in the Middle East* (pp. 70–95). New York: Praeger.

Hoffman, S. (1993). On the political psychology of peace and war: A critique and an agenda. In N. J. Kressel (Ed.), *Political psychology: Classic and contemporary readings* (pp. 342–359). New York: Paragon.

Holsti, O. (1962). The belief system and national images: A case study. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 4,* 244–252.

Jaggers, K., & Gurr, T. R. (1995). Tracking democracy's third wave with the Polity III data. *Journal of Peace Research, 32,* 469–482.

James, P., & Brecher, M. (1988). Stability and polarity: New paths for inquiry. *Journal of Peace Research, 25,* 31–42.

Janis, I. (1982). *Victims of groupthink.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Jervis, R. (1976). *Perception and misperception in world politics.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Jervis, R. (1988). Realism, game theory, and cooperation. *World Politics, 40,* 317–349.

Kaplan, M. (1957). *System and process in international politics.* New York: Wiley.

Kaw, M. (1990). Choosing sides: Testing a political proximity model. *American Journal of Political Science, 34,* 441–470.

Kegley, C. W., Jr. (Ed.) (1995). *Controversies in international relations theory: Realism and the neoliberal challenge.* New York: St. Martin's.

Kegley, C. W., Jr., & Raymond, G. (1986). Normative constraints on the use of force short of war. *Journal of Peace Research, 23,* 213–227.

Kegley, C. W., Jr., & Raymond, G. (1990). *When trust breaks down: Alliance norms and world politics.* Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Kegley, C. W., Jr., & Raymond, G. (1994). *A multipolar peace? Great-power politics in the twenty-first century.* New York: St Martin's.

Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the modern world economy.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Keohane, R. O. (1986). Realism, neorealism and the study of world politics. In R. O. Keohane (Ed.), *Neorealism and its critics* (pp. 1–26). New York: Columbia University Press.

Keohane, R. O. (1993). Institutional theory and the realist challenge after the Cold War. In D. A. Baldwin (Ed.), *Neorealism and neoliberalism: The contemporary debate* (pp. 269–300). New York: Columbia University Press.

Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S., Jr. (1977). *Power and interdependence: World politics in transition* (2nd ed.). Boston: Little, Brown.

Kim, C.-H. (1991). Third party participation in wars. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 35,* 659–671.

Krasner, S. D. (1983). Regimes and the limits of realism: Regimes as autonomous variables. In S. D. Krasner (Ed.), *International regimes* (pp. 355–368). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Krasner, S. D. (1991). Global communications and national power: Life on the Pareto frontier. *World Politics, 43,* 336–366.

Kratochwil, F. (1993). Norms v. numbers: Multilateralism and the rationalist and reflexivist approaches to institutions—A unilateral plea for communicative rationality. In J. G. Ruggie (Ed.), *Multilateralism matters: The theory and practice of an institutional form* (pp. 443–472). New York: Columbia University Press.

Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kupchan, C. A., & Kupchan, C. A. (1991). Concerts, collective security, and the future of Europe. *International Security, 16,* 151–198.

Lake, D. A. (1992). Powerful pacifists: Democratic states and war. *American Political Science Review, 68,* 24–37.

Larson, D. W. (1994). The role of belief systems and schemas in foreign policy decision-making. *Political Psychology, 15,* 17–34.

Layne, C. (1993). The unipolar illusion: Why new great powers will rise. *International Security, 17,* 5–51.

Layne, C. (1994). Kant or cant: The myth of the democratic peace. *International Security, 19,* 5–49.

Layne, C., & Schwarz, B. (1993). American hegemony—Without an enemy. *Foreign Policy, 92,* 5–23.

Lebow, R. N., & Stein, J. G. (1993). Afghanistan, Carter and foreign policy change: The limits of cognitive models. In D. Caldwell & T. J. McKeown (Eds.), *Diplomacy, force, and leadership: Essays in honor of Alexander L. George* (pp. 95–125). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Legro, J. W., & Moravcsik, A. (1999). Is anybody still a realist? *International Security, 24,* 5–55.

Levy, J. (1989). The causes of war. In P. Tetlock et al. (Eds.), *Behavior, society, and nuclear war* (vol. 1, pp. 209–333). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Linz, J. (1975). Totalitarian and authoritarian regimes. In F. Greenstein & N. Polsby (Eds.), *Handbook of political science* (vol. 3, pp. 175–357). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Maoz, Z., & Russett, B. (1993). Normative and structural causes of democratic peace, 1946–1986. *American Political Science Review, 87,* 624–638.

