

---

# Report on Recommendations to Drop MIDs\*

---

Douglas M. Gibler<sup>1</sup>, Steven V. Miller<sup>2</sup>, and Erin K. Little<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute for Social Science Research, University of Alabama*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Political Science, Clemson University*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Political Science, University of Alabama*

## Abstract

Report on Correlates of War Militarized Interstate Disputes (MID) for which our project recommends the dropping of a dispute from the dataset. In most cases, we provide a short narrative as it relates to the countries and dates described in the MID data.

**Version 2.03**—March 2018

---

\*Portions of this project were generously supported by two National Science Foundation Grants (SES#0923406 and SES#1260492). Of course, we remain responsible for any errors. Additional information on the project can be found at <http://dmgibler.people.ua.edu/mid-data.html>.

# Version History

**Version 1.0**—September 2013

**Version 1.1**—October 2013: Added MID#1143, MID#2182, MID#2217, MID#2368, MID#2870, MID#3228, MID#3363, MID#3500.

**Version 1.2**—January 2014: Added 29 disputes to the drop recommendations, including MID#1349, MID#1624, MID#1641, MID#1790, MID#2091, MID#2243, MID#2567, MID#2838, MID#2839, MID#2874, MID#2889, MID#2895, MID#2905, MID#3060, MID#3136, MID#3310, MID#3321, MID#3376, MID#3407, MID#3408, MID#3409, MID#3410, MID#3423, MID#3424, MID#3425, MID#3431, MID#3433, MID#3435, and MID#3808. Summaries for these as well as previous drop recommendations are included below. Note also that we changed our recommendations for MID#1643 and MID#2967 based on new information; that dispute is no longer included in the list below.

**Version 1.3**—Made multiple changes after MID workshop at UC Davis in January 2014.

- April 2014: Added MID#0251, MID#0262, MID#1022, MID#1042, MID#1149, MID#1150, MID#1164, MID#1183, MID#1216, MID#1217, MID#1255, MID#1398, MID#1496, MID#1501, MID#1509, MID#1523, MID#1526, MID#1604, MID#1659, MID#1786, MID#1787, MID#2015, MID#2028, MID#2076, MID#2077, MID#2084, MID#2093, MID#2134, MID#2183, MID#2189, MID#2210, MID#2213, MID#2227, MID#2293, MID#2314, MID#2340, MID#2617, MID#2620, MID#2624, MID#2628, MID#2829, MID#2911, MID#2941, MID#2943, MID#2979, MID#3039, MID#3233, MID#3234, MID#3235, MID#3236, MID#3255, MID#3385, MID#3442, MID#3505, MID#3517, MID#3541, MID#3655, MID#3711, MID#3811, MID#3829, MID#3874, MID#3880, MID#4043, MID#4157, MID#4163, MID#4178, MID#4274, MID#4327, MID#4336.
- Removed MID#0262, MID#0365, MID#1097, MID#1339, MID#1418, MID#1698, MID#1709, MID#1717, MID#1809, MID#2087, MID#2096, MID#2111, MID#2600, MID#2610, MID#2615, MID#2623, MID#2760, MID#2838, MID#2870, MID#2928, MID#3002, MID#3011, MID#3156, MID#3425, MID#3433, MID#3554.
- Moved MID#2078, MID#2368, MID#3321 to the Could Not Find Report.

**Version 1.4**—May 2014: Moved MID#0251, MID#1008, MID#1204, MID#1211, MID#1216, MID#1217, MID#1315, MID#1316, MID#1349, MID#1467, MID#1523, MID#1624, MID#2004, MID#2028, MID#2073, MID#2084, MID#2114, MID#2183, MID#2189, MID#2190, MID#2210, MID#2213, MID#2243, MID#2340, MID#2617, MID#2624, MID#2628, MID#2839, MID#2874, MID#2889, MID#2895, MID#2905, MID#2941, MID#2943, MID#2979, MID#2993, MID#3310, MID#3407, MID#3408, MID#3409, MID#3410, MID#3423, MID#3424, MID#3431, MID#3435, MID#3442, MID#3500, MID#3501, MID#3541, MID#3808, MID#3811, MID#3832, MID#4043, MID#4157, and MID#4336 to the merge report.

**Version 1.5**—November 2014: Added MID#0216, MID#1309, MID#1329, MID#1409, MID#2027, MID#2105, MID#2137, MID#2172, MID#2356, MID#2558, MID#2621, MID#2726, MID#3023, MID#3125, and MID#3324.

**Version 1.6**—December 2014: Removed MID#1128, MID#2738, MID#3723, MID#3824, and MID#3856. Moved MID#3857 to the merge report.

**Version 1.7**—June 2015: Added MID#1681, MID#2041, MID#2845, MID#3103, and MID#3402.

**Version 2.0**—July 2017: Added MID#0065, MID#1334, MID#1516, MID#2017, MID#2100, MID#2313, MID#2594, MID#3183, MID#3188, MID#3301, MID#3613, MID#3824, MID#3975, MID#4413, MID#4415, and MID#4421.

**Version 2.01**—September 2017: Added MID#2021.

**Version 2.02**—October 2017: Added MID#1737, MID#1776, MID#2561, MID#2737, MID#3701, MID#3702, MID#3950, MID#4344

**Version 2.03**—March 2018: Added MID#1702, MID#1799, and MID#2591. Removed MID#1157, MID#1526, MID#1790, MID#2594, MID#3060, MID#3115, MID#3701, and MID#3702.

## **MID#0065**

A Romanian deputy made a toast in front of the King of Austria that advocated for a newly independent Romania to annex Bukowina. Austria responded by stating that it would summon Romanian officials to repudiate the claim. If, as they expected, Romania refused the summons, there would be “grave news.” The threat was too vague to support coding a militarized incident here.

## **MID#0072**

An Italian fleet visited Durazzo, but it was not a display of force. According to Keesing’s, it was typical for the Italian fleet to make cruises in the Adriatic during this time and the visit to Durazzo on June 23, 1934 was normal and routine. Furthermore, an article from the Winnipeg Press from June 27, 1934 notes that Italian authorities on Tuesday, June 26 announced that a delayed telegraph accounted for the unexpected visit of the Italian fleet.

## **MID#0216**

MID#0216 is the Vixen Affair between Britain and Russia. Following successful Russian campaigns against the Ottoman Empire, Lord Ponsonby (the British Ambassador to Constantinople) and David Urquhart (First Secretary of the British Embassy at Constantinople) became alarmed by Russian occupation of Circassia and, thus, suspicious of Russia. Together, the two persuaded George Bell & Co, a British shipping company, to send a schooner (the Vixen) to trade on the Circassian port at Sudjuk-Kale. It was intercepted on November 26, 1836, and held on the ground that it had violated customs regulations by selling salt without passing through customs. Ponsonby and Urquhart felt this would be enough to get the UK to wage war with Russia.

However, Lord Palmerston was unwilling to press the issue. When Palmerston made a formal inquiry to the nature of the seizure (on May 6), Russian diplomat Nesselrode replied that the Vixen was confiscated for carrying illegal cargo into territory given to Russia following the Treaty of Adrianople. On May 23, Palmerston deemed the confiscation of the private vessel to be just and asked for no compensation.

Absent formal protest or militarized response, this is not a MID. We recommended dropping it from the data set.

## **MID#0217**

France disagreed with the other European powers over how to handle the dispute between the Porte and Mohammed Ali of Egypt. There is no evidence in Langer or Anderson’s “The Eastern Question” of any codeable action by France.

## **MID#0239**

A combined British, French, American, and Dutch naval force bombarded Chosu positions in Shimonoseki. The Chosu were an anti-foreigner faction that had tried to seize control of the government and failed. The government at Edo did not protest and, in fact, paid an indemnity to the coalition.

## **MID#0406**

The Italians had built fortified positions at Welwel in 1930, staffing the outpost with Somalis and Italian commanders. There was no protest from either Ethiopia or the international community. Ethiopia did not contest the Italian garrison until 1934.

## **MID#0508**

France said that it would not interfere in the war between Austria and Italy as long as Austria did not advance farther than Milan. France offered to arbitrate in Austria's favor if Austria agreed to this. There was no militarized incident.

## **MID#0601**

This was a one-day seizure. There was no protest from the US. From the New York Times: "Peru released without fines two U.S. tuna boats which gunboats seized Thursday about 30 miles from the South American coast, the manager of the boats said Friday. The boats, the Mary Elizabeth, and the Anna Maria, were taken to the Peruvian port Talara. Art Sousa said Peruvian authorities agreed the vessels apparently had drifted into their claimed waters and weren't fishing."

## **MID#1022**

MID#1022 is a double-count of MID#1021—it is within the same temporal domain of MID#1021 and also concerns the same issue and location, namely control of Netherlands' colony of New Guinea.

## **MID#1028**

MID#1028, is coded (inexplicably) as a one-day clash between the two countries. We found the original New York Times article (10/6/1936) used to code this incident. The text states:

President Toro's announcement said the continuance of the Paraguayan occupation of the Villa Monies-Santa Cruz road might easily lead to armed clashes between between Bolivian and Paraguayan troops and thus endanger peace. Certain diplomatic observers interpreted this statement as a threat to renew hostilities unless Paraguay accedes to the Bolivian demand and withdraws from the road.

This is a vague threat at best and is not a militarized incident per Correlates of War coding rules.

## **MID#1042**

The original coding of MID#1042 describes a clash between Jordanian and Egyptian forces as they were getting routed by Israel in June of the 1948 war. The coding is based on the following source (translated): "These conflicts and moreover, the defeat in Eretz Israel, led to armed incidents between the armies of Egypt and Jordan in the areas of Hebron and Bethlehem during the war, 1948, and a mutual defamation sequence where both sides accused each other for the joint defeat in Eretz Israel and even betrayal defamations that escalated to the level of a very severe cold war for many weeks."

There are several problems with this coding. First, it would have been impossible for these forces to come in contact with each other in June. Jordanian forces were not in the area. So, the incidents must have occurred around October, when Jordanian forces (Arab Legion) under Major Geoffrey Lockett went in to Bethlehem and Hebron with about 300 men to aid Egyptian forces. The cease fire took hold, and Israel did not continue an attack against the Egyptians as they withdrew. Jordan's King Abdullah wanted to represent the PLO following the war, and the Arab Legion's movements were an attempt at a land grab, which the Egyptians were aware of. However, there's no indication of any type of clash between the two forces.

## **MID#1082**

With MID#2135 and MID#1082, the original MID coders are referencing a dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay over a road between Villa Montes and Boyuibe (or Santa Cruz – sources suggest they may be the same thing). It occurs in the aftermath of the Chaco War between these two states (MID#1027), which left Paraguay as the clear winner of a war that Bolivia initiated. Paraguay occupied the road as a result of the war that concluded two years earlier, which was a source of frustration for the Bolivians. The road was Bolivia's main source for communication with the outside world, making Paraguay's occupation of that road problematic. However, coding this dispute as a Paraguayan occupation of territory (in a 6-month count) is incorrect. Paraguay had occupied this territory since the end of the war. The peace talks aimed at settling the war before this point did little more than affirm the new status quo that Bolivia, not surprisingly, wanted to rectify.

So, the current coding suggests that Paraguay occupied this road in this region in the month of May 1937. This is not what happened. MID coders most likely used a New York Times article dated on June 10, 1937 to start this as a six-month count. This article talks about “last month's agreement by which control of Bolivia's main-line road between Villa Montes and Boyuibe was taken from Paraguay and put in control of the International Police under the supervision of the neutral military officers representing the authority of the Chaco Peace Conference at Buenos Aires.” It mentions this in the context of Paraguay discussing the terms of the agreement publicly, which defied the obligations of the participants of the conference and started a diplomatic row. This prompted Bolivia to abort the restoration of relations with Paraguay and led to Paraguay to cite the armistice that ended the conflict. This armistice affirmed the new status quo.

Even then, it is technically incorrect to say this agreement was made in May. The agreement was signed on January 9, 1937. The terms of implementation were signed in an undated day in May 1937 (Zook 1960, 249) but not ratified by Paraguay. The army would not allow it, and popular opinion was decidedly against it. From here, domestic turmoil in both countries intervened, stopping this issue from spiraling out of control. In Paraguay, the army toppled the provisional government of Rafael Franco in order to prevent the terms of the Chaco Peace Conference (signed on June 12, 1935) from coming into effect. In Bolivia, German Busch finally overthrew his friend and confidante David Toro in July 1937. The status quo remained until 1938.

In March 1938, Argentina again forced the issue of settling the Chaco War. In fact, it was Argentina's determination to end this issue that got Paraguay, who enjoyed the favorable status quo, to begin the peace process in earnest. On May 27, 1938, a proposal was finalized that redrew the border in the Chaco (Zook 1960, 250, is used for these details). Paraguay got most of what

it wanted, reflecting their victory in war. Herein, a line was drawn from Esmeralda on the Rio Pilcomayo, northeast to a point called '27 November', southwest of Ingavi. From there, the line passed between Ravelo and Ingavi to Rio Paraguay, 7500 meters north of Bahia Negra. In the understanding of the conference participants, the desert region between 61 degrees and 63 degrees was a natural border between Paraguay and Bolivia. Bolivia was also obliged to pay 200,000 pounds in war indemnity. Bolivia accepted on May 31st; Paraguay was reticent.

Though Bolivia genuinely wanted peace, German Busch mobilized troops (MID#1029) as a response to Paraguay's refusal (sometime before June 24th, 1938). Paraguay gave a counterproposal, resulting in more negotiations. A draft treaty was reached on July 9, 1938, and a peace treaty was signed on July 21st, 1938, that ultimately concludes the war. It outlines an arbitration process to be followed, resulting in an award later in October.

## **MID#1130**

MID#1130 is the Iranian recapture of the Persian Socialist Soviet Republic, in the Gilan province. The ephemeral republic in the north of Iran had fallen under Soviet influence and, after a successful revolt in 1920 with Soviet assistance, declared independence from Iran and allegiance to the Soviet Union. However, a February 1921 friendship pact signed between Persia and Soviet Russia turned the tide against the Socialist Republic of Gilan. The Soviets promised to withdraw its troops from the area. Combined with British preferences for the Soviets to stop supporting the republic, they withdrew moral support as well. Reza Khan, with Soviet blessing, reclaimed the area and defeated the movement responsible for the republic by the end of October, 1921. The Persian Socialist Soviet Republic, beset with problems from its inception, dies here. The leader responsible, Kuchek Khan, was eventually caught and decapitated in December.

