

“A Revised Look At Interstate Wars, 1816-2007”  
Dan Reiter, Allan C. Stam, and Michael C. Horowitz  
October 15, 2014

## **Appendix**

This appendix describes the Interstate War Data (IWD) version 1.0 summarized in:

Dan Reiter, Allan C. Stam, and Michael C. Horowitz, “A Revised Look At Interstate Wars, 1816-2007,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution*

The data set itself is archived as an excel file, IWD10.xlsx, in the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* data archive and at Dan Reiter’s website at <http://polisci.emory.edu/faculty/dreiter/>. Updates to the data will be posted on Dan Reiter’s website. This note describes the structure of the data set, and also provides documentation for some of the coding decisions, in supplement to the discussion in the *JCR* article itself. Correspondence about the data including questions and suggested revisions or corrections can be sent to Dan Reiter at dreiter@emory.edu.

If these data are used in future research, please cite the “A Revised Look” article, using the finalized, correct citation (including appropriate year, volume number, and page numbers).

Though this data set builds on the Correlates of War (COW) 4.0 interstate war data, it is not in any way associated with or sanctioned by COW.

### **Part 1: Description of Data and Variables.**

The data set lists all interstate wars from 1816-2007. As discussed in the note, a war is a violent conflict between two or more members of the COW interstate system that inflicts at least 1000 battle dead. A state is a participant in a war if it suffers at least 100 battle dead, and/or contributes at least 1000 troops.

The data set is structured as follows. Each line of data is an initiator-war year. There is no separate line of data for each target, but each line identifies the state which the initiator attacks. So, if the US initiates war against Spain in 1898, there is a single line of data identifying the US as a war initiator and Spain as the target in that year; there is not an additional line of data identifying Spain as a belligerent. If the war lasts more than one year, then there is one line of data for each calendar year of the war. So, for the 1980-1988 Iran-Iraq War, there are nine lines of data.

The data set also identifies the initiation and termination dates of each war, generally following COW dates, with some exceptions described below. Each line of data has an entry month and an entry day variable, as well as an exit month and an exit day variable. For wars that last more

than one calendar year, those month/day variables indicate the dates of the year during which the war endured. So, a war beginning on March 15, 1980 and ending on April 15, 1981 would have for the 1980 line of data an exit month of December and exit date of 31, and for the 1981 line of data the entry month would be January and the entry date would be 1.

Note that there are a small set of wars for which COW codes short ceasefires during the war. For this data set, this means that a multiyear war may have a stop month/date coding other than December 31 for a year other than the last year of the war, and conversely it may have a start month/date coding other than January 1 for a year other than the first year of war. For wars in which a ceasefire started and stopped within a single calendar year, we created a second set of variables describing second start/end months and dates.

The data set includes information on which states fought on the side of the initiator and on the side of the target during the year of the line of data. A state is included as an allied belligerent if it fought at any point during that year.

An important issue is determining exactly how a state entered a war, whether it attacked to start a war, it entered an ongoing war because it was attacked, or it entered an ongoing war by choice, that is, by declaring war or by launching an attack against a belligerent already fighting a war. If a state chooses to enter a war after it has already begun, it is listed as the initiator in a separate line of data. That is, Italy is not an initial belligerent at the onset of World War I in 1914, but declares war in 1915, and hence there is a separate line of data identifying Italy as an initiator in 1915. There is a separate, dichotomous variable identifying such states as joiners. Any state entering an ongoing war (that is, declaring war against or attacking a state that is already a belligerent) by choice after it has begun is coded as a joiner.

Some states enter wars after they have begun because they are attacked, such as Germany invading Norway in 1940 after World War II has broken out. Such instances are identified as separate lines of data, Germany initiating against Norway. Note that in cases such as this the attacking state is not coded as a joiner, because it is initiating against a state that is not currently a belligerent.

We have two war identification variables. The first is a variable for which each initiator-target pairing gets the same coding for all years of the war. So, the five lines of data for the 1941-1945 Germany-Soviet Union war all get the same coding, but the Germany-Norway 1940 war gets a different coding. The second variable identifies all initiator-target codings with the same, larger war. So, all initiator-target cases within World War II (Germany-Soviet Union, Japan-US, Germany-Norway, etc.) get the same coding for this second variable.

## Variable Names and Descriptions

### version

This variable describes the version of the data. The first release of the data is version 1.0.

annualoutcome

This variable codes the outcome of the war, for that year.

- 0 War does not end in this year
- 1 War ends in victory for initiator
- 2 War ends in victory for target
- 3 War ends in draw

init\_name

Name of initiating state

init\_ccode

COW country code of initiating state

target\_name

Name of target state

target\_ccode

COW country code of target state

year

Year

month\_entry

Numerical code for month war starts during that year

date\_entry

Date war starts during that year

month\_exit

Numerical code for month war ends during that year

date\_exit

Numerical code for date war ends during that year

month\_entry02

If war stopped temporarily and restarted during that year, this is the numerical code for the month when the war restarted (-9 if no temporary stoppage during that year)

date\_entry02

If war stopped temporarily and restarted during that year, this is the date when the war restarted (-9 if no temporary stoppage during that year)

month\_exit02

If war stopped temporarily and restarted during that year, this is the numerical code for the month when the war stopped the second time (-9 if no stoppage during that year)

date\_exit02

If war stopped temporarily and restarted during that year, this is the date when the war stopped the second time (-9 if no second stoppage during that year)

init\_war\_id

This is an identification number identifying each initiator-target dyad

larger\_war\_id

This is an identification number identifying each larger war; sometimes a larger war will include multiple initiator-target dyads

init\_war\_name

Name of the initiator-target dyad

larger\_war\_name

Name of the larger war

joiner

Coded 1 if the init\_ccode state for this line of data joined the war (that is, the larger\_war\_id) after the war started, that is, the state did not launch the attack that started the war. If the init\_ccode state did launch the attack that started the war, this variable is coded 0.

adv2name

Name of ally of target (note that there are variables adv2name through adv14name, each identifying different target allies; note that -9 is the missing value, no target ally)

adv2ccode

COW country code of ally of target (note that there are variables adv2ccode through adv14ccode, each describing identifying allies; note that -9 is the missing value, no target ally)

ally1name

Name of ally of initiator (note that there are variables ally1name through ally16name, each identifying different initiator allies; note that -9 is the missing value, no initiator ally)

ally1ccode

COW country code of ally of initiator (note that there are variables ally1ccode through ally16ccode, each identifying different initiator allies; note that -9 is the missing value, no initiator ally)

Part 2: Discussion of Changes to COW Data.

This sections contains discussions of each war that experienced a changed coding, with citations for the discussions. Note that these discussions are not intended to be complete summaries, but rather focused justifications for the changes made. More complete summaries of the wars can be found in the COW publication *Resort to War*.<sup>1</sup>

In chronological order:

1. Austro-Sardinian War. COW codes Sardinia as initiating against Austria, Modena, and Tuscany, and the war lasting from 1848-1849. But Modena and Tuscany only fight through 1848, according to COW. Hence, Modena and Tuscany should be coded as exiting the war in 1848.
2. Crimean War. COW codes the Ottoman Empire as the initiator. The argument for Ottoman initiation is that the Ottoman Empire declared war first, in October 1853. The case for Russian initiation, conversely, is that Russia seized control, using troops, of some Ottoman provinces in June, following the failure of a diplomatic mission. Russia claimed that the 1774 Treaty of Kutchuk Kainardji gave Russia the right to intervene in these provinces to protect Christians being mistreated under Ottoman Rule. However, the Treaty does not provide such a privilege. The use of armed force to seize territory in an act not allowed in an international treaty can be judged as the first act of war, so Russia should be the initiator.<sup>2</sup>
3. War of Italian Unification of 1859. Note that Austria is the original initiator, but that France also should get coded as a joining initiator.
4. France-Mexico War 1862-1867. COW codes the outcome as transforming into intrastate war. IWD excludes the option of coding war outcome as transformation into intrastate war. We instead code the outcome as a Mexican victory. Anti-French Republicans secured a string of military victories in Mexico as the French leave. They also execute Maximillien, the Austrian that France tried to install as the new national leader of Mexico.
5. Spain-Chile, 1865. Peru is coded as a joiner.
6. Lopez War. We code as separate cases Paraguayan initiation against Brazil and Argentina. The Paraguayan attacks happened a year apart. It is approximately similar to coding German initiation against Belgium as separate from German initiation against the Netherlands in World War II.
7. Seven Weeks War. We make a number of small changes to dates of entry and exit. We also more carefully code who is fighting with whom, which in turn affects coding allies of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Meredith Reid Sarkees and Frank Whelon Wayman, *Resort to War: A Data Guide to Inter-State, Extra-State, Intra-State, and Non-State Wars, 1816-2007* (Washington: CQ Press, 2010). Note that the COW 4.0 data spreadsheet lists the end of the Hungarian Allies War as occurring on August 4, 1919 but *Resort to War* lists the end date as August 14. August 4 is the correct end date; the August 14 date appears to be a typographical error.

<sup>2</sup> René Albrecht-Carrié, *A Diplomatic History of Europe Since the Congress of Vienna* (New York: Harper and Row, 1958), 88; Roderic H. Davison, “‘Russian Skill and Turkish Imbecility’: The Treaty of Kuchuk Kainardji Reconsidered,” *Slavic Review* 35 (September 1976): 463-483.

initiator and allies of the target. There are essentially four different theaters of combat, and we code initiator and target allies accordingly: an eastern theater involving Prussia, Saxony, and Austria-Hungary; a western theater involving Prussia, Austria-Hungary, Hanover, Hesse Electoral, Bavaria, Hesse Grand Ducal, Baden, and Wuerttemberg; an Italian theater involving Italy and Austria-Hungary; and a Mecklenburg-Schwerin theater we treat as distinct because Mecklenburg-Schwerin troops came into contact only with Bavarian troops, as they assisted Prussia.<sup>3</sup>

8. Sino-Russian War 1900. COW includes this war. It needs to be dropped, as it is part of the Boxer Rebellion.

9. Third Central American War. COW codes Guatemala as initiating on May 27, 1906 against El Salvador and Honduras. However, May 27 is the day when exiled Guatemalan General Manuel Barillas led troops from El Salvador into Guatemala, with the intent of overthrowing the Guatemalan President.<sup>4</sup> That is, this is not at this point an incident of interstate violence (though Guatemala made accusations of Salvadoran cooperation with the rebels at this stage), and it is not an instance of violence initiated by Guatemala. A better coding is to code El Salvador as initiating the war on July 9. Barillas' May 27 incursion was quelled in a battle on June 11, and it appeared that peace was at hand in the latter half of June. However, on July 9, the frequently drunken Salvadoran Minister of War General Tomás Regalado led a Salvadoran invasion of Guatemala.<sup>5</sup> US Envoy to Central America William Merry cabled the State Department on July 10 that, "Salvadorian general commanding forced fight on Guatemalan territory."<sup>6</sup> Media reports at the time also conveyed that El Salvador initiated the war, such as, "Hostilities were begun by a large force of San Salvador troops invading Guatemala,"<sup>7</sup> and, "Cable advices received today from the American secretary of legation at Guatemala City indicate that the hostilities reported between the forces of Guatemala and Salvador were precipitated by the action of one of the Salvadorean generals commanding a force on the frontier in crossing into Guatemala."<sup>8</sup>

One source claims that Guatemala initiated the war, as the authors claimed to have found "only one course to indicate the initiator; that source puts the burden on Estrada Cabrera and Guatemala. Karnes (1961, 185-6) writes: 'Guatemalan troops were successful in repulsing [the invading exiles], and, blaming Honduras and El Salvador in particular for permitting the attacks, Estrada Cabrera mounted an offense against them.'"<sup>9</sup> However, Karnes does not directly mention the July 9 Salvadoran invasion in his brief discussion of the war, and the above sources

---

<sup>3</sup> Henry Montague Hozier, *The Seven Weeks' War: Its Antecedents and Its Incidents*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1872); Sir Alexander Malet, *The Overthrow of the Germanic Confederation by Prussia in 1866* (London: Longmans, Green 1870).

