CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: LINKAGE POLITICS - AN OVERVIEW
THE LEVEL-OF-ANALYSIS PROBLEM

The nature of political phenomenon within and among nations is generally studied at two distinct levels. One level of analysis is marked as comparative politics or national level study. It deals with the political behaviour of nations in terms of domestic factors only. The other one, revolves around the political process between or among nations, and is termed as international system level. Each level of analysis considers its area of study independent of the other and mutually exclusive. Students of comparative politics (national politics) tend to take external variables for granted and of no use for their area of research. "Likewise, with but few exceptions, the theoretical and empirical materials employed by specialists in international politics do not posit national or subnational processes, other than

---

governmental decision-making, as variables."\(^2\)

Considerable amount of research work has been done at these two levels of analysis. Specialists of these areas talk of their triumphant strides to explore the complexities of their field and pay little attention to the problems that fall in the domain of the other and in the overlapping areas between these two levels.\(^3\) Both, students of national and international politics, are indifferent to each other's research and are sceptical of each other's conceptual vocabulary and operating models to the extent that the exchange of each other's terminology and models "may diminish the elegance of existing models and require substantial revision in their central concepts."\(^4\)

The logic behind bifurcation between the national level of analysis and international system level derives strength from the two distinct political settings: domestic politics and international politics; each having different problems and priorities of its own. The decisive factor which separates domestic politics from international politics is: the presence of governmental machinery invested with sovereignty and monopoly of legitimate use of violence for maintaining and regulating


\(^3\) Ibid, p. 7.

pattern of political behaviour and to take measures to remove people's desperation to prevent them from taking recourse to ways of violence.  

National politics is the realm of authority, of administration and of law. International politics is the realm of power, of struggle, and of accommodation. The international realm is preeminently a political one. The national realm is variously described as being hierarchic, vertical, centralized, heterogeneous, directed, and contrived; the international realm, as being anarchic, horizontal, decentralized, homogeneous, undirected and mutually adaptive.  

Morgenthau while analyzing conditions of domestic peace, finds certain characteristics which are peculiar to the domestic politics, e.g., "overwhelming force, suprasectional loyalties, expectation of justice." He further argues that "the absence of these conditions on the international scene evokes the danger of war." While analyzing the theoretical aspects of international relations, scholars are of the opinion that international politics is generally passing through the state of nature - the stage which was prevalent before the emergence of nation-states. It is a stage of anarchy, devoid of law and order. International politics is,  

"politics in the absence of government."\textsuperscript{10} As Leurdijk observes, the formulation of an anarchy-order dichotomy, characterizing respectively the international and national political systems served to strengthen the assumption of the autonomy of the political process in both spheres because this dichotomy was supposed to exclude an explanation of process in the same terms.\textsuperscript{11}

The division between domestic and international system is also highlighted in the charter of the United Nations. For instance, Article 2, Clause 7 of the charter mentions,

> nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present charter ... \textsuperscript{12}

The theoretical discussion and the essence of the article discussed above make it amply clear that the national and international political systems constituted two different political realms, independent of each other and mutually exclusive. This distinction between domestic and international politics comprised the core of the realist approach to international politics.

This division has further led to straitjacketed compartmentalization between comparative politics and international politics. Wolfram F. Hanrieder puts it as the one stressing the "internal-motivational-psychological phenomena" and the other focuses on "external-operational-contingencies" representing

\textsuperscript{10} William T.R. Fox, "The Uses of International Theory", in Fox, ed., n. 1, p. 35.

\textsuperscript{11} Leurdijk, n. 9, p. 56.

national and international politics respectively. What has gone wrong with these two levels of analysis is that, each level takes the other for granted and excludes it from its focus of study. This factor has led to the lack of coherent understanding of political process at each level, since both are complimentary to each other. The mutual indifference results from the "lack of communication", structures of political data and the kinds of questions that are being raised by specialists in both domestic and international politics. National level of analysis and international system level function on the premise that their areas of study are independent of each other and have distinct and different kinds of political processes which are confined to their respective boundaries to be analyzed by different set of methods. This implies that domestic and international systems are isolated having no impact upon each other. Political processes which take place within these systems have its own causes and effects independent of the others. This notion, as the argument goes, establishes the existence of two different, and mutually exclusive political entities: domestic and international.

But what constitutes these two separate political entities is a challenging question which deserves


15 Ibid, p. 6; and Hanrieder, n. 13, p. 971.
serious consideration on the following issues. Are these two systems really different from each other to the extent that they can be analyzed independently in isolation from each other? Is it possible to have a common methodology and terminology to grasp the intricacies of both the systems in a single coherent way? Do they have similar or different kinds of institutions, structures and processes? Whether the actors performing roles in these systems are different in both systems or are overlapping? Are the states the only actors in the international system? Where from the boundaries of these systems begin and end? Do they affect the political process of each other? Such questions are well taken by scholars from different angles. But then, the way political process takes place in one political system and

affects its external environment, and vice versa, lacks systematic exploration in the field of international study.

