

*COLONIAL WAR AND THE
GLOBALIZATION OF DEMOCRATIC VALUES*

Hilde Ravlo & Nils Petter Gleditsch*

International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO) &
Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU)

Paper Presented to the Workshop on 'Globalization and Armed Conflict' at the
Joint Session of Workshops, European Consortium for Political Research
Copenhagen, 15–19 April 2000

Extra-systemic war – war between a member of the international system and a non-independent entity – has received much less attention from democratic peace scholars than interstate war or civil war. This paper is a study of extra-systemic wars in the time period 1816–1992 in the light of democratic peace theory. Since data on non-independent states are hard to find, the empirical analysis is exclusively at the national level, but based on some simple reasoning at the dyadic level. We make two contracting assumptions: (1) that adversaries in extra-systemic war are generally perceived to be non-democratic (2) that they are generally perceived to be democratic. There is wide agreement that while democracies rarely if ever fight one another in interstate war, they participate in war as much as non-democracies. Logically, these two regularities imply that mixed political dyads have the greatest propensity for war. If the first assumption about the adversaries in extra-systemic war is correct, we should expect democracies to fight extra-systemic wars more frequently than non-democracies. We find this indeed to be the case. But with a suitable set of control variables this relationship largely disappears, and we also observe that in the post-World War II period, democracies fight extra-systemic war less frequently than non-democracies. We surmise that this might be related to changes in the perception of non-European peoples, as embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

* **Hilde Ravlo** is Cand.polit. in Political Science from the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) in Trondheim. **Nils Petter Gleditsch** is Research Professor at the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO), Editor of *Journal of Peace Research*, and Professor of Political Science at NTNU. This paper draws on Ravlo's thesis (Ravlo, 1999). Ravlo's work was supported by a grant to PRIO & NTNU from the Norwegian Ministry of Defense. Our work on this paper was also supported by grants from the Research Council of Norway and the World Bank. We are grateful to Håvard Hegre, PRIO, for help with the data and to Han Dorussen, Jonathon Moses, and Mats Hammarström for comments. An earlier version was presented to the 41st Annual Conference of the International Studies Association, Los Angeles, CA, 14-18 March 2000.

The Democratic Peace

Democratic peace theory claims that democracy is an important force for peace. Democracies rarely if ever fight one another (Gleditsch & Hegre, 1997). They rarely experience civil war or serious internal violence (Hegre et al., 1999), and they generally do not engage in genocide or other extreme human rights violations (Rummel, 1995). While most studies have found that they participate in interstate war as frequently as non-democracies, Benoit (1996) found that in the period 1960–80, with a reasonable set of control variables, democratic nations were *less* involved in military conflict than other regime types. Even among those who concede that democracies do not differ in their rate of war participation, there is a real argument that they might nevertheless be more peaceful (Ray, 1995).

A number of challenges have been issued to the idea of a democratic peace. Realists have argued that the democratic peace proposition only holds in the Cold-war era (e.g. Farber & Gowa, 1995; Gowa, 1999), an argument that goes increasingly stale as the post-Cold War world accumulates an increasing number of peaceful dyad-years between democracies. An argument has also been made that the process of democratization is dangerous (Mansfield & Snyder, 1995), but the best evidence indicates that the danger of violence – whether external or internal – lies in political change generally (Ward & Gleditsch, 1998; Hegre, Ellingsen, Gates & Gleditsch, 1999). Moreover, after a relatively short time this effect is overwhelmed by the peaceful impact of a higher level of stable democracy.

Together, the two findings that democracies rarely if ever fight one another, while they participate in war as frequently as other states, logically imply that mixed political dyads have the highest hazard of war. This has been confirmed empirically (Raknerud & Hegre, 1997; Gleditsch & Hegre, 1997). There is some disagreement why this is so. For instance, if democracies were frequently attacked by non-democracies, their high rate of participation in war might be quite compatible with a defensive posture. Gleditsch & Hegre (1997) note that democracies less frequently initiate new wars, but more frequently intervene in on-going wars or civil wars while Gleditsch & Hegre (1998) focus on the question of the importance of a democratic neighborhood. In any case, a wide dissemination of democracy seems certain to ensure more peaceful relations in the long run.

One challenge to democratic peace theory that has not been extensively discussed in the literature concerns the role of democracies in extra-systemic war, i.e. colonial and imperial war. For instance, in a singularly violent attack on democratic peace theory, Haas (1995) argues that it is precisely the democracies that have made colonial conquests and fought wars to prevent the liberation of the colonies and that this flies in the face of democratic peace theory. Do colonial peoples count for nothing in the democratic peace?

Preferring to deal only with 'coherent', 'mature', and 'stable' democracies, when these varying regimes prevent coherence, maturity, and stability abroad, is clearly ethnocentric, an attempt to ask darker-skinned peoples to go to the back of the bus while serious research is in progress (Haas, 1995: 14).

Even writers who are sympathetic to the democratic peace, have noted the participation of democracies in extra-systemic as an anomaly. For instance, Russett (1993: 34) writes that many democracies have not only fought wars of self-defense. They have also fought imperialist wars to acquire or hold colonies, or to retain control of states formally independent, but within the range of their spheres of influence.

There has been very little systematic analysis of extra-systemic wars.¹ In this paper, we will take up the challenge to the democratic peace issued by Haas and others. However, we must limit our study of the relationship between democracy and extra-systemic war to the monadic level. This is because we have no data for the dependent territories that make up one of the parties in these wars. Using data on wars from the Correlates of War over the period 1816–1992, we find that indeed most of the extra-systemic wars have been fought by democracies. Analyzed at the bivariate level, there is a positive relationship between democracy and participation in extra-systemic war. This finding is significant for the period as a whole as well as for three sub-periods. When introducing several control variables, however, the relationship changes considerably.

Before we turn to this analysis, however, we briefly examine the theoretical foundations of the democratic peace and ponder how it might be applied to extra-systemic war.

¹ One partial exception is Chan (1984), which analyzed the monadic democratic peace using a dataset which included extra-systemic war and another that included interstate war only.

Why Democratic Peace?

Tracing the philosophical roots back to Kant (1795), numerous writers such as Waltz (1962), Doyle (1986), Maoz & Russett (1993), and Chan (1997), have summarized the theoretical justifications for why democracies should be less warprone than other types of government. While several theoretical arguments have been proposed, Chan expresses a common attitude when he states that this field of study suffers from a theoretical deficit relative to the extensive empirical findings.

Maoz & Russett (1993) investigate two possible explanations for the relative lack of conflict between democracies². The *normative model* suggests that democracies do not wage wars on each other because they have developed norms of compromise and co-operation that stop conflicts of interest from becoming violent. Democratic norms take time to develop. Thus, older democracies should tend to be more peaceful than more recent democracies. The *structural model* suggests that democracies face complicated mobilization processes that create institutional obstacles against going to war. The process of declaring and waging war in democracies is costly and takes time and stimulates attempts to try to find other ways of settling a conflict short of war. The structural model predicts differences in the peacefulness of states according to the extent of constitutional constraints within each country, an idea that Schjøset (1996) has taken further, to argue that certain types of democracies may be more structurally constrained than others and therefore more likely to be peaceful. Maoz & Russett conclude that the normative model receives more consistent and robust support from their analysis, joining scholars like Dixon (1993, 1994) and Raymond (1994) in their support for the normative model. However, other scholars remain firmly in the structural camp (Bueno de Mesquita et al., 1999).

The prevailing view, that there is a dyadic democratic peace, but no convincing evidence for a monadic democratic peace, does not aid us in choosing between the normative and the structural models. As has been shown elsewhere (Gleditsch & Hegre, 1998: 2), both explanations come in a monadic and a dyadic version.

² Maoz & Russett concede that these two models may not be mutually exclusive and that it is difficult to test them as alternatives.

How Extra-systemic Wars Challenge Democratic Peace Theory

While relations between modern states and pre-modern societies have generally been ignored or overlooked in evaluating the democratic peace proposition, some research on relations among pre-modern societies has offered a measure of support for the democratic peace proposition (Ember, Ember & Russett, 1993). Russett & Antholis(1992) found norms against attacking other democracies to be emerging among democratic city-states in ancient Greece.

Haas (1995: 7) questions the exclusion of colonies from studies of the democratic peace theory. Colonies sometimes practice democracy. But it is precisely the democratic metropolises which prevent colonies from becoming democracies. Excluding colonial war from the study of the democratic peace excludes some of the bloodiest wars fought by democracies. Haas (1995: 7) also notes that Russett & Antholis do not find any confirmation of the democratic peace thesis when including colonies in their sample.

