The Power of Perception: Securitization, Democratic Peace, and Enduring Rivalries

Derrick Charles Seaver
Wright State University
THE POWER OF PERCEPTION: SECURITIZATION, DEMOCRATIC PEACE, AND ENDURING RIVALRIES

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

By

Derrick Charles Seaver
B.A., Wright State University, 2007

2013
Wright State University
WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL

February 19, 2013


___________________________________
Vaughn Shannon, Ph.D.
Thesis Director

___________________________________
Laura M. Luehrmann, Ph.D.
Director, Master of Arts Program in International and Comparative Politics

Committee on Final Examination:

___________________________________
Vaughn Shannon, Ph.D.

___________________________________
Liam Anderson, Ph.D.

___________________________________
Pramod Kantha, Ph.D.

___________________________________
R. William Ayres, Ph.D.
Interim Dean, Graduate School
ABSTRACT


What best explains the democratic peace: empirical indicators of democracy or the mutual perceptions of democracy within a dyadic relationship? This paper will examine three enduring rivalry dyads: the United States-Great Britain, France-Germany, and India-Pakistan, during the course of their respective enduring rivalries (Bennett, 1997; Diehl and Goertz, 2000). Within each of these dyads, I will provide detailed case studies of two conflicts at different phases of democratization – six cases in total - in order to ascertain the answers to three questions: 1) What role, if any, did the democratic character of the individual governments play in the resolution of conflict between the dyadic members? 2) What role, if any, did perception of democratization, and the capability of securitization, play in the resolution of conflict between the dyadic members? 3) What role, if any, did other competing variables play in the resolution of conflict between the dyadic members?
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Chapter One
Real or Imagined: Perceiving Democracy through Securitization

Introduction

What best explains the democratic peace: empirical indicators of levels of democracy or the mutual perception of democracy within a dyadic relationship? This paper will examine three enduring rivalry dyads: the United States-Great Britain, France-Germany, and India-Pakistan, during the course of their respective enduring rivalries (Bennett, 1997; Diehl and Goertz, 2000). Within each of these dyads, I will provide detailed case studies of two conflicts at different phases of democratization – six cases in total - in order to ascertain the answers to three questions: 1) What role, if any, did the democratic character of the individual governments play in the resolution of conflict between the dyadic members? 2) What role, if any, did perception of democratization, and the capability of securitization, play in the resolution of conflict between the dyadic members? 3) What role, if any, did other competing variables play in the resolution of conflict between the dyadic members?

Immanuel Kant, writing at a time when autocracy was the rule and democracy most certainly the exception, argued that since the natural state of man was war, the state of peace “must be established”. He went on to detail three “definitive articles” through which this state of peace may become fully realized, the first of which was that “the civil
constitution of every nation should be republican” (Kant, 1983(1795): 111-2). Since that time scholars have debated the validity of these claims.

Liberal scholarship views the democratic peace as the ultimate realization of their empirical claims and the strongest refutation of realism. Steve Chan asserts that, “The democratic peace proposition is arguably one of the most robust generalizations that has been produced to date by this research tradition” (Chan, 1997: 60); John O’Neal and Bruce Russett start their work from the assumption that democracies very rarely, if ever, fight with one another (O’Neal and Russett, 2001: 43); and Jack Levy, in an oft-quoted statement, proclaims the democratic peace to be the closest thing we have to an “empirical law” in international relations (Levy, 1988 quoted in Hobson, 2011: 1905).

Subscribers to the democratic peace have offered up two potential reasons for the existence of peace between democracies. The first is structural, in that democracy requires the will of the people for the continuation of government. As such, democratic states will be less likely to go to war because the people comprising the electorate – who have to bear the costs of war – will be unlikely to offer their consent (Doyle, 2005: 464). This phenomenon was coined “audience costs” by James Fearon (1994), who was echoing Kant: “If (as must inevitably be the case, given this form of constitution) the consent of the citizenry is required in order to determine whether or not there will be war, it is natural that they consider all its calamities before committing themselves to so risky a game” (Kant, 1983(1795): 113).
The second explanatory factor posited for the democratic peace is the normative constraints imposed upon democratic governments. Doyle describes a situation whereby liberal principles add to international respect, and that these normative commitments are sustained by material incentives (Doyle, 2005: 464-5). These constraints are demonstrated by the “Kantian Triangle” of republican government, international trade, and international organizations and law (O’Neal and Russett, 2001: 35), or in Doyle’s (2005) words, the “three pillars of the liberal peace”. Both the structural and normative causal variables are meant as explanatory mechanisms for the findings of numerous large-\(N\) studies that all reach the same conclusion when examining democratic dyads: the absence of war between them (Doyle, 1983; Russett and O’Neal, 2001; Cox and Drury, 2006).

Realist scholars, on the other hand, have disagreed with both the theoretical and the empirical findings of the democratic peace. Realism rejects the claim that internal political structures can alter the systemic forces that lead to war. As Kenneth Waltz puts it, “in an anarchic realm, peace is fragile” (Waltz, 1988 reprinted in Betts, 2013: 104). This is counter to the claim of a democratic “perpetual peace” (Kant, 1795) offered by the democratic peace theory. Further, realists have questioned the empirical findings put forth to make the democratic peace generalization. David Spiro argues that the existence of “zero wars” between democracies is little better than random chance (Spiro, 1994: 62), and also that many more exceptions exist than democratic peace theorists are willing to accept, including the Finland-Britain dyad of World War II (Spiro, 1994: 73).
Christopher Layne dismisses the structural constraint explanation in turn, stating that if such constraints did exist, democratic peace would not simply be a dyadic phenomenon, but also a monadic one (Layne, 1994: 7, 12). He also, like Spiro, argues that since democracy was rare for quite a large portion of human history, the findings may be biased because the large-\(N\) is not so large after all (Layne, 1994: 39). Sebastian Rosato levels criticism at the other explanatory variable, normative constraints, by criticizing the idea that “perceptions of democracy” can be measured and that such measurement would be ripe for constant “regime redefinition” (Rosato, 2003: 592-3).

The robustness of this debate tends to confirm the assertions of many that the democratic peace is the most sizable contribution to date of the liberal research tradition. Nevertheless, where does this leave the democratic peace in the twenty-first century? It is facing a number of scholarly and practical challenges. First, ever since Fukuyama declared the “end of history” and the subsequent lack of counter viewpoints to liberal democracy in the post-Cold War world (Fukuyama, 1989), the spread of democratic governance has broadened. As such, what was a “small-\(N\)” proposition now must spread to all corners of the globe and will be more thoroughly subjected to both the structural constraints of realists and the cultural level constraints of Huntington and others.¹

At the scholarly level, other theoretical schools have begun to examine the democratic peace theory. Constructivism has added two additional viewpoints of the democratic peace. Ido Oren and John Owen each added subjectivity to the units of
analysis on democratic peace. Oren discussed the importance of normalizing a definition of democracy that is compatible with the time-period in which it exists (Oren, 1994: 151). His works traces the views of nineteenth century American political scientists Woodrow Wilson and John Burgess to show how perceptions of a democratic Imperial Germany changed over the course of the early twentieth century (Oren, 1994: 169-77). Owen, for his part, uses four cases studies from United States foreign policy to demonstrate that “if its peers do not believe it is a liberal democracy, they will not treat it like one” (Owen, 1994: 96). In other words, Oren and Owen both demonstrate that the perception of Other by a democratic Self in the context in which conflict is occurring – are they or are they not a democracy? – will have more bearing on the outbreak of escalation than will Polity scores looking back in hindsight.

Constructivists have also contributed an idea from the Copenhagen School – securitization theory – to argue that identity is the key explanatory mechanism behind the democratic peace (Hayes, 2009: 4). Christopher Hobson, for his part, argues that the Frankfurt School of Critical Theorizing should be applied to democratic peace (Hobson, 2011). The progressive research tradition of democratic peace, now entering its third century, is being examined at a more varied level as its impact spreads to parts of the world that were considered only as colonial holdings in the time of Kant.

The realist critiques of democratic peace theory must be taken seriously. I tend to agree that significant conceptual issues regarding the definition of both democracy and

---

1 See Huntington’s *Clash of Civilizations* in “Conflict after the Cold War: Arguments on Causes of War”
war (Rosato, 2003: 593) hinder the research program. I also agree with Spiro (1994: 62) and Layne (1994: 39) that the relative lack of democracies in the world, particularly in the nineteenth century, cast serious doubt upon the large-\(N\) empirical findings of many democratic peace theorists. Further, I fully accept the constructivists claims of Hayes and others who argue that the subjective reality of the “non-democratic other” can often times be more important than the objective reality of non-democratic governance (Hayes, 2009: 4). While structural and normative constraints upon democratic government can be objectively measured, these constraints also must be viewed, as Owen and Oren detailed, in the subjective perception of the beholder – the democratic body politic.

My thesis will test these varying claims to scholarly legitimacy by exploring the explanatory power of their causal mechanisms when applied to enduring rivalries. Enduring rivalries are a good laboratory for democratic peace research for two reasons. First, they provide a unique opportunity to establish a most-similar system design between cases where many variables can be controlled. In fact, as William Thompson puts it, the critical defining characteristic of an enduring rivalry is “non-anonymity” between the members (Thompson, 2001: 561). Second, enduring rivalries will be of paramount importance as democracy spreads and the challenges to the democratic peace thesis increase. According the Diehl and Goertz (2001: 145-6), of the sixty-three enduring rivalries that had existed or were continuing in 1992, forty-nine (78%) of them contained at least one dyadic member outside of North America and Europe. This means and Peace,” Richard K. Betts, 2013: 35-53
that as democratization spreads, and the challenge to the democratic peace theory becomes more abundant, one of the primary fault lines of conflict will be within enduring rivalries. Evidence of this was already seen in O’Neal and Russett’s list of “possible exceptions” to the democratic peace theory, which included the 1995 conflict between Ecuador and Peru, the 1999 Kargil War between India and Pakistan, and the 1998-2000 separatist war between Eritrea and Ethiopia (O’Neal and Russett, 2001: 48). Both the Ecuador-Peru and India-Pakistan dyads were identified as enduring rivalries (Diehl and Goertz, 2000: 145-6; Bennett, 1997: 235-6), and the Eritrea-Ethiopia dyad was also identified as such by Thompson (2001: 571).

I accept the classification of these conflicts as exceptions to the democratic peace, and also accept that other exceptions exist. My thesis will examine six of these exceptions. Within each of three enduring rivalry dyads, two cases will be examined, one of which a case of conflict and subsequent escalation, the second a case of conflict lacking subsequent escalation. Three tests will be applied to each. First, did the constraints provided by two democratic states, when viewed objectively, have any bearing on the presence of the dependent variable (escalation – which will be defined as movement from threat to display of force, and display of force to use of force)? Second, did the perceptions of one dyadic member of the other’s democracy have any bearing on the presence of the dependent variable? Third, did other independent causal variables have any bearing on the existence of the dependent variable?
By conducting these tests, this thesis will add to the existing democratic peace literature in three ways. First, it will go beyond the conceptual quagmire of defining “war” by accepting all militarized interstate disputes (MID) between democracies as exceptions to the rule, in order to get a firmer grasp on what leads democracies towards more peaceful relations with each other. Second, by examining democratic peace in relation to enduring rivalries, it will provide insight into the application of the democratic peace in an area that is sure to become more pertinent in international relations. Third, it will utilize past cases to put securitization theory to a robust test in order to ascertain whether objective democratization or subjective democratization is more important for peace within rivalry dyads.
**Literature Review**

*Enduring Rivalries*

Paul Diehl and Gary Goertz define an enduring rivalry as the existence of at least six dyadic disputes within a twenty-year period. This definition yields sixty-three enduring rivalries from 1816-1992, averaging close to thirty-eight years and fifteen conflicts each (Diehl and Goertz: 2000: 143-4). Their work served as the basis for numerous other scholars examining the field of enduring rivalries.

Scott Bennett argues that enduring rivalries should not be measured temporally (Bennett, 1997: 227-8). His definition, which he calls “interstate rivalries,” provides a primary contribution by taking the Diehl and Goertz list and making the end dates more precise. By classifying an enduring rivalry not by counting the number of wars and the number of years, but rather by the outstanding nature of lingering issues - “Intuitively anything about which two states may seriously disagree” (Bennett, 1997: 230) – Bennett can more accurately pin down the starting and ending dates for numerous enduring rivalries.

He uses as a case study the United States-British rivalry. Diehl and Goertz place the exact dates of the rivalry to be from 1837 to the start of the American Civil War in 1861 (Diehl and Goertz, 2000: 145). Bennett argues persuasively that the issues between the two states, namely boundary issues with Canada, British aid for the Confederacy, and colonial meddling by the British in North and South America, were not resolved until the late nineteenth century, at the earliest. Bennett chooses to not change the beginning date
of the rivalry (1837), but makes the claim that the end date could be either 1861, 1872, or 1903, depending on how one looks upon the treaties which smoothed relations between the Trans-Atlantic states (Bennett, 1997: 238-9).

Additionally, Bennett explores the France-German dyad and assigns a separate end date to it as well. Diehl and Goertz place the end of the enduring rivalry in 1945, the year in which the Third Reich was vanquished by the Allied Powers. Bennett, on the other hand, asserts that the final militarized dispute in 1954-5 over the re-armament of West Germany provides a more accurate concluding date (Bennett, 1997: 236), in that Germany accession into the Western European community settled any outstanding issues between the her and her continental neighbor. In conclusion, Bennett makes a compelling case that issue salience is the only true measure of the start, and conclusion, of enduring international rivalry (Bennett, 1997: 251).

William Thompson assesses the strengths and weaknesses of both Diehl and Goertz’s work, as well as Bennett’s, and makes the case that four separate categories should exist to classify rivalry. The first is “enduring rivalries,” which is the classification given by Diehl and Goertz, the second and third are “interstate rivalries” and simply “rivalries,” two variations based on Bennett’s methodology, and the fourth is “strategic rivalry,” a category offered by Thompson (Thompson, 2001: 568-73). He argues that where these four classifications really part ways is in “the definitions of their concepts” (Thompson, 2001: 568). Thompson critiques both Diehl and Goertz and Bennett for
placing too much emphasis on temporal dispute and year counting, while ignoring non-militarized issue salience (Thompson, 2001: 569, 574).

Thompson’s strategic rivalry classification has an impact on all three dyads under examination here. He classifies strategic rivalries as differing from the other classifications by being “non-dispute density” focused (Thompson, 2001: 582). In other words, just as Bennett had argued, so long as issue salience remains high, whether or not a militarized dispute occurs is irrelevant. An enduring rivalry is such not because of repeat militarized disputes, but because militarized disputes are an ever-present possibility. Thompson alters the dates for all three of the enduring rivalry dyads under examination here by utilizing this classification. He places the United States-Great Britain dyad from 1816-1904, the France-Germany dyad from 1816-1955, and the India-Pakistan dyad from 1947-continuous as of 2001 (Thompson, 2001: 570-3).

Democratic Peace Theory

The idea of a universal democratic peace is one of the most widely debated subjects in international relations, with literature stretching back at least to the late eighteenth century. Particularly during the latter years of the Cold War, and even more so after the collapse of the Berlin Wall, the belief that democratic pairs of states do not fight with one another has gained significant scholarly appeal. Steve Chan details this lively debate, which he classifies as “progressive,” with a review of literature dating to Dean Babst’s publication of A Force for Peace in 1972 (Chan, 1997: 61).
While the empirical claim of the democratic peace – namely democracies rarely, if ever, fight wars with one another – has been largely accepted, the underlying debate surrounds two areas. First, scholars have debated the identity of a causal mechanism for the generalized relationship between democracy and peace. In other words, now that there is an established belief that “it is,” we must establish “why it is so”. Second, there is a debate regarding the dyadic or monadic existence of democratic peace. Chan states that there are two competing claims to the democratic peace: democracies are, in general, more peaceful than non-democracies (monadic peace); democracies are only more peaceful towards each other (dyadic peace) (Chan, 1997: 62).

Aside from these two larger debates, three other research questions challenge the democratic peace. First, the fact that the democratic peace is part and parcel to the underlying question of international relations, namely how to foster peace, assures that it is susceptible to numerous theoretical challenges to its claim, particularly from realists (Rosato, 2003; Layne, 1994; Bachteler, 1997; Gartzke, 2000; Spiro, 1994) but also increasingly from constructivists (Hayes, 2009; Hayes, 2012; Xenias, 2005) and critical theorists (Hobson, 2011; Gat, 2005). Second, the democratic peace has been undermined by the other two pillars of the “liberal peace” (Doyle, 2005). The idea that the internal political structure of the state causes peaceful relations is weakened by the assertion that it may just as well be caused by mutual membership in international organizations or by an international trade regime (Doyle, 1983; Doyle, 1986; Doyle, 2005; Cox and Drury, 2006; Henderson, 1999; Maoz and Russett, 1993; O’Neal and Russett, 2001). Finally,
democratic peace theory relies on a highly contested concept as an independent variable (democracy) and a highly contested concept as a dependent variable (war). This conceptual cloudiness means that a significant amount of debate has been utilized on how to define each (Layne, 1994; Forsythe, 1992). Assessing the state of these five debates within the democratic peace field will aid my research by bringing clarity to the cases being studied and the variables by which to study them.

Structural vs. Normative Constraints

The structural theory of democratic peace argues that the citizens comprising a democratic state will be disinclined to support aggressive action because they will ultimately bear the cost of such action. Kant summarized this logic as such: “For it does not require the moral improvement of man; it requires only that we know how to apply the mechanism of nature to men as to organize the conflict of hostile attitudes present in a people in such a way that they must compel one another to submit to coercive laws and thus to enter into a state of peace, where laws have power” (Kant, 1983(1795): 124). For him, men had it within their capability to be peaceful. What prevented peace were autocratic governments and the ability the fostered for unelected leaders to launch war, go about their business, and leave the bill to be picked up by the citizenry. Under structural logic, this would be unthinkable in a democracy.

Structural constraints consist of a number of individual variables. I will briefly examine the primary restraint here: audience cost. Advanced by James Fearon, audience
cost theory argues that democratic leaders will be unlikely to launch military actions, unless they are assured of victory, for fear of electoral reprisal (Fearon, 1994). Hayes extends this viewpoint to include identity and securitization, by exploring the role of the democratic American public in refusing to securitize India in 1971, despite attempts by Nixon and Kissinger to convince them to do so, thereby essentially blocking military action between two democracies over Bangladesh (Hayes, 2012: 70).

Audience cost theory has been critiqued on different levels. Rosato argues that autocrats could very well be even more susceptible to audience costs, in that they could lose their lives (Hitler, Mussolini, etc.) and not just an election (Rosato, 2003: 594). Alexander Downes, in another line of critique, demonstrates that audience costs can be compromised by domestic political concerns with a case-study of the United States’ decision to escalate hostilities with North Vietnam in 1965.2

The normative theory of democratic peace is intimately related to the prevailing dyadic nature of the theory. Normative school adherents argue that democracies enjoy more peaceful relations with one another because their respective cultures “emphasize the role of shared democratic principles, perceptions, and expectations of behavior” (O’Neal and Russett, 2001: 53). Among these norms are a respect for sovereignty (Doyle, 1983: 213) and the externalizing of democratic norms, such as the rule of law and human rights (Zinnes, 2004: 435). Maoz and Russett find that normative constraints tend to be more

---

“significant” than structural constraints when identifying the causes of democratic peace (Maoz and Russett, 1993: 634).

This is largely accepted by default. In many ways, in order to accept the structural constraints argument for the democratic peace, you would have to accept the monadic peace theory. Put another way, if audience costs, along with the other inhibiting structural factors of democracy (group constraint, slow mobilization, and transparency) (Rosato, 2003: 594-8), were inhibitors of violence within democracy, why would they only inhibit violence towards other democracies? To paraphrase Rosato, if public constraint placed a limit on democracies war actions then they would be more pacific in general, not just towards other democracies (Rosato, 2003: 594). Normative constraints, as Maoz and Russett demonstrate, have empirical validity, but their acceptance is also required for the foundation of a dyadic democratic peace to hold.

Dyadic vs. Monadic Democratic Peace

The idea of a monadic democratic peace has far less scholarly adherents than the dyadic variation. In fact, some of the largest proponents of democratic peace reject the idea that democracies are less war-prone than their autocratic counterparts. Maoz and Russett list the fact that “democracies are as war-prone as non-democracies” as one of the essential two criteria needed for the democratic peace (Maoz and Russett, 1993: 624). By this calculation, the democratic peace is viewed through the lens of the magic of chemistry, whereby the non-pacific nature of individual democracies somehow yields
pacific relations when mixed together. John MacMillan classifies it in a far less flattering light, describing a “separate democratic peace” (dyadic) as a “phantom” of which we should give up chasing (MacMillan, 2003: 237). Realists have been even harder on the idea of monadic peace; with Layne using it to dismiss the entire idea of structural constraints based on that the fact that a monadic peace does not exist (Layne, 1994: 12).

Even those who defend the idea of a monadic democratic peace, including Lars-Erik Cederman, have to bolster their argument with other variables of the liberal peace. Cederman suggests that after three characteristics are in place – strategic tagging, ideological alliances, and collective security (Cederman, 2001: 475-7) – a normative process will take hold that will “take on a life of its own” (Cederman, 2001: 473). While his work provides a compelling case for this hypothesis, it is not exactly noteworthy that an international system whereby the norms of democracy, collective security alliances, and the combining of the “free world” would yield peace. If anything, this loosens the hold of domestic institutions as a primary causal variable. O’Neal and Russett find evidence for the monadic hypothesis, but classify the evidence as “controversial,” (O’Neal and Russett, 2001: 36) and Rousseau, et. al. finds some evidence for the monadic model as well, although their findings for the dyadic peace are far more substantial (Rousseau, et. al., 1996: 512).

The dyadic model of the democratic peace, on the other hand, enjoys robust support in the literature. O’Neal and Russett argue that, “Not only do democracies virtually never wage war on other democracies, they are also much less likely than other
kinds of states to have serious military disputes or skirmishes with each other” (O’Neal and Russett, 2001: 36). Even Rosato, whose realist critique of the democratic peace theory found its mark on many claims, conceded that the empirical findings of the democratic peace were “robust” (Rosato, 2003: 585).

Examining contemporary world events helps to highlight this dichotomous debate. The United States may very well not be at war, or be at risk of war, with a major democratic power, but they, the world’s oldest and arguably most well-respected democracy, have initiated wars in the past decade with Iraq and Afghanistan (Hobson, 2011: 1904) and are currently attempting to securitize Iran (Hayes, 2009: 979). The democratic peace rises and falls on its dyadic claim.

*Other Causal Variables*

Aside from mutual levels of democracy, numerous other independent variables have been put forward to explain the dependent variable of conflict escalation and challenge the democratic peace thesis. These include the existence of a security alliance, power imbalance, contiguity, existence of a great power within the dyad, hegemonic stability, civilizational differences, nuclear deterrence, economic interdependence, and common IGO membership (O’Neal and Russett, 2001). I will very briefly review some of the literature pertaining to these variables.
Security Alliance

Karl Deutsch defined a security community as “a group of people which had become integrated” (Deutsch, 1969(1957): 5). Speaking specifically about the North Atlantic area in the post-World War Two era, Deutsch argues that integration has occurred when “dependable expectations” of peaceful change among the members exists (Deutsch, 1969(1957): 5). It is no accident that Deutsch lists the experience of the early American states as his first case of a successful security community (Deutsch, 1969(1957): 16). Alexander Hamilton hailed the benefit of thirteen individual states joining to “resist a common enemy,”³ and Deutsch recognized this as an early example of a security community in the grouping of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The Deutschian ideal of “dependable expectations” would, if true, supplant the democratic peace claims to providing much the same causal mechanisms.

Power Imbalance, Contiguity, and Great Power Dyads

Thucydides recounted an exchange between the Athenians and the Melians, where a simple choice was put to the weaker party. The Athenians, enjoying a sizable power imbalance, implored the Melians to surrender peacefully and avoid war. The logic, to the Athenians at least, was self-explanatory: “the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must”.⁴

³ Federalist 29
While this episode resulted in a war due to the Melian refusal to surrender, the logic remains the same. Large power imbalances could offset war in that the weaker party would find the initiation of a war to be both irrational and detrimental to their security. Layne argues that “international political behavior is characterized by continuity, regularity, and repetition because states are constrained by the international system’s unchanging (and probably unchangeable) structure” (Layne, 1994: 10-1). This structure, according to Waltz, is anarchic and driven by rational, self-maximizing states. In other words, the drive for the accumulation of power means that states will be unable to break out of the security dilemma, whether or not they are democratic (Layne, 1994: 12).

The realist variable of power imbalance is intimately related to the variables of contiguity and the existence of a great power dyad. As was mentioned earlier, Bennett displayed the importance of “issue salience” (Bennett, 1997: 251) on the continuation of enduring international rivalry. Clearly, very few issues in a security-seeking realm have higher salience than that of contiguity. Quoting Vasquez, Diehl and Goertz goes so far as to state that geographical contiguity was the “critical factor” for whether or not conflict within an enduring rivalry dyad would escalate (Diehl and Goertz, 2000: 156).

Much the same can be said for the existence of a great power within a dyad. Just as a dyad separated by thousands of miles, for example Argentina and Mali, would rarely find a reason to go to war, so too will great power-minor power dyads rarely go to war. The Melian outcomes are most likely: the weaker nation acquiesces, or the larger nation obtains its goal short of war. As O’Neal and Russett accurately assert, “most countries at
most times are at peace” (O’Neal and Russett, 2001: 81). With this reality, we can not credit democratic peace for preventing conflict between dyads who for either power imbalance, contiguity, or great power status, chose to not go enter a conflict.

**Hegemonic Stability**

Hegemonic stability, either regionally or globally, is a double-edged sword for conflict. On one hand, it can reduce the likelihood of conflict and tamper its intensity. On the other, it could be a catalyst for a major-power war, regardless of the democratic status of the states involved.

Robert Gilpin tells us that declining hegemons face two options in order to bring their capabilities and commitments in to balance. The first is to retrench, or reduce commitments. *Prima facie*, this means that the existing hegemon was policing their region or the globe prior to this retrenchment. This could be a source for peace. However, once that decline has begun, the other option is to fight a hegemonic war for control of the system. In this way, hegemony can be a source of significant conflict (Gilpin, 1981).

**Civilizational Differences**

Aside from the democratic nature of government, a clear fault line between two states can be the cultural differences between them. Huntington, in *The Clash of Civilizations?*, defined a civilization as “the highest cultural grouping of people”. Shortly after the Cold War had ended, Huntington was arguing that culture, not systems of
government or power, will be the new division between peoples. O’Neal and Russett devote an entire chapter of their work to addressing the claims made by Huntington, concluding that empirical testing shows that “there is little evidence civilizations clash” (O’Neal and Russett, 2001: 256-7).