**COMPLEXITY OF THE POLITICAL PROCESS**

The nature of world system has changed tremendously due to various developments which took place after the World War II. World has become a global village. The lines of division between domestic and international politics are becoming blurred. The impermeable status of territorial boundaries among states gave way to easy access to foreign influences as a consequence of technological revolution, emergence of non-state actors and economic interdependence. The sovereignty of the states has been diluted and circumscribed. Kenneth E. Boulding in an attempt to explicate this transformed nature of relations among states conceptualized it as


In his words, everywhere is now accessible to everybody; there are no nooks, corners or retreats left, and no snugly protected centres of national power. The great continental heart lands are as exposed to aerial warfare as are the coasts to naval bombardment. The result is a sudden and dramatic collapse of unconditional viability.

Apart from the changes in territorial sovereign character of the state, its position in the international system as the sole actor also came under serious debate. Oran R. Young observed, "the current era is witnessing a movement away from a world system dominated by a single type of actor and toward a system characterized by extensive interactions among several qualitatively different types of actors." Various actors other than states interacted across territorial boundaries with their counterparts. This society to society transactions, popularly known as 'transnational relations', have significant bearings upon the internal


22 Young, n. 21, p. 139.

and external behaviour of states and have also influenced the official relationships among them. The phenomenon of non-state actor is not a recent development in the domain of world politics. But the emergence of "new varieties of issues and outcomes in international politics of the 1970's have opened new opportunities to non national actors to intervene in world affairs." Seyom Brown, while characterizing the changed structure of international politics, came to the conclusion that the end of cold war, the coming up of a number of issues other than the security one, and the proliferation of friendships and adversary relations across the boundaries have altered the essence of the world politics.

Increasing interdependence among states has further tarnished the sovereign and 'self sufficient unit' images of the states. The term of interdependence is abound with various different definitional meanings.


25 Mansbach and others, n. 16, pp. 46-64.


28 For details see: E.L. Morse, "Interdependence in World Politics", in James N. Rosenau and others, eds., World...
However, the crux of each of them does not approve the independent existence of states. The asymmetrical and imbalanced interdependence also known as Dependencia Theory reiterated the impact of world capitalist economy on the polity and economy of the political systems of the developing countries. Poverty of the underdeveloped world is equated with affluence of the developed nations. Both the developed and underdeveloped nations are considered as integrated "in a world wide network of commercial, financial and other relations", and irrespective of their being either capitalist or socialist they belonged to the capitalist world market. The emergence of capitalist world economy has made the economic sovereignty of otherwise sovereign and independent nations permeable. The analysis of domestic life of states, it was argued, seemed erroneous without setting them "in the context of the world division of labour, located in the world economy."  


30 Samir Amin (vol. 1), n. 32, pp. 1-36.

and Joel Edelstein attributed the underdevelopment of Latin American countries to the penetration of their political systems by the international capitalism especially North America’s economic influence in combination with cultural and political influences. \(^3^2\) On the other hand the continued accumulation of capital and wealth by the capitalists within advanced capitalist states is dependent upon the disadvantageous position of the underdeveloped world in the global structure of asymmetrical and imbalanced interdependence. "The short-term well-being of the population of the advanced capitalist societies is also dependent upon" this unequal equation of interdependence. \(^3^3\) This world capitalist system constituted a 'holistic phenomenon' which conditioned "the experiences and opportunities of member societies." \(^3^4\) In this context, the analysis of any of the individual society required to be pursued within a global system as against its bilateral relationship with other corresponding units. Moreover, the world capitalist system gave birth to group-to-group interdependence between the core of the core (elites of the developed world) and the core of the periphery (the elites of the


34 Ibid.
underdeveloped world). The class interests of the ruling elites in the underdeveloped world are dependent, in some form, upon international capitalism and imperialism. The dependency writers were of the view that transnational actors played a crucial role in collaboration with the local elites of the underdeveloped world in allocation of values for their political systems. These 'transnational interactions' could not be analyzed within the traditional framework of the state-centric approach.

All these factors, i.e., permeable character of state, non-state actors, transnationalism, interdependence and the world capitalist system, have contributed to profound structural changes in the domain of global system and gave rise to many complex issues. In the light of these developments, the traditional watertight division between domestic and international politics seemed to be redundant. In other words


37 Kaiser, n. 23, p. 790.

interaction between domestic and international politics has become a permanent feature of political processes at both the levels. Joseph Frankel argues, "(t)he difference between domestic and international politics are no longer as clear cut as a century ago." 39

Modernization, Edward Morse says, has removed the "ideal and classical distinction between domestic and foreign affairs which were characteristic features of the 'nonmodernized or premodernized societies'." 40 Boundaries convergence and across system phenomena has become so much frequent that it seemed increasingly difficult to differentiate between domestic policy and foreign policy. 41 In his concluding remarks in a review article, Fred W. Riggs noted, "what happens in India or Iran is no longer intelligible in terms of parochial Indian or Iranian events and forces but must be seen as part of a world transformation in which these particular pockets of semi-autonomy are working out their distinctive yet


41 Hanrieder, n. 13, p. 973.
somehow parallel destinies." Policy formulation and allocation of values within the states do not only respond to the domestic configuration of forces and given choices but also tremendously affected by the inputs from the international environment.