<sup>4</sup> Robert L. Scheina, *Latin America's Wars: The Age of the Caudillo, 1791-1899*, vol. 1 (Washington: Brassey's, 2003), 259.

<sup>5</sup> Scheina, *Latin America's Wars*, 259.

<sup>6</sup> *Foreign Relations of the United States 1906* (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1909), 835.

<sup>7</sup> "War Between Central American States," *West Australian*, July 17, 1906.

<sup>8</sup> "Salvador General Killed in Battle," *Atlanta Constitution*, July 13, 1906.

<sup>9</sup> Giacomo Chiozza and H. E. Goemans, *Leaders and International Conflict* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 185.

do seem to indicate that El Salvador did launch an attack on July 9.<sup>10</sup> Further, Karnes indirectly alludes to Regalado's invasion as raising the intensity of the conflict to the level of interstate war: "By July the skirmishes had ripened into war. Salvadorean casualties reached the thousands, and the commanding general, former President Tomás Regalado, was killed."<sup>11</sup>

In short, we code El Salvador as initiating war against Guatemala on July 9. Honduras did not join El Salvador's July 9 attack, but Guatemala did invade Honduras on July 13.<sup>12</sup> We code Guatemala as initiating against Honduras on July 13.

10. Fourth Central American War. COW codes Nicaragua as initiating against Honduras and El Salvador on February 19, 1907. However, it appears that El Salvador was initially neutral, but then intervened in the war on Honduras' behalf on March 11. El Salvador and Honduras do not formally declare war on each other until March 11.<sup>13</sup> Through early March, El Salvador remained on the sideline of the war.<sup>14</sup> Eventually, El Salvador elected to intervene in the defense of Honduras, its ally.<sup>15</sup> Specifically, several thousand Salvadoran soldiers joined with Honduran forces around March 11, and marched into combat with Nicaraguan forces.<sup>16</sup> Hence, we retain COW's coding of Nicaragua initiating against Honduras on February 19, but now code El Salvador as initiating against Nicaragua on March 11.

#### 11. World War I.<sup>17</sup>

Much of the below discussion identifies the individual war dyads within World War I that IWD identifies.

A. Japan should be coded as joining Britain in 1914, and then fighting until the end of the war. Japan initially seizes some German owned Pacific islands, and then launches a major military operation against German forces at Tsingtao, where there were 199 Germans killed in action (KIA), 415 Japanese KIA, and 13 British KIA.<sup>18</sup> Japan should be coded as being a belligerent for the rest of the war, for two reasons. One, Japan signs the Versailles Treaty. Two, Japan engages in military operations against Germany after Tsingtao. Specifically, Japan sent a cruiser and eight destroyers to Malta in 1917 for convoy duty. Eventually two more cruisers and four

---

<sup>10</sup> See Thomas L. Karnes, *The Failure of Union: Central America, 1824-1960* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1961), 185-186.

<sup>11</sup> Karnes, *Failure of Union*, 106.

<sup>12</sup> *Foreign Relations of the United States 1906* (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1909), 836.

<sup>13</sup> See the data set for Tanisha Fazal, "Why States No Longer Declare War," *Security Studies* 21(4): 557-593.

<sup>14</sup> See, for example, "Believe War Inevitable," *Washington Post*, March 8, 1907.

<sup>15</sup> See Mario Rodríguez, *Central America* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), 112.

<sup>16</sup> Newspaper reports at the time described 2500 Salvadoran troops landing on March 10, whereas Scheina (*Latin America's Wars*, 260) writes that 5000 Salvadoran troops joined with Honduran troops on March 11. Given that Scheina is a more contemporary, authoritative source, we code El Salvador's initiation as occurring on March 11. See eg "War Ships Storm City," *Washington Post*, March 19, 1907.

<sup>17</sup> Some of the documentation for the identification of individual warring dyads in World War I is in the data codebook for Nigel Lo, Barry Hashimoto, and Dan Reiter, "Ensuring Peace: Foreign Imposed Regime Change and Postwar Peace Duration, 1914-2001," *International Organization* (October 2008): 717-736, available at <http://polisci.emory.edu/faculty/dreiter/LHR%20IO%2008%20codebook.pdf>.

<sup>18</sup> Charles B. Burdick, *The Japanese Siege of Tsingtau* (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1976), 194.



more destroyers were sent. Also, two British trawlers and two British destroyers were manned by Japanese crews. One Japanese destroyer was torpedoed.<sup>19</sup>

B. We code the Russia-Central Powers World War I dyads as terminating in 1918, when the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk gets signed. Note that Russia initiating against Austria-Hungary is joining behavior, joining Serbia, already at war with Austria-Hungary.

C. For World War I and other wars, we do not include as cases instances of a country joining a dyadic conflict, when the joiner is already fighting with or against a member of the dyad. That is, if A and B are at war, B attacks C, and A then offers military assistance to C, we do not create an additional A-B dyad. Eg, we don't include as separate cases Britain or France initiating against Bulgaria in 1915, Italy initiating against Bulgaria in 1916, Turkey initiating against Greece in 1917 (1916), Greece initiating against Austria-Hungary in 1917, France initiating against Austria-Hungary in 1915, France initiating against Turkey in 1915, the UK initiating against Turkey in 1914, Germany initiating against Serbia in 1915, Germany initiating against Italy in 1915, Russia initiating against Bulgaria in 1916, Turkey initiating against Serbia in 1916, Romania initiating against Germany in 1916, Bulgaria initiating against Romania in 1916, the UK initiating against Austria-Hungary in 1915, or Britain initiating against Germany in 1940 following Germany's invasion of Norway. But, those joiners who participate in combat get included as state's allies in terms of calculating the alliance balance of power variable.

D. Greece-Bulgaria captures Greek declaration of war on the Central Powers in June 1917. Most of Greece's fighting was against Bulgarian troops.

E. Regarding the outbreak of World War I in the West, Germany declares war on Belgium, so there is a Germany-Belgium dyad. Germany also declares war on France, so there is a Germany-France dyad. Britain declares war on Germany, so there is a UK-Germany dyad.

F. Germany declares war on Portugal in 1916, and Portugal ends up sending troops to the Western Front. Portugal also battle German troops elsewhere, especially in Africa.<sup>20</sup>

G. Regarding Serbia, at the end of 1915, Central Power forces occupy the entirety of Serbia. The armed forces and the government escape in early December first to Albania, and then to the Greek island of Corfu.<sup>21</sup> So, it is coded as a defeat for Serbia. An alternative argument is that Serbia never technically surrendered, and the army participated in the Salonika campaign in 1917-1918. There's a corollary to Belgium 1914, in that Belgium was completely overrun, but the Belgian king never technically surrendered.<sup>22</sup> One could possibly make a similar argument for Iraq 2003. However, in all three cases the facts on the ground clearly indicate defeat. We code Serbia, Belgium, and Iraq as suffering defeat in each case.

---

<sup>19</sup> Ian Nish, "Japan, 1914-18," in Allan R. Millett and Williamson Murray, eds., *Military Effectiveness* (Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1988), vol. 1, 238.

<sup>20</sup> Micheal Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts: A Statistical Encyclopedia of Casualty and Other Figures, 1494-2007*, third edition (Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company, Inc., 2008), 444.

<sup>21</sup> Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*, 440; John Keegan, *The First World War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999), 254.

<sup>22</sup> We code the Germany-Belgium war dyad as ending in Belgian defeat on October 10, 1914, when the garrison at Antwerp surrenders to German forces. Keegan, *First World War*, 128.

12. Estonian War of Independence. COW codes the Soviet Union as initiating against Estonia. We code Finland as joining the war on Estonia's side.<sup>23</sup> Also, Britain and France should be included as belligerents, joining Estonia and Finland. Britain dispatched a force of 65-100 naval vessels and a small air force to the Baltic, under Rear Admiral Sir Walter Cowan. The flotilla arrived in Tallinn, Estonia on December 12, 1918, shelling bridges over the Narva River and severing Soviet supply lines.<sup>24</sup> The crews of this flotilla exceeded 1000 troops; the aircraft carrier *HMS Vindictive* alone had a crew of nearly 700. This flotilla saw combat. On December 16, British naval forces bombarded Soviet positions at Wesenberg (also known as Rakvere) in Estonia.<sup>25</sup> In late December, there were clashes between British and Soviet vessels, leading to the capture of two Soviet destroyers.<sup>26</sup> In May 1919, there was an indecisive naval engagement with the Russian navy, as the flotilla supported the Estonian army and navy. The British Baltic Squadron helped the Estonians capture the Russian fortress of Krasnaya Gorka on June 15, and on June 17 the force torpedoed the Russian cruiser *Oleg*. There was also a British air raid on the Russian naval base at Kronstadt on July 30, and another air raid/coastal motor boat attack on Kronstadt, knocking out two battleships and other units. The Anglo-French naval force fired on Russo-German forces at Daugavgrīva on October 15. On December 25, 1919, most of the British force was sent home, leaving only a cruiser and several destroyers. In total, the British force had disabled two Russian battleships. It also destroyed a cruiser, three destroyers, a submarine depot ship, two submarines, four torpedo boats, and several smaller vessels. Britain lost a light cruiser, two destroyers, a submarine, four mine sweepers, nine coastal torpedo boats, and smaller vessels. It suffered 171 KIA. We date French entry into the war to December 20, 1918, when French vessels were dispatched to the Baltic. French vessels involved in the war included two cruisers, *Gueydon* and *Montcalm*, each of which had a crew of 570. There was also the torpedo gunboat *Dunois*, with a crew of 138, as well as the destroyer *Garnier*, a similar, slightly larger destroyer, *Lestin*, and at least three smaller escort vessels.<sup>27</sup>

13. Latvian War of Liberation. We code Russia as initiating against Latvia and Germany starting on December 1, 1918. COW does not include Britain and France as belligerents, and it includes Estonia as a belligerent. By the coding rules of this data set, none of the three of these states should be included as belligerents fighting the Soviet Union in the Latvian War of Liberation, as they are already at war with the Soviet Union in the Estonian War (but, the forces of all three are included as allied forces aiding Latvia). However, Germany is not a belligerent in the Estonian War but is a belligerent in the Latvian War, and because Britain, France, and Estonia all engage in combat with Germany during the Latvian War, all three of them get included as initiating war

---

<sup>23</sup> Toivu U. Rann, *Estonia and the Estonians*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1991), 108.

