



The Dog That Won't Wag: Presidential Uses of Force and the Diversionary Theory of War

Strategic Insights, Volume III, Issue 5 (May 2004)

by William D. Baker

Strategic Insights is a monthly electronic journal produced by the Center for Contemporary Conflict at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California. The views expressed here are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of NPS, the Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

For a PDF version of this article, click [here](#).

On Monday, March 17, 2003, President George W. Bush addressed the nation to announce that a U.S. attack on Iraq was imminent. The following week, as American troops raced toward Baghdad and the eventual toppling of Saddam Hussein's regime, the results of a Gallup Poll conducted on March 22 and 23 indicated that Bush's job approval had increased from 58 percent in the days prior to his address to 71 percent following the invasion. Over the months that followed, as U.S. occupation forces struggled to put down a violent anti-American insurgency, Bush's job approval numbers bottomed out at 50 percent in mid-November, only to surge back to 63 percent following the capture of Saddam Hussein in mid-December. Today, with the 2004 general election approaching, the economic recover anemic, and President Bush's job approval numbers hovering once again around the 50 percent level, speculation is widespread as to whether a major military offensive along the Afghan-Pakistan border might capture al Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden in time to boost the president's approval ratings and cement the president's reelection.

In the 1998 film *Wag the Dog*, a fictional president manufactures a military conflict with a minor foreign country as a means of diverting public attention from a sex scandal. While it is unlikely that the attack on Iraq and the capture of Saddam Hussein were designed to bolster the president's popularity or to divert attention from a lackluster economic recovery, the prospect nevertheless is not beyond the realm of possibilities. While the notion that a president might provoke a crisis solely for political gain suggests a disturbingly cynical political calculus, the assumption that he might do so appears to be fairly widespread among the American electorate if films such as *Wag the Dog* are any indication. If such is the case however, it is reasonable to assume that there is evidence for this phenomenon beyond the anecdotal.

Few aspects of political behavior and interaction have elicited as much attention and study as has war, and the conditions surrounding presidential exercises of this authority have engendered considerable debate as well. While concern over the nature and scope of the presidential war power is as old as the republic itself—"[t]he constitution supposes, what the History of all Govts demonstrates, that the Ex. is the branch of power most interested in war, & most prone to it," James Madison wrote Thomas Jefferson in April 1798^[1]—it is only in recent decades that quantitative and analytical assessments of the circumstances surrounding presidential uses of force have been attempted. For the most part, these studies have fallen into two general categories: those addressing the circumstances surrounding and perhaps contributing to such decisions, and those focusing on the political and electoral ramifications of such decisions on the president and his party.

Public approval has become the coin of the realm for the modern presidency—presidents with broad support are more successful in pushing their legislation through Congress, in avoiding having their vetoes overridden, and in securing reelection for both themselves and members of their party. Anecdotal and some empirical evidence suggests that one of the most effective and simplest means of bolstering one's public approval is through uses of force, which are routinely accorded considerable television coverage and serve to spotlight the president's diplomatic and military expertise, not to mention his resoluteness as a leader. Given the disparities between past and more recent research into the "Rally 'Round the Flag" effect, as well as the serious ethical and political considerations raised by the issue, further research into the phenomenon is warranted.

Why is it that some presidential uses of force seem to boost the popularity of the chief executive, while others seem to go unnoticed by the electorate? Are presidents prone to making such decisions as a means toward diverting public attention from poor economic conditions, bolstering their public approval ratings, or influencing impending elections? In order to refine present theory and understanding of the diversionary theory of war and presidential uses of force, this research will reexamine the rally effect, employing a data set never before incorporated into past research on the phenomenon—the Correlates of War Project's Militarized Interstate Disputes data set, encompassing all militarized interstate disputes occurring between 1814 and 1992—and extending the analysis to include ten presidential administrations, the Roosevelt through the Bush presidencies.

Presidential Approval

The importance of public approval and support to presidential success is well documented. Both Abramson, Aldrich, and Rohde [2] and Fiorina [3] note that voting behavior in presidential and congressional elections is influenced by the popularity of the White House incumbent, while Marra and Ostrom [4] demonstrate that the president's public approval ratings play a role in the distribution of congressional seats. Presidential popularity has also been linked to presidential success in congressional roll call votes,[5] the success of presidential policy initiatives,[6] and congressional reactions to presidential vetoes.[7]

Popular presidents have more leverage in persuading other political actors to adopt administration priorities and policies as their own [8] and are more likely to present bold and ambitious legislative packages to Congress.[9] Although not binding, Crespi has observed that "[p]residential approval ratings have created a pseudo-parliamentary situation, whereby the president faces a monthly vote of confidence from the total electorate...this vote of confidence is accepted by both politicians and political analysts as an indicator of the president's political clout and, therefore, of his ability to govern effectively." [10] Quite simply, presidents enjoying substantial popularity and public support have more options and resources available to them and fewer concerns about congressional resistance to their policies, while unpopular presidents may be more vulnerable to congressional recalcitrance and investigations.

Presidential popularity is not a constant, however, and every president in the era of modern public opinion polling has seen his approval ratings wax and wane, sometimes considerably, for reasons that are often unclear. Marra, Ostrom, and Simon[11] note that there are three basic, though not mutually exclusive, schools of thought as to the dynamics that influence presidential popularity. One school of thought begins with the observation that, for most incumbents, public approval "moves ineluctably downward from the first day in office." [12] Advocates of this perspective [13] maintain that presidential approval is characterized by a gradual and steady erosion over the course of a presidential term, and that while events and developments may temporarily delay or even reverse this decline over the short-term, it cannot be forestalled indefinitely.