To quote R. V. Burks, "the domestic life of any country is affected to a greater or lesser degree by the circumstances which prevail in the outside world and the converse of this proposition is also true." The formation and dissolution of political and non-political organization in the domestic settings rely not only on the domestic forces and situations but also on the changing pattern of external forces. Moreover, external environment also effect the process of recruitment, building up and consolidation of the leadership pattern in the domestic set up. Peter Gourevitch cogently argues, "the international system is not only a consequence of the domestic politics and structures but a


43 Ibid, pp. 147-72.


45 Hoadley and Hasegawa, n. 24, p. 139-40 & 143.

cause of them." 47 Hence a student of international/national politics while analyzing one system cannot keep the other in abeyance at his will. J. David Singer emphasized,

"Thus, it may be argued that any description of national behaviour in a given international situation would be highly incomplete, were it to ignore the link between the external forces at work upon the nation and its general foreign policy behaviour." 48

But he argues that to combine the study at two levels (national and international) into a single framework poses a theoretical problem in the sense that both levels represent different analysis and are "couched in different frames of reference ... ." 49 In order to build a theoretical framework of study in this context he emphasized, "prior translation from one level to another must take place." 50 To quote him again,

"It should also be kept in mind that one could conceivably develop a theoretical model which successfully embraces both of these levels of analysis without sacrificing conceptual clarity and internal consistence." 51

Furthermore, the phenomenon of regionalism poses a serious challenge to the "traditional and comfortably neat separation between international and domestic politics." 52 Such phenomenon defy applicability of either comparative politics approach or international politics approach to the political process taking place in a

47 Gourevitch, n. 38, p. 911.
48 Singer, n. 1, p. 87.
49 Ibid, p. 91.
50 Ibid.
51 Ibid, p. 90.
52 Hanrieder, n. 13, pp. 972-73.
domain (domestic/international) whose causes and consequences "cannot be assessed in terms of either purely external or purely internal ramifications." Issues stemming from a region can not be clearly categorized as the product of domestic configuration of forces taking place in the constituting units of that particular region, or as they are the consequences of the political process of the region as such. In fact, the entire region in toto constitutes an immediate environment for its constituting units. The component units of a region, in addition, are easily vulnerable to the affects of such environment making it cumbersome to differentiate the role of internal and external factors on the political process in the member nations. This issue poses stern resistance to be understood in the traditional framework of international relations. It becomes more complicated when we go a step further to analyze the interactions between the whole region and its external environment. In this context, the political process in constituent nations of a region comes under the impact of three different environments: domestic, immediate external environment (regional), and the overall external environment (international). In a


54 For an elaborate analysis of different forms of environment, see, Rosenau, n. 44, pp. 60-63.

55 Wolfram F. Hanrieder did not take into account the impact of the overall external environment on the political behaviour of a region as a whole and on the political process in its constituting units and vice versa, see Hanrieder, n. 13, pp. 971-82; Michael Brecher has also left this issue in his, "International Relations and Asian Studies: The Subordinate State System of
region, the role of such variables on the political behaviour of a state can not be analyzed independently since it requires an intermediate level of analysis. This is largely responsible for the linkage politics approach to emerge against the backdrop of these developments in the domain of global system.

**LINKAGE POLITICS : ITS GROWTH AND MEANING**

The term 'Linkage Politics' was first used by James N. Rosenau to bridge a gap between the isolated fields of national and international politics, which had led to incarcerate the students of both these systems in different conceptual jails, where they rarely get an insight into the work of the other. Its origin can be traced back to the international relations programme of American Political Science Association convention, which was exclusively "designed to identify and explore the points at which the functioning of national political systems and the functioning of international political systems depend upon each other." It was in 1969, with the publication of James N. Rosenau's seminal work (Linkage Politics) on the interactions of two political systems that a platform for theoretical innovation in

---

56 It was held on March 1966.

this relatively new approach to study the political behaviour of states had been setforth.

Scholars of domestic and international politics, considered each other's area of study as generally entirely different and had of no reciprocal values mainly prompted Rosenau to develop this approach. He emphasized that such sceptical approach on the part of scholars in both systems is not only unjustified but also sticks impermeable conceptual boundaries rendering the development of 'across system theory' almost impossible on the one hand and the understanding of the political process in both these systems incomplete on the other.

