

Relationship Between the Type of Government and Support for War: Research on Major Wars Fought Since 1965

Joon Sung Kim

Seoul International School, Republic of Korea

ABSTRACT

Throughout the history of wars, especially during the 20th century, as wars became a national effort not only limited to the military, public support for wars has been an important factor in a government's decision to start, continue and end a war. This paper observes major wars that were fought during the second half of the 20th century, up to contemporary times, and examines the relationships between the warring nations' political systems, and how much support they have received from their people. The paper uses its own scale to measure both variables at play. The paper initially hypothesized that authoritarian states gain more support from their people during times of war, but eventually concluded that there is no significant correlation between the two variables.

Introduction

Today, and throughout history, there were and still are many different nations with different types of governments. Although liberal democracies are seen as the new norm that countries should follow, many countries at the moment are still authoritarian with little to no liberty at the hands of people with un-democratic aspects in their system of government. Only a couple of centuries ago, liberal democracies were perceived as dangerous ideas that challenged feudal order and were severely persecuted. As much as democracies and autocracies have different decision-making processes, and enter wars in different ways, it is possible to speculate which type of government can get more people to support the wars that they are fighting.

This paper will try to answer the question "How is Public Support for War Affected by The Type of Government?" and see which type of government, ranging from authoritarian to democratic regimes, tend to gain more support from their people when they are entering a war. To answer this question, this paper will look into wars that were fought during the 20th and 21st centuries, due to there simply being a lack of governments that fit our definition of a "democracy" before this time frame. Wars will refer to any kind of armed conflict between two or more nations, in which roughly 1000 or more people were killed(Correlates of War).

Literature Review

Before we look at each possible data point and attempt to synthesize a theory, it is necessary to look at what kind of mechanisms affect the support of war for countries with a diverse range of government types. Some major factors, other than the type of government that determine the amount of public support garnered may be financing and the number of casualties, which are the factors that are the most tangible for the people living their lives through periods of war.

Regarding finance, an increased financial burden is intuitively a negative factor for the amount of public support, since financial burdens negatively influence the quality of life for the people, and in some cases threaten the peoples' survival.

In "Borrowing Support for War: The Effect of War Finance on Public Attitudes toward Conflict," (Flores-Macías and Kreps 1013), we can see that, although factors such as how value-oriented (defense of an ideal such as liberty, democracy, or a sacred war against an ideology such as communism or facism) the war is may affect the public support for war, the financial burden for the people, especially the increasing of taxes tend to decrease war support. This is especially true in the examples that this study will discuss, since the study will observe wars that happened during the second half of the 20th century, and the 21st century, in which trade and other economic activities have been more active than ever.

Another factor that plays an important role in increasing or decreasing the amount of public support is the number of casualties. People, especially people living in countries that endorse liberalism and democracy as core values, or in other words prioritize liberty and rule by people as core values, tend to be less enthusiastic about their sons and daughters coming home in coffins. We can see this in "The Multiple Effects of Casualties on Public Support for War: An Experimental Approach" by S.S. Gartner, it illustrates their findings that recent casualties, casualty trends, and the interaction of the two influence public approval of a conflict, regardless of the chance for victory (Gartner 104). From this paper, we can conclude that the chance and hope of final victory or other benefits that may be gained from the possible victory in the war cannot substitute for the losses of manpower.

However, authoritarian regimes most likely have an easier time creating a consensus in their favor, since they have more power that can be used to control what the people see, hear, and interact with. "In countries in which the government makes energetic efforts to indoctrinate its citizens (the governments of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union are examples) even the least politically informed members of society may (in comparison with the least-informed Brazilians) exhibit moderately high levels of support for regime norm" (Geddes and Zaller 341). Even though not all authoritarian regimes spend a majority of their resources towards the indoctrination of its people, authoritarian regimes have the capability to do so at their convenience, while that option does not exist for democratic nations.

"A second source of variation in popular support for authoritarian regimes is the access of citizens in different countries to alternative sources of values." (Geddes and Zaller 341). This idea is proven not long after in the paper, where the writers explain other factors to the popular support for the regimes. If the people have access to outside information or have experiences participating in the democratic process (the author uses Brazil as an example), they are less likely to blindly support the regime.