<sup>24</sup> <http://www.esm.ee/11477/>; William Fletcher, "The British Navy in the Baltic, 1918-1920: Its Contribution to the Independence of the Baltic Nations," *Journal of Baltic Studies* vol. 7 no. 2 (1976): 138.

<sup>25</sup> "British Aid for Esthonia," *Times* (London), December 17, 1918.

<sup>26</sup> Ben Nimmo, "The Forgotten Fleet: The British Navy and Baltic Independence," *Baltic Times* December 15, 2004 [http://www.baltictimes.com/news/articles/11541/#.U7w\\_E.lDv8E](http://www.baltictimes.com/news/articles/11541/#.U7w_E.lDv8E).

<sup>27</sup> Edgar Anderson, "The British Policy Toward the Baltic States 1918-1920," *Journal of Central European Affairs* 19 (October 1959): 276-289; Edgar Anderson, "An Undeclared Naval War: The British-Soviet Naval Struggle in the Baltic, 1918-1920," *Journal of Central European Affairs* 22 (April 1962): esp. 48; Geoffrey Bennett, *Cowan's War: The Story of British Naval Operations in the Baltic, 1918-1920* (London: Collins, 1964); H. T. Lenton, *British and Empire Warships of the Second World War* (London: Greenhill Books, 1998), 584; Jean-Michel Roche, *Dictionnaire des bâtiments de la Flotte de guerre française de Colbert à nos jours* (France: Groupe Rezotel, 2005), vol. 2, 179, 243, 350

against Germany during the Latvian War. Germany is initially fighting the war with Latvia against the Soviet Union. However, German forces attempted to replace the Latvian government in a coup d'état on April 16, 1919. The standing Latvian government remained in power, however, and Germany switched sides in the war, deploying its troops against the Latvian army. Estonia initiated war against Germany first, attacking German forces in northern Latvia on June 22 at the battle of Cesis. Though Britain and France favored the embattled Latvian government forces, Britain and France up through middle 1919 appeared to avoid direct conflict with German forces. This changed in October. Following savage fighting between German and Latvian forces around October 8, Britain and France announced a blockade of Germany's Baltic coastline on October 10. The announcement of a naval blockade is itself not sufficient to mark war initiation, just as the Egyptian decision to blockade the Straits of Tiran in May 1967 does not initiate the Six Day War. There were some very minor conflicts in the next few days, including on October 12 when a German naval officer boarded a French gunboat and made demands (without causing any casualties), as well as perhaps accidental gunfire from a German vessel on French and British vessels on October 13. British and French initiation against Germany occurs on October 15, when British and French naval forces fired on the German-held fortress of Daugavgrīva. This initial action involved several British and French naval vessels with crews of nearly 2,000 sailors. German forces were involved in combat until November 1919, ultimately withdrawing from Latvian territory on November 23, 1919 (COW incorrectly codes Germany as exiting the war on July 3). We also code Poland as initiating against Russia late in the war, entering the war on January 3, 1920.<sup>28</sup> COW does not list Poland as a belligerent.

14. Russo-Polish War, 1920. COW 2.0 coded Poland as the initiator in 1920. COW 4.0 codes Russia as initiating in 1919. Along with many others, we code the Russo-Polish War began on April 25, 1920, when Poland invaded Russia with a force of 52,000 troops.<sup>29</sup> Low-level hostilities between Russia and Poland did commence prior to April 1920. However, there are two problems with the claim that one should code Russia as initiating the war before 1920: Poland initiated the pre-1920 violence, and the pre-1920 violence was relatively minor, far below the threshold of what is commonly thought of as "war" (armed conflict killing at least 1000). Regarding pre-1920 violence, one example might be Russo-Polish clashes near Bialystock and Brest-Litovsk in December 1918. However, the presence of German forces prevented any substantial violence at that time.<sup>30</sup> Another potential example is the conflict between Russian and Polish forces at Bereza Kartuska in February 1919. However, Polish forces initiated military conflict by entering this small township. This was a very minor incident involving only 62

---

<sup>28</sup> Raun, *Estonia and the Estonians*, 109-110; Anderson, "British Policy"; Anderson, "Undeclared Naval War"; Charles Phillips and Alan Axelrod, *Encyclopedia of Wars* (New York: Facts on File, 2005), vol. 2, 686-7; Alan Palmer, *The Baltic: A New History of the Region and its People* (Woodstock, NY: Overlook, 2005), 282-287; Charles L. Sullivan, "The 1919 German Campaign in the Baltic: The Final Phase," in V. Stanley Vardys and Romuald J. Misiunas, eds., *The Baltic States in Peace and War, 1917-1945* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1978), 31-42; Georg von Rauch, *The Baltic States: The Years of Independence Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, 1917-1940*, Gerald Onn trans. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1974); John Hiden, *The Baltic States and Weimar Ostpolitik* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

<sup>29</sup> Branislav Slantchev, "How Initiators End Their Wars: The Duration of Warfare and the Terms of Peace," *American Journal of Political Science* 48 (October 2004): 813-29; M. B. Biskupski, "Pilsudski, Poland, and the War With Russia, 1919-1920," *Polish Heritage* 35 (Winter 1984): 5. Clodfelter labels the war as "Russo-Polish War (1920-1921)" in the index (821), but as "Russo-Polish War: 1919-1920" in the text (370).

<sup>30</sup> Richard Debo, *Survival and Consolidation: The Foreign Policy of Soviet Russia, 1918-1921* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992), 57.

Polish soldiers capturing about 80 Soviet soldiers.<sup>31</sup> The insignificance of this clash is demonstrated by the perseverance of political contacts between Poland and Russia.<sup>32</sup> Regarding Russo-Polish clashes in March-April 1919, these minor events are clearly Poland initiating actions against Russia, not the reverse. Russia had taken control of Wilno in sovereign Lithuania, and Poland reacted by dispatching forces to eject Russian forces from Wilno, accomplishing this mission in late April.<sup>33</sup> Note that during this period it was Poland that took the initiative to seize territory in the turmoil of the Russian Civil War, capturing from February to October 1919 (including Vilna on April 21) contested border areas with substantial numbers of ethnic Poles. The Poles renewed their offensive when Russia demanded Polish evacuation of these areas.<sup>34</sup> In his definitive history of the war, Norman Davies claimed that in this first phase “the initiative lay with the Poles.”<sup>35</sup> This is not surprising, as the Russians wanted to avoid conflict with Poland to focus on fending off foreign forces during its own civil war.<sup>36</sup>

Some might also point to Soviet Russia’s “Target Vistula” plan, declared in November 1918, as Soviet war initiation. Despite its grandiose vision of a march to Warsaw, it amounted to nothing more than revolutionary rhetoric, the formation of the Soviet Western Army, and a reconnaissance in depth as far as the River Bug. Tellingly, there were no notable military clashes in this operation, as Soviet forces were entering territory just evacuated by German forces and did not seek to engage Polish forces. Davies wrote: “It is problematical whether ... ‘Target Vistula’ was intended to bring the Red army as conquering heroes into Warsaw. Its name suggests so. Yet the extremely tentative phrasing of its directives and the extremely parlous state of the Western Army suggest otherwise. ‘Target Vistula’ was probably no more than a phrase inspired by revolutionary bravado.”<sup>37</sup> Another scholar noted, “The Russian Western Army had never been intended to fight its way to the Vistula: it was far too weak.”<sup>38</sup>

In short, the pre-April 1920 clashes were quite minor, and generally initiated by Poland. The action which clearly escalated the conflict to the “war” level of intensity was Poland’s April 1920 invasion. Note that coding the war as beginning when major violence begins in April 1920 (that is, not with the pre-April 1920 minor violence) is consistent with COW 4.0 treatment of other wars, such as the 1977-1979 Vietnam-Cambodia War.

15. Lithuania-Poland War, 1920.<sup>39</sup> Casualty figures are not discussed in the handful of available sources on this conflict, including those cited by COW.<sup>40</sup> We have not found any sources that

---

<sup>31</sup> Norman Davies, *White Eagle, Red Star: The Polish-Soviet War, 1919-1920* (London: Orbis, 1983), 27.

<sup>32</sup> Andrzej Garlicki, *Jozef Pilsudski, 1867-1935*, John Coutouvidis, ed. and trans. (Aldershot, UK: Scolar, 1995), 96.

<sup>33</sup> Adam Zamoyski, *The Battle for the Marchlands* (New York: East European Monographs, 1981), 7; Davies, *White Eagle*, 25; Garlicki, *Pilsudski*, 93.

<sup>34</sup> Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*, 370. See also Orlando Figues, *A People’s Tragedy: The Russian Revolution, 1891-1924* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1996), 697.

<sup>35</sup> Davies, *White Eagle*, 396. See also Clodfelter, *Warfare*, 370.

<sup>36</sup> Debo, *Survival*, 58; Zamoyski, *Marchlands*, 8.

<sup>37</sup> Davie, *White Eagle*, 26-27.

<sup>38</sup> Zamoyski, *Marchlands*, 7.

<sup>39</sup> For sources on this conflict, see Stanley W. Page, “Lenin, the National Question and the Baltic States, 1917-19,” *American Slavic and East European Review* 7 (February 1948), 27; M. K. Dziewanowski, *Joseph Pilsudski A European Federalist, 1918-1922* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1969), 134; Andres Kasekamp, *A History of the Baltic States* (Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave, 2010), 104; M. K. Dziewanowski, *Joseph Pilsudski A European*

provide comprehensive casualty figures. The discussion in one Polish-language history of the conflict sheds doubt on the proposition that there were at least 1000 battle deaths. This source observes that the largest battle occurred at Seiny on September 22, in which about 40 were killed in total. It also reports that during the attack on Vilnius on October 9, each Polish regiment reported only “several killed.” The Poles entered Vilnius with about 20,000 troops, and given that regiments usually number in the low thousands each, that means that if there were perhaps a half dozen or so regiments each suffering only several killed, the total number of dead on the Polish side in the Vilnius was at the most in the low dozens.<sup>41</sup> In short, the best available evidence, scarce as is, indicates that the total battle deaths in the Lithuania-Poland conflict were likely far short of 1000.