A related criticism, raised by Forsythe (1992), among others, is that democracies have frequently intervened covertly against elected governments (such as Iran in 1953 or Guatemala in 1954). Some of these governments cannot be classified as mature democracies, and the number of battle-deaths have generally been too low to be classified as wars. Forsythe (1992: 393) nevertheless notes that one possible interpretation (argued strongly by Hunt, 1987) is that such interventions into the affairs of other countries are motivated by 'an informal ideology of US superiority, racism, and anti-revolution'. Hermann & Kegley (1998) have also speculated in such motives for interventions undertaken by democracies, and Galtung (1996) has characterized democracies as arrogant, missionary, and belligerent.

Democratic Peace and Extra-systemic Actors

If we could measure the degree of democracy of an extra-systemic actor, we would expect extra-systemic war to be negatively correlated with democracy in the dyad. In other words, we would not expect democracies to wage war on democratic extra-systemic actors, while we should expect non-democratic extra-systemic actors to fight democratic system members more frequently than non-democratic system members. The problem is that we have no data on the regime type of non-system members.

Let us make the naive and simple (but not altogether implausible) assumption that all non-system members are non-democracies, or are perceived as such. Then, if the mainstream position in the study of the democratic peace government. On this background, colonial war by democracies becomes not only understandable, but almost an is correct, we would expect non-system members to find themselves more frequently at war with democratic system members than with non-democratic system members. This follows simply from the observation that mixed dyads are more war-prone. In other words, under the assumption that extra-systemic actors are non-democratic, democracy in the system member should be *positively* correlated with extra-systemic war. The same argument applies as long as non-democracies are in the majority among the actors outside the interstate system. Looking at it from the point of view of system members, we shall call this 'the ungenerous assumption' about their opponents. Russett (1993: 34) seems to share this assumption, as at least to assume that democratic colonial powers shared it.³ He asserts that in extra-systemic wars democracies fought against people on the assumption that they did not have institutions of self-government. Not only were they available for expanding empires, but also for the benefits of modern material civilization and Western principles of self-imperative.

If we make the equally naive and simple (and perhaps less plausible) assumption that all extra-systemic actors are democracies, or are perceived to be. Then we should expect democratic system members hardly ever to engage in any extra-systemic war. On the other hand, the extra-systemic actors would still be forming mixed political dyads with non-democratic system members. Thus, there would still be extra-systemic war, but it would be *negatively* correlated with democracy in the system member. The same argument applies as long as the democrats are in a majority among the extra-systemic actors. We call this 'the generous assumption'.

If the extra-systemic actors are evenly divided between democrats and non-democrats, then we should expect the rate of extra-systemic war participation to be the same between democratic and non-democratic system members. In other words, in this intermediate case, there should be no correlation between democracy in the system member and participation in extra-systemic war.

³ Peceny (1997), in a study of whether the Spanish-American war is an example of a war between democracies, has argued that the decisive argument for war in the US was that royal

Thus, we have three very different hypotheses relating intra-systemic democracy to extra-systemic war:

Extra-systemic actors	Assumption	Frequency of extra-systemic war
Mostly democratic	Generous	Less for democratic system members
Evenly divided	None	No correlation with democracy
Mostly non-democratic	Ungenerous	More for democratic system members

We expect the ungenerous assumption to be most realistic, at least for the early period of colonial conquest. Thus, we expect a positive relationship between democracy in the system member and participation in extra-systemic war. This expectation is reinforced by the circumstance that the opposing party is not recognised as a state.⁴ A non-state cannot be expected to have the full range of institutions that the democratic system member would recognize as democratic.

Thus, although our test of the relationship between democracy and extra-systemic war remains at the monadic level, we need not make any assumptions about a monadic democratic peace generally. We do make some assumptions about the regime type of the extra-systemic actors, which we are unable to observe. We discuss the implications of this way of approaching the problem at the end of the paper.

Colonies and Empires

Colonialism and Imperialism.

Colonialism – defined as the conquest and control of land and goods – is not a European invention but is an old and pervasive feature of human history. The vast Roman, Mongol, Chinese, and Aztec empires subjugated a large number of people and a variety of ethnic groups. However, modern colonialism changed the world in a more fundamental way than the earlier colonial empires (Loomba, 1998: 4).

The terms colonialism and imperialism are often used interchangeably. Some distinguish between pre-capitalist and capitalist colonialism by referring to the latter as imperialism. But Imperial Russia was definitely pre-capitalist, as was Imperial

Spain was not *perceived* as democratic.

Spain (Loomba, 1998: 4) Some even place imperialism prior to colonialism (Boehmer, 1995: 3). The industrial revolution certainly made possible a new type of imperialism by giving it the tools to profoundly alter the relationship between mother country and colony (Ferro, 1997: 17). Under capitalism, imperialism did more than extract goods from the areas it conquered, it reconstructed the economies and drew the colonies in to the world economy. Lenin (1916) and other marxist writers linked the word imperialism to the growth of finance capitalism. In this way, imperialism is not linked to direct colonial rule, as economic dependency and control is ensured by the uneven links between the two areas. Thus imperialism can function without colonies, but colonialism cannot (Loomba, 1998: 7).

The Correlates of War project, whose data on extra-systemic war we use in the empirical part of the paper, divides extra-systemic war into two sub-types: *Imperial war* involves an adversary that is an independent political entity but does not qualify as a member of the interstate system because of limitations on its independence, insufficient population to meet the interstate system membership criteria, or a failure of other states to recognise it as a legitimate member. The second sub-type, *Colonial war*, includes international wars in which the adversary was a colony, dependency, or protectorate composed of ethnically different people and located at some geographical distance or, at least, peripheral to the centre of government of the given system member (Singer & Small, 1994: introduction)⁵. Thus, wars without a dependency relation are defined as *imperial*, wars within an empire *colonial*.

The first wave of colonization was characterized by a relatively small gap between the economic, military, and technical levels of the colony and the mother country. Trade was only on a small scale. The imperialist economy introduced structural changes in the colonies and increased the gap considerably. The colonies were de-industrialized and specialized in non-food-producing agriculture e.g. coffee, cotton and tobacco. A contradiction developed between the traditional subsistence economy and the imposed market economy (Ferro, 1997: 17).

⁴ We return below to question of whether the Correlates of War system membership may be too restrictive.

⁵ In earlier versions of the dataset, internationalized civil wars were included as a third form of extra-systemic war.

Modern imperialism, starting in the 1870s, gave rise to the most extensive colonial conquest in human history. By the 1930s, European colonies and ex-colonies covered 85% of the globe's land surface. Only parts of Arabia, Persia, Afghanistan, Mongolia, Tibet, China, Siam, and Japan had never been under formal European government (Fieldhouse, 1989: 373).

Ferro (1997: 19) distinguishes between three types of colonization: *Colonization of the old type* was related to trade on a small scale or the settlement in areas with scarce population. *Colonization of the new type* is related to the Industrial Revolution and financial capitalism. This type is commonly referred to as imperialism. *Imperialism without colonization* is the third type, which is present even after the de-colonization period. De-colonization can be seen as the substitution of one political authority for another, but with the economic relations intact.

Betts (1968) argues that *settlement* is fundamentally different from *colonial expansion*. He also distinguishes between *contiguous and non-contiguous expansion*. Physical distance usually implied a distinct difference between the imperial state and the dependent territory with respect to governing institutions, culture, and society (Betts, 1968: 14). The closer the dominated territory is to the dominating power, the greater the political and cultural similarity. Contiguous expansion usually results in absorption, while non-contiguous expansion most often does not.

Successful contiguous expansion results in total integration, as shown by the USA and to a large extent also by Russia. In other cases, such as the Third Reich and Napoleon's Grand Empire, such integration was only partial or temporary. There are few examples of successful non-contiguous expansion, resulting in absorption. The US succeeded in absorbing Alaska (even though Canada is wedged between the two) and Hawaii (despite over 3,000 kms of separation by sea), while France failed to integrate Algeria, only a short hop across the Mediterranean.

A Brief History of Colonization⁶

We provide a thumbnail sketch of the history of colonialism in the modern world as a historical background to the present study.

Four Routes to God, Gold, and Glory

During the 14th century started looking for new trading routes to India and China, in order to bypass the growing Ottoman Empire. Vasco da Gama succeeded in reaching India in 1498 by sailing around Africa and in 1543 a Portuguese expedition reached Japan. Columbus' journey to America was also aimed at finding a route to India. A third route was to lead to India through the interior of Africa. While these journeys mainly were in search of gold and spices, religion was also an important incentive. Columbus, for instance, had hoped to find gold in such quantities that it could underwrite the conquest of the Holy Land. The Ottomans for their part counted the trade associated with the European discoveries as a form of holy war.