A second school of thought emphasizes the domestic and international contexts in which the president operates and to which presidential popularity responds. According to this approach, residents are continually assessed based on their abilities to satisfy the expectations and desires of the electorate. Public approval has been shown to rise and fall in response to such stimuli as the rates of unemployment and inflation, levels of international tension, battle deaths during periods of war, and the success of the president's legislative agenda.^[14]

The third school of thought accepts this relationship between public approval and environmental stimuli, but emphasizes instead the symbolic nature of the presidency and the potential for ameliorating the negative impact of events in the domestic and international arenas through political drama and effective public relations strategies. Faced with the inevitable loss of such an important political asset, presidents might be expected to do whatever is in their power in attempting to minimize or even reverse this seemingly inexorable decline in public approval.^[15] Kernell^[16] and Brace and Hinckley^[17] even posit the development of a "public relations presidency" in the postwar era in which incumbents strategically or reactively "act in deliberate ways to achieve heightened popularity in the polls and in elections."^[18] Activities such as televised addresses, foreign and domestic travel, press conferences, and Rose Garden signings are all designed to present a coherent message or theme to the electorate, all with an eye toward maximizing and maintaining public approval.

Diversionsary Theory of War

While the realist school of international relations holds that virtually all international behavior can be explained through such exogenous factors as the prevailing level of international tension and strategic balance, the diversionsary theory of war posits that such internal domestic factors as presidential approval, election cycles, and the state of the economy may affect decisions to employ force as well. ^[19]The popular presumption that presidents will turn to military adventurism to divert attention from dismal economic conditions, faltering popularity ratings or pending electoral misfortune is well represented both historically and in the mainstream media, and owes much to the in-group/out-group hypotheses found in the sociological literature.^[20] Domestic considerations in both London and Buenos Aires undoubtedly played a role in the escalation of the Falklands War in 1982,^[21] and when the New York Times reported in August 1992 that the Bush Administration was considering military action against Iraq in order to bolster the President's reelection chances—a charge angrily denied by the White House—the presumption that a President might take the nation into battle to secure his own political objectives appeared to be widespread. Attempts at corroborating this conventional wisdom initially met with mixed results however, and early research found little or no relationship between domestic political or economic conditions and instances of foreign conflict.^[22]

Later research however has found evidence to suggest that domestic politics does play some role in the foreign policy decisions of national leaders. In recent decades, statistical evidence has suggested that presidential uses of force may indeed redound to the benefit of the chief executive's public approval ratings.^[23] Such benefits may prove transitory, however. Although the Reagan and Eisenhower administrations enjoyed significant short-term boosts in public support following popular military operations, Presidents Truman and Johnson both saw their public approval ratings plummet over the long term as a result of long and unpopular wars. George Bush, in perhaps the most telling example of the fickle nature of presidential approval in recent years, was denied reelection and turned out of office just eighteen months after registering the highest public approval ratings ever measured for an American president following the stunning victory by the United States over Iraq in the 1991 Gulf War. Clearly, the decision to use force may backfire if the electorate perceives that the commander-in-chief is exercising his constitutional authority for political gain.

On the other hand, scholars such as Arthur Stein have suggested that wars may in fact have a disintegrative effect on national cohesion, as families lose friends and relatives in combat, consumer goods become scarce, and national resources are redirected toward the war effort.^[24] More recent research, however, has cast doubt on the efficacy of this "Rally 'Round the Flag" effect in explaining variations in presidential popularity.^[25] Clearly, the relationship between presidential uses of force and presidential popularity is obviously more complex than conventional wisdom would have us believe.

Subsequent research has suggested that presidents may be more likely to consider military force when economic conditions are poor. James,^[26] Russett,^[27] Russett and Barzilai,^[28] James and Oneal,^[29] and Brace and Hinckley^[30] corroborate Ostrom and Job's findings^[31] that deteriorating economic conditions positively affect the likelihood that a chief executive will decide to employ military force in a crisis. Because economic conditions are so much more difficult to manipulate in the short term, presidents may find the use of military force abroad a more effective option for increasing their popularity. Mintz contends that the Bush Administration's decision to abandon economic sanctions in favor of military force in order to eject Iraq from Kuwait was due in part to worsening economic conditions in the United States in the fall of 1990,^[32] while Wang found that higher expected values for war and greater costs for backing down during war were associated with domestic considerations—poor economic conditions, the proximity of presidential elections, the number of seats held by the president's party in Congress—and with more violent responses to crises on the part of the United States.^[33] On the other hand, Meernik, in focusing on 458 presidential opportunities to use force between 1948 and 1988, found that levels of U.S. military aid and prior U.S. uses of force had a greater impact on presidential decision-making than did such domestic variables as popular approval or economic conditions.^[34]

Conventional wisdom also contends that political leaders should be more favorably disposed toward foreign conflict in order to elicit a rally and bolster their public approval when their personal popularity is low. Ostrom and Job^[35] and James and Oneal,^[36] however, find that presidential uses of force are in fact more likely when public approval is high, suggesting that relatively high levels of popular support are a prerequisite for the use of military force abroad. Similarly, Morgan and Bickers reviewed aggressive foreign policy actions on the part of the United States from 1953 through 1976, and found that the White House is more prone toward such behavior when the president is faced with a loss of support among his core partisans rather than from among the electorate as a whole, and that lower approval ratings from within the president's own party were found to have an impact on the U.S. initiation of militarized disputes.^[37] This finding is somewhat at odds with those of Lian and Oneal^[38], although the latter employed a somewhat different variable—U.S. uses of force—as their dependent variable.

Lindsay, Sayrs, and Steger maintain that presidential decisions to use force in a crisis are influenced less by public opinion than by the White House's relationship with Congress,^[39] while Brands argues that the U.S. interventions in Lebanon, Grenada, and the Dominican Republic were facilitated primarily by the lack of congressional opposition to such moves.^[40] Taken together, these findings suggest that, contrary to popular sentiment, political leaders do not routinely resort to force as a means toward bolstering their public approval ratings over the short-term.