There's no MID here. Gilan does not appear to be in the COW state system as a nominally independent state and, further, the Soviets abandoned the republic, declared its leader Kuchek Khan (of the Jangali movement) an "outlaw... [who] raided the most fertile part of Persia, the Gilan province, and caused misery, lamentable events and tragedies in order to establish his rule" (Chaqueri 1995, 360), and otherwise assisted Persia in retaking it. This follows from agreements signed with Britain, and later Persia, that was vital to the survival of the new Soviet state in Russia (Afary 1995, 20-21). There is no conflict between the Persians and the Soviets here, just a conflict between Tehran and a renegade northern province.

## **MID#1143**

Pollard (1933) is cited by the MID project, though his book contains no information to corroborate the dispute coding. Leong (1976) provides the most information, but his research does not support the coding as it is. The coding and the resources available strongly suggest this is a dispute in Harbin, Manchuria and very likely indicates the seizure of the Chinese Eastern Railway by the Chinese. The most support for this account comes from Leong (1976, 100-102). He talks of a dispute through February 1920, where the Chinese disbanded the local police force and gradually supplanted more and more CER Administration institutions with Chinese institutions. However, MID#1142 concludes with the abandonment of the Russian military forces in Harbin. The Chinese appear to be disputing with a company. Leong (1976, 107-109) talks about the process being basically complete by February 1921. Beyond that, it is not clear there is a dispute here. The

Russians did not have a military personnel in Harbin to support CER, and there is no evidence of a show of force. This is a coding error based off reading the Leong (1976, 26-27) passage about MID#1142.

## **MID#1149**

The original code sheet lists Zook (presumably Zook, 1964) as the source for this bilateral MID between Ecuador and Peru from November (-9), 1914 to January (-9), 1916. Peru is coded as engaging in a border violation, which was unreciprocated by Ecuador. The MID ends in a non-negotiated stalemate.

The closest description of anything involving an Ecuador/Peru dispute in Zook (1964) concerns this passage on p. 110. This is from Chapter 4, which details the period after Spanish attempts at arbitration.

The irreconcilable character of the positions, especially after the fall of the conciliatory Billinghurst government, brought to a standstill any progress toward a solution. The succeeding years were marked by Peru's continued advance and development in her area of jurisdiction, invariably with impotent objections from Quito. Ecuador protested violations of the status quo—a status quo whose very existence Valverde had denied a decade before. Lima continually replied with denials and assertions of her respect for the status quo, which she interpreted as within the limits of her possessions. While Ecuador thus relied upon languid diplomacy, Peru trusted in aggressive action. All the while, each voiced good intentions and paid lip service to the need for a final solution.

This paragraph concludes with the 32nd footnote to Chapter 4, which seems to source everything mentioned in this paragraph to “Memorias y documentos” of Peru. The next few paragraphs discuss Ecuador and Colombia, not Ecuador and Peru, and does not return to the Ecuador-Peru story in Zook's narrative until the year is 1917.

Since we have found the original codesheet, and the source listed for the case does not include a dispute, our recommendation is to drop this MID.

## **MID#1150**

The original code sheet lists Zook (presumably Zook, 1964) as the source for this bilateral MID between Ecuador and Peru from February (-9), 1917 to May (-9), 1918. Peru is coded as engaging in a border violation, which was unreciprocated by Ecuador. The MID ends in a non-negotiated stalemate.

There is just nothing in Zook to corroborate there being a dispute here. Zook's discussion of Ecuador and Peru's dispute on p. 110 (see: MID#1149), proximate to this time, pauses while Zook describes relations between Ecuador and Colombia. Zook then starts the bottom paragraph of p. 111 with the following.

In an interesting note, Ecuadorian Minister to Peru Jose Peralta charged 6 December 1917 that while no one denied that the first evidence of territorial dominion was occupation, it lacked value when it was arbitrary, unjust, and founded upon conquest and usurpation [ed. huh?]. The reply agreed but pointed out that the allegations

were inapplicable to Peru, who proceeded in accordance with her own valid titles. The Ecuadorian scorned these views, incisively attributing Peruvian enterprise to the cloak of armed force and military rule.

The next date is April 22, 1919, in which Peralta “lamented Ecuador’s timid, weak, shameful diplomacy of ‘protests for the usurpation of our territories.’ ”

Since we have found the original codesheet, and the source listed for the case does not include a dispute, our recommendation is to drop this case.

## **MID#1162**

There is little evidence of a meaningful dispute here, but the sources consulted suggest that Colombia likely evicted Peru from the contested Putumayo region during this time. This followed from an October 23, 1911 agreement whereby Peru signaled its willingness to relinquish claims to Putumayo. On the Peruvian side, the territory was clearly distant from Lima and required great effort to control against competing claims from Colombia. The area was rich in rubber, which initially provided opportunity. However, a rubber bust brought down the value of the territory (De La Pedraja 2006, 89).

Galvez (1920, 58-75) mentions that Colombia discovered a persistent Peruvian presence in Puerto Pizarro and Las Delicias, establishments in the contested territory that Colombia claimed. Their presence was discovered in 1913, as can be seen by the communications of the Colombian Minister in Lima during the year 1913 (Galvez 1920, 75). Galvez then mentions that the Peruvian troops, who arrived in order to re-establish claims to the area, were recalled. This does not really say whether they were forcibly evicted or Peru had to reiterate its orders to relevant soldiers that they were pursuing a diplomatic option to this issue. Making matters worse, Galvez (1920) is the only source cited for this. A fairly thorough search reveals nothing of interest regarding Las Delicias, Puerto Pizarro or the broader Putumayo region in 1913.

## **MID#1164**

This is a seizure of a Brazilian ship—the Yaquirana—with Catholic missionaries that was seized by a Peruvian gunboat on some day in August of 1918. It was held for five days. This is all according to a 1919 source (Galvez) that does not mention a protest by the Brazilian government, though it does mention protests by the ship’s captain. We can find no mention of a government protest in other sources, and, given the nature of the missionaries trip, it is unlikely that Brazil would have protested on their behalf. Therefore, our recommendation is that this seizure be dropped.

## **MID#1176**

This case describes actions by El Salvador against Salvadoran revolutionaries who had invaded from Honduras. There is no evidence that Honduras was supporting the revolutionaries.

## **MID#1177**

Siberian partisans wiped out a Japanese unit that was part of the Allied intervention in Siberia. Japanese troops destroyed a village in response. The Russian government was cooperating with Japan, and the partisans were rebelling against local, repressive policies.

## **MID#1183**

The construction of the fortines, including Fortin Saavedra, occurred two years later, from August to December 1924. This is according to Rout (1970: 13) and Zook (1960: 37-38). That fortification is already a dispute (MID#2131). Our recommendation is to drop this double count.

## **MID#1187**

The NYT describes this event: “Bolivia broke off diplomatic relations with Chile on April 16 following a dispute between the two countries over the waters of the Lauca River, which flows from Chile into Bolivia. Negotiations had been in progress for several months on the use of the Lauca River waters, which had been the subject of dispute for many years. On March 22 Bolivia had warned Chile that she would regard the diversion of water as an act of aggression, on the ground that this could not be done without the agreement of both countries. President Alessandri of Chile, however, ordered on April 14 that the sluice-gates of a new dam should be opened to supply an irrigation scheme and a hydroelectric project, thus, according to the Bolivian contention, reducing the flow of Lauca River waters into Bolivia. On April 20 the Bolivian Government requested a meeting of the Organization of American States to consider her complaint against Chile.” The threat was vague, and there was no response by Chile.

## **MID#1255**

MID#1255 is coded as clashes between Serbia and Albania that lasted from June 12, 1915 to sometime in February of 1916. However, there is no evidence of a dispute between Albania and Serbia during this period. Montenegro (not a CoW state until 2006) invaded Albania on June 11, 1915. Serbia responded on June 12th by helping the Albanians drive out the Montenegrins and routing Albanian rebels (not Albanian government forces).

Albania was in a state of civil war by July of 1914. Austro-Hungary asked the Albanian monarch, Prince William, for Albanian troops, but he refused due to the unrest. William finally fled Albania on September 3, 1914. Essad Pasha, an officer who had plotted with the Greeks to allow them to annex southern Albania, was arrested by Prince William in May of 1914 and fled the country with Greek help. He was invited to return by the Albanian Senate and signed an alliance with Serbia prior to his return. The secret Serbo-Albanian alliance (The Treaty of Nish), signed on September 17, 1914, allowed a close friendship and defensive alliance between the two countries. With help from the Serbians, in the form of troops and a subsidy, Pasha was able to capture much of the renegade territories in central Albania.

Later in the year, Serbia retreated from Bulgarian and Austro-Hungarian forces, with strategic aid from both France and Italy, and the Serbs were severely harassed by Albanian tribesmen. However,

there does not seem to be a dispute between any official Albanian entity and the Serbs during this retreat. The rebels were instead successfully harassing Serbian troops during the withdrawal.

*The New York Times*—the only source listed by the Correlates of War does not provide information regarding any codeable incidents.

At a January 2014 workshop at UC Davis, CoW found the following newspaper article in the *Atlanta Journal Constitution* (6/12/1915):

INVASION OF ALBANIA DEFENDED' BY SERBIA Nish. Serbia June 12 Via London  
The Serbian press bureau issued a statement today defending the incursion of Serbian troops into Albania and concluding as follows. Serbia realizes the Albanian question will be definitely settled by Europe but, she also is conscious of the fact that measures such as she is now taking are as much in the interest of the great powers as her own. The reasons for the present expedition the statement says are that Albania has been a hotbed of Austro-Turkish intrigue, resulting in Albanian raids in Serbia, and that Serbia realized long since that its fighting front against Austria would include the entire Albanian frontier. The statement recites that Serbia, during the Balkan war, reached the open sea through Albania only to be forced to relinquish this territory through Austrian Influence.

Rome. June 12 Via Chlue and Paris. It is understood that Italy is, in accord with the allies upon the friendly representations from Belgrade concerning the Serbian advance into Albania, expressing the desire that the question be left for solution by the peace conference after the war. It is stated that neither Italy nor the allies oppose the Serbian military advance toward the Adriatic across Albania but prefer that Serbia should not divert part of her forces from the main objective of the campaign, namely to fight Austria.

CoW concludes:

Serbia's incursion into Albania is documented (see supplemental pdfs: "Invasion of Albania Defended by Serbia" *The Atlanta Constitution* June 13, 1915). The dates are likely incorrect, and we recommend a change based on this document, but the actors and action (clash) seem reasonable. This MID should be kept.

However, this article does not support the coding of a dispute—far from it. The Serbians were defending themselves to their allies in World War I; their aid of Albania against rebels would not divert their attention from fighting Austro-Hungary. The Serbians were in Albania at the request of their central government to put down rebels in the civil war, and the Serbians were justifying this aid because the Albanian rebels were harassing Serbian troops.

## **MID#1278**

Rioting Turkish Cypriots clashed with British troops on the island. The Turkish press responded by putting pressure on the many Greeks living in Istanbul. Plans were discussed by the Greeks, Turks, and even the United States, about what to do with the 30,000 Greeks in the Turkish capital, but no direct threats to use force were ever made. There is no militarized incident here.

## **MID#1309**

This dispute is coded as a threat to use force directed towards Pakistan. However, the threat is too vague to be considered a militarized incident. India states that a fresh attack on Kashmir “will not be tolerated,” but there is no mention of force.

## **MID#1329**

This dispute is coded as the Democratic Republic of Congo’s (DRC) threat to use force against the Congo on August 15, 1963. The DRC stated it would take “measures of extreme necessity,” but no identification of an explicit use of force was made.

## **MID#1332**

A white mercenary force invaded the southern part of the Congo from Portuguese Angola. Portugal denied the reports. The US protested to Portugal, but the group was comprised of mercenaries and was not directed by Lisbon. This is not a militarized incident by Portugal.

## **MID#1334**

Shots from automatic weapons were fired on a police camp in Botswana. The shots came from across the Rhodesian border. There were no casualties, and a search of the area could not identify the attackers. The attack was much more likely to come from a rebel group based in Rhodesia rather than any official forces.

## **MID#1335**

Botswana placed an embargo on trade between itself and Rhodesia. This was not a blockade of Rhodesia and, therefore, not a militarized incident.

## **MID#1388**

Senegal accused Portugal of bombing a border village. Portugal denied the charge and asked that the UN Security Council investigate the charge. There is no independent evidence of the bombing besides Senegal’s claim.

## **MID#1398**

The South African Prime Minister, Vorster, made the following statement: “No country can allow Communist-trained terrorists to violate its territory without being punished or to injure or kill its citizens in such a cowardly manner. This is therefore being done in this case and, if the pursuers are attacked, they will defend themselves. The responsibility in this case rests squarely on the shoulders of the country making available its territory for this sort of aggression.” Local newspapers reported the statement as a threat against Zambia. However, Vorster later stated that the newspapers were highly irresponsible and overreached by claiming there was a threat against Zambia. Without

explicit mention of Zambia in the threat, and given Vorster's claims that the threat was not directed at Zambia, this does not qualify as a militarized incident.

### **MID#1409**

The Guinean president provided a villa to the ousted Ghanaian president. On March 13, 1966, the new Ghanaian leader asserted that the Guinean president had boasted to the former Ghanaian leader that "Guineas army would invade Ghana and restore Mr. Nkrumah to power." This was a private statement and, even if it were public, would not be specific enough to be considered a militarized incident.

### **MID#1415**

A South African airliner was struck by gunfire while landing in Angola. It was unclear who the attacker was. Further, it was suspected that the plane was accidentally hit, with the attackers mistaking the aircraft for the private plane of a President Neto, head of Angola's Popular Movement. The attacker was unknown, the attack was likely a mistake, and no protest was cited.

### **MID#1417**

When Togo declared its independence from France in 1956, a campaign was undertaken by Ghana (previously British Togoland), to unite the two former colonies under one flag. This quickly began a point of contention between the two nations. In November 1961 Ghana President Nkrumah felt that public opinion was on his side, and he stepped up efforts for reunification. Relations quickly deteriorated between the states, however. In the same month, Togo police held two Ghanaian police officers briefly when they went to secure the release of a fellow officer who had been arrested in Lome. The Ghanaian government responded by closing the Ghana-Togo border. The seizure was less than 24 hours, and the closing of the border did not constitute a blockade.