Nevertheless, Anastasia Xenias aptly applied this theory to the democratic peace. Xenia rightly characterizes civilization as a “fact,” a form of zero-sum thinking that leads to conflict. She goes on to say that “divisions are a fact, not a normative judgment,” (Xenias, 2005: 373) and therefore, conflict arising from them would pose yet another challenge to the democratic peace theory. This would significantly cloud the democratic perceptions of states across cultural lines. She argues that “in-group vs. out-group” lines have the longest history in international relations, and “if the dividing line is civilization, it can not be erased” (Xenias, 2005: 374). In other words, if civilization is involved, perpetual peace becomes unobtainable.

Nuclear Deterrence

No matter ones position on the development and proliferation of nuclear weapons, you would be hard pressed to downplay their significance to international relations. John Mearsheimer extolled their “pacifying effects” when he warned us all that we would “miss the Cold War,” in part because of the peace kept by mutually assured destruction in

---

5 Huntington, 35-6
Western Europe. This variable can certainly not be discounted when considering causes for peace.

However, like hegemonic stability, the effects of nuclear weapons can be both positively and negatively related to the dependent variable of conflict escalation. While Mearsheimer demonstrates that the “Long Peace” in Western Europe can indeed be explained in part by nuclear deterrence, Akisato Suzuki and Neophytos Loizides showed the opposite effects in South Asia. Discussing the India-Pakistan conflict, Suzuki and Loizides found that “security dilemmas at the unconventional/sub-conventional level (terrorism) were intensified rather than reduced by nuclear deterrence” (emphasis in original) (Suzuki and Loizides, 2011: 33). While the Cold War may be missed in Europe, it is not certain whether Cold War-level proliferation will be a welcome addition for peace everywhere.

Economic Interdependence and IGO Membership

Kant described “three definitive articles of peace” (Kant, 1983(1795): 112,115,118). In addition to democratic government, these articles include international organizations and “cosmopolitan law,” or in modern usage, free trade. Subsequently these have been defined as a “Kantian Triangle” (O’Neal and Russett, 2001: 35) and “three pillars of liberal peace” (Doyle, 2005). No matter the name, the addition of economic

---

6 See Why We Will Soon Miss the Cold War in “Conflict after the Cold War: Arguments on Causes of War and Peace,” Richard K. Betts, 2013: 18-35
interdependence and international organization membership are competing variables to the democratic peace theory.

Dan Cox and Cooper Drury, in a critique of the “three pillars” argument, demonstrate that bilateral trade and economic sanctions are not inversely related (Cox and Drury, 2006: 717). Mousseau, on the other hand, claims that economic development and democratic culture go together and that obtaining one without the other is unlikely (Mousseau, 2000: 473). Henderson claims that neoidealism rests not on democratic structures, but rather international regimes, and that those regimes are the causal mechanism towards peace observed by democratic peace (Henderson, 1999: 203-4). Doyle asserts that the existence of all three variables is required in order to obtain an “evolution towards peace” (Doyle, 1986: 1159), and in a later response to Rosato, Doyle makes the following declarative statement: “No one of these constitutional, international or cosmopolitan sources is sufficient, but together (and only where together) they plausibly connect the characteristics of liberal polities and economies with sustained liberal peace” (Doyle, 2005: 463). When assessing democratic peace, these additional liberal variables must be included alongside their theoretical rivals.
Both the independent variable and the dependent variable of most past work on the democratic peace are contested concepts. O’Neal and Russett are guided by a procedural definition of democracy, emphasizing the characteristics that most citizens can vote, that the government has come to power in a free and fair election comprised of at least two competitive parties, and that the executive is either popularly elected or held accountable by a popularly elected legislature (O’Neal and Russett, 2001: 44). Chan discusses the disputed nature of the concept at length, and draws a distinction between “democratization” and “consolidated democracy,” (Chan, 1997: 65-6) a distinction which is important for the democratic peace. Robinson, in attempting to generalize the concept of democracy back to Ancient Greece, quotes Weart who asserted that a democracy must be consolidated for “at least three years” before the democratic peace would apply (Robinson, 2001: 595). Even Kant drew a distinction between “republican government,” which he defined as separating executive from legislative power, and “democracy,” which he defined as despotism (Kant, 1983(1795): 114).

The research field has largely settled on the Polity III data set for a quantitative guide to democratization (O’Neal and Russett, 2001: 1997; Spiro, 1994: 55). But even this trusted 21-point scaling system, which ranks the democratic and autocratic characteristics of states back to 1800, raises conceptual questions. Let us examine an example from this research to highlight some of the pitfalls. Layne argues that a possible exception to the democratic peace is the War of 1812 (Layne, 1994: 40). He makes this
argument despite the fact that Polity III code’s Britain’s polity score for 1812 at -2, with a
democratic score of four and an autocratic score of six. The United States received a
Polity coding of 9 in 1812.7

The individual researcher now faces a choice. One could discard this exception as
being insufficiently so, in that empirically the United States-Great Britain dyad of 1812 is
not a mutually democratic dyad. However, I would not be so quick to dismiss Layne’s
suggestion. The British allowed restricted franchise, just as the United States did. Neither
state was anywhere near liberal in the modern sense, but the British had banned the slave
trade five years earlier while the United States had a slave owner occupying the White
House. If anything, this case demonstrates Oren’s caution against the bias of democratic
“coding,” stating that we must be careful to not make the United States the standard by
which all other states, at all points in time, are judged (Oren, 1994: 150).

Conceptual clarity has been equally elusive in regards to the dependent variable:
war. Most scholars rely on the Correlates of War Data, which following the lead of
Singer and Small (1972) places the definition of war at 1,000 battlefield deaths in
interstate combat8. Here, too, the quest for parsimonious definitions has posed significant
concerns. Both Layne and Spiro raised legitimate questions over the consideration of
Civil War, particularly in the United States, as a form of “interstate conflict” (Layne,
1994: 40; Spiro, 1994: 59). Additionally, numerous authors raised concerns over the
discounting of United States covert interventions during the Cold War, particularly in

7 All scores taken from the Polity website and demarcated as “Polity Scores, 1800-2010”

Another illustrative case can be found within this research. Layne utilizes as a case study the Ruhr Crisis of 1923, involving France and Weimar Germany, where the French seized the Ruhr region ostensibly as retribution for missed reparation payments under the Versailles Treaty. While it was reported that “murder, rape, robbery, deportation, and evacuations”\(^9\) were essentially daily occurrences, it is not clear whether 1,000 deaths were reached at all, and it is certainly clear that these deaths were not battlefield related. Most reports place the culprits as French soldiers, but the victims as passive German resistors to the French incursion.\(^{10}\) On one hand, Polity places both these states as democratic, while on the other hand, the Correlates of War does not list this as a “war”. I address both of these conceptual issues in this research.

---

\(^8\) Information obtained from the COW Typology of War: Defining and Categorizing War (Version 4)
Methodology/Research Design

Variables and Operationalization

Dependent Variable: Escalated Interstate Conflict

I will classify conflict using the Militarized Interstate Dispute (MID) data from the Correlates of War Project, Version 3.0. This data is far more encompassing than the Correlates of War data on the categorization of war, in that it includes “every threat, display, or use of force” between member states. Escalation shall exist when threat moves to a display of force, and a display to a use of force. As previously stated, I accept the classification by Layne and others of these cases as exceptions to the democratic peace theory, and the research will focus instead on the impact that democratic perceptions had on the decision to escalate by one or both members of an enduring rivalry dyad.

Independent Variable 1: Democratic Perception

Owen makes the persuasive case that it is whether or not a state perceives another as democratic, not whether it is objectively so on a coding scale decades into the future, that influences decisions for war or peace. Further, it is the failure to accept the role of subjectivity that prevents democratic peace theorists from grappling effectively with exceptions (Owen, 1994: 96-7). Oren agrees, arguing that a pro-American bias in the

10 Ibid.
11 Taken from Associate Document for the Correlates of War, Militarized Interstate Dispute Dataset, Version 3.0.
coding data sets makes it essential that we view democracy not from historical hindsight, but from the prevailing normative benchmarks of individual period time (Oren, 1994: 151).

The role of securitization must be added to the concept of democratic perceptions, particularly when dealing with democratic polities. Jarrod Hayes offered that the idea of successful securitization – the argument that an actor poses an existential threat to the state (Hayes, 2009: 982) – is the key determinant in the democratic research program. Further, it is the acceptance by the public of such an argument that delineates democracy from other forms of government. In other words, in democracy, the public has to agree with the securitization posturing of the government. Hayes argues that “shared democratic identity makes it very difficult for political leaders within democracies to successfully argue that another democracy poses an existential threat—a critical component to the securitization move” (Hayes, 2009: 4).

Hayes’ work is notable in that it brings to bear a new wrinkle in democratic peace studies. He utilizes the case studies of US-India and US-China relations to demonstrate the different capabilities of a democratic polity in securitization, against one state where a shared democratic “in-group” is perceived, and another where a distinctive “out-group” feeling exists (Hayes, 2009: 983). This work plans to build on that work by testing democratic perception as the key independent variable, while controlling for other variables. Additionally, by tracing the perceptions of the public within enduring rivalry dyads, which are conflictual and defined by “non-anonymity” between the actors
(Thompson, 2001: 561), we will be able to more clearly ascertain whether it is democracy or the initiating public’s perception of “others” democracy that truly matters when studying the democratic peace.

How then do we gauge public perception of democratization? According to Hayes, the Copenhagen School defines three characteristics for securitization. First, leaders engage in a “speech act” that places the target as an existential threat, or in Hayes’ words, uses the “grammar of security”. Second, the actor possesses the social capital or authority to make such a statement. Third, the securitizing entity will describe the role of the external actor meant to be threatening, in this case, a non-democratic entity (Hayes, 2012: 66).

In democracy, however, this is only the first phase. The second is the reception and reaction of the public to the securitization message. This process should also consist of three components. First, the in-group/out-group message is received by the public. Second, an opposition to securitization arises, based on the fact that the target is a democracy. Third, this opposition exerts influence over state leadership, and weakens the move towards securitization (Hayes, 2012: 70).

Supportive evidence during the securitization phase can be obtained by utilizing primary source documentation from key decision-makers and the general public. Particularly of importance is the reaction of the opposition during the securitization threat of a fellow democracy. It is axiomatic that a securitizing party will invoke the language of security in an attempt to move their respective publics toward a war-footing (Hayes,
2012). However, in a democracy, this language must also be buttressed by an assertion that the enemy state is also void of democratic credentials. As such, I will focus my research on the public statements of both securitizing and opposition party members, including speeches, newspaper articles, opinion editorials, and records of public protest. Additionally, securitization will also be examined as an electoral process. If audience cost theory holds, it will be most pronounced in the election results that surround a move towards securitizing another democracy. I will apply a static list of coding terms to assess the perception of democracy to ensure that all data is interviewed in a standard way in order to avoid bias.

For my hypothesis to hold, the following process should be observed: in an escalated conflict, the securitizing party should invoke both the language of security and assert that the opposing state is not democratic, while the opposition party should assert that the opposing state is democratic, with the securitizing party winning out with the public; in a de-escalated conflict, both the securitizing and opposition parties should invoke the same language, with the opposition party gaining the upper hand with the public at-large.
Independent Variable 2: Empirical Democracy

For this study to be truly robust, I will also consider whether it is empirical democracy that makes the difference in decisions to escalate conflict within enduring rivalry dyads. I will measure democracy by using Polity 3.0 scores along a 21-point coding scale.

Independent Variable 3: Power Imbalance

Power imbalance can be measured using the Correlates of War, Composite Index of National Capabilities (CINC), version 4.0. There is one exception. The data table only stretches back to 1816, meaning that I will be unable to obtain CINC data for the United States and Great Britain in 1811, the year preceding the start of the War of 1812. For this dyad-year I use the 1816 data, as I find no reason to believe any discernible difference would exist between the general military capabilities of the two states between 1811 and 1816.

Independent Variable 4: Economic Interdependence

Following O’Neal and Russett, I utilize the Statesman’s Yearbook for trade data prior to 1918, the League of Nations from 1920-1938, and the IMF in the post-World War Two era (O’Neal and Russett, 2001: 139-40). This information is compiled by the Correlates of War Trade Data Set, version 2.1, for the years 1870-2006.
Independent Variable 5: IGO Membership

I utilize the Correlates of War IGO Data, version 2.1. Again, the exception is the United States-Great Britain dyad in 1811. I will utilize the 1815 data, as I see no reason why this would have undergone a substantial change in that time frame.

Independent Variable 6: Great Power Dyad


Control Variables

In addition to the independent variables of this research, enduring rivalry dyads allow us to control for a number of variables within a most similar systems design model. The following variables were unchanged within the three enduring rivalry dyads over the course of both case studies within each.

Control Variable 1: Security Alliance

In order to determine whether joint membership in a security alliance existed, I will utilize the Correlates of War Main Alliance data, version 3.03. In this, and all quantitative data, I follow the lead of O’Neal and Russett and use the data from the
previous year of the conflict (O’Neal and Russett, 2001). As this data would be the most up to date that leaders would have, it is important to recognize this in the research.

*Control Variable 2: Hegemonic Stability*

I utilize the definition offered for global hegemony by O’Neal and Russett, recognizing Great Britain as the global hegemon prior to 1945, and the United States thereafter (O’Neal and Russett, 2001: 185).

*Control Variable 3: Civilizational Differences*

Huntington provides a specific list of civilizational differences, consisting of seven (and perhaps eight) global civilizations (Xenias, 2005: 372). I utilize this list to classify the civilization group of each dyad under review.

*Control Variable 4: Nuclear Deterrence*

Recognizing that nuclear deterrence may lead to peaceful relations between states, regardless of the political system of each, I classify a dyad as either both states possessing nuclear capabilities, or one or less states possessing nuclear capability.
Control Variable 5: Contiguity

Contiguity is measured by the existence of a common boundary between either of the two states’ territorial boundaries, the territorial boundaries of their colonial holdings, or the colonial holdings of one and the territorial boundary of the other (O’Neal and Russett, 2001: 101).

Case Selection

As previously mentioned, this research will focus on three enduring rivalry dyads: Anglo-American (1775-1903), Franco-German (1905-1955), and Indo-Pakistani (1947-Continous). The six conflict case studies will be of the War of 1812 and the Caroline Affair (Anglo-American), the Ruhr Crisis and the German Re-Armament Crisis (Franco-German), and the Kargil War and the Mumbai Terror Attack Crisis (Indo-Pakistani).

These case studies were selected based on three factors. First, they represent “hard cases” for the democratic peace theory, in that the outcomes of all six incidents under review were militarized interstate disputes. Second, all three dyads have been utilized by critics of the democratic peace as notable exceptions to the theory, and as such, provide a prime opportunity to explore why such exceptions took place. Third, and most importantly, the cases under review allow for a most similar systems case study design that should yield valuable results.

These cases were selected based on the dependent variable. By that I mean that the first case in each dyad was selected as a case of conflict with escalation, the second a
case of conflict either with less escalation or without escalation. While I fully recognize the potential pitfalls in this manner of case selection\textsuperscript{12}, I believe that it is both warranted and extremely valuable in this research project. According to George and Bennett, “cases selected on the dependent variable...can help identify which variables are not necessary or sufficient conditions for the selected outcome” (George and Bennett, 2005: 23). Such shall be the goal of this research. For example, by comparing two separate points in the lifespan of an enduring rivalry, many if not all independent variables can be controlled for. Contiguity does not change rapidly, and civilization not-at-all. Nuclear deterrence appears in both the 1999 and 2008 case studies within the India-Pakistan dyad, and of course does not exist in the earlier cases of the United States-Great Britain and France-Germany. In short, these cases are appropriate for selection based on the dependent variable.

Additionally, these cases provide the opportunity to engage in detailed and in-depth process-tracing, whereby the weight of certain causal variables can be determined (George and Bennett, 2005: 27). Process tracing, as detailed by George and Bennet, examines “histories, archival documents, interview transcripts, and other sources to see whether the causal process a theory hypothesizes or implies in a case is in fact evident in the sequence and values of the intervening variables in this case” (George and Bennet, 2005: 6). For example, it is highly possible that a host of factors caused the French to escalate in the Ruhr in 1923 and then stand-down over German re-armament in 1954-5.

\textsuperscript{12} See Barbara Geddes, “How the Cases you Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in
not least of which being the newly formed security alliance in Europe and the existence of a United States hegemonic presence. However, it is also possible that France had grown to perceive West Germany as a democratic ally, and these processes may have affected the norms of both states. Process tracing through case studies will allow this exploration to be furthered.

Further, I feel that the amount of variables under consideration – eleven when including our controls – and the hypotheses derived therefrom – that each IV is the cause of the DV – will ensure sufficient independence between the cases. In other words, I feel that this research will be governed with an exhaustive list of hypotheses under consideration, and provide the independence of each case under consideration from the one preceding it (George and Bennett, 2005: 33).

Finally, I acknowledge that both parsimony and generalizability will be sacrificed, as George and Bennett discuss, for the sake of “contingent generalizations” that apply to types and sub-types of cases. For this reason, my case selection reflects a Trans-Atlantic, single great power dyad; a continental, two-great power dyad; and a periphery, contiguous, non-great power dyad. The research is post-positivist by design, in that I do not pretend to be researching towards a finding that can posit neither a “general law” nor “tendencies that underlie behavior” (George and Bennett, 2005: 31).

It goes without saying that whether or not a state viewed another as democratic is case-specific, and contingent generalizations are the best that can be hoped for. But, if
one is to believe that anarchy truly is “what states make of it”\textsuperscript{14} and that in democracies, the people serving as “securitization audiences” (Hayes, 2012: 70) provide the last great line of defense between a Waltzian anarchy and a Wendtian anarchy, then the information these cases provide will be worth having. Ultimately, the research of these cases will answer the critical question posed by Harvey Starr about the democratic peace: “Which explanation works under what conditions?” (Starr, 1997: 15)

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid: 31

\textsuperscript{14} See Anarchy is What States Make of It in “Conflict after the Cold War: Arguments on Causes of War and Peace,” Richard K. Betts, 2013: 214-235
Chapter Two
Anglo-American Dyad (1803-1842): Self-Perception and the Democratic Peace

Introduction

Beginning with the hostilities surrounding the American War of Independence in 1775, the United States and Great Britain became locked in an enduring rivalry relationship that spanned until at least 1861 (Diehl and Goertz, 2000: 145) and perhaps as long as 1904 (Thompson, 2001: 570). This chapter will examine two conflictual points within this relationship, the first being a case of escalated conflict that occurred between 1803-1812 and ultimately led to the War of 1812, and the second a case of non-escalated conflict occurring between 1837-1842, surrounding territorial disputes in Upstate New York and the Aroostook region of Maine.

Both cases presented here resulted from disputes over the territorial integrity of the United States; both cases had significant issues arising from trading partnerships; and both cases occurred prior to the United States’ ascendance to great power status (O’Neal and Russett, 2001: 101-2). After controlling for numerous variables, I will examine the possible explanatory variables for the differing outcomes of escalation in the two cases.

This chapter will proceed as follows. I will examine the events surrounding the securitization efforts preceding the conflicts of 1812 and 1837 in turn. Each case study will be broken down thus.
First, I will briefly detail the context and background of each case. Second, I will examine the respective attempts at securitization by the leaders of both Great Britain and the United States in the lead-up to conflict. Third, I will discuss the opposition to securitization that occurred in both Great Britain and the United States in the lead-up to each conflict. Fourth, I will answer, in each case, whether the threat was successfully securitized by the elites and general public in either Great Britain and/or the United States. Fifth, I will examine the potential explanatory variables that could account for the differing outcomes in securitization between the cases. Sixth, I will briefly conclude the chapter by discussing the most likely explanatory variable.

**Anglo-American Dyad Case One: War of 1812, 1803-1812**

*Case Background*

The War of 1812, which took place between the United States and Great Britain from 1812-15, occurred in the midst of over one hundred years of hostility between the two nations dating to the commencement of the American War of Independence in 1775. My research will focus on the period from 1803-1812, from the outbreak of a second Anglo-French war that “entangled the U.S. merchant marine” (Owen, 1994: 108) up to the declaration of war on June 18, 1812. The time period was described appropriately by Latimer, who stated that “The grievances against European powers for interfering with American ships and sailors on the high seas had gathered momentum in a continuous
stream of events for more than a decade” (Latimer, 1956: 914). I will analyze what led to this ‘continuous stream of events’ towards war.

The War of 1812 represents a case of escalated conflict between the United States and Great Britain, and occurred within the context of a dyadic enduring rivalry and multinational international crisis. The United States had been maintaining tortured neutrality between France and Britain, who had been at war since 1793, despite the difficulty of maintaining neutrality in the early nineteenth century world of international affairs (Bukovansky, 1997: 222), and were continuing to do so in 1803 when the conflict with Britain restarted. This neutrality became even more tortured when, in 1807, the *HMS Leopard* fired at, impressed the sailors of, and captured the *USS Chesapeake* off the coast of Virginia (Hatzenbiehler and Ivie, 1980: 464). This led to the passage of the 1807 Embargo Act (Kaplan, 1957: 199), which attempted to fortify the American neutrality position, but also placed President Thomas Jefferson at odds with those hardline members of his own Democratic-Republican Party who sought war with Great Britain.

Furthering the move towards war, the election in 1810 of the Twelfth United States Congress, often referred to as “the War Hawk Congress,” brought to Washington, DC a group of young Democratic-Republicans bent on war with Great Britain (Risjord, 1961; Hatzenbuehler, 1972). Their election, and the continued hold on the White House by a fellow Democratic-Republican, James Madison, provided another critical turning point in the ongoing conflict with the United Kingdom.
Attempts at securitization, a concept discussed at length in Chapter One, by Democratic–Republicans were consistent and vigorous. Hatzenbuehler and Ivie identify “two sets” of categories in which these pro-war messages can be classified. The first were the “intrinsic harmfulness” arguments. These included the impressment of American sailors, seizure of ships, and the deprivation of commerce – both agricultural and industrial – that accompanied these British policies. This first category closely aligns with the “language of security” that might be expected from any party seeking a march to war.

The second category is described as the “lawlessness of nations” argument, and details slights to the universal law of nations and to the rights of man that had been committed by both France and Britain since the start of their conflict. Clearly, the largest of these was the infringement on the international right to free travel and commerce of the seas, but also included perceived infringements on United States sovereignty and the independence of nations throughout the Western Hemisphere (Hatzenbuehler and Ivie, 1980: 464-5). This second category neatly aligns with the hypothesis that, after providing a language of security to the debate, the securitizing party in a democracy will assert that the opposition does not share their democratic values.

My research, presented in this chapter, largely confirms the twin categorizations of pro-war messaging provided by Hatzenbuehler and Ivie. In fact, the consistency and
potency of the Democratic-Republican message, stretching over half a decade, displays a finely tuned political operation scarcely rivaled even today. In his *Seventh Annual Message to Congress*, Jefferson stated that "These aggravations (British impressment) necessarily lead to the policy either of never admitting an armed vessel into our harbors, or of maintaining in every harbor such an armed force as may constrain obedience to the laws, and protect the lives and property of our citizens, against their armed guests".15 16

The partisan press, which was the chief mode of political advocacy during the early nineteenth century, applied consistent pressure to the forces of war over the next three years preceding the election of the War Hawk Congress. The *New York Evening Post*, which had at one time been the vehicle of Alexander Hamilton’s Federalist Party, even declared in the wake of the *Chesapeake Affair* that “…we are ready to say that we consider the national sovereignty has been attacked, the national honor tarnished, and that ample reparations and satisfaction must be given or that war ought to be resorted to by force of arms”.17 18 In another hot-bed of Federalism, the *Boston Gazette* published a humorous allegory about a starving farmer, who realized that his livelihood had dried up while ironically attempting to starve out a woodchuck, in order to demonstrate the foolhardy policy of attempting to embargo the British into good behavior.19 And the

15 Presidential and Political Party Statements referenced were drawn from the extensive collection compiled by the University of California-Santa Barbara and compiled online at: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/.
16 Thomas Jefferson, “Seventh Annual Message to Congress” October 27, 1807
17 Many of the references to newspapers and leader statements has been provided by a collection compiled by Dr. Mark S. Byrnes in conjunction with Wofford University, in commemoration of the War of 1812 Bicentennial, and placed online at: http://webs.wofford.edu/byrnesms/1812.htm
18 *New York Evening Post* “The Chesapeake and the Leopard” 24 July 1807
19 *Columbia Centinel* “The Embargo and the Farmer’s Story” 25 May 1808
Aurora General Advertiser summarized the securitization message with this rebuke of Jefferson in 1809:

“The crisis comes upon us now, when we must look to our own security, and the policy which is best adapted to ensure our rights and our prosperity. France has fought our battles - had Britain triumphed, we should have been enslaved. We can have no natural sympathies for a government which has tyrannised over us in every shape - which has murdered, torn from their homes, and plundered our citizens, insulted our flag, our territory, and our independence - and trampled upon the laws of civilized nations”. \(^{20}\) (Italics added)

With the arrival in Washington of the War Hawk Congress in early 1811, securitization moved forward in earnest. John C. Calhoun (DR-SC), a newly elected member from South Carolina, a state Latimer dubbed the “protagonist of the War of 1812,” delivered multiple speeches in pursuit of war. His first, occurring on December 11, 1811, stated that it was the primary pursuit of any great nation to protect their citizens in the private endeavor of commerce (Latimer, 1956: 915). His second went quite a bit further. He stated in no uncertain terms that “for what is an inherent right, for what I deem the legitimate, or necessary carrying trade, the liberty of carrying our productions to foreign markets, and with the return cargo, in which agriculture is particularly interested, I would fight in defence of”. \(^{21}\) In a similar vein, Felix Grundy (DR-TN), a newly elected Congressmen from Tennessee, declared that “The true question in

\(^{20}\) Aurora General Advertiser 31 July 1809

\(^{21}\) Annals of Congress, Twelfth Congress, First Session: 482-3
controversy . . . involves the interest of the whole nation. It is the right of exporting the productions of our own soil and industry to foreign markets”.

Not to be outdone, Speaker of the House and prolific War Hawk Henry Clay (DR-KY) leveled this criticism of Great Britain:

“We are invited, conjured to drink the potion of British poison actually presented to our lips, that we may avoid the imperial dose prepared by perturbed imaginations. We are called upon to submit to debasement, dishonor, and disgrace—to bow the neck to royal insolence, as a course of preparation for manly resistance to Gallic invasion!”