While past research has suggested that public support for American presidents routinely increases in the short-term after uses of force,^[41] this support is often ephemeral and is likely to wane should the conflict become long-term.^[42] Might presidents time uses of force short of full-scale war to improve their own electoral prospects or those of their party? James and Oneal found that decisions to resort to military force are more common during the third quarters of presidential election years,^[43] a finding corroborated by Russett, suggesting that chief executives might be trying to instigate rallies in order to further their own political and electoral interests.^[44] Stoll, on the other hand, finds that presidents are actually less likely to resort to military force during election years, although uses of force are more likely to occur when the

United States is involved in an ongoing war,[45] while Gaubatz finds that democratic states in general are more likely to become involved in foreign conflicts earlier rather than later in their election cycles.[46] DeRouen finds that while the state of the economy plays no direct role in presidential decisions to use force, there is a significant relationship between presidential popularity and the state of the economy, a nonrecursive relationship between popularity and the use of force, and therefore an indirect linkage between the economy, presidential approval and uses of force.[47]

These findings present us with some troubling ethical questions. Ostrom and Job note that "as the leader of one of the world's great powers, the President of the United States is charged with the responsibility of guiding and implementing policies to protect and advance U.S. interests abroad." [48] However, their findings and those of others suggest that presidents from Roosevelt through Bush, when acting as commander-in-chief, have been more influenced by partisan politics than by the nation's strategic interests. If our leaders are truly motivated to use force not for national defense or strategic considerations but primarily in the hope of partisan gain, then the moral shortcomings of Watergate, Iran-Contra, and Whitewater must pale in comparison.

However, if presidents do in fact employ America's armed forces in attempts at arresting declining popularity or influencing elections, a program of education for U.S. leaders is sorely needed, because recent research indicates that the rally effect is neither certain nor strong. Offsetting this small expected benefit is the danger that the use of force for limited, political purposes might lead to an extended war, a result which has typically had a strong and uniformly adverse effect on presidential popularity.[49] Furthermore, the potential benefit to be accrued from such a political use of force is only about half that of a prime time televised foreign policy speech.[50]

Statistical Analysis

In order to determine whether presidents in fact pursue militarized interstate disputes as a means toward diverting public attention from poor economic conditions, influencing the electoral process, or bolstering presidential popularity, this paper will consider whether certain factors—prior presidential popularity, the proximity of elections, economic indicators—make presidential uses of force more likely. Data were compiled on militarized interstate disputes to which the United States was a party, presidential approval prior to the initiation of the use of force, public perceptions of business conditions, personal finances, consumer confidence and expectations, and the proximity of elections.

Militarized Interstate Disputes

Perhaps the most comprehensive data sets on international conflict is the Militarized Interstate Dispute (MIDs) data set, a revised version of Gochman and Maoz's original data collection[51] compiled by the Correlates of War (COW) Project. The MIDs data encompasses the years 1816-1992 and provides detailed information on the more than two thousand militarized disputes in which one or more states threatened, displayed, or used force against one or more other states over the course of this time period; of these disputes, 308 involved the United States.


The COW project defines a "militarized interstate dispute" as "a set of interactions between or among states involving threats to use military force, displays of military force or actual uses of military force. To be included, these acts must be explicit, nonaccidental, and government sanctioned." [52] Given these criteria, relevant cases must involve national political entities that are participants in the interstate system—disputes with terrorist groups, separatist movements, or other nonstate actors are therefore not included.

Although the MIDs data set includes 308 militarized interstate disputes involving the United States dating back to 1816, modern public opinion polling on presidential approval did not begin

until the middle of the 1930s, and even then polls were conducted only sporadically. This research will therefore focus only on the 193 militarized interstate disputes in which the United States was involved between 1933 and 1992, encompassing the Franklin Roosevelt through the George Bush administrations.

Figure 1 indicates that instances of militarized interstate disputes involving the United States are not distributed uniformly throughout the period being studied. Most notably, militarized disputes prior to 1948 appear to be significantly rarer than those in the post-1948 period. A number of potential explanations might account for this phenomenon. The relatively sparse nature of pre-1948 incidents may be simply a coding artifact, perhaps indicating the difficulties involved in identifying militarized disputes through historical records and media sources decades after the fact. Given the improved communications technologies that we find later in the study period, it may be that relatively minor uses or displays of force that would have been covered in media accounts in the latter portions of the study period may have been overlooked in the media accounts of the 1930s. Similarly, media attention on the American activities in the Pacific and European theaters in World War II might have resulted in the omission of relatively minor incidents that would have been covered more thoroughly in more peaceful times.

Figure 1



Another potential explanation for the relative scarcity of U.S. militarized disputes prior to 1948 is that the United States may simply have had neither the inclination nor the opportunity to become involved in such disputes. Indeed, prior to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor that led to the U.S. entry into World War II, there were strong isolationist sentiments among both the general public and within Congress; such sentiments might have dissuaded U.S. policymakers from initiating displays or uses of force during this period for fear of provoking a negative reaction from Congress or from the population as a whole.


Alternately, U.S. policymakers might have been willing to engage in displays or uses of force, yet simply not had the opportunities to do so. In their description and discussion of the entire MID data set, Gochman and Maoz note that militarized disputes involving two or more members of the interstate system—not just those involving the United States—have not been evenly distributed

over the time period of 1816 through 1992. Their analyses of all interstate disputes do indicate a marked decrease in militarized interstate disputes in the interwar period, especially during the 1930s, followed by another marked decrease in the late 1940s and early 1950s.[53] Similarly, Gochman and Maoz note that "by far the most disputatious period in terms of the numbers of disputes begun and under way has been the nuclear era..."[54] Gochman and Maoz attribute this increase in part to the growth in the size of the interstate system, as former colonies in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East gained their independence in the 1950s and 1960s.

Given the fact that the relatively few U.S. militarized interstate disputes in the pre-1948 period mirror the generally lower dispute levels globally, it is reasonable to assume that this finding is not a data collection artifact and does in fact reflect the generally less disputatious international environment the United States faced in the interwar period. Concomitantly, as the United States emerged as a world superpower and engaged the Soviet Union in a Cold War in the post-World War II era, opportunities for militarized interstate disputes increased, and attitudes toward such conflicts among both U.S. elites and the general public likely changed.