### **MID#1446**

From Keesing's: In an interview with Le Monde published in its issue of Feb. 3-4, 1974, President Mohammed Daud declared that "we support in every way the right of our brothers in Pakhtoonistan to self-determination", and when asked whether the phrase "in every way" covered military support replied: "I cannot answer precisely, but I can tell you that when bombs are falling on our brothers, when they are being murdered, if they ask for our aid we shall not remain indifferent." After expressing the hope that the problem would be settled "In a friendly and peaceful way", he claimed that the N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan had "always formed an Integral part of Afghanistan", from which they had been separated by "unequal and unjust trestles". He also alleged that the recent plot against the republican regime [in September 1973, see 26217 B] had been "financed by certain foreign countries", apparently alluding to Pakistan. There was no specific threat to use force against Pakistan.

## MID#1449

Nepal demanded the withdrawal of Indian military liaisons and wireless operators from posts on Nepal's Chinese border. India threatened to close the border in response. Nepal never threatened India's military, and India's threat was economic, not military. This is not a MID.

## MID#1496

MID#1496 is another diplomatic incident between the United States and Chile involving the seizure of a ship. The American vessel *Sportsman* was docked in Santa Maria and was offloading copper there. The Chilean ship *Esmeralda* noticed it and ordered the *Sportsman* to cease operations until it got a license from Chile. The commander of the *Esmeralda* then ordered the *Sportsman* to proceed to Caldera to obtain a license. The crew of the *Sportsman* refused and the ship was promptly boarded and taken to Caldera.

The American crew was allowed to leave over a week later under the provision that the ship not enter a Chilean port, but this was protested by the captain of the *Sportsman*. He filed a protest with the U.S. Minister in Chile, though no official action by the U.S. could be taken for the meantime. Diplomatic maneuvering was further complicated because the port at Santa Maria lay within a gray area delineating Bolivia and Chile. The *Sportsman* was also loading ore, which was a violation of Chilean customs laws but not a violation of Bolivian customs laws. The captain confessed to loading ore but thought he was in Bolivia.

On December 7th, the captain of the *Sportsman* filed a grievance seeking reparations of USD 35,593.75 with six-percent interest. The captain's claim was the seizure did not occur with Chilean jurisdiction and the seizure occurred with no justification or warrant. However, the United States and Chilean Claims Commission ruled in favor of dismissing the case several years later, arguing that A) the port was within Chilean territory in a manner consistent with international law of the day and B) the confiscation was legal. Because there was no fiscal penalty imposed on the *Sportsman* (only a dismissal and an admonition), no indemnity was necessary. With no protest and acknowledgement of the U.S. that the seizure was legal, this is not a MID.

## MID#1501

The original coders misinterpreted their Spanish source for this case (Barros, 1970, [follow this link to pages 261-262](#)). The coders believed that Bolivian troops were sent to Cobija to dismantle the Chilean guano processing plant there in 1861 and that Chile responded with a warship (show of force) followed by a request from the Bolivian president of his congress to declare war if necessary. In actuality, these events happened in 1863 and are already captured in MID#1502. Our recommendation is to drop this double count.

## MID#1509

The original Correlates of War codesheet suggests an Argentine show of troops in September of 1877 and a Chilean threat to use force in December 1877. Neither event qualifies as a militarized incident. First, Argentines prevented an American ship, the "Thomas Hunt", from loading salt. Note that the original coding translates Encina (1959, 187) as the ship being licensed to Chile; in

actuality, the schooner was American flagged with license to load salt by Chile. In either case there was no seizure or show of force, and there was also no protest by the United States.

The second event in December codes Chilean orders to fire on any Argentine sailors that tried to detain them during transit. We could find no mention of this event in Encina (1959, 190). Barros, (1970: 316) describes relations between Chile and Bolivia, not Chile and Argentina, and no such order is discussed. Moreno (1961, 224) is also silent on this event. Finally, even if we could substantiate that these orders were given, it is unclear that giving orders to your own military personnel to fire if provoked constitutes a threat to use force against Argentina.

Our recommendation is to drop this case.

## **MID#1516**

Fighting between Chile and Bolivia in the War of the Pacific ended on December 11, 1883. However, there was no cease fire nor formal agreement until April 4, 1884, when Chile forced an armistice (see Sarkees et al. but also Burr, p. 164, which is CoW's main source). This dispute is coded as a blockade, but Burr provides no evidence of a blockade. Instead, Bolivia tried to stall negotiations of a formal armistice, but Chile pressed and threatened renewed actions to force the issue before European powers could intervene. This is what occurred on some day in March of 1884. Bolivia acquiesced and signed the agreement on April 4th. By coding rule, this threat to occupy was part of MID#1518, which is the War of the Pacific.

## **MID#1525**

The American warship the Wasp was dispatched to retrieve the US ambassador in Paraguay during the War of the Triple Alliance. The Wasp was delayed when Brazil refused to allow the ship to proceed up the Parana River to Asuncion. Brazil eventually agreed that it would let the ship pass once all other options were exhausted. This was not a show of force by the United States and not a dispute.

## **MID#1558**

The US Senate began debating a resolution condemning Spanish rule in Cuba. There was no explicit threat to use force.

## **MID#1559**

From Clarke (2013): President Grant, accepting his explanations, declared (Dec. 7, 1875) that "he failed to find in the insurrection conditions that would take it out of the category of mere rebellion... To accord belligerent rights would therefore be unwise, premature and indefensible as a matter of right." The end of his message, however, contained a definite threat: "I shall feel it my duty, should the hope of a satisfactory adjustment, an early restoration of peace, and the removal of further causes of complaint be disappointed, to recommend to Congress at some not remote period during the present session what may then seem necessary." Grant's statement to

Cuba about telling Congress to “take whatever steps it deemed necessary” is not a threat to use force.

### **MID#1604**

MID#1604 codes an Indonesia protest over a Dutch move to send reinforcements to Netherlands New Guinea. Dutch forces captured several Indonesian infiltrators who staged a raid on the territory.

These incidents should already be included in MID#1021, which codes conflict over the same issue, between the same participants, and fought over the same location, lasting from two weeks prior to this set of incidents and lasting two years after the end date of these incidents. MID#1604 should be dropped.

### **MID#1611**

There was a warning by Rhodesia toward Zambia against harboring Rhodesian rebels. However, the warning likely concerned economic sanctions. There was definitely no threat to use force.

### **MID#1641**

This was a threat by the Italian Prime Minister (Crispi) to bomb Benghazi for “some imagined slight,” according to Lowe and Marzari. It is not a dispute, though, because this threat was made in private correspondence to the British Prime Minister (Salisbury). The Ottomans never knew of the threat, and Salisbury took great pains to remind Crispi that the goal of the powers was to maintain the Ottoman Empire.

### **MID#1652**

The US threatened to intervene if Cuba did not heed American advice on granting a concession to reclaim the Zapata Swamp. The exact phrasing of the threat is that US Secretary of State Knox would assert the right of the US to take measures “peaceful or otherwise”. The threat is too vague to be considered a militarized incident.

### **MID#1655**

Denmark’s troop mobilization was specifically not directed toward any state in particular and was instead meant to guard against use of its territory by belligerents. This is not a dispute.

### **MID#1659**

MID#1659 is a multilateral MID during World War I pitting Sweden against five of the World War I participants on Side B (United Kingdom, France, Austria-Hungary, Russia, Germany). It is coded with a HIACT of a Swedish threat to use force that was not reciprocated by any member of Side B. The MID lasts from November 6, 1915 to an unknown day in July 1916. It ends in a non-negotiated stalemate.

Specific Sources says this MID was coded using New York Times.

Our review of New York Times sources involving Sweden, as well as additional reports from other newspapers and various books and academic articles covering Sweden during World War I, does not lend support to having this MID in the data set. The start date corresponds with an announcement from Sweden to hold a peace conference done in part to address the ongoing naval pressure from Great Britain. This conference was eventually held in January of the next year. At that conference, Sweden announced that it was prepared to use force during the war if its territory were violated. This was followed by an announcement by Sweden of a substantial increase in military spending.

However, it would be a mistake to interpret this as a Swedish threat to use force against *all* the primary World War I participants (minus Italy). These measures, more a tacit threat against the United Kingdom if anyone, are vague by CoW's understanding and do not constitute codeable incidents.

We recommend dropping this MID.

## **MID#1681**

MID#1681 was coded as a U.S. threat to use force directed towards Haiti in February 1881. The statement of threat only indicated that the U.S. threatened to “demand satisfaction.” There was no mention of a use of force, and no other militarized incident took place between the participants for the six months before and after the incident over the same issue. Specific sources from CoW confirmed this report.

## **MID#1687**

MID#1687 is a bilateral dispute between Thailand and Japan. Japan is Side A. The MID begins on July 29, 1940 and ends on August 7, 1940 in a non-negotiated stalemate. Japan is coded as engaging in a border violation against Thailand. Thailand responds with a threat to use force.

CoW-MID's Specific Sources file says this was coded using the New York Times.

Our review used every search term imaginable from a week before the start date to the week after it and found no evidence for a dispute between Thailand (Siam) and Japan in the New York Times. We did find a New York Times report on the start date of MID#1687 that mentioned that Japan's advances against China in the Second Sino-Japanese War and the developments of World War II in Europe put Thailand in a position where it could not defend itself. The report corresponds to the start date of MID#1687 but it is not specifically about Thailand. It's about Japan's “Greater East Asia” aspirations in light of recent developments in the Second Sino-Japanese War and France and Great Britain's weakened state in Southeast Asia. The comment about Thailand reads more like foreshadowing the events of next year given Thailand's status as the lone independent country in Southeast Asia.

Japan violating Thailand's border is not inconceivable in the context of a lower-level incident. It is inconceivable that a border violation would be the correct coding, though. Japan had yet to

acquire territory in French Indochina that would make it land-contiguous with Thailand. That would come shortly in September of 1940. For both Thailand and Japan, France, or Vichy France, was the bigger issue for the time being. A war between France and Thailand (MID#0613), and a conflict between Japan and French Indochina, followed in the fall of 1940 that ultimately made Thailand and Japan land-contiguous.

Thailand threatening to use force against Japan is also not inconceivable, but it would be particularly foolish for Thailand to provoke Japan. Theoretically, if Japan violated Thailand's border because of what would eventually follow in 1941, a threat to use force to defend itself is inconsistent with CoW's understanding of a "threat to use force". That would also be mostly inconsistent with Thai foreign policy at the time.

If we adjust the search terms to 1941, the dispute makes more sense. More New York Times reports are available that would underscore ongoing issues between Japan and Thailand that both precipitated Thailand falling under Japanese domain and the Pacific Theater of World War II. However, this bilateral Thailand-Japan dispute would be captured in MID#1785. Nothing else between both sides would be independent of that.

## **MID#1696**

Portugal had tried to remain neutral during World War II, but was supplying wolfram to Germany. In Spring 1944, the Allies pressured Portugal to end this supply. In an effort to dissuade Portugal from buckling under Allied pressure, Germany sent a signal of its own, seizing the Portuguese refugee ship *Serpa Pinto*, and threatening attack on May 26, 1944. No attack occurred, and the ship was released. The entire incident lasted only 12 hours. The threat to use force was not targeting armed forces, and, since the incident lasted less than 24 hours, it should be dropped.

## **MID#1702**

MID1702 refers to a series of Ecuadorian seizures of U.S. fishing boats from August to October 30, 1952. The seizures were all interconnected the extent to which they concern a single issue (i.e. U.S. tuna boats not respecting Ecuador's internationally recognized maritime boundaries) but the boats Ecuador seized were private vessels. Per CoW coding instructions, these seizures become codable incidents only if Side B (here: the U.S.) protests diplomatically or responds militarily.

That did not happen in this case. The most the U.S. did was offer representation for one of the ships (the *Westerly* out of Los Angeles) per a *Los Angeles Times* report in October 19, 1952. However, this was not a protest nor should it be construed as such. The U.S. did not dispute Ecuador's maritime boundary nor did it advance a claim the detentions were illegal. It was only offering routine representation in what was effectively a routine domestic matter for Ecuador. We recommend removing this MID from the data set.

## **MID#1705**

A US fishing boat, the *Substreak*, had engine problems, and the boat drifted into Ecuadorian waters. The engine was fixed, and the boat attempted to flee but could not do so before being seized by an Ecuadorian navy patrol. The US never protested the incident.

## **MID#1725**

German U-boats attacked at least three Argentine ships and probably four. However, there was no protest by Argentina, and Argentina remained neutral. Argentine President Hipolyto Irigoyen was sympathetic to Germany, and Argentina was profiting from selling war materials. They demurred when the US asked all Western Hemisphere states to declare war on Germany. When the U-boats attacked German shipping, domestic protests increased, but Germany offered to apologize, salute the Argentine flag at sea, and launch an investigation. There was no protest of the sinkings and no militarized response by Argentina.

## **MID#1728**

A North Vietnamese Army journal published an article on the need to defend North Vietnam's claim to the Spratly and Paracel Islands. A Chinese paper printed an article detailing China's claim to the islands in response. No threats were made in this event and neither actor was an official representative of their government.

## **MID#1734**

All USA/UKG actions were directed against rebels who never took the capital. There was a non-specific warning by the United States against Guatemala, but it did not meet the criteria for a threat.

## **MID#1737**

On April 16, 1917 (MID#1776) and again on October 17, 1917 (MID#1737), a British government minister in The Hague threatened war with Dr. J.C.K. Van Aalst, the head of the Netherlands Overseas Trust, if he did not comply with British economic interests. Note that this declaration was against the Netherlands Overseas Trust (N.O.T.) and not against the Dutch government directly. As per Jones, Bremer, and Singer (1996: 170), this is not a militarized dispute: "Actions taken by the official forces of one state against private citizens of another state are generally not coded as militarized incidents. Exceptions include seizures (of personnel or material) within the confines of disputed territory, attacks on international shipping, and the pursuit (by air, land or sea) of rebel forces across international boundaries. Further, such incidents are included only when the "targeted state responded militarily or protested diplomatically."

## **MID#1742**

Fidel Castro threatened that if the US landed troops in Cuba then there would be "200,000 dead gringos." Castro recanted on the broad threat the next day.

## **MID#1745**

Bands of Tibetans had been carrying out attacks on Nepal. The Nepalese government dispatched officers to investigate. The forces were not official Chinese troops but were instead insurgents.

