

ceived recurring high-level attention by governments. Such efforts, both successful and unsuccessful, have been among the most important and controversial foreign policy undertakings of the Cold War. France developed a formal interventionist doctrine and fought two painful, costly counterinsurgency campaigns in Indochina that deeply divided France and were condemned internationally. Britain defeated Chinese insurgents and Kenyan insurgents in the Mau Mau Anticolonial Struggle, two counterinsurgency campaigns that culminated in transitions to independence for both countries. American counterinsurgency assistance, such as in Greece, the Philippines, Bolivia, and the mainland crush insurgent threats, but failed in the Republic of South Vietnam in the worst defeat in American history.

ALGERIAN WAR OF INDEPENDENCE; ARAB WARFARE; NATIONAL LIBERATION STRUGGLE; REVOLUTION; VIETNAM WAR.)

Thompson, *Defeating Communist Insurgency: A Study from Malaya and Vietnam* (London, 1966). Farb, *The Counterinsurgency Era: U. S. Documentation* (New York, 1977). D. Michael Shafer, *Signs: The Failure of U.S. Counterinsurgency Operations* (New York, N.J., 1988).

D. MICHAEL SHAFER

CAT. A nonconstitutional change of government leadership carried out with the use or threat of violence is known as a coup d'état. It has occurred historically in many African, Asian, and American states as the major form of government change. A coup d'état results in the formation of a military junta either dominated directly by members of the armed services who seized control or controlled indirectly by them or by closely aligned civilians.

Factors for coups d'état fall into three broad categories: factors internal to armed forces (corporate grievances); factors marking the environment of the political system as a whole; and external or extra-systemic factors. Corporate factors include budget, policy autonomy, and threats to military identity resulting from the expansion of paramilitary units. Personal factors refer to concerns of individual officers for various reasons, are disaffected from the national political and/or military leaders and are motivated by seizure of power and ouster of control. Environmental factors refer to economic, political, and social settings. In certain levels of ethnic fragmentation, polarization, and domestic violence have been associated with coups. International factors include trends in world prices, direct or indirect engagement of military intervention by out-

side groups, and financial and technical assistance that enhances the political and coercive strength of armed forces.

The success of a coup d'état depends largely on surprise and total commitment of resources by the insurgents. In broad terms, planners of coups rely on a total commitment of resources to achieve speedy success. Their desire is to displace the existing government as rapidly as possible. Planning of a coup d'état is confined to a small number of military officers. The risks of discovery and punishment preclude involvement of more than a handful of officers, themselves generally linked by ethnicity, rank, age, or other ties, until a few hours prior to execution. The new junta must seek some degree of popular legitimacy. As the overall levels of modernization rise within societies, the obstacles to gaining such legitimacy seem to have increased, with consequent shifts in the major types of coups d'état.

Coups d'état can be classified into four groups: oligarchic, modernizing, radical, and guardian. Oligarchic coups are largely of historic interest. Characteristic particularly of nineteenth-century Latin America, they took place within pre-industrial settings in which the officer corps showed little professionalization and levels of popular political awareness were minimal. Modernizing coups reflect increased professionalization of the officer corps and greater modernization of society. Such seizures of power are customarily led by military officers aware of the gap separating their societies from more developed ones, and ease the transition from traditional or oligarchic rule to rule by the urban middle classes and their allies. Radical coups introduce potentially revolutionary changes into society and place members of the armed forces into positions of unquestioned control. This intense politicization of the military, and the sweeping alterations undertaken in the distribution of power and resources, create widespread social tensions. The usual consequences have been either control falling into the hands of the military head of state and a reduction in the armed forces' direct political roles, or some form of military guardianship. Guardian coups occur in societies in which lower-class politicization has been encouraged and in which the armed forces have heritages of direct political involvement. Weaknesses of civilian governments, often manifested in uncontrolled domestic violence or runaway inflation, encourage such military takeovers; on the other hand, traditions of professionalism within the officer corps and a distaste for politics among officers inhibit long-term exercise of power. The juntas develop close ties with middle-class and technocratic groups, occasionally leading to the emergence of bureaucratic authoritarianism.