Of the 308 militarized interstate disputes since 1814 in which the United States has been a participant, 193 occurred during the period under study, 1933-1992. Figure 2 reflects the distribution of MIDs by administration during the study period. As indicated, the Reagan and Eisenhower presidencies experienced more militarized interstate disputes, and hence more opportunities to enjoy rally effects, than did the other modern presidencies. This disparity is obviously due not only to the fact that Eisenhower and Reagan both served two full terms in the Oval Office, but also that their presidencies coincided with the relatively more disputatious environments of the 1950s and 1980s (refer to Figure 1 above).

Figure 2: Rally Events per Administration



Tables 1 and 2 provide descriptive information on the disputes themselves in which the United States was involved between 1933 and 1992. Table 1 is based on data included in the Militarized Interstate Disputes data set and reports the highest action reached by the participants in the disputes in which the United States was a participant. As indicated, displays of troops, ships, planes, or other mobilizations accounted for more than 27 percent of the highest actions in the disputes, while border violations and blockades accounted for more than twelve percent. Twenty-three percent of actions consisted of occupations of territory, seizures, clashes and raids. Declarations of war and interstate war account for just over three percent of U.S. responses over the study period.

Table 1: Highest Action in Dispute by Either Party

	N	Percent
No Militarized Action	0	0
Threat to Use Force	8	4.1
Threat to Blockade	0	0
Threat to Occupy Territory	0	0
Threat to Declare War	0	0
Threat to Use Nuclear Weapons	0	0
Show of Troops	9	4.7
Show of Ships	23	11.9
Show of Planes	18	9.3
Alert	7	3.6
Nuclear Alert	0	0

	N	Percent
Mobilization	2	1.0
Fortify Border	0	0
Border Violation	20	10.4
Blockade	4	2.1
Occupation of Territory	1	0.5
Seizure	10	5.2
Clash	13	6.7
Raid	20	10.4
Declaration of War	2	1.0
Use of CBR Weapons	0	0
Interstate War	4	2.1
Joins Interstate War	0	0
Missing Values	52	26.9
Total	193	100

Table 2: Hostility Level of Dispute

	N	Percent
No Militarized Action	0	0
Threat to Use Force	8	4.1
Display of Force	79	40.9
Use of Force	50	25.9
War	4	2.1
Missing Values	52	26.9
Total	193	100

Table 2 measures the hostility level to which the dispute escalated. The fourteen types of military action presented in Table 1 are clustered into three broad categories. Threat to use force entails threats to use force, to blockade, to occupy territory, or to declare war. Display of Force includes alerts, mobilizations, and shows of force. Use of Force refers to actual blockades, occupations of territory, seizures, clashes, declarations of war, war, or other uses of military force.^[55] This typology is consistent with the coding scheme for events data employed by Leng and Singer^[56] and by Stoll.^[57] During the period in question, disputes in which the United States was a participant escalated to an actual use of force in just one-quarter of the cases considered, while threats or displays of force accounted for almost fifty percent of the cases.

Presidential Approval

For the purposes of this study, presidential approval levels are based on the Gallup Organization's measurements of this phenomenon beginning in the Roosevelt administration and continuing through the conclusion of the first Bush administration in January 1993. Gallup includes the presidential approval data for the Roosevelt and Truman administrations,^[58] the figures for the Eisenhower through Reagan administrations are found in Edwards and Gallup,^[59] while the statistics for the Bush administration are compiled in Saad.^[60] However, the Gallup Organization's measurements of presidential popularity were sporadic during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. During the Roosevelt presidency, Gallup asked only four presidential approval questions in 1943 and none in 1944, perhaps out of concern that any evidence of public dissatisfaction with the chief executive might hinder the war effort; in fact, the poll of December 1943 is the last of the Roosevelt presidency. Furthermore, as late as the 1970s the presidential approval question was omitted from surveys in the months preceding presidential elections, perhaps to avoid influencing the electoral outcome.

In order to ensure that any rallies associated with presidential uses of force were not contaminated or influenced by other contemporaneous events, cases in which the relevant public approval ratings were measured more than six weeks prior to or following the interstate dispute were omitted. Reliable public approval figures are therefore available for only 167 of the 193 interstate disputes in which the United States was involved between 1933 and 1993. Nevertheless, this sample is still larger than those utilized in most previous research on the rally effect.

The presidential approval data indicate that, on average, commanders-in-chief have been neither unusually popular nor unpopular prior to becoming involved in foreign disputes. The mean public approval presidents have enjoyed prior to uses of force is 56.54 percent (Table 1), just slightly above the average popularity level of 55.75 percent for all Gallup presidential approval polls during the entire study period; t-tests indicated a t-value of 1.10 and a two-tailed significance level of 0.273, indicating that the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in these scores cannot be rejected. This indicates that there is likely no relationship between uses of force and prior presidential popularity. This simple test suggests that the popular wisdom that presidents are more likely to turn to foreign adventurism when their popularity is either unusually low or unusually high is in error.


On the other hand, as indicated, presidential popularity prior to militarized interstate disputes tends to increase as the hostility levels of the disputes in question escalate. On average, presidents have tended to enjoy public approval levels more than ten percentage points greater when entering into a war than they do when engaging in a display of force (Table 3). These findings are consistent with those of Ostrom and Job[61] and James and Oneal,[62] who found that presidential uses of force are more likely when public approval is high, suggesting that relatively high levels of popular support are a prerequisite for the more serious categories of militarized interstate disputes.

Table 3: Public Approval Prior to Use of Force

	N	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
Presidential Approval Prior to All Militarized Interstate Disputes	167	56.54	13.45	26	87
Presidential Approval Prior to Threat of Force	5	56.2	13.48	39	72
Presidential Approval Prior to Display of Force	38	53.63	12.94	32	78
Presidential Approval Prior to Use of Force	119	57.13	13.44	26	87
Presidential Approval Prior to War	5	64.4	15.95	37	76

As indicated in Figure 3, however, there are wide disparities among presidential administrations in public approval levels prior to rally events. Only the Truman and Carter presidencies appear to have become involved in militarized interstate disputes when their public approval levels were low, while Presidents Roosevelt, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Bush each tended to enjoy fairly robust popularity levels prior to uses of force. These findings cast doubt on the efficacy of the diversionary theory of war, at least insofar as presidential approval is concerned.