These Congressional speeches preceded the actual request for war with Great Britain that President Madison sent to Congress on June 1, 1812. In it, he stated that “British cruisers have been in the continued practice of violating the American flag on the great highway of nations, and of seizing and carrying off persons sailing under it, not in the exercise of a belligerent right founded on the law of nations against an enemy, but of a municipal prerogative over British subjects”. Two portions of this statement are of note. First, Madison continued the language of security surrounding maritime rights as the reason for pending conflict. Second, he draws a coded distinction between “American citizens” and “British subjects” that was prevalent in pro-war rhetoric of this time period.

It is telling that this message echoed as part of the overall securitizing message of the Democratic-Republican Party, a message that was consistently spreading the language of a democratic United States, yearning to trade free, while a tyrannical and

---

22 Ibid.: 422-27
23 Ibid.: 599-602
monarchical Britain menaced the high seas. The *Washington National Examiner* drew this distinction between negotiating with France, perceived by many as a democratic other, and Great Britain:

“Let war therefore be forthwith proclaimed against England. With her there can be no motive for delay. Any further discussion, any new attempt at negotiation, would be as fruitless as it would be dishonorable. With France we shall be at liberty to pursue the course which circumstances may require. The advance she has already made by a repeal of her decrees; the manner of its reception by the government, and the prospect which exists of an amicable accommodation, entitle her to this preference. If she acquits herself to the just claims of the United States, we shall have good cause to applaud our conduct in it, and if she fails we shall always be in time to place her on the ground of her adversary”.  

Further, on the eve of Madison’s War Message, the *Niles Weekly Register* (Baltimore) also displayed the United States as peace-loving and deliberate and Great Britain as anything but, by stating that “It is very certain that no good citizen of the United States would wantonly promote a rupture with Great Britain, or any other country. The American people will never wage offensive war; but every feeling of the heart is interested to preserve the rights our fathers won by countless hardships and innumerable sufferings”.  

Across the Atlantic, the British were far less occupied with America than vice-versa. In fact, according to the journal of Henry Goulburn, a British diplomat who was involved in multiple facets of the war and peace negotiations, the June, 1812 United

---

24 James Madison, “Special Message to Congress on the Foreign Policy Crisis” 1 June 1812: Published by San Diego State University
25 *Washington National Examiner* “War Should be Declared” 14 April 1812
26 *Niles Weekly Register* 30 May 1812
States “declaration of war was unexpected” (Jones, 1958: 484). What little they did consider it revolved not around trading rights, but the ongoing campaign by the United States military to seize the colony of Canada from Britain, or in Goulburn’s words: “The real object of the war on the part of the United States, viz., the conquest of the Canada’s might be the result” (Jones, 1958: 484).

Great Britain was not nearly as concerned with the United States largely because she was chiefly concerned with the ongoing European war against Napoleon, a conflict with wide ranging implications for European balance of power politics. It was these considerations that led King George III to issue Orders in Council on November 11, 1807, which authorized the seizure and impressment of any ship from a neutral nation carrying goods to France. These Orders shattered the already fragile United States neutrality. While the securitization message of such a move clearly included a ‘language of security’, no debate was necessary inside a royal council. Parliamentary opposition did arise, but the Orders in Council remained in effect until June, 1812, too late to cease the United States from declaring war. These feeble deliberations are an example of why Owen declared that “by my definition, Britain (in 1812) can not be considered a liberal democracy” (Owen, 1994: 108).

27 Orders in Council 11 November 1807: Published by The Liberty Fund, Inc.
Opposition to Securitization

The attempted securitization within the United States occurred in line with the hypothesis being tested. The language of security was employed consistently and vigorously, placing the blame squarely on the shoulders of Great Britain and pinpointing maritime seizure and impressment as the causes for conflict, along with the slights to national honor and economy that it would accompany. Further, Great Britain was demonized as the non-democratic Other, utilizing language such as “tyrannized,” “enslaved,” “British poison,” “royal insolence,” “British subjects,” and “dishonorable negotiations”. The question of this research then becomes: would opponents counter that Great Britain was in fact democratic, and therefore worthy of continued negotiation?

In this early phase of American democratization, and an even earlier phase of the British process, the answer appears to be that they did not. Owen asserts that “very few Americans, and virtually no British, considered Great Britain a democracy at the time” (Owen, 1994: 108). My research again largely confirms these results. However, it also shows that many Americans did not consider themselves democratic, nor did most members of the opposition consider the process of democratization to be a positive one.

The opposition Federalist Party had, by the time of the war crisis, established two defining identities for itself. First, it was viewed by most Americans as a pro-British party, stretching back to the first war crisis in the late 1790’s which resulted, under the Federalist Administration of John Adams, in the Quasi-War against revolutionary France
(Owen, 1994: 105-8). Second, it was considered to be an anti-democratic party, highlighted by the ideology of its founder Hamilton, who called for a lifetime appointment for President and the United States Senate at the Constitutional Convention and declared, on the night before the duel which ended his life, that “Democracy is our real disease” (underline in original). These identities were embraced during the debate over war with Great Britain.

Opposition tended to fall in to two categories, aligning with the two identifies of the Federalist Party. The first, which attempted to directly rebut the perceived impact on national honor and economy, argued that the United States would end up more economically impaired by war than by peace and that the honor of the nation would be destroyed by an impending military defeat. Federalists, in the words of Strum, saw the war as one “for unprofitable conquest,” (Strum, 1980: 171) and therefore opposed the move on the grounds of a rational cost-benefit analysis. This rhetorical answer can be seen in the speech given by Congressman Samuel Taggart (F-MA), who delivered one of the first anti-war messages in the history of the United States Congress. He stated that, “Admitting war to be sincerely intended, no course could be devised more inconsistent
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28 Many historical documents were provided by The Avalon Project at Yale University Law School, published at: http://avalon.law.yale.edu
29 Madison Debate Notes of the Constitutional Convention 18 June 1787
with the maxims of sound policy than that which appears to be pursuing by the United States”.  

This opposition message did not end in the halls of Congress, as the Federalist press also did what it could to stem the tide of pro-war messaging. The New York Evening Post glibly stated that “there is all the difference in the world between an army on paper, and an army in the field,” and later ran a story titled “They Call it a War for Commerce!” aimed at disseminating the message that, in fact, this war would damage American commerce, and backed it up with detailed import-export figures. Later in the year, the Post buttressed these arguments by imploring: “Citizens, if pecuniary redress is your object in going to war with England, the measure is perfect madness,” and also printing that “the desire to annex Canada to the United States is as base an ambition as ever burned in the bosom of Alexander”.

The second oppositional category was a criticism of democracy itself. By this line of argument, the American people were being stirred to war by uncaring demagogues, largely the Democratic-Republicans of the South and West who did not share the refineries of the New England and New York Federalists. Even in the face of the empirical realities of the day, namely that trade would be hindered by a war and that success was far from certain, these War Hawks would gladly lead the nation down this path if only the nascent democratic ethos of America would let them.

31 Annals of Congress, Twelfth Congress, First Session: 1667
32 New York Evening Post “The Folly of Joining the Army” 24 January 1812
33 New York Evening Post “They Call it a War for Commerce!” 26 January 1812
Most Federalist press in this vein assumed the characteristic of condescension towards democratic government in general, and the democratic public in particular. The *Washington Federalist* proclaimed that “We have never, on any occasion, witnessed the spirit of the people excited to so great a degree of indignation, or such a thirst for revenge,” and the *Boston Gazette* stated that “The spirit of our citizens is rising and may burst into a flame. Everything should therefore be done to calm them till the Legislature has had time to mature its plans of redress”. Perhaps the heaviest anti-democratic argument came from an expected source, the *New York Evening Post*, which wrote that:

“The Jefferson party, in the very teeth of all their professions, yet sounding in our ears, refuse to restore intercourse with Great Britain, unless it is also restored with France. What language can convey the indignant emotions that every American must experience at this bare faced conduct? I am lost in amazement. How long will the people remain stone blind to the conduct of such rulers, and to the consequences which will result from it?”

In Great Britain, as in the United States, the evidence reveals no mention of the need to negotiate with a perceived fellow democratic state. To be sure, opposition to the Orders in Council did arrive, but their opposition took much the same tact as that across the Atlantic. On nine occasions between February 18 and March 25, 1808, the House of Commons took up opposition to His Majesty’s measures, mostly aimed at the economic hardship that could come from punishing states like the United States whose trade was
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34 *New York Evening Post* “An Address to the People of the Eastern States” 21 April 1812
35 *Washington Federalist* “The Chesapeake and the Leonard” 3 July 1807
36 *Boston Gazette* “Hateful Measures for Enforcing the Embargo” 2 February 1809
37 *New York Evening Post* 1 July 1809
highly beneficial to Great Britain. On one occasion, a group of MP’s led by Lords Granville and Grey went so far as to declare the Orders “wholly unjust and unnecessary, and in the highest degree injurious to the most important interests of the country”.

Additionally, a group of London and Liverpool merchants, similar in character and political ideology to their New England counterparts, petitioned Parliament for action against the Orders and wrote that ceasing United States trade was likely to do more harm than good to Great Britain. As in Parliament, the British merchant class appears to have been more concerned with the benefits of economic interdependence than the democratic sameness of the United States. However, unlike their North American business partners, those who shared the pro-economic interdependence view in Parliament were not on the same messaging point. The House of Commons specifically scoffed at the idea that these Orders violated the law of nations, instead reverting to the realist logic that “the question of the conformity of these Orders to the law of nations, cannot be viewed in the abstract”. In other words, these were not so much democratic opponents of war as they were opponents of economic malfeasance on the part of the King.

38 Transcripts of Parliamentary Debates and Papers are provided by the Hansard Report of Parliament, compiled online at http://hansard.millbanksystems.com
39 Protest Against the Orders in Council Bill 25 March 1808
40 Petitions from London and Liverpool Respecting the Orders in Council 10 March 1808
41 Text of the Orders in Council Bill 18 Feb 1808
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Was the Attempt at Securitization Successful?

On June 4, 1812, the United States House of Representatives voted 79-49 to declare war on Great Britain. Two weeks later, on June 17, the Senate voted 19-13 to do the same. The United States was at war – for a second time in thirty years – with Great Britain. But was the threat from Great Britain securitized, or was this simply a matter of war being necessitated by events?

Let’s explore the process of securitization in turns. First, was the in-group/out-group message received by the public? There is very little historical debate to the fact the message of opposition was received and deliberated upon by the public. From New England to New York (Strum, 1980) to South Carolina (Latimer, 1956) to Georgia (Talmadge, 1953), the United States participated in the debates over the War of 1812 like very few issues that had come before. In other words, in the years 1803-1812, the United States engaged in an all-encompassing “cool and serious reflection,” to use Cress’ words, over whether or not to go to war with Britain (Cress, 1987).

But, moving to the second question with an eye to the first, did an opposition arise that discussed an in-group/out-group dynamic? In other words, did the Federalist opponents of war attempt to incorporate the United States and Great Britain into a shared democratic group as an argument against war, in order to counter the out-group argument of the Democratic-Republicans? The answer appears to be that they did not. At no point did an admiration for British democracy appear to enter the picture, and worse, much
effort was spent by the Federalist Party deriding the democratic leanings of the United States. So much so that, in fact, a separate research question could be opened up in this case over how the poor perception of domestic democracy impacted the drive to war.

Third, did the opposition exert influence over the leadership of state and weaken the move towards securitization? Again, my research shows that this should be answered in the negative, but with a small caveat. The Congressional debate, particularly in the Senate, was distinguished by the fact that it was the first true anti-war democratic protest, and it certainly eroded the overwhelming majorities for war that one might have expected from the 1810 Congressional elections (Risjord, 1961; Johnson, 1969); but, again, very little if any of the opposition was based on the perception of Britain as a fellow democracy. Most of it was based on the narrow interests of a handful of Eastern merchants, an argument quickly rebutted by Calhoun who offered this immediately preceding his call to arms over the idea of a universal right to the seas:

“I would not be willing, that the good of the States, the good of the people, the agriculturists and mechanics, should be put at hazard to gratify the avarice and cupidity of a small class of men, who in fact may be called citizens of the world, attached to no particular country; any country is their country where they can make the most money”.

Giving the Federalist opposition the benefit of the doubt, however, one might still find evidence of successful opposition to securitization in the 1812 elections. Would the American voting public, small as they may have been in 1812, accept the message of the opposition? In a word: no. Despite the opponents taking “every opportunity to denigrate
the public image of the administration” ahead of the elections (Johnson, 1969: 151), the Democratic-Republicans gained seats in the Thirteenth Congress, and President Madison was re-elected. In sum, the Federalist opposition message, or lack thereof, was not accepted by the public, and securitization occurred.

In the case of Great Britain, war was not sought, but when it fell upon them the public rallied in “preservation of His Majesty’s dominions” (Jones, 1958: 485). Goulburn wrote specifically about the high esteem in which the “British public” held the Navy, and that there support for the conflict stemmed largely forthwith (Jones, 1958: 485). However, it is worth re-noting here that the opposition from Parliament was successful in overturning the Orders in Council that had created much of the strife, albeit too late to impact the debate in the United States. In this way, Britain’s opposition was at least mildly successful in winning the hearts and minds of the British people. Nevertheless, the British governmental system of the time, which earned the state a -2 on the Polity composite score, calls in to question the empirical reality of British democracy, as was demonstrated by the lack of Parliamentary power to have debated the Orders in Council in the first place.

42 *Annals of Congress*, Twelfth Congress, First Session: 482-3
Anglo-American Dyad Case Two: Northeastern Boundary Dispute, 1837-1842

Case Background

In contrast to the escalated conflict arising from tensions in the early nineteenth century, a quarter century later a similar conflict point was resolved without escalation. Following the War of 1812 and the Treaty of Ghent in 1815, Anglo-American relations reached agreement on the outstanding issues that had led to conflict, at least ostensibly. While impressment was put to rest, boundary disputes over the Northeastern boundary between the United States and Canada, which was still colonial British territory, threatened to inflame relations again during the 1830’s.

Two zones of conflict will be analyzed here. The first occurred in Upstate New York in December 1837. Shortly following the outbreak of a Canadian rebellion against British rule, United States citizens massed in the Buffalo region began giving aid and material support to Canadian rebels, some of which had taken shelter on Navy Island between Buffalo and Ontario. One form of aid came by way of steamboats, and one in particular, the SS Caroline, set off an international incident. As Ledbetter describes, “On December 29 (1837)…a small British fleet captured the Caroline, burned it, and then dispatched the smoldering hulk to the bottom of the Niagara River” (Ledbetter, 2009: 239). The destruction of the ship left one British citizen dead.

\[43\] http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/ghent.asp
The second area of friction occurred in the Aroostook Region in the northern recesses of the State of Maine, who had been engaged in an ongoing border dispute with Great Britain over the New Brunswick region since the Treaty of Paris in 1783 (Jones, 1975: 519). In 1837, the State Legislature ordered a census to be taken of the territory in order to more fully leverage federal dollars, but in defiance of this overt claim to territorial possession, the British colonial government of New Brunswick (disputably in Canada) had the census taker arrested and imprisoned, a move many Mainers considered an “outrage” (Jones, 1975: 520).

While both incidents were eventually settled by the Webster-Ashburton Treaty of 1842, for the purposes of this research they each experienced two critical turning points. The first for each was the outbreak of conflict, as the sinking of the *Caroline* and the arrest of the Maine census taker both received swift political attention in both nations. The second points, however, proved to be far more ominous for the prospects of war. Just as the *Caroline* incident seemed to be subsiding, New York arrested a Canadian-born British subject named Alexander McLeod, “and charged him with the murder of the American citizen who had died when the *Caroline* was taken” (Currie, 2005: 56). This incident, which occurred in 1840, set off a new round of Anglo-American disputes that revolved around the creation and interpretation of early international law.

During the Aroostook Affair, the second critical point occurred in 1839, when a firebrand Democratic Congressman, John Fairfield, assumed the Governorship of Maine and sent armed troops into New Brunswick, only to be met by British resistance (Jones,
1975: 523-4). This move was in contradiction of United States federal law, and brought the two nations as close to war as they had been since 1815. Both the McLeod and Fairfield incidents are essential reference points for the forthcoming analysis.

**Attempted Securitization**

Following the destruction of the *Caroline* in late 1837, the response from the British Minister to the United States, Henry Fox, was rather immediate and decisive. The position of the British Whig government, led by Prime Minister William Lamb, Lord Melbourne, was that the sinking of the *Caroline* was a “legitimate act of self-defense” and therefore justified (Currie, 2005: 56)\(^{44}\). Following the arrest of McLeod three years later, and shortly before being replaced as Foreign Minister, Fox’s tone did not change. In a letter from Fox to United States Secretary of State John Forsyth published in the *Harford Times*, Minister Fox stated that the *Caroline* was “engaged in piratical war” when she was sunk by “her Majesty’s people”.\(^{45}\)

In regards to the Aroostook Affair, the British government appears to have been primarily interested in the defense of the Canadian colony from American meddling, another example of realist logic and lack of democratic trust. This fear was not unfounded when considering the history of attempted and planned American incursions into this territory dating to the War of Independence. In a 1 January 1839 letter from

\(^{44}\) Quoted in Currie, but taken from a letter from British Foreign Secretary Henry Fox to United States Secretary of State John Forsyth: 6 February 1838

\(^{45}\) *Harford Times* “Mr. Fox to Mr. Forsyth” 9 January 1841
Charles Grant, Lord Glenelg, to New Brunswick\textsuperscript{46} Lieutenant Governor Sir John Harvey, Grant ordered him to “take steps for breaking up and rendering impassable so much of the road between the Penobscot and the Restook as lies within the Boundary claimed by Great Britain” (Le Duc, 1947: 32-3).\textsuperscript{47}

Posturing in the United States took on a far more jingoistic form. Henry Clay (W-KY), now a Senator from Kentucky who was considering a second bid for the presidency in 1840\textsuperscript{48}, traveled to New York to remind the voters of that area about his hardline stand against Great Britain during the 1812 crisis and his support for protective tariffs against British goods. These remarks, delivered in the Buffalo area, were not too thinly veiled at stoking anti-British sentiment on the eve of an election where New York’s votes would be critical (Heidler and Heidler, 2010: 302). And the \textit{Niles Weekly Register}, in what could only be described as an over-dramatization of events, reported that the frontier between New York and Canada will soon “be a theatre toward which the attention of the whole world will be anxiously directed” (Harris, 1997: 33).\textsuperscript{49}

Passions in Maine burned even brighter. Congressman John Fairfield (D-ME), who would later assume the Governor’s Chair in Maine and stoke emotions further, took to the floor of the House and denounced King William of the Netherlands, who had recently arbitrated the border dispute, as “hostile to liberal principles” and a tyrant over

\textsuperscript{46} New Brunswick was a British colonial province that adjoined the disputed Maine Aroostook territory.
\textsuperscript{47} Lord Glenelg was acting as the Secretary of State for the Colonial War – the Canadian Rebellion – under the Government of Lord Melbourne.
\textsuperscript{48} His first unsuccessful run occurred in 1832, losing to Andrew Jackson.
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Niles Weekly Register} “Correspondent Report from Jefferson County, New York”: 17 November 1838
his own people. He placed the monarch of the Netherlands in with Great Britain, stating that they formed a “band of conspirators against the rights of man”. 50

The Maine press was no quieter. Democratic newspapers such as the Kennebec Journal and Portland Eastern Argus, which would have tended to favor conflict, cried for war, while the Whig press in Bangor and Portland, which would usually have been more pacific, decried the British actions as an affront on Maine’s sovereignty while demanding action. By the eve of the armed insurrection between Maine and New Brunswick, Harvey had communicated to now Governor Fairfield that he considered the actions of Maine to be an “act of hostility, which will be met by me, to the best of my ability” 51 (Jones, 1975: 524).

While the British press remained largely pacific, exceptions abounded after the escalation of events in Maine and the arrest of McLeod in 1840. Both the Leeds Mercury and Manchester Guardian, which opposed war with the United States, made known that a conviction of McLeod would almost assuredly lead to war (Bernstein, 1998: 728). And Lord Palmerston, reacting to this public outcry in 1841, stated that America had become a “Bully” that needed to be “firmly and perseveringly pressed” (Bernstein, 1998: 728).

The language of security in this instance again took on realist forms. In the United States, outrage was expressed over perceived slights of territorial sovereignty, not entirely unlike the impressment claims of 1803-1812; in Great Britain, the language took on the form of opposition to American encroachments into British colonial holdings.

50 Appendix to Congressional Globe: March, 1838, 196-203
Opposition to Securitization

Unlike the case of 1812, however, opposition to securitization arose in both the United States and Great Britain. Both states had elements within their respective governments that attempted to securitize the other, but both were met with opposition to securitization from a wide subsection of their respective bodies politic.

In Great Britain, the Reform Act of 1832, which had been passed by a Whig government, greatly opened up the electoral process of the United Kingdom, and shifted politics largely into liberal hands. This ideological shift was clearly displayed over the public reaction to the Anglo-American crises of the 1830’s. Lord Palmerston, who was acting as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs under the Whig government of Lord Melbourne, referred to the United States as bound to Great Britain “by the Bonds of Kindred”. Four years later, in 1839, he wrote that “commercial interests on both sides are so strong…that it would require a very extraordinary state of things to bring an actual war”. It was not until Robert Peel took over 10 Downing Street in 1841 that Palmerston began to harden his American stance, partly due to events but more likely due to his attempt at keeping his position after the Conservative Peel had taken over the head of government from Melbourne (Bernstein, 1998: 727-728).

What is worth noting is that Lord Palmerston’s views during his tenure as Foreign Secretary closely mirror those of the increasingly liberal press of Great Britain. The

51 Letter from Lieutenant Governor Harvey to Governor Fairfield: 13 February 1839
language of democratic sameness with the United States was prevalent throughout the British press of this time period. The *Leeds Mercury* wrote regarding the Aroostook Affair that a war would be “monstrous and criminal infatuation,” and later expounded by stating:

“to go to war ... about some leagues of howling wilderness... with our best customer, our blood relation, and our great ally in the advancement of civilization and Christianity through the world, would be folly so monstrous and a scandal so flagrant, as to render the age in which we live infamous” (Bernstein, 1998: 726)

The *Edinburgh Review* wrote around the same time that Great Britain and the United States, “the mother and the child – to be the joint depositories of freedom and of faith” (Bernstein, 1998: 727). And even in the aftermath of the McLeod arrest, which had noticeably inflamed passions in both the press and the government, the *Manchester Guardian* declared that though action was required, war would be “exceedingly shocking to humanity, from the fact of its being carried on between kindred nations”.

In the United States, opposition was also vociferous and bipartisan. Perhaps the most pronounced form came by the way of President Martin Van Buren, an Upstate New York Democrat who had risen to the pinnacle of American power as Vice President for Andrew Jackson, the hero of the Battle of New Orleans. His political pedigree would have dictated war footing, but he opted for a different direction. In Ledbetter’s words, “Escalating rumors turned one dead from the incident (*Caroline*) into 20, then 30, as war
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fever swept New York State and much of New England. The situation was spinning rapidly out of control. Some thought war with England was inevitable. Others thought here was a golden opportunity for Van Buren to salvage a second term by rallying the nation in the cause of freedom against the hated monarchical aggressor. Van Buren chose peace” (Ledbetter, 2009: 239-240).

Why this counterintuitive stance from the Van Buren White House? Research of his comments of the time period reveals that his viewing Great Britain as a fellow democratic state, similarly to the bipartisan British view of America, had something to do with it. In his First Annual Message to Congress, four weeks prior to the Caroline incident, Van Buren declared that “the general relations between Great Britain and the United States are of the most friendly character, and I am well satisfied of the sincere disposition of that Government to maintain them upon their present footing”.

Following the incident and the increasing tensions in Maine, Van Buren chose a pacific path instead of conflict, mostly chiding his own citizens for their behavior. In his Second Message, Van Buren stated that “Information has been given to me, derived from official and other sources, that many citizens of the United States have associated together to make hostile incursions from our territory into Canada and to aid and abet insurrection there, in violation of the obligations and laws of the United States and in open disregard of their own duties as citizens,” but that:

55 Manchester Guardian 5 January 1842
56 Martin Van Buren, “First Annual Message to Congress” 5 December 1837
57 Martin Van Buren, “Second Annual Message to Congress” 3 December 1838
The offer to negotiate a convention for the appointment of a joint commission of survey and exploration I am, however, assured will be met by Her Majesty's Government in a conciliatory and friendly spirit, and instructions to enable the British minister here to conclude such an arrangement will be transmitted to him without needless delay. *It is hoped and expected that these instructions will be of a liberal character,* and that this negotiation, if successful, will prove to be an important step toward the satisfactory and final adjustment of the controversy*. 58 (Italics added)

As the situation progressed, Van Buren maintained an even keel. In his *Third Message*, he stated that “There is every reason to believe that disturbances like those which lately agitated the neighboring British Provinces will not again prove the sources of border contentions or interpose obstacles to the continuance of that good understanding which it is the *mutual interest of Great Britain and the United States* to preserve and maintain”. 59 (Italics added). His actions backed up his words. Despite the aforementioned political benefit that he could have gleaned from action, Van Buren pressed and Congress supported Neutrality Acts on January 5 and March 10, 1838, and another was signed by his successor, John Tyler, on September 25, 1841. 60

This position by Van Buren also received Whig support. Congressman Horace Everett (W-VT), addressed Congress at the height of the controversy on February 13, 1841, and made multiple references to the “friendly relations” between the United States and Great Britain, his optimism and support of “ongoing diplomacy,” and his heralding of past “executive correspondence,” namely the Neutrality Acts. 61 And in June, 1841,
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59 Martin Van Buren, “Third Annual Message to Congress” 2 December 1839
60 Appendix to Congressional Globe: February, 1841, 374-376
61 Ibid.
Senator William Rives (W-VA), a prominent member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, had a heated exchange with Senator Thomas Hart Benton (D-MO), an old-line Jacksonian Democrat, over the approach towards Great Britain. Invoking memories of the War of 1812 debate, Rives asked whether “gentlemen have held the sailors and marines of the Leopard personally amenable to our laws, and avenged the national insult upon them? I presume not”. To this Benton colorfully replied that “I would have hanged every one of them”. Rives then responded: “The Senator from Missouri, we all know, loves a summary mode of proceeding; but would such an act have been recognized by civilized nations, and approved by the general sense of mankind?”62 (Italics added)

Even John Tyler, the Democrat-turned-Whig who had assumed the presidency upon the death of William Henry Harrison, struck a cordial tone in his First Annual Message to Congress even while reaffirming American rights:

“Many of the States composing this Union had made appeals to the civilized world for its suppression long before the moral sense of other nations had become shocked by the iniquities of the traffic. Whether this Government should now enter into treaties containing mutual stipulations upon this subject is a question for its mature deliberation. Certain it is that if the right to detain American ships on the high seas can be justified on the plea of a necessity for such detention arising out of the existence of treaties between other nations, the same plea may, be extended and enlarged by the new stipulations of new treaties to which the United States may not be a party. This Government will not cease to urge upon that of Great Britain full and ample remuneration for all losses, whether arising from detention or otherwise, to which American citizens have heretofore been or may hereafter be subjected by the exercise of rights which this Government cannot recognize as legitimate and proper. Nor will I indulge a doubt but that the sense of justice of Great Britain will constrain her to make retribution for any wrong or loss which any American citizen engaged in the prosecution of lawful commerce may have experienced at the hands of her cruisers or other public authorities”.63 (Italics added)

62 Appendix to Congressional Globe: June, 1841: 110-112
63 John Tyler, “First Annual Message to Congress” 7 December 1841
In addition to the executive and legislative opposition to securitization, Secretary of State Daniel Webster, who had been appointed to succeed John Forsyth following the defeat of President Van Buren, also spun a national propaganda machine aimed at opposing war with Great Britain. Utilizing newspapers from the Eastern Argus in Maine, to the Washington National Intelligencer, to the southern outlet of the Charleston Courier, Webster was able to demonstrate that anything short of negotiations would lead to a “calamitous war with Great Britain” (Current, 1947: 191). Webster was convinced that this was necessary because the securitization forces had sought to “inflame the public mind,” and that the public should seek a “liberal and satisfactory arrangement” instead of war (Current, 1947: 192-3). On both sides of the Atlantic, the forces of opposition to securitization found themselves far more fortified than had been the case twenty-five years earlier.