The phenomenon of interaction between internal and external political environment and its impact on the behaviour of states is not a recent innovation. It has been reflected intermittently in the writings of various authors. For instance, Plato in his writings around 400 B.C., Clausewitz in the early nineteenth century, and Thucydides, in his Peloponnesian War had mentioned the role of interaction between domestic and international politics in the formulation of states internal and

58 James N. Rosenau, "Introduction: Political Science in a Shrinking World", in Rosenau, n. 44, p. 2.


60 The Editors, "Introduction", in Rosenau and others, n. 54, p. 2.
external behaviour."¹ A Prussian historian Leopold Von Ranke took into account this phenomenon in the preface of his Englische Geschichte.⁶² Michael G. Fry and Arthur N. Gilbert in an attempt to trace the history of linkage politics noted, "(t)he exploration of how national and international systems and process affect each other has always been a concern of historian, political philosophers and lawyers."³ Although the linkage between domestic and international political had long been an area of interest among varied scholars, no attempt was made to study it systematically in a coherent perspective.⁴

All the attempts dealing with linkage phenomenon are "derivatives of other concerns", and treated such linkages "as dependent variables, not as independent ones."⁵ Consequentially, the common content of the "findings and insights bearing on linkage phenomena has never been probed and compared."⁶ It was only in "late 1960 that James N. Rosenau, perhaps more than anyone

⁶¹ Robert Gilpin, "Has Modern Technology Changed International Politics", in Rosenau and others, n. 21, pp. 168-9.


⁶⁴ Rosenau, n. 2, p. 2.

⁶⁵ Ibid, p. 4.

⁶⁶ Ibid.
else, brought to the attention of political scientists the need for systematic study of national/international linkages."

Linkage politics serves as a unit of analysis, bridging the gap between domestic and international politics. It accounts for the study of overlapping area between domestic and international politics, left out of sight due to the inefficiency of theoretical parameters predominant in both comparative and international politics study. It is defined, "as any recurrent sequence of behaviour that originates in one system and is reacted to in another." Rosenau distinguishes between the two stages of linkage process: the initial and the terminal. The former refers to those sequence of behaviour that originates either within the polity or in its external environment and unfolds itself in the external environment or in the polity depending on the base of its origin. He termed such a process as outputs. The latter refers to those sequence of behaviour taking place either in polity or in the external environment to which external environment outputs and polity outputs respectively give rise, and termed it as environment inputs and polity inputs. For the conceptual clarity, he further subcategorized outputs and inputs into direct and indirect inputs and outputs.

67 Fry, Gilbert, n. 63, p. 425.
68 Rosenau, n. 44, p. 45.
69 Ibid.
70 Ibid.
according to the purpose of their origin. Polity and environmental outputs can be termed as direct polity and environmental outputs if the sequence of behaviour generating them is designed to bring about responses in other systems. 

Indirect polity and environmental outputs are those sequence of behaviour originating in polity or in its external environment that are not designed to evoke responses in their respective interacting systems. And the corresponding inputs generated by such outputs would be in the same sequence, direct polity inputs, indirect polity inputs, direct environmental inputs, and indirect environmental inputs.

After conceptualizing, direct polity and environmental outputs and inputs and indirect polity and environmental outputs and inputs, Rosenau identifies three different types of linkage processes where these varied inputs and outputs are linked together. He termed these linkage processes as "penetrative process", "reactive process", and "emulative process". Penetrative process takes place when the allocation of values in a society are determined by the outside polity along with local elites. Reactive process is the opposite of the penetrative one in the sense that the

71 Ibid.
72 Ibid, pp. 45-46.
73 Ibid, p. 46.
74 Ibid.
75 Ibid.
"actors who initiate the output do not participate in the allocative activities of those who experience the input, but the behaviour of the latter is nevertheless a response to the behaviour undertaken by the former."

Emulative process is a special case of the reactive process. Here the inputs are not only a reaction to the outputs but essentially take the same form as the outputs. Apart from the linkages which emerge from the convergence of direct-indirect polity outputs-inputs and direct-indirect environmental outputs-inputs, there is another form of linkage, which Rosenau termed as "fused linkage". Fused linkage emerged from the continuous reinforcement of outputs and inputs in a reciprocal relationship in the sense that outputs foster in input that instead of ending their "in turn fosters an output in such a way that they cannot meaningfully be analyzed separately."

What constitutes linkage between the domestic and international politics is not the single occurrence of an action in one system and reaction to it in another, rather it is the recurrence of such process which established the linkage. Moreover, the recurrence process should take place in both the systems. To quote Rosenau, "... given a recurrent behaviour within a

76 Ibid.
77 Ibid.
78 Ibid, p. 49.
polity, external reaction to it are not considered to form linkages with it unless they too are recurrent." 80

Linkage politics refers not only to the recurrent process of transactions between the internal and external environment of (State) and its impact on the internal and external policy of the concerned actor, but also to the processes in which interactions among the actors within the domestic politics affect their relations at the international level and vice versa. That is how, the interactions between the actors in the international system affect their domestic political process in particular, and of the other not involved in such interactions in general. The cold war between the super powers not only have bearings upon their domestic politics but also on the whole world as well, is a case in point.