However, at the end of the day, it is fair to say that authoritarian regimes potentially have, and in most cases use, the power that they have at their hands to control the flow of information, and indoctrinate their people in some form. What this all means is those authoritarian regimes are more likely to have their people's support. Nevertheless, it is still up for debate if this condition remains the same during periods of war.

Theory

When we put how much public support a government has received for a war, according to the type of its government ranging from authoritarian to democratic, authoritarian regimes would have tended to have more war support, due to the fact that they have more control over their peoples' minds, and the information they have access to. Authoritarian regimes inherently give the government more power compared to democratic regimes, and therefore the government has more power at hand to control expression of ideas and information that happens in their societies. This power could have been, and in many cases were utilized frequently during times of wars, in order to silence those who oppose the regime's war, and muster popular support for their war effort.

When even democratic regimes have frequently used policies to do such a thing, it is an effortless task to imagine authoritarian regimes doing such a thing in larger magnitudes.

Method

The amount of public support, and how it is affected by the country's regime type, which will be marked from authoritarian to democratic. Using these two variables, it would be possible to identify a pattern and draw a reasonable conclusion.

The amount of war support will be measured using a variety of sources. If there is a poll from a reliable source on the public support for a war, that data will be used, but if that is not the case, the paper would use election results, the number of crimes, and other studies on social stability or other statistics for the purpose of measuring war support, since people who support their country's war would not commit crimes that may sabotage their country's war effort.

To represent countries' political systems on the x-axis, the paper will use a scale of its own, a mix of The Economist's and Freedomhouse's democracy index. The scale will contain 5 possible outcomes for a nation's regime type.

Very Authoritarian	Government uses excessive force to suppress, crackdown, and surveil their citizens, absolutely no political/civil liberties, and no meaningful elections
Authoritarian	Government uses a moderate or little amount of force to suppress, crackdown, or surveil their citizens, close to no or minimal amount of political/civil liberties. No meaningful elections
Slightly Authoritarian	Government suppresses liberties that may harm the regime and its legitimacy ex. Right to assemble, freedom of speech. Minimal amount of suppression and surveillance for non-political liberties ex. Freedom of mobility, freedom of religion. Limited meaningful elections
Slightly Democratic	Government relies heavily on traditional/religious values and surveils and suppresses a small part of society, those who may pose a threat to the country ex. socialists, anarchists, etc. however, most people are granted important political/civil liberties. Meaningful elections
Democratic	Government has little or no reliance on traditional/religious values, no form of surveillance or suppression, and all citizens enjoy a wide range of liberties and rights. Meaningful elections

To measure the amount of public support for the war, a scale of 1 to 4 will be used, since in many cases we do not have access to the percentage of the population that supports the war, but rather have to rely on other data, both qualitative and quantitative. For example, qualitative data such as speeches by influential individuals, or any major riots or armed rebellions, and quantitative data such as the number of cases of public

dissent (eg. strikes or rioting,) and the number of deserters or defectors, will be used when a census is not available.

1	No support: most of the population against the war
2	Close to no support: majority of the population against the war
3	Limited Support: majority of the population are neutral or support the war
4	Lot of Support: most of the population supports the war

Regarding wars, we have two or more countries/entities fighting a war against each other. They all have a system of government, which can be placed in the 5 points of the above scale, ranging from very authoritarian to democratic.

These wars were fought between the mid 20th century to the 21st century. Going before this period would give a serious disadvantage to democracies in quantity, due to the fact that many governments before the second world war maintained an authoritarian system, and even those that we may call a democracy had many authoritarian characteristics, such as institutionalized discrimination, infringement of fundamental rights, and liberties such as habeus corpus, freedom of speech etc., and cracking down on radical political parties. Some belligerents may not be analyzed due to a lack of data, or due to the fact that they were not centralized enough to be referred to as one single country.

<u>Wars</u>	<u>Belligerents that will be analyzed</u>
Vietnam War	North Vietnam, South Vietnam, U.S.A.
Soviet-Afghan War	Soviet Union
Falklands War	U.K., Argentina
Gulf War	Iraq, U.S.A.
War in Afghanistan	U.S.A.
Iraq War	Iraq, U.S.A.