Russians living under the Mongols also discovered discovered the riches of China eventually those of India as well. In 1466 a Russian expedition to India was organized, the only such expedition that had no connection to a crusade. Later the focus changed and during the age of Imperialism, the Czar of Russia wanted to colonize the far east in the name of Orthodox Christianity.

Dividing the World - the First Phase

In the early part of the 15th century Portugal was the shipbuilding center of Europe. Knowledge of cartography and the development of a new type of ship, the galleon, made journeys south along the coast of Africa possible. Above all, the Portuguese wanted control of the sea trade. This was obtained at the cost of the Arab merchant ships that long had sailed in the Indian sea.

The treaty of Tordesillas in 1494 divided the newly discovered territories in two parts. Everything further West than 170 leagues of the Azores was to be Spanish territory, the rest went to the Portuguese. At the time Portugal seemed to be the victor, as

⁶ This section relies on almost entirely on Ferro (1997), Palmer & Colton (1971), and Woodruff (1989). For the purposes for which we use them here, there are only minor discrepancies between the works of these scholars

their expeditions were in the process of circumventing Africa, while the westward journey to India was not much more than a dream.

Following Columbus' 'discovery' of America, the Spanish Conquistadors tried to convert the Indian peoples. The Indians were regarded as equals in the sense that they were worthy of conversion. Gold was taken away in exchange for religion. When refusing further plunder, the Indians were subdued and enslaved. Conversion was no longer the main issue and the Indians were no longer regarded by their conquerors as equals. Those who were not yet Christians, were only fit to be slaves (Ferro, 1997: 32) Contemporary writers describe the attempts of conversion, violence, and unequal exchange, all essential features of later colonization as well. The tactics of meeting organized resistance with negotiation in order to break the resistance more effectively later succeeded in gaining large areas with only a few white men.

At the end of the 16th century The Netherlands became independent. At the same time Spain occupied Portugal, making it increasingly difficult for the Portuguese to defend their trading posts. Masters of the latest technology, the Dutch built ships at low cost. Merchants with money to invest put together private companies to seek spices and other goods in India and the rest of Asia. In 1602 the Oost Indische Kompanie was founded and the Dutch replaced the Portuguese where they were weak. The trading posts were reinforced by settlements, but very few individuals settled permanently in the new colonies. By 1640 Portugal had wrested itself free from Spain and tried – largely unsuccessfully – to take back the possessions they had lost to the Dutch. A Dutch colony had been established in Northern Brazil, settled in the Cape colony in 1652, and drove the Portuguese from the Celebes and the rest of the East Indian Archipelago. At the end of the 17th century the Portuguese held only Brazil in the West and Timor and Goa in the East.

The Spanish Empire fell apart in the 19th century when Spain was preoccupied with European matters and their colonies took up the fight for independence. At the end of the century, Spain was left with only Cuba, the Philippines, and a few small territories scattered around the world. Following the Spanish-American War in 1898, the USA acquired Cuba and the Philippines. The alleged motive for that war was to liberate the colonized peoples.

In the late 15th century, England was preoccupied with securing markets for wool and the wool fabrics produced in England. These commodities were its only exportable products and securing trading routes was a top priority. During the 16th and 17th century a dual colonial policy was adopted: On one hand, the British established settlement colonies. Expansion took place by settling unemployed people and former convicts. This ensured a market for English goods at the same time as food and the other colonial produce were welcome imports to England. The English also established private trading companies to take part in the trade with Asia. The Navigation Act of 1651, which required that commodities to be sold in England had to be carried by English ships, kicked off three wars with the Netherlands. The Dutch were perceived by the English as capable of blocking English merchants and navigating interests everywhere. The treaties concluded after the wars lowered the profitability of the sea trade for the Dutch and led to the decline of their colonial power.

France did not have a colonial policy during most of the 15th and 16th centuries and remained preoccupied with internal European conflicts. Cod fisheries eventually led French fishermen to Canada, and soon the fur trade proved to be even more profitable. Fear that the English would take over the fur trade made the French establish a permanent settlement in Canada. In the Caribbean, the French colonized 14 islands after a battle with Spanish forces in 1625. Under Richelieu the colonies became a matter of government policy, based on three principles: participation in the Asian trade with Asia, keeping Canada and preserving the West Indian colonies. The French monarchy's colonial policy served to check Spanish hegemony as well as the rising power of Protestant England.

Parts of India became the first protectorate after the French Indian Company argued that the France should take the Indian princes under protection and in return get land or a share of the tax revenue. The Treaty of Paris in 1763 forced France give up Canada and their Indian possessions to the British. The loss of India was as much a result of the company's own failures as a result of the treaty. But Dupleix, the head of company, was hailed as a hero during the effort to rebuild an Empire after 1770 and his hatred of the British was revived.

In 1552 the fall of the moslem state Kazan removed an obstacle to Russian expansion on both sides of the Ural mountains. Siberia was absorbed and a tax paid in sable was laid upon the inhabitants. Advances towards India and the Far East fol-

lowed and in 1649 Russian explorers reached the Kamchatka peninsula. The integration of the vast area from the early Russian territory and to the Pacific Ocean was completed before the expansion towards the Baltic and the Black Sea.

Japan also showed signs of expansion during the 16th century. Free from China, it tried to establish a sort of colonial system around itself. The Japanese wished to gain a foothold in the Far East, first and foremost casting its eyes upon Korea.

At the beginning of the 19th century India and the Indonesian Archipelago brought increasing profits to the British and the Dutch. The other European powers did not have any large profitable colonies, but the memories of colonial rivalries were kept alive.

Dividing the World - Second Phase

Until the Seven Years War (1756–63), England's Empire had been relatively small, homogenous, and based on trade. After the treaty of 1763, England acquired a vast and heterogeneous Empire somewhat out of proportions to its means. The Empire had required little expense and not much thought had been given to how it was ruled. Suddenly it became a military burden, with the continued rule over hostile populations incompatible with English principles of liberty.

After loosing the USA and becoming an industrial power England needed to change its economic relationship with the rest of the world. It required markets and raw materials. In a sense, it needed another America. A period of just a few years saw important ambassadors sent to China, the African Association set up, Central Africa explored, the North West Company established in Northern Canada, and James Cook installed in Botany Bay. This outburst of enterprise came after a long period of international conflict. The requirements of industrialization and the need for markets rivaled the compulsion for domination. But soon the latter prevailed. Other states joined the competition for new territories. Within a few decades almost the whole surface of the earth was divided between European states.

In contrast to the early colonialism, the imperialist became a matter of national one. An active colonial policy seemed a means to national success, a source of new

power, and a role on the world scene (Betts, 1968: 49). The asymmetrical power relationship not only made imperialism possible, it also made it tempting. Empire could be acquired quite cheaply. Most empires expanded from naval bases or trading posts acquired during the first colonial phase.

Towards Independence

The settlers or the administrators or the colonies were the first to voice a desire for independence from the colonial metropolis. As early as in 1544, Spanish American colonists rose against the protection granted by the metropolitan state to the indigenous population and similar episodes occurred later in other colonies. Eventually, the USA, the Spanish colonies in the Americas, and Brazil were freed from European dominance by European settlers who were still subjugating the indigenous peoples⁷. The same strategy was later successfully followed in South Africa, and unsuccessfully attempted in Rhodesia at the end of the 19th century and in Algeria as late as 1958.

The liberation movements at the end of the colonial era, on the other hand, originated in new elites among the colonized – westernized merchants, intellectuals, and militant religionists. The education provided by Christian missions helped in the emancipation process, while Buddhist, Hinduist, and Islamic revivals provided focal points for the resistance to European domination. A third source of influence was communist internationalism, supported by the Soviet Union and later by China and Cuba. The national struggle against imperialism was regarded an essential feature of the international proletarian struggle against capitalism.

De-colonization was not only a result of the struggle for freedom of the colonized peoples. In Europe, many intellectuals had for a long time questioned the moral and economic wisdom of colonialism. The emerging leading world power, the USA, was opposed to traditional colonialism. A turning-point was reached when India gained its independence in 1948. During the Suez crisis in 1956 the decline of the French and British empires became irreversible, and the rising power of the USA, the USSR, and third-world nationalism all the more evident.

⁷ Only in Haiti had blacks won their own freedom.

Colonialism is no longer an important feature of the foreign policy of any state. Most empires were dissolved during the first two decades following the Second World War, creating a large number of independent states. Numerous small colonies exist, but they total only about 0.1% of the world's population, and most of them are reluctant to face independence. The building of empires also seems to have come to an end. In recent years, the trend has been towards secession, rather than annexation. Between 1989 and 1999 some 20 countries became independent as a result of secessions or the dissolution of federal states (Gleditsch & Ward, 1999: 405–410). The struggle to preserve empires continues, however, in Russia, China, and elsewhere.

