

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

WHY DID CERTAIN CIVIL WARS DURING THE INTERWAR PERIOD HAVE
EXTERNAL PLAYER INVOLVEMENT?

MATTHEW SENIOR
FALL 2015

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for a baccalaureate degrees
in International Politics & History
with honors in International Politics

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Douglas Lemke
Associate Professor of Political Science
Thesis Supervisor

Michael Berkman
Professor of Political Science
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

This paper looks at civil wars during the interwar period (1917-1939). Specifically why certain conflicts during the period had third party intervention. This is explained with the creation of three hypotheses that look at three factors as potential reasons why there was external player involvement in only certain civil wars. The first factor that I looked at was important regions (China and Europe), and how in important regions civil wars were more likely to have external intervention. The second factor was that civil wars are more likely to have external player involvement from external players that have certain political ideologies such as communism, militarism, and fascism. And the third factor was that civil wars are more likely to have external involvement at beginning and end of the interwar period. Three tables were used to test these hypotheses, and in the end there was at least mild support for each of the hypotheses. The end result of this paper shows why most of the literature on civil wars especially involving external involvement starts the data with civil wars beginning in 1945, as most of the applications of the three hypotheses are focused on cases of civil wars during the interwar period.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review	3
Chapter 3 Theory	11
Chapter 4 Important Regions	15
Chapter 5 Type of Political Ideology of External Players	19
Chapter 6 Period of Time.....	24
Chapter 7 Conclusion.....	28
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	30

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Location of the Civil Wars.....	15
Table 2. Ideologies of External Players	19
Table 3. Third Party Intervention Over the Course of the Interwar Period	24

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to first thank Dr. Douglas Lemke for being my Thesis Supervisor. Also for all the help, support, and guidance that he gave me throughout the entire process. His Political Science class on civil wars was the inspiration for my thesis question.

The second individual I want to thank is Dr. Michael Berkman, my Honors Advisor. Who has not only been a major help for me as an advisor during my four and half years at Penn State, but also for his help and guidance during the Thesis Workshop Class.

I must also thank both of my parents. For all the love and support that they have given me throughout the years. I am the person I am today because of both of them.

I also want to give special thanks to Dr. Matt Golder, who signed my signatory page for me as a proxy for Dr. Berkman when he was unavailable to do so.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Civil wars are conflicts, which involve at least two sides in a country fighting among themselves for either control of the country, more power or rights, or separation from the country. A conflict between two sides alone in a country can be a long and bloody fight. Then the addition of an external player or players can add further complications to a civil war. External players can play a major role in affecting a civil war from the duration of the entire conflict to ensuring lasting peace once the conflict ends. The literature on external players affecting the duration of a civil war expresses different opinions about whether an external player actually helps to decrease the length of the civil war or if the external player actually increases the length of the conflict. The majority of the writing that is written on external players focuses on how they affect the duration of the civil war, while there is very little writing on why an external player enters a civil war.

Motivation leads to an action occurring. This is the reason why an individual does something. And this idea applies to the actions of countries and groups as well. Finding the motivation why an external player wishes to get involved in a civil war helps to explain what they want as the desired outcome of the conflict and what the external player's ultimate goal is. Reasons or motivations can range from protecting or helping an established government with similar ideology, preventing or overthrowing a government with an opposing ideology, securing land or trade, ensuring the protection of their state or border, or strengthening their power or position in the region. Another outside reason that can affect the decision making on if an

external player to enter a civil war is what is happening around the world. After World War I there was major involvement from external players in civil wars, while during the middle part of the interwar period there was less involvement from external players in civil wars. Looking at civil wars from *Resort to War, 1816-2007* (2010) there was total of eighteen civil wars that occurred from 1923-1933, the middle part of the interwar period. Only one of the civil wars had external player involvement. That means in total only 0.05% of the conflicts during that period had third party intervention.

This study looks at civil wars during the inter war period (1917-1939) and finds the reasons why there is external player involvement in certain civil wars and no involvement in others. Research on civil wars in general starts with data after World War II (1945). The interwar period is at large not looked at even though this time period has some of the most significant civil wars of the 20th century. The interwar period contains the rise of communism, fascism, and militarism. All three of these major ideologies had a major effect in causing civil wars during this time period, as well as effecting the involvement of external players. This study also shows the importance for foreign intervention of the location of a civil war and of the time period with which a civil war occurs in history. Ideologies, location, and time are all important components in explaining why some civil wars experience third party intervention while others did not.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

It is always important to look at research that has already been done on a specific subject, because it is important to see where research has been focused on the subject, as well as the viewpoints and opinions expressed by competent researchers. And how viewpoints might have changed overtime for the subject as new research comes out. There are many different ways to look at civil wars and do research on specific aspects of civil wars. A specific aspect of a civil war then can be looked at differently as well. Looking at the specific aspect of an external player or players in a civil war can be researched for different reasons. Most of the literature that I found involving external players also involved civil war duration. Different articles express different opinions about external players and how they might affect the length of a civil war. There is a difference of opinion across some of the articles if external players extend the length of a conflict or shorten the length of a conflict. I found no articles that focused on my theory of why do certain civil wars have external players and others do not. Also, most of the articles that I found focused on data sets of civil wars that happen after World War II with most beginning with 1945 as the starting date. That is not to say that information cannot be drawn from those articles.

Aysegul and Regan's *Networks of Third-party Interveners and Civil War Duration* (2012) focuses on the relation of external players and how third party interveners effect the duration of the conflict. The main research question for this article was "Does unilateral interventions exert a cumulative impact on civil wars depending on interveners' interrelations?"

