1

Leadership and Diplomacy

In 1978, James MacGregor Burns observed that "[l]eadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth."[1] More than three decades later, Burns's statement still encapsulates the challenge facing the leadership studies field. Undoubtedly important, but somehow indistinct in its influence, leadership is difficult to capture. The failure to understand this phenomenon, however, is not for lack of trying. At the popular level, the widely held but mistaken view is that leadership equals the art of acting strongly—that to lead must be to go ahead or to direct by example. However, history is replete with examples of leaders failing through too much aggression, and strong leadership may be bad leadership if it is unethical or immoral. In academia, sociologists, political scientists, management theorists, and psychologists all study leadership, often at cross purposes. For political science too, as Robert C. Tucker notes, "leadership is an elusive phenomenon and . . . there is no consensus amongst political scientists on what it means."[2]

Whereas subsequent chapters focus clearly on the Japanese context, this chapter is largely concerned with the leadership studies field. The aim is to establish the basic framework needed to understand the role of leaders in international affairs, what is known about political leadership, and how leadership in diplomacy might be most usefully understood. The chapter is broken into four basic parts. The first part synthesizes the current leadership literature so as to draw out the basic concepts that might be useful later in studying Japan. Three fundamental aspects of leadership are examined: (1) the concepts surrounding leadership, especially power, values, legitimacy, and authority; (2) the major leadership typologies from the field; and (3) the leadership *styles* used as analytical tools for understanding particular leaders. The second part then extends this leadership framework by developing the concept of *leadership strategy* as a way of assessing both the processes and the outcomes of political leadership. The

third part explains the domestic and international environmental context in which leadership operates, and also how these environments are linked. Since the book's case studies focus on the Group of Seven/Eight (G7/8) summits, this part also explores the nature of international summitry and the evolution of the G7/8 process. The chapter's final part then seeks to resolve where the leader, when acting as a nation's chief diplomat, fits within this framework.

Conceptualizing Leadership

Burns made his observation in the midst of a boom in leadership studies in the United States in the late 1970s. Yet, as the concept has received ever greater attention, so the definitions have multiplied while the prospects for conceptual clarity have arguably declined. One count of attempts to define leadership produced 221 entries between the 1920s and 1990s.[3] In his guide to the theory and practice of leadership, for example, Peter Northouse outlines five approaches to the study of leadership, three broad theories, and three types of leadership.[4] Burns argues that leadership is being "exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers." Elsewhere, he describes leadership as when leaders induce followers "to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations—the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations—*of both leaders and followers*."[5]

The task of defining political leadership is no less challenging. As Jean Blondel argues, "political leadership is almost certainly broader than any other form of leadership." Robert Elgie also describes in great detail the many attempts at definitions but declines to provide a definition of his own. He argues instead that, because of the thousands of definitions already in existence, and because the cultural factors surrounding leadership make anyone's definition as accurate or inaccurate as anyone else's, there is little value in further clarification. The "incremental addition to knowledge of a new definition," he suggests, "would be as near to zero as makes no difference."[6]

Power, Values, Legitimacy, and Authority

Understanding how political leadership has been defined does, nonetheless, provide some insight into the roles leadership might play in politics.

The interaction between authority, power, and values is especially relevant. In his definition of political leadership, Burns suggests that leadership is the "processes and effects" of power where a number of actors, with various motivations, engage with the motives of potential followers for the purpose of reciprocal benefit or real change. Political leadership, thus understood, is "*broadly intended 'real' change*" or "*collectively purposeful causation*."[7]

Power is thus a central dimension of leadership. Any kind of leadership—but particularly political leadership—is inevitably concerned with it. As Joseph Nye argues, "[y]ou cannot lead if you do not have power."[8] Likewise, Burns details humanity's obsession with power in the twentieth century and its terrible consequences. He argues that politics is more than simply power and the use of it; indeed, there is a need to recognize that, where some humans influence others, not all these relationships are exploitative or coercive. Beyond coercion, Burns asserts, there is scope for persuasion or exchange, as well as elevation and transformation. Leadership might thus be seen as a "special form of power."[9]

The task of defining power in political science unsurprisingly attracts controversy. Sometimes viewed as the capacity to "affect the behavior of others to get the outcomes you want," power can be divided into three dimensions: influence over decision-making, agenda-setting, and preferences.[10] Yet because leadership also operates on a non-coercive basis, there must be some reconciliation of motive and purpose. As such, leadership is often viewed as a moral relationship and must therefore be intimately concerned with values and have moral implications. In discharging values, leaders should take heed of the implications for good conduct, equality and justice, and the well-being of followers. Burns argues that a "leader and a tyrant are polar opposites." However, history is full of leaders who have demonstrated varying degrees of morality, thereby making any decision to exclude them from the study of leadership highly controversial. Blondel, for instance, views the exclusion of such leaders as "unjustifiable, unrealistic and indeed practically impossible."[11]