Was the Attempt at Securitization Successful?

On August 22, 1842 the United States ratified the Webster-Ashburton Treaty, putting to rest the boundary issues between the two states. Two months later, on October 5, Great Britain followed suit. Aside from the unfortunate circumstances of Amos Dufree, the sailor aboard the Caroline killed in the raid that landed Alexander McLeod
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65 Letter from Joseph Story to Daniel Webster 19 April 1842  
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67 http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/br-1842.asp
on trial for murder, not a single battlefield casualty occurred in the disputes. In light of these realities, was the threat securitized in either nation during this crisis? My research demonstrates that the threat was not securitized in either the United States or Great Britain.

First, in answering the question of whether the in-group/out-group message was received by the public, evidence exists that it was, although not universally interpreted by all parties in the same manner. The newspaper coverage of this event was wide-ranging in both the United States and Great Britain, stretching from Maine to South Carolina and over the Alleghenies in the former, and from Leeds and Manchester to London in the latter. Further, similar language was demonstrated by leaders on both sides of the aisle with the press that supported their political efforts. For example, there were as many Fairfield’s preaching the opinion of the Eastern Argus as there were Palmerston’s echoing the Leeds Mercury.

That being said, it was also clear that this in-group messaging, namely of a democratic oneness between Great Britain and the United States, was pronounced. While Webster, a long-standing war opponent who had also stood in opposition to the War of 1812, was utilizing a network of partisan papers to squelch war fever, pro-war outlets were drumming up support for another Anglo-American conflict. Even on the eve of the Webster-Ashburton negotiations that would ultimately conclude the conflict, the Cincinnati Chronicle, a bastion of anti-British sentiment, stated that Webster should press
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68 Much background information is provided by the Upper St. Johns, Maine Historical Society:
American claims to the “last extremity” (meaning war) at the negotiating table (Current, 1947: 187). However, whether one counted themselves among those who saw the United States and Great Britain as “kindred bonds” or whether they saw the British as “monarchical oppressors,” what is clear is that the in-group/out-group messaging was received and debated.

Second, did opposition arise that discussed the in-group/out-group language of the controversy? The answer here appears to be in the affirmative. While some language was utilized on realist grounds, describing war with Great Britain or the United States as “calamitous” and in their mutual “commercial interests,” far more ink and words were used to describe the two sides as members of a shared cultural and political self. This was demonstrated most notably by Senator Rives, who during the debate over the Webster-Ashburton Treaty ratification drew sharp contrasts between the recent events and those of 1812, and then hailed the British Government as now “under the influence of the moral and enlightened code which now controls the intercourse of nations”. Even reasonably hardliners took such a bent when trying to bring the other side to the negotiating table. Minister Fox, shortly before his dismissal by the Peel Government, wrote to Secretary Webster and asserted that “the United States could not mean to contravene ‘the universal practice of civilized nations’” (Currie, 2005: 56-7). And John Tyler, who often found

http://www.upperstjohn.com/history/northeastborder.htm
69 Cincinnati Chronicle 24 April 1842
70 Appendix to Congressional Globe: August, 1842: 66
71 Letter from Minister Fox to Secretary Webster 12 March 1841
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himself susceptible to pro-war forces due to his tortured partisan convictions, hailed the
Webster-Ashburton Treaty thus:

“The question of peace or war between the United States and Great Britain is a question of the deepest interest, not only to themselves, but to the civilized world, since it is scarcely possible that a war could exist between them without endangering the peace of Christendom”. 72 (Italics added)

Third, did the opposition exert influence over the respective governments and, therefore, prevent securitization? The answer is once again appears to be affirmative. This is perhaps no where more apparent than in the elections that took place in the United States and Great Britain in 1840 and 1841, respectively.

In the United States, William Henry Harrison bested Henry Clay for the Whig nomination, and became the first Whig elected President of the United States after defeating Martin Van Buren. His election was dominated by economic conditions arising from the Panic of 1837, which doomed Van Buren (Formisano, 1993; Zboray and Zboray, 1997), but when foreign policy did arise he took the side of pacific relations with Great Britain. This was evident in the fact that Van Buren, though losing nationally, won the counties in Maine and New Hampshire most affected by the Aroostook Affair, even though he too had a pacific feeling towards Great Britain.

Ultimately, Harrison served a little over a month in office before his untimely death, but in that time he appointed Webster Secretary of State. His successor Tyler, who was certainly a Democrat (despite his affiliation shift to seek the Vice Presidency), then
gave much leeway to Secretary Webster in his negotiations with Lord Ashburton over the boundary question. This position was backed by Whigs in Congress, who took control of the House and Senate for the first time. In short, the election of 1840 sent a cabal of forces to Washington bent on keeping the peace with Great Britain.

In Great Britain, the Conservative Robert Peel assumed the Premiership in 1841, and promptly made changes that aided peace as well. Peel passed over Henry Fox as negotiator with Webster, and instead gave the title to Lord Ashburton. This move was due to the fact that Fox was viewed by many as anti-American, and Peel sought peace with the United States through the introduction of a friendlier arbiter (Jones, 1953: 478). During the debate over ratification in Parliament, Palmerston, who had changed his tune largely due to the political affront he suffered by being relieved of his duties by Peel, declared Webster-Ashburton “Ashburton’s Capitulation”. However, the previous election had placed mostly pro-peace voices in Parliament, meaning Palmerston found himself “isolated in opposition” (Bernstein, 1998: 729).
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72 John Tyler, “Second Annual Message to Congress” 6 December 1842
Analysis of Anglo-American Dyad

The War of 1812 was a case of a securitized threat; the Northeastern Boundary Dispute was a case of failed securitization. The question this research requires of us is why? All five control variables are successfully controlled for in this case study, as are three potential independent variables: power imbalance, IGO membership, and the presence of a great power dyad. This leaves three potential independent variables with potential explanatory power: democratic perceptions, empirical democracy, and economic interdependence.

H1: Shifting levels of economic interdependence led to the securitization of threat during the War of 1812, and the failure to securitize the threat in 1837.

It is possible to explain the divergence in outcomes in these two situations by viewing the changing nature of trade that occurred between 1812 and 1837. For one, between 1793-1815, the United States and Great Britain maintained mutually reinforcing barriers to trade: in the United States, the “American System” of Alexander Hamilton and the Federalist Party provided tariff barriers to trade in direct opposition to the “British System” of free trade; in Great Britain, an ongoing war with Napoleonic France made their government hyper-sensitive to trade protections in the Caribbean. By 1837, some would argue, those barriers had begun to peel away.
To be sure, examples of this thought process can be found within the debates over the respective controversies. Calhoun specifically highlighted his willingness to fight in defense of free trade during the 1812 debates,\(^73\) and it was the capture of the *Chesapeake*, an American trading ship, that set the dispute in motion. Two and a half decades later, a far more positive spin was being put on the trading relations between the two nations. Senator Rives, in his comments regarding the ratification of Webster-Ashburton, highlighted the reciprocal interests between the two nations, including “commercial, moral, and political”. In Great Britain, Lord Palmerston wrote to Lord Granville and stated that the “commercial interests on both sides are so strong,”\(^74\) and used that language to justify his anti-war stance (Bernstein, 1998: 728). George Bernstein describes the failed securitization effort in Britain in terms that included trading considerations when he wrote: “This policy of appeasing the United States was forced on Liberal governments because their middle-class constituency perceived a 'special relationship' between the two countries, based on blood, religion, liberal traditions, and trade” (Bernstein, 1998: 725).

While this seems a plausible explanation, albeit hindered by the difficulty in accurate trading data from this time period, there are some reasons to question its validity. Anglo-American trade in 1812 was certainly hindered by the war with France, but only so because of the embargo policy in the United States which prompted the Orders in Council. In other words, the United States government could just as easily have
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\(^73\) *Annals of Congress*, Twelfth Congress, First Session: 422-27
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removed the 1807 Embargo Act, and it is likely that trade could have flowed more easily on open waters. Further, the tariff rate between the United States and Great Britain was far lower in 1812 than it was in 1837, especially after a string of United States tariff bills that began in 1816 starting taking effect, culminating in the oppressive Tariff of Abominations in 1828 (Remini, 1958). While these rates were lowered in 1833 by a Clay-Calhoun compromise tariff (Heidler and Heidler, 2010: 302), it was not until the 1846 Walker Tariff in the United States, and Corn Laws in Great Britain, that the two states began trading in earnest (James and Lake, 1989). As such, while trade relations may explain the differing outcomes to some extent, they appear to be an incomplete explanation.

_H2: The passage of the Reform Act of 1832, and the empirical advance of democracy in Great Britain, led to differing securitization outcomes in 1812 and 1837._

This case study provides one of the clearest cases of the democratic peace theories primary finding, namely that democracies rarely, if ever, go to war with one another (O’Neal and Russett, 2001: 43). By this argument, Great Britain was still a monarchy-in-transition in 1812, but by 1837 they had become democratic, leading to differing outcomes in these two episodes between the United States and Great Britain.

On the surface this seems plausible. In 1811, Polity lists the United States as having received a 9 on their composite democratic scale (with the highest being 10), and
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Letter from Lord Palmerston to Lord Granville 29 March 1839
Great Britain having received a -2. In 1836, on the eve of the Caroline Affair, the scores were identical. Nevertheless, Great Britain had passed the Reform Law four years earlier, and was democratizing, as evidenced by the 3 received in 1837 and then again throughout the controversy. It is not only possible, but likely, that leaders in the United States began to see Great Britain as empirically possessing democratic characteristics.

Similarly, the British and Americans of 1812 who perceived the United States as too democratic – America’s “stone blind people”\(^75\) – had dissipated. The language of 1837-1842 heralded the “liberal,” “civilized,” and “enlightened” Anglo-Saxon people on either side of the ocean, which could very well have been the result of improved democratic conditions in both nations, as the Reform Act took effect in the United Kingdom and the last vestiges of Federalism faded in the United States.

Two criticisms arise to this argument. First, the empirical democratization of these two states, particularly the United States, is greatly exaggerated by hindsight. Great Britain may be accurately described as democratizing slowly, but a state less than a decade into major reforms is bound to retain some level of negativity towards rampant democratization. This was evidenced in an 1841 letter from Palmerston to Lord Russell, in which he derided American leadership for bending to the whims of popular pressure: “The American Statesmen are the most profligate and corrupt that are I believe to be found in the world”\(^76\). A century and a half before Levy detailed the idea that democratic leaders may scapegoat domestic controversy by inflaming foreign conflicts (Levy, 1988),
Palmerston alluded to just such a phenomenon occurring in antebellum America. Further, debates over slavery had inflamed the American South since 1812 (Capers, 1948: 46), leading to deeper debates over the human rights and universal equality promised by democratic institutions, and even Webster, who stood at the crux of the discussion, lamented to a British financier in 1840 that American “locofocoism” – early populism – and British socialism had both been a poor recipe for their respective governments (Lower, 1939: 363).

Second, American leaders had already begun to recognize Great Britain as a member of the democratic Self prior to the passage and implementation of the Reform Law. President John Quincy Adams stated in 1826, in relation to the Maine Boundary Dispute, that “Our own dispositions and purposes toward Great Britain are all friendly and conciliatory; nor can we abandon but with strong reluctance the belief that they will ultimately meet a return, not of favors, which we neither ask nor desire, but of equal reciprocity and good will”. And even Andrew Jackson, who fought against the British in 1812 and who bore a permanent wound on his face from the boot of a British soldier received during the Revolution, made these remarks in 1829:

“With Great Britain, alike distinguished in peace and war, we may look forward to years of peaceful, honorable, and elevated competition. Every thing in the condition and history of the two nations is calculated to inspire sentiments of mutual respect and to carry conviction to the minds of both that it is their policy to preserve the most cordial relations. Such are my own views, and it is not to be doubted that such are also the prevailing sentiments of our constituents. Although neither time nor opportunity has been

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{75} New York Evening Post 1 July 1809 \\
\textsuperscript{76} Letter from Lord Palmerston to Lord Russell 19 January 1841 \\
\textsuperscript{77} John Quincy Adams, “Second Annual Message to Congress” 5 December 1826
afforded for a full development of the policy which the present cabinet of Great Britain designs to pursue toward this country, I indulge the hope that it will be of a just and pacific character; and if this anticipation be realized we may look with confidence to a speedy and acceptable adjustment of our affairs.

Under the convention for regulating the reference to arbitration of the disputed points of boundary under the 5th article of the treaty of Ghent, the proceedings have hitherto been conducted in *that spirit of candor and liberality* which ought ever to characterize the acts of sovereign States seeking to adjust by the most unexceptionable means important and delicate subjects of contention*. 

In sum, while it may seem likely that mutual democratization played a chief explanatory role in the differing outcomes in this case study, a closer examination shows that other explanations are at play.

*H3: Shifting democratic perceptions explain the differing outcomes of securitization attempts in 1812 and 1837.*

Many explanations can be posited for what shifted the perception of Americans that Great Britain was democratic, and vice-versa, including trade and empirical democratization. Additionally, domestic politics may have been at play, as the Northeastern Boundary Dispute occurred during contentious elections in both nations. Further, it may have resulted from the United States citizenry feeling more comfortable with their domestic democratic leanings. Finally, it may have been as simple as the passing of the torch for two respective generations – the Founders in the United States and the veterans of the Napoleonic Wars in Great Britain – to a new crop of leaders, as Toynbee first suggested (Toynbee, 1946). While these reasons for a shift in perceptions
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are fertile ground for future research, what my research displays is that democratic perceptions were critical in the differing outcomes within the Anglo-American dyad.

The events of 1812 and 1837 in this dyad present examples of most-similar systems design. In both instances territorial integrity was the primary stated concern of the language of security, in 1812 in the United States and in 1837 in both states; perceived British maritime abuse was a critical catalyst, in 1812 over the Chesapeake and in 1837 the Caroline; and Canada, and its place in the British Empire, was at center stage in both instances. A small number of variables could explain differing outcomes despite such similar situations.

The variable which shifted earliest and most noticeably, however, was the perception that each state held for the other’s democratic leanings. In the United States, language shifted from “tyrannized,” “enslaved,” “British poison,” “royal insolence,” “British subjects,” and “dishonorable negotiations,” in describing the British government in 1812, to “civilized,” “liberal,” and “enlightened” in 1837. This distinction was specifically highlighted by Senator Rives in his March, 1843 remarks looking back at the successful ratification of Webster-Ashburton, using language such as “wise and enlightened statesman of England,” “public councils of Great Britain,” and: “In the maintenance of peace and harmony between England and America, there are so many reciprocal interests of the highest importance involved, commercial, moral, and
It is just as striking that so many American diplomats and press outlets utilized these words in 1837, which added thickness to the identity of the United States as democratic, something that was equally lacking amongst Americans in 1812.

In Great Britain, the shift was equally pronounced. First a Whig government under Lord Melbourne, then a Conservative government under Robert Peel, supported and fostered peace with the United States, describing them as “kindred,” “blood relations,” “members of civilization and Christianity,” fellow “depositories of freedom and faith,” and even describing them as a “child to a mother”. These sentiments were echoed, if not originated by, the partisan press of Great Britain, largely emanating from the liberal middle class. This process stood in sharp contrast to Lord Goulburn’s dismissive musings about American democracy during the previous conflict (Jones, 1958).

---
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Conclusion

Does democratic perception serve as the causal variable of the differing outcomes in this case study? While future research into domestic politics and the self-identity of democratic citizens would be beneficial, the variables analyzed here indicate that it does serve such a purpose. All five control variables were successfully controlled for, leaving three independent variables as possible explanations: economic interdependence, empirical democracy, and democratic perceptions.

As demonstrated, changing perceptions of a democratic other preceded empirical democratic reforms in Great Britain, and both disputes took place before a vast majority of either Britons or Americans could participate in democracy. Further, mutual trade between Britain and the United States was no more beneficial in 1812 than it was in 1837. With these variables controlled, it appears that the perceptions of leaders such as Van Buren and Peel, and Ashburton and Webster, provided significant explanatory power in the differing outcomes in these early cases of Anglo-American conflict.
Franco-German Dyad (1918-1955): Democratic Perception in a Realist World

Introduction

France and Germany were an enduring rivalry dyad from 1816-1955 (Thompson, 2001: 570), a period marked by three large-scale conflicts, the Franco-Prussian War of 1871 as well as two twentieth century global wars, and numerous additional conflictual points along the way. This chapter will examine two of these moments, the first being a case of escalated conflict that occurred between 1918-1925 in the disputed Rhineland and led to a French invasion of the Ruhr, and the second a case of non-escalated conflict occurring between 1949-1955, surrounding the debates over West German re-armament following the Second World War.

Both cases presented here occurred following the conclusion of a global conflict in which France and Germany were oppositional combatants; both cases revolved around a dispute over German militarization; and both cases utilized the language of security regarding both national sovereignty and in-group/out-group classifications. After controlling for numerous variables, I will examine the possible explanatory variables for the differing outcomes of escalation in the two cases.

This chapter will proceed as follows. I will examine the events surrounding the securitization efforts preceding the conflicts of 1923 and 1955 in turn. Each case study will be broken down thus.
First, I will briefly detail the context and background of each case. Second, I will examine the respective attempts at securitization by the leaders of both France and Germany in the lead-up to conflict. Third, I will discuss the opposition to securitization that occurred in both France and Germany in the lead-up to each conflict. Fourth, I will answer, in each case, whether the threat was successfully securitized by the elites and general public in either France and/or Germany. Fifth, I will examine the potential explanatory variables that could account for the differing outcomes in securitization between the cases. Sixth, I will briefly conclude the chapter by discussing the most likely explanatory variable.

Franco-German Dyad Case One: Ruhr Crisis, 1918-1925

Case Background

At the conclusion of World War One, the Allied Powers negotiated a peace settlement with Germany that placed the latter in a near perpetual state of inferiority. France, uniquely wary of a resurgent German threat, pressed for clauses 254 and 256 of the Versailles Treaty\textsuperscript{80}, demanding reparation payments from Germany for the infliction of financial stress on the Allies caused by the conflict (Layne, 1994: 33-34).

Layne places the reparations issue, and the failure of Germany to meet their reparation payments, as the “immediate cause of the Ruhr occupation” (Layne, 1994: 34),

\textsuperscript{80} Treaty of Versailles: 28 June, 1919
but Articles 42-44 of the Versailles Treaty\textsuperscript{81} should not be overlooked in analysis. All three articles forbade German forces from creating fortifications or arming the mineral rich region on the Left Bank of the Rhine (known as the Rhineland or the Ruhr), and none provided much gray area for the Weimar German Government in regards to securing their Western border.

As early as April, 1920, mere months following the Peace of Versailles, the French government was considering an occupation of the Rhineland (Advocates of Peace Through Justice, 1920: 133), an area located on both banks of the Rhine River between Germany and France which had been disputed by French and Prussian/German forces since the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{82} For the next three years, tensions between the two nations rose to a boiling point before a German default on reparations in late 1922 led the French Government of Raymond Poincaré to order French and Belgian troops into the Ruhr in January, 1923. This occupation, which was described by the German government as a “moral state of war,”\textsuperscript{83} lasted until evacuations were agreed upon by the Allies in early 1925, and finally carried out in January, 1926 (Foreign Affairs, 1927: 682).

Layne argues that this series of events can be explained simply by a “geopolitical competition” between Paris and Berlin (Layne, 1994: 34). My research shows, however, that this analysis is overly simplistic. The French occupation of the Rhineland in 1923 was both a case of an escalated conflict as well as a securitized threat.

\textsuperscript{81} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{82} See Walter Marsden, The Rhineland (1973)
\textsuperscript{83} The Literary Digest: 10 February, 1923
In the case of the former, this case represents a clear deviation from the findings of democratic peace theory, in that both states were coded as democratic by Polity in 1922. In the case of the latter finding, however, research also indicates that although the threat was securitized, democratic perceptions make for a far less black-and-white canvas than the one Layne paints and, in so doing, demonstrates an explanation for the democratic peace despite the outcome of the crisis.

**Attempted Securitization**

On 5 April 1920, the French government issued a statement detailing the immediate need for military incursion into the Ruhr region. In it, they noted that the “sole object of these measures is to bring Germany a due respect of the (Versailles) treaty: they are exclusively of coercive and precautionary character” (Advocates of Peace Through Justice, 1920: 133). Spears and Morgan, as well as McCrum, point out that the French pushed for possession of the Rhineland during the negotiations at Versailles, and were rather disappointed in their inability to obtain the landmass (Spears and Morgan, 1925: 119; McCrum, 1978: 623). In this way, successive French governments were merely awaiting the threat that would fit the mold of a multi-year securitization process.

Under the leadership of Prime Ministers Millerand, Leygues, and Briand, this effort at securitization took the form of communications between France and her former World War allies, and little more. In January, 1922, however, Poincaré was elevated to the Premiership in France, giving the reigns of government to a man with a long-history
of anti-German sentiments. For starters, Poincaré was President of France during the outbreak of World War One, but his anti-German feelings ran even deeper than the obvious.

Poincaré spent much of his career working to place sole blame on Germany for the outbreak of the First World War, and consistently reminded his countrymen of previous slights against French sovereignty. He described the 1871 Franco-Prussian war as an act of violence that “France could not forget” where Germany “torn from her side a living piece of flesh (Alsace and Lorraine)” (Poincaré, 1925: 4), and was no more guarded in his opinion of France as the unitary democratic government on the European continent. He informed the French people that it is “their unenviable privilege to have as its eastern neighbor an immense and mysterious power whose political regime has nothing in common with other civilized nations, and of which the least one can say is that under the guise of advanced ideas it seeks to spread the most frightfully reactionary passions” (Italics added) (Poincaré, 1929: 522).

His government, not surprisingly, immediately began pressing for rapid and unimpeded reparation payments almost immediately upon his ascension to office in early 1922. By November, a Reparations Committee was in Berlin, and on December 16, Poincaré addressed the French Chamber of Deputies with a simple message. Reporting on a meeting the occurred in Berlin between the Reparations Committee and German Chancellor Wilhelm Cuno, Poincaré told the Chamber that the German answer “could be
summarized in a few words: We can do nothing until we have placed our currency on a
stable footing”. 84

Poincaré took care in this speech to explain to the French Deputies that he had
been vigilant over Germany, and that Germany had been granted a moratorium since his
assuming office in January, 1922. But, he reiterated, it was clear that reparations were not
coming, and in light of this, “if Germany will not pay up, the Treaty of Versailles affords
us a remedy,” namely the seizing by the “creditors of the Commonwealth…all the
national wealth of Germany”. 85 He concluded by asking the French Chamber to stand by
his upcoming order to “lay hands upon German property where that property really is” 86
– namely, the Rhineland.

In addition to this overt statement of policy, the Poincaré Government was also
busy behind the scenes increasing tensions with Germany. In October, 1922, the
Manchester Guardian published reports of French involvement in German separatist
movements taking place within the Rhineland (Reynolds, 1928: 201), and documents
released much later displayed Poincaré’s wanton disregard for the institutional
framework of German government. Despite statements to the contrary, Poincaré had
virtually cut off all discussions with official German government channels as early as the
summer of 1922, and instead was negotiating with individual industrialists in the Ruhr

84 The Living Age, “Why We Occupy the Ruhr” by Raymond Poincaré: 27 January, 1923; This article was
reprinted from a 17 December, 1922 column in the Paris Le Temps, and is a direct segment of Poincare’s
speech of 16 November, 1922
85 Ibid.
86 Ibid.
(Trachtenberg, 1981: 705). In this way, conflict had already ensued well before the official announcement of French and Belgian troop movements on 10 January 1923.

Nevertheless, the securitization message had gone forward. Schumacher wrote in the summer of 1923 that “it was well known that the events in the Ruhr are due to certain shortages in the German deliveries” (Schumacher, 1923: 155) and Miller stated that “there was no doubt” that Germany was in voluntary default of their reparation agreements (Miller, 1924: 46). Even Poincaré himself, responding to British Foreign Secretary Lord Curzon, wrote that Germany was in violation of her reparation pledges, and that “the Allies have never gotten anything from Germany, except when, together, they have threatened the use of force”. In short, the securitization message was crystal clear: Germany has defaulted on reparation payments; history shows that Germany will not act except by force; therefore, force is necessary.

Securitization in Germany, quite to the contrary of the situation in Paris, was far more organic. Chancellor Cuno’s government, through the Berlin Press, declared that Germany was “bound for oblivion, and nothing matters anymore,” and that the people of the Ruhr were ready to “go the limit in resisting France”. These overtures were, at the same time, predictable, soft, and wholly unnecessary. Wilhelm Marx, who would become Chancellor in late 1923, wrote that the degradation experienced in the Ruhr during this period needed to be seen to be believed, and detailed “the curtailment of personal

\footnote{87 Letter from Raymond Poincaré, French Prime Minster, to Lord Curzon, British Foreign Secretary: November 1923\footnote{88 The Literary Digest: 10 February, 1923}
liberty,” the “enormous financial and commercial losses,” and the nearly daily disturbing behavior (rape) of “drunken soldiers” brought upon the population of the Rhineland (Marx, 1929: 199).