(Aysegul, 2012: 575). The cases chosen were all civil wars from 1945 to 1999, which also have to cross the threshold of 200 fatalities. This added up to 153 civil conflicts, which is different from the focus of my theory that goes from 1917-1939 and focuses on eight civil wars. The independent variables were balancing, bandwagoning, interest similarity, network size, support for the rebels, Log GDP, Log rebel strength, ethnic fractionalization, extractable resources, democracy, Log population, and external rebel base. On a separate table extractable resources were broken down into gold, diamond, oil, and intensity. Several of the independent variables are useful with my theory of determining why an external player joins a conflict. The main dependent variable was the time to war termination in the next month. The method that Aysegul and Regan used was quantitative using multiple models and tables. Their data mainly came from prior work that they had done and published in 2006. They used duration analysis on the data, and a network approach as well. Their conclusion was analysis results from post-1945 civil wars support our expectations and show that interveners supporting opposing sides of the war increase war duration. On the other hand, third-party states bandwagoning on the same side of a civil war are effective in stopping the fighting only when the intervening parties share similar preferences. Aysegul and Regan's article states that external players can either shorten or extend the length of a civil war depending on the preferences of the external player or players.

Balch-Lindsay and Enterline's *Killing Time: The World Politics of Civil War Duration, 1820-1992* (2000) looked at when external players got involved in a conflict, how politics played a factor, and how the duration of the conflict was affected by external players. The research question was how external interventions affect civil wars in general, and what are the implications that this has with policymaking? The cases came from a sample of 152 instances of civil war from the COW database for the period 1820– 1992. This is one of the two articles that

were found that data set actually begins before 1945. The dependent variable was civil war duration. The independent variables were prior political grievances, geographic size, political system age, number of neighboring states, proximity to major power, separatists, government strength, civil war cost, intervention (opposition), intervention (government), balanced intervention, target of militarized dispute, local civil war, and local militarized interstate conflict. The method for the quantitative article was event history analysis, meaning that they rely on a statistical approach referred to in the literature as event history, or survival, analysis. They were using semi-parametric models, a subcategory of survival models, such as Cox regression, which does not require assumptions to be made about the distribution of survival times in a sample. The conclusion was that the civil war literature suggests that, regardless of whether third party interventions are benevolent or malevolent, their actions are strategic. Also, stating that regardless when there is external intervention it has an impact on a civil war. Lastly that military intervention reduces the length of a civil war. Balch-Lindsay's *Killing Time: The World Politics of Civil War Duration, 1820-1992* (2000) goes beyond just looking at how external players affect the duration of a civil war (where they come to the conclusion that external players decrease the length except when there are offsetting interventions; that is, when third parties intervene on both sides duration gets really long), but also that the article looks at the motives of the external players as well.

Balch-Lindsay, Enterline, and Joyce's *Third-Party Intervention and the Civil War Process* (2008) looks at the influence of external players on the civil war and its duration. The research question that was asked at the beginning of this article was what effect do third parties have on the evolution of civil wars? 213 civil wars from 1816 to 1997 using the Correlates of War (COW) Intra- State War Data were used in this analysis. The independent variables were

third parties, separatist issues, war costs, government reputation, economic development, and regime type. The method used for the article was quantitative. The Cox Competing Risks Model was used to do the empirical analysis. The conclusion was that the results show that third-party intervention decreases the time until the supported group achieves military victory. Furthermore, third-party interventions, on both the government and opposition sides, increase the time until a negotiated settlement occurs. Also, they argue based on their results that the competing risk method is better than alternative methods. The conclusion was that the competing risks approach provides considerably better leverage on the frequently cited dynamic qualities of civil wars and, in particular, the influence of interventions by third parties. (Balch-Lindsay, et al. 2008: 360). The importance of this article is that it shows how external actors can influence a civil war, particularly when focusing on the duration of the conflict. Also, that the article provides a conflicting viewpoint on if external players extend or shorten civil war's duration.

Cunningham's *Veto Players and Civil War Duration* (2006) looks at how the number of veto players affects the duration of a civil war. Veto players include internal factions in the country of the civil war as well as external players involved in the conflict. Cunningham's research question was why are some civil wars resolved quickly while others drag on for decades without resolution? The cases used were ACD wars starting after 1945. The types that were used were civil wars, internationalized civil wars, and extra-systemic wars. The unit of observation was civil war-month. The method used was Binary Time-Series Cross-Sectional (BTSCS) analysis using logit. This was a quantitative article. The independent variables were number of strict veto players, number of lenient veto players, coup, natural log of the population, ethnic fractionalization, number of original groups, number of splinter factions, number of external states, strongest veto, battle deaths, the percentage of the conflict zone that is mountainous, Sons

of the soil, ELF, number of veto players, resources, mountains, forests, lootable resources, and GDP. The dependent variable was war months. The conclusion was that veto players make it harder to end wars. Therefore in order to resolve a conflict it is important to get rid of as many veto players as possible. And if there are veto players it is important to communicate with them when trying to end a conflict. Lastly, if a comprehensive accord among veto players is not possible, international actors should seek to reach peace between the government and the strongest domestic insurgents first and then seek to integrate the smaller opposition groups. It is harder to make complex treaties than basic treaties. The more groups involved in a conflict the harder it is to end a conflict as each group has its own preferences and goals from the conflict. When another side is added it creates greater difficulties and can cause a conflict to drag on.