In terms of how leaders use their power, two further ideas are also important. These are *legitimacy* and *authority*. The process of obtaining legitimacy and authority again involves both leaders and followers, with the latter playing a key role in "legitimating" the former. Edwin Hollander argues that, as actors who legitimize leaders, followers have considerable power to shape leaders' influence, as well as the style of leadership offered and, ultimately, the group's performance. Thus viewed, followers are a major *source* of this authority. In his three models of legitimate authority, Max Weber places leaders into types depending upon the source of their

authority, whether it is grounded in rationality, tradition, or charisma. These types are in turn based on the rights of leaders under society's rules (legal authority); society's belief about established customs and leaders' roles within those customs (tradition); and charisma, or leaders' personalities, alone. The first two types of authority clearly rest on the *position* of the leader, whereas the third depends on the leader's *personality*. It is therefore possible to refer to *assigned* leadership (the first two types) and *emergent* leadership (the third type).[12]

Leadership Typologies: Agency versus Structure

Unsurprisingly, key assumptions, methodologies, and typologies are widely disputed in this diverse field. Yet the central debate in the historical development of leadership studies concerns the role of agency versus structure. As Brian Jones asks, "[t]o what extent are the actions of leaders determined . . . by forces beyond the leader's control? To what extent is leadership dictated by structure, and to what extent is there room for independent action?"[13]

   In its early development, the study of leadership focused first on individual political actors—the *great men* of history. This approach quickly drew criticism, however, which prompted a shift to an emphasis of structure over agency—to the *great forces* of history.[14] The contemporary literature has responded with a third paradigm, one acknowledging that individual personality and characteristics, as well as environmental influences, affect the processes and outcomes of political leadership. The political process, thus understood, has been described as a set of intricately wired computers where "political actors can be viewed as key junctures in the wiring, for example circuit breakers."[15] Much recent work on leadership takes this as a basic assumption, but differs in terms of the emphasis it places on either agency or structure.

   Current approaches to leadership fall into five broad categories: the *trait*, *behavior*, *influence*, *situational*, and *integrative* approaches. The *trait* approach focuses on the various attributes possessed by leaders, notably personality, values, motives, and skills. By contrast, the *behavioral* approach emphasizes the actions of leaders and seeks to study how they manage the demands, constraints, and conflicts in their leadership roles. A key research question for this approach concerns the kinds of behavior exhibited by effective leaders. The *influence* approach focuses on leaders' interaction or influence, and is therefore concerned chiefly with the way in which leaders exercise power. *Situational* approaches focus on the

opposite end of the leader–follower spectrum: how follower dynamics affect leaders. Accordingly, they tend to place greater emphasis on environmentally focused perspectives. For example, contingency theory posits that effectiveness in leaders depends upon how suited their leadership style is to the given context. Finally, *integrative* approaches are eclectic in nature as they draw on more than one of the other four approaches.[16]

Studies acknowledging the role of both agency and structure generally assume "the existence of certain general leadership qualities . . . along with the variability of leadership traits according to the demands of group situations."[17] This provides what is sometimes described as an interactional understanding of leadership or *interactionism*. This concept of leadership brings together the situational and trait approaches by employing three variables as analytical categories—situation, psychology, and skills—as well as the fourth variable of followers or environments. Political leaders are thus constrained by the process of government, meaning that "particular political structures" are clearly important to the outcomes of political leadership.[18]

Leadership Styles

A key problem for the various approaches to studying leadership is classification: which leaders go where and why? The widely used transformational-transactional model of leadership seeks to classify leaders based on their leadership *style*, or leadership processes, with the model's two basic leadership styles differing in their objectives, methods, and values.

Burns characterizes transforming leadership as an engagement between leaders and followers that raises both parties to "higher levels of motivation and morality."[19] By contrast, transactional leadership, according to Burns, is "when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things."[20] Transformational leadership, therefore, rests on a nonrational sentiment or emotion, whereas a transactional relationship is based upon a rational relationship of self-interest. The chief values of transactional leadership "are *modal values*, that is, values of means—honesty, responsibility, fairness, the honoring of commitments," while transformational leadership "is more concerned with *end-values*, such as liberty, justice, equality."[21] In reality, however, political leaders generally demonstrate both tendencies. As Bernard Bass notes, "*[m]ost leaders do both but in different amounts*."[22]

The contemporary transformational-transactional model of leadership rests on six basic factors, with the first four relating to transformational

leadership and the final two relating to transactional leadership. These are: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reinforcement, and management-by-exception. Finally, there is a seventh factor that, as Northouse argues, "falls at the far side of the transactional-transformational continuum."[23] This is laissez-faire leadership or non-leadership (see table 1).

