

# WORKING PAPERS

Working Paper no. 50

**FORCE AND AMBIGUITY : EVALUATING SOURCES  
FOR CROSS-NATIONAL RESEARCH – THE CASE OF  
MILITARY INTERVENTIONS**

Francisco Gutiérrez Sanín  
Andrea González Peña

Universidad Nacional de Colombia

June 2009

## **Crisis States Working Papers Series No.2**

ISSN 1749-1797 (print)  
ISSN 1749-1800 (online)

Copyright © F. Gutierrez Sanin and A. Gonzalez Pena, 2009

Although every effort is made to ensure the accuracy and reliability of material published in this Working Paper, the Crisis States Research Centre and LSE accept no responsibility for the veracity of claims or accuracy of information provided by contributors.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior permission in writing of the publisher nor be issued to the public or circulated in any form other than that in which it is published.

Requests for permission to reproduce this Working Paper, of any part thereof, should be sent to:  
The Editor, Crisis States Research Centre, DESTIN, LSE, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE.



**DESTIN**  
Development  
Studies Institute

**Force and Ambiguity:  
Evaluating Sources for Cross-National Research –  
The Case of Military Interventions**

Francisco Gutiérrez Sanín and Andrea González Peña  
Universidad Nacional de Colombia

The purpose of this paper is to discuss, based on a specific example (military interventions), some analytical problems involved in the construction and use of the ever increasing body of quantitative cross-national studies. Thanks to several waves of technological change, social scientists increasingly have recourse to large numerical databases, with the hope of extracting from them valid generalisations via probabilistic models. The models themselves have been subjected to an increasing sophistication. On the other hand, reflection on the nature of the data and of the counting procedures is still incipient. Yet such reflection is absolutely crucial. Practical researchers seldom read the small print that explains how databases are built, let alone invest time in studying the implications of this on the quality of their inferences. For example, the renowned democracy database, Polity,<sup>1</sup> is a standard reference point for quantitative investigators who want to study democracy or probe its degree of association with other variables. A query in JStore using simple criteria (Polity AND democracy AND journals since 1998) yielded 174 refereed journal articles, some of them very influential. Polity, however, is deeply problematic, and this will be explored in the following section. In the area of state failure and collapse the situation is worse. There has been a proliferation of databases, all of which have been the target of severe and authoritative criticism (Cammack et al. 2006). The quantitative study of civil wars is also highly suspect (Cramer 2003; Hegre and Sambanis 2006). We have chosen for our analysis the study of invasions,<sup>2</sup> because of its substantive importance but also because it is characterised by several positive traits, which might be missing in other fields, and which make quantification quite plausible. If we find problems here, *a fortiori* we would expect them to appear elsewhere.

As the previous paragraph suggests strong and consequential critiques about how global databases are built have already been made. Our paper pushes the analysis forward in two senses. First, there are problems that have not yet been acknowledged and we suggest that these might actually be the most fundamental ones. We call the already identified difficulties ‘Type A problems’, while the new ones that we discuss here we tag ‘Type B’. Second, we show that, in a sense, Type Bs are ‘intrinsic’: practitioners may be better or worse, more or less cunning and careful, but beyond their idiosyncratic skills and capacities the building of many databases (i.e. in the ‘general case’) will face some of the same sticky dilemmas. We stress, however, that we do not write in the spirit of technological conservatism: our purpose is to improve quantification, not to eschew it altogether.

In the first section of this paper, we briefly review two literatures: that relating to invasions, and to the evaluation of database building across several fields. In the second section we

---

<sup>1</sup> See <http://www.systemicpeace.org/polity/polity4.htm>.

<sup>2</sup> We use the terms intervention and invasion as if they were fully interchangeably expressions. In the context of this paper, invasion will mean military intervention.

show that, despite its comparative advantages, the interventions field faces severe Type A problems. The third section is dedicated to intrinsic ambiguity, i.e. Type B issues. In the conclusion, we suggest that formal models in the social sciences can, and should, take intrinsic ambiguity fully on board.

## **Literature Review**

It is by no means an exaggeration to claim that, with regards to the field of interventions, Rosenau (1969) established a canon that is still useful today. There are two reasons for this rare - at any rate in the social sciences - stability. First, Rosenau provided what even today is more or less universally (in the field) recognised as the first fundamental definition of invasion issued explicitly for classificatory purposes (Rosenau 1969:161):

Two characteristics are usually associated with behaviour classified as interventionary. Indeed, although the association is often left implicit, it is so pervasive in the literature that the two characteristics would appear to be necessary attributes of interventionary phenomena and as such to provide the basis for an operational definition. One is what may be called convention breaking character of interventions. The other is their authority-oriented nature. Stated briefly, all kinds of observers from a variety of perspectives seem inclined to describe the behaviour of one international actor toward another as interventionary whenever the form of the behaviour constitutes a sharp break with then-existing forms AND whenever it is directed at changing or preserving the structure of political authority in the target society.

Second, Rosenau identified the characteristics that he believed made military interventions more amenable to quantification than other phenomena. They are such big scale operations, and such political highlights, that they inevitably leave traces. Compared with the study of civil wars, or state failure, where data are missing, or critically poor, precisely where they are most needed, interventions nearly always leave a wealth of public evidence. We may add that, since many of the most prominent invaders have been democratic countries, the process involved in the operation - from the decision to launch it to withdrawal - is registered and controlled by public organs and the media. Modern invasions are also generally bounded in time: they have a beginning and an end. Therefore, in contrast to political homicides for example, counting invasions should not be that difficult. 'For this reason', claims Rosenau (1969:155), 'interventions may be more easily operationalised and measured than is the case with other types of influence'.