In the list of belligerents, we can see a variety of countries like the U.S. or the U.K. which are considered to be liberal democracies with relatively more liberties compared to other countries, to countries like the Soviet Union, which was a Marxist state with totalitarian characteristics. In this paper, we will look at each countries' type of government, and put them on a scale, meanwhile looking at the wars that they fought, and how much support they got from their populations.

Vietnam War

In the Vietnam War, there was North Vietnam on one side, the US-backed South Vietnam, and the US itself on the other side. North Vietnam eventually came out victorious, and one of the biggest factors to the eventual victory of North Vietnam, or the Socialist Republic of Vietnam was the lack of popular support in South Vietnam, or the Republic of Vietnam, and the US.

First, to look at each side's political system, North Vietnam has one dominant political institution, the Vietnamese Communist Party. Voter turnouts in the National Assembly are nearly universal, and the majority of seats are filled by male members of the Communist Party(Britannica "Vietnam Government and Society"). From here, we can see that Vietnam was a one-party dictatorship, with no meaningful elections. Freedomhouse also rates Vietnam to be a not-free state in 2021, and there have not been any significant reductions of liberties in Vietnam throughout the last 60 years. Therefore, Vietnam can be rated as an authoritarian nation on our scale.

There is not that much data on the amount of support the North Vietnamese regime gained during their war with the south, but we can infer, using the fact that their government did not collapse during the intense US bombing campaigns, and that they were successful at launching an offensive against a well trained and well equipped South Vietnamese army and defeat it, that they garnered some level of support for their war, allowing us to rate them at a score of 3, where the people had limited support for war, since we have no hard evidence to believe that the people were actively enthusiastic about their war against the south.

However, South Vietnam also fails to be a democratic state, due to it having many totalitarian characteristics. "Though the South Vietnamese government presented itself to the world as a developing democracy, it was anti-democratic, autocratic, corrupt and nepotistic" (Alpha History). South Vietnam, led by Ngo Dinh Diem, did not have meaningful elections, and did not guarantee its people basic liberties such as the freedom of belief. "In May 1963, on the eve of Vesak (a celebration of Buddha's birthday), Diem issued a decree banning the display of religious flags in public. Thousands of Buddhists in Hue rioted in response. The demonstration was brutally dispersed by government forces and eight people were killed" (Alpha History). Therefore, South Vietnam can also be rated as an authoritarian state.

We can see that South Vietnam's Saigon Regime and the war efforts led by it were unpopular among the people, by the fact that there was a large guerilla force, the Vietcong, in the nation throughout its existence. "The Viet Cong's ranks were soon swelled by many noncommunist Vietnamese who had been alienated by the corruption and intimidation of local officials" (Britannica "Vietnam War"). A guerilla fighting force that was engaging the South Vietnamese army and endorsed by the North Vietnamese, being supported by the people shows that the South Vietnamese people were unsupportive of their regime and its war effort, allowing us to rate their support for war at 1.

Unlike the two countries, the US can be rated as a democracy, due to the fact that throughout the Vietnam War, people could actively protest against the war, and make their voices heard using ballots. The Presidency changed hands from LBJ and the Democratic Party to Nixon/Ford and the GOP through the Vietnam War. There were constant anti-war protests, therefore the freedom of speech was guaranteed for the people. For example, on October 21 of the year 1967, 100,000 people gathered in Washington D.C. to protest against the war.

The US had varying levels of support throughout the Vietnam War. In a Pew Research Article about a Gallup poll in which the people were asked "Was the decision to send troops a mistake?", in August of 1965, 60% responded no, while 24% said yes. Roughly two years later in January 1967, the public opinion was still in favor of the war, with 32% saying the decision was a mistake, and 50% still saying it was not a mistake. However, as US casualties mounted, the same poll done an year later received a response with 46% saying the involvement was a mistake. By January 1969, that number had risen to 52%, and eventually in January 1973, that number became a 60%, with only 29% still believing that the war was not a mistake. (Rosentiel). Overall, the amount of support in the US can be ranging from a 2 to a 4, and for the purposes of this paper, it will be placed at a 3.