The first two types of transformational leadership are *idealized influence* and *inspirational motivation*. Idealized influence, also known as *charisma* and the first factor of the transformational leadership style, has a long tradition in sociology and political science. The word charisma itself has become such an everyday term that its meaning has been obscured. Weber characterizes charisma as a special talent, a power that is divinely conferred. He refers to natural leaders as the "bearers of specific gifts of body and mind that . . . [are] considered 'supernatural,'" in that only a select few possess such talents.[24] Inspirational motivation, the closely-related second factor, refers to the way some leaders communicate high expectations to followers, thereby inspiring those followers to increase their commitment to a shared organizational vision. Leaders do not need to be charismatic in order to inspire, however. In order to influence followers or other actors, many refer back to shared cultural understandings

Table 1. Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles

Transformational Leadership	*Transactional Leadership*
Charisma or idealized influence	Contingent reinforcement
Inspirational motivation	Management-by-exception

Intellectual stimulation
    Rational, empirical, existential, and
    idealistic
	Intellectual stimulation
	    Rational and empirical

Individualized consideration	Other types: opinion, group, party, legislative, executive
Laissez-faire	

Source: James MacGregor Burns, *Leadership* (New York: Harper & Row, 1978); Bernard M. Bass, *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations* (New York: The Free Press, 1985); Peter G. Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2007).

and symbols, assimilating to themselves those actions and values that are embodied in their society's myths.[25]

The second two types of transformational leadership are *intellectual stimulation* and *individualized consideration*. Intellectual stimulation focuses on problem solving and is concerned with beliefs and values rather than action. These are viewed as being either rationally, empirically, existentially, or idealistically-oriented. Indeed, the first two could be either transformational or transactional depending upon the context (see table 1), with existentially oriented and idealistically oriented intellectual leaders more clearly transformational.[26] Individualized consideration, on the other hand, refers to the relationship between leaders and small groups. Here, transformational leaders build links through communication techniques based on personal exchanges. These leaders aim to have followers or other actors considering not only their own interests but also the implications of their ambitions and actions.[27]

Whereas transformational leadership emphasizes nonrational human behavior, transactional leadership is a process whereby a leader aims to satisfy others' needs and wants in a way that causes them to pursue the leader's aims. The relationship is sometimes viewed as iterative bargaining in which participants are aware of the resources and views held by others but do not share a purpose beyond the exchange.[28] The rational exchange inherent in transactional leadership is sometimes described as "instrumental compliance"—with reward and punishment the central features. Compliance, however, is not necessarily automatic: leaders must be capable of delivering their side of the bargain. According to Burns, this style of leadership consists of several broad subtypes: opinion, small group, party, legislative, and executive leadership.[29]

The two main factors identified in this rational exchange are known as *contingent reinforcement* and *management-by-exception*.[30] The first of these represents the positive side of the instrumental exchange—leaders offer rewards (reinforcement) in return for certain behavior. The second represents the negative side of the instrumental exchange. It operates on a principle of leaders monitoring the behavior of others and intervening to correct this behavior only when it becomes problematic.[31] The processes of followership management, negotiation, and bargaining are vital to these elements of transactional leadership. Such leaders rely on their proximity to power and use their position as a broker of this power. The greater the level of protection or benefits that transactional leaders can offer, the greater the control and consensus they can be expected to demand.

A Leadership Strategy Model

Understanding Process and Outcome

Leadership is often portrayed as a way of *doing things*; yet it is also about *achieving things*. Is leadership a process or an outcome? And how should leaders be assessed? Blondel argues that the principal classification of leadership must be the *impact* leaders have.[32] In this respect, the transactional-transformational model, while a good starting point for assessing leaders, struggles to distinguish between impact and process because it is a style-based (i.e., process-based) model. Are leaders more transformational or transactional because of the way they behave or because of what they achieve? As with so many other aspects of leadership studies, Burns and his transformational leadership concept have had a major influence on this issue. The argument that political leadership is "real and intended change" or "purposeful causation" suggests that leadership is more than simply a process. The first part of Burns's criteria for transformational leadership requires substantial *real* change. The second part is that these changes must be *intended* (rather than accidental).[33]

But how much and what kind of change is necessary for leadership to be transformational? Bass also distinguishes between transformational and transactional leadership based on the nature of the change such leadership effects. He sees a "first order of change"—a change of degree—as the product of transactional leadership facilitated by the exchange between leaders and followers. By contrast, the "second order of change"—bringing about a transformation in the attitudes and beliefs of followers—must come from transformational leadership. The key feature that distinguishes transformational leadership, therefore, is one of nature and not degree.[34] Thus understood, whether leaders can be transformational if they only bring about numerous instances of change is doubtful, even if these changes ultimately lead to a transformed environment. Transactional leadership can thus never bring about the quality of change required of transformational leadership.