The German government could do nothing to stop French occupation and the German public did not invite it; but once it came, attempted securitization came to the people through the press of the Weimar Republic. The German satirical magazine Simplicissimus ran a political cartoon in 1923 with Gutenberg standing before his printing press declaring “I never intended this,” as the press spat out deutschmarks at a rapid clip, an allusion to the German people that French reparations policy was creating the scourge of hyperinflation.\textsuperscript{89} Other press forms were far less comical. The Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung wrote that France should make no mistake that “German fury is not an apparition,” and the Frankfurter Zeitung decried the occupation as a French maneuver of “pure violence”. The same newspaper later declared Poincaré to be a modern day Louis XIV, who should be met with stiff resistance.\textsuperscript{90} The language of security was well represented in the German press.

\textsuperscript{89} Simplicissimus: 1923
\textsuperscript{90} The Literary Digest: 10 February 1923
Opposition to Securitization

Opposition towards French policy in the Ruhr was expressed both from within and from without the Republic. Unlike many past international conflicts, the Ruhr Occupation occurred within the specter of the newly formed League of Nations, an international organization that tellingly did not include Germany (although the French and Germans did share twenty-five international organization memberships in 1922). This meant that French action did not just require the approval of their population, but also to some extent the approval of the international community.

Although Belgium and, by a weird twist of international law Italy, shared in the occupation on the margins, the Rhineland movements were, for all intents and purposes, a French operation (Miller, 1924: 46). Tellingly, neither the British nor Americans chose to participate in the occupation. The United States withdrew its European forces altogether via Bremen (Reynolds, 1928: 203), and the British stonewalled the occupation in late 1922. At the Conference of Prime Ministers, held in December, 1922 in London, the British and French were “quite unable to agree,” but “M. Poincaré made known his determination to proceed with the occupation of the Ruhr, whether or not Britain sanctioned it” (Roosevelt, 1925: 114).

The British and Americans were not silent in their opposition. The New York Evening Post ran a headline story titled “Is the Occupation of the Ruhr Legal?” in August, 1923, and decried the degradation of trade that French troops instigated when
they struck German industry. The *American Journal of International Law* also ran a 1923 article by Finch titled “The Legality of the Occupation of the Ruhr Valley” (Miller, 1924: 46). In a similar vein, British officials invoked pleas to international law. Lord Curzon’s letter to Poincaré stated emphatically that “His Majesty’s government has never concealed their view that the Franco-Belgian action...was not a sanction authorized by the Treaty of Versailles itself,”91 and Lord Buckmaster stated in a speech to the House of Lords that he feared French occupation counterproductive, and stated that it would leave Germany “naked to the assaults of anarchy”.92 Finally, in August, 1923, the British Government published all of its correspondence with the French during the crisis for the express purpose of “arousing world opinion against France”.93

In an increasingly globalized world of media, these opposition stances began to filter inside the French Republic. After months of rallying-around-the-flag,94 Prime Minister Poincaré began to see his domestic position weaken. In May, 1923, he unexpectedly tendered his resignation to President Millerand, only to promptly revoke it, after being rebuffed in the Chamber of Deputies.95 This refutation occurred when he asked the Chamber to support his decision to try a French military official in the Rhineland for sedition after the official had allegedly colluded with Communists, and
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91 Letter from Lord Curzon, British Foreign Secretary, to Raymond Poincaré, French Prime Minister: November 1923
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took their refusal to do so as a “vote of no confidence”.\textsuperscript{96} This was a dramatic reversal, in that the Chamber had repeatedly greeted Poincaré with only standing ovations since the start of the crisis\textsuperscript{97}, and the idea of securitizing Germany as a potential Communist insurgency was a common theme of the Poincaré Government since 1918 (Dorten, 1925: 400). Although his policy was ultimately sustained, domestic opposition was beginning to crack the armor of Poincaré.

These political chinks were largely explainable due to the insufficiency of his Ruhr policy. Buckmaster made clear in his speech that occupation had not only failed to deliver reparations to France, but rather made it less likely that they would be received, as the occupation caused a significant inflationary spiral in Germany.\textsuperscript{98} Poincaré himself acknowledged this when, in a January 1929 interview with American press, he stated he knew that “Paralyzing the mining industry in the Ruhr may inflict hardships on France” (Roosevelt, 1925: 115). And in the heart of the conflict, in June 1923, Herman Schumacher, an academic at the University of Berlin, laid out in clear numeric terms that if the occupation would have been sustained over a long period of time, “reparation payments will be quite out of the question” (Schumacher, 1923: 162).

Poincaré acknowledged this opposition in his upcoming election, as his tone shifted dramatically. By late 1923, he stated publicly that he was ready to consider “all

\begin{flushleft}
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means of settlement that could possibly render payment more rapid and sure,” means of settlement that could possibly render payment more rapid and sure,99 a fairly stiff delineation of his hardline policies just months earlier. And, in the clearest rebuff of his Ruhr policies inside France, Poincaré was voted out of office in 1924 and replaced by a pro-peace party of opposition, which included Aristide Briand in a succession of new Premieres. While Marks asserts that this loss had more to do with the economic crisis than with the Ruhr policy100, it is hard to separate the two. Further, Poincaré kicked off his 1924 campaign with a speech on the Ruhr101, and it is reasonably clear that the diplomatic crisis played a defining role in the election, whether overtly or not.

The shift in German governance brought on by opposition was no less dramatic. Gustav Stresemann, a former political theorist at the University of Berlin, was elected Chancellor of Germany in 1923 on a pledge to ease tensions with France. He then became Foreign Minister under his successor, Wilhelm Marx, later the same year. Marx opened up a work on the Ruhr Crisis shortly after leaving office by quoting a Former German Minister, Walter Rathenau, who had proudly proclaimed “Peace! Peace! Peace!” at the Genoa Conference some years earlier (Marx, 1929: 198). This was a fitting summation of their tenure.

Stresemann played a defining role in German opposition. Faced as Chancellor with the prospect of Communism or anarchy, brought about largely by the collapse of the German economy, Stresemann worked to save parliamentary democracy in Germany

99 Meriden Morning Record, “Speech by Poincaré Defends Ruhr Policy”: 24 December 1923
100 See Sally Marks (1999)
(Wright, 1995: 112). He did this by reaching out to the same opponents of French policy that helped replace Poincaré in France. These included British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs Austen Chamberlain (Wright, 1995: 109), French Prime Minister Aristide Briand, and US Budget Director Charles Dawes (Stresemann, 1924: 552).

In the course of their negotiations, this group of leaders was able to effectively oppose French occupation through two routes. First, they crafted the Dawes Plan of 1924, which stabilized inflation in Germany through a United States agreement (Stresemann, 1924: 555). Second, they signed the Locarno Treaty in 1925 with six participating nations, which ended the Ruhr Occupation and included a pledge from Germany and France to no longer settle border disputes by force.102 Dawes, Briand, and Stresemann were each awarded Nobel Peace Prizes in 1925 and 1926; Germany joined the League of Nations in 1926; and both France and Germany became signatories on the 1928 Kellogg-Briand Pact, calling for the outlawing of all war. In his Nobel Peace Prize Lecture, Stresemann summed up the German opposition of this time period by stating that the problems facing the Weimar Republic required solutions that only a “new Germany” – a liberal state – could have brought forward.103

101 *The Lewiston Daily Sun*, “Premier Will Base His Demand to Be Returned to Power on this Point”: 16 April 1924
102 *Locarno Treaties*: 16 October 1925
103 Nobel Lecture of Gustav Stresemann: 29 June 1927
Was the Attempt at Securitization Successful?

In this case, was the in-group/out-group message received by the public? While research indicates that the answer is in the affirmative, it also presents us with a unique case. Both nations had been mired in a war mere months before hostilities over the Ruhr commenced, with Roosevelt placing the date of first consideration the earliest: “beginning with the armistice” (Roosevelt, 1925: 112). In France, the in-group/out-group message was best defined by Poincaré, whose speech to the Chamber of Deputies detailed the idea that France belonged to a civilized group of nations, while Germany would not respond to requests except by force.¹⁰⁴ In Germany, the same language was utilized. Chancellor Cuno compared Poincaré to past French imperialists, namely Louis XIV, and compared the Treaty of Versailles to the Peace of Westphalia in claiming that it would be used to achieve “the ruin of Germany”.¹⁰⁵ Both populaces received a message of a modernizing Self and an obstinate Other.

Once that message was received, did an opposition arise that discussed a differing in-group/out-group dynamic? The affirmative answer to that question is far less cloudy. Both Poincaré and Cuno were turned out of office within eighteen months of the commencement of hostilities, and both were replaced by future Nobel Laureates who sought peace. Further, for one of the first times in world history, an international opposition helped alter domestic populations, demonstrating that a democratic exchange

¹⁰⁴ The Living Age, “Why We Occupy the Ruhr” by Raymond Poincaré: 27 January, 1923
¹⁰⁵ The Literary Digest: 10 February, 1923
of ideas could shape the behavior of fellow democracies, and in so doing, providing a strong case for normative democratic peace.

It is the research into the third question of securitization that makes the Rhineland a unique case. Did the opposition exert influence over the leadership of state and weaken the move towards securitization? On its face, it would seem that this could be answered in the affirmative as well; in fact, it would be rare to witness another case where both nations involved in conflict witnessed such swift and dramatic leadership changes over the issue of conflict. However, this conclusion would disregard the events that occurred immediately before the escalation of the Ruhr Crisis.

Layne astutely quotes Schmidt who describes these events as a practical renewal of war (Layne, 1994: 33), which shows that from 1919 until 1923 both publics were aware of the pending danger that crisis could set off. In light of this, the events of 1922 are just as instructive as the events of 1923-4. As The Marquess of Lothian details, in 1922 Aristide Briand, during an earlier stint as Prime Minister, worked with the British on a treaty that would have settled the affairs of Europe peacefully. In response, Poincaré took the position that peace was unlikely to occur, “threw M. Briand out of office,” dismissed the Genoa Conference of which Marx hailed, “and attempted to coerce Germany to do the impossible by invading the Ruhr” (Lothian, 1936: 47). This series of events would reflect a failed case of peaceful opposition forces securing control over the state, and also a successful case of securitization.
On the flip side, the political events of 1923-4 take an almost fully contrary tact, with each side playing the reverse role. If this were considered to be the seminal moment in the process, research would then find that securitization did not occur in this case. In order to get at the heart of the research here, and bring some clarity to this question, it is worth noting the one variable that both of these cases have in common: the language of security did not include democracy.

The key events of 1923-4 all surrounded the failure of the Poincaré Government’s Ruhr policy to deliver the desired result – reparations – and the diplomatic isolation being caused by a France unwilling to work with the rest of the world. Even committed French liberals like Briand still harbored doubts about Germany, as illustrated by a stern exchange he had over reparations a single year before Poincaré took office (Lauzanne, 1921: 28). The one exception in the equation was Stresemann, whose liberal tendencies appeared so strong that most realists with whom he negotiated were frustrated by what they perceived as his naïveté (Wright, 1995: 110), but even that was not enough on its own to avert escalation. In the final analysis, the events leading up to the escalation in the Ruhr lead me to classify this case as a successful securitization, while also conceding that the events of 1923-4 demonstrate a case of constructed democratic peace.
Franco-German Dyad Case Two: West German Re-Militarization, 1949-1955

Case Background

I will now examine a second case within the Franco-German dyad: the deliberations surrounding the push for West German re-armament following the Second World War, which was resolved without conflict escalation. In 1923, rising National Socialist leader Adolf Hitler used the events in the Ruhr as a catalyst to lead the Munich Putsch, an ultimately unsuccessful action that nevertheless started in motion a chain of events that would lead to his assumption as Führer of the Third German Reich in 1934. In 1940, Hitler’s forces invaded and occupied France as part of operations during the Second World War, and they were not fully defeated by Allied forces until May 1945.

Subsequent conferences and agreements struck by the Allies, including at Yalta and Potsdam, dictated harsh medicine for Germany, much as was the case in the aftermath of the First World War. Following the defeat of Nazi Germany, the nation was split into separate occupied zones, with eastern territory under the control of the Soviet Union and western territories in the hands of the United States, Great Britain, and French occupying forces. Additionally, reparations were meted out to the Soviet Union in the form of forced labor and industrial capacity subjection, and a harsh process of demilitarization and de-Nazification were instigated. By 1949, with the Cold War fully underway, Soviet controlled territories split from Western controlled zones formally, with West Germany forming the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and East Germany.
forming the German Democratic Republic (GDR). In this way, post-World War Two sanctions exceeded their predecessor in that the German state, as the world knew it, ceased to exist.

Concurrent with the formal recognition of separate states, the question of re-arming the FRG was placed before the Western Allies, most notably France. This situation carried enormous significance, in that West German re-armament would be accompanied by membership in the newly formed North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and would also provide a significant departure from the anti-militarization and anti-integration policies of France in the post-World War One environment. Following the outbreak of a second global conflict, regional leaders were much more attuned to the importance of these debates. French President Charles de Gaulle stated his belief that the “destiny of Germany is truly the central problem of the universe,” (Grosser, 1963: 551) and no less dramatically, German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer declared “German developments to be of great significance for developments in the whole of Europe and therefore in the whole world” (Adenauer, 1952: 156).

Despite this seeming agreement, the discussions that began in 1949 and ended with German re-armament in 1955 were anything but smooth. There was a significant French attempt at securitization of the FRG, an attempt whose end was to prevent re-armament. This case study will explore that attempt and analyze what caused it to fail, ultimately demonstrating that democratic perceptions played a critical role in the different outcomes of 1923 and 1955.
Attempted Securitization

Attempts at securitizing threat in the post-World War Two environment had more
to do with securitizing threats to nationalism than framing West Germany as a renewed
threat to Western security. While viewing the FRG, and its centrist Chancellor Adenauer,
in these terms was not non-existent, all attempts at securitization must be viewed in a
broader light.

In 1950, French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman proposed the Schuman
Declaration, declaring in simple terms that “If peace is to have a chance there must first
of all be a Europe,” and to form this Europe, “all French and German steel and coal
production” shall be placed under a “higher authority” (McKesson, 1952: 19). In short,
the Schuman Plan “promised a unity of European peoples” (Parker, 1952: 381). On 25
June 1952, a six-nation delegation of Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands,
France and West Germany ratified the Declaration, formalizing the European Coal and
Steel Community (ECSC) (Menderhausen, 1953: 269).

As the Schuman Plan began to take root, new ideas for “Europeanization” came
along with it, and debates over those proposals took on an international flavor. Among
the most consequential was an American-backed proposal for France, West Germany,
Italy, and the Benelux nations to form a common European Defense Community – or
European Army – and the European Defense Treaty was signed in 1952 to this effect
(Kunz, 1955). By its very nature, this pact called for the re-armament of the FRG, and significant opposition was raised to its enactment during the ratification process.

This opposition tended to fall into two categories. The first could be described as nationalist opposition, arising largely from a belief system in the sovereignty of national military forces. This view was neatly summarized by French Premier Pierre Mendes-France, who although an eventual supporter of EDC ratification, shared some of his own early misgivings in that “it was impossible for a patriot to consent to the tearing apart of the nation”. De Gaulle dismissingly called the proposal a “kind of British-American protectorate”. To this class of opponents, the threat was in the systemic nature of military integration, not in the make-up of the parties involved.

The second category of opponents to military integration could be described as anti-West German re-armament, and my analysis here will focus on their attempts at securitization. Before proceeding, however, two points are of note. First, as was previously stated, the opposition of this group was with a different tone, yet remained part and parcel to the larger opposition forces that opposed German re-armament on nationalist grounds. Second, this case is unique in that no overt military violence was ever reasonably threatened upon West Germany by those in France wishing to securitize the threat. The result of successful West German securitization would have been a state commensurate with their post-World War inferior position in Central Europe, as well as increased vulnerability towards the Soviet threat in the East. While these scenarios were
in no way positive, a scenario did not exist whereby France would take any military action in the FRG.

The anti-German opponents looked upon even the newly created FRG with distrust. In 1952, shortly following the signing of the Bonn and Paris Agreements which set discussions of the EDC in motion, President de Gaulle stated that the treaties “Give Germany entire sovereignty and quality of rights without counterobligation. Nothing prevents it (Germany) from taking up again tomorrow all its ambitions of yesterday”.108 This opposition materialized in January 1953, when Gaullists helped elect Radical Socialist and EDC opponent René Mayer to the Premiership by a comfortable margin.109 That same day, Mayer dumped Robert Schuman from the French Cabinet in hopes of solidifying the anti-integration forces inside Paris.110 Mayer’s government did not last long, but he was replaced in 1954 by another Gaullist, Pierre Mendes-France. Mendes-France bucked de Gaulle in an attempt to gain passage of a compromise EDC plan, but his Premiership was mired in consistent political infighting over foreign policy, including West German re-armament.111 Later that year, De Gaulle was successful in getting his spokesman in the National Assembly, Jacques Soustelle, to deliver a blistering rebuke against the EDC in which he listed three reasons

---
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that ratification should be opposed. The first was procedural in nature; the second was that “the controls on German rearmament are more imaginary than real”; the third was that “there is no assurance that German nationalists will not come to power after the disappearance of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer”.  

Even when victories were secured by Mendes-France, they were done so in a negative fashion. In October, 1954, shortly after surviving a confidence vote by a wide margin of 350-113 in the National Assembly, the press reported a lack of enthusiasm for his government over the West German plan. One parliamentarian was quoted as saying “We have done our duty, but you can’t expect us to enjoy it”. In February, 1955, Mendes-France was replaced by Edgar Faure, another Gaullist.

In Germany, opposition to the EDC was expressed exclusively from a nationalist perspective. Kurt Schumacher, a member of the Social Democratic Party credited as the chief opponent of the Adenauer Government, derisively referred to the Chancellor as “Chancellor of the Allies,” and his fellow partisans in the press took to stating that “The Chancellor always gets everything…that others want, only a little bit earlier” (Grosser, 1963: 556). Despite this line of attack, there was never any questioning in West Germany of either French democratic leanings or a burgeoning West German democracy.

\[ \text{\textsuperscript{112} The News and Courier, “De Gaulle Backer Hits Paris Pact”: 22 December 1954} \]
\[ \text{\textsuperscript{113} The Vancouver Sun, “Paris Votes to Re-Arm Germany”: 12 October 1954} \]
\[ \text{\textsuperscript{114} The News-Sentinel, “Mendes-France Rule End by 319-273 Vote”: 4 February 1955} \]
Opposition to Securitization

International opposition to French securitization of West Germany was both swift and forthright. On 2 March 1952, reports surfaced of a so-called “Stalin Note,” which was reportedly sent to Chancellor Adenauer. Western fears of Soviet encroachment into Europe were stoked by the idea that the Soviets may attempt to “conclude a peace treaty with Germany”\(^\text{115}\) that could place them in the sphere of the Warsaw Pact nations. These fears were somewhat relieved by Stalin’s death in 1953 and the end of the Korean Conflict in the same year, but United States pressure for FRG militarization did not change message. In early 1953, newly-elected United States President Dwight Eisenhower wrote Chancellor Adenauer and informed him that “the whole European defense system would totter if France and Germany – the key nations – refused to ratify (the EDC)”\(^\text{116}\). Eighteen months later, after it became apparent that France would initially resist EDC ratification, Eisenhower (along with British Prime Minister Winston Churchill), threatened to recognize West German re-armament anyway, stating that “This recognition will be granted, no matter what the French do to the tottering edifice of the European Defense Community”\(^\text{117}\).

In addition to American personnel, British governing authorities also opposed securitization on security grounds. Churchill stood by Eisenhower in his quest to play

\(^{115}\) Information was provided by Germany History Documents (GHDJ): http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=3082

\(^{116}\) The Leader-Post, “Message from Ike”: 7 January 1953
hardball with de Gaulle over the EDC, and the Labor Party leader Clement Attlee, chief opponent of Churchill, was often more pronounced. In 1954, he addressed Parliament, stating that the EDC was killed “not by Western democratic people – it was the Communists and Gaullists (followers of national Gen. Charles de Gaulle) in France who destroyed it” (Italics added). In sum, opposition to the securitization of internationalism was pronounced strongly by France’s two most powerful allies.

Nevertheless, much of this opposition was from without. Within France, de Gaulle was successful in opposing the EDC largely because he convinced his people that it was in France’s best security interest to do so. His argument stemmed largely from the fact that he did not believe France to be strong enough to control a newly formed EDC, and as such he hoped to see “each of the six nations – including Germany – to have its own army”.

Opposition towards the anti-German securitizers was far more broad-based within both France and Germany. As early as 1949, Robert Schuman was already laying out before the world the question at hand in this time period. In a speech to the United Nations, he stated that “The first President of the new Federal Republic has just been elected and the first Chancellor designated. The destiny of Germany is again conferred on the Germans themselves”. Continuing, he cautioned that “The rhythm of developments
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that follow will depend on the results of this experiment (European integration)”. In a document published a few years later, Schuman placed “German nationalism, nourished by incessant but futile scoldings” at the heart of the bloodshed of two world wars, and hailed the election of Adenauer and his parliament, the Bundestag, in 1949 (Schuman, 1953: 350-2).

These overtures were both sincere and directed at a purpose. Realist concerns over the growing Soviet threat provided the impetus for Western pressure, but if the FRG were to be allowed to rearm, it would be so only because French and German citizens could come to realize that they shared a democratic ethos. This time period marked what Fukuyama would later call the “end of history,” or more accurately, the beginning of the end of history, in that the world was beginning to see itself in terms of democratic versus non-democratic spheres.

But which side was West Germany viewed on? Schuman was not the only diplomat to view West Germany as being a burgeoning, if not already in tact, member of the democratic club. By June of 1950, American High Commissioner in West Germany John McCloy was communicating with Allies that by working with “political party leaders, trade unionists, churchmen, and young people,” West Germany would soon be democratic territory (Schwartz, 1986: 371). Further, this was casen as a primary ultimatum: if progress was made, German rearmament would be viewed as both “necessary and desirable” to the West (Schwartz, 1986: 372).

---

Western newspapers wasted little time in making similar descriptions. The *Youngstown Vindicator*, quoting from the Foreign Affairs Desk of the Associated Press, described West Germany as the “barrier on the turnpike between the democratic West and Communist East,”¹²² and the *Sydney Morning Herald*, referred to Adenauer as “the Good German” who simply wanted to make West Germany a cooperator in Europe.¹²³

Perhaps the largest spokesman for this opposition message, as well as the largest proponent of West German democratization, was Chancellor Adenauer. In 1952 he wrote that “Our Western culture is based upon the liberty of the individual and the rule of law in human society,” before going on to discuss at length the history of democracy on the European continent (Adenauer, 1952: 156). He then makes the case that “We regard this European (defense) community as the way of living which is in harmony with our great occidental traditions, a way which alone can bestow permanency upon democracy and preserve the peace and security of the European countries” (Adenauer, 1952: 159).

In a companion piece to Schuman’s 1953 trope, Adenauer opened up his work by pointing out the importance of the *Bundestag* being popularly elected in 1949, but again made the case that democracy required military power in order to stand (Adenauer, 1953: 361-2). And in 1955, after the original EDC proposal had failed and a new compromise reached that allowed for re-armament, Adenauer thanked the British and Americans who

¹²¹ See Fukuyama (1989, 1992)
¹²² *Youngstown Vindicator*, “Allies Not Likely to Abandon Rearming West Germany” by DeWitt Mackenzie: 4 January 1951
¹²³ *The Sydney Morning Herald*, “The Difficulties of Dr. Adenauer”: 26 August 1954
welcomed them into “fraternal cooperation with people to whom they feel bound by common interests and ideals” (Adenauer, 1955: 183).

Adenauer’s campaign for the world – particularly France - to see Germany in a democratic light was not limited to academic musings. In 1951, in response to a reporter’s question over German re-unification, Adenauer stated emphatically that it was desired, “but in no case at the price of freedom”. That same year, he pronounced enthusiastically that Germany “will prove herself a reliable and unflinching partner of the free nations”. And shortly after being re-elected, Adenauer did not claim a personal victory, but rather a “victory for democracy” in West Germany, a state still stung by memories of the grossly failed Weimar Republic.

Was the Attempt at Securitization Successful?

Analysis of whether or not securitization occurred in 1949-1954 shows a clear case of failed securitization. Those in favor of branding West Germany as a threat attempted to do so along two lines: that a European Defense Community posed a significant risk to national sovereignty, and that West Germany could once again pose a threat to French national security if re-armament was permitted. While the former securitizers met with minimal success, the latter met nothing but abject failure.
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First, was the in-group/out-group message received by the public? The messages placed before the voters of France and Germany were identical: West Germany should not be allowed to re-arm because they could pose a threat to the future security of France and no European security community should be formed because it would pose a risk to national sovereignty. Though these debates encompassed numerous treaties\textsuperscript{127}, they consistently displayed a dominant influence over French and FRG politics during this time period.

France endured twelve changes in the Premier’s office between the introduction of the Schuman Declaration and the decision to re-arm West Germany in 1955, most of which the result of de Gaulle’s influence over the discussions on West Germany. And in Germany, Adenauer’s fourteen years as Chancellor were defined by these debates. In other words, there is a reason that both de Gaulle and Adenauer put such dramatic flair on descriptions of this issue, because during these years, they were, to paraphrase de Gaulle, the central concern of their political universe.

Did an opposition then arise that discussed a differing in-group/out-group dynamic? Research suggests that this clearly occurred. Focusing briefly on the first securitization message, namely that an EDC posed a threat to national sovereignty, opposition came from the international community and an increased Anglo-American military presence on the continent made this influence decisive.\textsuperscript{128} But even within the impacted nations, concerns over this line of thinking were pronounced. In 1952, shortly

\textsuperscript{127} For analysis of the numerous international treaties of 1949-1954 in Europe, see Kunz (1955)
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before the Bonn and Paris Agreements that led to the EDC, Adenauer affirmed to the Allies “You cannot leave us without protection” (Onslow, 1951: 453). New geopolitical realities seemed to require new thinking.

The second message received even deeper opposition. Adenauer was a consummate proponent of West German democratization, and he served as Chancellor of the FRG throughout the entirety of the 1950’s. In this way, he was an enemy inside the gates, posing opposition to the securitizers like Schumacher, who never fully took the reigns of power. And in France, although de Gaulle was successful in curtailing the EDC ratification, he did so on the grounds of national sovereignty. Neither he nor the succession of Premiers who allied with him displayed any sustained worries about West German democracy, save for the speech by Soustelle. But even that speech, which helped to topple the Mendes-France government, came after the National Assembly had given Mendes-France a large numerical vote of confidence\textsuperscript{129} and also after it became clear that German re-armament would inevitably occur (Schwartz, 1986: 372).\textsuperscript{130}

Finally, did the opposition exert influence over the leadership of state and weaken the move towards securitization? In this case, the answer is once again appears to be in the affirmative. As has been previously stated, Schumacher’s Social Democratic Party never held the reigns of power in Germany during the entirety of the debates, meaning Adenauer’s Centrist Coalition was consistently exerting influence over the state.