In order to reflect different phases in the history of colonialism, we have divided the empirical analysis of the 180-year period covered by the Correlates of War data, i.e. the period since the Congress of Vienna, into three sub-periods: 1815–70 (the colonial era), 1870–1945 (the imperialist era) and 1945–92 (the de-colonization era). Before moving to the empirical analysis, however, we need to extract from history some reasons for colonial expansion and the defense of colonial interests. Our ambition is not to construct a fully specified theory of colonial war, but to study the relationship between extra-systemic war and the democratic peace. However, we do need to discuss a broad set of relationships in order to establish a reasonable set of control variables. In particular, we are looking for variables which could be responsible for a spurious relationship with our main explanatory variable.

Alliances

A common realist explanation for the dyadic democratic peace is that democracies are joined in alliances that represent their common interest. At the monadic level, things become a bit more complicated, especially in an analysis of extra-systemic war. At the dyadic level of analysis one would assume that states join alliances in order to increase their security. In a defense pact, for example, a state can rely on other states to come to its assistance, in case of an attack. On the other hand, if an ally is attacked, a defense pact can cause a state to be involved in a conflict that it would not have joined otherwise. Because states tend to sign alliance agreements when they perceive a security threat (Walt, 1985: 33), the number of alliances may reflect the state's conflict potential (Gleditsch & Hegre, 1998: 21).

According to Snyder (1991: 5) great powers are concerned with how they are perceived by their potential and acquired allies. An aggressive policy against extra-

systemic entities can be seen as a sign of power and greatness and thus strengthens the great power's image as a reliable and able ally. A 'softer' policy can lead allies to interpret the great power as declining or not able and willing to use power in critical times. Even a soft policy towards extra-systemic adversaries can affect and possibly harm the relationship between a great power and its allies. A state with many allies cannot afford to be regarded as conflict-avoiding in 'minor' conflicts of this type. A state that avoids a violent conflict with a dependency would be perceived as less able and willing to enter a conflict to help an ally.

Non-aggression pacts usually involve potential enemies (Raknerud & Hegre, 1997: 394) and neutrality pacts would probably not affect the extra-systemic war potential because they do not require the ally to have significant military strength. Therefore, we include only defense pacts, where the ally is expected to make a contribution to military strength. Failing to flex its muscle in a conflict could lessen a country's credibility as an alliance partner. Therefore, we would this type of alliance to significantly enhancing the probability of all kinds of war, including extra-systemic war.

Colonial Possessions

The number of colonies held by a state has will affect its extra-systemic war participation. Having an adversary is of course a necessary condition for war and the probability of war will be greater if the potential adversaries are numerous. Snyder (1991: 3) argues that a state with a large number of colonies is more likely to engage in colonial war because such a state is more likely to have internalized a domino theory of empire. Having a colony is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for fighting extra-systemic wars, which could be imperial as well as colonial. An extra-systemic war could also conceivably be fought by a state that did not have any colonies on behalf of one that did.

Other War Involvement

All types of involvement in armed conflict are costly. We assume that if a state is involved in interstate war, civil war, or a militarized dispute it is less likely to have the resources to fight an extra-systemic war at the same time.

Proximity

States that are geographically proximate are much more likely to fight wars than states further apart (Bremer, 1992; Gleditsch 1995), because such wars are less costly, because proximate states have more interaction where a conflict of interest may arise, or because they quarrel over shared territory or resources (Vasquez, 1995).

Since we do not have dyadic data for the democracy variables and will be performing our analysis at the monadic level, we must translate the dyadic regularity between distance and war to the monadic level. Gleditsch & Hegre (1998) use the number of common borders as a control variable. However, the opponents in extra-systemic wars are colonies or other political entities that are generally far away. We could have measured the distance between the war theatre and the system member participating in an extra-systemic war, but it is not obvious what the relevant distance measure would be for countries which are not in an extra-systemic war in a given year. Since most extra-systemic wars take place in the equatorial region, we have chosen to represent the distance variable by the latitude of the system member. The hypothesis is that further North the system member is located, the lower the probability of involvement in an extra-systemic war.

Research Design

The unit of analysis in this study is the nation-year. A state is included in the study when it becomes independent according to the COW criterion, which is when it is recognized as a member of the international system. All independent states are included for the period 1816–1992. Using the nation-year as the unit of analysis makes it possible to control for the fact that some states have been members of the international system for a longer period and thus have had more opportunity to get involved in wars (Chan, 1984: 623). The dataset analyzed in this study consists of 11,309 cases. We analyze the COW period as a whole, as well as three sub-periods.

Colonial and Imperial Wars

We use the data on extra-systemic war in the Correlates of War dataset. The most recent published edition of the dataset (Small & Singer, 1982), reports 51 extra-systemic wars for the period 1816–1980. The most recently deposited dataset (Singer & Small, 1994) contains 149 wars up to 1992, 84 colonial and 65 imperial. The expansion of the list is not just due to the inclusion of 12 more years, but also results from a re-

laxation of the coding criteria: For these wars, threshold criterion of 1,000 battle deaths no longer has to be met in a single year.

In the tables reported below we do not distinguish between imperial and colonial war, the two sub-types of extra-systemic war. However, we have also made some analyses of colonial war only, and the results (particularly for the democracy variable) are not dramatically different.

To wage an extra-systemic war a state must either have dependent areas or an ambition to acquire such areas. But not all colonial powers fight colonial wars. Haiti, South Africa, Australia, Japan, New Zealand, Israel, and Denmark have had dependent areas without waging war on them.

28 states have participated in extra-systemic war according to the COW dataset⁸. This includes all the great powers, with the exception of Japan. However, from the late 17th century, Japan was at least as expansionist as the European states (Ferro, 1991: 103, Snyder, 1992: 151). Initially, expansion meant settling the islands that today make up the state of Japan. Japan is first included in the COW dataset in 1860. Thus, some of the early Japanese advances in the 18th and 19th centuries are not included. Other advances met those of the European states and China, resulting in interstate war in some instances. During World War II, Japanese expansionism was aimed at establishing domination of most over Asia with later settlement. But these conflicts are counted as interstate wars, and form part of World War II. Had Japanese aggression succeeded, future wars between Japan and its opponents might have been classified as civil wars or as extra-systemic war.

Civil war is defined in the COW project as wars within a state, i.e. a territorial unit where all the subjects of the territory have the right to participate in the central government in the same manner regardless of ethnicity, race, or religion (Small & Singer, 1982: 211). This criterion is used to distinguish between states and dependencies, where some or all of the subjects are not allowed to take part in the metropolitan government. It is not enough for an area to have declared independence for it to be an

⁸ These states are included in a table presented in Appendix 1. The table gives the number of wars fought by each state and whether they were imperial or colonial wars.

interstate war. The new area is not considered to be sufficiently independent and internally integrated before at least six months have passed.

States may have an interest in blurring the distinction between the metropolitan state and the dependency by claiming the dependency to be a province, as France did with Algeria prior to independence in 1962. A portion of the population in a colony may even be granted full or partial citizenship rights within the colonial power.

The concept of war requires that both sides are capable of inflicting death upon the other party. This does not necessarily imply power parity, but that the weaker force is able to resist at some cost to the stronger party (Singer & Small, 1982: 214). All wars included in the COW dataset require the participation of at least one system member. System membership, in turn, requires a degree of outside recognition of the state. Prior to 1920, this is operationalized as diplomatic relations with Britain and France. This inherently Europe-centered view of things may underestimate the warfare of other political entities in the earlier periods. On the other hand, many recent extra-systemic wars were fought by poor and relatively small states like Ethiopia and Somalia. Thus, using the COW dataset might skew the results against finding peaceful behavior by democracies in earlier periods, whereas the results for the most recent period could be influenced by some long wars fought by Third-world countries. We have used the dataset without making any changes, based on the belief that the dataset is the best one available and that any change must be guided by a thorough reconsideration of the criteria used rather than performed on an ad-hoc basis.⁹

The Sub-periods

The long COW period is divided into three sub-periods in an attempt to control for differences in the international environment that would otherwise be difficult to control for. In the first period, 1816–70, the acquisition of colonies and other far-away possessions was based mainly upon private commercial interests. Having a colony meant above all to have a reliable partner for trade at favorable terms. Of 1,809 nation-years in this period, there were 125, or 6.9%, with extra-systemic war.

⁹ For one recent such effort, see Gleditsch & Ward (1999).

After 1870 the state was more involved in the colonial enterprise and the economic ties were much closer. At that time, too, the European state system was relatively complete, following the unification of Italy and Germany. This period was strongly influenced by nationalism and social Darwinism. The imperialist colonial period lasted at least until the Second World War. Of 3,578 nation-years in this period, 155 or 4.3% experienced extra-systemic war.