Disengagement of armed forces from direct political roles poses many problems. The usual impetus comes from divisions within the governing junta

between hard-liners and soft-liners, the latter preferring to return to the barracks to reduce intramilitary tensions, the former pressing for intensification of the military's role. Such tensions also often lead to further coups d'état, thus continuing a cycle of "praetorian" politics. The rapid pace of liberalization and democratization in Latin America during the 1980s, and pressures against several African and Asian military juntas, suggest the importance of emerging norms of governmental control over the armed forces.

(See also AUTHORITARIANISM; DEMOCRATIC TRANSITIONS; MILITARISM; MILITARY RULE; POLITICAL VIOLENCE; REVOLUTION.)

Edward Luttwak, *Coup d'Etat: A Practical Handbook* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979). Claude E. Welch, Jr., *No Farewell to Arms? Military Disengagement from Politics in Africa and Latin America* (Boulder, Colo., 1987). S. E. Finer, *The Man on Horseback: The Role of the Military in Politics*, 2d ed. (Boulder, Colo., 1988).

CLAUDE E. WELCH, JR.

CRISIS. The term *crisis* comes from the Greek *krisis*, meaning to separate. A medical crisis is a turning point in a serious illness toward either recovery or death. In international politics, the turning point may be between war and peace.

Scholarship and analysis in world politics has stipulated more specific meanings for crisis. At least three alternative definitions deserve attention. They represent not only definitional distinctions but also different levels of analysis and alternative theoretical and practical concerns. Thus it is possible to distinguish between systemic crises, international confrontation crises, and governmental decision-making crises.

*International systems consist of a set of actors regularly interacting according to some structure that is maintained by norms, laws, or the distribution of capabilities. From a systemic perspective, a crisis is a strong shock to the structure that holds the system together. Thus a systemic crisis threatens the stability of the international system and creates the possibility of a system transformation. For example, the bipolar international system led by the opposing superpowers that prevailed after World War II has experienced a crisis with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty Organization.

A core question to those, such as Kenneth Waltz (*Theory of International Politics*, New York, 1979), concerned with systemic crises is: When does a crisis lead to the destabilization of the international system? Some scholarship has inquired whether one kind of international system (e.g., multipolar vs. bipolar) is more susceptible to crises and the conditions under which they destabilize the system. Descriptive studies have sought to determine the conditions that trigger systemic crises. Typically these

have been envisioned as wars or *revolutions that dramatically alter the power distribution among actors in international politics. In the increasingly economically interdependent international system that prevails today, other types of events (e.g., national currency collapse, depression) may be future crisis triggers.

Not all systemic crises need be dysfunctional for a system, particularly if it has leaders with a capacity to adapt and learn from the shocks. Leaders in systems or subsystems may actually use crises as a means of forcing member governments to take initiatives they otherwise might not take. The leadership of the *European Community has repeatedly used deadline crises as a means of forcing member governments to take further integrative steps or risk collapse of that subsystem, which produces beneficial results no party wishes to forgo.

A second type of crisis is an international confrontation crisis that typically, but not always, is bilateral. Whereas systemic crises between actors focus only on the consequences for nations confronting one another. These crises are defined as a major challenge by one actor to the status quo position of another. After an initial escalatory challenge that triggers the situation, the fundamental dynamic involves bargaining—either directly or by means of some form of tacit signaling.

Analysts using the actor confrontation perspective on crisis frequently rely on one of two methods of inquiry—comparative case studies or the theory of games. Researchers applying *game theory generally address the conditions under which a stable solution to the crisis can be found. Analysts using case studies have focused on such issues as types of *strategy, third-party intervention, and the conditions governing escalation. Glenn Snyder and Paul Diesing (*Conflict Among Nations*, Princeton, N.J., 1977) have effectively illustrated both approaches. Like other students of international confrontation crises, they pose the basic question: What bargaining strategies produce a successful outcome without escalation to greater violence or war?

In the third or crisis, the focus is on a single country. Governmental or decision-making crises involve an event or other stimulus that poses a severe problem for the policymakers and possibly their constituents. Definitions of crisis emphasize properties of the situation facing the policymakers, usually as they are perceived by the decision makers. My own definition (Charles F. Hermann, "International Crisis as a Situational Variable," in James N. Rosenau, ed., *International Politics and Foreign Policy*, New York, 1969) involved three properties: high threat, short time, and surprise. More specifically a crisis involves the combination of high threat to basic goals of the policymakers, short time before the situation evolves in a manner undesired by them,

and appearance as a surprise (i.e., a lack of expectation that the situation would occur).