\textsuperscript{128} The Milwaukee Journal: “Pacts Blasted by De Gaulle: Tells Fear of Reich”: 6 June 1952
\textsuperscript{129} The Vancouver Sun, “Paris Votes to Re-Arm Germany”: 12 October 1954
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In France, a more traditional pattern emerges. De Gaulle held effective authority over France throughout the discussions, but his leadership was inconsistent on this matter, as he attempted to balance Western Allied concerns with French domestic politics. Further, a succession of Premieres and Presidents – namely Pierre Mendes-France and René Coty – bucked de Gaulle’s leadership and worked closely with the United States and Britain to craft a German re-armament plan. In fact, de Gaulle’s leadership had so weakened by 1955 that Coty called on Christian Pineau, a left of center United States ally who led a “Franco-American friendship society” in the National Assembly to form a government. One of the critical issues listed for the shift was “West German rearmament,” a clear sign that French public opinion had turned towards reconciliation.

In his Declaration, Schuman declared that a united Europe would create a “fusion of interest” that would ultimately lead to the elimination of the “age-old enmity between France and Germany” (McKeeson, 1952: 19). By 1955, it appeared that the proponents of securitizing West Germany had failed to convince the citizens of the two nations, and the citizens of the world, that this course was dangerous. The fusion of interests between the two states had begun.

132 The Modesto Bee, “Pflimlin Quits; French Cabinet Crisis Deepens” by Wilbur Landry: 14 February 1955
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Analysis of Franco-German Dyad

The mid-twentith century period reviewed in this dyad was marked by a shift from a multi-polar world order to the bi-polar world order of the Cold War. While the two case studies under review, particularly the re-armament crisis, do not provide probable cases of conflict and occurred within the confines of this shifting balance of power within Europe, they nevertheless saw significant friction points which are instructive for research into the democratic peace.

Both cases under examination in the Franco-Germany dyad present examples of failed securitization and successful securitization, albeit in adverse order. In the first case, liberal orthodoxy regarding an international community allowed the Briand factions within France to oppose securitizing the threat over the Ruhr, whereas realist orthodoxy allowed the Poincaré Government to successfully securitize the threat years later. On the other hand, realist orthodoxy originally allowed de Gaulle and his allies to securitize a West German threat and defeat EDC ratification in 1954, but liberal orthodoxy over a shared European value set allowed de Gaulle’s detractors, working in conjunction with the Adenauer forces in Germany, to defeat securitization over German re-armament in 1955.

The research indicates that two variables are potentially explanatory for these series of events. These variables are the presence of a great power dyad and democratic
perceptions. All five control variables and the remaining independent variables were successfully controlled.

H1: The fact that both France and Germany were great powers in 1923, but only France in 1955, accounts for the differing outcomes over the Ruhr and German re-armament.

As defined by Russett and O’Neal, the Franco-German dyad of 1923 consisted of two great powers, whereas the Franco-FRG dyad of 1955 consisted of only France. This reality is far more telling when viewed within the surrounding circumstances of the time periods. In 1923, Germany was part of a multi-polar international system of which she was a part; in 1955, the Federal Republic of Germany was a rebuilding player in an emerging bipolar system, caught in between the United States and her Western allies and the Soviet Union and her Eastern allies, most notably the DRG.

This logic would dictate that France was successful in securitizing the German threat in 1923 because their population felt it represented the greatest threat to French security. On the other hand, in 1955, neither France nor West Germany was able to securitize a threat from the other because they realized that each needed the other more than they did not, and joined forces to balance against a Soviet threat. This line of thinking was brought home by The Calgary Herald, who wrote shortly after re-armament that although the original EDC had set off “French apprehensions,” “the political and military situation has radically changed since then”. They were referring to the fact that “fear was born out of Korea,” and that the Western world had increasingly come to see
the Soviet Union as an expansionist threat. Both common sense and a significant portion of this research would dictate that this variable did, in fact, have something to do with the differing outcomes.

To be sure, evidence seems to exist that indicates behavior commensurate with bandwagoning on the part of the West German Bundestag, particularly Chancellor Adenauer. In numerous works, Adenauer implores the West to accept the FRG into a security pact in order to save them, in part, from the Red Menace on their Eastern border (Adenauer, 1952; Adenauer, 1953; Adenauer, 1955). By this logic, the fact that Germany was no longer a great power had left the state vulnerable in 1954 and with only the option of joining the West.

Despite this evidence, two glaring deficiencies exist within for this explanation. First, the idea of communist aggression existed in 1923, and was in fact one of the primary tools used by Poincaré in his push to securitize the Ruhr. In fact, the difference between the “communist threat” of 1923 and the threat of 1955 would tend to tilt the balance towards a reversal of outcomes in these two cases. Great concern was given in Paris in 1923 to making sure that the Weimar Republic did not get overcome by domestic communists, yet no viable international organization existed to combat the eventuality if it so occurred. Compare that to 1955, where even without a Franco-German alliance, both the United Nations and NATO existed to stop a far more overt communist threat. One is

---
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forced to ask why Poincaré, under those circumstances, would choose to further destabilize the domestic German government, while de Gaulle and his allies would choose the more difficult political path which also left France more vulnerable. It would appear that one might expect the opposite outcomes to occur.

Second, and more tellingly, great power calculations would dictate an extraordinarily different course for the Adenauer Government. Consider two possibilities. On one hand, Adenauer could have chosen to push for German re-unification and alliances with either the East or the West, or in a best case scenario, both. The “Stalin Note” considers just such a plan. On the other hand, Adenauer could have pursued a course of democratization and alliance with the West, fully understanding that his actions would earn him the enmity of the Soviet Union and East Germany, both of which occupied his borders, albeit through satellite states (Vigers, 1951: 153). Realist logic would dictate the former, yet Adenauer pursued the latter.

\textit{H2: Differences in democratic perceptions of the Other resulted in differing outcomes over the Ruhr in 1923 and German re-armament in 1955.}

These two cases provide a unique situation by which to analyze the effect of democratic perceptions, in that they play out through such similar means. In the first case, a clear line of distinction can be seen between the negotiations that occurred between the anti-German French President Poincaré and the nationalist German President Cuno, and

\footnote{\textit{The Outlook}, “Poincaré’s Ruhr Policy Sustained”: 6 June 1923}
those that occurred between President Briand of France and Minister Stresemann of Germany.

Both Poincaré and Cuno were successful in securitizing the threat of the Other to their countrymen largely because they sold the in-group/out-group messaging so vociferously. In short, there was not a thing that Cuno could do that would make Poincaré see Germany as a democratic equal that could be trusted, and there was nothing that Poincaré could do that would make Cuno see France as anything but an aggressor. Briand and Stresemann, on the other hand, consistently perceived each other, and each other’s nations, as democratic equals.

Turning to the latter case, there is a similar line of distinction between the dealings of de Gaulle and those of the Premiers who moved through French cabinets in 1953-55. De Gaulle was a staunch French nationalist who, despite Adenauer’s outward pleadings and the empirical realities of the day, could not see Germany as a viable negotiating partner unless France consistently maintained the upper hand. This policy was reinforced by René Mayer, a Radical Socialist, but he was ousted in favor of Joseph Laniel, a Centrist, who was replaced by Pierre Mendes-France, a man who bucked de Gaulle on West German re-armament. Ultimately, Mendes-France’s policies were continued by a succession of Premiers leading up re-armament, but not before a Cabinet crisis had ensued largely over the issue of West Germany. French policy of the time moved in a continuing direction towards recognizing the need to negotiate with a
democratic West Germany, ultimately leading them, under Premier Edgar Faure, to approve the measure in March, 1955.\footnote{\textit{The Milwaukee Sentinel}, “Mendes-Frances Makes Strong Appeal to Swing Pact Vote”: 28 December 1954}

**Conclusion**

This research suggests that the democratic perceptions that leaders hold of one another, and their ability to securitize that message with their respective publics, has a crucial impact on the escalation of conflict. It further suggests that these two cases, long regarded as pinnacles of realist thought, need further re-consideration.

When taken independently and considered alongside the global conflicts that surrounded them, they seem to be clear cases of power calculations. When taken together, however, it appears more likely that shared democratization and European identity were awaiting a positive perception, and that the Third Reich was an interregnum period of Franco-German relations. The conclusion of this case study is that the democratic perceptions that a Briand has of Germany, and a Stresemann and Adenauer have of France, play a critical role in determining an outcome of peace or conflict.

\footnote{\textit{The Miami News}, “Treaty Foes Near French Showdown”: 26 March 1955}
IV

Chapter Four
Indo-Pakistani Dyad (1998-2009): Democratic Perceptions During the Fourth Wave

Introduction

India and Pakistan have been engaged in an enduring rivalry dyad since the partition of the two states in 1947, and continue so at this time (Diehl and Goertz, 2000: 146; Thompson, 2001: 572). Their rivalry has been delineated by two distinct periods: the first occurring between 1947 and 1998, while both states were non-nuclear and went to war in 1947, 1965, and 1971, and the second occurring after 1998, when Pakistan joined India in the nuclear club. This chapter will examine two points of conflict which have occurred during the latter phase, the first being a case of escalated conflict that occurred in 1999 leading to the Kargil War in the disputed Kashmir Region, and the second a case of non-escalated conflict occurring in 2008, following the terrorist attacks in Mumbai, India.

Both cases presented here were the result of infringement upon Indian territorial sovereignty and both cases occurred while each state possessed the capability of a nuclear strike. After controlling for numerous variables, I will examine the possible explanatory variables for the differing outcomes of escalation in the two cases.

This chapter will proceed as follows. I will examine the events surrounding the securitization efforts preceding the conflicts of 1999 and 2008 in turn. Each case study will be broken down thus.
First, I will briefly detail the context and background of each case. Second, I will examine the respective attempts at securitization by the leaders of both India and Pakistan in the lead-up to conflict. Third, I will discuss the opposition to securitization that occurred in both India and Pakistan in the lead-up to each conflict. Fourth, I will answer, in each case, whether the threat was successfully securitized by the elites and general public in either India and/or Pakistan. Fifth, I will examine the potential explanatory variables that could account for the differing outcomes in securitization between the cases. Sixth, I will briefly conclude the chapter by discussing the most likely explanatory variable.

**Indo-Pakistani Dyad Case One: Kargil Conflict, 1999**

*Case Background*

In early May, 1999, Indian civilians inside the disputed Kashmir Region reported the presence of Pakistani military personnel within an area thought to be on the Indian side of the 1972 Line of Control (LoC). By late May, Indian military officials were reporting that 17 Indians had already been killed by Pakistani forces, along with an additional 90 injuries, and air strike operations were announced in the Kargil, Dras, and Batalik regions on 26 May 1999. It was the first time in twenty years that hostilities had boiled over into armed conflict between the two nations.\(^{139}\)

\(^{139}\) *BBC News*, “India Launches Kashmir Air Attack”: 26 May 1999
These developments were met by the international community with both surprise and fear. While the two states had long harbored mutual enmity, having fought armed conflicts in 1947, 1965, and 1971, guns had fallen silent in recent years. Further, the fruits of improved democratization in both nations had brought them closer together than at any previous time in their histories. On February 21, 1999, Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee, a member of the Hindu Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), and Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, a member of the Islamic Pakistani Muslim League (PLMN), signed the Lahore Declaration in the Pakistani capital. This document pledged mutual cooperation and bipartisan negotiations to settle disputes between the two states, historically pledging that each nation would “protect all human rights and fundamental freedoms” as well as each other’s sovereignty. This occasion led Prime Minister Vajpayee to declare that “there is nothing in our bilateral relations that can ever be resolved through violence,” and Bollywood actor Dev Anand, who was along for the trip, dramatically stated that “This is the greatest moment in the history of the world”.

The developments at Lahore were encouraged by an international community anxious to see peace in the region due to developments a year earlier. Within three weeks of each other, India and Pakistan had carried out nuclear tests in May 1998. While India had developed nuclear weapons in 1974, Pakistan was a new member of the nuclear
armament club. These tests confirmed to the world that any Indo-Pakistani conflict could now become a nuclear exchange.

The agreement of Lahore, a nuclear umbrella deterrent, and dyadic democratic peace theory would have dictated peace in the spring of 1999. Nevertheless, conflict ensued. Tarzi hypothesized that the explanation for this can be found in the fact that Pakistan was a “poorly functioning” – or illiberal – democracy (Tarzi, 2007: 51). This chapter largely confirms those findings, but also concludes that securitization efforts on the part of India played a critical role, and that their actions would have dictated conflict regardless of the empirical status of democracy within Pakistan.

Attempted Securitization

Farzana Shakoor, a Senior Research Officer at the Pakistan Institute of International Affairs, evaluated the aftermath of Lahore by stating bluntly “the past record of negotiations on Kashmir is not very impressive” (Shakoor, 1999: 50). This analysis certainly encapsulates an explanatory mechanism for the conflict in Kargil, namely that the two nations, though recently engaged in mutual democracy and negotiations, simply did not have a normative history of trust. This is clearly on display when examining each state’s attempted securitization of the other.

Within the Indian government, the language of security took on an almost immediate sense of realist necessity. Upon the commencement of Indian Air Force (IAF) operations – codenamed “Operation Vijay (Victory)” - BJP Secretary Narendra Modi
stated that “Pakistan has been waging a proxy war against India for the past 10 years despite the Shimla Agreement. If they are doing it again despite the Lahore bus visit, it just shows that they have not changed a bit”.\textsuperscript{142} IAF Air Commodore S Bhojwami declared that “this action was forced on India,” and that had they not acted, “Pakistan would have been encouraged to extend its operation further”.\textsuperscript{143} Perhaps in the most jingoistic form of all, Union Minister LK Advani pledged to “smash” the Pakistani operation, which he described as a “totally new and disturbing dimension” to militancy in Jammu and Kashmir.\textsuperscript{144} In other words, India’s BJP Government attempted to securitize the threat by making a simple claim: Pakistan had breached their territorial sovereignty in Kashmir, and that sovereignty required defending.

Inside Pakistan the securitization efforts were far less concise. Ostensibly, the reasoning of the Sharif Government for movement into Kashmir dealt with a historical dispute over the boundaries of the LoC. This argument was put forward two weeks into the conflict escalation by Pakistani Foreign Minister Sartaj Aziz, who argued that a more clearly delineated LoC would help ease tensions in the region.\textsuperscript{145} This issue was also raised between Sharif and United States President Bill Clinton when Sharif said that, in the view of his government, the Kashmir situation needed to be placed within a “larger issue” over the LoC if the tensions were to be resolved. This information, which was not

\textsuperscript{142} \textit{The Indian Express}, “Bus Won’t Ride Over Kargil”: 28 May 1999
\textsuperscript{143} \textit{The Indian Express}, “India Unleashes Air Power” by Manvendra Singh: 27 May 1999
\textsuperscript{144} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{145} \textit{The Indian Express}, “Jaswant Talks Tough, Aziz Gets the Message” by Arati R. Jerath: 13 June 1999
made public until five years after the conflict, was met derogatorily by President Clinton, who stated that it was akin to “nuclear blackmail”.\textsuperscript{146}

While the issues over Kashmir and the LoC played a role, they appear to have become part of the dialog ex post facto. Therefore, Pakistani securitization efforts seemed to be of a more psychological nature. During the early days of the conflict, Pakistani Army spokesmen Brigadier Rashid Qureshi disseminated a disputed claim regarding Indian bombs in Pakistani territory, calling the situation “very, very serious”. He placed the blame of escalation squarely on Indian shoulders, and warned against the build-up of Indian troops and aircraft on the Kashmiri border.\textsuperscript{147} In essence, Pakistani securitization claims lie within a psychological escalatory spiral, whereby each reaction is more severe than the one which provoked it, and is exacerbated by psychological structural conditions taking place while the conflict is occurring.\textsuperscript{148}

If this theory of securitization is true, and this research suggests that it is, Indian government officials faced a choice that could well have de-escalated the situation. On one hand, they could have built upon existing attempts at dialog, holding Vajpayee to his word that nothing in their bilateral relations could be resolved through conflict. On the other, they could press forward with a securitization claim that not only stressed realist concerns over sovereignty, but also exonerated India of the charge that it had made the

\textsuperscript{146} The Hindustan Times, “Clinton Snubbed Sharif for Linking Kargil War with Kashmir Issue”: 11 July 2004
\textsuperscript{147} BBC News, “Pakistani Army on High Alert”: 26 May 1999
\textsuperscript{148} For a detailed discussion of these psychological processes, see Pruitt and Kim (2004): 96-106
first moves in the escalatory spiral. Evidence suggests that the Indian government chose the latter course.

The Indian newspaper Merinews, in an analysis following the conflict, concluded that the media was used as a “weapon” by India to turn domestic and international opinion against Pakistan, and that these efforts were successful due to Kargil being the first “live war in South Asia”. The language of security employed in this campaign carried with it the implication that Pakistan was, at best, a troubled member of the democratic club who could not be trusted. India attempted to display to their public and the world that it was, in Tarzi’s words, General Pervez Musharraf, Chief of Army Staff, who was in control of the civilian military of Pakistan and responsible for the incursion into Kargil, and that Sharif was simply along for the ride (Tarzi, 2007: 51).

What Musharraf was not controlling, Indian securitizers argued, radical Islamists were. As early as May 25, 1999, The Statesman headlined a cover story “Pakistani Army Officers among Kargil Infiltrators”. Just two days later, The Hindustan Times could declare that “Intrusion Obviously Had Full Backing of Pak Government,” and two days following that, The Hindu headlined “Evidence of Pak Intruders on Indian Side”. The Indian press did not stop there. On May 26, 1999, the Indian Express asked “Is Osama bin Laden in Kargil?” These headlines continued unabated, as India made a concerted effort to cast itself as “responsible and trustworthy,” and its neighbor as “nonsecular and
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149 Merinews, “How Media Influenced the Kargil War”: 1 March 2011
150 For further analysis of these stories, see Rand Corporation: “The Significance of the Kargil Crisis” in Limited Conflicts Under the Nuclear Umbrella, 2001: 24
unstable”.

Three years following the conflict, *The Hindu* proclaimed that “India's encounter at Kargil was with the two-headed enemy, the militant in the rearguard and the Mujahedeen in the vanguard, actively abetted by the Pakistani GHQ that provided excellent, relentless, logistical and incessant artillery fire support bolstering the aggressive endeavor to redraw the Line of Control”.

This line of thinking, which *Merinews* later reported was coordinated heavily with *The Hindu, The Indian Express, BBC News,* and *CNN,* was echoed by Prime Minister Vajpayee at a national address delivered on 7 June 1999. He stated to his people that:

“Regulars of the Pakistan Army and infiltrators have been sent across. Fomenting insurgency here was heinous enough. But this time Army regulars have been sent. They have been sent to occupy our territory. And, having occupied it, to choke off our links with other parts of our country - in particular with Siachin and Ladakh. This step has been taken after a great deal of preparation. *It was a preplanned operation.*” (Italics Added)

In sum, attempted securitization in India simultaneously took on the language of both realist concerns for the sovereignty of Kargil, as well as an attempt to securitize Pakistan as an unstable neighbor controlled by militants and radical Islamists, not by democratic institutions. In Pakistan, attempted securitization was cased in the language of self-defense, arguing from the beginning that India was responsible for the conflict escalation and only later discussing issues regarding the Line of Control and its boundaries.
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151 Ibid.: 25
152 *The Hindu,* “Encounter at Kargil”: 8 January 2002
153 *Merinews,* “How Media Influenced the Kargil War”: 1 March 2011
Opposition to Securitization

Opposition to securitization was robust in Pakistan while being nearly non-existent in India. Judging on the empirical democratic ratings of the two states in 1998 – Pakistan (-6) and India (9)\(^\text{155}\) – this realization is ironic. Nevertheless, research suggests that it was the Indian public that rallied around their government, while a significant portion of the Pakistani political establishment did not do so.

With parliamentary elections bearing down in India, almost no opposition arose to securitizing the threat in Kargil. Shakoor accurately observed that “the BJP government exploited the situation to its full advantage knowing well that in an election-year an anti-Pakistani policy would guarantee success” (Shakoor, 1999: 50). What little opposition was cast dealt more with the Vajpayee governments’ inability to see the threat looming in Kargil than with the actions taken since the bombing had ensued.\(^\text{156}\) For their part, India Today reported, without much evidence, the fact that “Pakistan is hell-bent on internationalizing Kashmir was apparent from the way they have rewritten the script in the new Indo-Pakistani drama unfolding,” while criticizing the Vajpayee government for appearing “a trifle delayed” in handling the threat.\(^\text{157}\) In other words, those who were opposed to the BJP policy were, at least publically, in opposition due to the government
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\(^{154}\) Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee’s Address to the Nation During the Kargil Crisis: 7 June 1999

\(^{155}\) Polity IV


\(^{157}\) India Today, “Blasting Peace” by Manoj Joshi and Harinder Baweja: 7 June 1999
not acting harsh enough towards Pakistan, not because they felt that the threat should not be securitized.

In Pakistan, on the other hand, opposition was rather significant for a nation being described by the Indian and world press as not being sufficiently democratic. The Dawn, a Pakistani newspaper, editorialized in July 1999 regarding the lack of cause for the ongoing conflict. They stated, “The people of Pakistan are not asking why Kashmir has not been liberated. All they are saying is that if this had to be the consequence of this adventure, what was the need to start it in the first place?”158 Far more critically, Benazir Bhutto, the former Pakistani Prime Minister and leader of the opposition Pakistan People’s Party (PPP), penned a widely circulated opinion editorial to the New York Times on 8 June 1999. In it, she calls for a “Camp David for Kashmir,” and lists as one of her “principal regrets” that she put territorial issues in the region ahead of improved Indo-Pakistani relations during his tenure as Premier. She highlighted with confidence that India and Pakistan could experience what Israel and Jordan had, namely the democratic principles of “genuine confidence…built with deliberate, incremental advances, which quickly triggered extraordinary and rapid progress”.159

This opposition was all the more noteworthy due to the fact that Bhutto had twice been in exile to military rule after her father, former Prime Minister Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, had been hanged by a previous military regime. Her opposition was so widely publicized

throughout Pakistan and the world due to both her international celebrity and the sharp parallels being drawn between General Musharraf, who was pressuring the Sharif Government for firmer action in Kashmir, and Muhammad Zia ul-Haq, the military leader who hung the elder Bhutto. As late as 2009, Musharraf, who never hid his support and operational control of the early stages of the Kargil incursion, was stating that the mission was a “success” in that it brought global attention to the Kashmiri dispute, a statement not surprisingly in line with a prominent strain of Pakistani security language.

Was the Attempt at Securitization Successful?

The opposition which did exist in India, which was both rare and quiet, evaporated completely in early June 1999. The BJP Government, in what *The Indian Express* declared was a “sound decision,” released tape recorded conversations between General Musharraf and Lieutenant General Mohammed Aziz Khan. Under the jingoistic *Express* headline “A Rogue Army,” the tapes revealed a series of conversations taking place over the course of several weeks between Musharraf, Khan, and Foreign Minister Aziz which showed coordination with the highest levels of the Pakistani government, including Prime Minister Sharif. In short order, the Indian attempt at securitization was bolstered by recordings that neatly matched the securitization
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160 *One India News*, “Kargil was a ‘big success’: Pervez Musharraf”: 24 July 2009
161 *The Indian Express*, “A Rogue Army”: 14 June 1999
162 *Frontline*, “A Long Haul Ahead” by Praveen Swami: 2 July 1999
narrative. As a result, Indian and Pakistani peace talks in New Delhi broke down on 13 June, largely at the request of Indian Foreign Minister Jaswant Singh.163

This research indicates that the in-group/out-group message within India, namely that Pakistan was an unstable neighbor incapable of keeping control of its own government, was resoundingly received. Additionally, very little to no opposition arose to challenge this language of security, and that which did was effectively silenced with the release of the Musharraf-Khan conversations. Finally, the remnants of this opposition did not challenge for control of the state, as the BJP and Vajpayee swept the 1999 elections. Extolling the virtues of Indian democracy, Vajpayee called the wave of electoral success in the wake of the Kargil Conflict “The Mandate of ‘99”.164

The question of whether a threat was securitized within Pakistan is more complex, and requires attention to each phase of the process. First, was the in-group/out-group message received by the Pakistani public? It appears from this research that the message of India-as-aggressor was, in fact, received by a significant portion of the Pakistani domestic public. As Shafqat notes, both major political parties in Pakistan were “conspicuously silent during the crisis” – Bhutto’s individual opposition inside the PPP notwithstanding – while the “religious right exploited the crisis to mobilize public opinion” (Shafqat, 2009: 281). Just as Vajpayee’s BJP utilized the crisis for electoral gain, so too did the right-wing elements of Pakistani politics.

164 India News, “Vajpayee Sworn in as Prime Minister: Address to the Nation by Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee”: 16 October 1999
Second, did opposition arise within Pakistan to challenge this language of security? The answer to this question also appears to be in the affirmative. Benazir Bhutto was the highest profile opponent of the Sharif policy inside Pakistan, but United States President Clinton probably provided more weight in shaping international and domestic opinion. In the early days of the “American unipolar moment,” Clinton broke ties with their historic ally Pakistan and aligned the United States squarely with India over Kashmir (Bisaria, 2009). This pressure was so pronounced after 4 July 1999, the date in which United States involvement formally commenced, that Musharraf cited it as the main reason why he ultimately left decisions of escalation up to Sharif after that date.

Third, did the opposition exert influence over the leadership of state and weaken the move towards securitization? The answer to this question appears, somewhat surprisingly, to be affirmative. On 12 July 1999, Sharif addressed the Pakistani nation on his decision to draw troops down in Kashmir. In a long oration, he derided those who allowed themselves to be “swept away by emotion,” “raised sentimental slogans,” and conspired to “obtain power and advance their political careers”. He then extolled his own virtue in the peace process, stating that “I did not follow the popular upsurge, if you recall. The results are there for everyone to see. If you have faith, you should only take those decisions which in your judgment are correct”. In essence, he displayed the
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decision making and the language of someone who chose the opposition to securitization over the popular democratic pressures to increase tensions with India.

