

# Alliances as Conflict Managers:

Yonatan Lupu <sup>1</sup>   Paul Poast <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>George Washington University

<sup>2</sup>Rutgers University

# Summary

# Summary

## **Question:**

Do rivalries impact alliance formation?

# Summary

## **Question:**

Do rivalries impact alliance formation?

## **Our Argument:**

To unveil relationship, need to use proper unit of analysis ( $k$ -ads) and properly code threats (rivals)

# Summary

## **Question:**

Do rivalries impact alliance formation?

## **Our Argument:**

To unveil relationship, need to use proper unit of analysis ( $k$ -ads) and properly code threats (rivals)

## **Why it matters:**

# Summary

## **Question:**

Do rivalries impact alliance formation?

## **Our Argument:**

To unveil relationship, need to use proper unit of analysis ( $k$ -ads) and properly code threats (rivals)

## **Why it matters:**

- Revitalize the “conflict management” alliance literature

# Summary

## Question:

Do rivalries impact alliance formation?

## Our Argument:

To unveil relationship, need to use proper unit of analysis ( $k$ -ads) and properly code threats (rivals)

## Why it matters:

- Revitalize the “conflict management” alliance literature
- Show benefits of moving from dyadic to  $k$ -adic analysis.

# Summary

## Question:

Do rivalries impact alliance formation?

## Our Argument:

To unveil relationship, need to use proper unit of analysis ( $k$ -ads) and properly code threats (rivals)

## Why it matters:

- Revitalize the “conflict management” alliance literature
- Show benefits of moving from dyadic to  $k$ -adic analysis.
- Merge network and  $k$ -adic approaches



# Outline

- 1 Motivation
- 2 Argument
- 3 Research Design
- 4 Results
- 5 Conclusion

# NATO During the Cold War:

# NATO During the Cold War:

It's for...

# NATO During the Cold War:

It's for...

## Deterring Soviets



# NATO During the Cold War:

It's for...

## Deterring Soviets



## Deterring Germany



# Alliances as Conflict Managers

# Alliances as Conflict Managers

**Focus of Most Alliance Lit:** Alliances balance *external* threats.  
(Walt 1987...)

# Alliances as Conflict Managers

**Focus of Most Alliance Lit:** Alliances balance *external* threats.  
(Walt 1987...)

**Other Alliance Lit:** Alliances manage conflict b/w allies.  
(Weitsman 2004...).



# Alliances as Conflict Managers

**Focus of Most Alliance Lit:** Alliances balance *external* threats.  
(Walt 1987...)

**Other Alliance Lit:** Alliances manage conflict b/w allies.  
(Weitsman 2004...).

## Consider this:

First balancing alliance (Franco-Russian) not concluded until 1894.

# Question

If conflict management is a common explanation for alliance formation, then what explains...

## Question

If conflict management is a common explanation for alliance formation, then what explains...

**L&R (2000):** Conflictual relations decrease  $\Pr(\textit{Alliance})$

**Cramner et al (2012):** Conflictual relations increase  $\Pr(\textit{Alliance})$

**Gibler (2008):** Conflictual relations no impact on  $\Pr(\textit{Alliance})$

## Question

If conflict management is a common explanation for alliance formation, then what explains...

**L&R (2000):** Conflictual relations decrease  $\Pr(\textit{Alliance})$

**Cramner et al (2012):** Conflictual relations increase  $\Pr(\textit{Alliance})$

**Gibler (2008):** Conflictual relations no impact on  $\Pr(\textit{Alliance})$

**Our Answer: Dyadic Focus**

# Need for a Different Approach

# Need for a Different Approach

## We Agree with

- Cramner et al (2012), Maoz (2008), Maoz et al (2007), etc.
- Network analysis is way to go.

# Need for a Different Approach

## We Agree with

- Cramner et al (2012), Maoz (2008), Maoz et al (2007), etc.
- Network analysis is way to go.

## HOWEVER,

- Must account for when states form multilateral alliance as a group (Fordham and Poast Forthcoming) = use *k*-adic data.
- Must properly code threat (Poast, Von-Hagen Jamar, and Morrow N.D.) = use *rivals*

## Unit of Observation: $k$ -ad

**What is a  $k$ -ad?** Group of  $k$  number of states (Poast 2010).

**Dyad:** Is when  $k = 2$

**Triad:** Is when  $k = 3$

**Quad-ad:** Is when  $k = 4$

etc.



## Dependent Variable: Alliance Formation

Two groups of groups of states b/w 1815 and 2002:

## Dependent Variable: Alliance Formation

Two groups of groups of states b/w 1815 and 2002:

**Group 1:** All groups that formed alliances.

**Group 2:** Random sample of groups that did not form alliances.

## Dependent Variable: Alliance Formation

Two groups of groups of states b/w 1815 and 2002:

**Group 1:** All groups that formed alliances.

**Group 2:** Random sample of groups that did not form alliances.

**Alliance Formation Data:** ATOP (Leeds et al 2002).

# Key Independent Variable: Rivalry Density

$$D_{t,i} = \frac{2E_{t,i}}{N_{t,i}(N_{t,i} - 1)} \quad (1)$$

where  $E_{t,i}$  is the number of rivalries in the  $k$ -ad-year and  $N_{t,i}$  is the number of states in the  $k$ -ad-year.

**Rivalry Data:** Thompson 2001

# Research Design Summary

**Unit of Observation:**  $K$ -ad Year

**DV:**  $K$ -ad form alliance in year  $t$  (ATOP).

**Key IV:** Rivalry Density (Thompson 2001).

**Controls:** CINC, Number of  $k$ -ad members, common threat density, max polity difference, distance, min polity score, previous alliance formations.

**Estimation:** Logit with time polynomial

# Multivariate Model

Table : Main Results

	Base Logit	RE Logit	FE Logit	Cox
<i>Main Variables</i>				
Rivalry Density	-1.01*** (0.27)	-1.01*** (0.25)	-1.73*** (0.63)	-1.08*** (0.27)
Common Threat Density	0.61*** (0.18)	0.61*** (0.18)	1.05** (0.48)	0.69*** (0.20)
Number of Observations	21,855	21,855	12,678	19,154

\*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$

# Multivariate Model

Table : Base Logit, by Alliance Type

	Defense	Offense	Neutrality	Nonagg	Consultative
<i>Main Variables</i>					
Rivalry Density	-1.06*** (0.30)	-1.70*** (0.49)	0.57 (0.76)	-0.90* (0.51)	-1.57*** (0.45)
Common Threat Density	0.66*** (0.19)	1.38*** (0.33)	0.99 (0.64)	0.27 (0.39)	1.18*** (0.25)
Number of Observations	21,855	21,855	21,855	21,855	21,855

\*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$

# Rate of Conflict (MID) Onset

Table : For Dyads with Rivals, Alliance v. Not in Alliance

## In Alliance

	Yes	No
Rate of MID Onset	0.070	0.096
	N= 8,382	N = 4,722

Table : For K-ads with Rivals, Alliance v. Not in Alliance

## In Alliance

	Yes	No
Rate of MID Onset	0.195	0.297
	N= 200	N = 5,179



# Conclusions

## Question:

Do rivalries impact alliance formation?

## Our Argument:

To unveil relationship, need to use proper unit of analysis ( $k$ -ads) and properly code threats (rivals).

## Why it matters:

- Revitalize the “conflict management” alliance literature
- Show benefits of moving from dyadic to  $k$ -adic analysis.
- Merge network and  $k$ -adic approaches

THANK YOU!