There is a second article of Cunningham's that focuses specifically on external players and not on the other internal players that can be involved in a conflict that fit into the category of veto players along with external players. This article also focuses on how external players extend the length of a civil war. Cunningham's *Blocking Resolution: How External States Can Prolong Civil Wars* (2010) main research question was how do external states prolong civil wars? He used Version 3, 2005 of the Uppsala/International Peace Research Institute Oslo Armed Conflict Dataset (ACD). The ACD was chosen because it identifies incidents of violence involving at least one state actor that generate more than 25 casualties in a given calendar year, over some incompatibility classified as control over the central government or territory, where groups seeks secession or autonomy of a particular piece of territory. The specific cases chosen from the ACD were all civil wars that were between 1945 and 2004 and fell under the types of intrastate wars or internationalized civil wars. This brought about 700 cases of which 60 had external actors that military intervened in them. The dependent variables were goals for the outcome of the conflict

between the external states and the internal combatants are different, and if these goals are motivating the intervention. The independent variables were clearly independent intervention, quasi-independent intervention, non-independent intervention, the number of battle deaths, regime type of the civil war state, and lootable resource. The control variables included are the natural log of the civil war state's population, a measure of whether the conflict is a governmental or territorial conflict, the natural log of the country's gross domestic product per capita, the level of ethnolinguistic fractionalization in the civil war state, the proportion of neighboring countries that are democracies, and a dichotomous variable indicating whether the conflict year took place during the Cold War. The method for the article was quantitative and used the Cox Proportional Hazards model regression because the ACD was not suited for other types of duration analyses. The conclusion was the empirical results demonstrate that interventions with independent agendas lead to substantially longer conflicts, and that in fact this subset of interventions is a major driving factor behind the general relationship between military interventions and longer civil wars. External actors can make it harder to negotiate and strong international pressure is usually needed to force a third party actor to leave a country. This article is important because it contradicts the conclusions from Balch-Lindsay's *Third-Party Intervention and the Civil War Process* (2008), which said that military intervention from external players could decrease in the duration of a civil war as long as there is no intervention on the opposing side as the most likely outcome is a stalemate, which maximizes duration. This shows how external actors and their place in civil wars are still not clearly defined in how they affect the duration of civil wars. The articles in this literature review reach different conclusions about how external players affect the duration of a civil war.

The final article that I looked at was Regan's *Third-party Interventions and the Duration of Intrastate Conflicts* (2002), which not only looked at how external players effect the duration of a civil war but also the type of intervention. Regan's research question was does external intervention help reduce the duration of a civil war? The method that Regan used was quantitative using the Weibull specification. Regan used his own data on civil conflicts from 1944 to 1999 that was generated and modified from his previous articles, Regan (1996, 1998, 2000). The dependent variable was operationalized as the duration of the conflict in months. While the independent variables in broad terms from the article were: "(1) whether there was an intervention, (2) aspects of the timing of the intervention, (3) the number of casualties, (4) the intensity of the conflict, (5) the type of intervention, and (6) characteristics of the parties to the conflict." (Regan, 2002: 60). The conclusion of Regan's article stated how his results showed that external interventions are more likely to lead to longer conflicts. Also, that economic intervention is less likely than military intervention to end a conflict. Regan's article is important because multiple articles on external intervention make reference to this specific article. His article is important in that Reagan's work deals with not only military intervention, but also economic intervention, which occurs with one of the civil wars in the data set that I created.

Most of the literature that I found on civil wars and external intervention focuses on how external intervention in a conflict affects the duration of the conflict. On that specific subject, I found that there are conflicting opinions on the subject. With some political scientists believing that external intervention extends the length of a civil war, while others have the opposing opinion that external intervention actually shortens the duration of the civil war.

The literature that I read on the subject of civil wars and external players focused primarily on the duration of the conflict. Most of the articles that I read had data sets that started

in 1945 after World War II ended. I found no articles that focused on the specific time period that I am looking at (the Inter War Period (1917-1939)). This shows that my research is unique in that respect. I believe that my research will contribute to the literature in that I am adding another aspect in what can be researched about external player involvement in civil wars. That is why I believe my research is original.

Chapter 3

Theory

The only data set that extends before World War II is the COW data set. It is interesting since of the major wars of the 20th Century are included only in this data set and not others. Both of these conflicts (the Russian Civil War and the Spanish Civil War) occurred during the interwar period (1917-1939), and raised the question of why few of the empirical articles include this time period. The interwar period offers a variety of civil wars that involved external players and other major civil wars that had no external involvement. This led to the question why do certain civil wars have external players and others do not during the Interwar period? Civil wars that were selected lasted at least one year in time, long enough for external involvement to possibly happen. Three case studies are created to look at the characteristics of civil wars to show the reason for external player involvement. Based on the criteria of lasting at least one year, a total of 8 civil wars during the interwar period were selected. These conflicts were the Russian Civil War (1917-1921), Hungary's Red Terror War (1919-1920), Gilan Marxist War (1920-1921), Chinese Northern Expedition War (1926-1928), Cristeros Revolt (1926-1929), Ikhwan Revolt (1929-1930), Chinese Civil War Phase 1 (1930-1936), and Spanish Civil War (1936-1939). These civil wars were found from the *Resort to War, 1816-2007* (2010), which provides the participants including external players, dates of the conflict, where the conflict was fought, the initiator, the outcome, a narrative of the conflict, and sources on the conflict. Observations on civil wars from the interwar period were used to come up with three hypotheses.