The concept of linkage politics is not only confined to the interactions between the governments of the polities engaging in direct and indirect output input convergence but also expands to "those recurrent activities that private persons or groups undertake with the intent of preserving or altering one or more aspects of the polity's external environment." 81 Interactions between private persons and groups across the boundaries refer to the roles played by the other actors than the states only. This approach of research was further

80 Ibid.
81 Ibid, p. 54.
developed by J. Stephen Hoadley and Sukehiro Hasegawa. 82

According to the interactions between the private groups, individuals and political parties in Japan and People’s Republic of China help to bring together these two mutually hostile polities and how such interactions have effected their internal political process.

Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov expands the scope of linkage politics concept to study "the two research levels of international relations, that of the state and of the system." 83 On the state level, he perceives, Rosenau tries to identify the interacting role of following variables in the formation of a state’s foreign policy: internal political actors outside the ruling elite of a given state; government of another state, or internal political actors not party to that government. Interactions between these variables only determine the political behaviour of a given state vis-a-vis others.84 Should this mean, that the ruling government of a given state has no role to play in such transactions? Secondly, do these interactions influence the foreign policy behaviour of a given state only and leave its internal political environment untouched and vice versa.

A through study of Rosenau’s linkage politics approach does not accept such analysis.

82 Hoadley and Hasegawa, n. 24, pp. 131-58.


84 Ibid.
Some scholars in an attempt to establish linkages between domestic and international system posit parallelism between the process of these two systems. They emphasize that an analytical framework developed to highlight political process at one level can equally be applied the other by virtue of the fact that both these systems are political. All these scholars based their analysis on the isomorphic nature of the domestic and international politics. Wolfram F. Hanrieder, who too considers isomorphism as a prerequisite condition for the linkages between domestic and international systems, criticized their approach on the ground that they had failed to vindicate isomorphism as such and reduced it to a "mere parallelism between the processes of international and domestic politics." He argues, since both domestic and international systems have different analytical environment or levels of analysis, propositions derived from them can not be cumulative because they are rooted in "different set of empirical data and methodological assumptions." The concepts to find linkages between both these systems must be, according to him, isomorphic. In his innovative, highly abstract theoretical framework he puts forward two

85 Alger, n. 16; Masters, n. 16; Miller, n. 16; and Russett, n. 16.

86 Hanrieder, n. 13, p. 976.

87 Ibid, p. 975.

concepts—compatibility and consensus—which, he claims, "do share this isomorphic quality and hence are useful not only for contrasting external and internal patterns of foreign policy phenomena (although this is in itself desirable) but also for making integrative propositions about the linkage between international and domestic systems." What he meant by the concept of compatibility, is a feasibility relationship between the foreign policy goals and its operational environment. In other words, foreign policy goals must be compatible with the conditions prevalent in the operational environment and be deemed appropriate by outside observers. On the other hand consensus refers to domestic homogeneity in the state on the ends and means of foreign policy. Given both these conditions, Hanrieder emphasizes the national system becomes highly penetrative to the extent that the standard feasibility factor common to both the concepts (compatibility and consensus) begins to coalesce and hence establishes the linkage between domestic and international politics. But unlike Rosenau, W.F. Hanrieder's framework accounts for unidirectional linkages. It stresses the importance and impact of an external environment on the domestic

89 Hanrieder, n. 13, p. 978.


91 Hanrieder, n. 13, p. 977.

political process of a polity and not vice versa. Linkage politics neither submits to the parallelism between domestic and international political processes nor it considers isomorphism as a precondition for the establishment of such linkages as propounded by some scholars. It acknowledges the existence of two distinct analytical environment. But at the same time, it disposes the traditional watertight division between domestic and international politics, rendering both these systems confined within different and mutually exclusive framework of analysis. It does not challenge the structural division between domestic and international system. What it challenges, is the analysis of political process at these two levels in isolation of each other. "Dichotomizing between 'domestic' and 'international' forces masks the fact that international forces are frequently congruent with domestic political aims and vice-versa. There is no automatic tension between that which is 'domestic' and that which is 'international'". Moreover, in the present technologically advanced and interdependent world the horizons of the "geographical dimension of the political processes of the states" are not limited to the geographical boundaries of states, but expanded beyond the borders." In his critical analysis of the impact of international economy and international state system on the formation of regime type and

93 Pempel, n. 38, p. 725.

94 Leurdijk, n. 9, p. 61.

coalition pattern and the role of the domestic structure in the behaviour of states in the international sphere, Gourevitch came to the conclusion that international relations and domestic politics are closely inter-related and cannot be understood in isolation of each other.