This confusion between process and outcome is a significant weakness. Nye, for instance, is critical of the confusion surrounding transformational leadership, "because theorists use it to refer to leaders' objectives, the styles they use, and the outcomes they produce."[35] Given what is now assumed about environmental factors, if transformational leadership refers only to outcomes and not style, it becomes a social-determinist concept that minimizes the role of individuals. Furthermore, if leader-

ship outcomes are critical to defining a leadership style, the resulting conceptual model is circular: outcomes become both a product of and an input into style. Accordingly, Nye uses separate terms for styles and objectives. *Transforming* leadership refers to situations where leaders bring about change to followers' views, while *transformational* leadership refers to situations where leaders bring about change to the world at large. In some ways, however, this only adds to the confusion, since similar terms are being used to describe multiple but quite distinct concepts.[36]

Aurelia George Mulgan partially resolves this problem by distinguishing between two types of transformational leadership: *strong* and *weak*. Her distinction is based on the "extent of change" leaders bring about. "Transformational change, by definition," she argues, "is radical and path-breaking in its effects, literally 'transforming' rather than merely altering."[37] Strong transformational leadership is where leaders possess both a strong vision for change (or leadership style) and the capacity to achieve it (as demonstrated by results), while weak transformational leadership is when leaders might possess a vision but are unable to effect the change. If leaders achieve major change through a transactional leadership style, however, their leadership remains transactional. Yet this approach weakens the basis for comparison between the two styles—one leadership type is now outcomes-based (transformational) while the other (transactional) is process-based. Further, it cannot easily address the question of how leadership combining both styles might be understood.[38]

A more flexible approach is developed by Blondel, who divides the task of assessing leaders into two dimensions. The first measures the *degree of change* that leaders achieve. This change extends from maintenance, through moderate to large change. The second dimension adds the *scope of change* that leaders achieve. The impact of leaders on their environments can have a *wide*, *moderate,* or *specialized* scope. This means that the first dimension distinguishes leaders "depending on the extent to which they are concerned with maintenance or change in the society," while the second distinguishes between leaders by "assessing the scope and range of intervention."[39] Leaders may bring about change that is large but limited in its application (i.e., to a particular area of society or policy).

Adding Vision to Style

If leadership outcomes can be characterized depending on the degree and scope of change involved, how might leadership processes be added to this framework? In answer to this problem, this book puts forward the concept

of *leadership strategy*.[40] Leadership strategy combines the two main elements of leadership—vision and style. *Vision* acts as an abridgement of the motivations, ambitions, and goals of political leaders, and covers the moral aspects of leadership. *Style*, on the other hand, is a short form for the various ways in which leaders engage in politics and pursue their goals. It therefore covers the kinds of trait and behavioral approaches examined earlier. Leaders come to power with numerous goals or intentions regarding change. Indeed, Blondel argues that leadership vision is "a general classification of the goals—or general orientations—of political leaders."[41] These may change over time as leaders respond to new events or shifting follower expectations; however, they are a central part of most leaders' approach to politics. Even the least involved laissez-faire leaders generally come to office with some form of leadership platform.

In terms of classifying leadership visions, Blondel's model of *effected* change (leadership outcomes) can be used as the basis for a model of *intended* change. The horizontal plane would run from a wide scope of intended change on the left, through a moderate scope, to a specialized scope on the right. The vertical plane would run from a minimum degree of intended change on the top to a maximum degree on the bottom (see table 2). For example, an *innovative* leadership vision, involving a maximum degree of change to a specialized scope, would appear on the bottom-right of the table. A *conservational* leadership vision, involving a minimum degree of change to a wide scope, would appear on the top-left of the table. On the other hand, a *reassuring* leadership vision, encompassing a moderate degree of change across a moderate scope, would appear in the middle of the table.[42]

Leadership Environments

How are different political environments important in shaping political leadership? Already this chapter has established that leadership is now largely understood in the field as an interactive process between individual and environment. For this book, the role played by the international summit environment of the G7 or G8 economic summits is particularly important. How Japan's prime ministers have operated in the confined atmosphere of the summits, engaging with the leaders of the world's major economic powers, will clearly affect the processes and outcomes of their political leadership. Yet it is also important to review the other political environments surrounding these summits, since leaders acting

Table 2. Change and Scope in Leadership Visions and Outcomes

Degree of Change	Scope of Change		
	Wide Scope	*Moderate Scope*	*Specialized Scope*
Minimum Change	Conservational	Paternalistic	Managerial
Moderate Change	Repositional	Reassuring	Redefinitional
Maximum Change	Revolutionary	Reformist	Innovative

Source: Jean Blondel, *Political Leadership: Towards a General Analysis* (London: Sage, 1987).

as diplomats are influenced by multiple political environments and their interactions.