16. China-Japan War, 1937-1945. COW 4.0 codes a China-Japan War as starting in 1937 and ending on December 6, 1941, with a Japanese victory. China then gets folded in as a participant in World War II, a separate COW war. It is inappropriate to code China-Japan hostilities as ending in 1941, and it is inappropriate to code Japan as winning. China and Japan did not cease hostilities at this time, nor did they sign a peace treaty or ceasefire. Combat was ongoing throughout December; for example, the Third Battle of Changsha starts on December 19, 1941, in which Japan’s 11<sup>th</sup> Corps attacks 37 Chinese divisions defending the city. In that battle alone, China claimed to have inflicted 6000 Japanese KIA.<sup>42</sup> The more appropriate approach is to code Japan as initiating war against China in 1937, and that war does not end until the Japanese surrender to the Allies in 1945. As a member of the Allies, China should be coded as the victor.

## 17. World War II.

Much of the below discussion identifies the individual war dyads within World War II that IWD identifies.

---

*Federalist, 1918-1922* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1969), 313-319; Norman Davies, *White Eagle, Red Star: The Polish-Soviet War, 1919-1920* (London: Orbis Books, 1983), 241.

<sup>40</sup> Sources that COW refers to in its summary of the war that do not discuss casualty figures include Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*; Palmer, *The Baltic*; Dennis Hupchick and Cox, *The Palgrave Concise Historical Atlas of the Middle East*, revised and updated edition (New York: Palgrave, 2001); William L. Langer, *European Alliances and Alignments, 1871-1890* (New York: Kopf, 1931); Henrikas Rabinavicius, “The Fate of Baltic Nations,” *Russian Review* 3 (Autumn 1943): 34-44; George C. Kohn, *Dictionary of Wars*, revised edition (New York: Facts on File, 1999); Anatol Lieven, *The Baltic Revolution: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and the Path to Independence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003); Phillips and Axelrod, *Encyclopedia of Wars*, vol. 2, 694; R. B. Mowat, *A History of European Diplomacy 1914-1925* (London: Edward Arnold, 1927); James D. White, “National Communism and World Revolution: The Political Consequences of German Military Withdrawal From the Baltic Area in 1918-1919,” *Europe-Asia Studies* 46 (8): 1349-1369; Stanley W. Page, “Lenin, the National Question, and the Baltic States, 1917-19,” *American Slavic and East European Review* 7 (February 1948): 15-31; Davies, *White Eagle, Red Star*. Other consulted sources on the conflict that do not mention casualties include Vytas Stanley Vardys and Judith B. Sedaitis, *Lithuania: The Rebel Nation* (Denver: Westview Press, 1966); Alfred Erich Senn, “Lithuania’s Fight for Independence: The Polish Evacuation of Vilnius, July 1920,” *Baltic Review* 23 (1961): 32-39; *Times of London*, 1920; League of Nations, *The Lithuanian-Polish Dispute* (London: Eyre and Spottiswood, 1921-1923), 3 vols.

<sup>41</sup> Piotr Lossowski, *Konflikt Polsko-Litewski 1918-1920* (Warsaw: Ksiazka I Wiedza, 1996), esp. 152 and 180. Thanks to Hubert Tworzecki for translation.

<sup>42</sup> Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*, 393.

A. Germany, Italy, and Hungary invade Yugoslavia in 1941. Hungarian forces attack on April 11, specifically its Third Army with several corps in reserve. Other Hungarian units attack other areas the next day.<sup>43</sup> Hence, Germany, Italy, and Hungary are coded as initiating war against Yugoslavia.

B. Canada declared war against Germany, Italy, and Japan. Canada started participating in combat operations against Germany as early as 1940. Canada had high enough levels of participation in the Pacific to count as a belligerent, including the 1,975 Canadian troops sent to Hong Kong in late 1941, 40% of whom were killed or wounded in combat. Japan is coded as initiating war against Canada instead of the reverse, because Japan enters war in the Pacific because of the December 8 Japanese attack on Hong Kong, which included an attack on Canadian forces stationed there.<sup>44</sup>

C. Australia and New Zealand each initiate against Germany and Italy. They both declare war on Germany, with Britain, in September 1939. New Zealand began mobilizing its population for war immediately after its formal declaration of war in September 1939.<sup>45</sup> Australia started participating in combat operations against Germany as early as 1939. New Zealand forces were available as early as 1940, participating in combat in north Africa.<sup>46</sup> Japan is coded as initiating against New Zealand and Australia, because New Zealand and Australian troops are deployed in Singapore when Japan attacked on December 8, 1941.<sup>47</sup>

D. Ethiopia participates in the East African campaign against Italian forces. Micheal Clodfelter estimates that Ethiopian military and civilian casualties numbered about 100,000. Ethiopian forces start fighting Italian troops before Ethiopia reenters as a COW state system member (May 5, 1941), but the Italians surrender, soon after, and COW codes Ethiopia as exiting the war on July 3.<sup>48</sup> COW 4.0 has Ethiopia entering World War II on January 24, 1941, but the COW state membership data set codes Ethiopia as not being a member of the state system until May 5 of 1941.

E. Hungary declares war on the USSR on June 27, 1941. This occurs after aircraft bomb the Hungarian city of Kassa on June 26, some four days after German forces invaded the Soviet Union. The Hungarian government claimed the aircraft were the Soviet, but the Soviets never took credit. It conceivably could have been German action to provoke Hungarian action, it could have been a Hungarian-German conspiracy to create a *casus belli* for war between the Soviet Union and Hungary, or it could have been an accident, as the Soviets might have mistaken it for a Slovak city. The evidence is inconclusive, making it very difficult to code.<sup>49</sup> Given the lack of

---

<sup>43</sup> Nigel Thomas and László Pál Szábó, *The Royal Hungarian Army in World War II* (New York: Osprey, 2008), 14.

<sup>44</sup> I.C.B. Dear and M.R.D. Foot, eds., *The Oxford Companion to World War II* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 186.

<sup>45</sup> Frederic Lloyd Whitfield Wood, *The New Zealand People at War: Political and External Affairs* (Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Internal Affairs, 1958), 98.

<sup>46</sup> Dear and Foot, *Oxford Companion*, 799.

<sup>47</sup> Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*, 532; <http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/war/war-in-the-pacific/war-against-japan>.

<sup>48</sup> Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*, 471-472.

<sup>49</sup> Deborah S. Cornelius, *Hungary in World War II: Caught in the Cauldron* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2011), 147-151; N. F. Dreisziger, "New Twist to an Old Riddle: The Bombing of Kassa (Košice), June 26, 1941,"

Soviet diplomatic actions or Soviet declaration of war on Hungary at the time of the bombing, and the likely Soviet motivation to keep Hungary out of the war in the context of the recent German invasion of the Soviet Union, we code Hungary as initiating war against the Soviet Union. Also, COW codes Hungary as exiting the war in January 1945. However, Hungary engages in substantial conflict in the first months of 1945. We code Hungary as exiting the war on April 1, 1945.<sup>50</sup>

F. Romania initiates war against the USSR in 1941, exits the war in defeat in 1944. Then, in 1944, Romania declares war on Hungary and Germany, and defeats both as a member of the Allies in 1945. Note that we code Romania-Germany conflict as starting on August 24, 1944, not September 9, 1944, as COW codes it.<sup>51</sup>

G. We add a case of the United Kingdom initiating against Vichy France in 1940. UK-French hostilities easily produce over 1000 casualties; the sinking of the French vessel *Bretagne* alone killed 1012.<sup>52</sup> The United Kingdom has enough military successes to call this a victory, including at Mers-el-Kébir, Syria, Gabon, and Madagascar, though it did less well at Dakar. Military operations continue up through the end of 1942, and the war ends when Vichy France exits as a COW member November 11, 1942.

H. Bulgaria declares war on the US and United Kingdom in December 1941. This leads to initial Anglo-American bombing raids, escalating to more intense raids up through 1944, killing several hundred. That conflict ends with armistice in 1944. The Soviet Union declared war on Bulgaria in September 1944 and invaded, but it appears that the invasion caused negligible Bulgarian or Soviet casualties. Then, Bulgaria declares war on Germany and de facto war on Hungary, in late 1944. Bulgaria sends 339,000 troops into Balkans, and then up through Hungary and Austria, at the cost of 32,000 Bulgarian KIA.<sup>53</sup>

I. Germany initiates war against Italy in 1943. Though Italy declares war on October 18, German military action precedes the Italian declaration of war, including the German massacre of Italian troops on Cephalonia on September 15, as well as the German seizure of Rome.<sup>54</sup>

J. COW codes France as reentering the nation-state system on August 25, 1944. We code France as de facto initiating war against Germany upon its reentrance into nation-state system. France contributed more than 100,000 troops in the campaign against Germany in 1944-45.<sup>55</sup>

K. Brazil participates in the Italian campaign against Germany, 1944-45, sending 25,000 troops. Though Brazil declares war against Italy in 1942, we do not include a Brazil-Italy dyad because

---

*Journal of Modern History* 44 (June 1972): 232-242; Thomas Sakmyster, "The Search for a Casus Belli and the Origins of the Kassa Bombing," *Hungarian Studies Review* 10 (Spring 1983): 53-65.

<sup>50</sup> See the discussion on p. 112 of the data codebook for Lo et al, "Ensuring Peace."

<sup>51</sup> See the discussion on pp. 108-109, 120 of the data codebook for Lo et al, "Ensuring Peace."

<sup>52</sup> Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*, 469.

<sup>53</sup> Marshall Lee Miller, *Bulgaria During the Second World War* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975); Dear and Foot, *Oxford Companion*, 171.

<sup>54</sup> Dear and Foot, *Oxford Companion*, 588; Peter Calvocoressi, Guy Wint, and John Pritchard, *Total War: The Causes and Consequences of the Second World War* (New York: Pantheon, 1989), vol. 1, 401.