Soviet-Afghan War

In the Soviet-Afghan War, there was the Soviet Union alongside the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan fighting against a loose alliance of Mujahideen fighters. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan will be disregarded from this examination, due to the fact that it was influenced heavily, to an extent in which it could be considered a puppet of the Soviet Union. “Soviet troops killed Amin and installed Babrak Karmal as the Soviet’s puppet head of government” (Office of the Historian, The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan and the U.S. Response, 1978–1980).

The Soviet Union at the start of the invasion was led by Leonid Brezhnev. He was not a hardline Stalinist, but was a conservative, and was not tolerant of any form of social dissent. “In September 1965 the writers Andrey Sinyavsky and Yuly Daniel were arrested and later sentenced to seven years’ and five years’ hard labour, respectively, for publishing works abroad that slandered the Soviet state. Over the following years many other writers and their sympathizers also were arrested, imprisoned, or placed in labour camps” (Britannica “The Brezhnev Era”). Therefore, since the USSR under the leadership of Brezhnev had certain amounts of government force used in cracking down and suppressing the people, it can be rated as an authoritarian regime.

We do not have access to data on the Soviet Peoples’ support for the war in Afghanistan, but an inference is possible. First of all, there was significant draft dodging in the non-Russian parts of the Soviet Union. “Moreover, the Soviet army was not a volunteer army, and the bulk of its soldiers were draftees. Though draft-dodging was a serious crime in the Soviet Union, war-inspired anti-militarism and draft resistance became common across the non-Russian Republics.” (Reuveny and Prakash, 700). The Soviet Union also spent 18 billion rubles(Global Security), and lost 14,500 lives(The Atlantic) fighting its war. Moreover, the Union collapsed only two years after they withdrew from Afghanistan. Therefore, we can infer that the people were not enthusiastic about the war in Afghanistan, allowing us to rate their support approximately at a 2.

Afghanistan consisted of many mujahideen groups, ranging from individuals such as Ahmad Shah Massoud, who supported democracy for Afghanistan(Massoud Foundation), to Mohammad Omar who later became the founder of the Taliban(Britannica “Mohammad Omar”). These groups were fragmented and later fought against each other, so we can not give a definitive score on the scale for a single “Afghanistan” during this war.

Falklands War

In the Falklands War, there was Argentina with a military dictatorship and the UK with a parliamentary democracy. At the start of the war, the UK was under the leadership of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, and Argentina was under the leadership of President Leopoldo Galtieri. Thatcher was from the conservative party, which sits on the center-right of the political spectrum(politics.co.uk), which is also the ruling party of Britain, led by Boris Johnson. The UK has had a parliament since 1215(UK Parliament,) and a long tradition of democracy. They also have elections where the people voted for their own districts’ members of parliament, and a diverse range of liberties, which was also the case at the start of the Falklands War. Therefore, the UK can be classified as a democracy on our scale.

Argentina under its Military dictatorship can be classified as a very authoritarian regime. Although there were many other authoritarian regimes throughout the world, Argentina was unique in that their suppression and murder of the people were done in a systematic manner. “The military juntas systematically kidnapped, tortured, and killed between ten thousand and thirty thousand Argentine citizens, as well as people of other European and Latin American nationalities. These killings were not random but were instead carefully planned

at the upper levels of the military government” (Finchelstein 47). “30,000 people were made to “disappear” by Argentina’s 1976-83 dictatorship, mostly young opponents of the bloody regime” (Goñi).

For the UK, there is good and reasonable evidence to assume that the public supported the war. “Opinion polls have long recorded an immediate surge of support for governments in such circumstances and this case was no exception. This was helped by the fact that the opposition parties who initially saw the issue in terms of embarrassing the government for its “loss” of the islands found themselves associated with the cause of their recapture” (Freedman 210). Both the Conservative Party, which wanted to liberate the island back from the Argentines for their reputation and support, and the Labour Party, which associated themselves with the goal of liberating the island by criticizing the ruling party for their incompetence, were in support of military action to liberate the islands back from the Argentines. Because of the fact that the politicians have been elected by the people, therefore are representing the people’s will, and that they have a disincentive to initiate a war that the public would have been against, highly suggests that the public was supportive of the war, giving it a score of 4 on war support.