Experience, though, has shown that Rosenau's expectations were overly optimistic. Both legal scholars and social scientists have discovered that to build a working operational definition of invasion is extremely difficult. Legal scholars faced a two-fold challenge: first, to coordinate the interests of powers that had contradictory interests, which additionally fluctuated (Nyiri 1989); and second, to deal with the fact that public definitions are also systems of incentives. For example, if military interventions are to be defined by the trespassing of the boundaries of a sovereign country by hostile uniformed troops of another country, as has frequently been the case, would-be interveners might choose to attack by indirect means, launching or supporting non-state armed challenges against the government they want to attack (e.g. Nyiri 1989). Is this method an intervention or not? The majority of mainstream jurists and diplomats answered the question positively, at one time or another; but of course indirect aggression is much more difficult to identify. Similar dilemmas were faced

by the major actors of the international system, for example at the UN Security Council (Ferencz 1972; Nyiri 1989).

Rather surprisingly, social scientists have been slower than lawyers to recognise the enormous centrality of the issue of interventions. Despite the fact that these seem to have a rather bright future, the field output remains relatively meagre. Reacting to Rosenau's programme, researchers have: a) criticised its deductive nature, suggesting a more historical and case-by-case approach (e.g. Finnemore 2003); b) proposed several different operationalisations, which have given origin to three major databases (Pearson and Baumann 1992; Regan 2002b and Tillema 1991); c) created probabilistic models to spell out the causes or consequences of invasions in a given period (for example, Hermann and Kegley 1996, 2001; Meernik 1996; Gleditsch et al. 2004; Pearson 1994; Pickering 2001; Regan 2002a; Tures 2005). In the process, several deficiencies at both the definitional and operational level have been uncovered. Hermann and Kegley, in their path-breaking reflection (2001), showed how any conclusion about the relation between interventions and democracy would depend on how we define the latter. We can have a purely procedural understanding of democracy, or one more related to the existence of certain basic liberties. They conclude that a procedimental specification would permit more optimistic conclusions with respect to the impact of interventionism than a more conventional one (Hermann and Kegley 2001: 238, 243-244). Other authors, including database builders, have recognised, candidly and lucidly, that the counting procedure is not easy at all (see especially Tillema 1991).

Why should this be? The purported advantages that the study of invasions had in Rosenau's vision did not spare them some of the serious dilemmas generally faced by any database builder. Some of these were identified by Munck and Verkuilen, in their evaluation of democracy databases (2002), especially but not exclusively Polity. Their choice was no coincidence: democracy is a very central academic and political concern in the contemporary world. Additionally, Polity managers have been extremely careful in explaining explicitly how and why they have graded the level of democracy in each country or year. Only very few global databases have achieved the level of transparency and accessibility that Polity has. What are the problems of Polity and other major democracy databases according to Munck and Verkuilen? Mainly, that there are still 'important gaps' related to the conceptualisation of the category to be measured, a step that both materially and logically precedes measurement. Munck and Verkuilen find that, regarding definition, there are two big dangers: 'conceptual stretching' (Sartori 1970); and what may be called 'conceptual restriction'. Munck and Verkuilen observe that, in relation to democracy, researchers were too aware of stretching, but turned a blind eye to excessive restriction. Additionally, democracy is a multidimensional concept, but the ultimate result of each database is an aggregate index of democracy (for example, a mark between 0 and 10). Despite this, Munck and Verkuilen believe, the question of aggregation has not been sufficiently covered. 'The selection of level of aggregation', they note, 'calls for a delicate balancing act'. The 'sheer amount of attributes and information that can be associated with a richly developed' concept can become unmanageable:

On the other hand, it is necessary to recognise that the move to a higher level of aggregation may entail a loss of validity, in that information about systematic variation among the cases may be lost... the selection of the level of aggregation is an explicit choice that must be justified in light of the need to balance the desire for parsimony and the concern with underlying dimensionality and differentiation. (Munck and Verkuilen 2002: 22)

In other words, there is a trade-off between validity and tractability. This is an extremely important point, to which we will return below. Measurement itself is full of sunken reefs. Investigators have to juggle with multiple indicators for the same phenomenon, and they have no clear recipe to choose one or the other. Munck and Verkuilen showed how the intention of addressing this issue through radical simplification was self defeating. They conclude that:

..with a few notable exceptions, existing democracy indices have displayed a fairly low level of sophistication concerning the process of aggregation. The biggest problem is that most index constructors have simply assumed that it is appropriate and desirable to move up to the highest level of aggregation, that is, to a one-dimensional index. (Munck and Verkuilen 2002: 27).

Similar glaring flaws have also been found in other major databases and influential statistical exercises. For example, quantitative studies of civil wars have been challenged from many points of view: establishment of purely *ad hoc* cut-off points, wrong or equivocal proxies (e.g. Cramer 2003) and poor operationalisation of the concept - often the measurement simply does not capture the underlying idea. Let us see now how the interventions field fares in this regard.

### **‘Type A’ Problems**

Despite the fact that it exhibits more conceptual coherence than several other fields, and that it deals with a comparatively simple (*vis-à-vis* democracy, say) and directly observable phenomenon, the study of interventions suffers from many of the drawbacks pinpointed by Munck and Verkuilen, among others. These are more or less immediately perceivable and here we highlight the main ones. First, there is an almost overwhelming conceptual dispersion. Despite the weight of Rosenau’s influence, every author adopts his or her personal definitional variant, occasionally unaware that subtle differences between one definition and another might alter decisively the quantification. In Table 1 we show the level of coincidence of the three major extant invasion databases.