<sup>55</sup> Dear and Foot, *Oxford Companion*, 402.

it appears there is no consequential combat between Brazilian and Italian forces. Brazil aids in the Battle of the Atlantic against German U-Boats, and then deploys troops to Italy in 1944, after Italy has exited the Axis. Brazil also formally declares war against Japan in June 1945, but makes no military contributions to Japan's defeat, so we do not include a Brazil-Japan dyad.<sup>56</sup>

L. The Soviet Union needs to be included as a state joining the German-Polish War in 1939, initiating against Poland as a joiner. The Soviets committed nearly half a million troops, suffered 852 KIA, and killed perhaps 5000 Polish soldiers.<sup>57</sup>

M. Britain and France declared war on Germany on September 3, but do not aid Poland with troops, so they are not coded as joining Poland in its war with Germany. However, during the so-called "Phony War" from late fall 1939 to spring 1940, there were major combat operations involving Britain, France and Germany. Britain initiated violence against Germany, bombing German vessels in several German harbors on September 3-4, 1939, killing 8 German sailors. Note also that France attacked Germany at the Saarland in early September 1939, inflicting perhaps 200 casualties. There were also significant naval clashes during this period. The UK lost 515 in September 1939 when *Courageous* was sunk, and a further 833 in October 1939 when *Royal Oak* was sunk. The French also participated in naval operations, for example committing two cruisers to help pursue the *Graf Spee* in Fall 1939.<sup>58</sup> We code Britain as initiating against Germany in 1939 and winning in 1945, and France as initiating against Germany in 1939 and losing in 1940; fighting against Britain 1940-1942; and rejoining the Allies in 1944 to win in 1945.

N. South Africa declared war on Germany in September 1939. The South African Navy engaged in mine-sweeping and anti-submarine duties as early as January 1940. It participated in major combat against Germany from about 1941, including the defense of Egypt, allied air operations in Europe, and naval anti-submarine warfare.<sup>59</sup> South Africa also participated in the 1942 British operation in Vichy-held Madagascar with a brigade. South Africa fought with Britain and Ethiopia against Italy from 1941-1943.<sup>60</sup>

O. We create a new dyad of the 1941-1944 Continuation War between Finland and the USSR in World War II. Germany invaded the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, and on that same day the Soviet Union initiated war against Finland, launching air, artillery, and ground attacks against military and civilian sites on Finnish soil. Finland formally declared war on the Soviet Union on June 25.<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Dear and Foot, *Oxford Companion*, 157.

<sup>57</sup> Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*, 465.

<sup>58</sup> Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*, 513.

<sup>59</sup> Dear and Foot, *Oxford Companion*, 1024-1026; H.R. Gordon-Cumming, *Official History of the South African Naval Forces during the Second World War (1939-45)* (Simon's Town, South Africa: Naval Heritage Society, 2008), 29.

<sup>60</sup> Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*, 471.

<sup>61</sup> Henrik Meinander, "Finland and the Great Powers in World War II: Ideologies, Geopolitics, Diplomacy," in Tiina Kinnunen and Ville Kivimäki, eds., *Finland in World War II: History, Memory, Interpretations* (Boston: Leiden, 2012), 71-72; Waldemar Erfurth, *The Last Finnish War* (Washington: University Publications of America, 1979), 17-18; Dan Reiter, *How Wars End* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009).



18. The 1940 Franco-Thai War is deleted because of insufficient casualties. COW estimates 700 deaths per side, but the source of that casualty estimate is unclear. Clodfelter estimates that the French suffered 200 casualties.<sup>62</sup> The best source for the French side attributes 321 French dead.<sup>63</sup> The best source for the Thai side is 160 dead.<sup>64</sup> This total of 481 dead is far short of the 1000 battle dead minimum.

19. Korean War, 1950-1953. COW does not list the USSR as a participant. However, recent scholarship has revealed that the USSR was a consequential combatant through deployment of air defense troops and fighter pilots, with first aerial combat occurring on November 1, 1950. The USSR deployed a peak of 20,000 personnel in anti-aircraft units in North Korea. It also deployed its 64<sup>th</sup> Air Defense Corps to Manchuria in November 1950, a force of 26,000; overall, 72,000 Soviet troops served on the China-Korea border. 299 Soviet military personnel died during the Korean War.<sup>65</sup> Soviet aces alone were responsible for 293 “kills” in aerial combat.<sup>66</sup>

COW indicates that the Korean War began on June 24, 1950. The conventional wisdom is that the war started on June 25, 1950 with the North Korean invasion of South Korea. *Resort to War* makes no reference to any events on June 24, but does make specific reference to the June 25 invasion. Bruce Cumings provided a revisionist, alternative account of the start of the Korean War, summarizing the official North Korean claim that the war started when South Korean forces began shelling North Korean territory on June 23. But, this North Korean claim has not been confirmed by other sources, *Resort to War* makes no reference to Cumings’ book, and even taken at face value this would mean both a different start date than June 24 (June 23), and a different war initiator (South Korea).<sup>67</sup> We agree with the conventional wisdom, and code the war as beginning on June 25, 1950.

20. Ifni War, 1957-58. This should be excluded, as there are not enough casualties. One source indicates only 56 Spanish dead, from November 1957 to April 1958.<sup>68</sup> There were perhaps a bit more than that. Micheal Clodfelter indicates 62 dead at battle of Ifni in 1957, and then an additional 292 KIA in January 1958 battle at Etchebera.<sup>69</sup> Still, even the high end of these figures are well short of the 1000 KIA threshold. John Mercer indicated the Spanish deployment of 9000 troops, and the French deployment of 5000 troops.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*, 396.

<sup>63</sup> Claude Hesse D’Alzon, *La Presence Militaire Française en Indochine (1940-1945)* (Chateau de Vincennes: Publications du Service Historique de l’Armée de Terre, 1985), 98n.

<sup>64</sup> Sorasan Bhangsbha, *Songkhram Indochin: Thai rop Farangset Pho. So. 2483* (Krung Thep, Thailand: Sarakadhi, 2002), 160. Thanks to Rick Doner for translation.

<sup>65</sup> Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*, 709. See also Spencer C. Tucker, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Korean War: A Political, Social, and Military History*, volume II (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2000), 607-608.

<sup>66</sup> Paul M. Edwards, *Korean War Almanac* (New York: Facts on File, 2006), 546-547; Steven J. Zaluga, “The Russians in MiG Alley,” *Air Force Magazine* 74 (February 1991): 74-77.

<sup>67</sup> Sarkees and Wayman, 147-148. An example of the conventional interpretation of the war starting on June 25 is William Stueck, *Rethinking the Korean War: A New Diplomatic and Strategic History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 61. For Cumings’ interpretation, see Bruce Cumings, *Korea’s Place in the Sun: A Modern History* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1997), 260-261.

<sup>68</sup> Thomas A. Marks, “Spanish Sahara: Background to Conflict,” *African Affairs* 75 (January 1976): 6

<sup>69</sup> John Scurr, *The Spanish Foreign Legion* (Oxford: Osprey, 1985), 37 indicates 278 KIA at this battle.

<sup>70</sup> Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*, 589; John Mercer, “The Cycle of Invasion and Unification in the Western Sahara,” *African Affairs* 75 (October 1976): 503.

21. There are a number of issues regarding the Vietnam War. COW lists Cambodia as a participant in the Vietnam War, on the US side, entering the war on March 1, 1970, and suffering 2500 casualties.<sup>71</sup> This decision seems to come from the assumption that “South Vietnam also received support from five other states that sent troops into the war (South Korea, Thailand, Cambodia, the Philippines, and Australia).”<sup>72</sup> However, there is no indication that Cambodia ever sent such troops to fight in South Vietnam. One of the definitive statistical sources on Vietnam does not list Cambodia as a nation deploying troops to the Vietnam War.<sup>73</sup>

There are other reasons why the claim of Cambodian participation in the Vietnam war as COW describes seems difficult to sustain. Cambodia under the rule of Prince Sihanouk maintained neutrality, and in some regards and during some periods leaned to the Communist side, including tolerating (to various degrees) the basing of Communist troops on Cambodian soil. It is possible that COW’s claim revolves around the overthrow of Sihanouk by Lon Nol in March 1970. However, the facts fail to support this claim. Sihanouk was not overthrown until March 18, so the March 1 war entry date is still puzzling. Further, the Cambodian government had a trade agreement with North Vietnam that allowed North Vietnam to use the Cambodian port of Sihanoukville to provide supplies to Communist forces based on Cambodian soil, and to allow for the purchase of supplies in Cambodia. This agreement was not cancelled until March 12. More generally, the new government under Lon Nol reaffirmed its neutrality in late March, going so far as to order Cambodian border troops to avoid contact with Viet Cong or North Vietnamese forces.<sup>74</sup> Conflict on Cambodian territory escalated starting in late March, but COW handles those hostilities with its War of the Communist Coalition, coded as beginning on March 23, 1970, and involving North Vietnam vs. Cambodia, South Vietnam, and the US. We include the War of the Communist Coalition, but delete Cambodia from participating in the Vietnam War.

Following COW, we code the US as initiating the Vietnam War on February 7, 1965 with the Flaming Dart I airstrikes against North Vietnamese Army bases, in retaliation against Viet Cong attacks on American forces at Camp Holloway near Pleiku earlier that day. One could code North Vietnam as initiating the Vietnam War, coding the first act of aggression to be the Communist attack on Camp Holloway. However, the best available evidence seems to indicate that the attack on Camp Holloway was initiated by Viet Cong insurgents operating inside South Vietnam and not ordered by North Vietnam.<sup>75</sup> Hence, though Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese government worked closely together, the Camp Holloway attack is probably not best identified as one state attacking another state.

---

<sup>71</sup> COW provides its coding of war entry dates in the data set, available at [http://www.correlatesofwar.org/COW2%20Data/WarData\\_NEW/WarList\\_NEW.html#Inter-State War Data](http://www.correlatesofwar.org/COW2%20Data/WarData_NEW/WarList_NEW.html#Inter-State%20War%20Data).

<sup>72</sup> Sarkees and Wayman, 155.

<sup>73</sup> Micheal Clodfelter, *Vietnam in Military Statistics: A History of the Indochina Wars, 1772-1991* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1995), 295.

<sup>74</sup> Jonathan S. Grant, Laurence A. G. Moss, and Jonathan Unger, eds., *Cambodia: The Widening War in Indochina* (New York: Washington Square Press, 1971), 304; William Shawcross, *Sideshow: Kissinger, Nixon and the Destruction of Cambodia* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1979), 118, 123-4.

<sup>75</sup> Mark Moyar, *Triumph Foresaken: The Vietnam War, 1954-1965* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 486 n14.

