Motivation: Declared shooting wars are not the modal form of interstate conflict

Actor A
- Russian soldiers in Crimea
- Iranian proliferation
- Drones in Yemen/Pakistan
- Chinese island building

Actor B
- Economic sanctions
- Stuxnet cyber attack
- Terrorism
- US naval show of force
**Puzzle**

**Domains of Conflict** – Different tools are used during different conflicts

- What is the relationship between military tools and conflict outcomes?
- Given these tools have different strengths and weaknesses, what can that tell us about a country’s motivation?
- Why do states pick aggression in one domain over another?
- Given aggression in one, which domain do states respond in?
Mobilizing your military for war is different than mobilizing your military for diplomacy. Diplomacy is generally preferable to war (Clausewitz 1830).

- If diplomacy is reachable and favorable, states seek diplomacy.
  - Pre-war action is conveying information about resolve/capabilities.
- If diplomacy is unreachable or unfavorable, states seek war.
  - Pre-war action is maximizing chance of tactical military victory.
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Empirical and Theoretical Background

Mobilization means **less** war (deterrence model):
• Costly signal (Cashman 2000, Cimbala 1994, Fearon 1997, Quek 2013)

Mobilization means **more** war (spiral model):
• Feigning weakness (Slantchev 2005, 2010)
• Expectation causes endogeneity (Sample 2016)
• Down payment on costs (Macomber 2014)
• Shifts balance of power (Tarar 2013)

Mobilization means **more/less** war:
• Types of mobilization (Lai 2004, Mackey 2014)
Theory of Military Mobilization and Signaling

Tactical military victory and negotiated settlement are zero-sum:

- Private information and incentives to misrepresent (Fearon 1995)
- Costs and benefits of secrecy (Lai 2004, Carson 2017, Mackey 2014)
Theory of Military Mobilization and Signaling

Knowing the means an actor deploys during a crisis reveals expected utility for war vs negotiated bargain in ways that predicts the most likely outcome.

H1: Mobilizing for tactical victory predict more war because tells us there is a higher expected utility for war.

H2: Mobilizing for diplomacy predict less war because tells us there is a higher expected utility for negotiated bargain.
Theory of Military Mobilization and Signaling

Knowing the means an actor deploys during a crisis reveals expected utility for war vs negotiated bargain in ways that predicts the most likely outcome.
Research Design

Unit of analysis – Crisis-dyad
Dependent variable – Crisis outcome
Explanatory variable – Pre-crisis mobilization
Research Design

Moves in figurine algebra

- \( e4 \) e5
- \( \text{f3} \) c6
- \( \text{b5} \) a6
- \( \text{xc6} \) dxc6
- \( \text{d3} \) b4+
- \( \text{c3} \) f6
- 0-0 \( \text{xc3} \)

• Create first large-scale move by counter-move event dataset of international crises
The U.S. crisis was triggered on 16 October when the CIA presented to President Kennedy photographic evidence of the presence of Soviet missiles in Cuba. The U.S. responded with a decision on the 20th to blockade all offensive military equipment en route to Cuba. When this was announced on 22 October, a crisis was triggered for Cuba and the USSR.

An urgent meeting of the UN Security Council was requested by both the U.S. and Cuba on the 22nd, and by the USSR the next day. On the 23rd as well, the Soviets accused the United States of violating the UN Charter and announced an alert of its armed forces and those of the Warsaw Pact members. That day Cuba responded by condemning the U.S. blockade and declaring its willingness to fight.

...
Technical Innovations

Corpus of historical crises

New ontology for classifying moves and countermoves

New online interface for human coding
Findings

Land
• Armor
• Artillery
• Troops

Sea
• Aircraft carriers
• Submarines
• Surface ships

Air
• Bombers
• Fighters
• Missiles
• Surveillance

WMD
• Chemical
• Biological
• Nuclear
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Sea</th>
<th>WMD</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initial Observations

- Land is the preferred tool during crises.
- US uses air and sea at higher rates than its competitors or allies.
- Sea crises involve surface ships more than submarines or aircraft carriers.
- But, aircraft carriers have the highest rates of victory for the US.
Implications for Homeland Security

• Which threats succeed? Which escalate to violence?
• Forecasting real world conflict escalation through historical analogy
• How has international conflict changed, what tools are becoming more common, which are less common?
• Complementary threats
• Order of threats
Conclusion: Real Time Analysis

• Replicate human codings through on new texts through semi-supervised learning and natural language processing (NLP)
• Build a large corpus of global news and social media events using large scale knowledge mining