The Domestic Environment

The domestic context in which leaders operate can be understood as an aggregation of the processes and norms of followers and other political actors. This is sometimes described as the *organizational context* of political leadership or "the broad sense of social interaction among dyads, small groups, formal organizations, institutions, ad hoc collectivities, horizontal social strata, vertical societal segments, and whole political communities."[43] Within this broad context, followers as well as political opponents exist along with "all other members of a society."[44] The domestic context is an environment of *extensive expectations*. Some expectations may emanate from followers close to the leader, such as political factions, whereas others may be more sweeping, such as the expectations of the public. According to James Rosenau, political environments have *formal* and *informal* expectations, the former being institutionalized expectations and the latter referring to unwritten rules and norms. These expectations, which can often be vague and contradictory, establish various opportunities and constraints on leaders' scope for action and must generally be balanced if leaders are to remain in power.[45]

Formal expectations, or institutions, are a central part of modern political environments. Elgie argues that they create "patterns of leadership" and shape the positional power of leaders and thus the nature of assigned leadership. In other words, institutions are often established to constrain leaders. Accordingly, he highlights three important institutional factors shaping leaders' political environments: (1) how resources are structured within the executive; (2) how the balance of resources

are allocated between the executive and other parts of government; and (3) how resources are structured within, and between, political parties.[46] Which institutional factors might be important? The manner in which leaders are elected (or dismissed) or the powers allocated to leaders while in office can shape leadership. Constitutional powers are especially important, although material resources—access to information, expert advice, and so on—also play a central role in defining leaders' capabilities. Similarly, the structure of resources between, and within, political parties shapes leadership behavior in several ways. Leaders may behave differently depending on whether they lead their political party or stand apart from it (such as in a presidential system). The level of support—the size of the majority—enjoyed by the leader's party, or coalition of parties, may limit or expand the leader's influence.[47]

However important these institutional structures, they can often be negated by informal expectations. Leaders are often able to alter institutional makeups or conduct politics in a way that sidelines formal structures. Often nebulous, but arguably no less influential, historical, cultural, and societal influences clearly play a role. These include the historical baggage leaders inherit, the social attitudes with which they must deal, and the expectations of the wider public. Informal factors may be quite specific, such as the role played by leadership succession, but they may also be quite broad. The existence of clearly defined, socioeconomic groups may play a role, either by limiting leaders' ability to make difficult decisions, or by opening up opportunities for them to pursue previously unattainable goals.[48]

The International Environment

The international context is understood quite differently from the domestic context, with the key factors more strongly contested. Whereas the domestic leadership environment is based on clear institutional frameworks, the international environment is often characterized by the very absence of such frameworks, that is, by international anarchy. International relations (IR) is thus a system of "self-help," created, as Kenneth Waltz puts it, by "the coaction of self-regarding units."[49] This central position given to states is a feature of much IR theory, particularly realism. According to these approaches, it is the state and not the individual which is the main unit of analysis for IR. Again, Waltz argues that structures cannot be defined by every actor in international relations but by the key actors. States "set the scene" of international relations even as other actors may participate.[50]

For structural realists, anarchy means that the structure of the international system negates the effects of particular characteristics of states, or substate actors such as leaders. Waltz divides potential factors in international affairs into three *images*, with individual actors making up the first image, states the second, and the international system the third. As potential causes of interstate war, for example, these images equate to such phenomena as: selfishness, aggression, or stupidity (first image); the internal structure of states (second image); and international anarchy (third image). Individual leadership may vary widely even as similar international outcomes are repeated consistently. In other words, however varied individual leadership, according to Waltz, it is still all functionally the same. Offensive realists, such as John Mearsheimer, similarly argue that IR's structural factors, particularly anarchy and the distribution of power, drive its outcomes. Offensive realism "pays little attention to individuals or domestic political considerations."[51]

Yet many other IR approaches interpret anarchy differently. First, anarchy is not always viewed as exogenous. It is often seen as the product of interaction between norms and customs that might be expected of a society. In developing the idea of an international society, the English School theorist Hedley Bull points to the norms and rules of world politics that are established and maintained through international diplomacy.[52] Constructivists also argue that interaction between states is dependent on how these states—by developing identities, interests, norms, and shared meanings—construct the anarchy in which they operate.[53] Second, anarchy is also not universally viewed as preventing non-state actors from playing important roles. Liberal institutionalists Robert Keohane and Nye argue that, under increasing *complex interdependence* in world politics, the interaction between sub-state groups diversifies, thereby eroding the clear distinction between international and domestic that underpins state-centric views of IR. Societal groups, government agencies, and even individual political actors can play substantial roles in international affairs.[54]