The third period is 1946–92. After World War II, most colonies obtained independence. At the same time, the international environment changed from a balance of power policy in Europe to a world dominated by the Cold War between USA and the Soviet Union. Of 5,909 nation years in this period, 135 or 2.3% saw extra-systemic war.

Control Variables

In one of the first multivariate analyses of its kind, Bremer (1992) made use of seven predictors to dyadic interstate war, geographical proximity, power parity, major power status, alliance, regime type, level of development, and degree of militarization. In a study of the monadic democratic peace, Gleditsch & Hegre (1998) used Bremer's analysis to derive a set of control variables at the nation level. We follow their design here.

Operationalization

Extra-systemic War

The dependent variable is dichotomous, whether or not extra-systemic war occurs in a given year. The study is based on 134 extra-systemic wars with a total of 417 nation-years of war between 1815 and 1992. Our research design blurs the difference between short and long wars. For instance, the Belgian war (1830–31) lasted only two months, but since it went from one year to the next, its three participants are assigned a total of six nation-years of extra-systemic war. Our design also does not take account of the possibility that a system member may have fought more than one extra-systemic war in a given year, as Great Britain has done on some occasions, although this is unusual. Less than a quarter of the war years (100) involved more than one extra-systemic war for any state, and no state has ever fought more than four wars simultaneously.

Bremer (1992: 320) has argued strongly for the need to distinguish between the *onset* and *incidence* of war since the start of the war and different processes may govern its continuation. His own study is therefore limited to the *onset* of war. His view is not shared by Blainey, (1988: x) who argues that ‘... the beginning of wars, the prolonging of wars, the ending of wars and the prolonging or shortening of periods of peace all share the same causal framework ... [T]he same factors are vital in understanding in understanding each stage in the sequel of war and peace.’ Oneal & Russett (1999: 428) also take the view that ‘... for several reasons, researchers should be concerned with all years in which states are involved in a conflict’. This belief is based on the assumption that national leaders frequently re-evaluate a decision to use force. Maintaining a conflict thus reflects the same mix of domestic politics, the availability of military and economic resources, and international alignments that shaped the decision to go to war in the first place.

Apart from Bremer’s theoretical argument, studying the onset of war rather than the incidence of war is also seen as a way to alleviate the problems of autocorrelation. When only studying the first year of a war, the dependence between war cases is reduced. However, deleting years of continuing war from the dataset only remedies a part of the problem, since peace also tends to persist from one year to another (Raknerud & Hegre, 1997; Chan, 1997: 73). Reducing the number of war events also implies that it may be difficult to obtain statistically significant results. Of the 417 nation-years with incidence of extra-systemic war in this study, only 140 contain onsets of war. Since both Bremer’s and Blainey’s arguments are somewhat compelling, we include analyses of incidence as well as onset of war to see if the findings are robust. In the analyses using incidence of war, we include an extra control variable to account for extra-systemic war in the previous year.

Independent Variables

Regime Type

Regime type is our most important independent variable. Most previous studies of the democratic peace have used categorical measures of regime type. Maoz & Russett (1993) make use of a continuous measure of joint democracy (which Russett has later abandoned), and Hegre et al. (1999), Gleditsch & Hegre (1998), and others use the full

range of the Polity 21-point scale of democracy minus autocracy. Chan (1997: 71), on the other hand, argues that a dichotomous measure better reflects the perceived attributes state leaders give to their counterparts. Some scholars, such as Dixon (1994) and Farber & Gowa (1995), use a trichotomous variable with 'anocracy' for a polity that is neither democratic nor autocratic. Here we use the more finely graded measure.

Of the various datasets available, only the Polity dataset covers the entire range of the COW period.¹⁰ We use the democracy and autocracy indexes from the Polity III dataset (McLaughlin et al., 1998) for all independent states. Following Jagers & Gurr (1995), we subtract the autocracy scores from the democracy scores, so the resulting index varies between -10 (full autocracy) to 10 (full democracy). We use this measure in part because of the critique from Haas (1995) that some states are denied a status as democracies because of technicalities of the study. If democracy is an important force for peace, we expect differences not only between democracies and non-democracies, but also between states with different degrees of democracy.

Democratic Norms and Institutional Constraints

Since it is difficult to choose between the nonviolent norms and institutional constraints as explanations of the democratic peace, we try to take both into account, but with no attempt to assess their relative merits. Maoz & Russett (1993) suggest that norms can be judged by the political stability of the polity or by the degree to which it experiences violent internal conflict. Maoz & Russett prefer the latter, but in this study we make use of a measure of stability. Since the stability of a non-democratic polity seems less likely to affect the propensity to fight extra-systemic war, we have coded a country as a stable democracy if at least ten years have passed since the polity became democratic. States that were democratic when they entered the international system are coded as non-stable the first ten years. Some states lose their status as members of the international system for a limited period, an example being Norway during the German occupation in World War II. Such countries are coded as stable democracies from the first year of re-entry, if they were in that category prior to the interruption. Thus, stable non-democracies and unstable polities are coded the same.

¹⁰ However, Vanhanen's measure of democracy has just become available to cover the same time period (see Vanhanen, 2000 and the data posted on the web).

In a sense, this variable is an interaction term, combining democracy and stability in one measure.

We measure institutional constraints by a component of the Polity index, a seven-point scale ranging from unlimited executive authority to executive subordination. Since this variable is highly correlated with democracy (Gleditsch & Ward, 1997), we use it as a substitute for the democracy variable rather than as a supplement.

Major Power

A state is considered a major power in the years it is included as a major power in the COW project's dataset. These nation years are scored 1, otherwise 0.

Alliances

The COW dataset identifies three types of formal alliances (Singer & Small, 1969), but only defense pacts are included in this analysis. Nations are coded with the number of alliance membership in a given year. We also include an interaction term between major power and alliances. This is in response to the argument made by Snyder (1992: 5) that major powers with many alliances may behave differently from major powers with few alliances. On the interaction term, minor powers are coded 0, regardless of their number of alliance memberships.

Number of Colonies

The number of colonies is calculated on an annual basis using data in Gleditsch (1988) as a starting point and supplementing with information from various encyclopediae, mainly Aschehoug & Gyldendal (1982). The colonies are included at the start of the time period or from the time when a colony is established. The year the colony is established, is entered in the dataset, and the year the colony obtained independence is coded as the first year of independence. This coding scheme does not account for areas that are still dependent on a system member. We made this decision because it is difficult to account for all dependent areas. There are areas that by formal agreement form a part of a system member, as Tibet is a part of China. This agreement is challenged by Tibetans who want independence. Thus, one can regard Tibet as a Chinese colony with a great conflict potential. On the other hand, there are colonial an-

nexations that over time have become an integral part of the member state, like in the USA. Thus, some colonies have become inseparable parts of system members while some dependencies that are based upon formal agreements rather than violent occupation or annexation remain as conflict areas. One could of course include as dependencies those areas that are still contested, but this would raise the problem of how large the independence movement must be for the situation to be defined as contested. Hawaii has a movement for independence, as does Bretagne. Moreover, we would face a selection problem if we excluded peaceful dependencies or areas that have been dependencies in the past but which are now regarded as inseparable from a system member. Since it is virtually impossible to make sure that all relevant dependencies are included, we have chosen to focus on the dependencies that have later become independent members of the international system.

The resulting variable is measured in the number of colonies held by a colonial power in a given year. Only 19.5% of the nation-years in this analysis are for a state with one or more colonies. 9.2% of the nation-years involve one or two colonies, and only 5% of the cases involve more than five colonies.

Economic Development

To measure the level of economic development we use energy consumption per capita, which is available for a long time period. Although this measure has some weaknesses, it allows the measurement of economic activities that take place outside the market place and are not included in the formal economy. We log-transform the variable because it is very skewed. The data come from the COW project's national capability dataset (Singer & Small, 1993).

Other Conflict Involvement

We include as a single control variable whether or not the country is involved in a civil war, an inter-state war, or a militarized international dispute. Less than 10% of the country-years are affected by civil war or interstate war, while over 30% of the country-years experience a dispute.

Geographical Latitude

We assess the distance factor by using a crude measure of the average distance between a state and its extra-systemic adversary, the northern latitude of the system member's capital. Most dependencies are situated towards the south, and most system members fighting extra-systemic war are located (more or less) in the north. Therefore, a high value on this variable should proxy reasonably well a longer distance to the scene of the fighting. All southern latitudes are set to 0. This measure is not optimal, as it does not account for the relatively shorter distance between member states engaged in territorial expansion closer to home. One example of this is Russia's expansion into neighboring areas. But even so one would expect this variable to be negatively related to extra-systemic war. The data were largely obtained from Kristian S. Gleditsch¹¹, with some data for missing states obtained from *The Times' Concise Atlas of World History* (1992) and *Diercke Weltatlas* (1992). The latitudes are recalculated from degrees and minutes to a decimal representation.