We have a different coding of the outcome of the Vietnam War than does COW. COW codes the war as ending in a North Vietnamese victory in April 1975. We code the US and its non-South Vietnam allies as experiencing a draw in January 1973. Some may propose that the Vietnam War must be viewed as a defeat for the US and its allies, even as of 1973. The core rationale for the draw coding is that the Paris Peace Accords at face accomplished some important US goals. North Vietnam's core goal was the subversion of the non-Communist government in Saigon, a goal it had formally approved as far back as 1959, pursuing this goal through ever escalating support of Communist insurgency in South Vietnam, and eventually through deployment of North Vietnamese troops to South Vietnamese territory.<sup>76</sup> From the outset of the war, the core US goals were to eliminate violent North Vietnamese subversion of the South Vietnamese government. For example, in August 1964, soon after the Gulf of Tonkin Incident, the US offered economic aid to North Vietnam, and accordingly avoidance of American hostility, if North Vietnam ended the insurgency in South Vietnam.<sup>77</sup> The Paris Peace Accords de jure accomplished this goal, in the sense that the agreement allowed for South Vietnamese self-determination, forbidding foreign countries from interfering. The Accords also reflected concessions on the part of North Vietnam, including dropping the demand that the ruling South Vietnamese government be replaced by a coalition. These concessions were probably driven by the 1972 American "Linebacker II" bombing campaign,<sup>78</sup> and occurred in the context of a ground combat/pacification environment that had been improving, from the American point of view, since 1969.<sup>79</sup> That said, the agreement certainly did not accomplish all American goals, as the agreement recognized the right of the Viet Cong to participate in South Vietnam's process of self-determination.

Some might reply that the unexpected human costs paid by the United States justify coding this as a defeat for the US. Notwithstanding our general approach of ignoring costs when assessing outcomes, this view underestimates Communist casualties. Indeed, Communist casualties dwarfed American casualties, both in absolute and relative terms (that is, casualties as a percentage of the total population). American military deaths from 1965-1974 were 46,000, compared to some 951,000 Communist deaths.<sup>80</sup>

We code South Vietnam as fighting the Vietnam War from February 1965 up through April 1975, suffering defeat. The potentially controversial element of this coding is that we code the January 1973 peace agreement as stopping the war between North Vietnam and all countries besides South Vietnam, but not stopping the war between North Vietnam and South Vietnam, though South Vietnam was a signatory to the agreement. Other studies have recognized that some cease fires are meaningless.<sup>81</sup> We observe that though the January 1973 agreement

---

<sup>76</sup> George C. Herring, *American's Longest War: The United States and Vietnam, 1950-1975* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1996), 74-75.

<sup>77</sup> Stanley Karnow, *Vietnam: A History* (New York: Penguin, 1983), 376-7.

<sup>78</sup> Robert A. Pape, *Bombing to Win: Air Power and Coercion in War* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1996), 202-3.

<sup>79</sup> Lewis Sorley, *A Better War: The Unexamined Victories and Final Tragedy of America's Last Years in Vietnam* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1999).

<sup>80</sup> John E. Mueller, "The Search for the 'Breaking Point' in Vietnam: The Statistics of a Deadly Quarrel," *International Studies Quarterly* 24 (December 1980): 497-519.

<sup>81</sup> Virginia Page Fortna, *Peace Time: Cease-Fire Agreements and the Durability of Peace* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).

stopped fighting between North Vietnam and several countries including the US, it brought almost no pause in the fighting between North and South Vietnam. Even after the ceasefire many NVA (North Vietnamese Army) units remained in South Vietnam. South Vietnamese President Nguyen Van Thieu referred to the 1973 armistice as a “phase” in the war, and refused to use the word “peace” in his public statements. South Vietnam launched operations against areas held by the NVA and the Viet Cong. The NVA launched three division-scale operations in 1973.<sup>82</sup> Several historians agree that the accord offered essentially no pause in the fighting between North and South Vietnam. Harry Summers wrote that “the agreement was almost immediately violated by both sides.”<sup>83</sup> Lewis Sorley: “Very soon after the Paris Accords were signed the North Vietnamese resumed their attacks. Their task was made easy by the thirteen NVA divisions and 75 regiments—an estimated 160,000 troops in all—still in place in South Vietnam.”<sup>84</sup> Micheal Clodfelter: “Nixon claimed the attainment of his ‘peace with honor,’ but the war had ended only for America. Having endured for so long, the conflict refused to end. The cease-fire broke down almost immediately.”<sup>85</sup>

22. COW 4.0 codes Pakistan as winning the 1965 Rann of Kutch War, claiming India concedes to allow a plebiscite. That war is better coded as a draw. The Soviets mediated the peace deal, and though they supported India they also wanted to restrict Chinese influence in Pakistan, so they did not want to damage Pakistan’s interests too greatly.<sup>86</sup> The peace deal, the Tashkent Declaration, required both sides to withdraw to their prewar borders (at war’s end, each side possessed some of the other side’s prewar territory). Here is one summary of the peace deal, stressing mutual concessions: “The importance of the Tashkent Declaration lay in that it represented important concessions on both sides. The Indians gave up strategic positions captured in the Azad Kashmir region, and the Pakistanis agreed to withdraw from territory that they had seized in the conflict. The Indians backed down from their original position that Pakistan acknowledge its responsibility for guerilla infiltration. Apart from conceding the strategic positions of the Haji Pir pass and Titwal, which brought about domestic discontent, [Indian Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri] gave up little at Tashkent. (Brines, 1968, p. 405) [Pakistani President Muhammed] Ayub [Khan], however, came away without having achieved much. As a result the 1965 war, and more importantly, its outcomes probably marked the beginning of Ayub’s end.”<sup>87</sup>

As to the specific plebiscite issue, there are a few reasons why the plebiscite commitment is not enough rationale to justify coding Pakistan as winning. First, India had committed in principle to a plebiscite in Kashmir as early as the late 1940s.<sup>88</sup> That is, any commitment to a plebiscite at the end of the 1965 War does not represent a change in India’s previous diplomatic position. Second, though *Resort to War* refers to an Indian commitment to a plebiscite, it does not indicate the source of this commitment. The 1966 Tashkent Declaration is the peace treaty between the

---

<sup>82</sup> Stanley Karnow, *Vietnam: A History* (New York: Viking Press, 1983), 657-658; Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*, 741.

<sup>83</sup> Harry G. Summers, Jr., *Vietnam War Almanac* (New York: Facts on File, 1985), 279.

<sup>84</sup> Sorley, *Better War*, 363.

<sup>85</sup> Clodfelter, *Vietnam War*, 206.

<sup>86</sup> Sumit Ganguly, *The Origins of War in South Asia: Indo-Pakistani Conflicts Since 1947*, second edition (Boulder: Westview Press, 1994), 77.

<sup>87</sup> Op. cit, 77.

<sup>88</sup> Russell Brines, *The Indo-Pakistani Conflict* (London: Pall Mall Press, 1968), 6.

two sides, and it makes no mention of a plebiscite.<sup>89</sup> Other sources do not indicate an Indian commitment to a plebiscite as part of the peace deal.<sup>90</sup> Third, in its conceptual discussion of war outcomes, COW makes reference to scholarly consensus about war outcome. Yet, it does not refer to any sources that indicate that argue that Pakistan won. Indeed, some specialists make the exact opposite claim, that Pakistan actually *lost* the war: “Clearly, Pakistan was compelled by the military situation to accept India’s insistence upon restoring the *status quo ante*, with only minimum face-saving provisions in the UN resolution for some future consideration of the problems for which the country had embarked on war. This was, perhaps, the strongest indication that, for all practical purposes, Pakistan had lost the conflict.”<sup>91</sup> Relatedly, some argue that India got the better deal in the Tashkent Declaration: “Even though Shastri died during the [Tashkent] talks, India got the best deal. Initially Pakistan tried to argue for the liberation of Kashmir on the basis of self-determination, a diplomatic solution to its failure to gain its military objectives, but India really achieved more by insisting on, and achieving, a restoration of the *status quo ante bellum*.”<sup>92</sup>

23. Regarding the Six Day War, we code Jordan as joining the war. Israel was urging Jordanian restraint, and Jordan took the first militarized action, launching artillery attacks against civilian areas and airfields on the first day of the war, June 5, 1967.<sup>93</sup>

24. The Second Laotian War Phase 2 of 1968-1973 is a new war in COW 4.0. North Vietnam initiates, engaging Laotian government forces with the goal of aiding the Pathet Lao Communist insurgents in Laos, and destabilizing the Laotian government. COW codes the start date as January 13, 1968, based on an NVA air raid launched on a US observation base on top of a mountain in Phou Pha Thi in Laos that day. However, the war should probably be coded as starting on December 12, 1967. On that day, two North Vietnamese battalions along with several companies of Pathet Lao Communist insurgents overran a Laotian government position ten miles north of Saravane.<sup>94</sup>

On February 22, 1973, the sides signed a formal peace agreement, “Agreement on the Restoration of Peace and Reconciliation in Laos.” The agreement is a ceasefire, calls for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Laos, a return of all prisoners, and that within 60 days the establishment of the Provisional Government and National Coalition Council. This was a framework for national conciliation, without spelling out important details.

COW codes the war as ending in April 1973 despite the signature of the February agreement, probably because there was some ongoing combat after the February agreement, including

---

<sup>89</sup> *Resort to War*, 156-157; <http://www.jammu-kashmir.com/documents/jktashkent.html> <downloaded December 13, 2010>.

<sup>90</sup> Brines, *Indo-Pakistani Conflict*; Ganguly, *Origins of War*.

<sup>91</sup> Brines, *Indo-Pakistani Conflict*, 375.

<sup>92</sup> Rob Johnson, *A Region in Turmoil: South Asian Conflicts Since 1947* (London: Reaktion Books, 2005), 145.

<sup>93</sup> Michael B. Oren, *Six Days of War: June 1967 and the Making of the Modern Middle East* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 186.

<sup>94</sup> Victor B. Anthony and Richard R. Sexton, *The War in Northern Laos, 1954-1973* (Washington, DC: Center for Air Force History, US Air Force, 1993), 264.

hundreds of American B-52 sorties, as well as attacks by North Vietnamese and Laotian forces.<sup>95</sup> The fighting tapered off in April, when a follow up Protocol agreement was signed, filling out the details of the new governance structure. The Protocol was a power-sharing agreement between the Lao government and the Pathet Lao. Some observers view the Protocol as representing gains for the Pathet Lao,<sup>96</sup> but others disagree, noting that some Pathet Lao demands were not met, as refugees were not required to return to their villages, cease-fires lines were viewed as somewhat fluid, government officials could travel throughout the country (including in Pathet Lao controlled areas), the Pathet Lao's deputy premier was not seen to be superior to the government's deputy premier, and the date of the next general elections was not established.<sup>97</sup>

COW codes the war as ending in North Vietnamese victory. The argument seems to be not that the April 1973 agreement represented a Pathet Lao victory, but rather that eventually the Pathet Lao eventually took over: "The fighting in Laos died out relatively soon after that, with the war ending in April 1973. On September 14, 1973, a coalition government was created in Laos, including all the factions; however, the Pathet Lao gradually took over the government."<sup>98</sup> As discussed in the text, we code outcome based on the achievement of political goals at wars' end, not whether or not goals were achieved in the months or years following wars' end. Accordingly, we code the war as ending in a draw, concurring with COW's ending date of April 17, 1973.