In the coming months, the fact that opponents of securitization had, indeed, taken control of the Sharif Government became increasingly clear. Just three days following Sharif’s address, retired Pakistani General Mirza Aslam Beg “lashed out” at Sharif for making the Pakistani military a “scapegoat” for the actions in Kargil, actions which were becoming widely seen as a debacle for Pakistan (Deshpande, 1999; Deshpande, 1999; Navlakha, 1999). Beg went on to blow the whistle on Sharif, claiming that he had authorized the incursion in January, one month prior to his meeting with Vajpayee in Lahore. Sharif never disputed this claim, demonstrating that his opinion on Kargil evolved along with domestic and global opinion. Nonetheless, one month following the cessation of hostilities, the Jamaat-e-Islami, an Islamic fundamentalist party, held a 30,000 person anti-United States rally in Lahore calling for Sharif’s resignation, and Bhutto’s PPP held a similar event chiding Sharif for starting the conflict in the first place.

On 12 October 1999, just days before Vajpayee was sworn-in in India, General Musharraf ousted Sharif in a military coup and took control of Pakistan. This move came almost immediately upon Sharif’s dismissal of Musharraf for his behavior in Kashmir,

and was reported as an obvious “blow to democracy”. A month later, he was arrested for a host of questionable charges, convicted, tortured, and exiled to Saudi Arabia. Upon his return to Pakistan in 2007, he promised a full probe into the “Kargil misadventure,” and went on primetime Indian television to apologize for the Kargil incident, mark it as a low-point in bilateral relations, and state that he “wished it had never happened”.

In summary, this research suggests that the Kargil threat was securitized in India, but that its failure to be securitized in Pakistan following United States involvement in the crisis prevented further escalation. Nevertheless, it was India’s securitization of a perceived instability within Pakistani democracy that ultimately led to a conflict spiral, one which ironically resulted in the collapse of a Pakistani democratic government.
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Indo-Pakistani Dyad Case Two: Mumbai Crisis, 2008

Case Background

I will now turn to the events surrounding the Mumbai Terror Attacks of 2008, a case which ultimately resulted in a non-escalated conflict between India and Pakistan. On 26 November 2008, a coordinated terrorist attack struck the Taj Mahal Hotel in Mumbai, India, killing nearly two hundred Indians and wounding three times as many. This attack came on the heels of previous strikes (Ganguly, 2008), but stood apart for its acerbity. As the New York Times reported, “Even by the standards of terrorism in India, which has suffered a rising number of attacks this year, the assaults were particularly brazen in scale and execution”.

Many similarities existed between the incursion into Kargil and the attacks in Mumbai. First, the Indian government instantaneously responded by assessing the attacks as, fundamentally, a violation of their sovereignty. Second, questions arose regarding the perpetrators of the attacks, as they were not readily identified as a member of a foreign military operation. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh (INC), in a newspaper interview shortly following the attack, described the assailants as simply a group “based outside the country”. Third, Pakistan, through its President Asif Ali Zardari (PPP),

175 Prime Minister Manmohan Singh’s Address to the Nation: 27 November 2008
176 The Hindu, “Political India Responds Unitedly” by Harish Khare: 28 November 2008
disavowed any government involvement with the attackers. Fourth, the 1999 incursions took place in the midst of the Indian national elections of that year, while the 2008 Mumbai attack occurred during the season of State Assembly elections.

Despite the similarities, two key differences existed between the events of 1999 and those of 2008. First, Zardari and Singh represented leadership qualities that stressed democratic sameness over realist militarism. Singh was opposed to the more militant BJP factions within his nation, and Zardari was the husband of Benazir Bhutto, who was assassinated less than a year before the attacks by militants within Pakistan, as well as a member of the secular Pakistani People’s Party (PPP). Second, while the language of security emanated from outside the halls of government, within each government new dialogue took place in the aftermath of 26 November. *Economic and Political Weekly*, writing in December 2008, described this dynamic: “given that class-power elite's identification of "the terrorists" with the forces of darkness in Manichaean conflict with those of light (the self-appointed protectors of "democracy", "freedom", and "justice" on a global scale and all who are with them), the whole discourse invariably gets confined to ways of meeting the terrorist threat, which in practice boils down to "necessary" counter-terrorism” (Economic and Political Weekly, 2008). This research largely confirms the analysis that what one views as “necessary” measures to root out terrorism – namely mutual democracy - best explains the differing outcomes of these two cases in conflict.
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Attempted Securitization

Initially, the government of India presented a unified front to their citizenry, demonstrating a domestic want to both mourn the victims of Mumbai and also to not challenge the international prowess of Singh’s Congress Party. Shortly thereafter, however, members of the BJP began accusing Singh and his government of weakness in the face of Pakistani terror.

The first criticism leveled at the Singh Government was directed at what the BJP perceived as a weak domestic political structure that allowed the attacks to occur in the first place. L.K. Advani, the Opposition leader in the Lok Sabha, came out as early as 29 November in criticism of the inactions of the Indian government. He characterized the Singh Government as having a “non-serious approach” to terror, and described the actions of the militants as “full-scare war” on India. The Hindu reported that this was done largely for political purposes, stating that “the leadership (of the BJP) felt that it could not let go of the opportunity to electorally cash in on the episode”.

The remarks for Advani were accompanied by word that he would not travel with Minister Singh to Mumbai, and also were accompanied by a BJP electoral advertisement that boldly stated: “Fight Terror, Vote BJP”. Within a week of the shift in policy, the BJP campaign appeared to be gaining steam. A shopkeeper who operated near the Taj
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Mahal Hotel, and who was directly impacted by the attacks, commented to the press that “The system has failed. We all know that no government can prevent a well-orchestrated terrorist attack but our politicians have been irresponsible”. Attempting to further capitalize, the BJP redirected its language of security and directly pointed the finger at Pakistan. On 5 December, BJP officials communicated to Minister Singh that they would only offer support to the government if “effective steps were taken against Pakistan,” describing their border nation as having “diluted cooperation,” potentially giving nuclear materials to “non-state actors,” and “having no control” over jihadi terrorists.

Pakistan displayed no such unity in the face of Indian accusations. Similarly to the case of 1999, members of the Pakistani Muslim League derided the Zardari Government for its decision to send Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) Chief Ahmed Shuja Pasha to India in order to assist in the investigation. The Dawn described the action as “incredible and unbelievable” in an opinion editorial, and the various leaders of PML factions wasted little time in their criticism of Zardari for weakness.

PML-N spokesman Ahsan Iqbal described the cooperative actions of the Zardari Government as “hasty,” and asserted that previous Indian accusations against Pakistani terror involvement had proven false. He described the call from India for cooperation from the ISI as tantamount to a “summons”. Representatives from the PML-Q, a faction headed by the ousted military leader Pervez Musharraf, stated that sending the ISI was an
“admission of guilt”. Finally, former ISI General Asad Durrani ostensibly supported Zardari’s right to make the decision on behalf of Pakistani’s, but stated that he would not have personally done so. These efforts, like their Indian counterparts, had some semblance of success. News reported detailed radio and talk show callers in Pakistan claiming that India had received what she deserved in Mumbai, with one reportedly discussing an international conspiracy of Americans, Jews, and Indians aimed at “defaming” Pakistan.185

In sum, the language of security on both sides of the South Asian divide in 2008 took on a similar dialogue as 1999. Members of the Hindu BJP in India argued that their domestic institutions were too weak to adequately respond to terror, and further, that Pakistan was too unstable a neighbor to trust with controlling jihadists or possessing nuclear weapons.186 In Pakistan, members of the various Muslim League sects chided Zardari for bowing to Indian demands while also charging India with conspiring in an anti-Pakistani message that often proved false before the world community. In other words, both sets of securitizers viewed action as necessary because neither saw the other as a good-faith partner.

185 The Hindu, “Decision to Send ISI Chief to India Draws Flak” by Nirupama Subramanian: 29 November 2008
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Opposition to Securitization

In stark contrast to the Kargil Conflict, in 2008 the language of security was coming from opposition parties in India and Pakistan – the BJP and the Muslim League, respectively – and opposition to securitization from governing parties. Both Prime Minister Singh’s Congress Party and President Zardari’s Pakistani People’s Party adhered to principles of cooperation and mutual democracy, and both worked to oppose securitizing the threat that arose from the Mumbai terror.

The night following the 26 November attack, Minister Singh addressed the nation and promised a full response against those who perpetrated the crimes. In it, he stated that their neighbors (Pakistan) would not be allowed to use their territory for terrorist training, but even in a largely realist speech preaching security, he called on his nation to maintain the principles of “peace and harmony”. 187

By 5 December, Congress Party members had effectively ruled out military options in response to Mumbai, and even went so far as defending their party’s stance of opposing crossing the LoC during the Kargil Conflict. 188 On 11 December, Singh defended his party’s policies in these terms: “let not our commitment to civilized norms be misconstrued as a sign of weakness”. In the same speech, he placed the internal government debates within clear parameters, stating that “the idea of India as a functioning democracy and a pluralistic society is at stake”. 189 Two days later, before an
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international and domestic audience, Singh spoke extensively about democracy, and placed it in a regional context. He defined terrorism and extremism as a “threat to democracy and development” in the entire South Asian region.\footnote{\textit{Prime Minister Manmohan Singh’s Address to the International Conference of Jurists and Terrorism, Rule of Law, and Human Rights: 13 December 2008}}

Further, the INC made it abundantly clear that any attempt by the BJP to securitize the Pakistani threat from Pakistan was a political stunt. Their spokesman, Manish Tewari, blasted the BJP, saying “I know they are desperate for votes, but I wish they had waited” to oppose the INC in their negotiations. Congress President Sonia Gandhi extolled the virtues of keeping the ISI Chief’s visit out of public site as a strong diplomatic move, stating that it “was not a publicity campaign,” and Senior Congress leader Veerappa Moily questioned the BJP’s patriotism, specifically citing Advani’s unwillingness to travel with Singh to the Mumbai terror site.\footnote{\textit{The Hindu}, “Why Fish in Troubled Waters, Asks Congress” by Anita Joshua: 29 November 2008} In total, the INC was clear that it preferred a diplomatic solution to the terrorist attack in Mumbai, and was not afraid to confront the securitizers in the BJP on these terms.

In Pakistan, opposition to securitization came from inside the halls of government as well. President Zardari, uniquely qualified as the husband of the late democratic champion Benazir Bhutto, used his first address after being elected to the Pakistani presidency to highlight the quest for democracy. He opened his words with a salute to his late wife, and boasted his pride in “standing in front of the seat of democratic power in
Pakistan”. One week later, he addressed the United Nations and described the fight for democratic values as the chief quest of the times, stating that its development faces threats from both heavy-handed dictators and Islamic terrorists. He stated, in no uncertain terms, that “Democracy is not like a switch that can be turned on and off when it’s convenient. It is a universal value guaranteed to all men and women,” and called for his new government to work tirelessly to promote those values.

Following the attacks, Zardari’s commitment was seemingly unshaken. After stating that his nation was not responsible for the attacks, he made numerous overtures to India, each extolling a brand of democratic oneness. Three days after the blast, his Prime Minister reached out to Singh and stated their shock and horror at the events, and expressed an interest that these occurrences not shake their united goals of eradicating “poverty, hunger and disease”. In the same vein, Pakistani Foreign Minister Shah Mahmood Qureshi pledged his government’s support of aiding India in finding and prosecuting the terrorists, declaring that “Pakistan’s hands are clean”.

Perhaps recalling the international, and particularly United States, response to the events in Kargil, Zardari also conducted a series of efforts directed at both his own population and that of the world. In early December he appeared on the Larry King Live show in the United States, and called the terrorists “stateless actors who are holding

---

192 President Asif Ali Zardari’s Address to a Joint Session of Parliament: 20 September 2008
193 President Asif Ali Zardari’s Address to the United Nations: 26 September 2008
194 The Hindu, “Decision to Send ISI Chief to India Draws Flak” by Nirupama Subramanian: 29 November 2008
hostage the whole world,” including Pakistan, who he reiterated had no say in the efforts. He assured the Pakistani people and the world that his government would proceed to gather proof against the jihadists, try them in open court, and sentence them for their actions 

promises which he ultimately followed through on after participating in a multinational process to bring them to justice.

Days later, United States Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Joint Chiefs Chairman Mike Mullen visited with South Asian leaders in Lahore and urged restraint between the two nations, with Zardari in agreement. He gave an interview to CNN asking both sides – India and Pakistan – to “take a breath,” and said that the attacks in Mumbai were directed at both India and Pakistan as a threat to the free world, and that they directly challenged Pakistan’s “new democratic government and the peace process with India that we have initiated”. Most tellingly, in an op-ed written to the New York Times around this time, Zardari speaks positively about his neighbor, writing that “India is a mature nation and a stable democracy. Pakistanis appreciate India’s democratic contributions”. He once again spoke of the threat to democracy in both nations posed by the Mumbai attacks, and quoted his late wife in saying that “democracy is the best revenge against the abuses of dictatorship”. He closed with this observation: “In the current environment, reconciliation and rapprochement is the best revenge against the
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dark forces that are trying to provoke a confrontation between Pakistan and India, and ultimately a clash of civilizations”. 

Was the Attempt at Securitization Successful?

In early January 2009, Indian officials turned over to Pakistan a dossier that included evidence of the guilt of numerous terrorists within Pakistan’s borders. Pakistan cooperated with the information, and a joint operation ultimately succeeded in bringing the terrorists to justice. Arrests began in late January 2009, prompting immediate outcries from jihadist Imams within Pakistan as further attempts to securitize the threat continued. Military options were not considered further, if they had been previously at all.

It appears that neither the threat in India nor Pakistan was securitized. First, was the in-group/out-group message received by the respective publics? Both nations were in periods rife with public interaction. In Pakistan, Zardari had assumed the presidency months before and following the era of Musharraf, leading many in the Pakistani public to tune in to the potential for democratic governance. This was demonstrated by the
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reported interaction with radio and television sparked by the PML propaganda campaign deriding the Zardari Government.\textsuperscript{203}

In India, an ongoing election cycle prompted the public to be hyper-aware of the in-group/out-group messaging being put forth, demonstrated not least of which by the nearly immediate shift in the BJP position on the attacks to a more militant posture. This decision appears to have been a direct result of political consideration, and was undoubtedly received by the public. Further, a report of the time showed that India’s media covered the attacks with an “engaged diversity” that allowed both political factions to bring their messages forward to the public (Muralidharan, 2008: 16). Finally, news reports detailed how the Mumbai terror attacks represented the first social media foreign policy tragedy of the region, prompting six million tweets and causing one commentator to describe Mumbai as a “social media experiment in action”.\textsuperscript{204} In short, the messages put forth by the competing political factions in each nation were received, perhaps by a wider array of citizens than at any time in history.

Second, did opposition arise within both nations to challenge this language of security? The answer to this question is not only affirmative, but both nations displayed a sizable level of opposition language. In Pakistan, Zardari and his PPP engaged in a full-scale domestic and international media blitz which drove at one goal: making clear their stance that the terrorism in Mumbai was a terrorist attack on democracy in the entire

\textsuperscript{203} \textit{The Hindu}, “Decision to Send ISI Chief to India Draws Flak” by Nirupama Subramanian: 29 November 2008
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region. This campaign was so effectively administered that, in no less than a week, Indian, Pakistani, and United States government officials were lauding Pakistan’s cooperation in the process\footnote{\textit{CNN}, “Tweeting the Terror: How Social Media Reacted to Mumbai” by Stephanie Busari: 28 November 2008}, and by late January, military options were being taken off the table permanently.

For India’s part, Singh’s government also consistently opposed BJP efforts to securitize the threat of Pakistan. Even with electoral pressures, Singh’s Congress Party went so far as to challenge the patriotism of BJP members for their failure to rally around the government policy of peace\footnote{\textit{PBS}, “Rice Visits Pakistan Urging Cooperation in Mumbai Investigation”: 4 December 2008}, and continued to treat Pakistan as a democratic ally throughout, as indicated by his repeated speeches in late November and early December 2008.

Third, did the opposition exert influence over the leadership of state and weaken the move towards securitization? The answer is, once again, an affirmative. President Zardari mostly withstood the pressures from the PML to take on a more hostile stance towards India, and retains the Presidency of Pakistan to the present. The one exception to this was his ultimate recalling of his ISI Chief from India under popular pressure (Baruah, 2008-9: 197), but even this did not stop his government from assisting in the ultimate apprehension of the responsible terrorists. His administration has been marked with increasing democratic gestures, which now include the granting of “most-favored nation” trade status to India and a 2012 visit to the nation, the first by a Pakistani leader.
since 2005. Ahead of the meeting, the Pakistani Foreign Minister commented that "it is the desire and commitment of both the governments to make it an uninterrupted and uninterruptable process," with the sentiments returned by Singh.207

Minister Singh still presides in India as well, and his opposition to securitization was also successful in capturing the democratic polity. In the 2008 State Assembly Elections, the INC was successful at defeating the BJP, which prompted a contemporary analyst to write that “the electorate has wisely not fallen for the BJP’s campaign that whipped up the issue of terrorist violence” (Economic and Political Weekly, 2008: 5). The following year, Singh’s INC also won the national elections. While Singh and his government engaged in some saber-rattling at the behest of opponents²⁰⁸, just as Zardari had, the opposition to securitization was clear and consistent, as well as ultimately successful, and military action did not occur between the two nations as it had in 1999.

²⁰⁷ CNN, “Pakistan President to Visit India Amid Warming Ties” by Harmeet Shah Singh: 6 April 2012
²⁰⁸ See Time, “Pakistan Continues to Resist India Pressure on Mumbai” by Omar Waraich: 7 January 2009 and The Hindu, “Pakistan Now Holds the Key to Probe: Investigators” by Praveen Swami: 1 December 2008
**Analysis of Indo-Pakistani Dyad**

During the 1999 Kargil Conflict, the threat of Pakistan in India, and vice-versa, was securitized; in 2008, the same threats were not. This dyad represents a close approximation of a most-similar systems case study, albeit with more potential variables than the previous dyads. It is worth noting that numerous variables require future research on this time period within the Indo-Pakistani dyad, including additional United States involvement in the post-11 September world, most notably in Afghanistan, and the want of the Indian government to foster democracy in the region. Nevertheless, the research conducted here is instructive on the role of democratic perception. In these cases, all control variables were successfully controlled, including nuclear weapons capability, and two additional independent variables – mutual IGO memberships and great power status – were also controlled for.

In ascertaining the cause of differing securitization outcomes, four independent variables remain: democratic perceptions, empirical democracy, power imbalance, and trade interdependence. Additionally, it is important to analyze domestic politics as a potential explanatory variable in this case, due to the diametric shift in governing powers at the time of conflict.
H1: Differences in trade interdependence accounts for the differing outcomes in the Kargil Conflict and the Mumbai terrorist attacks.

According to numerous scholars, trade balance is a key component in the maintenance of peace.\textsuperscript{209} By this logic, the fact that the two nations were less integrated in trade at one point, and not at the other, would dictate differing conflict outcomes. In this case, however, the conflict behavior of the two states represents an inverse relationship from what would be expected. In 1998, both nations were far more dependent on trade with the other than they were in 2007, and yet conflict escalated in 1999 but not in 2008. Scholars of the liberal peace would argue the exact opposite. Further, at no point in the research did issues of trade become raised by political authorities or media outlets, giving significant doubt to the validity of this variable as explanatory.

H2: Differences in power capabilities account for the differing outcomes in the Kargil Conflict and the Mumbai terrorist attacks.

According to both Correlates of War data and military spending, India maintained a positive power imbalance in 1998, while both nations were largely balanced in 2007. This logic would dictate that successful securitization in 1999 resulted from the belief in India that military operations would be successful, whereas in 2008 the result would be a perceived military stalemate.
While this logic carries some validity, and requires further research, the variable of nuclear capabilities cast serious doubt upon its explanatory power. At no point was a full-scale military option considered by either side, and the presence of nuclear capabilities by each side makes relative military power calculations largely obsolete. In late December 2008, *The Hindustan Times* hypothesized that “war between nuclear weapons states is out of the question”. While this presents itself as an explanation for failed securitization in 2008, it does not account for the fact that the same situation existed nine years previously, and yet securitization and war occurred. Cast in this light, power balance considerations were seemingly equal in 1999 and 2008.

**H3: Differences in empirical democracy account for the differing outcomes in the Kargil Conflict and the Mumbai terrorist attacks.**

According to *Polity IV*, in 1998 Pakistan was rated as -6 on a 21 point democracy scale, and as 2 in 2007. India, for her part, was rated as 9 in both 1998 and 2007. The argument for this variable as explanatory would be that in 1999 India was correct in assuming that they could not negotiate in good democratic faith with Pakistan, while in 2008 that process was possible. Two significant questions arise to this line of argument.

First, the empirical rating of 2 on the *Polity* scale is far from a maximalist democracy. As demonstrated in the case of Great Britain in the nineteenth century, this score is highly subjective, and many of the same concerns were rattling Pakistani
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democracy in 1999 as in 2008. However, for the sake of research, it is still important to take the empirical democratic scores of Pakistan as a possible explanatory variable.

Second, and with that said, a look inside the case study itself provides a clearer challenge to this argument. Within India, empirical democracy was the same in both cases, yet India securitized the threat in 1999 and not in 2008. Further, within Pakistan, the case study reveals a more fragile democracy in 2008 than in 1999. The Sharif Government had been in power for nearly two years when the Kargil Conflict began, and had the support of enough members of the Pakistani Muslim League in order to sign the Lahore Declaration in early 1999. The Zardari Government, on the other hand, had been in power for only months when the Mumbai Attacks occurred, and had been riddled with attacks, including the assassination of Benazir Bhutto, for over a year. Additionally, as a PPP government, the PML presented both a strong front in the streets of Pakistan and as an oppositional party. In short, the chances of the Zardari Government falling to domestic political securitization attempts appeared more likely to occur than the Sharif Government falling to the same forces.
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H4: Differences in domestic government account for the differing outcomes in the Kargil Conflict and the Mumbai terrorist attacks.

The most noticeable difference in the research design is that, when the two conflicts occurred, different political ideologies controlled the state. In 1999, India and Pakistan were controlled by religiously based political parties – Vajpayee of the BJP and Sharif of the PML, respectively – whereas in 2008, the two states were controlled by less conservative, democratic-secular parties – Singh of the INC and Zardari of the PPP, respectively. The logic of this variable as explanatory would argue that since both parties in power were less apt to securitize, securitization did not occur.

This explanatory variable makes practical sense, and would also require additional research to fully vet its explanatory power. However, the process of securitization itself demonstrates that it may be incomplete. In 1999, the BJP not only pushed the language of security over Pakistan, but was validated in Vajpayee’s “Mandate of ‘99”. Within Pakistan, Sharif’s Government attempted to oppose securitization, and was ultimately ousted in a coup. In both instances, the democratic public of India, and the military complex of Pakistan, could have reversed securitization, and ultimately conflict escalation, by pursuing the opposite course. Neither did so.

On the other hand, the exact opposite process played out in 2008. Both Zardari’s PPP and Singh’s INC faced significant pressure to securitize the threat. Yet both parties remain in power to the present day, with Zardari further expanding democratic ideals in
the face of potential internal coups and electoral defeat, and Singh surviving an electoral challenge which coincided precisely with the Mumbai Attack and its aftermath. In other words, while opposition to securitization emanating from inside the government bully-pulpit may have influenced the differing outcomes, securitization ultimately took different routes at the hands of their respective democratic populations.

**H5: Differences in democratic perception account for the differing outcomes in the Kargil Conflict and the Mumbai terrorist attacks.**

Explaining the differing outcomes in this case study, as well as further explaining the differing domestic political situations, appears to lie strongly in the explanatory power of differing democratic perceptions. This case study reveals that this occurred on three fronts. First, within India, the Singh Government consistently repeated a core message of its role in a new democratic ethos. Utilizing terminology such as “norms of the civilized world” and “threats to democracy,” India appears to have been increasingly viewing itself in the realm of the democratic self. Further, they viewed Pakistan as a partner in this process, although a flawed partner, throughout the process of 2008. Vajpayee displayed no such language in 1999.

Second, within Pakistan, Zardari consistently and unabashedly attempted to place his nation within the context of a democratic state under attack from terrorists. This was done in both the domestic and international press, and made a partner out of the United
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States, which was decidedly on the other side in 1999. Zardari viewed restraint – “both sides taking a breath”\textsuperscript{212} – as a sign of democratic restraint, whereas Sharif was quick and consistent to utilize the realist language of security in his public assessments.

Third, and most importantly, both publics displayed differing reactions to the two securitization attempts. In 1999, the Indian public consistently rallied-around-the-flag, displaying little to no opposition to the securitization attempts of the BJP Government, and in Pakistan, securitizers vehemently opposed the anti-securitization of the Sharif Administration, ultimately leading to his downfall. On the other hand, in 2008 both publics trusted the other as a democratic partner enough to rebuff securitization. It becomes abundantly clear throughout this case study that trust had developed between the two nations between 1999 and 2008, and that the overt use from both sides of democratic language to dissuade securitization played a critical role in these shifts in attitude.

\textsuperscript{212} Bihari Vajpayee*: 16 October 1999
Conclusion

The Indo-Pakistani dyad reveals that, even under the nuclear umbrella, questions of securitization and perceptions of democratic self and other can lead to decreased conflict escalation, often in the face of overwhelming odds. India and Pakistan, like the previous dyadic case studies, had displayed an historic animosity that seemingly ruled peace out of the question. Their nations had fought wars in 1947, 1965, and 1971, and even after nuclear weapons were introduced in Pakistan, in the Kargil in 1999. In this way, their historical animosity may have been even deeper than the previous dyads reviewed here.

Nevertheless, in 2008, the two sides experienced a conflict pressure point and yet chose peace. While numerous explanatory variables have potential explanatory capabilities – trade dependence, power imbalance, empirical democracy, domestic politics, and democratic perceptions – it is somewhat clear from this research that the perception of a democratic self and other, and the role this status requires in international affairs, led to peace in the aftermath of the Mumbai Terrorist Attacks.

Chapter Five  
Constructing the Democratic Peace  

Analysis and Conclusion

What best explains the democratic peace: empirical indicators of democracy or the mutual perceptions of democracy within a dyadic relationship? The cases of enduring rivalry dyads researched here reveal a likely answer: a perception of democracy, not empirical democracy, is the best explanatory variable for the existence of a democratic peace. It is the belief in democratic oneness with a dyadic partner, perpetuated by elites and accepted by the public within a democratic sovereignty, which ultimately leads to peaceful relations even inside dyadic tandems riddled with enduring hostility.