**Table 1: Correlation between the three databases**

	<b>Pearson &amp; Baumann 1992</b>	<b>Regan 2002</b>	<b>Tillema 1991</b>
<b>Pearson &amp; Baumann 1992</b>	1		
<b>Regan 2002</b>	0,0566	1	
<b>Tillema 1991</b>	0,3526	0,118	1

It should be noted that they fully agree in only 15 percent of the cases: an almost purely random result. In other words, to decide what is or is not an invasion, one might as well toss a coin! Clearly, each database is counting different things. The root of the problem is related to Munck and Verkuilen’s stretching-restricting (or to put it another way, comprehensive but intractable vs. tractable but flat) dilemma. There are authors, and databases, that would try to stick to the most formalistic possible definition, to be able to identify with the maximum of clarity the cut-off points (where an event becomes interventionary). For example, both Pearson and Baumann (1992) and Tillema (1991) establish that an invasion must involve the movement of regular troops within the target country (See Table 2). Thus, they will count as invasions only those events in which uniformed members of the armed forces of a country trespass the borders of another (Gleditsch et al 2004; Hermann and Kegley 2001; Walter and Snyder 1999). But this is simultaneously too restrictive and too broad - and it completely

ignores the very long legal debate referred to above. It also produces severe anomalies.<sup>3</sup> Other databases aim to be more inclusive (Regan 2002), but then where to establish the cut-off points for expanding your definition is a question that remains open. Second, the ‘delicate balance’ related to multidimensionality has not been achieved. Neither journal papers nor the codebooks of the databases explicitly justify the specific level of aggregation that has been chosen.

**Table 2: Definition, Dimensions and Aggregation**

Authors	Definition	Dimensions	Stretching or Restriction	Aggregation
<b>Pearson &amp; Baumann 1992</b>	‘We continue to define military intervention operationally as the <u>movement of regular troops or forces</u> (airborne, seaborne, shelling, etc.) of one country <u>into the territory or territorial waters of another country</u> , or <u>forceful military action by troops already stationed by one country inside another</u> , in the context of some <u>political issue or dispute</u> . Regular forces here <u>do not include paramilitary forces</u> , as defined by the MILITARY BALANCE publications of the IISS, <u>and since actions by border guards or police are therefore excluded</u> , we run less risk than in the past of including very minor border skirmishes and shooting incidents.’	5	<u>Restriction</u> : It does not include paramilitary force and actions by border guards or police (skirmishes and shooting incidents)	Didn’t use
<b>Regan 2002</b>	‘I define third party interventions in intra-state conflicts as <u>convention breaking military and/or economic activities</u> in the internal affairs of a foreign country <u>targeted at the authority structures of the government</u> with the aim of <u>affecting the balance of power between the government and opposition forces</u> .’	4	<u>Restriction</u> : Civil war <u>Stretching</u> : military and economic	Didn’t use
<b>Tillema 1991</b>	‘ <u>Overt military interventions</u> represent <u>direct military operation</u> <i>openly</i> undertaken by <u>a state's regular military forces within foreign lands</u> in such a manner as to risk immediate combat, hence war, <i>merely if</i> they encounter armed resistance... It represents <u>all combat-ready foreign military operations</u> undertaken by regular military forces and <i>only</i> such operation.’	4	<u>Stretching</u> : All combat	Didn’t use

Codification in the field of invasions remains basically idiosyncratic. For example, Tillema (1991) makes a gargantuan effort to substantiate the inclusion of his events on a case-by-case basis, but fails to explain the operational criteria used for such inclusion, let alone for exclusion. Idiosyncratic codification is not reliable, among other things because social scientific concepts are interactive and evolve historically (Cramer 2003, 2006; Finnemore 2003; *inter alia*). This in principle should not be considered an unsolvable problem, because by ‘climbing the ladder of abstraction’ (Sartori 1970) – or delimiting adequately the period – it is always possible to capture the essential aspects of the phenomenon. However, if historical malleability is not factored in, then the probable result will be definitions tailored to one period or to one type of invasion. More trying is the interactive, non-parametric (Elster

<sup>3</sup> Events like the Bay of Pigs incursion, or operation PBsuccess, Sudan and Egypt in Chad (1981) are not included in any of the three databases. The major undertaking of the US in Nicaragua in the years 1989-1992 (ONUCA) is classified as an intervention by Pearson and Baumann, but not by Regan.

1992), character of the concept. This affects especially strongly all definitions related to the use of force. The post-World War II institutions were built having in mind the objective of preventing aggressive militarism. The cost of being tagged as an aggressor can be very high. Invaders therefore endeavour to conceal their acts. They do so juridically, trying to show that the event corresponds to some concept of legality and justice. They do so politically, maintaining that the invasion is legitimate for a variety of reasons. As the international context makes some forms of interventions particularly costly and burdensome, invaders not only change their words but also their deeds, for example privileging indirect intervention or including in every interventionary event a democratic agenda. Long ago, a legal scholar stated that ‘it is seemingly easier to evoke aggression than to dispel it, and easier to commit aggression than to define it. What has been universally condemned as ‘the gravest of all crimes against peace and security throughout the world’ has yet to be consensually particularized’ (Ferencz 1972). At least in the legal field, this dismal conclusion still holds.