## **MID#1761**

The American secretary of state informed the Spanish minister in Washington that the US would resist any Spanish attempts to increase its influence in Central or South America. Specifically, Seward stated the US President would be, “obliged to regard them as manifesting an unfriendly spirit toward the United States, and to meet the further prosecution of enterprises of that kind in regard to either the Dominican republic or any other part of the American continent or islands with a prompt, persistent, and if possible, effective resistance.” The U.S. attitude toward Spanish attempts to increase influence in South America does not qualify as a specific threat or militarized incident.

## **MID#1767**

The United States’ “Great White Fleet” arrived in Yokohama, Japan on its circumnavigation tour. The fleet was most definitely a statement regarding the strength of the US navy and came amid assurances to Roosevelt that the Japanese were drained from war with Russia and could offer no resistance. However, the fleet itself was not necessarily a direct threat to Japan – it was more a statement to the world – and Japanese ships were friendly to the fleet and offered escort to their harbor. This is not a militarized incident as CoW would code it.

## **MID#1769**

The German fleet was ordered to assemble off the coast of Norway at the start of WWI in order to transport the German Emperor who was visiting there. There was no evidence of a Norwegian protest. Norway also partly mobilized its military during the outbreak of the war, but this mobilization was not directed at Germany as it had declared itself neutral. This is not a militarized incident.

## **MID#1776**

On April 16, 1917 (MID#1776) and again on October 17, 1917 (MID#1737), a British government minister in The Hague threatened war with Dr. J.C.K. Van Aalst, the head of the Netherlands Overseas Trust, if he did not comply with British economic interests. Note that this declaration was against the Netherlands Overseas Trust (N.O.T.) and not against the Dutch government directly. As per Jones, Bremer, and Singer (1996: 170), this is not a militarized dispute: “Actions taken by the official forces of one state against private citizens of another state are generally not coded as militarized incidents. Exceptions include seizures (of personnel or material) within the confines of disputed territory, attacks on international shipping, and the pursuit (by air, land or sea) of rebel forces across international boundaries. Further, such incidents are included only when the “targeted state responded militarily or protested diplomatically.”

## **MID#1786**

This one-day dispute is when Britain declared war on Finland after Finland did not comply with British demands to cease hostilities against the Soviet Union. Finland and Britain are already taking part in MID#0258, World War II, with Finland fighting for the Axis powers and Britain coordinating with the Soviets. This is not a separate dispute but is part of the larger war.

## **MID#1787**

This declaration of war—Brazil against Germany—is already part of MID#3503, and this dispute should be dropped from the dataset.

## **MID#1799**

On May 18, 1960, Russia and Japan signed a new fishing agreement that established rules for Japanese fishermen in the northwest Pacific. The new rules limited the Japanese salmon and salmon-trout take to 67,500 tons, down from 120,000 a few years earlier. It also prohibited Japanese fishing “southeast of the southern Kuriles and south of Kamchatka and adjoin the large existing prohibited zone covering the whole of the Okhotsk Sea and waters surrounding the Kuriles and Kamchatka.” The Japanese fishing industry complained about the adverse effect the stringent standards would have, especially on smaller fishing companies.

Despite the new rules, Japanese fishermen continued to fish off the Kuriles. From January 1961 through September the Soviets seized 76 Japanese fishing boats and 501 crew members for fishing in Russian territorial waters, including 62 off the northern Kuriles and 10 off the southern Kuriles. From time to time the Soviets released captured Japanese vessels. For instance, the USSR seized five Japanese fishing vessels on August 19th but then released them on the 30th. However, by September 30th, the Soviets had only released 21 ships and 447 crew members. According to the Maritime Safety Agency, the Soviet Union had seized 76 Japanese fishing boats with 501 men aboard for alleged illegal fishing in the Russian territorial waters in the nine-month period from January, 1961. The figures were well above the comparable figures for 1960. Sixty-two boats were caught in waters off the Southern Kuriles and 10 others in the Northern Kurile waters. As of September 30, the Russians had released 21 boats, with 447 crew members.

Ultimately, Japan did not protest these seizures. The private fishing vessels were violating the terms of the 1960 agreement.

## **MID#2003**

In 1866, the American Secretary of State issued a statement stating that the US attitude would not remain neutral if Spain occupied Peruvian territory. The Secretary of State’s statement is much too vague to qualify as a threat to use force. This is not a dispute.

## **MID#2015**

MID#2015 suggests an attack by Thailand on Laos on June 12, 1966. No primary sources suggest any such action and instead point to an unstable peace in Laos. The United States, at the invitation of Laos, did bomb insurgents in Laotian territory on this date.

## **MID#2016**

In response to increasing numbers of communist insurgents in territory controlled by the Laotian government, the Thai army increased patrols on its border with Laos. The Thai government border

buildup was an effort to protect itself from insurgents. There is no evidence in the source to suggest that the Laotian government protested against this buildup or that the buildup was intended as a show of force directed at the Laotian government itself.

## **MID#2017**

This dispute is coded as a Thai alert targeting Laos in February of 1970. However, Thailand put its border troops on alert after a possible North Vietnamese border incursion into Laos. Thai troops also moved into Laos to help defend against possible North Vietnamese advances. Laos was never a target during this time period, and the Thai-Vietnamese conflict is already captured by the Vietnam War (MID#0611).

## **MID#2019**

Indonesia warned of possible “irresponsible acts” against Dutch nationals in Indonesia unless the Netherlands resolved the dispute over Dutch New Guinea. The threat was not specific and also not directed at the Netherlands or the Dutch government.

## **MID#2021**

Several thousand Chinese Nationalists were allowed to cross the border into Indo-Chinese territory and were accepted as refugees by the French. The Nationalists were what was left of the army of General Pai Chung-shi, who had been intercepted by the Communists and forced to flee. The French promptly disarmed the Nationalists and allowed them to enter Indo-China despite prior warnings by the Chinese not to do so. Communist China only responded with a verbal protest the same day. The threat from the Chinese was non-militarized, and there was no border violation as originally coded since the French allowed the refugees into their territories.

## **MID#2027**

On 26 November 1961 the Philippines detained two Taiwanese fishing vessels and their seventeen crew members in the Sulu Sea. However, there is no evidence of an official Taiwanese protest.

## **MID#2041**

MID#2041 was originally coded as a Dominican border violation into Haiti on 16 February 1949. The start date refers to Haitian charges that the Dominican President Rafael Trujillo was involved in a plot to overthrow the Haitian government and that Col. Aster Roland of the Haitian Army was using Dominican radio to broadcast subversive messages. No border violation was reported or alleged. The dispute was resolved diplomatically through the Organization of American States on 25 February 1949—the originally coded end date; there was no militarized incident contemporaneous to the original coding. Specific sources from CoW confirmed this report.

## **MID#2048**

Both Chile and Peru, the only combatants in this case, denied that an attack, clash, or other action occurred. Both countries stated that reports from Bolivia were false.

## **MID#2051**

Ecuador told the US State Department in a memorandum that it would go to war to “protect her Amazonian rights in the pending conflict between Colombia and Peru.” There is no indication that Ecuador was targeting any one country, and they were certainly not targeting both Colombia and Peru in tandem.

## **MID#2076**

This case involves the coding of two incursions by Chilean forces into Argentine territory in 1891. As per Moreno (1961: 195-196), which is the source cited by the original codesheets, these were de-armed rebels from the Chilean civil war that were fleeing the conflict, being rounded up by Argentine forces, and then returned to Chile. Chilean officials thanked the Argentines for returning the prisoners to Chile. Our recommendation is to drop this case.

## **MID#2077**

The original coders suggests a show of ships by Argentina in March of 1905 that was not reciprocated by Chile. Specifically, a navigational buoy was placed on or near Navarino Island. Moraga (1969, 192) details the incident in which the Argentine navy **secretly** dispatched a group of sailors to replace the “Spar Buey” near Puerto Williams, on Navarino, with their own marker. The Argentines then used it as evidence of ownership for a map of the area. The Director of the Hydrographic Office of the Chilean Navy reported the situation to superiors in July, and Argentina argued that the buoy was placed to aid navigation. Chile reviewed the situation in December, argued that the Argentine position was absurd, but agreed to negotiate a solution.

The placement of the buoy was obviously not a show of force since it was done secretly, and no land was seized. There was outrage by Chilean citizens at the printing of the map, but there was no protest by the government, which did not even act within six months following the discovery of the marker. In short, there is no militarized incident here. Our recommendation is to drop this case.

## **MID#2091**

On April 28, 1956, 12 Chinese soldiers equipped with tommy guns and telescopes crossed the border into India east of Nilang at the area right up to Chang Chokla pass within Indian Territory. In response, the Indian government instructed its officer commanding its border security force to instruct the Chinese forces to leave Indian Territory immediately. India noted that they assumed that the crossing was due to ignorance and not a border violation. There was no protest for this incident; both sides considered it a misunderstanding.

## **MID#2093**

MID#2093 is a border dispute between India and China in August and September of 1958. It wholly overlaps the larger border dispute coded in MID#1707. The location of conflict, the issues, and the participants are the same in these two disputes, and, thus, MID#2093 should be dropped.

## **MID#2100**

On April 6, 1973, at the request of the Chogyal of Sikkim, Indian military forces moved into the Kingdom in order to maintain law and order in the area. Two days later, the Sikkim administration was taken over by the Indian political officer in order to maintain Sikkim's political stability and ensure peace in the region. The Chinese government protested the actions of India in Sikkim on April 12, accusing the Indian military of confiscating control of the Kingdom under the "pretext of disturbances." China not only protested the movements of the Indian military, but the right to which they had to do it, under the Indo-Sikkim treaty of 1950.

The original CoW coding has this as a show of force against China, but the moves, whether trumped up, were always internal for India. There was no show of force against China.

## **MID#2104**

Iran protested to Iraq that Iraqi tribesmen ("bandits" according to the Iranians) killed an Iranian tribesman and stole 500 sheep and cattle in the Kermanshah area on February 6th. The protest occurred on February 10th. There is no indication that the Iraqi government sponsored these actions or even had control over the tribesmen. This is not a dispute.

## **MID#2105**

Shatt al-Arab connects the Iraqi port of Basra and the Iranian ports of Khorramshahr and Abadan to the Persian Gulf. Under a 1936 agreement Iraq was responsible for piloting tankers in the river and Iran was responsible for assigning berths, but for several years Iraqis had also handled the berthing assignments. On 16 February Iran announced that its nationals would once again handle berthing arrangements, but the Iraqi pilots opposed the decision. They refused to pilot the tankers, stranding several in the water. By the end of the month the oil refinery at Abadan had to slow production because it had no way to move the oil, and by early March the refinery stopped production altogether. "Intense diplomatic activity" (Middle East Record, 1961, 293) took place between Iraq and Iran in March. On 27 March Iraq announced construction of a new port at Umm Qasr to reduce its dependence on the Shatt al-Arab. On 8 April Iran agreed to send any unresolved issues to the ICJ. On 23 April Iraqi leader General Kassim and Iranian ambassador to Baghdad Gholam Abbas Aram agreed that tanker traffic would resume with Iraqi pilots and that an Iraqi mission would visit Tehran the following month to continue discussions. The talks did not take place. There was no actual militarized incident during this impasse; the refusal to pilot tankers is not a show of force. This a diplomatic dispute but not a MID.

## **MID#2108**

This case is based on a report by Baghdad Radio that a clash between Iraqi and Iranian army units killed 30 Iranians soldiers and captured 14. There was no information about Iraqi casualties. Iran denied the event, and there are simply no other reports that the event occurred. Baghdad radio was an arm of the Iraqi regime and often engaged in propaganda and incitement of the public. Iran had denounced a 33-year old agreement between the two states over navigation of the estuary of the Tigris and Euphrates (the Shatt al Arab). Further, the Iraqis were smarting from their recent swift defeat by the Israelis. Without corroboration from another source, there is not enough evidence that this event occurred.

## **MID#2134**

The original coders considered this an 8-month-long bilateral dispute between Paraguay and Bolivia, starting on March 1, 1936. In the timeline we were given there were two possible militarized incidents: the Paraguayan harassment of truck convoys on the international road (Villa Montes-Boyuibe road) in March of 1936 and the “thinly veiled threat” by Bolivia on October 1936. The dispute was coded as ending on January 9, 1937, with the signing of an agreement.

The harassment of trucks on the international road took place in territory by the Paraguayan military following the Chaco War. Both countries were in negotiations over several issues, and the Paraguayans were using the harassment as leverage in the disputes. They also did not allow the Bolivians to repair the road. Since the Paraguay military, though behaving badly, had some authorization to be on that road, it is not a militarized incident. A later agreement (in August) between the two countries outlined proper behavior for the military forces in the region and curtailed the harassment. This is all contained in Rout (1970: 158-159), which is the original source for the incident.

The second incident is already included in the dataset as MID#1028, which is coded (inexplicably) as a one-day clash between the two countries. We found the original New York Times article (10/6/1936) used to code this incident. The text states:

President Toro’s announcement said the continuance of the Paraguayan occupation of the Villa Monies-Santa Cruz road might easily lead to armed clashes between between Bolivian and Paraguayan troops and thus endanger peace. Certain diplomatic observers interpreted this statement as a threat to renew hostilities unless Paraguay accedes to the Bolivian demand and withdraws from the road.

This is a vague threat at best and is not a militarized incident per Correlates of War coding rules, and Paraguay did not respond. Since there are no militarized incidents during this time period, our recommendation is to drop this case and MID#1028, which was also previously listed as a dispute we could not find.

## **MID#2135**

With MID#2135 and MID#1082, the original MID coders are referencing a dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay over a road between Villa Montes and Boyuibe (or Santa Cruz – sources suggest they may be the same thing). It occurs in the aftermath of the Chaco War between these two states

(MID#1027), which left Paraguay as the clear winner of a war that Bolivia initiated. Paraguay occupied the road as a result of the war that concluded two years earlier, which was a source of frustration for the Bolivians. The road was Bolivia's main source for communication with the outside world, making Paraguay's occupation of that road problematic. However, coding this dispute as a Paraguayan occupation of territory (in a 6-month count) is incorrect. Paraguay had occupied this territory since the end of the war. The peace talks aimed at settling the war before this point did little more than affirm the new status quo that Bolivia, not surprisingly, wanted to rectify.