For Argentina, there was also a lot of support regarding the occupation of the Falkland Islands. “Nationalist sentiment over the Falklands had been precipitated in 1977 when Argentina’s claim to another archipelago—the three Beagle Channel islands—was refused by the International Court of Justice in favor of Chile... With popular support at home, Argentine troops landed on the Falklands and South Georgia island in early April, overcame the British Royal Marines stationed there, and raised the Argentine flag” (Britannica “Galtieri and the Falklands War”). Also, “the invasion certainly improved, albeit temporarily, the regime’s popularity” (Freedman 199). For these reasons, we could also give Argentina a 4 on the scale of war support.

Gulf War

The Gulf War was mainly fought between the US and Iraq in 1991. “On August 2, 1990, a force of one hundred thousand Iraqi troops invaded Kuwait and overran the country in a matter of hours. The invasion of Kuwait led to a United Nations Security Council embargo and sanctions on Iraq and a U.S.-led coalition air and ground war, which began on January 16, 1991” (Office of the Historian, The Gulf War, 1991).

With the election of George H.W. Bush in 1988, the US also held an election for the lower house of its legislature, the House of Representatives. In that election, the Democratic Party came out victorious with 260 seats, meanwhile, the Republican Party, which won the presidency, only gained 175 seats (US House of Representatives: History, Art & Archives, Congress Profiles.) Also, after the American victory in the Gulf War in 1991, the presidency changed hands once again, with the election of Bill Clinton as the 42nd President of the US. We can clearly see once more that the US does not have any major authoritarian characteristics within its system of government and that it is a democracy in which power can switch hands according to the peoples’ will. For this reason, it can once again be rated as a democracy.

Iraq on our scale can be rated as a very authoritarian country, due to the fact that it used excessive force to suppress its minority groups and dissenters with excessive force, leaving tens of thousands of people dead. “The government’s notorious attacks on the Iraqi Kurds have come in phases. Between 1977 and 1987, some 4,500-5,000 Kurdish villages were systematically destroyed and their inhabitants forcibly removed and made to live in ‘resettlement camps.’ ... In addition to abuses particularly aimed at the Kurds and Shi’a Muslims, the Iraqi people under Saddam Hussein have suffered a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights... In addition, a ubiquitous network of security services and informants has suppressed independent civilian institutions and terrorized the Iraqi population into virtual silence. Torture techniques have included hangings, beatings, rape, and burning suspects alive. Thousands of Iraqi political detainees have died under torture. There have also been a staggering number of ‘disappearances’—believed to range between 250,000-290,000” (Justice For Iraq).

The popular opinion of the US was far from anti-war. The amount of public support for the war in the US was fairly high when the Bush Administration officially declared war on Iraq on Jan. 15, 1991. “A Jan. 17-18 Gallup Poll asked the public if it approved of ‘the military action against Iraq’ or if the ‘United States should have waited longer to see if economic and diplomatic sanctions were effective.’ A rally effect was evident, as three in four Americans (78%) said they approved of the military action, and only 17% said the United States should have waited longer” (Carroll). We could therefore rate the US’ popular support for war at a 4 on our scale.

Like many other authoritarian regimes, there were no public opinion polls done on the Iraqi people. However, we can know that the Iraqi public’s support for their war was not very high, due to the fact that a significant portion of the army deserted while fighting against the US-led coalition forces. “One well-placed source estimated that 100,000 Iraqi soldiers deserted during that period, with most returning home to Iraq. ‘No single problem was any worse for the Iraqi military than desertion,’ one senior U.S. official said ... The Central Command and Pentagon determined that Iraq had 43 divisions in the Kuwaiti theater and assigned an average strength of about 12,000 to each, giving a total of about 516,000; the other 29,000 were from headquarters or other special Iraqi units. It is now clear, officials said, that the divisions had many fewer men, probably ranging from 4,000 to 10,000 each.” (Woodward). Regardless of the regime’s goals to defeat the US-led coalition and annex Kuwait, the number of deserters in the Iraqi army shows that the mostly conscripted Iraqi soldiers were interested more in saving themselves, than fighting for their Regime. Therefore, we can rate Iraq’s popular support for the war at a 1.

