

Tables and Figures

Tables

2.1	Menu of common policy responses to domestic unrest	17
2.2	Summary of hypotheses	44
3.1	Probit analyses of low-level spectacles, 1960–1982	53
3.2	Rare-events logit and probit analyses of interstate war, 1960–1982	54
3.3	Negative binomial regression model of domestic unrest, 1948–1982	62
3.4	Percentage change in incidents of domestic unrest across regime types	66
3.5	Summary of results	68

Figures

2.1	The traditional approach to studying diversionary war	17
2.2	Policy substitutability and diversionary war	19
2.3	Leader preferences, environmental factors, and policy substitutability	26
2.4	Extractive capacity and the use of diversionary tactics	37
3.1	Examples of pauper states	48

3.2	Examples of princely states	49
3.3	The effect of an increase in domestic unrest on the predicted probability of interstate war as extractive capacity varies	55
3.4	Causal pathway by which pauper states fight diversionary wars	70
3.5	Causal pathways by which pauper states stage diversionary spectacles	71
3.6	Causal pathways by which pauper states do not use diversionary tactics	72
4.1	The Argentine junta's decision to invade the Falkland Islands, 1982	77
4.2	President Leopoldo Galtieri's ranking of responses to domestic unrest	80
4.3	Argentina's extractive capacity, 1960–2000	84
5.1	The U.S. government's decision to send troops to Utah, 1857	104
5.2	President James Buchanan's ranking of responses to domestic unrest	111
5.3	Government (federal, state, and local) revenue as a percentage of GNP	118
6.1	The French monarchy's decision to assemble the Estates General, 1788	133
6.2	King Louis XVI's ranking of responses to domestic unrest	136
6.3	The Habsburg monarchy's decision to request Russian intervention in Hungary, 1849	144
6.4	Prince Felix zu Schwarzenberg's ranking of responses to domestic unrest	145
6.5	The Peruvian government's decision to muddle through, 1988	154
6.6	President Alan García's ranking of responses to domestic unrest	155
6.7	Peru's extractive capacity, 1960–2000	159