From a decision-making perspective a basic question is: What effects do crises have on the quality of decisions? A decision-making crisis need not involve an international problem. Probability of war, a defining characteristic is the probability of war, a crisis may include domestic events that threaten the government as well as those emerging in world affairs. Thus in *comparative politics a governmental crisis refers to a pending vote of no confidence in a parliamentary regime that challenges the continuation of the government.

Prescriptive studies seek to advance means to avoid crises or to manage them without severe consequences. Such studies can be undertaken at any of the three levels of crisis, but they tend to be concentrated at that of governmental decision making. Crisis management research establishes a standard for the quality of decisions (e.g., rationality, adaptation, avoidance of war) and then identifies circumstances in policy-making that tend to produce a deviation from that standard. Proposals for avoiding these crisis-induced difficulties are then recommended. For example, Irving Janis (*Victims of Groupthink*, Boston, 1972) contends that decision groups in crisis tend to engage in excessive concurrence seeking that erodes the quality of decisions. He proposes steps to reduce this concurrence-seeking behavior.

Each of the three levels (and definitions) of crisis concerns different questions. In systemic crises, when do such events lead to destabilization? In international confrontation crises, when do bargaining strategies produce successful outcomes without war? In governmental crises, what effects do such events have on the quality of decisions? Thus, the definition of crisis and the level of analysis used depend upon the problems to be addressed. At all levels, the overriding question is how the affected actor(s) deals with an acutely threatening situation.

(See also COLD WAR; DETERRENCE; DIPLOMACY; INTERDEPENDENCE.)

Richard N. Lebow, *Nuclear Crisis Management* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1987). Michael Brecher, Jonathan Wilkenfeld, and Sheila Moser, *Crises in the Twentieth Century*, 2 vols. (New York, 1988).

CHARLES F. HERMANN

CROATIA. See YUGOSLAVIA.

CUBA. Lying 145 kilometers (90 mi.) off the U.S. coast, Cuba is situated at the entrance to the Gulf of Mexico. Consequently, despite its small size (about 11 million people in 1992), it has always been of strategic interest to the United States, which has tried many ways to acquire control over Cuba or to assure its allegiance. The Cubans, however, have had other ideas.

Historical Background. Cubans had been expelled from Spain in 1492, and in the so-called Spanish-American War of 1898, Cuba was to lose the struggle, the United States intervened under the guise of helping Cuba gain independence from Spain. Although Cuba was granted full sovereignty after the war, the United States imposed protectorate status over Cuba in a proxy between 1901 and 1934. The United States derived from the Platt Amendment the right to intervene in the United States to intervene in Cuba and property and to "assure Cuba's independence." Over the years, U.S. marines did intervene in Cuba to restore order and protect Cuban national interests on the island.

In 1933, Gerardo Machado, president of Cuba, since 1925, was forced to resign by a student-led opposition. He was replaced by reformer Dr. Ramón Grau San Martín. Grau San Martín elected Roosevelt administration to power. The government had "communist" influences. In 1934, backed a coup by Colonel Fulgencio Batista (1934–1944). A mulatto of humble origins, Batista had a reputation as a populist by his support of labor legislation, but he was a military force to pursue his goals.

The years 1944–1952, Cuba was a period with liberal democracy, were a period of reform. The country was governed by a coalition of first reformer Grau San Martín and Fulgencio Batista Socarrás. Although the period was a period of optimism inspired by the reform party, the two leaders abused their power. In an avalanche of corruption, Batista's men in the United States and the colonel returned to power. Batista's more unscrupulous and more corrupt. The United States.

Led by a young university student, Fidel Castro, a handful of Cuban revolutionaries to Batista's seizure of power. The revolutionaries fought for power with the assistance of a garrison in 1953, a military operation that was a success. Taken prisoner, Fidel Castro gave a speech with the provocative speech, "Where do I go, Me," a rallying cry for the revolution. Batista's men were amnestied and released where they plotted their return to power. Batista they set sail for Cuba aboard the *Granma*. In the next two years, the Batista government and revolutionaries in the country were overthrown on 1 January 1959, with Batista fleeing Cuba. Fidel Castro became the first leader of the Cuban Revolution, cheered as a national hero.

The *Cuban Revolution of 1959 was a socialist revolution. First a reformer, Castro's reform program was a socialist position. Fearing *nationalism,