Figure 3: Average Presidential Approval Prior to Rally Event



Economic Conditions

The state of the economy has long been recognized as an important influence on presidential popularity.[63] The economic data in Table 4 are based on components of the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center's Index of Consumer Sentiment and the Conference Board's Consumer Confidence surveys. The Michigan data were sporadic through the late 1940s and early 1950s, but were reported quarterly by the 1960s and monthly by the late 1970s. The Conference Board's data, unfortunately, does not begin until 1969. Nevertheless, the variables employed, Michigan's consumer expectations of personal finances (PERFIEXP) and consumer expectations of business conditions over the next twelve months (BUSCON12), as well as the Conference Board's indices of consumer confidence (CCINDEX) and consumer expectations (EXPECTS), capture the attitudes of the public and are naturally influenced by public perceptions of unemployment and inflation.

Table 4: Consumer Confidence Levels Prior to Militarized Interstate Disputes

	N	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
Business Conditions - 12 Months	152	120.47	35.32	32	168
Personal Finances Expected	147	121.74	10.22	92	141
Consumer Confidence	94	87.00	18.90	43.2	138.20
Consumer Expectations	94	93.87	17.10	45.20	122.40

Summary statistics for the consumer confidence data prior to the militarized interstate disputes are found in Table 4. As might be expected, all of the consumer confidence variables are positively correlated with one another and these correlations are all significant at the 0.01 confidence level. For the purposes of this research, the most recent consumer sentiment survey data prior to the use of force are employed. Cases in which the most recent consumer sentiment survey is more than three months prior to the use of force in question are omitted.

The mean values for Business Conditions - 12 Months (120.42) and Personal Finances Expected (121.74) are somewhat higher than the average for the entire 1947-1987 period covered by the data (111.94 and 118.96, respectively), and these differences are significant. Comparing the means of the Business Conditions - 12 Months data resulted in a t-value of -3.20 and a 2-tailed significance level of 0.002, while a comparison of the means of the Personal Finances Expected data returned a t-value of -2.24 and a 2-tailed significance level of 0.027. The null hypothesis that

there is no significant difference in these scores may therefore be safely rejected in these instances.

The mean values for Consumer Confidence (87) and Consumer Expectations (93.87), however, are virtually identical to those for the entire 1969-1992 period covered by the Conference Board's data (90.77 and 94.41, respectively), and t-tests indicated that the differences were not statistically significant. While the findings for Consumer Confidence and Consumer Expectations would seem to counter the premise of the diversionary theory that presidents are more inclined to turn to military adventurism to divert public attention from the state of the economy, the findings for "Business Conditions" and "Personal Finances" suggest that presidents may, counterintuitively, be more likely to become involved in uses of force when consumer confidence and expectations are relatively high.

Electoral Calendar

As noted previously, there is a widespread assumption that presidents might resort to foreign military action as a means of influencing impending elections. While some research has suggested that presidents are indeed more likely to become involved in uses of force as elections approach,[64] others have failed to find such a relationship.[65] In order to assess the relationship between uses of force, presidential approval, and the electoral calendar, the variable NEXTELEC will represent the months remaining until the next presidential election.

As indicated in Table 5, the propensity for the president to lead the nation into a militarized dispute does not appear to be related to the electoral calendar. When all 193 MIDs cases are considered, the average amount of time until the next presidential election is just under two years. While there is a positive correlation between the use of force and a presidential election in the same quarter—excluding uses of force in December and the latter part of November following an election—the relationship is not statistically significant. This suggests once again that presidents do not seem to routinely schedule uses of force as a means of influencing impending elections.

Table 5: Hostility Level and Months until Election

Hostility Level	Mean	N	SD	Min	Max
All MIDs	23.31	193	13.16	0	47
Threats of Force	26.17	6	14.76	6	44
Displays of Force	25.52	40	11.12	1	41
Uses of Force	22.62	139	13.44	0	47
War	22.00	8	17.19	1	42

It may be that presidents who wish to influence impending elections through uses of force would only favor certain kinds of military action. Given the potentially disastrous effects a major military endeavor might have on a presidency, as evidenced by the Truman and Johnson experiences, a chief executive might be more inclined toward threats and displays of force rather than uses of force or war in the months preceding elections. However, as indicated in Table 5, there appear to be no appreciable differences among the different hostility levels in the amount of time until the next election. For each hostility level, the average amount of time until the next presidential election is about two years.

Conclusion

Conventional wisdom, sociological theory, and past research have often suggested that presidents may be inclined to seek out foreign military adventures in order to bolster sagging

public approval ratings, influence voting behavior prior to elections, or divert attention from lackluster economic conditions. Such theories have gained credence in recent decades through statistical and anecdotal evidence suggesting that such uses of force may raise the chief executive's public approval ratings, although the benefits appear most often to have been minor and transitory, in both real and political terms.

That a president may elicit a surge of patriotism and public approval for his administration and its policies through an international crisis is perhaps one of the most deeply held tenets in American politics, and for a number of years the anecdotal evidence that such a phenomenon in fact existed was supported by the prevailing empirical research.^[66] More recent studies, however, have cast doubt on the efficacy of the rally effect to accurately account for and explain what happens to public opinion and presidential popularity during militarized interstate disputes; while public support for the president during international crises does increase in many instances, this increase is often small, is by no means certain, and appears to be contingent on a number of contextual factors.^[67] Clearly the relationship between presidential uses of force and presidential popularity is more complex than conventional wisdom would have us believe.