The first hypothesis is civil wars in China and Europe are more likely to have external player involvement than other regions. Civil wars in China and Europe are both regions with industrial countries that are more concerned with the nations surrounding them. Other regions such as Africa or Middle East were areas during this time period where most of the region was either colonized by European powers or were countries that were not highly industrialized at the time. The United States was excluded as an important region because of its isolationism during the interwar period. Therefore, industrialized countries are more likely to be involved in other civil wars because they have the resources to get involved in a conflict and because of their own economic interests in nearby countries.

The second hypothesis is civil wars are more likely to have external player involvement from external players that have certain political ideologies such as communism, militarism, and fascism. The goal of countries with ideological bases of communism, militarism, and fascism is to expand their power base. Also, countries with these ideologies have authoritarian types of government, which allows for fewer people to make decisions and fewer people to prevent decisions of getting involved in a conflict. As there are fewer people to prevent intervening. Therefore, countries with these kinds of ideologies are more willing to get involved and have an easier time getting involved in a civil war than other countries.

The third hypothesis is civil wars are more likely to have external involvement at beginning and end of the interwar period. What is happening around the world at a given time has a heavy influence on how countries are acting. Economic depression leads to countries focusing on improving their own economies and not focusing on what is happening in other countries. This was the case during the middle portion of the interwar period. While, at the same time using the second hypothesis about how countries with ideologies of communism,

militarism, and fascism are more likely to get involved in a civil war can explain why during the beginning and the end of the interwar period there were more external player involvements in civil wars. Because at the beginning of the interwar period communism had begun with the Russian Revolution occurring during the latter part of World War I. The fear of Marxism itself caused other countries to become involved in civil wars where one of the participants was trying to establish a communist government. (Sarkees, 2010: #677). And then near the end of the interwar period was when countries with ideologies of communism, militarism, and fascism had finally established themselves and had the economic and military base with which to get involved as third party participants. Therefore, the period of time plays a major role in affecting whether countries will become external players in a civil war.

The three hypotheses can be used to create then three tables. The first table focuses on important regions. For the first hypothesis a two by two table was created that has a y-axis of third party intervention and an x-axis of important regions (Europe and China). Then the upper cells across are civil wars with no third party intervention and the lower cells across are civil wars with third party intervention. The left cells going down are civil wars that are not in the important regions, while the right cells going down are civil wars in the important regions. The case study explains then why each civil war is in what cell.

The second table focuses on type of political ideology from external players. For the second hypothesis I created a two by two table that has a y-axis of third party intervention and an x-axis of communism, militarism, and fascism or not having these ideologies. The upper cells across are civil wars with no third party intervention and the lower cells across are civil wars with third party intervention. The left column of cells going down are civil wars that do not have external intervention with external players with communist, militarist, or fascist ideologies, while

the right column cells going down are civil wars that do have external intervention with external players with communist, militarist, or fascist ideologies. The second table shows how often that political ideologies of communism, militarism, and fascism play a role in causing third party intervention in a civil war.

The third and final table involves third party intervention over the course of the interwar period. The y-axis is third party intervention with the upper cell being intervention and the lower cell being no intervention. The x-axis is each year of the interwar period beginning in 1917 and ending with 1939. The civil wars are then placed in the upper or lower cell depending on if there was third party intervention or not. And then placed across the x axis based on when the conflict occurred and for the amount of years that the civil war lasted. This third case study shows the importance of when a civil war occurred has a direct effect on if there was or was not third party intervention.

The three case studies together are able to explain why certain civil wars in the interwar period had third party intervention. Together the three case studies are able to help explain the outliers that can be found in each case study. The three cases are most effective when used together to answer the question about external players involvement in civil war during the interwar period. It is important to remember that these three hypotheses specifically focus on civil wars that occurred during the interwar period and not on civil wars that occurred after World War II.

Chapter 4

Important Regions

Table 1. Location of the Civil Wars

Location of the Civil Wars			
		Important Region	
		No	Yes
3rd Party Intervention	No	Ikhwan Revolt Cristeros Revolt	Chinese Civil War Phase 1
	Yes	Gilan Marxist War	Spanish Civil War Hungary's Red Terror War Russian Civil War Chinese Northern Expedition

The first hypothesis is civil wars in China and Europe are more likely to have external player involvement than are civil wars in other regions. This hypothesis is the base point of the first case study that focuses on important regions in the world. These two important regions are Europe and China. The reason why these two regions are different than other parts of the world during the interwar period was that Europe was filled with industrial nations that were economically concerned about the nations around them and that China was near Japan an industrialized nation that had aspirations of expansion and gaining greater spheres of influence in Asia and the Pacific, therefore they were more inclined to take action in China as well. A two by two table was created that has a y-axis of third party intervention and an x-axis of important regions (Europe and China). Then the upper cells across are civil wars with no third party intervention and the lower cells across are civil wars with third party intervention. The left cells

going down are civil wars that are not in the important regions, while the right cells going down are civil wars in the important regions. This two by two table is labeled as Table 1. Location of the Civil Wars and can be located at the beginning of this chapter.

The upper left cell of Table 1 has no third party intervention and is not in an important region. The two civil wars that fit into this cell are Ikhwan Revolt (1929-1930) and the Cristeros Revolt (1926-1929). The Ikhwan Revolt occurred in Saudi Arabia located in the Middle East. (Sarkees, 2010: #708). The Cristeros Revolt occurred in Mexico. (Sarkees, 2010: #701). Both of these cases are quite straight forward.

The lower left cell contains third party intervention, but is not in an important region. The one civil war in this cell is the Gilan Marxist War (1920-1921). This conflict took place in Iran and had outside intervention from the Soviet Union. This case does not follow the expectations of hypothesis one. (Sarkees, 2010: #708). The second and third tables explain why there was third party intervention in this conflict even though it not in an important region.