25. War of Attrition. COW codes this as a stalemate between Egypt and Israel, because "neither side was achieving its aims."<sup>99</sup> This assessment is difficult to support, for two reasons. First, COW does not describe what the aims of the two sides were. Second, the context clearly indicates that Egypt failed to accomplish its aims, and Israel did accomplish its aims. Egypt's aims were to persuade Israel to abandon some or all of its territorial positions in the Sinai peninsula. In this, it failed. Indeed, in the course of the war Israel acquired *more* Egyptian territory, seizing Shadwan Island in the Gulf of Suez. Israel accomplished all of its goals of maintaining its territorial position. Some might claim that Egypt's true goal was simply to degrade the Israeli military, but here Egypt failed as well, in that Israel lost 260 KIA to Egypt's 5,000 or so civilians and soldiers killed.<sup>100</sup>

26. COW 4.0 adds a new war, "War of the Communist Coalition," which was in previous versions of COW a civil war. The COW narrative is that on March 23, 1970, ousted Cambodian leader Prince Sihanouk establishes FUNK as an umbrella organization for all groups opposed to the Cambodian government under Lon Nol. FUNK was to be trained and assisted by North Vietnam, so that is deemed to be the start of the war. Within days, COW claims, 40,000 NVA

---

<sup>95</sup> Earl H. Tilford, *Setup: What the US Did in Vietnam and Why* (Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama: Air University Press, 1991), 272-274.

<sup>96</sup> Jane Hamilton-Meritt, *The Tragic Mountains: The Hmong, the Americans, and the Secret Wars for Laos, 1942-1992* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1993), 323.

<sup>97</sup> MacAlister Brown and Joseph J. Zasloff, "Laos 1973: Wary Steps toward Peace," *Asian Survey* 14 (February 1974), 168-169.

<sup>98</sup> *Resort to War*, 159.

<sup>99</sup> *Resort to War*, 160.

<sup>100</sup> Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*, 616; Kenneth M. Pollack, *Arabs at War: Military Effectiveness, 1948-1991* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), 91.

and VC troops attack Cambodian government positions. COW codes the war as ending on July 2, 1971, when North Vietnam withdraws forces, and the conflict devolves into a civil war. The termination coding of this war is probably incorrect, because conflict between Cambodian government and NVA forces continued until the end of 1971. Contact with North Vietnamese forces did trail off in the summer of 1971, but that was because the NVA was regrouping, not retreating. That fall, Cambodian insurgent and NVA forces launched decisively successful offensives against Cambodian government forces, including in reaction to the Cambodian Chenla II operation. After the defeat, North Vietnamese forces appear to have withdrawn into Cambodia, perhaps in late 1971, having concluded that “Lon Nol and company [to be] a dead letter.”<sup>101</sup> We code the war as ending on December 3, 1971, when the Chenla II operation ends.<sup>102</sup>

This is probably best characterized as North Vietnam initiating against and defeating Cambodia, with some US and South Vietnamese forces aiding Cambodia. Consistent with our treatment of some cases in World War II, we do not judge US and South Vietnam as primary initiators or targets in the War of the Communist Coalition, because they are already fighting North Vietnam in the Vietnam War.

27. COW 4.0 codes Pakistan as initiating the 1971 Bangladesh War. India should be coded as initiating. The broader context is that in 1971, a human rights crisis in East Pakistan (the region that eventually became the nation of Bangladesh) drew India’s interest and escalating involvement. Artillery and small arms fire exchanges across the India-East Pakistan border began as early as May, but these actions were of insufficient intensity to mark the beginning of the war. We mark the war as beginning in November, when India troops began to cross the border with East Pakistan “in strength.” These Indian troops began to seize and secure enclaves of territory permitting the operations of Bangladeshi rebel groups (Schanberg 1971). On November 20, an Indian infantry division attacked a village on the East Pakistan side of the border, and Indian attacks soon escalated. COW codes Pakistan as initiating the war, because of the December 3 Pakistani airstrike on Indian airfields. However, there was enough Indian aggression prior to the airstrike to justify coding India as initiator.<sup>103</sup> The authors of a leading history of the war declare: “[December 3] is usually cited for the commencement of the third Indo-Pakistani war, and because of the air strikes, Pakistan is often depicted as having taken the initiative in starting the war. In more realistic, rather than formal, terms, however, the war began on 21 November, when Indian military units occupied Pakistani territory as part of the preliminary phase of the offensive directed at capturing and liberating Dhaka.”<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup> Craig Etcheson, *The Rise and Demise of Democratic Kampuchea* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1984), 114-115; David P. Chandler, *The Tragedy of Cambodian History: Politics, War, and Revolution Since 1945* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 213-214; William Shawcross, *Sideshow: Kissinger, Nixon and the Destruction of Cambodia*, revised ed. (New York: Touchstone, 1987), 202-204.

<sup>102</sup> Sak Sutsakhan, *The Khmer Republic at War and the Final Collapse* (McLean, VA: General Research Corporation, 1978), 79.

<sup>103</sup> Gary J. Bass, *The Blood Telegram: Nixon, Kissinger, and a Forgotten Genocide* (New York: Knopf, 2013), 142, 258, 261-2; Sydney Schanberg, “India Approaches War Footing as Fighting Intensifies,” *New York Times*, November 21, 1971.

<sup>104</sup> Richard Sisson and Leo E. Rose, *War and Secession: Pakistan, India, and the Creation of Bangladesh* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 214.

28. Regarding the War over Angola, 1975-76, we code both South Africa and Zaire as initiating on October 23, 1975 against Cuban troops based in Angola. Angola, not yet independent, declares independence November 11 and joins the war. On February 12, 1976, South Africa withdraws. In sum, South Africa and Zaire initiate, and Cuba and Angola win.

29. Regarding the Second Ogaden War, 1977-78, COW codes Somalia as initiating, Cuba intervening on behalf of Ethiopia, and the war transforming into intrastate war. We code the outcome as Ethiopian/Cuban victory. The military dimension is a Somali invasion of the Ogaden region, initial military success, then Somali withdrawal from the region. After the interstate phase ends, the non-state WSLF attacks Ethiopian forces, which is the intrastate conflict aspect. We code Cuba as a joiner.

30. Regarding the Vietnam-Cambodia War, COW 4.0 codes this war as occurring from 1977-1979, because the conflict prior to 1977 did not produce sufficient casualties. COW codes Cambodia as initiating. After the Khmer Rouge took power in 1975 and after the Vietnam War ended, Cambodian forces seized some disputed islands, then Vietnamese forces seized Vai (or Wai) island. There were talks in June 1975, and peace endured from 1975 through the end of 1976. Khmer Rouge attacked Vietnamese villages in April 1977. COW codes the war as beginning with a Cambodian attack in September 1977.<sup>105</sup> COW codes this war as being transformed into an extra-state war. We code the interstate phase as culminating in Vietnamese victory, because the Cambodian government is overthrown.

31. Regarding the 1979 China-Vietnam War, COW codes China as winning. This war should instead be coded as a draw. All that *Resort to War* indicates about the outcome is that “on March 5, China announced that it had punished Vietnam sufficiently... Though the war was short, it cost thousands of fatalities and ruined four Vietnamese provincial capitals.”<sup>106</sup> Aside from the fact that Vietnam as well as China claimed victory in the war,<sup>107</sup> in general outcomes should be coded using criteria other than belligerents’ public claims that they won.

The more important questions are, what were Chinese goals, and did they accomplish them? China’s military goal appeared to be to inflict costs on Vietnam. Accomplishing the military goal of inflicting costs might serve one of two possible political goals. First, it can be part of a coercion campaign, inflicting costs on the target coupled with a demand that the target take some action. However, Vietnam did not respond to the invasion by making any concessions. Second, demonstrating an ability to inflict costs on Vietnam might be a means of demonstrating Chinese military power and the willingness to use force. Some view this as China’s fundamental motive. It is difficult to assess whether accomplishing the military goal of inflicting costs allowed China

---

<sup>105</sup> Odd Arne Westad and Sophie Quinn-Judge, eds., *The Third Indochina War: Conflict Between China, Vietnam, and Cambodia, 1972-79* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 232; Ramses Amer, “Border Conflicts Between Cambodia and Vietnam,” *Boundary and Security Bulletin*, vol. 5 no. 2 (1997): 80

<sup>106</sup> *Resort to War*, 171.

<sup>107</sup> Henry J. Kenny, “Vietnamese Perceptions of the 1979 War With China,” in Mark A. Ryan, David Michael Finkelstein, and Michael A. McDevitt, eds., *Chinese Warfighting: The PLA Experience Since 1949* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2003), 232-233



to accomplish its longer term political goals, and notably, we restrict ourselves to evaluating whether or not a state accomplished its goals at the end of the war.<sup>108</sup>

We code this war as a draw. China accomplished no specific political goals at war's end, such as territorial acquisition, Vietnamese withdrawal from Cambodia, or a Vietnamese commitment to better treatment of ethnic Chinese living in Vietnam. There were perhaps some indirect effects with mixed consequences for each side, such as the war demonstrating the limits of Soviet willingness to aid Vietnam. King Chen summarized the mixed outcome of the war as follows: "In spite of the fact that both China and Vietnam claimed a victory over the other, neither had achieved its major objectives. So far as China is concerned, its publicized limited objectives were only partially obtained. First of all, it had not destroyed any of Vietnam's strong divisions. Second it was unable to make the border area free from armed conflicts. Third, it had not forced the Vietnamese army to withdraw from Cambodia. Fourth, it failed to influence the Hanoi government to change its policy toward Chinese residents in Vietnam. On the other side of the ledger, China had raised doubts in Hanoi about Soviet willingness to intervene with force against China. Moreover, the PRC had also obtained some support from the ASEAN for its attempt to stop further Vietnam's further move in Southeast Asia, and it had caused an immediate ill-effect on the Vietnamese economy."<sup>109</sup>

32. 1982 Lebanon War. COW 4.0 codes this as a stalemate. It is not clear from *Resort to War* why this gets coded as a stalemate. The closest is the remark that Israel and Syria "maintained troops in areas of Lebanon for many years."<sup>110</sup> This is clearly an Israeli victory. Israel's main goal was to eject the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) from Lebanon. Israel accomplished this goal, and also secured territorial control of southern Lebanon to improve the security of northern Israel. Syria failed to prevent Israel from establishing an enduring foothold in Lebanon, or from ejecting the PLO. Syria did maintain troops in Lebanon in the years that followed the 1982 war, but had had troops in Lebanon since the 1970s. The war may have created a long term strategic, political problem for Israel, but our approach is to code outcomes based on accomplishment of goals at the end of the war, rather than on assessing whether or not the war helped a belligerent achieve long term grand strategy goals.

