

Warfare and Political Decision-Making

Part I- Introduction

Warfare has always been part of human history. The earliest illustration of mankind displayed the use of warfare by mankind to achieve various purposes such as the expansion of land-resources and the strengthening of an empire. Many leaders of the past have hoped to achieve long lasting peace through the use of warfare, hoping it would be “the war to end all wars”, but sadly, that is not the case. However, it is widely believed that warfare can be reduced through a more controlled government, in which its people or judiciary branches of the government examine the elected leader. These governments include democratic governments such as the United States, or figurative monarchical constitutional nations with hereditary chief of state such as the United Kingdom of Great Britain. Their systems limit the power of a leader’s will to engage in war, so that a sole individual’s judgment cannot determine the path of a nation. This argument, however, has not always been true. Some of the nations that engage in wars most frequently have been the democratic nations that give its people the power to choose their leaders. Whether or not powers have directly influence in war is a question worth answering.

Part II- Selection of Two or More Variables

The variables selected are the following:

☞☞V761, *Check on Leaders’ Power*: few, checks exists, leaders secure support, or no leaders act independently.

☞☞V759, *Perception on Leaders’ Power*: very powerful, somewhat powerful, or limited.

☞☞V892, *Frequency of External Warfare*: continual, frequent, or infrequent.

By cross-examining V761 and V759, with V892, the statistics will show the relationship between the power of leadership and frequency of wars.

Part III- Hypothesis

I believe that nations with more powerful leaders will be more likely to have warfare. Conversely, nations with less powerful leaders or none at all will engage in war less frequently. In sum, the following is the relationship of power to war in my hypothesis:

More Power = More War

Less Power = Less War

Certainly, the power of a leader will not be the sole cause of war, but it should be one of the more important factors. In addition, no matter what system is chosen, there will always be war, the only difference is whether it takes place frequently or infrequently.

Part IV- Possible Significance

Warfare is perhaps the most disastrous creation of mankind. It is almost certain that we cannot avoid its occurrence; the best we can do is to prevent it from happening frequently. At any given moment, there is warfare going on in the world. It can be the United States, the strongest country of the world with a democratic government, or it can be Gambia, a little-known country isolated in the corner of the world that suffers consistent warfare. What can we do to prevent warfare? We may not be able to eliminate warfare, but it is our responsibility to at least reduce the chances of conflicts between nations. Through the research and cross-examination of the variables mentioned earlier, I hope we can find a practical way to achieve peace for all.

Leaders of World War I

My proposal states that nations with a strong presence of check and balance of power on their leaders will be less likely to engage in war. I will use the information I gathered regarding World War I and discuss how it relates to my topic. World War I, or the Great War, was supposed to be “The War to end all wars”. During the War, it was estimated that more than 10 million men lost their lives on the battlefield, and another 20 million were wounded. Sparked by the

assassination of Austria-Hungary's Archduke Franz Ferdinand, men involved in the combat from both sides, the Central Powers (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey), and the Allied Powers (Britain and Empire, France, Belgium, Russia, Italy, USA), totaled over 65 million. The Great War was indeed one of the worst disasters in the history of mankind. The massive amount of resources dedicated to the war and the full-out assault of each country's troops were unforeseen.

There were many countries involved in the War, but only the major ones (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, Turkey, Britain and Empire, France, Belgium, Russia, Italy, and USA), will be discussed. Among these countries, I will group them in nations with few or no power restraints on its leaders (monarchical nations- Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, Turkey, Britain, Belgium, Russia, and Italy), and nations with a strong presence in check and balance of power on the leaders (USA and France).

There are many ways to determine who really initiated or wanted to be involved in the war, but in reality, the only country that had no intention of getting involved at all was Belgium. As a result, the rest of nations to certain extent initiated the War. The fact that Belgium and its monarchical government wanted to stay neutral does not conform to my hypothesis. However, the rest of the monarchical nations were actively involved in war. It is also true that even with the presence of democratic government in French and the United States, both countries voluntarily participated in the war. Although some of the monarchical nations did have representational government and an elected Prime Minister, the kings at the time still had significant influence. Even the British, with its House of Lords, one of the two law-making bodies of the Empire that granted seating based on inheritance instead of election, proved that the king and its royalties had great influence. Still, many would argue that those countries like France and Britain were forced to defend itself and had no intent to start war, but from the German perspective, the military build-up and the threat of France and Britain to attack Germany was what compelled the German to take action in the first place. The fact that these countries, except for Belgium, mobilized their

troops and declared war before they were invaded showed they were prepared to launch wars, and thus should fall into the category of countries engaging in war voluntarily.