So, the current coding suggests that Paraguay occupied this road in this region in the month of May 1937. This is not what happened. MID coders most likely used a New York Times article dated on June 10, 1937 to start this as a six-month count. This article talks about "last month's agreement by which control of Bolivia's main-line road between Villa Montes and Boyuibe was taken from Paraguay and put in control of the International Police under the supervision of the neutral military officers representing the authority of the Chaco Peace Conference at Buenos Aires." It mentions this in the context of Paraguay discussing the terms of the agreement publicly, which defied the obligations of the participants of the conference and started a diplomatic row. This prompted Bolivia to abort the restoration of relations with Paraguay and led to Paraguay to cite the armistice that ended the conflict. This armistice affirmed the new status quo.

Even then, it is technically incorrect to say this agreement was made in May. The agreement was signed on January 9, 1937. The terms of implementation were signed in an undated day in May 1937 (Zook 1960, 249) but not ratified by Paraguay. The army would not allow it, and popular opinion was decidedly against it. From here, domestic turmoil in both countries intervened, stopping this issue from spiraling out of control. In Paraguay, the army toppled the provisional government of Rafael Franco in order to prevent the terms of the Chaco Peace Conference (signed on June 12, 1935) from coming into effect. In Bolivia, German Busch finally overthrew his friend and confidante David Toro in July 1937. The status quo remained until 1938.

In March 1938, Argentina again forced the issue of settling the Chaco War. In fact, it was Argentina's determination to end this issue that got Paraguay, who enjoyed the favorable status quo, to begin the peace process in earnest. On May 27, 1938, a proposal was finalized that redrew the border in the Chaco (Zook 1960, 250, is used for these details). Paraguay got most of what it wanted, reflecting their victory in war. Herein, a line was drawn from Esmeralda on the Rio Pilcomayo, northeast to a point called '27 November', southwest of Ingavi. From there, the line passed between Ravelo and Ingavi to Rio Paraguay, 7500 meters north of Bahia Negra. In the understanding of the conference participants, the desert region between 61 degrees and 63 degrees was a natural border between Paraguay and Bolivia. Bolivia was also obliged to pay 200,000 pounds in war indemnity. Bolivia accepted on May 31st; Paraguay was reticent.

Though Bolivia genuinely wanted peace, German Busch mobilized troops (MID#1029) as a response to Paraguay's refusal (sometime before June 24th, 1938). Paraguay gave a counterproposal, resulting in more negotiations. A draft treaty was reached on July 9, 1938, and a peace treaty was signed on July 21st, 1938, that ultimately concludes the war. It outlines an arbitration process to be followed, resulting in an award later in October.

## **MID#2137**

Between March and June 1975, Ethiopian troops were battling the Eritrean secessionist movement. This case is coded as an attack by Ethiopia on Sudan sometime in March of 1975. However, the only attack by Ethiopian troops during this month or the next concerned the Eritrean town of Umm Hagar, which Eritrean guerrillas had occupied in the previous week. There is also an Umm Hagar in Sudan, and this confusion probably accounts for the mistaken attack coding. Eritrea was not a member of the state system until 1993, so this is a domestic dispute and not a MID.

## **MID#2145**

This was part of MID#1026 between Paraguay and Bolivia. Forces from both countries fought each other, but the battle took place on Brazilian territory. However, Brazil never protested the incursion, and Brazil was definitely not the target of either state. The original CoW coding was two separate incursions into Brazilian territory (MID#2145 and MID#2146), but both of these should be dropped.

## **MID#2146**

This was part of MID#1026 between Paraguay and Bolivia. Forces from both countries fought each other, but the battle took place on Brazilian territory. However, Brazil never protested the incursion, and Brazil was definitely not the target of either state. The original CoW coding was two separate incursions into Brazilian territory (MID#2145 and MID#2146), but both of these should be dropped.

## **MID#2147**

As Bolivia and Paraguay prepared to go to war due to a border dispute, the Argentinean president was rumored to have told both governments that he would not permit the war to happen. Unofficial observers were the source for the Argentine statement, and the actual statement does not constitute a threat that would comprise a militarized incident.

## **MID#2172**

During the first week of November 1965, violence erupted between the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots. On the evening of November 5, when the Security Council called for a halt in the violence, a member of Turkey's delegation suggested that, if the Cyprus government was not able to prevent further attacks on Turkish Cypriots in the Famagusta area, the Turkish military may retaliate against the Greek Cypriots. This was not an explicit threat directed towards Cyprus and does not specify a use of force.

## **MID#2182**

This is a double count of MID#1142, the Harbin Crisis between Russia and China in December of 1917.

## MID#2217

MID#2217 is a duplicate of MID#0027—the Berlin Crisis between the United States and the Soviet Union. It has the same start dates, but the end date is one month prior to the end date listed in MID#0027. MID#0027 also has West Germany as a participant, but MID#2217 does not.

## MID#2227

Upon Tito's death, U.S. President Jimmy Carter stated, "I reaffirm today that America will continue its long-standing policy of support for Yugoslavia and do what it must to provide that support." CoW coded this as a threat to use force against the Soviet Union, but it really is too vague to be considered such a threat.

## MID#2309

French and Spanish troops quartered in the port of Casablanca exchanged fire. The Spanish troops supposedly fired first and the French troops responded. 1 Spanish soldier was killed. 2 French soldiers were injured. The Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of War said the incident would not affect relations between the countries and the Spanish War Minister described the incident as a "drunken brawl". French officials similarly agreed that the incident would not affect relations between the countries. Spanish soldiers were beating an unarmed Algerian sharpshooter. The sergeant in charge of the city gate and a French subaltern who were both unarmed tried to intervene. Then, Spanish forces opened fire and French soldiers fired back. This was clearly not authorized from the state-level down and does not seem to be taken at least by the Spanish government as a clash. 5 of the soldiers involved in the exchange of fire were arrested and handed over to French officials. Therefore, I do not think this is a dispute.

## MID#2313

In the midst of the Mexican Civil War, one of the greatest (vocalized) concerns of the European powers was the safety of its citizens. Having decided that the war was becoming mishandled and out of control, Spain sent the cruiser *Emperador Carlos V* to Mexican waters. The cruiser was welcomed by the Huerta government, which sent an envoy aboard the cruiser to invite the commander, his officers, and the crew to be guests of the Mexican government in Mexico City. There is no dispute here since the warship was welcomed by the Mexican government.

## MID#2314

MID#2314 is coded as a joint, German-Russian dispute with a highest action of clash against China in 1900. It is coded as separate from the Boxer Rebellion (MID#0031), with the rebellion-coded dispute ending when the Dowager Empress fled Beijing on August 15, 1900.

There are several problems with this interpretation. First, Germany and Russia were not coordinating together against China, and separately from the other Allied partners, though both states were actively raiding Boxers after the fall of Beijing. (MID#3250 codes the Manchurian war between Russia and China during this time.)

Second, the troops and navies of the Allied forces remained in China well past the August 16, 1900 end date of MID#0031, which is the beginning date for this dispute. In short, there is no reason to think that the Allied intervention in China during the Boxer Rebellion should be two separate disputes.

MID#0031 should be recoded as follows:

- End date changed to 9/07/1901, with the signing of the protocol ending the conflict
- Settlement changed to negotiation

## **MID#2327**

MID#2327 is a bilateral MID between Israel and Turkey occurring on one day on August 10, 1976. Israel is Side A, coded as having seized something from Turkey. Turkey did not reciprocate. The MID ends in a non-negotiated released.

Specific Sources says this MID is coded using Facts on File and New York Times.

This MID refers to an Israeli seizure of a 700-ton Turkish freighter called Caferokam. The boat and crew of seven were seized after leaving the Lebanese port of Tyre. Reports differed on whether the boat was in international or Israeli waters. The former is more likely the case.

A follow-up report says the Turkish freighter was carrying a large cargo of arms destined for Palestinians in Lebanon.

We were not able to prove the seizure lasted more than 24 hours. More importantly, we did not find evidence of a protest by the Turkish government.

## **MID#2356**

On June 5, 1986, the Venezuelan foreign minister stated that “as long as Venezuela exists as a state” it would continue to exercise rights over the islands within its gulf and the gulf up to the north of the Guajira Peninsula. He labeled as “absurd” a “draft amendment on the status of the islands” devised by a Colombian magistrate. There was no explicit mention of any specific threat to use force directed towards Colombia.

## **MID#2365**

MID#2365 is most likely the Allied intervention in Southern Russia and Ukraine. It has a start date of November 23, 1918 and an end date of April 6, 1919. The United Kingdom, France, and Russia are originators. Romania and Greece join on December 17, 1918. The United Kingdom had a HIACT of 7. The other members of Side A had a HIACT of 14. Russia has a HIACT of 16. The MID ends in a non-negotiated victory for Side B. The start date is not entirely clear. Coincidentally, it does happen to be a year to the day after the Russian Civil War MID (#0197) originally started in November 23, 1917, with the threat from the Allies over Bolshevik attempts to pursue a separate peace with Germany. This campaign in Southern Russia is actually connected

to other interventions by the Allies in Siberia and North Russia. The end date coincides with the French retreat from Odessa (Fischer 1951, 180-182). France's goal was to occupy Odessa, and its hinterlands, in order to provide food and ammunition to the anti-Bolshevik Whites in the vicinity. France never entertained the idea of combat in this capacity.

When, in March 1919, the Red Army was advancing on Odessa, the original cause for France was lost. Parliament in France ordered the evacuation on April 2, 1919. The French had vacated the area on April 6, 1919. Fischer says that, from that point forward, French involvement in the Allied intervention in the Russian Civil War took on a strictly non-combat role. Effectively, France exits the Russian Civil War MID (#0197) on this date. The Allied campaign in Southern Russia represents one part of a multifaceted Allied campaign to prevent the Russians from making peace with Germany during the end of World War I, and to overthrow the Bolshevik government. Per the terms of a December 23, 1917 agreement between the two, leading the effort against Russia in North Russia, the Baltic and the Caucasus was the responsibility of the United Kingdom. France, in exchange, would be able to lead the charge in Ukraine and Crimea (Fischer 1951, 154-155, 836). In short, this was France's "domain" during the Allied intervention, whereas Great Britain took the lead on North Russia.

## **MID#2366**

MID#2366 is the Allied intervention in Murmansk and Arkhangelsk, for which the start date is the landing at Murmansk on June 28, 1918 (Strakhovsky 1944, 43-44). The United States, France, Italy, and Serbia are on Side A. Russia is on Side B. HIACT for all is 14, excluding Russia, for which the HIACT is 16. End date is October 12, 1919. The end date coincides with the Anglo-British retreat from Murmansk (Arnot 1967, 158). The campaign in Murmansk and Arkhangelsk was a core theater of the Allied intervention in Russia, which is already captured in MID#0197. It is not a stand-alone MID, per the Correlates of War's understanding of what is a "militarized interstate dispute", or dispute coding rule #2 (Jones, Bremer and Singer 1996, 169, 175). See: Fischer 1951, 143-144.

## **MID#2542**

Irish fishing patrol boats fired on a Spanish trawler that had entered Irish waters. However, Spanish ambassador ordered the captain of the Spanish trawler to surrender to the Irish before the Irish ever opened fire on the Spanish trawler. The Spanish also sided with the Irish authorities against the fishing boats illegally fishing in Irish waters.

## **MID#2558**

This case is coded as an attack by Iran on an Italian tanker on September 7, 1985. However, no shots were fired, and the seizure or "inspection" of the cargo lasted only five hours. This is not a militarized incident since seizures must last at least twenty-four hours.

## **MID#2561**

On October 8, 1985, a missile or a rocket hit a West German container ship traveling from North Yemen to Kuwait. West Germany did not protest the ship attack.

## **MID#2567**

Two Southern Yemeni jets forced an Air Djibouti (airline owned by the Djibouti government) plane to land in Southern Lebanon. The plane was kept in Southern Lebanon for 4 hours while officials searched for opponents of the Southern Yemeni government. The seizure did not meet the 24-hour rule.

## **MID#2591**

An Israeli jet stopped a Libyan plane over the Mediterranean and forced it to land in Israel after suspecting a Palestinian terrorist leader was on board. They found no terrorist and allowed the Libyan plane to continue its flight. A Syrian official was on the plane, but the seizure was less than 24 hours. This is a drop.

## **MID#2606**

Given the participants, the start date, and the sources used, MID#2606 is a double count of MID#0197. MID#0197 already captures all the participants and first and last militarized incidents. This is not a separate dispute.

## **MID#2608**

MID#2608 refers to the house arrest of Robinson McIlvaine, a US diplomat in Guinea, on 30 October 1966. The Guinean government believed that the US was responsible for a series of Guinean arrests by Ghana earlier in the week. When it was proven that the US had no hand in the arrests, McIlvaine was released on 31 October 1966. One-day seizure. Less than 24 hours. (see MID#2608.source1.pdf - "Mr. McIlvaine was ordered held under house arrest for almost 24 hours...")

## **MID#2620**

MID#2620 is coded as a Zairean seizure of Congolese property, which was required with a threat to use force. The MID occurs between August 21, 1971 and August 19, 1972. The MID ends in a negotiated compromise.

Specific Sources says this MID is coded using the Africa Research Bulletin and the African Contemporary Record.

Our review of these sources do not support coding a MID here. We found no evidence of a Congolese threat to use force. Further, Zaire did not seize Congolese diplomats but rather declared them persona non grata and asked them to leave. It appears as if the original MID coders misread the ongoing trial of these diplomats as a seizure when these diplomats were being tried in abstentia for allegedly aiding a coup plot orchestrated by students of a university in Kinshasa.

We recommend dropping this MID.

## **MID#2621**

On July 7, 1971, Idi Amin ordered the border with Tanzania and Rwanda closed and any aircraft violating Ugandan airspace shot down. Amin said that guerrillas from Zambia were entering Uganda through Rwanda. Rwanda's minister of Commerce, Mines, and Industry, Anastase Makusa, was in Kampala when Amin gave the order and protested vigorously. Rwanda's major export agricultural product, coffee, was in season, and most of Rwanda's trade passed through Kampala. But Amin kept the border closed.

Amin met Rwanda's ambassador in Kampala, Alphonse-Marie Kagenza. Soon after, on 4 August, Amin reopened the border with Rwanda, but he made three demands: "(i) The Rwandan Government must stop immediately activities by anti-Ugandan guerrillas in its country. (ii) It should prevent Tanzania carrying out any anti-Ugandan military activities through Rwanda. (iii) It should prevent any subversive activities in Rwanda against Uganda" (Africa Research Bulletin, 1971, 2193).