The upper right cell contains no third party intervention, but is in an important region. The one civil war in this cell is the Chinese Civil War Phase 1(1930-1936). This conflict takes place in an important region (China), but technically does not have any outside intervention. The Chinese Civil War Phase 1 goes into a hiatus as the two sides involved in the conflict the Nationalist Guomintang (Kuomintang) and the Communists signed a united front agreement because of the threat of the eventual invasion by Japan, which moved the conflict from being an intra-state war into becoming an inter-state war. (Sarkees, 2010: #710). Therefore the conflict ended right as an external player was going to enter into the conflict. Had the hiatus not been reached before Japan got involved, then the conflict would have never been considered an outlier and instead would have been placed in the lower right cell.

The lower right cell contains third party interventions that occurred in important regions. There are four civil wars in this cell: Russian Civil War (1917-1921), Hungary's Red Terror War (1919-1920), Chinese Northern Expedition War (1926-1928), and the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939). The Russian Civil War, Hungary's Red Terror War, and Spanish Civil War all occurred in Europe, while the Chinese Northern Expedition War occurred in China. The external players in the Russian Civil War were Finland, France, Japan, United Kingdom, and the United States. (Sarkees, 2010: #677). The external players in Hungary's Red Terror War were Romania and Czechoslovakia. Those two countries invaded Hungary and changed the civil war from an intra-state war into an interstate war. The Romanian and Czech armies forced out the communist controlled government under Bela Kun, which eventually allowed the anti-communist forces under Admiral Miklos Horthy de Nagybanya to become head of state. (Sarkees, 2010: #683). The Spanish Civil War had direct external involvement on the side of the Falange (Royalist, Militarist, and Fascist troops led by General Francisco Franco) from Germany, Italy, and Portugal, while there was direct external involvement on the side of Leftist Spain from foreign volunteers. The Soviet Union was indirectly involved as an external player also on the side of the leftist government of Spain. The Soviet Union did not send troops directly, but sent aid in the form of equipment and other materials. (Sarkees, 2010: #718). The Chinese Northern Expedition War had one external player, Japan, on the side of the Nationalist Guomintang (Kuomintang), who were going against the warlord government in Beijing. (Sarkees, 2010: #700). All of these cases fit with the hypothesis.

Of the three civil wars in this analysis, all three that occurred in Europe had third party intervention. With the two civil wars that occurred in China, one of them had external intervention and the other one almost had external intervention, but instead reached a temporary

peace and became an inter-state war. Two of the three civil wars that did not occur in important regions did not have third party intervention. Based on the observations from Table 1 and the explanations of the two outliers (Chinese Civil War Phase 1 and Gilan Marxist War) then the case study supports that hypothesis one is correct in that civil wars are more likely to have external player involvement in Europe and China.

Chapter 5

Type of Political Ideology of External Players

Table 2. Ideologies of External Players

Ideologies of External Players			
		Communism, Fascism, Militarism	
		No	Yes
3rd Party Intervention	No	Chinese Civil War Phase 1 Ikhwan Revolt Cristeros Revolt	
	Yes	Hungary's Red Terror War Russian Civil War	Spanish Civil War Chinese Northern Expedition Gilan Marxist War

The second hypothesis is that civil wars are more likely to have external player involvement from external players that have certain political ideologies such as communism, militarism, and fascism. These three political ideologies focus on some sort of expansion or spreading of the ideological ideals. The *Oxford Dictionaries* defines communism as: “A political theory derived from Karl Marx, advocating class war and leading to a society in which all property is publicly owned and each person works and is paid according to their abilities and needs.” The goal of communism is to spread it across the world. Countries with communist governments worked to spread this ideology into other countries. The *Oxford Dictionaries* definition for militarism is “The belief or desire of a government or people that a country should maintain a strong military capability and be prepared to use it aggressively to defend or promote national interests.” Countries with militaristic governments are going to take action to ensure that

they are protecting their national interests and strengthening their country, which can come in the form of expansion or military involvement. The *Oxford Dictionaries* defines fascism as: “An authoritarian and nationalistic right-wing system of government and social organization.”

Fascism is a term synonymous with Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, and Fascist Spain. There is even a definition of fascism in relationship to these fascist states as the *Oxford Dictionaries* states when the term was first used: “The totalitarian right-wing nationalist regime of Mussolini in Italy (1922–43), and the regimes of the Nazis in Germany and Franco in Spain were also fascist. Fascism tends to include a belief in the supremacy of one national or ethnic group, a contempt for democracy, an insistence on obedience to a powerful leader, and a strong demagogic approach.” This belief in supremacy of one national or ethnic group puts a fascist country at odds with other countries especially when there is also contempt for democracies as fascist countries are trying to remove democratic governments. These three political ideologies explain why a country would be more inclined to become a third party player in a civil war.

A two by two table was created for this case study that has a y-axis of third party intervention and an x-axis of communism, militarism, and/or fascism of the intervening state. The upper cells include civil wars with no third party intervention and the lower cells are civil wars with third party intervention. The left cells are civil wars that did not have external intervention with third party players with communist, militarist, or fascist ideologies, while the right are civil wars that did have external intervention with third party players with communist, militarist, or fascist ideologies. This two by two table is labeled as Table 2. Ideologies of External Players, and can be located at the beginning of this chapter.