Linkage politics implies that although two distinct analytical environment exists, for all practical purposes both are affecting each other reciprocally. The operation of political processes in both domestic and international politics is a cause and effect of each other. Although both these systems are separated from each other on some structural basis, such demarcation does not postulate the functioning of political process as an independent phenomenon immune to external environment and vice versa. To say that political processes at the two levels are differentiated by order/ anarchy dichotomy or to consider that domestic and international systems are similar owing to the fact that both are political system, does not provide insight to the determining factors which influence the political behaviour of actors at both the levels. What distinguishes linkage politics, is that irrespective of similarities and differences between domestic and international politics, both are affecting each other and cannot be properly understood if attempted, in isolation.

96 Gourevitch, n. 38, pp. 884-911.
CONFLICT LINKAGE

The phenomenon of relationship between domestic and foreign conflict behaviour of nations has long been a subject of interest among varied social scientists. They share a common belief that the ruling elites of a crisis-ridden state try to divert the attention of the people from the internal crisis by embarking on some foreign conflict or raising an alarm of such behaviour. Such a practice precludes the simmering dissension within the society. Such scapegoat-mechanism are frequently employed to maintain internal cohesion and to strengthen the declining position of the leadership. Similar ideas are presented by Lewis Coser, who puts a condition that "the degree of group consensus prior to the outbreak of the conflict seems to be the most important factor affecting cohesion." Reformulating Simmel's proposition, Lewis Coser argues, "Social system lacking social solidarity are likely to disintegrate in the face of outside conflict, although some unity may be despotically


99 Lewis A. Coser, "Conflict with Out-Groups and Structures", in Wilkenfeld, n. 59, p. 16.
enforced."\(^{100}\) Muzafar Sherif in an empirical attempt to verify the 'ingroup-outgroup hypothesis' which was similar to that of Coser's, proved the validity of such claims.\(^{101}\)

These theoretical contentions developed in the socio-psychological approach also find expression in the traditional approach to international relations. Traditional approach based on the premise that in order to get rid of internal instability and to achieve domestic cohesion, the power wielding leadership engages in an external conflict or stresses the possibility of such threat and consequently diverts the intention of the people from such internal crisis. Kenneth N. Waltz, in his seminal work, quotes Jean Bodin that,

the best way of preserving a state and guaranteeing it against sedition, rebellion and civil war is to keep the subjects in amity one with another, and to this end to find an enemy against whom they can make common cause.\(^{102}\)

Quincy Wright also emphasized internal links of a state's external conflict behaviour.\(^{103}\) Barry R. Farrell\(^{104}\) argues that political leaders of constitutional democracies attach considerable attention to the

---

100 Ibid, p. 18.


102 Waltz, n. 1, p. 81.


international issues with the purpose of diverting people's concern from the internal political crisis. He adds, irrespective of different circumstances, similar tactics are employed in totalitarian regimes. Michael Brecher\textsuperscript{105} confining his analysis mainly to the third world countries observes, "in many third world states the situational change that triggers an international crisis for decision makers often occurs within the domestic environment ... ." Raymond Aron\textsuperscript{106} also points out the close links between domestic and international violence. Richard N. Rosecrance\textsuperscript{107} in his systematic study of world politics formulates a tentative generalization that a correlation may exist between international instability and domestic insecurity of elites. In fact, he does not consider such a correlation as a permanent phenomenon. "War may occur in the absence of internal instability, internal friction may occur in the absence of war."\textsuperscript{108} However, given the chaotic international patterns, he contends that these two factors appear to be associated together.\textsuperscript{109} He particularly emphasizes, the importance of internal environment as a guide to the foreign


\textsuperscript{107} Rosecrance, n. 38, p. 304.

\textsuperscript{108} Ibid, p. 305.

\textsuperscript{109} Ibid.
behaviour of states. Criticizing the institutional theories advocating changes in the international system as remedial to war and conflict among states, he cogently argues that international stability and external peace are based on the domestic stability and internal peace, not the other way round.\textsuperscript{110} To quote him that "international constellations and patterns of conflict are very often determined as the inadvertent by-product of domestic change."\textsuperscript{111}

Henry A. Kissinger also finds a relation between the domestic condition of a state and its consequent foreign behaviour. He writes, "If domestic structures are reasonably stable, temptations to use an adventurous foreign policy to achieve domestic cohesion are at a minimum."\textsuperscript{112} Frank H. Denton, following a neutral stand on the issue of internal or external causes of war among states argues that, "civil wars that precede and contribute to international war and international wars that cause internal instability and contribute to civil wars, are both "Intuitively satisfying hypotheses."\textsuperscript{113} Similar views were put forward by George Modelski. He opines, every internal war endangered the stability of international system, and that every change in the

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid, p. x.