War in Afghanistan

The war in Afghanistan was fought between the US and the US-backed Republic of Afghanistan, against the Taliban regime. The US invasion of Afghanistan was mostly due to Al Qaeda being accused of committing the 9/11 terrorist attack that killed over 3000 people. “Bush eventually calls on the Taliban regime to ‘deliver to the United States authorities all the leaders of al-Qaeda who hide in your land,’ or share in their fate.” (CFR)”

The US will be considered once again as a democracy. At the start of the war, the US had a lot of support from its own citizens. “Eighty-eight percent approved of the military action in the latest Gallup poll. Polls released by Newsweek over the Oct. 26 weekend and by CBS and the New York Times on Tuesday, based on interviewing conducted Oct. 25-28, also showed 88% approval for the war. (Newport)”. As it can be seen in the Gallup poll above, the US support for its war in Afghanistan can be rated at a 4.

For the Taliban, there is not a sufficient amount of data to place their war support on our scale. Afghanistan did not have enough infrastructure connecting the country together and was ethnically divided, therefore not functioning as one single country. This decentralization is still a problem in Afghanistan after years of American attempts to rebuild it, and it would still have been a problem back then.

Some may argue that there were opposing ethnic groups to the Taliban that took up arms alongside the US, however, as much as opposition to the Taliban existed, Afghanistan was retaken by them only after 2 decades with enormous resources from the US and the Western world invested in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. Therefore, we can not conclusively declare the existence and the direction of a certain public sentiment for the war.

Iraq War

In 2003, the US invaded Iraq, accusing its dictator Saddam Hussein of “harboring terrorists and the instruments of terror, the instruments of mass death and destruction, and he cannot be trusted. The risk is simply too great that he will use them or provide them to a terror network (Cirincione and Mukhopadhyay)”.

The US has maintained its democratic government, and likewise, Iraq continued to be a very authoritarian state under Saddam Hussein. The US had also gained a fairly large amount of support for their war against Iraq. “Gallup found that from August 2002 through early March 2003 the share of Americans favoring war hovered in a relatively narrow range between a low of 52 percent and a high of 59 percent. By contrast, the share of the public opposed to war fluctuated between 35 percent and 43 percent” (Smith and Lindsay). Therefore, since we see the majority of the population supporting the war, but no fanatic support from the vast majority, we can rate the US’ support for war at a 3..

For Iraq, again there is not a sufficient amount of data on the Iraqi population’s opinion for their war. However, the high desertion rates present once more can provide some insight into the minds and perspectives of the common Iraqi citizen on their war against the US. Saddam Hussein, the dictator of Iraq had to personally deploy the Iraqi special forces officers in some areas in order to prevent regular officers from deserting(Sharrok). The Iraqi soldiers clearly did not intend to put up a fight against the invading Americans, and especially, the officers who were most likely trained more intensively than the normal soldiers, shows that Iraqi morale, and support for war was very low. Furthermore, Iraq surrendered only after a month’s fighting with minimal US and NATO losses. Therefore, we can rate Iraq at a 1 for the amount of war support they had gained.

Analysis of Data

Unlike what the hypothesis may have suggested previously, the results show that Democratic countries, specifically from the Vietnam War to Nowadays, tend to gain more support when they are entering their wars, therefore rejecting the aforementioned hypothesis.

Out of the 4 cases where a country had scored a 4 when entering a war, in three cases the countries were Democratic(US, UK) and in only one case, was the country authoritarian(Argentina). Furthermore, the average support for war from Very Authoritarian to Slightly Authoritarian combined was lower than the average support for war from democratic countries, at 2. On the contrary, the average support for war of the democratic nations was 3.5, 1.5 higher than the authoritarian regimes.

Very Authoritarian	Argentia, 4	Iraq, 1(Gulf War)	Iraq, 1(Iraq War)	
Authoritarian	Vietnam, 3	South Vietnam, 1	Soviet Union, 2	
Slightly Authoritarian				
Slightly Democratic				
Democratic	USA, 3(Vietnam War)	UK, 4	USA, 4(Gulf War)	USA, 3(Iraq War)

Conclusion

Significance

As the initial hypothesis of this paper, there is a general consensus that totalitarian regimes have an easier time getting their people to support their wars. However, as this study shows, the system of government does not

play the most influential role in peoples' decisions to support the war. Rather, peoples' support for their own countries' war depends mostly on a multitude of different reasons.