The upper left cell contains civil wars with no third party intervention and therefore no external players with communist, militarist, or fascist ideologies. This cell contains three civil

wars: Chinese Civil War Phase 1, the Ikhwan Revolt, and the Cristeros Revolt. Both the Ikhwan Revolt and the Cristeros Revolt were civil wars where religious power was the driving force in causing the civil war. The Cristeros created a Catholic rebellion against the Mexican government controlled by President Plutarco Elias Calles who was vehemently anticlerical because he believed that the Catholic Church had too much control over Mexican society. The civil war ended with President Emilio Portes Gil removing many of the restrictions on the church, which caused many of the Cristeros to stop fighting. (Sarkees, 2010: #701). The Ikhwan Revolt involved the Ikhwan, a paramilitary group of religious warriors, rebelling because they did not believe that Ibn Saud, leader of Saudi Arabia, was a fervent enough Wahhabi leader, and thus they caused the Ikhwan Revolt. Saudi Arabia defeated the Ikhwan. (Sarkees, 2010: #708). Both of these conflicts were not about political ideologies and not located in important regions so that explains why there was no external intervention in either of the conflicts. The third case in this cell is quite different. The Chinese Civil War Phase 1, as explained in the previous chapter, went on a hiatus right before action was going to occur from Japan run by a militarist government. The civil war was stopped because of the Japanese threat creating instead an inter-state war that occurred. (Sarkees, 2010: #710). If the civil war had continued and the Japanese had gotten involved in the civil war, then this conflict would have been moved to the lower right cell and would have added to the evidence that external players during the interwar period were mainly countries with political ideologies.

The lower left cell contains third party intervention, but no external players with political ideologies of communism, militarism, or fascism. The two civil wars in this cell are the Russian Civil War and Hungary's Red Terror War. Both civil wars had communist governments in place that anti-communist forces rebelled against and were aided by external players. The reason why

there were no external players with communist, militarist, or fascist ideologies was because there were no countries at that point during the interwar period (prior to 1922) with militarist or fascist ideologies. And then in terms of external players with communist ideologies, they were fighting in civil wars themselves in order to survive. Both the Bolsheviks (Russian Communist) and the Reds (Hungarian Communist) could not get involve in another civil war when they were dealing with their own civil wars. (Sarkees, 2010: #677 & #683). Both of these civil wars contradict the hypothesis as it is external players without an of the ideologies that are getting involved in the conflicts to prevent communist states.

The upper right cell contains no civil wars because it is impossible to have external players with ideologies when there are no third party interventions. Thus it neither supports nor refutes my hypothesis; it is empty construction.

The lower right cell contains third party intervention with external players with ideologies of communism, militarism, and fascism. There are three civil wars in this cell: Spanish Civil War, Chinese Northern Expedition War, and Gilan Marxist War. The Spanish Civil War had third party players on the side of the Falange (Royalist, Militarist, and Fascist troops) from Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy as well as Portugal. The leftist government of Spain had indirect involvement from the Soviet Union (the only communist state in the world at that time). (Sarkees, 2010: #718). The Gilan Marxist War involved the Soviet Union aiding Mirza Kuchik Khan in establishing the Soviet Socialist Republic of Iran (SSRI) in the Gilan province of Iran. The Soviet Union was attempting to spread its communist ideology. The Iranian government eventually succeeded in ending the SSRI. (Sarkees, 2010: #687). Both of these civil wars show how fascist and communist states were willing to become third party players in civil wars to aid sides with similar ideology and to spread their influence. The Chinese North

Expedition War provides an example of militarism with Japan. “The growing threat to the government in Beijing led Japan to intervene, sending troops to protect Japanese interest,” (Sarkees, 2010: #700). Japan did not aid the Nationalist Guomindang.

The second hypothesis is weakly supported in this evaluation of cases. Of the five civil wars that had third party intervention, three had external players with ideologies of communism, militarism, or fascism. The two civil wars that did not have third party players with these ideologies do not support the hypothesis. A majority of intervention cases were as expected by my theory, and therefore I conclude the theory weakly supported.

Chapter 6

Period of Time

Table 3. Third Party Intervention Over the Course of the Interwar Period

3rd Party Intervention in Civil Wars																								
Intervention	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>Hungary's Red Terror</p> <p>Gilan Marxist</p> <p>Russian Civil War</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>Chinese Northern Expedition</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>Spanish Civil War</p> </div> </div>																							
	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>Cristeros Revolt</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>Ikhwan Revolt</p> <p>Chinese Civil War Phase I</p> </div> </div>																							
No Intervention																								
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>1917</td><td>1918</td><td>1919</td><td>1920</td><td>1921</td><td>1922</td><td>1923</td><td>1924</td><td>1925</td><td>1926</td><td>1927</td><td>1928</td><td>1929</td><td>1930</td><td>1931</td><td>1932</td><td>1933</td><td>1934</td><td>1935</td><td>1936</td><td>1937</td><td>1938</td><td>1939</td> </tr> </table>	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939
1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939		

The third hypothesis is that civil wars were more likely to have external involvement at the beginning and the end of the interwar period. One of the major advantages that a quantitative case study allows is that observations can be made about the civil war and about what is

happening in the world when the conflict is occurring. Even though the interwar period only lasted twenty-three years there were major changes that happened around the world that directly affected the civil wars that occurred during this point in history. The hypothesis about why certain times during civil wars are more likely to have external players is directly based on how the interwar period changed over time.