international system threatened to provoke a series of internal crisis. Bernard K. Gordon found strong relationship between prior internal dissension in Indonesia and her subsequent hostile attitude towards Malaysia during 1962-1965. Kuang-Sheng Liao's empirical analysis of turbulent situations in the domestic politics of China during 1967-1969 and its impact on her external behaviour confirms relationship between domestic and foreign conflict behaviour. Ernst Haas and Allen Whiting contend that ruling elite in a state may pursue a foreign policy of conflict in order to maintain its position and guard it against the internal dissension. They add that in times of extreme crisis the ruling group usually follow a policy of espousing the cause of external threat, real or otherwise, to unite the divided people, behind the facade of common cause—which is a threat to all. C. R. Mitchell asserts, "... that all international conflict in the post-1945 international system has occurred because of governments being sucked into conflict that originated within the


boundaries of other states.\textsuperscript{118} Arno J. Mayer\textsuperscript{119} presents a similar thesis in his historic volume. He states, war-time foreign policy formulations are the direct consequence of internal power struggle. John W. Burton\textsuperscript{120}, while rejecting the power politics approach to war and peace among states, attributes the potential conflict between states to the domestic contradictions within them rendering each system insecure without any real external threat. Alan Wolfe\textsuperscript{121} in his concise study reveals how united states of America, time and again, construct the straw-man of Soviet threat to serve her domestic interests. He finds a direct relationship between domestic situations in America and the so called Soviet threat.

The above discussion discerns a tendency on the part of a majority of scholars to perceive a general relationship between prior domestic conflict in a state and its subsequent foreign conflict behaviour. They take such linkages for granted and consider no need to engage in extensive causal explanation to prove their existence.


\textsuperscript{120} Burton, n. 38, pp. 1-24.

This 'diversion-encapsulation hypothesis' developed by scholars in the field of socio-psychological studies and the traditional school of international studies has been put to empirical analysis by a number of scholars collectively known as, 'quantitative school' of international relations. They employed different types of statistical techniques and database to verify the validity of the traditionalist notion of linkage between prior domestic crisis and subsequent external conflict behaviour. Quantitative studies undertaken by different scholars have covered varied number of


124 Statistical techniques used in quantitative studies include: Factor Analysis, Multiple Regression, Bivariate Correlates, Multiple Correlations using Factor Scores and Bivariate Correlations using Factor Lags, Markov Models, Markov Models with Additional Lap, Multiple Correlations with Time Laps and Stepwise, Canonical Analysis and Path Analysis.

125 Data Sources include: New York Times and New York Time Index, Facts on Files, Deadline Data on World Affairs, Britannica Book of the Year, New International Year Book, Kessings Contemporary Archives. Many studies are based on 'Dimension of Nations Project'.

states for different periods of time and further distinguished them on the basis of the form of state and the type of conflict behaviour they have undergone.

The credit to set forth the quantitative approach for the empirical study of linkages between domestic and foreign conflict behaviour goes to Rudolf J. Rummel whose celebrated work\textsuperscript{127} become a pattern for the subsequent similar studies. Pitirim A. Sorokin\textsuperscript{128} is considered as the grandfather of such studies and Rummel their father. As, Joseph M. Scolnick Jr. writes,


"Rummel's influence has been very large."\textsuperscript{129} The subsequent studies were motivated by a notion to either confirm or refute the findings of Rummel's study that, "Foreign conflict behaviour is generally completely unrelated to domestic conflict behaviour."\textsuperscript{130} Detailed evaluation of these studies has differently been attempted by varied scholars.\textsuperscript{131} The central point of all the various review of these studies is that the internal and external conflict behaviour are not strongly related.

Bar-Simon-Tov "accepts as hypothesis, the traditionalist's propositions that connections do exist between the two types of conflict,"\textsuperscript{132} - internal and external. He is critical of the quantitative school to test this hypothesis exclusively by quantitative examination as the only empirical method. He further adds that instead of "developing new theoretical assumptions concerning the relationship between internal and external

\textsuperscript{129} Joseph M. Scolnick, Jr., "An Appraisal of Studies of the Linkage between Domestic and International Conflict", \textit{Comparative Political Studies} (Newbury Park, CA), vol. 6, No. 4, January 1974, p. 485.

\textsuperscript{130} Rummel, n. 127, p. 100.


\textsuperscript{132} Bar-Simon-Tov, n. 83, p. 37
political conflicts, the quantitative school has focused upon empirical examination of the traditional school's hypotheses. 133 Traditionalists propositions on conflict linkage, he argues, are also not final. They are tentative and extremely general. These propositions can not be subjected to empirical proof unless relevant variables are located. 134 In an attempt to synthesize the idea of linkage politics and conflict linkage, he divides linkage politics, between linkage politics as a foreign policy, and as a system theory which he extends to "the two main levels in international relations research (i.e.) of the state and of the system." 135 For a synthesis between these two levels which is the prime aim of linkage politics, he presents a theoretical framework, 136 different from that of Rosenau's which he considers as inadequate and vague, as it confined linkage politics framework solely to the analysis of foreign policy. Given the multiplicity of differences between internal political variables, varied forms of external environments and different varieties of internal and external conflicts, he selected single state as his universe of study to be analyzed in a combination of the quantitative method and qualitative or historical

135 Ibid, p. 38.
136 For detailed analysis of the theoretical framework see. Ibid. pp. 27 & 28-29.
method.\textsuperscript{137} The quantitative method he asserts help identifying the intensity of the relationship between internal and external conflict. But then, qualitative or historical method provides insights for the understanding of underlying causes and conditions for such linkages.\textsuperscript{138} His analysis is confined to the traditional hypotheses, in contrary to the findings of quantitative school.