Possible Improvements

This study fails to acknowledge and take into account the diverse factors that may possibly affect the amount of popular support for a country. Besides from the type of government, there may be other factors to the amount of popular support garnered, such as the socioeconomic well-being of the people, certain sentiments within the nation and its people, the amount of value orientation in the war(eg. Human Rights, Democracy)the type of war, etc.

For example, one of the reasons the US had a high amount of support for its war at the start of the war in Afghanistan was due to the existence of 9.11, in which a terrorist group hidden by the Taliban regime had been highly suspected to have committed the 9.11 attack.

Another factor is the inherent differences of wars that are of a defensive or an offensive nature. This study fails to take into account the different natures of wars. There is good reason to believe that the average citizen of a nation would perceive an offensive war, in which his or her own country invades or involves itself with a different country, differently from a defensive war, where one's own country is being invaded by a foreign nation, due to the fact that there is more to possibly lose in the case of a defeat in a defensive war than an offensive war.

The Wars that this research focused on occurred throughout the modern era, and this research may not be applicable to wars that happened during the early 20th century and beforehand.

Future Research

Future research can be conducted that examines the relationship between the two variables of this research, to see how each variable affects one another. Or it could look at wars that happened before the data set of this research, to see if the two variables show a different relationship in the late modern period or the middle ages.

Research may provide more insight into the methods of classifying the diverse types of governments that exist at the moment and existed throughout history, and which characteristics of each regime type may play a role in the creation of a public opinion. Also, there is the question that still remains about which factors play a role in shaping the opinions of different groups and people within a society about a war that their country is fighting. For example, the way an average working-class citizen views a war would be drastically different from how a wealthy businessman would view a war.

The question of regime type and public opinion is not only limited to wars. Even in authoritarian regimes, there have been revolts and uprisings, and in some cases, they successfully overthrew a regime. It is a fact that Authoritarian regimes are also incentivized to listen to the opinions of their people(although at varying degrees). Well, then how much do they need to care, and how much do they usually care are questions that still do exist.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my advisor for the valuable insight provided to me on this topic.

Works Cited

- Geddes, Barbara, and John Zaller. "Sources of Popular Support for Authoritarian Regimes." *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 33, no. 2, [Midwest Political Science Association, Wiley], 1989, pp. 319–47, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2111150>.
- U.S. Department of State*, U.S. Department of State, history.state.gov/milestones/1977-1980/soviet-invasion-afghanistan.
- U.S. Department of State*, U.S. Department of State, history.state.gov/milestones/1989-1992/gulf-war.
- Revisiting the Case for War*, ciaotest.cc.columbia.edu/olj/fp/fp_janfeb04/fp_janfeb04j.html.
- "1215 To 1399." *UK Parliament*, www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/evolutionofparliament/originsofparliament/birthofparliament/keydates/1215to1399/.
- "About the Correlates of War Project." *Correlates of War*, 5 Apr. 2014, correlatesofwar.org/.
- "The Brezhnev Era." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., www.britannica.com/place/Soviet-Union/The-Brezhnev-era.
- Carroll, Joseph. "Americans on Iraq: Military Action or Diplomacy?" *Gallup.com*, Gallup, 11 Apr. 2021, news.gallup.com/poll/6946/americans-iraq-military-action-diplomacy.aspx.
- "Congress Profiles: US House of Representatives: History, Art & Archives." *Congressional Profiles | US House of Representatives: History, Art & Archives*, history.house.gov/Congressional-Overview/Profiles/101st/.
- "The Diem Regime and the Viet Cong." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., www.britannica.com/event/Vietnam-War/The-Diem-regime-and-the-Viet-Cong.
- Finchelstein, Federico. "From Holocaust Trauma to the Dirty War." *Historical Reflections / Réflexions Historiques*, vol. 41, no. 3, 2015, pp. 47–58., www.jstor.org/stable/24720626. Accessed 11 Sept. 2021.
- Freedman, Lawrence. "The War of the Falkland Islands, 1982." *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 61, no. 1, 1982, pp. 196–210. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/20041358. Accessed 11 Sept. 2021.
- Flores-Macías, Gustavo A., and Sarah E. Kreps. "Borrowing Support for War: The Effect of War Finance on Public Attitudes toward Conflict." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, vol. 61, no. 5, 2017, pp. 997–1020. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/26363915. Accessed 11 Sept. 2021.
- "Galtieri and the Falklands War." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., www.britannica.com/place/Argentina/Galtieri-and-the-Falklands-War.
- Gartner, Scott Sigmund. "The Multiple Effects of Casualties on Public Support for War: An Experimental Approach." *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 102, no. 1, 2008, pp.