Table 3 is created in which the y-axis is third party intervention with the upper cells being intervention and the lower cell being no intervention. The x-axis represents each year of the interwar period beginning in 1917 and ending with 1939. The civil wars are then placed in the upper or lower cell depending on whether there was third party intervention. And then placed across the x-axis based on when the conflict occurred and for the amount of years that the civil war happened. This table that is seen at the beginning of the chapter is labeled as Table 3. Third Party Intervention Over the Course of the Interwar Period, and is unique in that when something occurred is important.

During the first six years of the interwar period from 1917 until 1922 there are no civil wars in the lower cell with no intervention from external players. The three civil wars that occurred during the first six years all are in the upper cell with intervention from third party players. The fear of Marxism was a driving factor for many countries to become involved as external players in both the Russian Civil War and the Gilan Marxist War. (Sarkees, 2010: #677 & #683). Marxism as defined by the *Oxford Dictionaries* as: “The political and economic theories of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels...Marx and Engels predicted the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism by the proletariat and the eventual attainment of a classless communist society. “ The fear of the rise of Marxism was a driving force around the world for countries to get involved in civil wars to prevent the overthrow of capitalist

governments. This was the major reason why there was external player involvement in civil wars during the beginning of the interwar period. This was seen with the Russian Civil War. “Other countries, fearing the spread of Marxism, also began to intervene.” (Sarkees, 2010: #677).

During the middle portion of the interwar period from 1923 to 1933 there were three civil wars that fall in the lower cell with no intervention from external players. And then there is one civil war that is in the upper cell that has intervention from third party players. The Great Depression hit the western industrialized world during the beginning of the second half of the interwar period, which caused a financial and industrial slump that continued in the subsequent years. (*Oxford Dictionaries*). One of the possible reasons why countries did not get involved in civil wars during the middle of the interwar period was that countries focused on their slumping economies and were not willing to use resources in a conflict occurring in another country. Looking at historical records, leaders’ diaries, or correspondences would be needed to be used to indicate if leaders wanted to intervene in a conflict, but couldn’t because they didn’t have the funds. Explanations for why both Cristeros Revolt and the Ikhwan Revolt did not have external player involvement can be explained using the first two tables concerning important regions and the fact that both civil wars were about religious issues with the governments not being religious enough (Sarkees, 2010: #701 & #708). The one outlier in the table is the Chinese Northern Expedition War as it was the only conflict during the middle of the interwar period that had external intervention. The explanation for why this civil war had third party intervention can also be explained by the first two case studies as the conflict occurred in an important region (China) and that the external player involved was Japan, a country with a militarist government.

Finally civil wars that occurred during the end of the interwar period (1934-1939) had external involvement. This is seen with the Spanish Civil War, the only civil war that occurred

during the latter part of the interwar period. The first two tables can explain the reason why the Spanish Civil War had external players. The Spanish Civil War not only offered a chance to support sides with similar ideologies, but also provided a testing ground for new equipment and weapons as well as a chance to have troops gain combat experience. (Sarkees, 2010: #718). The Spanish Civil War supports the theory in its placement is consistent with the third hypothesis, but it is the first two cases that explain why the case had external involvement. Though it technically never had external intervention, the Chinese Civil War Phase 1 is a civil War that started during the middle of the interwar period, but continued into the later part of the interwar period and also most had external party participation by Japan, but the Communist and Nationalist Guomindang were able to create an agreement to fight the Japanese threat. (Sarkees, 2010: #710). The Chinese Civil War Phase 1 provides details that show during the end of the interwar period countries were preparing for eventual military conflict and expansion. The interwar period ended with World War II.

The third hypothesis is supported by this analysis of cases, as there is only one of the civil war that does not fit the model. The importance of when something happens can be seen when dealing with two almost identical events that happen during different periods of time and one is successful and the other one is not successful because of the differences in what is happening in the world. How the Chinese Northern Expedition had external player involvement, while the Chinese Civil War Phase 1 did not have third party intervention. Both conflicts occurred in China, but at different times during the interwar period. The third analysis of cases shows the importance of observing what is going on around civil wars.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

The thesis had positive results in general as the question asked "Why did certain civil wars during the interwar period have external player involvement?" was able to be answered. The three cases of analysis demonstrate that all three hypotheses were supported, as the tables created for each individual case study showed how the certain civil wars corresponded to expectations external player involvement and the explanatory cases.

The first analysis of cases showed how civil wars in important regions (Europe and China) were more likely to experience third party involvement. As Table 1 showed, four out of the five civil wars that were in important regions had external player involvement, while the last case which did not technically have external player involvement Chinese Civil War Phase 1, was actually ended because of the threat of Japan invading China caused a cessation of war between the Chinese factions. The war thus, went from being a civil war to being an interstate war between China and Japan. Of the three other civil wars that did not occur in an important region, two did not have external player involvement.

The second analysis of cases shows the importance of the political ideologies of external players. Of the five civil wars that had external player involvement, three had external players that had ideologies of communism, militarism, or fascism. Two civil wars did have third party participation, but did not involve external players with one of the three ideologies. This suggests weak support for the hypothesis about intervener ideology, as a small majority of cases conform to my expectations.

The third analysis of cases showed the importance of when a civil war occurred during the interwar period for whether it experienced external intervention. All four of the civil wars that occurred right at the beginning or right near the end of the interwar period had external player involvement, while

three of the four conflicts that happened during the middle of the interwar period did not have any external player involvement.