Results

We first present a summary of the bivariate analysis¹² before moving on to the multivariate regression results. We present in parallel fashion the results for the onset and incidence of war. We start by analyzing the entire time period and then move on to the three sub-periods.

Bivariate Analysis

The results of the bivariate analyses are summed up in Tables I-III. In Table I we show that democracies are more involved in extra-systemic war than we should expect on the basis of their share of nation-years. This is true for the first two sub-periods, and for the entire period since the Congress of Vienna, and is consistent with the blast against the democratic peace found in Haas (1995). But it is also compatible with the standard interpretation of the democratic peace adopted in this paper, if we assume that most non-system participants in extra-systemic war are non-democracies.

Table I: Democracy and the Incidence of Extra-systemic War, 1816–1992

¹¹ Personal communication, 27 April 1999.

¹² Details can be found in Ravlo (1999): 57-70.

	Share of democratic nation-years (%)	Share of nation-years with war where democracies are involved (%)
Early sub-period	8.8	23.2
Middle sub-period	26.9	46.0
Late sub-period	34.3	24.2
Whole period	28.0	33.6

Tables II-III present bivariate correlations between extra-systemic war incidence and onset) and democracy (dichotomous as well as many-valued measures) and each of the control variables. Most of the bivariate correlations between democracy and extra-systemic war are positive. However, the many-valued measure of democracy is negatively correlated with the incidence of extra-systemic war in all periods. Nine out of the 16 correlations are significant. The dichotomous measure of democracy consistently provides a positive and significant correlation with extra-systemic war up to, but not including, the de-colonization period. All the correlation coefficients are relatively small. Overall, we do not find a strong and uniform relationship between the two variables. However, some support is found for the notion that democracies are more active in extra-systemic war than non-democracies, except during the period after World War II.

Table II: Bivariate Correlations, Incidence of Extra-systemic War (r)

	Whole period	1816-69	1870-1945	1945-92
Stable democracy	0.006	-0.060*	0.089**	-0.002
Democracy - dichotomous	0.025*	0.150**	0.111**	-0.033*
Democracy - many-valued	-0.029**	-0.004	-0.049**	-0.011
Civil war	0.049**	0.038(*)	0.078**	0.059**
Interstate war	0.052**	0.040(*)	0.025	0.079**
Disputes	0.139**	0.216**	0.123**	0.142**
Major power	0.310**	0.402**	0.318**	0.185**
Alliances	0.033**	0.031	0.039*	0.064**
Major power*alliances	0.132**	0.146**	0.119**	0.141**
Number of colonies	0.424**	0.608**	0.382**	0.354**
Distance	0.134**	0.129**	0.179**	0.055**
Advanced economy	0.031**	0.399**	0.101**	-0.004

**=significant at the 0.01 level, *=significant at the 0.05 level, (*)=significant at the 0.1 level.

As far as the control variables are concerned, the results are mostly in the expected direction. Major powers are involved in more extra-systemic war in all sub-periods (for onsets as well as incidence of war), alliances tend to dispose for war participation (except in the first sub-period), and there is a strong interaction effect between these two variables. The two variables number of colonies and the northern latitude are also consistently found to have a positive and significant relationship to extra-systemic war. In other words, states that fight extra-systemic wars tend to be located far to the north. Somewhat surprisingly, at least at first glance, distance has a positive impact on extra-systemic war. Advanced economies tend to have more extra-systemic war, except in the most recent sub-period, but the results are weaker for war onsets than for incidence. Countries that participate in international disputes, have significantly more extra-systemic war, regardless of period and measure of war. Civil war and interstate war also tend to predispose for extra-systemic war in the same year, but these results are not as consistent.

Table III: Bivariate Correlations, Onset of Extra-systemic War (r)

	Whole period	1816-69	1870-1945	1945-92
Stable democracy	0.010	-0.037	0.068**	0.008
Democracy - dichotomous	0.030**	0.100**	0.089**	-0.007
Democracy - many-valued	0.006	0.039	0.009	-0.005
Civil war	0.019**	0.027	0.056**	0.010
Interstate war	0.045**	0.029	0.030	0.073**
Disputes	0.082**	0.125**	0.095**	0.073**
Major power	0.199**	0.230**	0.203**	0.111**
Alliances	0.020*	0.034	0.040*	0.036**
Major power*alliances	0.087**	0.107**	0.098**	0.076**
Number of colonies	0.294**	0.370**	0.279**	0.204**
Distance	0.087**	0.055*	0.112**	0.035**
Advanced economy	0.019(*)	0.084(*)	0.064**	-0.002

**=significant at the 0.01 level, *=significant at the 0.05 level, (*)=significant at the 0.1 level.

Multivariate Analysis

Many of the control variables correlate with democracy and we must expect that the introduction of controls should alter the picture significantly. Table IV and V give re-

sults for multivariate regression analyses (with logistic regression) for the incidence and onset of extra-systemic war. Indeed, we do find that the role of democracy appears in a new light. For the whole period, as well as for the post-World War II sub-period, democracy is significantly and negatively related to extra-systemic war, for onsets as well as incidence of war. Not a single coefficient linking democracy to extra-systemic war is positive: most of these coefficients are insignificant. During the imperialist period (1870–1945) democracy appears to have no relationship to extra-systemic war, whether we look at incidence or onsets. The negative relationship between democracy and extra-systemic war for the most recent sub-period is so strong that (unlike what was the case for the bivariate analysis) it swamps the other periods and produces a negative relationship for the entire period also.

Table IV: Relative Effects for the Incidence of Extra-systemic War, Logistic Regression

	Whole period	1816–69	1870–1945	1945–92
Democracy (many-valued)	-0.13**	-0.08	-0.01	-0.14**
Civil war	0.14**	0.02	0.23**	0.04(*)
Interstate war	-0.02	-0.06	-0.00	0.01
Disputes	0.10**	0.08	0.05	0.05*
Major power	0.18**	0.20	0.42**	0.16
Alliances	-0.13(*)	-0.17(*)	-0.16*	-0.02
Major power*alliances	-0.27	0.13*	-0.40	-0.16*
Number of colonies	2.73**	4.03**	0.73**	38.88**
Distance	0.11*	0.00	0.35**	0.03
Advanced economy				-0.07
War the year before	11.54**	7.27**	7.16**	33.25**

** significant at the 0.01 level, * at the 0.05 level, (*) at the 0.1 level.

Relative effect = (effect/mean probability of the sample).

Among the control variables, we once again find strong results for the number of colonies, and for major powers (except in the first sub-period). We also find some relationship between extra-systemic war and civil war, but not with interstate wars or disputes. Our distance measure is very clearly related to extra-systemic war in the imperialist period, once again with a positive sign. In the analysis of the incidence of extra-systemic war, the variable ‘War the year before’ has a highly significant positive influence.

Table V: Relative Effects for the Onset of Extra-systemic War, Logistic Regression

	1816–69	Whole period	1870–1945	1945–92
Democracy	-0.31*	-0.16**	-0.01	-0.67**
Civil war	-0.01	0.08	0.09*	0.07
Interstate war	-0.02	0.04	0.01	0.07
Disputes	0.19(*)	0.16**	0.05*	0.28*
Major power	0.32	0.35**	0.27**	0.70**
Alliances	-0.28	-0.23**	-0.13	-0.07
Major power*alliances	1.06	0.73	-0.13	-133.33**
Number of colonies	9.83**	9.38**	0.38**	166**
Distance	-0.34	0.45**	0.08**	0.12
Advanced economy				-0.17

**=significant at the 0.01 level, *=significant at the 0.05 level, (*)=significant at the 0.1 level.

The Democracy Variable

The Whole Period

Democracy has a large and highly significant negative effect on the incidence as well as the onset of extra-systemic war. For incidence, a change from autocracy to democracy decreases the war proneness of that country to approximately one-third. For onsets, the reduction is one-sixth.

The Colonial Era

Democracy has no significance for the incidence of extra-systemic war in the first sub-period, but a large and highly significant negative effect on the onset of war.

The Imperialism Era

The democracy variable is not significant either for the incidence or the onset of war.

The De-colonization Era

Democracy has a large effect and is highly significant both for the incidence and the onset of extra-systemic war.