33. Regarding the 1990-1991 Gulf War, we treat the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait differently from COW. COW codes the Gulf War as a single war, beginning with the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in August 1990, and ending with the UN coalition's liberation of Kuwait and ceasefire in April 1991. Consistent with our treatment of World War II in particular, we break up the Gulf War into two campaigns, the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the UN's liberation of Kuwait. Kuwait is first conquered, there is a significant duration of peace, and then there is the initiation of the campaign to liberate Kuwait. Hence, the Gulf War should be analyzed in pieces, as we analyze World War II in pieces, for example coding France as losing a war with Germany in 1940, then reentering the war in 1944 to achieve victory over Germany in 1945.

---

<sup>108</sup> Xiaoming Zhang, "China's 1979 War with Vietnam: A Reassessment," *China Quarterly* no. 184 (December 2005): 851-874 presents an interpretation more sympathetic with the view that the war provided China with some longer term political benefits. However, we focus on the accomplishment of aims at war's end, and not on longer term assessments.

<sup>109</sup> King C. Chen, *China's War With Vietnam, 1979: Issues, Decisions, and Implications* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1987), 115-116.

<sup>110</sup> *Resort to War*, 174.

An important question to ask is whether the August 1990 Iraqi invasion of Kuwait qualifies as a war. We find that it does not, because of insufficient casualties. The data on casualties during the August 2, 1990 Iraqi invasion of Kuwait are poor, though all sources claim that the 16,000 strong Kuwaiti military put up little resistance, surrendering the capital about four hours after the invasion began. In the words of one major study of the Gulf War: “The Iraqi land force met virtually no resistance.”<sup>111</sup> On August 5, 1990, the *Sunday Times* (London) reported that Kuwaiti hospital sources indicated that some 600-800 Kuwaitis had been killed since the commencement of fighting, but that report does not indicate whether that figure is for civilian deaths, military deaths, or both.<sup>112</sup> The Kuwaiti government claimed in December 1990 that 4,200 Kuwaiti soldiers had been killed during the invasion, but that figure may or may not include post-invasion deaths from the occupation.<sup>113</sup> Later, a 1994 publication, based on Kuwaiti government documents, lists a total of 99 Kuwaiti soldiers killed during the August 2 invasion.<sup>114</sup> Clodfelter (632) provides no estimates of Kuwaiti casualties, and allows that no more than 200 Iraqis died in the conquest.<sup>115</sup> On balance, the best judgment is that there were probably far fewer than 1000 battle casualties during the few hours of combat, probably no more than a few hundred at most.

Some might argue that the Iraq-Kuwait War ought to be included as an interstate war even if it falls short of the 1000 battle death threshold, because it was clearly an interstate, violent conflict, one state invaded another, and many troops were involved. However, if the Iraq-Kuwait War were to be included on such grounds, then this would be justification for including several other events as “wars” that COW excludes. Examples include: the April 1939 Italian invasion of Albania (22,000 Italian troops, Italian fatality estimates ranging from 12 to 700); the April 1940 German invasion of Denmark (1400 invading German troops, 69 German and Danish fatalities); the 1983 American invasion of Grenada (nearly 13,000 troops involved, 65 fatalities); the December 1989 American invasion of Panama (28,000 US troops involved, 88 fatalities); the 1968 Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia (600,000 invading troops, 11 Soviet dead and 70 Czech dead); and the 1940 Soviet occupations of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania.<sup>116</sup>

34. Regarding the War of Bosnian independence, COW codes this war as beginning on April 7, 1992, the date that Bosnia-Herzegovina becomes independent. COW claims that substantial, former Yugoslav Army (JNA) troops were engaged in fighting on Bosnian soil, and lists Bosnia, Yugoslavia, and Croatia as belligerents. We instead code this conflict as an intra-state war, for two reasons. First, this is more like an internationalized civil war. That is, coding this as a civil war would for consistency’s sake probably require coding the Russian Civil War and the Spanish

---

<sup>111</sup> Anthony H. Cordesman and Abraham R. Wagner, *The Lessons of Modern War, Volume IV: The Gulf War* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996), 47.

<sup>112</sup> *Sunday Times* (London), August 5, 1990, 1.

<sup>113</sup> Alberto Bin, Richard Hill, and Archer Jones, *Desert Storm: A Forgotten War* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998), 24n.

<sup>114</sup> Ali Abdul-Lateef Khalifouh, ed., *Kuwaiti Resistance as Revealed by Iraqi Documents* (Mansouria, Kuwait: Centre for Research and Studies in Kuwait, 1994), 55.

<sup>115</sup> Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*, 633. It is not clear where that 200 estimate came from. It does not appear in the four Gulf War sources Clodfelter includes in his bibliography. There are no casualty estimates in other leading sources on the Gulf War, including the *Gulf War Air Power Survey* and Cordesman and Wagner, *Lessons of Modern War*.

<sup>116</sup> Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*.

Civil War as interstate wars (they are now coded by COW as intrastate wars). Second, it is not clear that the JNA troops in Yugoslavia should be deemed as agents of the Serbian government. *Resort to War* refers to them as “former JNA members.” They were under the command of Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic, and had been technically released from the JNA, though they still received support from Belgrade.<sup>117</sup>

35. Regarding the 1995 Cenepa War, COW 4.0 codes this month-long episode as an interstate war. We exclude this as a war, because there is not enough data to suggest that there were at least 1000 battle dead. Clodfelter estimates 78 dead.<sup>118</sup> Herz and Nogueira report the following: “There are no reliable sources for the number of casualties in the Cenepa War. Bonilla estimates deaths at 1,500, based on confidential reports from Ecuadorian offices. Generals Gallardo and Paco Moncayo, respectively defense minister and army commander at the time; Colonel Luis Hernandez, commander of one of the main units involved in the fighting; and Lieutenant-Colonel Luis Aguas, who also participated directly in operations, considered that number extremely high and agreed roughly on no more than 500 casualties, most of them on the Peruvian side. We had no access to Peruvian estimates of casualties.”<sup>119</sup> Official Ecuadorian government estimates were 34 Ecuadorian soldiers killed, and official Peruvian government estimates were 50 Peruvian soldiers killed.<sup>120</sup> Gabriel Marcella and Richard Downes estimate 300-400 dead, noting that, “The ‘fog of war’ in the jungle made it difficult to distinguish fact from fiction and the value of official claim from counterclaim.”<sup>121</sup> The Uppsala Armed Conflict Data claims that hundreds were killed.<sup>122</sup>

*Resort to War* cites three sources, a personal communication from David Scott Palmer, a personal communication from David Mares, and an unpublished 1995 paper by Adrian Bonilla, presented at a Latin American Studies Association conference, estimating 1500 casualties.<sup>123</sup> The Bonilla conference paper was eventually published as a chapter in an edited volume. The Sarkees and Wayman book was published in 2010, and in 2012 Mares and Palmer published a book on the Ecuador-Peru rivalry.<sup>124</sup> In the Mares and Palmer book, they are a bit equivocal, in one place (1) indicating that casualties ranged from published estimates in the 200-300 range to unpublished estimates ranging as high as 4500, though in another place in the text they simply refer to published estimates of 100-300 (38). Their sources are as follows. First, there is an interview with an Ecuadorean diplomat estimating as many as 4000 casualties.<sup>125</sup> Second, there

---

<sup>117</sup> *Resort to War*, 177; Carole Rogel, *The Breakup of Yugoslavia and the War in Bosnia* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998), 32.

<sup>118</sup> Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*, 695.

<sup>119</sup> Monica Herz and João Pontes Nogueira, *Ecuador vs. Peru: Peacemaking Amid Rivalry* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2002), 47.

<sup>120</sup> Vassilas K. Fouskas, *Politics of Conflict: A Survey* (London: Routledge, 2007), 36.

<sup>121</sup> “Introduction,” in *Security Cooperation in the Western Hemisphere: Resolving the Ecuador-Peru Conflict*, Gabriel Marcella and Richard Downes, eds. (Coral Gables, FL: North-South Center Press, 1999), 1, 14n.

<sup>122</sup> [http://www.ucdp.uu.se/gpdata/gpcountry.php?id=49&regionSelect=5-Southern\\_Americas](http://www.ucdp.uu.se/gpdata/gpcountry.php?id=49&regionSelect=5-Southern_Americas)

<sup>123</sup> *Resort to War*, 181.

<sup>124</sup> David R. Mares and David Scott Palmer, *Power, Institutions, and Leadership in War and Peace: Lessons from Peru and Ecuador, 1995-1998* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2012), 145. Note that Mares and Palmer refer to one estimate of 4500 casualties, but there are citing the Palmer essay indicating one source claiming 4000 casualties.

<sup>125</sup> David Scott Palmer, “The Search for Conflict Resolution: The Guarantors and the Peace Process in the Ecuador-Peru Dispute,” in *Security Cooperation in the Western Hemisphere*, 39n. Palmer also makes the unreferenced claim

is the Bonilla paper. Third, there is a 1996/1997 *Security Studies* article by Mares, in which he claimed that “reliable unofficial estimates put the dead at over 1,000 during 34 days of fighting,” though there is no reference or citation to support this claim.<sup>126</sup> It is worth noting that there were about 10,000 troops involved in the war, and a fatality rate of 10% (getting to the COW minimum threshold of 1000) would indicate intense conventional combat, probably more intense than probably occurred. By comparison, the Battle of the Bulge in 1944-45, also a 30 day campaign, experienced about 10% fatalities, and that was one of the more intense battles in the 1944-45 campaign to defeat Germany.

36. Regarding the 1999 Kosovo War, COW codes several non-US NATO nations as belligerents. Given the COW coding rule that a belligerent must contribute at least 1000 troops or suffer 100 casualties, this war is better off coded with the US as the only participant, versus Serbia. There were no NATO casualties during the war. In terms of troops involved, only about 375 non-US aircraft were involved, spread across as many 13 countries, and most of those aircraft contained crews of a single pilot.<sup>127</sup> We do not code NATO aerial support crews as combatants, as neither the airbases in Italy hosting NATO aircraft nor the aircraft carriers deployed to the Adriatic Sea risked being attacked by Serbian naval or aerial forces.<sup>128</sup>

---

that “interviews by respected scholars with Peruvian and Ecuadorian military authorities put the figures much higher, between 1,000 and 1,500.”

<sup>126</sup> David R. Mares, “Deterrence Bargaining In The Ecuador-Peru Enduring Rivalry: Designing Strategies Around Military Weakness,” *Security Studies* 6 (Winter 1996/97): 103.

<sup>127</sup> Steve Bowman, “Kosovo and Macedonia: US and Allied Military Operations,” Congressional Research Service Issue Brief, July 8, 2003.

<sup>128</sup> The Serbian navy was tiny, mostly river-oriented, and especially limited by the loss of Croatian ports following the dissolution of Yugoslavia. On the 1999 Serbian navy, see “NATO and Non-NATO Europe,” *Military Balance*, vol. 99, no. 1 (1999): 30-103.