The diversionary theory of war, the widely held belief that presidents will be predisposed toward uses of force in militarized interstate disputes as a means of boosting their own public approval ratings, diverting public attention from domestic political or economic troubles, or to influence impending elections, assumes, of course, that the rally effect is in fact real, or at least that presidents believe that it is. However, key elements of the diversionary theory of war have been brought into question as a result of this research. Despite popular presumptions to the contrary, presidents are in fact not more likely to become involved in crises when their popularity is low, and actually are more likely to enjoy higher than average public approval levels prior to becoming involved in militarized disputes. The economic data presented also suggest that presidents are not more inclined to seek out foreign military diversions when the consumer confidence in the health of the economy is low, but that in fact consumer confidence and expectations tend to be higher than average prior to a dispute. Similarly, the proximity of elections does not appear to be a factor in the onset of militarized interstate disputes either.

However, while these results do cast doubt on the proposition that presidents are inclined toward international adventurism as a means of bolstering their own political positions, it is possible that presidents in political difficulty are in fact simply more selective and discriminating in their choices as to what activities they choose to divert public attention. As indicated previously, Russett notes that a president may realize a greater boost to his public approval ratings through a nationally televised primetime speech without the long-term risks entailed should a limited military dispute escalate into war.^[68]

For more insights into contemporary international security issues, see our [*Strategic Insights*](#) home page.

To have new issues of *Strategic Insights* delivered to your Inbox at the beginning of each month, email ccc@nps.edu with subject line "Subscribe". There is no charge, and your address will be used for no other purpose.

About the Author

William D. Baker currently teaches American Studies, American Government, Comparative Politics, and other social science courses in the Department of Humanities at the Arkansas School for Mathematics, Sciences, and the Arts in Hot Springs, Arkansas. Baker's work has been published in the *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *Southeastern Political Review*, *Midsouth Political Science Review*, the *Encyclopedia of American Law*, the *Encyclopedia of Public Administration*

and Public Policy, the *Encyclopedia of the Supreme Court*, the *Encyclopedia of the Great Depression and New Deal*, and *Uniting States*. Baker received his Bachelor of Arts in Foreign Service and his Master of Arts in Political Science from Baylor University, and his Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Alabama.

References

1. Cited in *The Writings of James Madison*, Gaillard Hunt, ed. (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1900-1910).
2. P. R. Abramson, John H. Aldrich, and David W. Rohde, *Change and Continuity in the 1984 Elections* (Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1987).
3. Morris Fiorina, *Retrospective Voting in American National Elections* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981).
4. Robin F. Marra and Charles W. Ostrom, Jr., "Explaining seat change in the U.S. House of Representatives, 1950-86," *American Journal of Political Science* 27:165-92 (1989).
5. George C. Edwards, *Presidential Influence in Congress* (San Francisco, CA: Freeman, 1980).
6. D. Rivers and N. Rose, "Passing the President's Program," *American Journal of Political Science* 29: 183-96 (1985).
7. David W. Rohde and Dennis M. Simon, "Presidential Vetoes and Congressional Response," *American Journal of Political Science* 29: 397-427 (1985).
8. Richard E. Neustadt, *Presidential Power and the Modern Presidents* (New York: Macmillan, 1980).
9. P. Light, *The President's Agenda* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982).
10. I. Crespi, "The Case of Presidential Popularity," in *Polling on the Issues*, ed. A. H. Cantril (Cabin John, MD: Seven Locks Press, 1980).
11. Robin F. Marra, Charles W. Ostrom, Jr., and Dennis M. Simon, "Foreign Policy and Presidential Popularity: Creating Windows of Opportunity in the Perpetual Election," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 34:588-623 (1990).
12. Michael B. MacKuen, "Political Drama, Economic Conditions, and the Dynamics of Presidential Popularity," *American Journal of Political Science* 27: 165-192 (1983).
13. Thomas E. Cronin, *The State of the Presidency*, 2nd edition (Boston: Little, Brown, 1980); Michael B. MacKuen, "Political Drama, Economic Conditions, and the Dynamics of Presidential Popularity," *American Journal of Political Science* 27: 165-192 (1983); John E. Mueller, "Presidential Popularity from Truman to Johnson," *American Political Science Review* 64: 18-33 (1970); John E. Mueller, *War, Presidents, and Public Opinion* (New York: Wiley, 1973); James A. Stimson, "Public Support for American Presidents: A Cyclical Model," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 42: 1-21 (1976).
14. Samuel Kernell, "Explaining Presidential Popularity," *American Political Science Review* 72: 506-522 (1978); D. Hibbs, "On the Demand for Economic Outcomes," *Journal of Politics* 44: 426-62 (1982); Michael B. MacKuen, "Political Drama, Economic Conditions, and the Dynamics of Presidential Popularity," *American Journal of Political Science* 27: 165-192 (1983); Charles W. Ostrom and Dennis M. Simon, "Promise and Performance: A Dynamic Model of Presidential Popularity," *American Political Science Review* 79: 334-358 (1985).
15. Paul Brace and Barbara Hinckley, "Presidential Activities from Truman through Reagan: Timing and Impact," *Journal of Politics* 55: 382-398 (1993); Richard A. Brody and Benjamin I. Page, "The Impact of Events on Presidential Popularity: The Johnson and Nixon Administrations," in *Perspectives on the Presidency*, ed. Wildavsky, Aaron (Boston: Little, Brown, 1975); T. R. Haight and Richard A. Brody, "The Mass Media and Presidential Popularity," *Communications Research* 4: 41-60 (1977); Samuel Kernell, *Going Public* (Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly, Inc, 1986); John R. Lee, "Rallying 'round the flag," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 7:252-56 (1977); Richard E. Neustadt, *Presidential Power and the Modern Presidents* (New York: Macmillan, 1980); L. Ragsdale, "The Politics of Presidential Speechmaking," *American Political Science Review* 78: 971-84 (1984); L. Ragsdale, "Presidential Speechmaking and the Public Audience: Individual Presidents and Group Attitudes," *Journal of Politics* 49: 704-727 (1987).
16. Kernell, *Going Public*.