The closing of the border was directed at guerillas, not the Rwandan government. A border closing is also not a show of force.

## **MID#2637**

MID#2637 is a bilateral MID between India and Pakistan occurring on July 15, 1970. It is coded as one-day threat to use force from India against Pakistan, which was unreciprocated. The MID ends in a non-negotiated stalemate.

Specific Sources says this MID was coded using *Facts on File* and *New York Times*.

This dispute is about Kashmir. Indira Gandhi was quoted as saying the following:

"We shall deal with them with a strong hand."

She later followed that with this statement in the same public meeting.

"I am not saying this as a threat to anyone. I am not in the habit of giving threats; you all know what great responsibility devolves on us. We have to maintain the territorial integrity of Jammu and Kashmir and the rest of the country, and work for their economic development."

This is not specific enough to count as a threat to use force.

## **MID#2701**

With the Allied intervention in Russia, China seized the opportunity to recover the right of navigation through the Amur. The Russians threatened the Chinese with violence but on August 20th four Chinese vessels followed by Japanese torpedo boats sailed north toward the Amur. On September 17th the Russians allowed the ships to take shelter at Nikolaevsk but warned not to go further. The Chinese decided to go against the Russian request and sailed north on October 18th. They were fired upon on October 25th by one of Kalmykov's Ussuri Cossack units and had to go back to Nikolaevsk. This is another MID that has to do with the Allied Intervention in Russia, but the MID is not between Japan and China. Due to Japanese intervention, the Chinese seize an opportunity to go North. The dispute occurs between the Russians and the Chinese (which is MID#2700). The Japanese are really just bystanders.

## **MID#2703**

After signing a Sino-Soviet Alliance Treaty in August, China demanded that the Soviet union had to hand Manchuria over to the KMT government to keep the peace and its obligations under the treaty. On September 14th 1945, Soviet military commanders landed in a military aircraft in Yen-an, China to discuss future actions in Manchuria with the communist party. This was the first official visit of a representative of the USSR government to the headquarters of the CCP. On September 16th 1945, the Soviet-Mongolian headquarters of the Transbikal Military Region which was responsible for Manchuria, informed the CCP that 'the main forces of the Eighth Route Army should be urgently ordered to move northward immediately.' This was to ensure the take over of the regions that the Soviet Union occupied in Inner Mongolia and Manchuria. The goal was to maintain the connection to Outer Mongolia and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union believed that it could establish better relations with with Chinese communists than the KMT government. There was no show of force on either side of this diplomatic dispute.

## **MID#2706**

There is no evidence of this dispute between China and Russia in 1962, especially a clash. There is nothing in Day, Tsien-hua, or Clubb. ProQuest, Google Scholar, Google Books, etc. There is instead two different sources that suggest "a significant detente in the Sino-Soviet dispute appeared to develop" during spring through September of 1962.

## **MID#2712**

The Soviets charged that China had engaged in several border violations across the Mongolian border. However, China vehemently denied these accusations, and contemporary analysts suggested they were fabricated by the Soviets. The violations themselves also did not make sense strategically for the Chinese. Without additional evidence, this seems nothing more than Soviet propaganda.

## **MID#2726**

The Soviet Union engaged in global naval exercises in April 1975. There was no specific target, and other states did not allege they were being targeted but cautiously acknowledged that the Soviet Union was presenting its capabilities to the world.

The original end date of this case, in June 1975, corresponds to a note the Soviet Union gave Japan cautioning them not to sign a treaty with China. The note did not threaten any particular type of action if Japan did sign the treaty. There is no militarized incident here.

### **MID#2737**

Canada said it would seize any French fishermen caught fishing in the Burgeo Bank area, south of Newfoundland. Canada claimed France had exceeded its cod quota. This threat to use force was directed against civilians, not the French government.

### **MID#2756**

An Angolan jet mistook a plane carrying the Botswanan president for an enemy aircraft and fired on it. The plane was able to land, and there were only a few minor injuries. The firing was accidental, and there was no protest.

### **MID#2761**

A Turkish soldier shot two Greek Cypriot national guardsmen, wounding one and killing the other. He then broke into the home of a Greek Cypriot woman and attempted to rape her. Greek Cypriot policemen arrived and killed the soldier. This was not sanctioned by Turkey. The soldier was not representing official Turkish policy. This is not a militarized dispute.

### **MID#2787**

After an attack on a Turkish village near the Syrian border by Kurdish rebels, the Turkish Foreign Ministry told Syria to tighten border security. Turkey said it may retaliate against the Kurdish rebels next time. This was not a threat to use force against Syria, and any threat made was not specific.

### **MID#2795**

A United Arab Emirates flagged tanker, the Anita, struck what was likely an Iranian mine in the Gulf of Oman and sunk with only a handful of crew member surviving. There is no way of proving that Iran placed the mine or deliberately aimed to attack the UAE, and, as such, this is not a militarized incident.

### **MID#2813**

The waters around the Falkland Islands were in dispute between Argentina and Britain. A Japanese fishing vessel was seized by the Argentinian coast guard on February 13th 1987. The Japanese admitted that they had been in the economic zone without permission. On March 24th another Japanese fishing boat was seized in the same waters for illegal fishing. There was no protest from Japan.

## **MID#2814**

The Dutch and Belgians sent mine sweeping vessels as a part of a coalition of countries clearing the Persian Gulf of mines. This was not a show of force against Iran and not a militarized incident.

## **MID#2829**

This is coded as a threat to use force by Turkey against Bulgaria on October 3, 1987. The event is coded based on a summary New York Times report from October, but the coding references a statement by the Turkish Prime Minister in August. His statement: “we shall not abandon the case of ‘Turks’ in Bulgaria. We shall settle it as we did in Cyprus. After the operation in Cyprus there is no trace of Greek Cypriots and Greeks.” This statement is obviously too vague to justify a threat to use force according to CoW’s coding rules.

## **MID#2830**

Bulgaria claimed a Turkish fishing boat sunk when it collided with a Bulgarian patrol boat inside Bulgarian waters. Turkey disputed the claim, and there is no other evidence of the incident.

## **MID#2831**

The Israeli navy intercepted a Cypriot ferry and told it to return to Cyprus. It was suspected of ferrying Palestinian guerillas. There was no seizure, and, regardless, the incident lasted less than 24 hours.

## **MID#2837**

This case is coded as a show of force by Britain, France, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Germany, and Russia, on May 18, 1896, against Greece, and lasting until July 6, 1896. However, the Great Powers sent a contingent of 450 troops and ships in February of 1897 (not 1896) and eventually launched a blockade until Crete was pacified. This show of force is described in MID#0056. This case probably refers to the increasing pressure placed on the Sultan to resolve the Cretan Crisis in 1896 – the Great Powers had fleets in the Mediterranean. However, that pressure never constituted a codeable militarized incident.

## **MID#2842**

India accused Portugal of violating Indian airspace multiple times during the year by aircraft flying to Goa and stated that “actions would be taken” if the practice continued. Portugal denied all accusations, and the threat by India was not specific and did not necessarily imply militarized actions.

## **MID#2843**

A DC-3 transport plane was forced to land in the Suez Canal Zone by an Egyptian military plane. It may have been off course. Regardless, it was on the ground for forty-five minutes according to

reports. The plane was not attacked, and the seizure was less than 24 hours, with no protest of a border violation by Egypt. This is not a militarized incident.

### **MID#2845**

MID#2845 was coded as the Chilean seizure of U.S. fishing boats and the U.S. threat to use force that followed. On 13 December 1957, the coded start date, Chile fired warning shots across the bows of 23 U.S. fishing boats as a show of force when the boats refused to leave Chilean territorial waters. No boats were seized in the incident, and the U.S. did not deliver a note of protest. The end date, 18 December 1957, corresponds to comments from the U.S. warning Chile not to interfere with U.S. fishing vessels. There was no seizure and no threat of force by the US. Normally, this would be considered a show of force if it were against a military vessel, but a show of force against private citizens is not a militarized incident. Chilean representatives confirmed there was no protest from the United States.

### **MID#2846**

Albania machine gunned an Italian fishing boat that had drifted into its waters. One fisherman died. However, there was no protest from the Italians.

### **MID#2848**

The Norwegian navy seized a Soviet trawler fishing within Norwegian territorial waters. There is no evidence of protest from the Soviets.

### **MID#2856**

Syrian anti-aircraft guns fired on four Italian and three French private planes that were flying from Lebanon to Turkey to help fight locust swarms. None were damaged, and there was no protest from Italy or France. Without protest, this attack on private planes is not a militarized incident.

### **MID#2864**

The Soviet Navy seized two Danish salmon fishing cutters and took them to the port of Liepaja. There was no protest from Denmark.

### **MID#2866**

Israeli policemen seized a Lebanese fishing boat and arrested five crew members for illegal fishing. Lebanon did not protest.

### **MID#2867**

The Dominican Republic forced down a US C-47 transport carrying a military attache. The US asked for an explanation, and the Dominican Air Force commander apologized. This is not a militarized incident.

## **MID#2882**

On June 11, 1961, a Soviet patrol vessel seized and detained several Japanese fishing vessels off Hokkaido, Northern Japan, alleging that the fishermen had violated Soviet territorial waters. On July 15, the Soviet government announced that the vessels would be released. There is no evidence of any protest by Japan.

## **MID#2883**

The British and Danish governments had signed an agreement in 1959 that granted British fishing rights off the Faroe islands but reserved the six miles of water that surround the Faroe islands for local fishermen. This dispute began on 29 May when the Danish frigate Niels Ebbesen allegedly found the Red Crusader, a British fishing trawler, within six miles of the Faroe islands. The Niels Ebbesen stopped the Red Crusader and sent an unarmed boarding party to the British fishing ship, but once the Danish party had come aboard the Red Crusader raced for Scotland with the Niels Ebbesen in chase. A Royal Navy frigate, HMS Troubridge, and a British fishing-protection vessel, Wotton, met the Red Crusader on its way. On 30 May officers from the Wotton met with the commanding officer of the Niels Ebbesen at sea and negotiated the release of the boarding party. The boarding by the Danes was less than 24 hours long. The Red Crusader was a private boat, and so its actions did not constitute the acts of the British government. The British and Danish military forces negotiated the release of the boarding party. This is not a militarized incident. The British foreign secretary explicitly stated that this was a private incident with diplomatic overtones and not a militarized incident.

## **MID#2893**

Soviet authorities seized a Japanese fishing boat for violating Soviet territorial waters. Three of the sailors were eventually released, but there was no protest by Japan.

## **MID#2896**

The Soviets seized two Finnish trawlers and a speedboat. Finland did not protest but “awaited explanation” for the Soviet actions. One of the trawlers confirmed to the Finnish coast guard that it had found a place for alcohol smugglers on the boat. This is not a militarized incident without a protest.

## **MID#2900**

A British cutter strayed into Chinese waters and was seized. The boat and the crew were released the next day unharmed, and the British stated that the crew was well treated. Britain made no protest. This is not a militarized incident.

## **MID#2902**

The Polish navy seized eight Danish and two West German fishing vessels within Polish territorial waters. There were no protests of the incident, but the Danish embassy in Poland was asked by

their government to provide assistance. This is not a militarized incident without a protest.

### **MID#2903**

A Soviet patrol boat seized a Japanese fishing boat in disputed waters. There was no protest by Japan.

### **MID#2909**

This case is a duplicate of MID#2220 in which Soviet fighters shot down an American training jet after it strayed over the East German border, killing 3 American officers. Another American plane was shot down over East Germany by Soviet fighters, and its two crew were detained. They were released 17 days later. The dates overlap, and the issue is the same in both cases.

### **MID#2910**

The official Soviet press agency claimed US military planes buzzed a Soviet tourist ship in the Mediterranean. This was not a show of force against a tourist ship, and there was no formal protest.

### **MID#2911**

A six-ton Japanese fishing boat was seized by a Soviet patrol boat in disputed waters. There was no protest by Japan.

### **MID#2912**

South Vietnam seized two Taiwanese fishing boats and their 40 crew for violating Vietnamese waters. There was no protest.

### **MID#2917**

This case refers to the interception of a Spanish passenger plane over Israeli airspace on 4 April 1965. After ignoring orders to land, an Israeli Air Force jet fired warning shots and forced a Spanish passenger plane to land. The crew was questioned and released on 5 April 1965, less than 24 hours from the first interception by the Israelis. The pilot apologized for the incursion, and there was no protest on either side of the incident.

### **MID#2939**

Norway seized trawlers from the Soviet Union, Denmark, and East Germany after they entered restricted waters near a Norwegian military base. Several other boats escaped. There were no protests.

## **MID#2945**

The South Vietnamese Navy detained and released Taiwanese fishermen after they landed on one of the Paracels. Both South Vietnam and Taiwan claim the islands. The fishermen were only detained for about two hours, and, hence, this does not qualify as a militarized incident.

## **MID#2952**

The US Coast Guard seized 5 Canadian trawlers for illegally fishing within US territorial waters off of Washington. There was no protest from the Canadian government.

## **MID#2953**

This refers to an American seizure of a Canadian fishing vessel near Seattle. There was no evidence of protest by the Canadian government.

## **MID#2954**

This case refers to the US seizure of a Cuban fishing boat near Cape Cod on 17 August 1975. The boat was found in violation of the Coastal Fisheries Act but was released without fines on 22 August 1975. Cuba did not protest.

## **MID#2957**

This case refers to the Panamanian seizure of two U.S. tuna boats on 26 April 1976 in the Canal Zone waters. The boats were released on 6 May 1976. There is no indication of a formal protest. The US was said to be studying the note given by Panama.

## **MID#2966**

Thirty-eight Chinese boats, many of them armed, anchored around the Senkaku Islands and began shouting pro-China slogans about how the islands belonged to China. These boats were not official Chinese forces and were not representing the Chinese government. This is not a militarized incident.

## **MID#2970**

The Norwegian navy boarded 6 Danish fishing boats and told them to leave an area in the North Sea claimed by both countries. The boardings lasted less than 24 hours.

## **MID#2978**

Libya accused two American fighters of buzzing a Libyan jetliner. This was not a show of force by the United States government.