Moreover, whereas structural realists see states as predominantly subject to systemic pressures and thus treat them as unitary actors, those working in the foreign policy analysis field view "unit-level factors and actors" as equally important. The formal and informal expectations that constitute part of the domestic environment in which leaders operate, as noted above, also influence states' international behavior. These might include cognitive and psychological traits such as perception at the individual level, bureaucratic politics, party politics, or wider societal preferences.[55] This focus on the sources of state behavior parallels defensive

and classical realist perspectives. Defensive realists such as Stephen Walt contend that it is not changes in the international balance of power that shape state behavior but changes in the balance of threats, suggesting that these kinds of subjective state intentions, perceptions, and beliefs also expand the scope for unit-level influence. Likewise, neoclassical realists recognize the influence of unit-level factors intermediating between the systemic factors and states.[56]

The potential importance of these factors raises the question of whether leadership preferences should be treated, as structural realists contend, as irrelevant to overall international outcomes. Daniel Byman and Kenneth Pollack argue that these assertions are in fact "empirically weak,"[57] a criticism that has been a feature of IR theory since the end of the Cold War. Structural theory, it is suggested, has made IR less able to predict or explain international behavior even as it has strengthened its social science credentials.[58] Byman and Pollack point to Walt's study of alliance formation as highlighting the weaknesses in the structural position in terms of states balancing or bandwagoning based only on the distribution of power. During the two World Wars, states bandwagoned on the Allied powers more than on the Axis powers, even though the distribution of power favored the former. In the 1960s in the Middle East, states balanced against Syria even though its power projection capabilities were relatively modest. In both cases, it was how these states perceived the intentions of others—a balance of threats—that shaped their behavior more than a balance of power.[59]

Domestic-International Linkages

A central challenge for those aiming to include such unit-level factors in explanations of international outcomes, however, is determining how the domestic and international levels interact. Describing a single level is not sufficient, nor is creating lists of factors or generic observations about the interactions across different levels. The key issue, to paraphrase Robert Putnam, is to identify "when" and "how" these different levels influence each other.[60]

The major response to this challenge has been the development of the *two-level games* concept for understanding international negotiations.[61] The basic idea is that the interactions between the domestic and international levels of negotiations, or summits, are comprised of leaders dealing with each other in an international game while also dealing with their respective domestic constituencies in a concurrent domestic game.

These leaders might enter into agreements at summits before seeking domestic ratification for them; however, the real process is more likely to begin at the domestic level as domestic actors bargain over acceptable compromises before the summits begin. As the leaders then negotiate at the international level, they must also keep in mind the need to get their agreements approved, or ratified, domestically. This process creates reverberation effects between the two levels in what has been described as the *second image reversed*. This idea describes the "impact of international pressures on domestic politics, and the consequences that has back on international relations."[62]

It is this need for ratification that provides the link between the levels. Three broad forms of ratification can be identified: *approval*, *authorization*, and *acquiescence*. These have been used to describe: (1) ratification after summitry negotiations; (2) ratification before negotiations, such as a legislature providing a head of state broad negotiating powers; and (3) informal ratification.[63] Ratification also shapes the approach of domestic level actors. Because these actors cannot independently change the agreements that leaders have concluded, they must either accept or reject them wholesale. What is ratifiable at the domestic level, therefore, provides the room for leaders to negotiate agreements successfully at the international level. Often described as the *win-set*, this refers to the set of potential agreements that would *win* the approval of sufficient numbers of domestic actors when making a *yes* or *no* decision. What is acceptable domestically is likely to influence how leaders behave internationally. For example, if faced with domestic constituents opposed to a new agreement, leaders may actually enjoy a stronger bargaining position. They may be able to say: "I'd like to accept your proposal, but I could never get it accepted at home."[64]

The kinds of domestic factors that shape this bargaining process are essentially those formal and informal expectations, or preferences, discussed earlier. Helen Milner refers to them as the *structure of domestic preferences*.[65] In terms of intentional negotiations, domestic actors, or followers, can be classified into two basic groups relating to how they view the potential international agreement. They can be dovish (favor the position taken by other states) or hawkish (oppose the positions of other states). This structure of domestic preferences may be influenced by a range of additional factors relating to the nature of the bargaining process. These include the costs of rejecting an agreement, the level of commitment entailed, or the nature of the ratification process required.[66] Further, domestic actors may even make decisions regarding a potential

agreement based on outside considerations and even separate bargaining. In other words, they may approve or reject an agreement with no thought for the agreement itself. They may instead make their decision based on the *quid pro quo* concessions they expect to extract in return for their consent.