17. Brace and Hinckley, "Presidential Activities from Truman through Reagan," *Journal of Politics*.
18. Ibid.
19. Jack S. Levy, "The Diversionary Theory of War: A Critique," in *Handbook of War Studies*, ed. Midlarsky, Manus (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1989).
20. Lewis A. Coser, *The Functions of Social Conflict* (New York: Free Press, 1956); George Simmel, *Conflict and the Web of Group Affiliations* (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, [1898] 1955).
21. H. Norpoth, "Guns and Butter and Government Popularity in Britain," *American Political Science Review* 81: 949-959 (1987).
22. L. Hazelwood, "Externalizing Systemic Stress: International Conflict as Adaptive Behavior," in *Conflict Behavior and Linkage Politics*, Wilkenfeld, J. ed. (New York: David McKay, 1973); C. W. Kegley, N. Richardson, and G. Richter, "Conflict at Home and Abroad," *Journal of Politics* 40: 742-52 (1978); Rudolph Rummel, "Dimensions of Conflict Behavior Within and Between Nations," in *Yearbook of the Society for General Systems* 8: 10-50 (1963); R. J. Tanter, "Dimensions of Conflict Behavior Within and Between Nations 1958-1960," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 10: 41-64 (1966); Jonathan Wilkenfeld, "Domestic and Foreign Conflict Behavior of Nations," *Journal of Peace Research* 1: 56-69 (1968).
23. John E. Mueller, "Presidential Popularity from Truman to Johnson," *American Political Science Review* 64: 18-33 (1970); John E. Mueller, *War, Presidents, and Public Opinion* (New York: Wiley, 1973); John R. Lee, "Rallying 'round the flag," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 7:252-56 (1977); Samuel Kernell, "Explaining Presidential Popularity," *American Political Science Review* 72: 506-522 (1978); Robert S. Erikson, Norman R. Luttbeg, and Kent Tedin, *American Public Opinion* (New York: MacMillan, 1980); Lee Sigelman and Pamela Johnston Conover, "The Dynamics of Presidential Support During International Conflict Situations: The Iranian Hostage Crisis," *Political Behavior* 3: 303-318 (1981); Michael B. MacKuen, "Political Drama, Economic Conditions, and the Dynamics of Presidential Popularity," *American Journal of Political Science* 27: 165-192 (1983); Richard A. Brody, "International Crises: A Rallying Point for the President?" *Public Opinion* 6:41-43 (1984); Richard A. Brody, *Assessing the President* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991); Charles W. Ostrom and Dennis M. Simon, "Promise and Performance: A Dynamic Model of Presidential Popularity," *American Political Science Review* 79: 334-358 (1985); Jon Hurwitz and Mark Peffley, "The Means and Ends of Foreign Policy as Determinants of Presidential Support," *American Journal of Political Science* 31: 236-258 (1987); Bruce M. Russett, *Controlling the Sword: The Democratic Governance of National Security* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990).
24. Arthur A. Stein, *The Nation at War* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978).
25. Patrick James and John R. Oneal, "The Influence of Domestic and International Politics on the President's Use of Force," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 35: 307-332 (1991); Larry Hugick and Alec M. Gallup, "'Rally Events' and Presidential Approval," *The Gallup Poll Monthly* 309 (June 1991); Richard A. Brody, *Assessing the President* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991); Bradley Lian and John R. Oneal, "Presidents, the Use of Military Force, and Public Opinion," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37: 277-300 (1993); John R. Oneal and Anna Lillian Bryan, "The Rally 'Round the Flag Effect in U.S. Foreign Policy Crises, 1950-1985," *Political Behavior* 17: 379-401 (1995); Patrick James and Jean-Sebastien Rioux, "International Crises and Linkage Politics: The Experiences of the United States, 1953-1994," *Political Research Quarterly* 51: 781-812 (1998); William D. Baker and John R. Oneal, "Patriotism or Opinion Leadership? The Nature and Origins of the 'Rally 'Round the Flag' Effect," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 45: 661-87 (2001).
26. Patrick James, *Crisis and War* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988).
27. Bruce M. Russett, *Controlling the Sword: The Democratic Governance of National Security* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990); Bruce M. Russett, "Economic Decline, Electoral Pressure, and the Initiation of Interstate Conflict," in *Prisoners of War*, ed. Charles S. Gochman and Alan Ned Sabrosky (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1990);
28. Bruce M. Russett and G. Barzilai, "The Political Economy of Military Spending and Military Action," in *The Political Economy of Military Spending in the United States*, ed. A. Mintz (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1991).
29. Patrick James and John R. Oneal, "The Influence of Domestic and International Politics on the President's Use of Force," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 35: 307-332 (1991).