Governments of World War I: 1914

The information below lists the countries and types of government they had in the period.

Russia: Monarchy.

France: Republic.

Italy: Monarchy with representational government.

USA: Federal Republic.

Belgium: Monarchy with representational government.

Austria Hungary: Monarchy.

Ottoman Empire also known as Turkey: Monarchy under military Dictatorship.

Germany: Monarchy with representational government.

Bulgaria: Monarchy with representational government.

British: Monarchy. (Perhaps the only figurative monarch among the countries in 1914, however, compared to today, the monarchs at the time still had great power).

World War II

The only reason that World War I is not the most horrifying tragedy in the history of mankind is because of the outbreak of World War II. As catastrophic as WW I was, WW II surpassed it in every perspective. During WW I, a total of 10 million people lost their lives, in WW II, Russia alone lost nearly 20 million lives. The total number of people killed, military personnel and civilian combined was estimated to be 55 million, not including the Jews that were massacred by the German dictator, Adolf Hitler. The cost of the war was immense, “A rough consensus has been reached on the total cost of the war. In terms of money spent, it has been put at more than \$1 trillion, which makes it more expensive than all other wars combined” (Encarta). The war changed the face of the earth and the power distribution of the world. Countries such as Germany, Britain, France, and Japan no longer symbolized world powers. Instead, the United

States and USSR dominated the world stage for the next fifty years. Indeed, war creates nothing but horror and deaths, if there is anything positive about war; it is perhaps the fostering of “comradeship” (All Quiet on The Western Front, Erich Maria Remarque).

How did World War II erupt? There were many reasons that led to the outburst of the war, but leadership involvement was one of the major factors that initiated the war. After all, it was “Adolf Hitler, German leader who launched the war” (Encarta). The list of the most influential countries and leaders in WW II were:

Germany: Hitler, dictatorship.

Italy: Mussolini, dictatorship.

Russia: Stalin, dictatorship.

Japan: Hirohito, Emperor with representational government.

United States: Roosevelt, federal republic.

Britain: Prime Minister Churchill, figurative monarchy under Queen Elizabeth.

French: de Gaulle, Republic.

It was evident that the Axis power (Germany, Italy, Russia, Japan) initiated the war, and all four countries were controlled under one single leadership. Because of the leadership of Hitler and the secret pact between the Axis powers, Germany, Italy, Russia, and Japan soon took their part in the War. The fact that these leaders with nearly no power restraints initiated the war corresponds to my hypothesis. On the other hand, although the French and the British declared war before they were invaded, unlike their active participation in WW I, they were doing everything possible to avoid war. The famous “Appeasement Policy” during the British Chamberlain era, which surrendered a vast amount of land and resources to Germany, showed that Britain did not want to engage in war, until they had virtually no choice. The United States, who was caught in surprise by the bombing of Pearl Harbor, clearly was forced to fight in the war. Then the French, as many historians argued, were so exhausted by the First World War, they simply did not want to fight anymore. As a result of low morale, the lack of will to fight eventually led the French to a sudden

collapse in their national defense and a quick defeat. The tally of the WW II leaders again agrees with my hypothesis, as all four dictators of the Axis powers made the first attempt to start war, while the US, Britain, and the French tried to avoid war. Although Britain had a monarchical government, the queen was figurative and had much less influence than the period of WW I, while the power for the House of Lords was reduced significantly as well. In conclusion, the results for both WW I and WW II correspond to my hypothesis: less powerful leaders will be less likely to engage in war, while powerful leaders will engage in war more frequently.

SPSS: Cross Tabulation

The included cross tabulation table also displays consistency **with** my hypothesis of the relationship between leaders and the frequency of war. Nations of leaders with “few” checks and balances have 80% continual or frequent warfare, while Nations of leaders with “checks exist” accounts for 65% continual or frequent warfare. Furthermore, nations of leaders “securing support” drops slightly to 61.8%. Nations of “no leaders act alone” sees a huge drop with only 33.8% in continual and frequent warfare. The approximate **significance** level of 0.011 is also a clear indication of the accuracy (p8). In addition, Nations with “very powerful” perception of leaders’ power have 77.3% continual or frequent warfare. Nations with “somewhat powerful” perception of leaders’ power have a much lower continual or frequent warfare at 42.3%. Finally, nations with “limited” perception of leaders’ power have an increment of 54.5% of continuous or frequent warfare (p9). Although the last result is unexpected, the nations with “limited” power perception still had lower frequency of war than nations with “very powerful” perception of leaders. The approximate **significance** level of 0.056 is also within the acceptable range.