Marks, S. P. (1980). The peace–human rights–development dialectic. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 4,* 339–347.

Martin, L. (1992). Institutions and cooperation: Sanctions during the Falkland Islands conflict. *International Security, 16,* 25–50.

Mastanduno, M. (1991). Do relative gains matter? *International Security, 16,* 73–113.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (1995). The false promise of international institutions. *International Security, 19,* 5–49.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics.* New York: Norton.

Meernik, J. (1994). Presidential decision making and the political use of military force. *International Studies Quarterly, 38,* 121–138.

Mitrany, D. (1966). *A working peace system.* Chicago: Quadrangle.

Morgenthau, H. J. (1985). *Politics among nations* (6th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Moul, W. B. (1988). Great power alliances and the escalation to war of conflicts between unequals, 1815–1939. *International Interactions, 15,* 25–43.

Newell, A., & Simon, H. (1972). *Human problem solving.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Niou, E. N. S., & Ordeshook, P. C. (1991). Realism versus neoliberalism: A formulation. *American Journal of Political Science, 35,* 481–511.

Nye, J. S., Jr. (1988). Neorealism and neoliberalism. *World Politics, 40,* 235–251.

Pastor, R. A. (1992). *Whirlpool: U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America and the Caribbean.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Pearson, F. (1974a). Foreign military interventions and domestic disputes. *International Studies Quarterly, 18,* 259–290.

Pearson, F. (1974b). Geographic proximity and foreign military intervention. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 18,* 432–460.

Pennington, N., & Hastie, R. (1987). Explanation based decision making. *Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society, 9* (pp. 682–690). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

Powell, R. (1991). Absolute and relative gains in international relations theory. *American Political Science Review, 85,* 1303–1320.

Powell, R. (1994). Anarchy in international relations theory: The neorealist-neoliberal debate. *International Organization, 48,* 313–344.

Raymond, G., & Kegley, C. W. (1987). Long cycles and internationalized civil war. *Journal of Politics, 49,* 481–499.

Reiter, D. (1994). Learning, realism, and alliances: The weight of the shadow of the past. *World Politics, 46,* 490–526.

Riggs, R. E., & Plano, J. C. (1994). *The United Nations* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Riker, W. H. (1977). The future of a science of politics. *American Behavioral Scientist, 21,* 11–38.

Ripley, B. (1993). Psychology, foreign policy, and international relations theory. *Political Psychology, 14,* 403–416.

Rosati, J., & Creed, J. (1997). Extending the three- and four-headed eagles: The foreign policy orientations of American elites during the 80's and 90's. *Political Psychology, 18,* 583–624.

Rosenau, J. N. (1990). *Turbulence in world politics: A theory of change and continuity.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rubino-Hallman, S. (1998). When gender goes to combat: The impact of representations in collective decision making. In D. A. Sylvan & J. F. Voss (Eds.), *Problem representation in political decision making* (pp. 261–278). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Russett, B. (1993). *Grasping the democratic peace.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Schafer, M., & Crichlow, S. (2000). Bill Clinton's operational code: Assessing source material bias. *Political Psychology, 21*, 559–571.

Schweller, R. L. (1996). Neorealism's status quo bias: What security dilemma? *Security Studies, 5*, 90–121.

Shank, R. C., & Abelson, R. P. (1977). *Scripts, goals, plans, and understanding*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Shapiro, M., & Bonham, G. M. (1982). A cognitive process approach to collective decision making. In C. Jonsson (Ed.), *Cognitive dynamics and international politics* (pp. 19–37). New York: St. Martin's.

Simon, H. A. (1969). *The sciences of the artificial* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

SIPRI yearbooks (1978–1994). Solna, Sweden: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.

Sivard, R. L. (1993). *World military and social expenditures 1993*. Washington, DC: World Priorities.

Siverson, R., & King, J. (1980). Attributes of national alliance membership and war participation, 1815–1965. *American Journal of Political Science, 24*, 1–15.

Small, M., & Singer, D. J. (1982). *Resort to arms: International and civil wars, 1816–1929*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Snyder, R. C., Bruck, H. W., & Sapin, B. (1962). *Foreign policy decision making: An approach to the study of international politics*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Sollenberg, M. (Ed.) (1995). *States in armed conflict 1994*. Uppsala, Sweden: Uppsala University Department of Peace and Conflict Research.