Incidence and Onset of War

While the conceptual difference between incidence and onset of war may be important, the differences between the two sets of results are not striking, and we cannot discern

any particular pattern to them. What is most important from our point of view, is that the results for the democracy variable are quite similar. This strengthens our confidence in the finding that democracy has exercised a negative influence on extra-systemic war in the post-World War II period, and that it did not seem to have any significant restraining influence in the imperialist period.

Imperial and Colonial War

We have made some additional tests using the colonial war data alone and for several different measures of democracy (dichotomous and many-valued democracy, executive constraints, stable democracy). The results are not markedly different. For some measures of democracy in the early period, colonial war has a significant negative relationship to democracy, but for the middle period none of them are significant. For the late period, both the dichotomous and the many-valued democracy measure are clearly and significantly negatively related to colonial war.

Conclusions

While realist variables such as the major power status and the number of colonies swamped the influence of regime type during the first 130 years covered by this study, it appears that the presence of democracy emerges as a significant force in the post-World War II period. It is tempting to associate this with the increasing international recognition of universal standards of human rights in this period. While racism certainly continues to exist, official racism has declined. In the post-World War II period only a single state, South Africa, openly subscribed to a racist ideology, while as late as the 1930s the superiority of 'the white race' was more or less taken for granted in wide circles in the West. The formation in 1945 of a truly global international organization, the United Nations, the adoption in 1948 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the emerging principle of self-determination for colonial peoples formalized by the UN in its 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples - all testify to this major change in the global normative structure. By 1970, the UN labelled colonialism 'a crime'.

A basic assumption for democracy – and thus for the democratic peace – is that all human beings are considered to be equal. This was not the case for the inhabitants of the colonies. When the expansion began, religious conversion was a part of the goal. This suggests that indigenous peoples of the colonies were regarded as at least potential equals. But, as the economic goal became more important, the indigenous populations were treated more harshly and with less respect. The Social Darwinism of the late 19th century became a moral justification for exploitation and inequality.

The post-World War II change in norms has several earlier origins. Adherents of natural law, echoing Thomas Aquinas, argued that even non-Christians had rights under international law. Slavery was largely abolished in the first half of the 19th century. The means that the British used to fight the Boer war (1899-1902) proved so repugnant to public opinion at home and abroad that it contributed to South African independence in 1910. After World War I, the League of Nations' defined three levels of mandate, depending on how quickly the colonial peoples were expected to be able to 'stand by themselves'.¹³ During World War II, the Atlantic Charter called for self-determination, although the British initially claimed that it applied only to the states under the control of Nazi Germany.

World War II was in some ways a war against an extreme version of the racist mentality – directed mainly against Jews, gypsies, and Slavonic peoples. The universal norms adopted by the victors provided a visible sign that norms of fundamental inequality were no longer thought of as just. Crawford (1993: 53) refers to 'a long-term trend toward the humanization of the other'. Similarly, Russett (1993: 34-35) refers to a period of colonial expansion where the ethnocentric views of the European colonizers automatically assumed that the people who were colonized did not have democratic institutions. Later, decolonization occurred when the colonial government lost confidence in its own normative right to rule. This change seems to be reflected in the findings in this paper.

¹³ For more detail, see Crawford (1993), which we draw on in this section.

Appendix 1: System Members that Have Fought Extra-systemic Wars

	Colonial war	Imperial war	Total
Great Britain	25	17	42
France	13	12	25
Turkey/Ottoman empire	12	3	15
Russia	5	7	12
Spain	7	1	8
China	4	2	6
Netherlands	4	1	5
Austria-Hungary	3		3
Argentina	2	1	3
Germany	2	1	3
Italy	1	2	3
Portugal	3		3
Ethiopia		3	3
Cuba		2	2
India		2	2
Iraq		2	2
Mexico	1		1
USA	1		1
Philippines	1		1
Peru		1	1
Egypt		1	1
Yugoslavia		1	1
Belgium		1	1
Somalia		1	1
Iran		1	1
Indonesia		1	1
Morocco		1	1
Mauritania		1	1
Number of wars	84	65	149

Source: Singer & Small (1994).

References

- Aschehoug og Gyldendals leksikon* (1982) Oslo: Kunnskapsforlaget.
- Benoit, Kenneth (1996) Democracies Really are More Pacific (In General), *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 40(4): 636–657.
- Betts, Raymond F. (1968) *Europe Overseas: Phases of Imperialism*. London: Basic Books.
- Boehmer, Elleke (1995) *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bremer, Stuart (1992) Dangerous Dyads: Conditions Affecting the Likelihood of Inter State War, 1816–1965, *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 36(4): 309–341.
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce; James D. Morrow, Randolph M. Siverson & Alasdair Smith (1999) An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace, *American Political Science Review* 93(4): 791–804.
- Carment, David (1993) The International Dimensions of Ethnic Conflict: Concepts, Indicators and Theory, *Journal of Peace Research* 30(2): 137–150.
- Chan, Steve (1984) Mirror, Mirror, On The Wall: Are the Freer Countries More Pacific?, *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 28(4): 617–648.
- Chan, Steve (1997) In Search of Democratic Peace: Problems and Promise, *Mershon International Studies Review* 41(1): 59–91.
- Crawford, Neeta C., 1993. 'Decolonization as an International Norm: The Evolution of Practices, Arguments, and Beliefs', in Laura R. Reed & Carl Kaysen, eds, *Emerging Norms of Justified Intervention*. Cambridge, MA: Committee of International Security Studies, American Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- Diehl, Paul F. (1991) Geography and War: A Review and Assessment of Empirical Literature, *International Interactions* 17(1): 11–27.
- Diercke Weltatlas* (1992) Braunschweig: Westermann.
- Dixon, William J (1993) Democracy and the Management of International Conflict., *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37(1): 42–68.
- Dixon, William J (1994) Democracy and the Peaceful Settlement of International Conflict, *American Political Science Review* 88(1): 14–32.
- Doyle, Michael W (1986) Liberalism and World Politics, *American Political Science Review* 80(4): 1151–1169.
- Ember, Carol; Melvin Ember & Bruce M. Russett (1993) The Democratic Peace in Nonindustrial Societies, in Bruce Russett et al.: *Grasping the Democratic Peace*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (99–119).
- Farber, Henry S. & Joanne Gowa (1995) Politics and Peace, *International Security* 20(2): 123–146.
- Ferro, Marc (1997) *Colonization: A Global History*. London: Routledge.
- Fieldhouse, David K. (1989) *The Colonial Empires*. London: Macmillan.
- Forsythe, David P. (1992) Democracy, War and Covert Action, *Journal of Peace Research* 29(4): 385–395.
- Galtung, Johan (1996) *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development, and Civilization*. London: SAGE, for PRIO.
- Gleditsch, Kristian S. & Michael D. Ward (1998) Double Take: a Re-examination of Democracy and Autocracy in Modern Politics, *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41(3): 361–383
- Gleditsch, Kristian S. & Michael D. Ward (1999) A Revised List of Independent States since the Congress of Vienna, *International Interactions* 25(4): 393–413.
- Gleditsch, Nils Petter (1988) *Norge i verdenssamfunnet: En statistisk håndbok*. [Norway in the World Community: A Statistical Handbook]. Oslo: Pax.
- Gleditsch, Nils Petter (1995) Geography, Democracy and Peace, *International Interactions* 20(4): 297–323.
- Gleditsch, Nils Petter & Håvard Hegre (1997) Peace and Democracy: Three levels of analysis. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 41(2): 283–310.