The concept of intervention is related in quite a complex form to other ones such as aggression. ‘Invasion’ is a term that is semantically surrounded by other terms and concepts that are not quite synonyms: ‘war’, ‘imperialism’, ‘international incident’, ‘military aid’, for example. It is very clear that there is a dense interconnection between all the elements of this web. Furthermore, there is an affinity between intervention and military aid: should countries that get huge levels of aid from another be considered ‘intervened’ or not? Whatever the answer, it should be consistent.<sup>4</sup> The problem has already been noted by Rosenau, Regan and others. As Rosenau (1964: 153) remarks:

Often intervention is defined in such a general way that it appears to be synonymous with imperialism, aggression, colonialism, neocolonialism, war, and other such gross terms that are used to designate the noncooperative interactions of nations. One observer, for example, finds it useful to define imperialism in terms of ‘action that ... are intrusions into the affairs of another people’, a definition which is hardly differentiable from the view that ‘intervention’ refers to conduct with an external animus that intends to achieve a fundamental alteration of the state of affairs in the target nation... Nor is noncooperative animus necessarily considered to be a characteristic of interventionary behavior. Foreign aid programs have been classified as intervention, and, to the distress of some international law specialists, so have collective security measures taken by several nations to protect their common interests.

## **‘Type B’ Problems**

We start by revisiting the problem of multidimensionality. Not only does finding the adequate level of aggregation require a ‘delicate balance’; there are other quite fundamental issues that have not been addressed by the literature, and that even the most sophisticated criticisms to existing databases have still not fully captured. The first one is the problem of aggregation from the point of view of the logical operators used to ‘flatten’ the concept from many dimensions to one. In other terms, not only the level but also the type of aggregation is an issue. If there is definitional dispersion in the field (in the sense that each researcher has his or

---

<sup>4</sup> Existing databases appear to violate this minimal condition, classifying some forms of aid as intervention and ignoring others. For example Colombia appears invaded in 1989 (by the United States) in Regan (2002). Why in this year and not in others? Cuba is invaded in 1978 (by the Soviet Union) in Pearson and Baumann (1993); Tanzania, 1964 in Tillema (1991) and Pearson and Baumann (1993). Idiosyncratic codification would seem to invite all kind of biases and inconsistencies.

her own version of what an invasion is, and that this has a potentially big impact on measurement), aggregation dispersion (in the sense that each author uses different logical operators, almost never explaining why) is even more eminent. A glimpse of this is captured in Table 2.

In Table 3, we analyse 67 different journal definitions of invasion from a formal point of view. In column 1 we put the number of criteria, in columns 3 to 6 the operators used to aggregate them, and in column 2 the number of definitions (from the universe of 67) that fit this description. For example, row 1 indicates the definitions that used only one criterion; naturally, they do not use any aggregation operator. In the second and subsequent rows come the definitions that use two criteria; naturally, they can use only one aggregation operator. Row 2 captures the definitions that use two criteria and aggregate them with an AND. The majority prefer the broader OR rather than the more restrictive AND. There are 15 papers that opt for pure ANDs, 18 for pure ORs and 12 for a combination of both. Typically, in this corpus of papers not once can there be found a reflection of why one or another combination of operators is adopted. Yet this is crucial, and can be visualised through the following simple exercise. If we applied the Rosenau definition with an AND (as the author proposed) or with an OR, to the main existing databases, the variation is very big (Table 4). In Pearson and Baumann (1992), of their 667 reported cases, using Rosenau's definition with an OR we would get also 667, and with an AND 532. Regan (2002) – who explicitly bases his coding in Rosenau's definition – counts 551 cases of military intervention (he includes also economic intervention). Using a Rosenau's OR only applied to military events would circumscribe his universe to 429, and an AND to 363. The count for Tillema (1991) is 469 with an OR and 254 with an AND. Simply stated, the use of different aggregation operators fully determines the result of the coding procedure.



**Table 3: Types of classification in the literature (67 definitions)**

# of criteria	# of definitions	AND	OR	MAX	Non interpretable
1	13				
2	5	X			
2	14		X		
2	1			X	
3	10	X			
3	4		X		
3	4	X	X		
3	1				X
4	3	X			
4	5	X	X		
5	2	X	X		
5	1	X	X	X	
Difficult to specify	5				X

Source: Papers from the following journals: International Security, Vol. 5 (1981); Vol. 20 (1995). American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 32 (1988); Vol. 47 (2003). Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 29 (1992); Vol.38 (2001), Vol. 17 (1980), Vol. 26 (1989), Thesis Univeristy of Maryland (2004), The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 39 (1995); Vol. 43 (1999); Vol. 6 (1962); Vol. 27 (1983); Vol. 40 (1996); Vol. 44 (2000); Vol. 34 (1990); Vol. 39 (1995); Vol. 40 (1996); Vol. 15 (1971); Vol. 13 (1969); Vol. 32 (1988), The American Journal of International Law, Vol. 97 (2003); Vol. 89 (1995); Vol. 92 (1998); Vol. 74 (1980); Vol. 39 (1945); Vol. 51 (1957); Vol. 82 (1988); Vol. 69 (1975); Vol. 94 (2000); Vol. 48 (1954); Vol. 86 (1992); Vol. 83 (1989); Vol. 95 (2001). World Politics, Vol.18 (1965); Vol. 32 (1980); Vol. 34 (1982); Vol. 21 (1969); Vol. 44 (1992); Vol. 20 (1967); Vol. 42 (1990); Vol. 26 (1974). International Security, Vol. 23 (1998); Vol. 21 (1996); Vol. 2 (1977); Vol. 8 (1983). American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 47 (2003); Vol. 35 (1991). The Journal of Political and Military Sociology (2001). Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association, Vol. 37 (2002). Military Affairs Vol. 39 (1975). Political Behavior, Vol. 20 (1998). ECPR Joint Sessions of Worlshops (2004). Thesis Uppsala University (1986).