## **MID#2983**

Argentina stopped a Brazilian research vessel in the disputed Beagle Channel. A reporter for Jornal do Brasil actually spoke by telephone with the commander of the Brazilian ship, and quotes him as saying (a) that the Argentines demanded that he wait 13 hours for an Argentine pilot to arrive, which he refused to do, and (b) that he tried negotiating with the Argentines for 15 minutes, at which point he shifted his course (the Argentine ship had stopped in front of the Brazilian one's prow and refused to budge) and left the scene.

## **MID#2985**

On June 1, 1954, the Chinese government seized a British naval vessel passing by the Sanman Island in border to "conduct an inquiry into what the craft was doing." The vessel and crew were released on July 10, 1954. There is no evidence of any protest by Britain.

## **MID#2990**

Three Chinese Nationalist junks fired upon one British freighter and stripped two others of their cargo. There was no formal protest from the British.

## **MID#2994**

The Soviets seized four Japanese schooners for poaching in Soviet waters. There was no formal protest by Japan.

## **MID#3008**

The Soviet Union forced a South Korean airliner to land after it entered Soviet airspace. There was no hostile action against the plane and no protest from the South Koreans.

## **MID#3012**

A Moroccan expeditionary force with French logistical support assisted Zairean troops in fighting rebels attacking from Angola. These were not Angolan forces.

## **MID#3023**

On October 26, 1979, Burma seized four Thai fishing trawlers along with 10 Thai fishermen for violating Burmese territorial waters in the districts of Polbia and Kawthaung in the Andaman Sea. There is no evidence of an official protest from Thailand.

## **MID#3039**

MID#3039 codes a one-day attack on a Liberian tanker by Iraq during the Iran-Iraq War. The October 9, 1984, attack is consistent in location and issue with all the other Iraqi attacks on Liberian tankers during 1984 and 1985; these are coded in MID#3046. The only difference in the

October 9th incident is that British military personnel were on board, and two British officers died in this attack.

Rather than having separate disputes, we recommend dropping MID#3039 since the incident is consistent with all other Iraqi activity against Liberian ships. Britain should be a joiner to MID#3046 for one day since they protested that attack.

### **MID#3077**

Three Argentinean fishing vessels were intercepted by British warships near the Falkland Islands and told to leave the area. The fishing vessels complied and there was no violence. Argentina protested, but the interception lasted less than 24 hours. There was no attack on the boats.

### **MID#3081**

The speaker of Iran's parliament said they would take action against any Gulf state supplying arms to Iraq: "if truckloads of arms continued to go to Iraq then Iran will have the right to an appropriate response." The article makes reference to past incidents between Kuwait and Iran. In this particular case the threat is vague and does not constitute a militarized incident.

### **MID#3084**

The Prime Minister of the Philippines stated that they would not allow encroachment on the Spratly Islands by China. Specifically, the PM was quoted as saying, "the Philippines would defend these strategically important places with their rich underground resources and would not allow encroachment by China or any other countries." This is not a specific threat.

### **MID#3087**

Pakistani military sources claimed that Soviet and Afghan troops had destroyed Iranian border posts. However, the Iranian military denied the claims. There is no militarized incident if all the participants deny the event occurred.

### **MID#3094**

Moroccan jets pursued guerrillas into Mauritania. There was no protest from the Mauritanian government.

### **MID#3103**

MID#3103 is coded as a dispute between Cameroon and Nigeria. Sources indicate "molestations" by Cameroonian gendarmes against Nigerian fishermen. However, the nature of these molestations is never made evident, no official Nigerian protest is ever reported, and no location was described that might indicate a clear violation of Nigerian territory. An earlier incident from May did occur but is represented in MID#3104.

These states had contested their territorial and maritime borders around the Bakassi Peninsula, which was believed to have rich oil deposits. Nigeria administered the peninsula, but Cameroon claimed it. On 10 December the governor of Cross Rivers State (Nigeria), Clement Isong, “alerted the nation of a renewed wave of molestation of Nigerian fishermen by Cameroonian gendarmes.” The Cameroonians, he said, were attempting to tax the fishermen. Specific sources from CoW confirmed this report.

### **MID#3121**

From Keesing’s: “President Mobutu announced on Feb. 4, 1980, that Zairean troops were being sent to guard the border with the Congo, where it was claimed that a camp had been identified in which were said to be 800 Cuban forces and nearly 3,000 Zairean dissidents. Subsequent reports alleged that the Congolese Government (which denied the presence of Zairean dissidents in the country) had put a stop to preparations by such groups for an attack on Zaire.” The show of force targeted non-state actors, and there is decent evidence that the Congolese were acting to put down the insurgents targeting Zaire. This is not a militarized incident.

### **MID#3123**

Argentina’s navy opened fire on two Bulgarian trawlers illegally fishing in Argentinean waters who resisted detention. There is no indication of a formal protest from Bulgaria about the action.

### **MID#3125**

This case is coded as two Ghanaian threats to use force directed towards Togo. The first, in August of 1977, codes a statement that “Ghana has no territorial ambitions on any country but will never permit an inch of her territory to be encroached on by any country.” The second, in November, followed a statement that Ghana “is prepared to shed blood to the last drop to defend the territorial integrity of the nation.” Neither incident specifies an explicit target or a specific use of force; there is no dispute here.

### **MID#3136**

This dispute is a duplicate of MID#2683.

### **MID#3153**

Jordan accused Saudi Arabia (and also Egypt) of inciting unrest after Jordan signed the Baghdad Pact. Neither state denied these claims, as riots went on for four days in Jordan. However, there is no evidence for a show of force from Saudi Arabia during this time.

### **MID#3164**

This case duplicates MID#1123. Iraq accidentally bombed a Turkish village while pursuing Kurdish rebels. Later, Iraqi war planes attacked the border area, killing two Turkish soldiers. Turkish fighters also shot down an Iraqi jet. Iraq claimed that the fighter had been shot down in Iraq, while

Turkey claimed it was shot down for violating Turkish air space. The issue for both cases was the same, and the dates overlap. This is not a separate set of militarized incidents.

### **MID#3177**

Israel seized a Greek freighter that had been towed into port after engine problems. It was carrying arms to Palestinian fighters in Lebanon, and there was no protest from the Greek government.

### **MID#3183**

On July 24th, 1923, Turkey signed the Treaty of Lausanne with Greece and the Allies, bringing the Turkish role in World War I to a close. However, Greek and Turkish interpretations of the Treaty of Lausanne later came into conflict over the Greek Patriarchate. Under the treaty the two countries would conduct an exchange of populations, and Turkey would not interfere with the Greek Patriarchate. On February 8th, 1925, Turkey deported Constantine VI, Ecumenical Patriarch of the Greek Orthodox Church, under the exchange agreement because he was not a Turkish citizen. Greece protested that the deportation of Constantine violated Turkish promises to leave the Patriarchate alone and mobilized troops. It also sought remedy at the Hague, but Turkey refused. So, on February 8th, Turkey deported Constantine, and on February 11th, Greece pursued its case at the League of Nations. Turkey maintained that Constantine was a resident of Erdek when the Mudros armistice was signed and should therefore be included under the Greek-Turkish exchange-of-populations agreement.

In February a Kurdish uprising challenged Turkish rule, diverting Turkish resources from the Patriarch dispute. The League of Nations heard the dispute on March 14th, and on April 29th, Constantine agreed to abdicate once a Greek-Turkish agreement was signed. Turkey and Greece signed the first of several agreements relating to the exchange of persons on June 21st. Constantine resigned, and Vasil Georgiadis took office in Turkey on July 13th.

This is coded as shows of force by both Turkey and Greece, beginning on February 8th, 1925, which was the day Constantine was deported. The end date corresponds (off one day) with the date Constantine agreed to resign. We could not find a show of force, for either side, during these dates nor proximate to the events described by this conflict. The dispute was complicated but never militarized.

### **MID#3188**

We found three possible incidents across this border using the CoW-stated source (New York Times) and web searches. Each incident involved non-state actors (private citizens or Macedonian revolutionaries), and none of the incidents were protested. Serbia did ask Bulgaria to control its citizens better. This is not a militarized dispute per CoW rules.

### **MID#3194**

Iceland seized four Soviet fishing vessels for illegally fishing in Icelandic waters. The captains were fined and released. There was no formal protest from the USSR.

## **MID#3198**

This case refers to the detainment by Indonesia of four British ships and two Panamanian ships on 3 September 1951. Singapore's embassy in Jakarta negotiated the release the following week, but there was no protest from either Britain or Panama.

## **MID#3201**

This case refers to the Soviet seizure of several British fishing boats in 1952 and January of 1953. The Valafell was seized on 21 May 1952. Another British fishing boat, the Equerry, was seized on 21 September 1952. Another seizure occurred 17 December 1952. This boat was fined and released on 30 December 1952. More seizures occurred in January. In each case the boats were detained for a short time, and in many cases the boats were asked to pay fines. There was no British protest of the seizures.

## **MID#3204**

Chinese Nationalists seized and later released a Danish-flagged freighter operating out of Hong Kong. The boat was released on August 28th, and three or four of the Chinese crew were to be tried for being Communist agents. Denmark did not protest.

## **MID#3212**

Chinese Nationalists seized a Japanese freighter off of Formosa. There was no protest from the Japanese government.

## **MID#3222**

An American shrimper was accidentally shot by the Mexican Coast Guard when confronted for illegally fishing in Mexican waters. This was actually one seizure out of about 25 by the Mexicans. The United States asked for an explanation of the shooting, but there was never a formal protest. Mexico instead asked the UN General Assembly for confirmation of a 9-mile limit to territorial waters versus the 3-mile limit argued by the United States.

## **MID#3223**

A Norwegian patrol ship fired shots to scare off Soviet trawlers illegally fishing in Norwegian waters. There was no protest.

## **MID#3224**

Yugoslav patrols seized 22 Italian fishing boats in the Adriatic, six miles off its coast. There is no evidence of a formal protest by Italy. However, this incident and several others led both countries to adopt a treaty in 1958 that details the procedures for seizure and detention of boats illegally fishing in territorial waters.

## **MID#3226**

Communist guerillas raided a Thai training camp for defense volunteers. These were guerillas, not Laotian troops.

## **MID#3228**

MID#3228 is a duplicate of MID#1685, concerning the seizure and escape of a Polish submarine from Talinn, Estonia.

## **MID#3233**

In March 1825, American and British forces landed at Sagua La Grande, Cuba, in pursuit of pirates. Pirates do not constitute a militarized force, and there was no protest from Spain.

## **MID#3234**

In November 1824, Commodore David Porter landed with a party of 200 men in the town of Fajardo (Puerto Rico) which had sheltered pirates, thus insulting American naval officers, and forced an apology. Pirates do not constitute a militarized force, and there was no protest from Spain.

## **MID#3235**

In October 1824, the U.S.S. Porpoise landed bluejackets near Matanzas, Cuba in pursuit of pirates. Pirates do not constitute a militarized force, and there was no protest from Spain.

## **MID#3236**

On April 8th 1823, the United States landed forces in pursuit of pirates near Escondido, Cuba. They also landed near Cayo Blanco on April 16th. On July 11th U.S. forces landed at Siquapa Bay and on July 21st at Cape Cruz. They also landed at Camrioca on October 23rd. Pirates do not constitute a militarized force, and there was no protest from Spain.

## **MID#3237**

In 1822, the United States landed naval forces on the northwest coast of Cuba to suppress piracy. The forces burned a pirate station on the island. Pirates do not constitute a militarized force, and there was no protest from Spain.

## **MID#3238**

“An erratic Scotchman” named Sir Gregor McGregor recruited a force of 50 men in Baltimore, sailed them to Amelia Island off Spanish Florida, and demanded and received the surrender of the Spanish garrison there. These were not official US forces.

## **MID#3255**

MID#3255 is coded using a Chinese source that roughly translates, “A Brief History of the Russian Aggression of China,” written by Fu Summing. The timing of the events described in this dispute—a highest action of attack by Russia, with no militarized response by China—corresponds well with events taking place in Mongolia. China controlled Mongolia, but the Khalkha Mongols declared their independence from the Qing Dynasty of China in 1911. In 1912 Russia sent a small military mission to Yihe Huree (modern day Ulaanbaatar) to train the fledgling Mongolian army. This army attacked Chinese forces beginning on June 1st and forced the surrender of a Chinese garrison at Hovd in Western Mongolia at the end of August. There is no evidence that Russian forces did more than train the Mongolian troops, and, since Mongolia is not an independent system member until 1921, this is not a dispute.

## **MID#3256**

Russian Cossacks attacked and killed 200-400 Chinese Mohammedans in Sinkiang province in November 1916. Negotiations continued into January with no resolution. Russia wanted to use this incident to get China to oust the Germans and join the Allies in World War I, saying Germans had antagonized the Cossacks and instigated the riot. The attacks were not carried out by an official militarized force. They were carried out by Russian nomads (Cossacks) who happen to join the military at various points in history. In this case the Cossacks were acting independently.

## **MID#3266**

There is no militarized incident here. Mao had asked the USSR for military aid, equipment and Soviet personnel. Stalin declined any direct military assistance but sent a dispatch of advisors from the Soviet General Staff. This seemed to be in fear of sparking a war with the U.S., which seemed determined to defend Taiwan. Mao repeatedly asked the Soviet Union for military assistance for the conquest of Taiwan. His vice chairman, Liu Shaoqi, brought the issue to his talks with Stalin from July 1949 through August 1949. On July 11th, Stalin outright rejected the request stating that the assistance could cause a world war. On July 25th, Mao sent a telegram to Liu that urged him to again ask Stalin for military assistance; a topic which Stalin avoided during the talks. On July 27th, he repeated that he did not want to risk war with the United States, and Liu withdrew his request for support and closed the issue.

## **MID#3268**

A Botswana police station took damage during an exchange of fire between South African and Zambian forces in Rhodesia. Botswana was not the target.

## **MID#3270**

Portuguese commandos raided a PAICG [African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde] guerilla base in Senegal. These were not Senegalese troops or representatives, and Senegal did not protest.