Moreover, after breaking down the distribution of the variables into the nations in the continent of Africa, Circum-Mediterranean, East Eurasia, Insular Pacific, North America, and South America, they have demonstrated most, if not all, nations in different regions conform to my hypothesis. One of the continents that shows inconsistency to my hypothesis is South America. Even in the category of “No leaders act independently”, there is still 80% of continual

or frequent warfare. The unusually high rate of warfare in the category is a sharp contrast with all other continents, which almost all fall into the rate of “infrequent”. Another continent that differed from my hypothesis is Insular Pacific, in the category of “few” power restraints; there is 100% infrequent warfare, however, there is also only one country in the category of “few” power restraints. The inconsistency might be contributed to the occurrence of negative value in the Kendall’s tau-b of both Insular Pacific and South America; there values are -.423 and -.172, respectively (11, 12).

Conclusion

Although not every single statistic supports the hypothesis, overall, it has been accurate. Under most circumstances, nations with strong presence of checks system are less likely to engage in war, while nations with little or no power restraints are more likely to be involved in warfare. Indeed, far too many times in the history of mankind, war has been a game for ambitious politicians to gain power and wage innocent lives for their greed. People have sacrificed their lives under the name of patriotism and heroism, yet most of the time they were just the tools of these politicians’ desires for more control. It is up to the people to monitor their leaders in order to prevent continuous warfare and to maintain peace.

Reference

- ?? <http://encarta.msn.com/encnet/refpages/refarticle.aspx?refid=761563737>
- ?? <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/us.html#Govt>
- ?? <http://motlc.wiesenthal.org/pages/iilww.html>
- ?? <http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/FWW.htm>
- ?? <http://www.pbs.org/greatwar/timeline/index.html>
- ?? http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/special_report/1998/10/98/world_war_i/197437.stm

?? Microsoft Encarda Encyclopedia, 2002

?? Marc Ross, 1983. Political Decision Making and Conflict: Additional Cross-Cultural Codes and Scales. *Ethnology* 22: 169-192.

?? Valerie Wheeler [Nammour], 1974. Drums and Guns: A Cross-Cultural Study of the Nature of War. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Oregon.

V892, Frequency of External War-Attacking VS V761, Checks on Leader's Power

Crosstab

		V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking				
			1 Continual	2 Frequent	3 Infrequent	Total
V761 Checks on Leader's Power	1 Few	Count	1	3	1	5
		% within V761 Checks on Leader's Power	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	2 Checks exist	Count	6	7	7	20
		% within V761 Checks on Leader's Power	30.0%	35.0%	35.0%	100.0%
	3 Leaders secure support	Count	7	14	13	34
		% within V761 Checks on Leader's Power	20.6%	41.2%	38.2%	100.0%
	4 No leaders act independently	Count	1	5	12	18
		% within V761 Checks on Leader's Power	5.6%	27.8%	66.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	15	29	33	77
		% within V761 Checks on Leader's Power	19.5%	37.7%	42.9%	100.0%

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error ^a	Approx. T ^b	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-b	.237	.092	2.545	.011
N of Valid Cases		77			

^a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

^b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

V892, Frequency of External War- Attacking VS V795, Perceptions of Political Leaders' power.

Crosstab

		V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking			Total	
		1 Continual	2 Frequent	3 Infrequent		
V759 Perceptions of Political Leaders' Power	1 Very powerful	Count	8	9	5	22
		% within V759 Perceptions of Political Leaders' Power	36.4%	40.9%	22.7%	100.0%
	2 Somewhat Powerful	Count	5	6	15	26
		% within V759 Perceptions of Political Leaders' Power	19.2%	23.1%	57.7%	100.0%
	3 Limited	Count	4	14	15	33
		% within V759 Perceptions of Political Leaders' Power	12.1%	42.4%	45.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	17	29	35	81
		% within V759 Perceptions of Political Leaders' Power	21.0%	35.8%	43.2%	100.0%

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error ^a	Approx. T ^b	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-b	.181	.094	1.913	.056
N of Valid Cases		81			

^a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

^b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

V761 Checks on Leader's Power * V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking * V200 Region Crosstabulation