**Table 4: The Rosenau definition with an AND or with an OR**

	Pearson & Baumann 1992	Regan 2002	Tillema 1991
<b>No. cases</b>	667 cases	551 cases (132 economic intervention and 429 military intervention)	469 cases
<b>OR cases</b>	667 cases	429 cases	469 cases
<b>AND cases</b>	532 cases	363 cases	254 cases

Second, when reducing a concept from a multidimensional world to a one-dimensional one, order becomes an issue. Concepts that live in a multidimensional space produce data points that are not ordered, but ultimately a coder needs an instruction to translate them into an ordered set, say of zeroes and ones (or alternatively an ordinal scale), that tells if an event is, or is not, an invasion, and (perhaps) how intensely it corresponds to the concept (its ‘degree of invasiveness’). In effect, while scales ‘live’ in a well ordered world with a clear hierarchy, social scientific concepts are almost always multidimensional. Multidimensional worlds are richer, but are less ordered, than scales. Indeed, there is a whole set of statistical tools and

theories oriented towards the building of correct scales from complex intellectual constructs. Operationally, this has many expressions. First, multidimensional concepts can be made less complex by factorial and principal component analyses, which allow the researcher to see below and beyond an apparently baffling multidimensionality (e.g. Widaman 1993). If this type of reduction of order cannot be achieved, then different forms of aggregation can be considered (starting from Multidimensional Scaling, a tool explicitly thought to address the problem – e.g. Wenstop 1980; Williams and Nigel 2002). Last but not least, approaches such as structural equations allow the researcher to incorporate multidimensionality directly into the model, assuming that the complex concept is a ‘latent variable’ expressed by other, explicit ones (e.g. Bollen 1989). But none of these techniques fully solves the specific problem of social scientific databases, partly because none of the above techniques guarantees full reduction to a single dimension.


But by far the main complication is that the imposition of complete order may be a quite fundamental distortion of the concept. In effect, it is typical of social scientific concepts – in fact, of all multidimensional concepts – that they live in a world where only partial, and not total, order exists. Forcing total order operationally is not only contrived, it also misrepresents the very idea that is trying to be quantified. Any formalism or codification based on the idea that there is an underlying total order assumes a sunken, but generally unwarranted, premise. To take a simple example: in Rosenau’s definition, there are two criteria to classify whether or not an event is an invasion – its tinkering with the authority structure, and its convention-breaking nature. How to compare an event that transforms deeply the authority structure of a country while trying to minimise the breaking of convention, with one that operates the other way round? Correspondingly, in Table 5 we see three different types of real life situation: those that fulfil both Rosenau’s criteria to an eminent degree; those that are only partially authority-oriented; and those that are strongly authority-oriented but only weakly convention-breaking (because they have been fully supported by the UN, for example). While the first category should go into any database, what to do with the other two? And if they are included, how to compare them if they are intrinsically unordered (see Figure 1)?

It should be noted that, as a consequence, the problem of order affects particularly strongly, but not exclusively, those databases that try to arrive at an aggregate, one-dimensional grade. However, it also concerns all those database builders who expect to establish a clear cut-off point between events and non-events, since to establish this one has to suppose total order.

**Table 5: Convention Breaking and Authority-Oriented**

	<b>Convention -Breaking AND Authority-oriented</b>	<b>Convention-Breaking</b>	<b>Authority- Oriented</b>
<b>Pearson &amp; Baumann 1992</b>	1969-Prague	1981- Peru & Ecuador	1950-Korean War
<b>Regan 2002</b>	1975-Angola		1949-China
<b>Tillema 1991</b>	1963-Cyprus	1979-Chad & Libya	1956- Dominican Republic


**Figure 1: Intervention or Non-intervention?**



Source: authors

The supposition that there is an underlying total order in general entails other difficulties. Social scientific concepts tend to be ‘radial’ (Lakoff 1990), in the sense that they are gradual (they ‘fade out’ from a prototype to less typical examples, see Figure 2) and are thus full of grey areas. Multidimensionality and ‘radiality’ are typical of social science concepts. In the interventions field there are several sources of this intrinsic fogginess. First, there is no ‘natural’ cut-off point. Each definition more or less adequately defines what a prototypical invasion is. Different events and situations approximate up to a certain point the respective prototype. Where should we put the line below which an event is no longer classified as an invasion? The definitions certainly give no specific instructions in this regard. What will the coder do with an event that comes very near the prototype in one dimension, but very far in another one? The solution offered by the invasion databases – idiosyncratic AND binary codification – is particularly unattractive. It does not differentiate clearly an event from a non-event, and in regards to the former it collapses very big ones with very small ones. The bombing of a borderline checkpoint, or a hot persecution by a neighbouring country, is counted on the same footing as the Vietnam or the Gulf wars. Somehow, this seems fatally wrong. Including everything in the same mixed bag is a source of confusion; in particular, the myriad of very small events acts as noise in relation to the big, prototypical ones, so the statistical associations that are found (or rejected) are predicated on a universe very far away from the prototype that was supposed to be analysed in the first place (big, canonical interventions). For example, as seen in Table 4, using Rosenau’s more stringent AND aggregation operator, the number of events from each database is cut by a factor of almost two. There is as much noise as information. It is quite clear that no statistical analysis performed over this universe of events is speaking about what happens near the prototype. Introducing a yardstick to measure the ‘degree of invasiveness’ (or, if preferred, the degree of the similarity of a given event to the prototype) would have allowed researchers to differentiate events from the point of view of their size and weight.

**Figure 2: Function  $R^2$  – Non-ordered**



Note: the classificatory exercise needs a function that goes from  $R^2$  – non-ordered world to an ordinal scale where total order exists (for any two events A or B, you have  $A > B$ ,  $B > A$  or  $A=B$ ).