30. Paul Brace and Barbara Hinckley, "The Structure of Presidential Approval: Constraints Within and Across Presidencies," *Journal of Politics* 53: 993-1017 (1991).
31. Charles W. Ostrom, Jr. and Brian L. Job, "The President and the Political Use of Force," *American Political Science Review* 80: 541-566 (1986).
32. Alex Mintz, "The Decision to Attack Iraq: A Non-Compensatory Theory of Decision Making," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37: 595-618 (1993).
33. Kevin H. Wang, "Presidential Responses to Foreign Policy Crises: Rational Choice and Domestic Politics," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 40: 68-97 (1996).
34. James Meernik, "Presidential Decision Making and the Political Use of Military Force," *International Studies Quarterly* 38: 121-138 (1994).
35. Charles W. Ostrom, Jr. and Brian L. Job, "The President and the Political Use of Force," *American Political Science Review* 80: 541-566 (1986).
36. Patrick James and John R. Oneal, "The Influence of Domestic and International Politics on the President's Use of Force," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 35: 307-332 (1991).
37. Clifton T. Morgan and Kenneth N. Bickers, "Domestic Discontent and the External Use of Force," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 36: 25-52 (1992).
38. Bradley Lian and John R. Oneal, "Presidents, the Use of Military Force, and Public Opinion," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37: 277-300 (1993).
39. James M. Lindsay, Lois W. Sayrs, and Wayne P. Steger, "The Determinants of Presidential Foreign Policy Choice," *American Politics Quarterly* 20: 3-25 (1992).
40. H. W. Brands, "Decisions on American Armed Intervention," *Political Science Quarterly* 102: 607-624 (1987).
41. John E. Mueller, "Presidential Popularity from Truman to Johnson," *American Political Science Review* 64: 18-33 (1970); John E. Mueller, *War, Presidents, and Public Opinion* (New York: Wiley, 1973); Richard A. Brody and Benjamin I. Page, "The Impact of Events on Presidential Popularity: The Johnson and Nixon Administrations," in *Perspectives on the Presidency*, ed. Wildavsky, Aaron (Boston: Little, Brown, 1975); Michael B. MacKuen, "Political Drama, Economic Conditions, and the Dynamics of Presidential Popularity," *American Journal of Political Science* 27: 165-192 (1983).
42. Timothy Y. C. Cotton, "War and American Democracy: Electoral Costs of the Last Five Wars," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 30: 616-635 (1987); Samuel Kernell, "Explaining Presidential Popularity," *American Political Science Review* 72: 506-522 (1978); John E. Mueller, *War, Presidents, and Public Opinion* (New York: Wiley, 1973).
43. Patrick James and John R. Oneal, "The Influence of Domestic and International Politics on the President's Use of Force," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 35: 307-332 (1991).
44. Bruce M. Russett, "Economic Decline, Electoral Pressure, and the Initiation of Interstate Conflict," in *Prisoners of War*, ed. Charles S. Gochman and Alan Ned Sabrosky (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1990).
45. Richard J. Stoll, "The Guns of November: Presidential Reelections and the Use of Force, 1947-1982," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 28: 231-246 (1984).
46. Kurt Taylor Gaubatz, "Election Cycles and War," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 35: 212-214 (1991).
47. Karl R. DeRouen, Jr., "The Indirect Link: Politics, the Economy, and the Use of Force," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 39: 671-695 (1995).
48. Ostrom and Job, 541.
49. Timothy Y. C. Cotton, "War and American Democracy: Electoral Costs of the Last Five Wars," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 30: 616-635 (1987).
50. Russett, *Controlling the Sword*, 36.
51. Charles S. Gochman and Zeev Maoz, " Militarized Interstate Disputes, 1816-1976: Procedures, Patterns, and Insights," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 28: 585-615 (1984).
52. *Ibid.*, 587.
53. *Ibid.*, 591-592.
54. *Ibid.*
55. *Ibid.*, 585-615.
56. Russell Leng and J. David Singer, "Towards a Multi-Theoretical Typology of International Behavior," in *Mathematical Approaches to International Relations*, ed. Mario Bunge, Johan

- Galtung and Mircea Malitza. (Bucharest: Romanian Academy, 1977).
57. Richard J. Stoll, "The Guns of November: Presidential Reelections and the Use of Force, 1947-1982," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 28: 231-246 (1984).
58. George H. Gallup, *The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion 1935-1971*, 3 vols. (New York: Random House, 1972).
59. George C. Edwards with Alec M. Gallup, *Presidential Approval* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990).
60. Lydia Saad, "Bush Job Performance - Trend," *Gallup Poll Monthly* 328 (1993).
61. Charles W. Ostrom, Jr. and Brian L. Job, "The President and the Political Use of Force," *American Political Science Review* 80: 541-566 (1986).
62. Patrick James and John R. Oneal, "The Influence of Domestic and International Politics on the President's Use of Force," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 35: 307-332 (1991).
63. Samuel Kernell, "Explaining Presidential Popularity," *American Political Science Review* 72: 506-522 (1978); Michael B. MacKuen, "Political Drama, Economic Conditions, and the Dynamics of Presidential Popularity," *American Journal of Political Science* 27: 165-192 (1983); Charles W. Ostrom and Dennis M. Simon, "Promise and Performance: A Dynamic Model of Presidential Popularity," *American Political Science Review* 79: 334-358 (1985); Robin F. Marra, Charles W. Ostrom, Jr., and Dennis M. Simon, "Foreign Policy and Presidential Popularity: Creating Windows of Opportunity in the Perpetual Election," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 34:588-623 (1990); Eugene Wittkopf, "End of the Vietnam Syndrome? Domestic Sources of International Orientation Change," in *Changing Course in Foreign Policy*, ed. Charles F. Hermann, Margaret G. Hermann, and Richard K. Hermann (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1994).
64. Charles W. Ostrom, Jr. and Brian L. Job, "The President and the Political Use of Force," *American Political Science Review* 80: 541-566 (1986); Patrick James and John R. Oneal, "The Influence of Domestic and International Politics on the President's Use of Force," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 35: 307-332 (1991).
65. Richard J. Stoll, "The Guns of November: Presidential Reelections and the Use of Force, 1947-1982," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 28: 231-246 (1984); Kurt Taylor Gaubatz, "Election Cycles and War," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 35: 212-214 (1991).
66. Samuel Kernell, "Explaining Presidential Popularity," *American Political Science Review* 72: 506-522 (1978); John E. Mueller, "Presidential Popularity from Truman to Johnson," *American Political Science Review* 64: 18-33 (1970); John E. Mueller, *War, Presidents, and Public Opinion* (New York: Wiley, 1973).
67. Richard A. Brody, *Assessing the President* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991); Bradley Lian and John R. Oneal, "Presidents, the Use of Military Force, and Public Opinion," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37: 277-300 (1993); John R. Oneal and Anna Lillian Bryan, "The Rally 'Round the Flag Effect in U.S. Foreign Policy Crises, 1950-1985," *Political Behavior* 17: 379-401 (1995); Patrick James and Jean-Sebastien Rioux, "International Crises and Linkage Politics: The Experiences of the United States, 1953-1994," *Political Research Quarterly* 51: 781-812 (1998).
68. Russett, *Controlling the Sword*, 36.