Sorokin, G. L. (1994). Arms, alliances, and security tradeoffs in enduring rivalries. *International Studies Quarterly, 38*, 424–446.

Stein, A. (1993). Coordination and collaboration regimes in an anarchic world. In D. A. Baldwin (Ed.), *Neorealism and neoliberalism: The contemporary debate* (pp. 39–59). New York: Columbia University Press.

Sylvan, D. A. (1998). Reflecting on the study of problem representation: How are we studying it, and what are we studying? In D. A. Sylvan & J. F. Voss (Eds.), *Problem representation in political decision making* (pp. 333–342). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sylvan, D. A., & Haddad, D. M. (1998). Reasoning and problem representation in foreign policy: Groups, individuals, and stories. In D. A. Sylvan & J. F. Voss (Eds.), *Problem representation in political decision making* (pp. 187–212). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sylvan, D. A., Majeski, S. J., & Milliken, J. L. (1991). Theoretical categories and data construction in computational models of foreign policy. In V. M. Hudson (Ed.), *Artificial intelligence and international politics* (pp. 327–346). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Sylvan, D. A., & Thorson, S. J. (1992). Ontologies, problem representation, and the Cuban Missile Crisis. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 36*, 709–732.

Sylvan, D. A., & Voss, J. F. (Eds.) (1998). *Problem representation in political decision making*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tetlock, P. E. (1985). Integrative complexity of American and Soviet foreign policy rhetoric: A time series analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*, 565–585.

Tetlock, P. E. (1993). Psychological advice on foreign policy: What do we have to contribute? In N. J. Kressel (Ed.), *Political psychology: Classic and contemporary readings* (pp. 320–341). New York: Paragon.

Thorson, S. J. (1984). Intentional inferencing in foreign policy: An AI approach. In D. A. Sylvan & S. Chan (Eds.), *Foreign policy decision making: Perception, cognition, and artificial intelligence* (pp. 280–309). New York: Praeger.

Tillema, H. K. (in press). *Overt military intervention in the Cold War era*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

U.S. Department of State Dispatch (1990–1994). Collected statements of the U.S. Department of State.

Vasquez, J. A. (1987). Foreign policy, learning, and war. In C. F. Hermann, C. W. Kegley, Jr., & J. N. Rosenau (Eds.), *New directions in the study of foreign policy* (pp. 366–383). London: Allen & Unwin.

Vayrynen, R. (Ed.) (1987). *The quest for peace.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Voss, J. F. (1998). On the representation of problems: An information-processing approach to foreign policy decision making. In D. A. Sylvan & J. F. Voss (Eds.), *Problem representation in political decision making* (pp. 8–26). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Voss, J. F., & Dorsey, E. (1992). Perception and international relations: An overview. In E. Singer & V. Hudson (Eds.), *Political psychology and foreign policy* (pp. 3–30). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Walker, S. G. (1995). Psychodynamic processes and framing effects in foreign policy decision-making: Woodrow Wilson's operational code. *Political Psychology, 16,* 697–718.

Walt, S. (1987). *The origin of alliances.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Waltz, K. (1964). The stability of a bipolar world. *Daedalus, 43,* 881–909.

Waltz, K. (1979). *Theory of international politics.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Wayman, F. W., & Jones, D. M. (1991, March). *Evolution of conflict in enduring rivalries.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Vancouver.

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents (1978–1994).

Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what states make of it. *International Organization, 46,* 391–426.

Winter, D. G., & Stewart, A. J. (1977). Content analysis as a technique for assessing political leaders. In M. G. Hermann (Ed.), *A psychological examination of political leaders* (pp. 27–61). New York: Free Press.

Wittkopf, E. (1986). On the foreign policy beliefs of the American people: A critique and some evidence. *International Studies Quarterly, 30,* 425–466.

Wolfers, A. (1962). *Discord and collaboration.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Woodward, S. L. (2000). International aspects of the wars in former Yugoslavia: 1990–1996. In J. Udovički & J. Ridgeway (Eds.), *Burn this house: The making and unmaking of Yugoslavia* (rev. ed., pp. 217–246). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Young, M. (1998). Representing problem representation. In D. A. Sylvan & J. F. Voss (Eds.), *Problem representation in political decision making* (pp. 213–248). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.