Source: authors

Basic social scientific concepts are not only ‘radial’, they are also verbal in nature (or ‘linguistic variables’, Yen and Langari 1999). By this we mean that they are full of linguistic hedges, modifiers that speak about the degree to which a condition is fulfilled. You can see that the operational Rosenau (1969) definition is plagued by linguistic hedges (we italicise them): ‘Two characteristics are *usually* associated... *although the association is often left implicit ... seem inclined to belief... sharp* break with then-existing forms...’.<sup>5</sup> How do you know that an implicit relation has been correctly identified? When do you know something is sharp or blunt? But such vagueness is not the product of some lack of dexterity by Rosenau: it is the social scientific common ground.

It is very difficult to come across a social scientific definition that is not multidimensional, radial and heavily hedged. The combination of these three characteristics – when it is inevitable – we call ‘intrinsic ambiguity’. We do not claim that intrinsic ambiguity makes quantification impossible; we claim, instead, that – when it is present – hardly any model that fails to take it seriously is plausible. Lack of plausibility stems from: a) issues related to aggregation operators (the use of different operators yields widely different results); b) issues related to an uncalled for and hidden assumption of total order, when the original concept that wants to be operationalised only establishes partial order; c) issues related to vague cut-off points, that leads to contrived and *ad hoc* solutions; d) issues related to the linguistic, hedged nature of social scientific definitions, that inevitably (at least in the general case) includes in the concept modifiers that express subjective evaluation of degree (for example, degree of similarity to a certain prototype, or intensity in which a phenomenon is present in an event).

<sup>5</sup> The same can be said about the definitions that guide the construction of the three major databases. See Table 2.

## Conclusion

Quantitative cross-national research is here to stay. Not only is technological conservatism intellectually wrong, it is also simply unviable. However, quantitative investigations have to face a troubling tension. On the one hand, probabilistic models have become ever more sophisticated and abstruse, but on the other hand database building remains as flimsy as ever (perhaps increasingly so). Modellers have a lot to say about nuances of correlations, but frequently they cannot specify correctly what phenomena they are trying to correlate. Researchers have not as yet fully identified and understood all the sources of this tension, nor have they extracted from it the necessary conclusions.

Counting is important – but counting what? While in some delimited areas – for example, electoral time series – this kind of question is marginal, in many other ones it is central. In this paper, we saw that database building in the field of invasions – dealing with a relatively clear cut, identifiable, phenomenon, and exhibiting a much better tradition than many other ones in tinkering with definitional niceties – is affected by two classes of problems: conceptual dispersion and unsolved tradeoffs (Type A), and intrinsic ambiguity (Type B). Marginal improvements within the same conceptual universe can help to patch up some of the issues raised by Type A. However, if we are right, Type B cannot be dealt with in this fashion: vague boundaries, radiality, linguistic hedges, lack of total order, are intrinsic to social scientific reasoning. In database building, we would do better to resort to existing formalisms that allow us to explicitly model this type of uncertainty (Yen and Langari 1999; Pfeilsticker 1981), instead of trying to achieve some kind of spurious clear cut precision. The dilemma of indulging in a wholesale rejection of quantification, or simply ignoring ambiguity, can and should be solved by taking it fully on board.

## References

- Bollen, Kenneth. 1989. *Structural equations with latent variables*. New York: Wiley.
- Cammack, Diana, McLeod, Dinah, Rocha, Alina and Christiansen, Karin. 2006. *Donors and the 'Fragile States' agenda: A survey of current thinking and practice*. London: Japan International Cooperation Agency.
- Cramer, Christopher. 2003. 'Homo economicus goes to war: methodological individualism, rational choice and the political economy of war', *World Development* 30(11): 1845-64.
- Cramer, Christopher. 2006. *Civil war is not a stupid thing. Accounting for violence in developing countries*. London: Hurst & Company.
- Elster, Jon. 1992. *El cambio tecnológico. Investigaciones sobre la racionalidad y la transformación social*. Barcelona: Gedisa.
- Ferencz, Benjamin. 1972. 'Defining aggression: where it stands and where it's going', *American Journal of International Law* 66(3): 491-508.
- Finnemore, Martha. 2003. *The purpose of intervention. Changing beliefs about the use of force*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Gleditsch, Nils Petter. 1992. 'Focus on: Democracy and peace', *Journal of Peace Research* 29(4): 369-376.
- Gleditsch Nils, Lene, Christiansen and Hegre, Havard. 2004. 'Democratic jihad?. Military intervention and democracy', paper presented at Joint Sessions of Workshops, Uppsala, Sweden..
- Hegre, Havard and Sambanis, Nicholas. 2006. 'Sensitivity analysis of the empirical literature on civil war onset', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50(4): 508-535.
- Hermann, Margaret and Kegley, Charles. 1996. 'How democracies use intervention. A neglected dimension in the study of democratic peace', *Journal of Peace Research* 33(3): 309-322.
- Hermann, Margaret and Kegley, Charles. 2001. 'Democracies and interventions: is there a danger zone in the democratic peace?' *Journal of Peace Research* 38(2): 227-235.
- Lakoff, George. 1990. *Women, fire, and dangerous things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meernik, James. 1996. 'United States military intervention and the promotion of democracy', *Journal of Peace Research* 33(4): 391-402.
- Munck, Gerardo and Verkuilen, Jay. 2002. 'Conceptualizing and measuring democracy evaluating alternative indices', *Comparative Political Studies* 35(1): 5-34.
- Nyiri, Nicolas. 1989. *The United Nations' search for a definition of aggression*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Pearson, Frederic. 1994. 'Geographic proximity and foreign military intervention', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 18(3): 432-460.
- Pearson, Federic and Baumann, Robert. 1992. *International military intervention, 1946-1988*. St. Louis: University of Missouri, St. Louis, Center for International Studies.
- Pfeilsticker, Arne. 1981. 'The systems approach and fuzzy set theory bridging the gap between mathematical and language oriented economists', *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 6(3): 209-233.