95–106. <i>JSTOR</i>, www.jstor.org/stable/27644500. Accessed 11 Sept. 2021.

“Government and Society.” *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., www.britannica.com/place/Vietnam/Government-and-society.

“How an Argentinian Man Learned His 'Father' May Have Killed His Real Parents.” *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 22 July 2016, www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jul/22/argentinian-stolen-baby-guillermo-perez-roisinblit.

“Justice for Iraq: A Human Rights Watch Policy Paper.” *HRW*, www.hrw.org/legacy/backgrounders/mena/iraq1217bg.htm.

Maoz, Zeev, and Nasrin Abdolali. “Regime Types and International Conflict, 1816-1976.” <i>The Journal of Conflict Resolution</i>, vol. 33, no. 1, 1989, pp. 3–35. <i>JSTOR</i>, www.jstor.org/stable/174231. Accessed 13 Sept. 2021.

“Mohammad Omar.” *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., www.britannica.com/biography/Mohammad-Omar.

Newport, Frank. “Public Opinion of the War in Afghanistan.” *Gallup.com*, Gallup, 3 Apr. 2021, news.gallup.com/poll/9994/public-opinion-war-afghanistan.aspx.

“Our Mission and Vision.” *Massoud Foundation*, 3 Apr. 2021, massoudfoundation.com/mission-vision/.

Pike, John. “Military.” *The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan- 1979-1989*, www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/war/afghanistan-1979.htm.

“A Profile of the Conservative Party - All You Need to Know.” *Politics.co.uk*, 16 June 2021, www.politics.co.uk/reference/conservative-party/.

Rosentiel, Tom. “Polling Wars: Hawks vs. Doves.” *Pew Research Center*, Pew Research Center, 30 May 2020, www.pewresearch.org/2009/11/23/polling-wars-hawks-vs-doves/.

Reuveny, Rafael, and Aseem Prakash. “The Afghanistan War and the Breakdown of the Soviet Union.” <i>Review of International Studies</i>, vol. 25, no. 4, 1999, pp. 693–708. <i>JSTOR</i>, www.jstor.org/stable/20097629. Accessed 11 Sept. 2021.

Smith, Caroline, and James M. Lindsay. “Rally 'Round the Flag: Opinion in the United States before and after the Iraq War.” *Brookings*, Brookings, 28 July 2016, www.brookings.edu/articles/rally-round-the-flag-opinion-in-the-united-states-before-and-after-the-iraq-war/.

“South Vietnam under Ngo Dinh Diem.” *Vietnam War*, 8 Oct. 2020, alphahistory.com/vietnamwar/south-vietnam/.

Taylor, Alan. “The Soviet War in Afghanistan, 1979 - 1989.” *The Atlantic*, Atlantic Media Company, 4 Aug. 2014, www.theatlantic.com/photo/2014/08/the-soviet-war-in-afghanistan-1979-1989/100786/.

“Thousands Protest the War in Vietnam.” *History.com*, A&E Television Networks, 13 Nov. 2009, www.history.com/this-day-in-history/thousands-protest-the-war-in-vietnam.

“Timeline: U.S. War in Afghanistan.” *Council on Foreign Relations*, Council on Foreign Relations, www.cfr.org/timeline/us-war-afghanistan.

“Vietnam: Freedom in the World 2021 Country Report.” *Freedom House*, freedomhouse.org/country/vietnam/freedom-world/2021.

“Widespread Desertions from Iraqi Army.” *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 19 Mar. 2003, www.theguardian.com/world/2003/mar/19/iraq.davidsharrock.

Woodward, Bob. “100,000 IRAQI TROOPS MAY HAVE DESERTED.” *The Washington Post*, WP Company, 17 Mar. 1991, www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1991/03/17/100000-iraqi-troops-may-have-deserted/8b984022-6f76-46af-90a3-9c6a63d49a91/.