The above discussion of conflict linkage studies ranging from socio-psychological through traditional to quantitative approaches reveals that the major thrust of these attempts is to stress or to verify whether internal conflict behaviour give impetus to external conflict behaviour. This implies that these studies deal with only one sided linkages without taking into account the role of external environment in fomenting internal conflict,\textsuperscript{139} and how such externally effected internal

\textsuperscript{137} Ibid, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{138} Ibid, pp. 1-3 & 172.

\textsuperscript{139} Although Bar-Simon-Tov's second variant of linkage foreign policy refers to the externally motivated internal conflict where "external conflict is seen as the independent variable affecting the internal conflict", but such type of analysis covers only a limited aspect of the role of external environment and leaves aside the impact of undirected foreign policy initiative on the internal political process of an other state to which James N. Rosenau refers as "indirect environment output". Similarly, his first variant of linkage foreign policy highlights the predominant role of internal political environment 'as the main factor affecting foreign policy making'. But again his analytical framework seems to be ambivalent in the sense that it does not clarify whether the internal political environment affecting foreign policy of a state is the result of the only domestic conditions of the concerned state or also directly or indirectly is being affected by its external environment which in turn, affect the foreign policy of the state along with its domestic conditions. For a detailed
conflict behaviour in turn affect external conflict behaviour and environment. Moreover, conflict linkage studies are confined only to the links between the internal environment of a state and its external political behaviour rather than to the relationship between a state's internal political process and its external environment. These studies do not tell us how the internal crisis in state 'A' will affect the political process in state 'B'. Instead, their inquiry is limited only to the impact of domestic conflict on the external conflict behaviour of the state concerned and not with its external environment. It is a different thing that such external conflict behaviour of a state having its roots in its domestic politics, entangled the other states in the crisis and subsequently affect their internal and external political processes. If the external crisis makes some changes in the internal politics of a country it can not be considered as an impact of the external environment as such. Because, here the role of external factors is not independent, it is rather relative. For example, sometimes internal dissension can be tackled without engaging into an external war but only by the threat of such war which is not real. Conflict linkage studies do not deal with the phenomena of relationship between the domestic environment of a country and its external environments. On the contrary, their scope is limited to the impact of

analysis of the term linkage foreign policy see ibid, pp.2, 38-42.
internal political process of a country on its external behaviour. But then linkage politics deals with areas where domestic and international politics overlap and affect each other reciprocally.

The above discussion proves that conflict linkage studies do not fit into the wider framework of linkage politics owing to their different and confined level of analysis. Linkage politics embraces, as mentioned earlier, the interaction between domestic and international politics, between internal and external environment as against the relationship between internal political process of a state and its external behaviour which is repeatedly stressed by conflict linkage scholars.

THE LINKAGE POLITICS APPROACH TO THE U.S. OCCUPATION OF JAPAN

The U.S. occupation of Japan is a rewarding case for the investigation of linkage between domestic and international politics. The occupation of Japan, in the opinion of Dower, could be seen, "as an almost classic case study of the mesh of international and domestic policy." It fits closely to the 'penetrative process' of linkage as defined and elaborated by Rosenau.

During the occupation, the SCAP participated in the decision making process of the Japanese government. The

distinctive feature of the various reform measures introduced then in the Japanese society, was that they were brought about, not only from the perspective of the domestic requirements of Japan, but, perhaps more so, from the point of view of their importance to the national interests of the U.S. In such a situation of foreign participation in the national decision making process with a view to introduce reforms in domestic society and politics, two interesting question arise. First, how far it is feasible to force a society to internalize values which are alien to it and are imposed from above by another nation through such coercive arrangements like military occupation after a defeat in a war? Second, whether it is permissible for an occupation army and its administrative machinery to intervene extensively in the internal affairs of an alien society and to reorient it along such values which were unknown to its inhabitants or at least strongly opposed by the domestic ruling elites?

The pressures for foreign participation in national decision makings are becoming common in the context of international inequalities and the relationship of dependence and domination among nations. This has evoked sharp reactions in developing nations which emphasize on national autonomy of politics and administrations as the supreme value. Such reactions are expressed most strongly in international gatherings such as those under the auspices of NAM and the UN.