- Pickering, Jeffrey. 2001. 'The conflict-prone and the conflict-weary: War outcomes and types of military intervention, 1946-1996', *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 29(1): 221-239.
- Regan, Patrick. 2002a. 'Third-party interventions and the duration of intrastate conflicts', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46(1): 55-73.
- Regan, Patrick. 2002b. *Users manual for Pat Regan's data on interventions in civil conflicts*. Binghamton: Binghamton University.
- Rosenau, James N. (ed.). 1964. *International Aspects of Civil Strife*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenau, James. 1969. 'Intervention as a scientific concept', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 13(2).
- Sambanis, Nicholas. 2004. 'What is civil war? Conceptual and empirical complexities of an operational definition', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48(6): 814-858.
- Sambanis, Nicholas and Elbadawi, Ibrahim. 2000. 'External interventions and the duration of civil wars', *Policy Research Working Paper Series* 2433, Washington DC: World Bank..
- Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. 'Concept misinformation in comparative politics', *American Political Science Review* 64(4): 1033-1053.
- Tillema, Herbert. 1989a. 'Foreign overt military intervention in the nuclear age', *Journal of Peace Research* 26(2): 179-196.
- Tillema, Herbert. 1989b. 'Foreign overt military intervention in the nuclear age: a clarification', *Journal of Peace Research* 26(4): 419-420.
- Tillema, Herbert. 1991. *International conflict since 1945. A bibliographical handbook of wars and military intervention*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Tures, John. 2005. 'Operation exporting freedom: the quest for democratization via United States military operations', *Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations* 6(1): 97-111.
- Walter, Barbara and Snyder, Jack. (eds). 1999. *Civil wars, insecurity, and intervention*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wenstop, Fred. 1980. 'Quantitative analysis with linguistic variables', *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 4(2): 95-115.
- Widaman, Keith. 1993. 'Common factor analysis versus principal component analysis: Differential bias in representing model parameters?' *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 28(3): 263-311.
- Williams, Jon and Steele, Nigel. 2002. 'Difference, distance and similarity as a basis for fuzzy decision support based on prototypical decision classes', *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 131(1): 35-46.
- Yen, John and Langari, Reza. 1999. *Fuzzy logic. Intelligence, control, and information*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.





## Crisis States Working Paper – Series 2

- WP1 James Putzel, 'War, State Collapse and Reconstruction: phase 2 of the Crisis States Programme' (September 2005)
- WP2 Simonetta Rossi and Antonio Giustozzi, 'Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration of ex-combatants (DDR) in Afghanistan: constraints and limited capabilities', (June 2006)
- WP3 Frederick Golooba-Mutebi, Gabi Hesselbein and James Putzel, 'Political and Economic Foundations of State making in Africa: understanding state reconstruction', (July 2006)
- WP4 Antonio Giustozzi, 'Genesis of a Prince: the rise of Ismail Khan in western Afghanistan, 1979-1992' (September 2006)
- WP5 Laurie Nathan, 'No Ownership, No Peace: the Darfur Peace Agreement', (September 2006)
- WP6 Niamatullah Ibrahim, 'The Failure of a Clerical Proto-State: Hazarajat, 1979-1984' (September 2006)
- WP7 Antonio Giustozzi, 'Tribes and Warlords in Southern Afghanistan, 1980-2005' (September 2006)
- WP8 Joe Hanlon, Sean Fox, 'Identifying Fraud in Democratic Elections: a case study of the 2004 Presidential election in Mozambique'
- WP9 Jo Beall, 'Cities, Terrorism and Urban Wars of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century', (February 2007)
- WP10 Dennis Rodgers, 'Slum Wars of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: the new geography of conflict in Central America', (February 2007)
- WP11 Antonio Giustozzi, 'The Missing Ingredient: non-ideological insurgency and state collapse in Western Afghanistan 1979-1992', (February 2007)
- WP12 Suzette Heald, 'Making Law in Rural East Africa: SunguSungu in Kenya', (March 2007)
- WP13 Anna Matveeva, 'The Regionalist Project in Central Asia: unwilling playmates', (March 2007)
- WP14 Sarah Lister, 'Understanding State Building and Local Government in Afghanistan', (June 2007)
- WP15 Pritha Venkatachalam, 'Municipal Finance Systems in Conflict Cities: case studies on Ahmedabad and Srinagar, India', (July 2007)
- WP16 Jason Sumich, 'The Illegitimacy of Democracy? democratisation and alienation in Maputo, Mozambique', (September 2007)
- WP17 Scott Bollens, 'Comparative Research on Contested Cities: lenses and scaffoldings', (October 2007)
- WP18 Debby Potts, 'The State and the informal in sub-Saharan African economies: revisiting debates on dualism', (October 2007)
- WP19 Francisco Gutiérrez Sanín, Tatiana Acevedo and Juan Manuel Viatela, 'Violent liberalism? State, conflict, and political regime in Colombia, 1930-2006: an analytical narrative on state-making', (November 2007)
- WP20 Stephen Graham, 'RoboWar™ Dreams: Global South Urbanisation and the US Military's 'Revolution in Military Affairs'', (November 2007)
- WP21 Gabi Hesselbein, 'The Rise and Decline of the Congolese State: an analytical narrative on state-making', (November 2007)
- WP22 Diane Davis, 'Policing, Regime Change, and Democracy: Reflections from the Case of Mexico', (November 2007)
- WP23 Jason Sumich, 'Strong Party, Weak State? Frelimo and State Survival Through the Mozambican Civil War: an analytical narrative on state-making', (December 2007)
- WP24 Elliott Green, 'District Creation and Decentralisation in Uganda', (January 2008)
- WP25 Jonathan DiJohn, 'Conceptualising the Causes and Consequences of Failed States: A Critical Review of the Literature', (January 2008)
- WP26 James Putzel, Stefan Lindemann and Claire Schouten, 'Drivers of Change in the Democratic Republic of Congo: The Rise and Decline of the State and Challenges For Reconstruction - A Literature Review', (January 2008)
- WP27 Frederick Golooba Mutebi, 'Collapse, war and reconstruction in Uganda: An analytical narrative on state-making', (January 2008)
- WP28 Frederick Golooba Mutebi, 'Collapse, war and reconstruction in Rwanda: An analytical narrative on state-making', (February 2008)
- WP29 Bjørn Møller, 'European Security: the role of the European Union', (February 2008)
- WP30 Bjørn Møller, 'European Security: The Role of the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe', (February 2008)
- WP31 Laurie Nathan, 'Anti-imperialism Trumps Human Rights: South Africa's Approach to the Darfur Conflict', (February 2008)
- WP32 Ben Moxham, 'State-Making and the Post-Conflict City: Integration in Dili, Disintegration in Timor-Leste', (February 2008)
- WP33 Kripa Sridharan, 'Regional Organisations and Conflict Management: comparing ASEAN and SAARC', (March 2008)