V200 Region	V761 Checks on Leader's Power			V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking			Total
				1 Continual	2 Frequent	3 Infrequent	
1 Africa	V761 Checks on Leader's Power	1 Few	Count	1	1		2
			% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking	33.3%	12.5%		13.3%
		2 Checks exist	Count	1	2	1	4
			% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking	33.3%	25.0%	25.0%	26.7%
		3 Leaders secure support	Count	1	5	1	7
		% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking	33.3%	62.5%	25.0%	46.7%	
		4 No leaders act independently	Count			2	2
		% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking			50.0%	13.3%	
		Total	Count	3	8	4	15
			% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
2 Circum-Mediterranean	V761 Checks on Leader's Power	1 Few	Count		1		1
			% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking		20.0%		9.1%
		2 Checks exist	Count	3	1		4
			% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking	75.0%	20.0%		36.4%
		3 Leaders secure support	Count	1	2	2	5
		% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking	25.0%	40.0%	100.0%	45.5%	
		4 No leaders act independently	Count		1		1
		% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking			20.0%	9.1%	
		Total	Count	4	5	2	11
			% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
3 East Eurasia	V761 Checks on Leader's Power	1 Few	Count		1		1
			% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking		25.0%		8.3%
		2 Checks exist	Count	1	2	1	4
			% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking	100.0%	50.0%	14.3%	33.3%
		3 Leaders secure support	Count		1	4	5
		% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking		25.0%	57.1%	41.7%	
		4 No leaders act independently	Count			2	2
		% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking			28.6%	16.7%	
		Total	Count	1	4	7	12
			% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
4 Insular Pacific	V761 Checks on Leader's Power	1 Few	Count			1	1
			% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking			12.5%	10.0%
		2 Checks exist	Count			3	3
			% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking			37.5%	30.0%
		3 Leaders secure support	Count		1	3	4
		% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking		50.0%	37.5%	40.0%	
		4 No leaders act independently	Count		1	1	2
		% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking		50.0%	12.5%	20.0%	
		Total	Count		2	8	10
			% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
5 North America	V761 Checks on Leader's Power	1 Few	Count				
			% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking				
		2 Checks exist	Count	1		1	2
			% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking	20.0%		12.5%	12.5%
		3 Leaders secure support	Count	4	3	1	8
		% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking	80.0%	100.0%	12.5%	50.0%	
		4 No leaders act independently	Count			6	6
		% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking			75.0%	37.5%	
		Total	Count	5	3	8	16
			% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
6 South America	V761 Checks on Leader's Power	1 Few	Count				
			% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking				
		2 Checks exist	Count		2	1	3
			% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking		28.6%	25.0%	23.1%
		3 Leaders secure support	Count	1	2	2	5
		% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking	50.0%	28.6%	50.0%	38.5%	
		4 No leaders act independently	Count	1	3	1	5
		% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking	50.0%	42.9%	25.0%	38.5%	
		Total	Count	2	7	4	13
			% within V892 Frequency of External War - Attacking	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

V200 Region		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
1 Africa	Pearson Chi-Square	7.946 ^a	6	.242
	Continuity Correction			
	Likelihood Ratio	8.050	6	.234
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3.370	1	.066
	N of Valid Cases	15		
2 Circum-Mediterranean	Pearson Chi-Square	6.847 ^b	6	.335
	Continuity Correction			
	Likelihood Ratio	7.748	6	.257
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.153	1	.283
	N of Valid Cases	11		
3 East Eurasia	Pearson Chi-Square	6.943 ^c	6	.326
	Continuity Correction			
	Likelihood Ratio	7.983	6	.239
	Linear-by-Linear Association	4.062	1	.044
	N of Valid Cases	12		
4 Insular Pacific	Pearson Chi-Square	2.188 ^d	3	.534
	Continuity Correction			
	Likelihood Ratio	2.737	3	.434
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.778	1	.182
	N of Valid Cases	10		
5 North America	Pearson Chi-Square	11.250 ^e	4	.024
	Continuity Correction			
	Likelihood Ratio	14.404	4	.006
	Linear-by-Linear Association	4.749	1	.029
	N of Valid Cases	16		
6 South America	Pearson Chi-Square	1.238 ^f	4	.872
	Continuity Correction			
	Likelihood Ratio	1.712	4	.789
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.469	1	.494
	N of Valid Cases	13		

a. 12 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .40.

b. 12 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .18.

c. 12 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .08.

d. 8 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .20.

e. 9 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .38.

f. 9 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .46.

Symmetric Measures

V200 Region			Value	Asymp. Std. Error ^a	Approx. T ^b	Approx. Sig.
1 Africa	Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-b	.431	.210	1.895	.058
	N of Valid Cases		15			
2 Circum-Mediterranean	Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-b	.338	.181	1.905	.057
	N of Valid Cases		11			
3 East Eurasia	Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-b	.595	.116	4.294	.000
	N of Valid Cases		12			
4 Insular Pacific	Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-b	-.423	.190	-1.622	.105
	N of Valid Cases		10			
5 North America	Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-b	.581	.203	2.931	.003
	N of Valid Cases		16			
6 South America	Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-b	-.172	.209	-.811	.417
	N of Valid Cases		13			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.