In the Anglo-American dyad of the nineteenth century, three explanatory variables potentially accounted for the escalation of conflict in 1812 and the subsequent avoidance of such escalation in the latter portions of the 1830’s: economic interdependence, empirical democracy, and democratic perception. This research demonstrates that economic interdependence was no more valued in 1812 than in 1837, and even a cursory process-tracing of the time period between the two conflicts reveals a shifting perception of shared democratic self predating changes in empirical democracy inside the two states. On the contrary, the difference in executive and legislative leadership within both the United States and Great Britain, vis-à-vis the perception of other as a democratic partner, proved to be a critical causal mechanism.
In the twentieth century, the Franco-German dyad offered only two competing variables for conflict in the Ruhr and the follow-on cessation of hostilities regarding West German re-armament in 1955. One, realist power considerations, proves remarkably capable in predictive power for the onset of tension, but would predict an opposite outcome for the alleviation of such in one instance and not in the other. The other, mutual democratic perceptions, particularly as they pertain to German leader Konrad Adenauer, demonstrated strong causal capabilities.

Finally, in our current century, the Indo-Pakistani dyad analysis revealed a host of potential causal variables to explain conflict escalation in the Kargil but not following Mumbai, including trade interdependence, power capabilities, empirical democracy, and democratic perceptions. While this dyad challenged the findings of democratic perception as a causal variable more strenuously than the other two, process-tracing of the time period revealed that democratic perceptions not only accounted for a peaceful outcome in 2008, but the lack thereof may have accounted for both the escalated conflict of 1999 as well as the subsequent collapse of the democratic Pakistani government.

Process-tracing has allowed for this research to analyze “the dash,” in George and Bennett’s words (George and Bennett, 2005: 205-232), and in so doing helps to fill-in a long overlooked hole in democratic peace theory. By this it is to say that theoretical democratic peace rests on a simple covering law: State A displays empirical democracy, based on composite scoring after the fact; State B displays similar characteristics;
therefore, State A and State B will be at peace. This theoretical underpinning is highly incomplete, largely for two reasons.

First, peace is a contested concept, largely because peace is defined in the negative as the absence of war. The search for a “positive peace,” one for which many democratic peace theorists strive, is highly elusive (Adler, 1998: 166-168). As such, enduring rivalry dyads present a unique problem for the democratic peace, one which can not be easily overcome with a covering law. This often amounts to debate over the similarly contested concept of war, but need not do so. The process-tracing of the “dash” between points A and B in enduring rivalry conflicts allows us to garner a fuller comprehension of the historical, political, and cultural conditions of these hostilities, leading us closer to an understanding of a positive peace between rivals. This research demonstrates that democratic perceptions are a key component to that puzzle.

Second, oftentimes even with the loosest definitions of war and peace, democratic peace theory experiences exceptions to its covering rule. The War of 1812 between the United States and Great Britain, the Kargil conflict between India and Pakistan, and arguably the Ruhr Crisis between France and Germany, would all be included as exceptions, amongst others. This research provides an explanatory mechanism for these outcomes. In the same way that Walt made a progressive contribution to neorealist theory by postulating a “balance of threat” (Walt, 1987), the process-tracing of these enduring rivalry dyads provides a first step towards a progressive contribution to democratic peace theory, namely a theory of “democratic perception” as causal variable.
To further demonstrate these points, this concluding chapter will be presented as follows. First, I will discuss the impact of domestic democratic norms on the trajectory of the case studies under review. Second, I will discuss the prevailing realist challenge to democratic peace theory, and show that the case studies researched here reveal that a constructivist approach is often overlooked largely because of this parsimonious challenge. Third, I will use these case studies to demonstrate that new norms arose around the democratic peace that could add a layer to the prevailing normative dyadic theory. Fourth, I will explain the implications of this research on structural and monadic democratic peace theories. Fifth, I will conclude with a brief discussion on other potential cases impacted by this research, as well as suggested avenues for future research on a constructed democratic peace.

Domestic Democratic Norms: Sen’s “Universal Value”

Upon concluding the research of these dyadic conflicts, a pattern clearly materializes. What becomes quickly apparent is a chronological pattern of the power of democratic perceptions that neatly matches a geographical spread of domestic democratic norms. This pattern aligns with both Huntington’s hypothesis regarding waves of democracy (Huntington, 1991), as well as McFaul’s later postulation that a “Fourth Wave” of democratization was underway (McFaul, 2002).
The first dyad under review existed in the Atlantic sphere, with conflict occurring
during the time period detailed by Huntington as the “First Wave”; the second took place
in the core of Europe, during the upheavals and subsequent governmental rebuilding
years that occurred surrounding the antebellum and post-World War Two era
(Huntington, 1991: 12). The third, that of India and Pakistan, occurred during the 1990’s,
an era marked by Huntington as having seen democracies spread to all corners of the
globe, excluding sub-Saharan Africa (Huntington, 1991: 14). The Indo-Pakistani dyad
was also impacted by McFaul’s opinion that many newly emerging democracies, in this
case Pakistan, may backslide and choose “authoritarian government” when faced with
security threats (McFaul, 2002: 212).

Case studies reveal the importance of this pattern on research into democratic
perceptions. All three case studies share at least one dyadic member struggling with
perceptions of their own democracy at the point of conflict escalation, and both dyadic
members embracing their role as a democratic state during the point of conflict
resolution. Within the Anglo-American dyad, the United States’ largest opposition party
to securitization in 1812 – the Federalists – were discounted in no small part because of
their opposition to United States democracy itself, and many elites and citizens in Great
Britain openly shunned democratic norms. Within the Franco-German dyad, both sides
struggled with their individual democratic identities in 1923, with France viewing her
position as that of an aggrieved security state and Germany wrestling within the confines
of the Weimar Republic. Within the Indo-Pakistani dyad, Pakistan had significant anti-
democratic pressures applied upon the government of 1999, so much so that a military
coup seized power mere months after conclusion of the conflict in Kargil. None of these
self-perceptions existed in 1837, 1955, or 2008, respectively.

Further, Amartya Sen demonstrates how this lack of democratic perception at the
state level can be just as damaging to a democratic peace as the lack of perception of a
democratic other. He states that “universal consent is not required for a universal value,”
but rather only that “the claim of a universal value is that people anywhere may have
reason to see it as valuable” (Sen, 1999: 12). In this way, one can not expect either
empirical democracy or the perceptions of a democratic other to display any impact on
dyadic conflict before a body politic first perceives itself as democratic, and perceives
that categorization as something to value, let alone the normative acceptance of peaceful
conflict resolution that accompanies it.

It is pertinent that Sen’s work revolved around the case of India in 1999, a region
of the world and a state under examination in this research. If, as Sen asserts, India was
one of the last remaining “battlegrounds in the debate” over democratization as a
“universal value”, it is not surprising that the acceptance of a democratic-self on the
Indian subcontinent led to the peaceful resolution of conflict in the wake of the Mumbai
terrorist attacks. This is even less surprising when viewed in the context of the dyadic
case study, in that Pakistan greeted a new government under President Zardari in 2008
that differed greatly from the administration of President Sharif in 1999, not least of
which because of the contrast between Zardari’s unflinching belief in Pakistan as a
democratic partner and Sharif’s fence-sitting with radical members of his own political party on the same topic. In sum, the recognition and analysis of this pattern of democratization shows us that the first piece to any constructivist explanation of a democratic peace must be the adoption of domestic democratic perception: “We are a democratic self”.

International Realist Norms: Points of Conflict

A second pattern also emerges when viewing these case studies in totality, namely the existence of a strong realist explanatory variable for points of conflict within enduring rivalry dyads. All three demonstrate geographical considerations: in the case of the Anglo-American dyad the fight for control of Atlantic trading lanes, in the other two dyads direct geographic proximity. Additionally, each case presents a unique realist variable. The Anglo-American dyad experienced points of conflict over United States sovereignty, the Franco-German over the security of the French state in a hostile Europe, the Indo-Pakistani in the dispute over the territory in Kashmir. It is more than probable that this existence, coupled with the prevalence of realist theory in international relations, is what has led to the lack of attention to democratic perceptions: why seek out other explanatory variables when certain ones readily present themselves?

The first critique of this assertion is that not all conflict is equal. For one to assert that it is so one must have a commonly accepted definition of the term itself, a definition
which has proved elusive at best. The concept of “war” has been debated by scholars for decades (or longer), and no clarity has ever fully been brought to this subject (Singer and Small, 1972; Layne, 1994; Spiro, 1994; O’Neal and Russett, 2001; Rosato, 2003). Further, common sense demonstrates that there is a difference between the escalated conflicts of 1812, 1923, and 1999, and the de-escalated conflicts of 1837, 1955, and 2008. This case study approach not only encourages that all conflict not be treated equal but demands it, and therefore provides a clearer explanatory picture to the traditional realist variables.

Second, the individual case study reviews largely disqualify realism as explanatory. In the first case, American sovereignty was far less impugned by the sinking of the Chesapeake in 1812 than by the existence of British troops on United States soil in Maine in 1837. In the Franco-German dyad, French security was not under threat in either conflict, as Germany was a vanquished former adversary in both 1923 and 1955. In the third case study, Pakistani militants were responsible for far less deaths in Kargil in 1999 than they were in Mumbai in 2008, and denied official government responsibility in both cases. Yet, in each dyad, conflict escalated in the first case and was successfully resolved in the second.

Additionally, many of the control variables included in this research disqualified other realist considerations from explanatory power. In the case of the United States and Great Britain, neorealist balancing theory (Onuf, 2002: 220-1) would have dictated an Anglo-American alliance in 1812, with the Napoleonic war raging, and an Anglo-
American split in 1837 with control over the Western Hemisphere at stake. In fact, it is noteworthy that in this case those opposed to securitization in 1812 were calling for exactly that outcome, while the securitizers of 1837 were not quiet in their opposition to Great Britain as a hemispheric menace. Turning to the Franco-German dyad, Mearsheimer’s view of the formation of international institutions (Mearsheimer, 1995) would have dictated not only significant French opposition to West German re-armament in 1955, but also would have predicted a West German alliance with the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, in the final analysis, West Germany became a democratic member of NATO, matching up far more closely with Ruggie’s prediction that alliances involving the United States would not fit European “balance of power logic” (Ruggie, 1995: 69). Finally, in the Indo-Pakistani dyad, Waltz’s theory of nuclear deterrence (Waltz, 2013) would have dictated peace in both 1999 and 2008, yet it only existed in the latter.

These conclusions demonstrate that a constructivist explanation is necessary for the differing outcomes of conflict securitization within these three dyads. To concede a point, this gap could very well be filled by Walt’s theory of “balance of threat” as opposed to empirical threat, nuclear deterrence, or balancing. But, on the flip side, this gap could also be filled by a theory of democratic perception. After a thorough review of the historical record, I conclude that the latter carries greater explanatory power.
Finally, a third pattern arises from the case studies encompassed by this research. In each case of successful conflict securitization, the securitizing state became engaged in consistent hostility with other, leading in part to the failure to securitize the following threat. This pattern goes great lengths in explaining how a theory of democratic perceptions can enhance the study of a normative democratic peace.

A quick overview of each successful case of securitization demonstrates this pattern. Following the War of 1812, Madison’s Democratic-Republican Party achieved unprecedented electoral success. Nevertheless, territorial disputes and trade wars continued to flare between the United States and Great Britain, leading ultimately to the Monroe Doctrine in 1823 and the election of John Quincy Adams, a former Federalist, in 1824. After France’s incursion into the Ruhr in 1923, Poincaré was unsuccessful in holding his Presidential seat even past the 1924 election, being replaced by the pro-peace Aristide Briand. The following twenty years of Franco-German relations was nothing short of exhaustive in its scope of carnage, culminating in the tragedy of the Second World War. And, following the Kargil conflict of 1999, President Sharif was ousted in Pakistan in place of military dictator Pervez Musharraf, and Prime Minister Vajpayee, though securitizing the Pakistani threat during the 1999 election, lost his seat in 2004 to Sonia Gandhi’s Indian Congress and their message of peace and stability.
The contrasting efforts at securitization – in 1837, 1955, and 2008, respectively – paint an even clearer picture. In each instance, democratic publics were treated with the language of democratic oneness with the other half of their respective enduring rivalry dyads, which stood in stark contrast to the successful securitizations of before. There is a marked difference between Clay’s “potion of British poison to bow the neck of royal insolence” and Van Buren’s “instructions of a liberal character”; between Poincaré’s description of Germany sharing “nothing in common with a civilized nation” and Schumann’s description of Germany as having its destiny “conferred on itself”; between Indian press descriptions of Pakistan as the “militant in the rearguard and the Mujahedeen in the vanguard” and Minister Singh’s commitment to “civilized norms” in the face of Mumbai.

This pattern is valuable for two reasons. First, it demonstrates the point put forth by Hayes that “shared democratic identity makes it very difficult for political leaders within democracies to successfully argue that another democracy poses an existential threat—a critical component to the securitization move” (Hayes, 2009: 4). In short, a democratic public must securitize the threat being put forth by elites, and in each one of the case studies reviewed here, they chose securitization in the first conflict, but not in the second. Further, democratic perception proved critical in the move towards securitization in all six conflict cases. This pattern both reinforces normative democratic peace, whereby two democracies are unlikely to make war on one another (Chan, 1997:62), and
shows the overall importance of democratic perception on the dependent variable put forth by the democratic peace.

Second, it provides a third and final component to the constructivist view of the dyadic democratic peace. Onuf details that the peace and security of human society depends on three components: “security of possession, transference by consent, and the performance of promises”. In his words, “every society has the same start, and then each are allowed to follow its own path” (Onuf, 2002: 215). In each case, the states within the enduring rivalry dyad underwent an escalated conflict at the hands of successful securitizers. At the conclusion of each, the citizens of those societies recognized that the stability of their possessions, the transference of power by consent, and the performance of their governmental promises were impeded by conflict. Therefore, at the next attempted securitization, a different outcome ensued. In short, democratic normative values of peace began to set in.

In line with this, it is telling that war between the dyadic partners involved did not occur again following the last conflict studied here. The United States and Great Britain never came as close to war again as they did in 1837, now enjoying a long-standing alliance; France and Germany remain NATO allies, even following the reunification of Germany after the fall of the Soviet Union; India and Pakistan are closer now than at any point in their histories, having enacted trade agreements and cricket exchanges in the past five years. The processes at play in these case studies demonstrate that a new dyadic norm – a standard of appropriate behavior for actors with a given identity (Finnemore and
Sikkink, 1998: 891) - was taking hold. In this case, in order to achieve Onuf’s human society pillars, actors with a given identity (democracies) began conforming to a new standard of behavior (peaceful resolution of conflict), or to paraphrase Wendt, democracies began to make the most of anarchy (Wendt, 1992).

What these case studies further contribute to this hypothesis is the role of democratic perception. If liberal theorists are correct and empirical democracy is the causal variable behind peace (Doyle, 1983; Doyle, 1986; Doyle, 2005; Cox and Drury, 2006; Henderson, 1999; Maoz and Russett, 1993; O’Neal and Russett, 2001), then these norms are unnecessary in that peace will take place from a systemic structural constraint, namely domestic institutions. But, as these case studies demonstrate, this did not occur in 1812, 1923, or 1999, requiring us to further explore the creation of pacific dyadic relationships between democracies. This research demonstrates the explanatory capability of democratic perceptions, and once these perceptions are adopted, the idea that the democratic peace occurs due to the construction of an international norm of behavior for democratic states.

Normative Democratic Peace: Democratic Peace Theory as an Institution

The research presented here opens up a number of possibilities for future researchers, many of which will be discussed below. However, one possible area of future research deserves extended attention. If democratic perceptions construct a
democratic peace, and the phenomenon is not the direct result of empirical democracy, then these research findings will have an impact on the fields of study into monadic democratic peace, as well as structural restraint theory.

As democracy continues to expand into a universal value, presumably more citizens of states that display empirical democratic characteristics, and some that do not, will begin to view themselves as members of a democratic one. If this is the case, similar events should occur to those that took place over securitization efforts in the United States in 1837, France in 1955, and India and Pakistan in 2008. In this way, monadic peace could find many more intellectual adherents, as well as the evidence to support the findings.

Additionally, structural restraints upon democratic war-making could also be bolstered by this research. In line with monadic democratic peace theory, the linchpin of a structural theory of peace is the idea of audience cost. In short, audience cost theory posits that democratic leaders will be unlikely to launch military actions, unless they are assured of victory, for fear of electoral reprisal (Fearon, 1994). It was exactly this theory that prompted Hayes to do his extensive research on securitization, the process by which democratic electorates restrain their leaders from making war even when otherness is used by securitizers as validation, and has wide-reaching implications for the theory of a structural democratic peace (Hayes, 2012: 70).

A case worthy of future research that would bolster both claims is that of United States-Iranian relations during the Administration of President Barack Obama. In many
ways, this case mirrors those of the case studies under review, with the exception that the dyad is not recognized as an enduring rivalry (Diehl and Goertz, 2000; Thompson, 2001). In both 2001 and 2003, President George W. Bush pushed to securitize Afghanistan and Iraq, respectively, in the aftermath of the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks. This securitization was successful, as indicated by widespread congressional support and Bush’s re-election in 2004. However, upon the election of President Obama in 2008, partly on an anti-war platform, the United States has chosen to not seek military action against Iran, despite its nuclear ambitions and the objection of realist scholars (Kroenig, 2012).

This case demonstrates the capabilities of democratic perception on explaining a monadic, structural democratic peace, although in a more mature form than the cases reviewed by this research. While President Bush successfully securitized and took action against both Afghanistan and Iraq, two non-empirical democracies, Obama has chosen not to seek action against Iran, another exclusion from the empirical democratic club. In a recent speech to the United Nations, in which Obama warned against a nuclear Iran, he extolled the United States’ roll in the perpetuation of “not just American or Western values – but universal values”.213 These values included, amongst many others, the peaceful resolution of conflict.

The outgrowth of this research would be a better understanding of how both democracy and the perception of democracy can transform into institutional restraints
unto themselves. As both “zones of peace” and “zones of democracy” multiply, it is seemingly possible that as more people begin to view themselves as upholders of democratic traditions, as well as begin viewing their neighbors of the same, that monadic and structural democratic peace can begin to take hold. This phenomenon was discussed by both Katzenstein and Neumann in relation to the European core, with significant discussion devoted to the Franco-German dyad reviewed here (Katzenstein, 1993; Neumann, 1998).

Francis Lieber, the first academic American political scientist, described the power of institutions thus: “It always forms a prominent element in the idea of an institution, whether the term be taken in the strictest sense or not, that it is a group of laws, usages and operations standing in close relation to one another, and forming an independent whole with a united and distinguishing character of its own” (Onuf, 2002: 218). The idea of a group of perceived democracies following a basic law of usages and operations, namely the peaceful resolution of conflict, appears to fit this model.

Impact on Other Cases

Returning to the dyadic model specifically reviewed in this research, four other cases with an eclectic geographic spread appear to warrant similar research. I will briefly detail those here.

First, the Anglo-Argentinian dyad has been an enduring rivalry since 1965 (Thompson, 2001: 570). In 1982, the two nations went to war over the Falkland Islands. At the time, Argentina was not rated a democracy by Polity, but it was democratizing, as indicated by its score of 8 in 1983. Since that time, hostilities have continued to erupt with no further military action occurring. Most recently, in 2012, a dispute over oil flared up between the two states\textsuperscript{214}, and efforts at securitization are presently occurring in both London and Buenos Aires. The resolution of this latest Anglo-Argentinian conflict could provide the most ready case by which to further test the implications of democratic perceptions.

Second, the Egyptian-Israeli dyad has been an enduring rivalry since the two fought a war in 1948 (Thompson, 2001: 571). Since that time, the two states have engaged in a host of conflicts surrounding the Sinai Peninsula, ending in the Camp David Accords of 1978. While Egypt experienced decades of non-empirical democracy, the changes of the Arab Spring would provide a strong test case for democratic perceptions, particularly as crisis points continue to open up between the two Middle Eastern states.

\textsuperscript{214} BBC News, “Falkland Islands Oil Dispute: UK Hits Back at Argentina”: 16 March 2012
Third, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia, though both democratizing states, provide a strong test dyad for future research. The two have been classified as an enduring rivalry since the escalated conflict that occurred during the Yugoslav Wars of 1992 (Thompson, 2001: 570), and any further conflict points could very well depend on the perceptions each have of the others’ democratic sameness.

Fourth, the Eritrea-Ethiopian dyad could provide the best potential case for future research. Ethiopia is marginally an empirical democracy, registering a 1 on the Polity IV scale. Eritrea, on the other hand, is disputed largely because elections have been hampered by the residual effects of the War of Independence fought between itself and Ethiopia a decade ago. Nevertheless, this is listed as having been an enduring rivalry since 1998 at the point of Eritrean independence, not dissimilar to the Anglo-American dyad of the nineteenth century (Thompson, 2001: 571). In this case of severely contested empirical democracy, perceptions thereof could prove important in explaining any future conflict points between the two states.

Potential for Future Research

In addition to monadic and structural democratic peace, as well as additional dyadic case studies, the research presented here also poses four additional avenues for future researchers. First, a great deal could be gained by research into a “longer dash” than the one under consideration. While the results gleaned from process-tracing the
securitization of threat within enduring rivalry dyads proved significant for democratic perception theory, even more beneficial would be a process-tracing of the events that transpired in between the two conflict points. For example, a detailed look at the historical, political, and cultural issues that transpired between the United States and Great Britain from 1815-1837, France and Germany from 1925-1955, and India and Pakistan from 1999-2008, would allow researchers to identify the normative shifts that led to increased positive perceptions of democracy. If one accepts that “actors and structures mutually constitute each other” (Hopf, 1998: 181), they would also believe that this type of research would bring greater clarity to the mutually constituted processes that occurred leading up to a shift in perceptions. This work would build upon the exhaustive effort put forth by Kupchan in his explanation of how hostile relationships become more productive (Kupchan, 2010).

Second, this research also opens the way for leadership and psychological studies of perception. If, in fact, perception of democracy is an important causal variable in explaining democratic peace, then how that perception is formed becomes paramount. One avenue is the process-tracing previously discussed; a second would be the psychology of individual leaders. What was it about Van Buren that made him perceive Great Britain as a democratic ally while Madison did not? What influenced the psychology of a democratic peace activist like Briand while de Gaulle remained largely an arch-realist? What psychologically hot-wired Vajpayee and Sharif towards social identity politics (Ilgit and Ozkececi-Taner, 2012), while Singh and Zardari tended
towards inclusiveness? These questions would help ideationally unite the psychological and constructivist schools of normative studies (Shannon, 2012).

Third, scholars researching conflict theories also could explore a variable that was not studied here. A possible explanation for the difference in outcomes within all three dyads is that, since both sides recently concluded a conflict with one another, each dyad was effectively locked within a continuous tit-for-tat game model whereby each side had a telegraphed example of the other’s expected actions (Pruitt and Kim, 2004: 70). If this is in fact the case, new process-tracing could re-open the black box to determine how learned negotiation set the two sides upon the path towards a de-escalatory spiral, as opposed to the escalatory spiral that had characterized their previous dyadic relationship (Pruitt and Kim, 2004: 171-188). Exploration of the negotiation variable would be a valuable addition to this work.

Fourth, the research presented questions the way in which the scholastic community chooses to score democracy. The Anglo-American dyad, for example, demonstrates the pitfalls of current methods, notably the fact that the United States in 1812 was scored a 9 on the Polity scale while a slaveholder occupied the White House. Significant questions could also be raised about the validity of democratic scoring of monarchical Great Britain in 1837, unstable Weimar Germany in 1923, and the fragile Pakistani democracy in 2008. In each case, these questions beg for further analysis, but also enhance the importance of understanding democratic perceptions as a potential causal variable.
Conclusion

The research presented provides an answer to the research question presented, as well as three progressive contributions to democratic peace theory scholarship. When posed with the question of what best explains the observation of a democratic peace, empirical indicators of democracy or the perception of democracy, detailed case studies of the Anglo-American, Franco-German, and Indo-Pakistani enduring rivalry dyads yield the result that democratic perception is a strong explanatory variable. While empirical democracy continues to matter, this research demonstrates that democracy in the objective form may be necessary, but certainly not sufficient, in explaining the relative peace that has been observed between democratic dyads.

Beyond this narrow research question, this thesis also provides three contributions that each lead towards future research. First, it offers that how elites and, ultimately, members of the electorates that comprise democratic states perceive the democratic sameness of a competing dyadic rival has a significant role in the explanatory power behind the democratic peace. In this way, it attempts to fill in a gap in the democratic peace research, namely that caused by exceptions that have become increasingly vexing to what Chan calls “the most robust generalization that has been produced by this research tradition” (Chan, 1997: 60).

Second, this research provides a positive step towards the integration of normative and structural democratic peace theories, as well as an avenue towards a monadic
democratic peace. Normative theory, which counts a preponderance of the overall theoreticians in this tradition, emphasizes “the role of shared democratic principles, perceptions, and expectations of behavior” (O’Neal and Russett, 2001: 53). When coupled with Hayes’ securitization theory and Fearon’s audience cost theory, however, the structural constraints of a democratic populace become intertwined with the normative constraints offered by most prevailing democratic peace theorists. The study of democratic perception, particularly amongst citizens of the polis, provides a contribution towards integrating these seemingly adverse concepts.

Empirical democracy, however, could provide a similar avenue when studied as part of the tripartite research traditions of O’Neal and Russett, Hayes and Fearon. Democratic perceptions, on the other hand, display a third unique contribution to the democratic peace theory literature. Emanuel Adler, in 1997, stated that the “democratic peace cries for a constructivist explanation” (Hayes, 2009: 11). This work does not claim to do that; however, it does provide a hypothesis for future research that could add to this discussion.

The hypothesis posits that first, citizens within democratic states begin to adopt the normative values of democrats, ultimately leading to the domestic perception that ones state is a rightful member of the democratic club, and all the values in which that entails. Second, international realist norms, such as sovereignty and security, lead the elites of the state to seek conflict. Third, whether or not that conflict is securitized, the events surrounding the securitization lead to domestic political retribution for the
securitizing party, largely because the citizenry has come to accept a higher expected utility from peace than war as part of a democratic ethos (Adler, 1998: 165). Fourth, this domestic retribution leads to further conflict points being solved peacefully. Fifth, these new normative values lead to reciprocation, and norms begin to mutually constitute the actors and the structure of the system (Hopf, 1998: 181) – i.e. a democratic peace within anarchy.

Ted Hopf wrote that “If democracies do not fight each other, then it must be because of the way they understand each other, the intersubjective accounts of each other, and the socio-international practices that accompany these practices” (Hopf, 1998: 192). The study of these three enduring rivalry dyads demonstrates that this intersubjective understanding is, indeed, at the core of the democratic peace, and further research into the subject proves promising in providing a larger constructivist contribution to this scholarship.
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