The Summit Environment

The specific leadership environment under examination here is the international summit. The use of summits in diplomacy is not new. Historically, summits tended to be extraordinary events held to reach landmark agreements. The practice of leaders meeting to discuss diplomatic affairs preceded the creation of embassies and overseas missions in the fifteenth century. Recently, however, they have gradually become the norm of international politics, a common feature of diplomacy. As Peter Weilemann states, "non-participation by a leader makes more headlines than participation."[67] Indeed, the proliferation of the term today suggests that the concept is in danger of losing its meaning. A *summit* now refers to any meeting between heads of state or government, important politicians from differing countries, or even other non-governmental actors. This is very different from what might be described as the Churchillian view—that summits were "not only the meetings of political leaders but also the meetings of leading states."[68]

It is possible to characterize summits depending on the nature of participants, how they communicate, whether their meetings have been institutionalized, or whether they have the support of a permanent administration. In terms of the participants, for example, the diplomacy taking place at a summit should be of the "highest possible level." For communication, summits might be expected to involve face-to-face dialogue, while they may lack permanent institutional frameworks or administrations compared to international organizations.[69] Yet summits often do not fit into such strict criteria. For instance, given its permanent administration in Indonesia, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) summit might be viewed as a regional institution rather than a summit, despite being quite different from other regional organizations such as the European Union. Yet an ASEAN spinoff, the East Asia Summit, would still be considered a summit.

Alternative characterizations might focus instead on goals or processes. In terms of the former, summits are conducted for a range of reasons. They may be set up in order to end military conflict, establish a new political order, or facilitate cooperation or communication

between states within a particular group. Clearly identifiable and measurable results, such as the achievement of some kind of peace accord or economic agreement, however, are not always forthcoming. As Weilemann argues, many summits fit into the *orientation* category of summits which quickly become "photo-opportunity" summits.[70] In terms of processes, three broad types can be identified: the *serial* summit, the *ad hoc* summit, and the *exchange-of-views* summit.[71] The serial summit is distinguished by its recurring nature: it takes place at regular intervals, most usually annually, over an extended period. The ad hoc summit is often an area-specific gathering, although it may also develop into some kind of limited series of irregular summits based around this common theme. The exchange-of-views summit is most often bilateral, low-key, and possibly even secretly conducted.

THE G7/8 SUMMITS

Where do the G7 and G8 summits fit amongst these criteria? The G7/8 summits have been a mixture of competition and cooperation. The G7/8 did not emerge from an international treaty or major international conference but came into being instead as a response to a series of international crises, notably the oil shock of the early 1970s. However, the G7/8 summits were also envisaged, even in their early years, as an opportunity for ongoing informal discussions. The facilitation of economic cooperation and the management of economic problems quickly became the dominant goals of the summits. From the beginning, therefore, the summits were interaction rather than problem-based.

The G7 model first appeared at a meeting between the finance ministers of Britain, France, the United States, and West Germany in the library of the White House (thus nicknamed the "Library Group") in 1973. The group would later be joined by Japan to form the Group of Five (G5) finance ministers. The leaders' summit idea was again floated at a meeting of the initial four held in Helsinki in 1975, and soon after a date was set for the first summit to be held in Rambouillet. Italy was also invited to attend, while Canada joined at the following San Juan summit. In 1977 the European Community also joined as an onlooker. Subsequent summits have been held in a host of locations more or less exotic, including Williamsburg, Paris, Okinawa, Evian, and Gleneagles. Locations sometimes appear to be chosen based on their inaccessibility to non-governmental and civil society groups likely to protest against the summits. At the first Tokyo summit, various Japanese groups (e.g., the

Japan Red Army) attempted to disrupt proceedings in protest against the summit's "imperialism."[72]

Over the years, the G7/8 has gradually become larger and more complex. What was originally envisaged as an opportunity to hold an informal "chat," soon transformed into a process taking up much of the year. Between 1975 and 1981, the G7 consisted only of leaders' summits, albeit with others attending, such as the "sherpas." These "personal representatives" of the leaders have met regularly in the lead-up to the summits and play an influential role on behalf of their leaders. From the second round of summits, beginning in 1982, pre-summit ministerial meetings were gradually introduced whereby the finance, foreign, and trade ministers met separately. This expansion was accompanied by an increase in the number of meetings and working groups between the participants' respective bureaucracies.[73] Because of its early emphasis on economics, the G7/8 has variously been known either as an "economic summit" or "summit of industrialized countries." At times it has been referred to as the "Western economic summit" or the "seven-power summit."[74] Yet the headline issues of the G7/8 have varied widely. Despite an initial focus on macroeconomics, subsequent summits began examining microeconomic development (e.g., during the mid-1980s and early 1990s).[75] Security issues also began to receive more attention from the early 1980s, with nuclear deployment and arms control issues taking up a major part of discussions.

