

Recap: Audience Cost Theory

- Audience cost = penalty for backing down from threat
- Key assumptions
 - Increase over time in crisis
 - Higher for democracies
- Conclusions
 - Democratic peace
 - Democratic advantage vs. autocracies

Two Faces of Audience Cost Theory

- 1. Characterization of strategically optimal behavior for states in crises
- 2. Explanation of actual patterns in real-world crises

Why Be Skeptical?

Audience cost explanations seem ... weird.

Does the public *really* get mad when leaders are caught bluffing?

Does public clamor *really* push leaders into wars they don't want?

Snyder and Borghard: Summary

Prongs of their argument against audience cost theory:

- 1. Dependence on questionable assumptions
- 2. Lack of empirical support

The Importance of Assumptions

Does reliance on questionable assumptions matter? It depends on the *purpose* the theory is used for.

(per Snyder and Borghard)

- 1. Leaders try to tie their hands
- 2. Publics care about word-deed consistency
- 3. Audience costs are large
- 4. Targets of threats understand audience costs

- (1) "Leaders seek lock-in, not flexibility."
- Actually a conclusion, not an assumption
- So why don't leaders play along?
 - Don't want to win?
 - Risk aversion?
 - Unknown unknowns?

- (2) "Publics care a great deal about consistency between threats and deeds, independent of their preferences on policy substance."
- Critical for both purposes of theory
- Substantive preferences can matter
 - "Baked into" cost of war and benefit of victory
 - Invariant over time

- (3) "Domestic audience costs are substantial, independent of other reputational considerations."
- Extension of previous point
- Even backing down immediately may have costs
- Audience costs = additional penalty

- (4) "The targets of threats understand domestic audience costs mechanisms and expect them to be decisive."
- Crucial for both purposes of theory
- Common knowledge
 - Relative ability to generate audience costs
 - Rules of the game

Hypotheses

- Autocracies are unlikely to stand firm when threatened by democracies
- Democracies are unlikely to back down after making a threat
- Democratic leaders are likely to be punished if they back down

How to Test?

- Statistical inference
- Experiments
- Case studies

Case Study Method

- 1. Collect relevant cases
 - Crises involving democracies and autocracies
- 2. Determine in each case:
 - Did the outcome match the theoretical prediction?
 - Did it match for the *reason* the theory suggests?

Audience Costs in the Cuban Missile Crisis

- Top-line predictions borne out
 - U.S. (democracy) issues public threat
 - Soviet Union (autocracy) backs down
- But were audience costs at work?

Audience Costs in the Cuban Missile Crisis

- U.S. decisions
 - Public opinion pre-crisis
 - "You've got to move immediately, or ... you're going to have a lot of instability in this country"
 - Was Kennedy locked in? Did he want to be?
- Soviet decisions
 - Why mention the Turkish missiles publicly?

Snyder and Borghard: Conclusions

- Audience cost theory relies on questionable assumptions
- Case studies don't support predictions or mechanisms
- Audience costs play a secondary role at best

Problems "All Else Equal"

Does the theory really imply that audience costs are the primary determinant of crisis outcomes?

Problems

Selection Bias

If audience costs really did work as promised, wouldn't it be rare for leaders to pay them?

For Next Time

 Read Gaubatz, "Democratic States and Commitment in International Relations" (JSTOR)

Image Sources

- JFK: Wikimedia Commons