The tables support claims that my argument enjoys overall success in answering the question of why certain civil wars during the interwar period had external players and why others did not. But there are several major problems with this thesis. The first major problem is the number of civil wars that I used was only eight total civil wars, which is a very small number and allowed for any outliers to be explained. Also, it limited the number of conflicts that were not in Europe or China to only three. By picking civil wars that lasted at least one total year the number of civil wars were lower than the total number of civil wars that occurred during the period. Also, several civil wars were not used because there was so little amount of information on them and that they could only be found in *Warfare and Armed Conflicts: A Statistical Reference to Casualty and Other Figures, 1494-2007* (2008). If all the civil war of the interwar period were used then the case studies could have produced different results. The second major problem was that the interwar period might have been unique in the reasons why external players became involved in conflicts. The theory may not help us understand interventions in civil wars that occurred after World War II. The third case study is only relevant for the interwar period. This realization shows why most of the literature on civil wars especially involving external involvement starts the data with civil wars beginning in 1945. The application of these case studies would have to be modified to work with modern civil wars. This thesis though is relevant in that it shows how a qualitative approach to civil wars can be used to explain why certain civil wars have external involvement. Hopefully this will show how qualitative approach of observing and dealing with descriptions also have a place in research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aydin, Aysegul, and Patrick M. Regan. "Networks of Third-party Interveners and Civil War Duration." *European Journal of International Relations* 18.3 (2012): 573-97. *ProQuest*. Web. 13 Mar. 2014.
- Balch-Lindsay, Dylan, and Andrew J. Enterline. "Killing Time: The World Politics of Civil War Duration, 1820-1992." *International Studies Quarterly* 44.4 (2000): 615-42.
- Balch-Lindsay, D., A. J. Enterline, and K. A. Joyce. "Third-Party Intervention and the Civil War Process." *Journal of Peace Research* 45.3 (2008): 345-63.
- Clodfelter, Micheal. *Warfare and Armed Conflicts: A Statistical Reference to Casualty and Other Figures, 1618-1991*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1992.
- Clodfelter, Micheal. *Warfare and Armed Conflicts: A Statistical Reference to Casualty and Other Figures, 1494-2007*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2008.
- Cunningham, David E. "Blocking Resolution: How External States Can Prolong Civil Wars." *Journal of Peace Research* 47.2 (2010): 115-27.
- Cunningham, David E. "Veto Players and Civil War Duration." *American Journal of Political Science* 50.4 (2006): 875-92.

Fearon, James D. "Why Do Some Civil Wars Last so Much Longer than Others?" *Journal of Peace Research* 41.3 (2004): 275-301. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 Mar. 2014.

Kalyvas, Stathis. "Commitment Problems in Emerging Democracies: The Case of Religious Parties." *Comparative Politics* 32 (2000) 379-398.

Metternich, N. W. "Expecting Elections: Interventions, Ethnic Support, and the Duration of Civil Wars." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 55.6 (2011): 909-37.

Oxford Dictionaries, Oxford University Press, 2014. Web. May 2014.

Phillips, Charles, and Alan Axelrod. *Encyclopedia of Wars*. New York: Facts on File, 2005.

Regan, P. M. "Third-party Interventions and the Duration of Intrastate Conflicts." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46.1 (2002): 55-73.

Sarkees, Meredieth Reid., and Frank W. Wayman. *Resort to War 1816 - 2007*. Alexandria: CQ Staff Directories,US, 2010.

Thomas, Hugh. *The Spanish Civil War*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 2011.

ACADEMIC VITA

Matthew H. Senior

Education:

The Pennsylvania State University

University Park, PA

College of Liberal Arts

December 2015

Bachelors of Arts, International Politics (International Relations Option) with Honors

Bachelors of Arts, History

Business Minor

Penn State's Dean's List throughout undergraduate studies

September 2011 – 2015

Relevant Experience:

Penn State Football

University Park, PA

Recruiting Intern

September 2011 – December 2015

Coach Joe Paterno's Assistant to Recruiting Coordinator Bill Kavanaugh

Coach Bill O'Brien's Assistant to the Director of Player Personnel Bill Kavanaugh

Coach James Franklin's Assistant to the Director of Player Personnel Andy Frank

- Organize and research college comparisons to use in recruiting of top prospects using Microsoft Excel
- Conduct and compose long term research projects on college recruiting to present to the head coach
- Collaborate in the operation of the recruiting lounge on game days and other recruiting events
- Evaluate and create highlight tapes on potential prospects using Hudl

National Football League Players Association

Washington D.C.

Legal Intern

June 2015 – August 2015

- Gathered background information on prospective agents and drafted denial letters for unqualified agents
- Created hearing and appeal binders for staff lawyers for their cases
- Conducted research on various cases and compiled a list of all previous player representatives of the NFLPA
- Scheduled appeals and deposition dates for staff lawyers
- Performed a research for a potential new program for the NFLPA involving players and police officers

Tier 1 Sports Management

Wayne, PA

Researcher

May 2012 – May 2015

- Assemble and analyze college coaches' contracts that is used to create and organize the information into different databases on Microsoft Excel
- Examine information on different college coaches' nonprofit organizations and charities to be used in the creation and development of a charity for a college head coach
- Interpret information on the NFL Draft that is used to design and organize a database on the material

Honors/Awards

Schreyer Honors College

September 2011 – 2015

- Honors Undergraduate Thesis Research Paper

Phi Alpha Theta National History Honors Society

March 2014 – Present

- American honor society for undergraduate and graduate students and professors of history
- Student speaker at the 2015 Penn State Phi Alpha Theta Induction Ceremony

Leadership/Activities

Penn State Undergraduate History Round Table

Member

Treasurer

- Manage the club's funds for all events & assist in the coordination and organization of club event

University Park, PA

September 2011-December 2015

January 2014-May 2015