Just as the G7/8 has expanded, so have the surrounding institutions. The Group of Twenty (G20) has been the most high-profile example of such expansion. Formed out of the G8 Cologne summit of 1999 as a meeting of finance ministers and central bank governors, the G20 was a response to the Asian financial crisis of the late 1990s and the elitism of the G7/8. With the global financial crisis in full swing in late 2008, and the G8 seemingly unable to develop coordinated policies, the G20 appeared better able to incorporate the new powers in the global economy (e.g., China). However, the G20's greater size makes cooperation more difficult and risks turning the summit into a "mini-United Nations" or just another photo-opportunity summit.[76]

The Leader as Chief Diplomat

Where does the leader acting as chief diplomat fit into this framework? Key decision makers have a unique role in mediating international and domestic pressures because they are "directly exposed to both spheres."[77]

They are the sole formal link between the two levels, in effect the gate-keepers. This matches other assumptions made about the role of leaders in international affairs, particularly the idea that leaders play a signifi-cant role in establishing the intentions and strategies of states.[78] Despite this, the personalities, perceptions, and preferences of leaders receive less attention in the literature on two-level games than other state-level factors. Putnam, for example, assumes that "the chief negotiator has no independent policy views, but acts merely . . . as an agent on behalf of his constituents."[79]

Leadership Rationality: Perceptions, Preferences, and Strategies

Mostly, leaders are assumed to be rational political actors. As Milner explains, executives are treated as rational utility maximizers concerned chiefly with re-election. Such utility (pay-off) maximization is an impor-tant part of rational-choice models. Under a *comprehensive rational choice* model, leaders face a clear problem, are fully informed, and have sufficient options, abilities, and time to find a resolution that maximizes their utility (i.e., that they adapt fully to this set of choices). Under a less demanding model, that of *bounded rationality*, truly rational decision-making is lim-ited by poorly defined problems, incomplete or inaccurate information, poor skills, and limited time (nonrational factors). Behavior under these conditions may be considered to have rationality, or *intended rational-ity*, if the decision maker, despite environmental or cognitive limitations, is seeking to adapt to changing environments. Both kinds of rationality involve ends-means reasoning and can thus be contrasted to *irrational-ity*, which lacks this kind of reasoning.[80] Yet intended rationality can be highly constrained. Leaders are often uncertain about the views of their domestic environment concerning foreign policy, and their views can be distorted not only by a lack of information but also by wrong information, particularly where ideology plays a role. Moreover, their imperfect access to information can itself affect their political environments, by arousing suspicion or undermining confidence.[81]

Indeed, misperception appears to be a key challenge for leaders in diplomacy. Robert Jervis highlights how structural factors interact with individual idiosyncrasies when he argues that, because key decision makers in IR operate in an anarchical environment, they are always on the alert for "dangerous plots." This increases the scope for mispercep-tion, since seemingly devious plots are sometimes just innocuous plans. "Beliefs," Jervis suggests, "are much more common than the reality they

seek to describe."[82] Andrew Kennedy examines the individual level of foreign policy by tracing the impact of the *national efficacy beliefs* of Mao Zedong and Jawaharlal Nehru on their country's respective foreign policies. Kennedy looks in particular at the extent to which the strategic and diplomatic approaches of these two nations were shaped by Mao's and Nehru's strong attitudes toward their national military and diplomatic capabilities. Certainly, decision makers may interpret coincidental events as part of a pattern, misjudge how their own policies are perceived, or overemphasize their own significance. Expectations of behavior, whether based on past experience or accepted norms, are also susceptible to disruption, and wishful thinking is especially problematic. Finally, cognitive dissonance—the gap between beliefs and actions—provides ample scope for self-justification as actors reorganize beliefs and perceptions to better match their decisions.[83]

What motivates leaders in international affairs? And how might leaders' preferences and strategies shape their behavior? "Reelection is not the only goal attributed to political actors," Milner suggests. Some "have argued that political actors desire to implement their party program most of all."[84] In international negotiations, basic terms such as dove, hawk, and agent are used to describe leaders' preferences in contrast to those of their constituents: doves are more open to agreement than their constituents; hawks are less open; and agents have approximately the same openness. Overall, three basic alternatives for leaders' values, objectives, and styles as they relate to international negotiations are worth noting. These are to (1) protect or increase domestic popularity; (2) shift domestic politics towards established policy preferences or ideological beliefs; or (3) pursue established ideas of the national interest. The first of these is consistent with rational choice motivations. However, the second and third factors clearly include so-called "idiosyncratic 'first image' factors," such as "past political history or personal idealism," and so highlight the need to understand the factors shaping leaders' perceptions and biases.[85]

Leaders may employ a number of strategies aimed at reshaping their political environments. In response to the challenges of ratification in international negotiations, leaders may attempt either to constrict or to expand what agreements are acceptable domestically. The first is known as *tying hands*, and the second as *cutting slack*. Leaders may attempt to influence the ratification procedure by changing voting rules, amending legislation, or shifting the interests of domestic actors. *Side-payments* involve actors linking separate, unrelated political issues and exchanging