

be assembled. Even then, we do not expect that the relevant universe of cases can be identified or that a sample can be constructed. We cannot address the question of how often deterrence succeeds or fails. We can, however, hope to discover why, when, and how deterrence succeeds and fails.

The subsequent methodological steps are open to question, for they depend entirely on the results of the identification and coding of cases. If a sufficiently large number of cases of deterrence successes can be documented, then the development of longitudinal models which can be analyzed statistically is one promising path of analysis. Based on our admittedly preliminary search of the evidence of cases of immediate deterrence in this century, we are not optimistic.

If only a small number of cases of deterrence success can be identified, then the design of causal models to be subjected to quantitative testing is precluded. The data would not justify this kind of methodology. We will have no choice but to rely on a carefully controlled comparison of cases as the primary methodology of testing deterrence theory. This kind of testing has its strengths and weaknesses. It is, of course, more difficult to generalize from an analysis of a small number of cases. To compensate in part for the limited ability to generalize, we plan to isolate several "critical" cases for especially detailed analysis and controlled comparison.¹⁶⁹ Analysis of cases in which deterrence theory predicts a low probability of success and deterrence nevertheless succeeds should constitute a strong test of the theory.

Detailed analyses of critical cases also provide significant advantages. They can narrow the gap between essential theoretical

169 In the experimental tradition, a "critical" experiment is one which seeks real world observations confirming the empirical expectations of a theory in circumstances most unlikely to have done so unless the theory is powerful. When the hypothesized result nevertheless occurs, it constitutes the strongest test of the theory. See Arthur L. Stinchcombe, *Constructing Social Theories* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1968), pp.20-28.