- Gleditsch, Nils Petter & Håvard Hegre (1998) Hazardous States and Safe Neighborhoods: The Democratic Peace at the Nation-State Level, paper presented at 39th Annual Conference of the International Studies Association conference in Minneapolis, MN, 18–21 February.
- Gowa, Joanne (1999) *Ballots and Bullets – The Elusive Democratic Peace*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Haas, Michael (1995) When Democracies Fight One Another, Just What is the Punishment for Disobeying the Law?, paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association conference, Chicago, IL, August.
- Hegre, Håvard Tanja Ellingsen, Scott Gates & Nils Petter Gleditsch (1999) 'Towards a Democratic Civil Peace: Democracy, Democratization, and Civil War 1834–1992', paper presented at the Launch Conference for the World Bank project on 'Civil War, Crime, and Violence in the Third World', 22–23 February 1999, available on www.worldbank.org/research/conflict/papers/peace.htm.
- Hermann, Margaret G. & Charles W. Kegley (1998) The U.S. Use of Military Intervention to Promote Democracy: Evaluating the Record, *International Interactions* 24(2): 91–114.
- Jagers, Keith & Ted Gurr (1995) Transitions to Democracy: Tracking the Third Wave with Polity III Indicators of Democracy and Autocracy, *Journal of Peace Research* 32(4): 469–482.
- Lenin, Vladimir I. (1916) *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*.
- Loomba, Ania (1998) *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Mansfield, Edward D. & Jack Snyder (1995) Democratization and the Danger of War, *International Security* 20(1): 5–38.
- Maoz, Zeev & Bruce Russett (1993) Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946–86, *American Political Science Review* 87(3): 623–638.
- McLaughlin, Sara et al. (1998) Timing the Changes in Political Structures: A New Polity Database, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 42(2): 231–242.
- Oneal, John R. & Bruce M. Russett (1999) Assessing the Liberal Peace with Alternative Specifications: Trade Still Reduces Conflict, *Journal of Peace Research* 36(4): 423–442.
- Palmer, R R. & Joel Colton (1971) *A History of the Modern World*. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Peceny, Mark (1997) A Constructivist Interpretation of the Liberal Peace: The Ambiguous Case of the Spanish-American War, *Journal of Peace Research* 34(4): 415–430.
- Raknerud, Arvid & Håvard Hegre (1995) The Hazard of War: Reassessing the Evidence for the Democratic Peace, *Journal of Peace Research* 34(4): 385–404.
- Ravlo, Hilde (1999) Does Democracy Matter In Preventing Extra-systemic War? Thesis for the Cand. Polit. Degree in Political Science, Department of Sociology and Political Science, Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Ray, James Lee (1995) *Democracy and International Conflict*. Columbus, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Raymond, Gregory A. (1994) Democracies, Disputes, and Third Party Intermediaries, *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 22(1): 1–20.
- Rummel, Rudolph R. (1995) Democracies ARE Less Warlike Than Other Regimes, *European Journal of International Relations*. 1(4): 457–479.
- Russett, Bruce M., ed. (1993) *Grasping the Democratic Peace*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Russett, Bruce M. & William Antholis (1992) Do Democracies Fight Each Other? Evidence from the Peloponnesian War, *Journal of Peace Research* 29(4): 415–435.
- Schjølset, Anita (1996) Are Some Democracies More Peaceful Than Others?, paper presented at the 37th Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, San Diego, CA, 16–20 April.
- Singer, J. David & Melvin Small (1969) 'Formal Alliances: An Extension of the Basic Data', *Journal of Peace Research* 6(3): 257–282.

- Singer, J. David & Melvin Small (1993) *Correlates of War Project: National Material Capabilities Data 1816–1985*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.
- Singer, J. David & Melvin Small (1994) *Correlates of War Project: International and Civil War Data, 1816–1992 Data File*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR 9905)
- Small, Melvin & J. David Singer (1982) *Resort to Arms: International and Civil Wars, 1816–1980*. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.
- Snyder, Jack (1991) *Myths of Empire: Domestic Politics and International Ambition*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Times Concise Atlas of World History* (1992) London: Times Books.
- Vanhanen, Tatu (2000) A New Dataset for Measuring Democracy, 1810–1998, *Journal of Peace Research* 37(2): 251–265.
- Vasquez, John (1995) Why Do Neighbors Fight? Proximity, Interaction, or Territoriality?, *Journal of Peace Research* 32(2): 277–293.
- Walt, Stephen (1985) Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power, *International Security* 9(1): 42–43.
- Waltz, Kenneth (1962) Kant, Liberalism, and War, *American Political Science Review* 56 (2): 331–340.
- Ward, Michael D. & Kristian S. Gleditsch (1998) Democratizing for Peace, *American Political Science Review* 41(3): 51–61.
- Woodruff, William (1989) *A Concise History of the Modern World*. London: Macmillan.

The Database

- The original data table made from the Manuscript
 - Designed to preserve information
 - Footnotes and sources are missing, but can be found in the PDF-converted manuscript
- The index
 - Our calculation of the index, based on the data table.
 - The function is still not implemented in the database, but is an independent algorithm.
- Vanhanen Country Table

The Database (cont.)

COW Country Table

- For connecting to COW datasets.
- Version information
 - Information on the updates and changes we have done on the different versions

The web page

- <http://www.svt.ntnu.no/iss/data/vanhanen>
- The latest version of the database in Access 2000 and 97 formats.
- The latest version of the Index of Democratization in different formats
 - Stata, SPSS, Excel, CSV
- Previous versions available in the archive
- The original manuscript available in PDF

Using the dataset

			Vanhanen				
		-9	0	1	2	Total	
	-9	13766	32501	47209	19242	112718	
COW	0	12376	146977	19461	928	179742	
	1	3440	23837	153829	13227	194333	
	2	582	1287	12316	48396	62581	
	Total	30164	204602	232815	81793	549374	

Gamma = 0,55 with missing

Gamma = 0,95 without missing

Table 1, Polity III

TABLE 1						
<i>Type of relationship</i>	Two Democracies	One Democracy	No Democracies	Missing	All dyad years	Number of dyad years
At war with each other	0,05	0,19	0,14	0,24	0,17	916
Allied in war	0,51	0,20	0,13	0,31	0,23	1289
Other	99,44	99,61	99,73	99,55	99,60	547169
Total	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	
Number of dyad years	62 518	194 333	179 742	112 718		549 374

Table 2, Polity III

TABLE 2			
<i>Country 1</i>	<i>Country 2</i>	<i>Years</i>	<i>Anomalous Dyad Years</i>
Spain	United States	1898	1
Lithuania	Poland	1919-1920	2
Finland	Australia, Canada	1941-1994	24
	New Zealand		
	South Africa		
	United Kingdom		
	United States		
India	Pakistan	1965	1
India	Pakistan	1971	1
Cyprus	Turkey	1974	1
Total			30

Table 3, Polity III

TABLE 3							
	Two	One	No			Number of	
<i>Type of relationship</i>	Democracies	Democracy	Democracies	Missing	Total	Conflict	All
						Dyad Years	Dyad years
Interstate War	0,05	0,19	0,14	0,24	0,17	916	549 374
Armed Conflict	0,01	0,07	0,09	0,01	0,04	36	91 666
Militarized dispute	0,33	0,92	0,80	0,51	0,73	4 013	549 374

Table 1, Vanhanen

TABLE 1						
<i>Type of relationship</i>	Two Democracies	One Democracy	No Democracies	Missing	All dyad years	Number of dyad years
At war with each other	0,04	0,18	0,19	0,30	0,17	916
Allied in war	0,45	0,15	0,21	0,42	0,23	1289
Other	99,51	99,67	99,60	99,28	99,60	547169
Total	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	
Number of dyad years	81 793	232 815	204 602	30 164		549 374

Table 2, Vanhanen

TABLE 2			
<i>Country 1</i>	<i>Country 2</i>	<i>Years</i>	<i>Anomalous Dyad Years</i>
Lithuania	Poland	1920	1
France	Australia, Canada	1940	5
	New Zealand		
	United Kingdom		
	Norway		
Finland	Australia, Canada	1941-1944	20
	New Zealand		
	United Kingdom		
	United States		
Hungary	Australia, Canada	1945	7
	France, Brazil		
	New Zealand		
	United Kingdom		
	United States		
Cyprus	Turkey	1974	1
Total			34

Table 3, Vanhanen

TABLE 3							
	Two	One	No	Missing	Total	Number of Conflict	All
<i>Type of relationship</i>	Democracies	Democracy	Democracies			Dyad Years	Dyad years
Interstate War	0,04	0,18	0,19	0,30	0,17	916	549 374
Armed Conflict	0,01	0,04	0,08	0,00	0,04	36	91 666
Militarized dispute	0,30	0,74	0,91	0,62	0,73	4 013	549 374

Comparing

TABLE 4					
	Two	One	No		All dyad
<i>Type of relationship</i>	Democracies	Democracy	Democracies	Missing	years
Polity III	0,05	0,19	0,14	0,24	0,17
Complete Vanhanen	0,04	0,18	0,19	0,30	0,17
Competition, Vanhanen	0,09	0,18	0,28	0,30	0,17
Partisipation, Vanhanen	0,10	0,18	0,15	0,30	0,17

Comparing

TABLE 4				
<i>Logistic bivariate regression with Waronset as the dependent variable</i>				
<i>Independent variable</i>	Odds Ratio	Standard Error	z	sig
Polity III	0,773	0,075	-2,650	0,000
Complete Vanhanen	0,562	0,053	-6,098	0,000
Competition, Vanhanen	0,776	0,067	-2,950	0,000
Partisipation, Vanhanen	0,470	0,038	-9,352	0,000
TABLE 4				
<i>Logistic regression with Waronset as the dependent variable</i>				
<i>Independent variables</i>	Odds Ratio	Standard Error	z	sig
Competition, Vanhanen	1,296	0,135	2,495	0,013
Partisipation, Vanhanen	0,412	0,038	-9,147	0,000
Correlation between competition and Partisipation is 0.71				