- WP34 Monica Herz, 'Does the Organisation of American States Matter?' (April 2008)
- WP35 Deborah Fahy Bryceson, 'Creole and Tribal Designs: Dar es Salaam and Kampala as Ethnic Cities in Coalescing Nation States'
- WP36 Adam Branch, 'Gulu Town in War and Peace: displacement, humanitarianism and post-war crisis' (April 2008)
- WP37 Dennis Rodgers, 'An Illness called Managua' (May 2008)
- WP38 Rob Jenkins, 'The UN peacebuilding commission and the dissemination of international norms' (June 2008)
- WP39 Antonio Giustozzi and Anna Matveeva, 'The SCO: a regional organisation in the making' (September 2008)
- WP40 Antonio Giustozzi, 'Afghanistan: transition without end' (November 2008)
- WP41 Niamatullah Ibrahim, 'At the Sources of Factionalism and Civil War in Hazarajat' (January 2009)
- WP42 Niamatullah Ibrahim, 'Divide and Rule: state penetration in Hazarajat, from monarchy to the Taliban' (January 2009)
- WP43 Daniel Esser, 'Who Governs Kabul? Explaining urban politics in a post-war capital city' (February 2009)
- WP44 Francisco Gutierrez et al, 'Politics and Security in Three Colombian Cities' (March 2009)
- WP45 Marco Pinfari, 'Nothing but Failure? The Arab League and the Gulf Cooperation Council as Mediators in Middle Eastern Conflicts' (March 2009)
- WP46 Anna Matveeva, 'The Perils of Emerging Statehood: civil war and state reconstruction in Tajikistan' (March 2009)
- WP47 Jennifer Giroux, David Lanz and Damiano Sguaitamatti, 'The Tormented Triangle: the regionalisation of conflict in Sudan, Chad and the Central African Republic' (April 2009)
- WP48 Francisco Gutierrez-Sanin, 'Stupid and Expensive? A critique of the costs-of-violence literature' (May 2009)
- WP49 Herbert Wulf and Tobias Debiel, 'Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanisms: tools for enhancing the effectiveness of regional organisations? A comparative study of the AU, ECOWAS, IGAD, ASEAN/ARG and PIF' (May 2009)

These can be downloaded from the Crisis States website ([www.crisisstates.com](http://www.crisisstates.com)), where an up-to-date list of all our publications including Discussion Papers, Occasional Papers and Series 1 Working Papers can be found.



The Crisis States Research Centre aims to examine and provide an understanding of processes of war, state collapse and reconstruction in fragile states and to assess the long-term impact of international interventions in these processes. Through rigorous comparative analysis of a carefully selected set of states and of cities, and sustained analysis of global and regional axes of conflict, we aim to understand why some fragile states collapse while others do not, and the ways in which war affects future possibilities of state building. The lessons learned from past experiences of state reconstruction will be distilled to inform current policy thinking and planning.

## **Crisis States Partners**

### **Ardhi University**

Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

### **Collective for Social Science Research**

Karachi, Pakistan

### **Developing Countries Research Centre (DCRC)**

University of Delhi

Delhi, India

### **Department of Environmental and Geographical Sciences**

University of Cape Town

Cape Town, South Africa

### **Instituto de Estudios Políticos y Relaciones Internacionales (IEPRI)**

Universidad Nacional de Colombia

Bogotá, Colombia

### **Makerere Institute of Social Research**

Makerere University

Kampala, Uganda

## **Research Components**

### **Development as State-Making**

### **Cities and Fragile States**

### **Regional and Global Axes of Conflict**

### **Development Studies Institute (DESTIN)**

LSE, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE

Tel: +44 (0)20 7849 4631

Fax: +44 (0)20 7955 6844

Email: [csp@lse.ac.uk](mailto:csp@lse.ac.uk)

Web: [www.crisisstates.com](http://www.crisisstates.com)