## **MID#3271**

Portugal warned the Congo and Zambia that their economies would be damaged if they did not stop terrorists based in their countries from attacking the Benguela Railway. There was no threat to use force. From Keesing's: All traffic from Zambia on the Benguela Railway to Lobito was suspended by the Portuguese authorities on March 20, 1967, because of rebel attacks, but was resumed on April 6. A statement issued jointly by the Portuguese Ministers of Defence, Foreign Affairs, and Overseas Territories on April 8 warned both Zambia and the Congo (Kinshasa) that their economies would be seriously damaged unless they took steps to prevent terrorists allegedly based in their countries from making further attacks on the railway. The statement said that saboteurs in the earlier attacks had come from Zambia and the Congo, "where they have been welcomed and helped," and went on: If these countries do not want to co-operate, or are not interested, or do not possess the means to put an end to terrorist activities, the Portuguese Government declines any responsibility for the situation which may be created, and does not consider that it has the duty to sacrifice itself for the interests of the landlocked countries when these very countries do not protect their own interests."

## **MID#3301**

This case is coded by CoW as a threat to use force against Britain on October 1st, 1903. The end date corresponds with the arbitration deadline announced on October 20th. The CoW source listed for this dispute is Jones, "The American problem in British diplomacy, 1841-1861." However, there is no mention of 20th Century events in the source, as the title would imply.

We believe the original coders wanted to capture the sentiment delivered from United States President Theodore Roosevelt to the three American members of the tribunal arbitrating the Alaska Boundary Dispute (see also MID#:0002). Roosevelt told his representatives (Secretary of War Elihu Root, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, and ex-Senator George Turner) that the United States would move troops into the area if the decision did not go as the United States hoped. The lone British arbiter backed the United States, against the hopes of the two Canadian arbiters, and the decision went with the United States, 4-2. The private conversation was not a threat to the British or then-British holdings. No militarized events had occurred in the area over that issue since the signing of the Hay-Herbert Treaty earlier in January.

## **MID#3320**

The Times of London reported twice in the month of April, 1817, commenting specifically on an article put out by the Brussels Oracle on April 4. The Oracle article concerned Turkey putting itself on the "war establishment," seeking redress for past unfortunate arrangements and highlighted the fact that Russia had not yet completely demobilized its military from the past war, specifically citing bases and Russian troop movement in Poland. Both Times articles denounced these troop movements and reports of war establishment in Turkey as mere rumor, one going so far as to denounce them as an "unprincipled attempt to agitate the feelings of Europe." There is no corroboration that the Ottomans engaged in any show of force in April of 1817.

## **MID#3324**

This case is a British show of force in late January of 1878 against Russia during the Russo-Ottoman War of 1877-8 (MID#0187). The militarized incident concerns the same issue, participants, and actions as MID#0307 and should be dropped as a duplicate case.

## **MID#3342**

This is a mobilization of the civilian guard in Switzerland to protect property near the start of World War I. The “alert” does not involve military personnel and is not directed at any other states.

## **MID#3350**

The British seized a Norwegian trawler for laying mines off the English coast. The action was not protested by Norway.

## **MID#3363**

MID#3363 concerns the German capture of a Somoan leader. The Germans sent four warships to Somoa after the breakup of the Tripartite Washington Conference of 1887, captured Malietoa and carried him off into exile. Somoa is not in the state system in 1887, and the United States’ representative had explicitly stated that its flag did not protect Somoa. There were no warships or American or British troops in the area, and, hence, there was no show of force by the Germans.

## **MID#3376**

In September 1962, Israel and Egypt began accusing the other of having kidnapped a West German rocket expert, Dr. Heinz Krug. Krugs Intra Trading Company supplied Egypt with rocket parts. On July 21st 1962, Egypt’s secret rocket center launched its first rocket. Israel charged that Egypt had kidnapped Krug in order to halt a deal between him and an Israeli firm. Egypt charged that Israel had planned to kidnap all scientists working on rockets, automatic weapons, aircraft, or other such projects.

On November 30th 1962, Israeli Premier David Ben-Gurion warned that Israel could not remain passive in the case that the United Arab Republic intervened in a country closer to Israel like it had in Yemen.

The kidnapping, if confirmed, could possibly be a dispute with West Germany, if West Germany protested. The threat by Ben-Gurion was too vague to constitute a threat to use force.

## **MID#3385**

MID#3385 continues to describe the dispute over the town of Taba in the disputed area of the Sinai. MID#3384 was originally coded as ending on January 21, 1983, less than seven months prior to this dispute. However, we found evidence that Israel admitted to several border incursions,

and Egypt protested border postings in Taba and other areas in June of 1983. With no six-month gap, this should be coded as one long dispute. Therefore, we recommend dropping MID#3385 and extending MID#3384 to July 5, 1985.

### **MID#3402**

In August 1952, Syria's leader, Col. Adib Shishekly, stated that "the Middle East is not large enough for both Arabs and Jews." On August 18th 1952, Israel's Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion denounced the statement and called it a grave violation of the armistice agreements and a threat to peace. Israel asked for the mixed armistice commission to meet immediately. The threats to Israel were thought to have possibly just been for Syrian audiences, but Israel reacted because they "could not afford to be complacent."

There is no sign of a show of force, and the language in the statement does not constitute a threat.

### **MID#3429**

This is the same dispute as MID#3405, which was a series of clashes and seizures between Israel and Egypt and Syria. There seems to be no justification for the earlier start date in this case (July 1954 versus October 1955 in MID#3405). This case should be dropped.

### **MID#3505**

MID#3505 is coded as a 184-day declaration of war by Bulgaria against Hungary in 1941. This makes no sense as Hungary and Bulgaria would soon be allied later in the same year. Instead, the date (April 24, 1941) corresponds with a Bulgarian decision to declare war in those areas of Greece and Serbia occupied by Bulgarian troops. Since Greece and Serbia were knocked out of the state system by German occupation, there is no dispute here.

### **MID#3517**

MID#3517 is a double count of MID#1789 which codes a German attack on a Colombian vessel in 1943 and Colombia's entry into WWII. This case is actually counted three times in the dataset (see also, MID#3886). Both MID#3517 and MID#3886 should be dropped.

### **MID#3524**

MID#3524 is a double-count of MID#3877, in which Mexican ships are attacked by German submarines and Mexico declares war on Germany, Italy, and Japan.

### **MID#3553**

Swiss recruits accidentally crossed the border into Liechtenstein during an exercise. Switzerland apologized to Liechtenstein, who accepted the apology.

## **MID#3571**

This was not a dispute between Sri Lanka and India. It was a seven-day offensive by Sri Lanka against Tamil Tiger rebels within Sri Lanka. India had had peacekeepers in the area from 1987 to 1990, and the Tamils used the peacekeeping force as motive for their assassination of Indian Prime Minister Gandhi in June of 1992. There was no attack of India by Sri Lankan forces.

## **MID#3609**

This was the seizure of a Spanish vessel and crew. Spain had originally blamed Morocco, but the Polisario Front claimed responsibility and held the crew of 15 fisherman. There are not two state actors in this incident.

## **MID#3613**

MID#3613 describes a purported show of force by 2,500 troops conducting a joint US-Omani military exercise in Oman. Yemen is coded as the target of the exercise because it complained about the “dangerous actions” of the United States one day after the exercise ended. However, the American government had actually tried to keep the exercises and cooperation with Oman secret and would only confirm the exercises in private. The Omani government wanted to avoid criticism from other Arab countries.

## **MID#3640**

Guinean exiles and mercenaries launched a failed invasion from Portuguese Guinea into neighboring Guinea. Portugal denied any involvement though Guinean protests argued that a Portuguese general had given instructions to the mercenaries. Even if this was the case, the forces were irregulars.

## **MID#3646**

This case concerns the Russian ultimatum given to the Chinese in March of 1911, which is actually MID#3647. The dates of this case are earlier to note the tension between the two countries and the increasing belligerence of Russia. The case codes a border fortification by Russia that lasts for almost one year. The original source for the case is in Chinese, and a translation suggests that there was no separate militarized incidents besides the threat by Russia in MID#3647. Searches of other sources confirmed this, and this case should be dropped.

## **MID#3655**

This is a conflict between rival Chinese warlords in the Battle of Urumqi (1933). Sheng Shicai, the warlord in Xinjiang, appealed to the Soviets for aid in the fight. Chiang Kai-shek, the head of the Chinese state, considered sending official Chinese forces to the area, but backed off the idea when he heard the Soviets were involved. The Soviets were invited into the conflict between rival warlords, fighting for the Chinese governor, and the Chinese state did not protest. Unless there is

evidence of protest from Chiang Kai-shek, which there is not, this becomes a first incident coding rule issue (JBS, p. 169). With no protest, there is no militarized incident.

### **MID#3710**

A German U-Boat stopped an American ship en route from Bordeaux to Ireland. The German commander had thought it was a Greek ship he had ordered to turn back the previous day, and he allowed the American ship to proceed when he realized his mistake. The incident lasted less than 24 hours and was never protested.

### **MID#3711**

MID#3711 is a one-day dispute in which Rumania declared war on the United States in support of Germany. However, the originally coded date was off by one year (1940 instead of the correct year of 1941). With the correct date, both states are involved in the World War II conflict (MID#0258). Per JBS (1996: 170): “5) Military interactions between two states are not coded as separate militarized incidents if they are at war. A state at war may, however, be involved in one or more incidents of military confrontation with a state that is not involved in that war.”

### **MID#3712**

The US froze Hungarian assets in March of 1941 since Hungary was dominated by Germany. Hungary protested and said that it would “see to it that Hungarian interests were taken care of.” This is hardly a threat to use force.

### **MID#3803**

A Soviet patrol accidentally crossed the Turkish border and surrendered when they realized their mistake. Both countries withdrew troops from the border to avoid further incidents. This is not a militarized incident by Russia and was not interpreted as such by Turkey. Consult JBS qualifications #3, #4 (p. 169-170) News reports do suggest increased troops and military preparedness by both states, but these reports are not enough to constitute coding a show of force incident for either side.

### **MID#3821**

This case duplicates MID#3542.

### **MID#3824**

CoW has MID#3824 as a single-incident, unreciprocated seizure in 1940 between the United Kingdom and Portugal. Our review shows that a British patrol stopped a Portuguese steamer to remove an Italian consul during World War II. Italy protested this seizure of a government official while Portugal, a nominal ally of the United Kingdom and neutral during the war, did not protest the momentary detention of the vessel. Italy was the target of the seizure and not Portugal. Since Italy was already at war with Britain, this incident is part of World War II, MID#0258.

## **MID#3828**

Turkey broke diplomatic relations with Germany on this date, and sources confirmed that there was no Bulgarian reaction to the move. Sofia had actually been establishing closer relations with Russia as well as distancing themselves from Germany. There is no evidence of a clash between Turkey and Bulgaria on this date.

## **MID#3829**

MID#3829 is a double count of MID#3719, the German seizure of Finnish vessels in 1939 and 1940.

## **MID#3830**

On December 10th 1939, the Soviets rebuked Germany for supplying Finland with arms against the Soviets and allowing them to fly over, land, and refuel on German territory. This was a diplomatic dispute and not a military one. On December 14th, the USSR and Germany signed two treaties in response to reports of a rift between the two states.

## **MID#3831**

Mexico asked the Allies on December 20th 1939 to allow the shipment of German manufactured goods to Mexico. Germany and Mexico had contracted oil for manufactured goods at the outbreak of the war. Mexico asked Germany for the goods to repay the debt of the oil and Germany stated that the goods were ready but could not make it to Mexico because of the blockade. Mexico told the allies that the goods had already been paid for prior to the war, and to allow the passage of the ships. There was also an incident on December 19th 1939 in which a German freighter on a voyage from Mexico to Germany was fired upon by a British cruiser. The freighter fled to Fort Lauderdale, Florida. Since Germany and Britain were already at war, this militarized incident is part of the larger MID/war.

## **MID#3833**

British warships forced a German battleship into a Uruguayan port after a running battle. There was no indication that the British violated Uruguayan waters, and Uruguay issued no protest. Without a protest in this situation, there is no militarized incident between Britain and Uruguay.

## **MID#3837**

A British source said (“authoritatively”) that an Italian submarine sank a Spanish ship, which might serve British interests if it meant altering the bargaining going on between the Axis and Franco regarding Spanish admission into World War II on behalf of the Axis. However, Rohwer (1997, 127) argues that the Monte Moncayo was probably sunk by a mine in the Mediterranean as there were no Allied or Italian submarines in the vicinity.

## **MID#3858**

This case is a policy dispute pitting Bulgaria against Germany and Rumania. Germany received large amounts of food and oil from the Balkans, so Hitler attempted to keep peace in the region. He variously tried to check Italy's aggressive policy there, satisfy Hungarian and Bulgarian claims to Romanian territory peacefully, and to avoid Great Britain's intervention in Greece (Center of Military History, 1986, 1). Bulgaria wanted to avoid conflict too. The Bulgarian leader, Tsar Boris, declared neutrality in September 1939, and he declined Soviet and Balkan requests for alliance in late 1939 and early 1940. However, Bulgaria also had unfulfilled territorial ambitions. With pressure from Germany, Bulgaria and Romania signed the Craiova Agreement on 7 September 1940, which granted all of Southern Dobruja to Bulgaria and led to a population exchange between Northern and Southern Dobruja. The Bulgarians were ecstatic.

However, in October Rumania accepted 20000 German troops, prompting worry in Bulgaria that it was next. The Germans took over Rumanian sea assets; constructed large airports in Rumania; sent Rumanians for pilot training in Germany; and, most importantly, seized Rumanian oil fields. In mid-October Germany turned the pressure on Bulgaria to align with the Nazi regime. Germany pressured Bulgaria to mobilize 300,000 to 400,000 men "as a gesture against Turkey and Greece" ("Denial in Moscow"). Bulgaria resisted that pressure, but it did implement several Nazi-friendly policies: a new economic agreement with Berlin that fixed the currency exchange rate, anti-Semitic policies, and dissolution of the social clubs Bulgarian politicians often joined. Turkey worried that Germany would occupy Bulgaria.

On 23 October Turkey announced its intention to invade Bulgaria if Bulgaria permitted a Nazi occupation. On 6 November the media reported that Bulgaria had aligned with Germany and Italy in exchange for territory. Bulgaria signed the Tripartite Pact on 1 March 1941. There was no show of force by Germany and no border fortification by Bulgaria against Germany. A new dispute was created for the Turkish threat to Bulgaria, however.

## **MID#3859**

Turkey warned Bulgaria not to join Italy against Greece. Russia was being wooed by the Axis powers not to stand with Turkey. Russia told Germany in early November 1940 that it had offered Bulgaria a guarantee similar to that of Germany. There was no threat to use force against Bulgaria by the Soviets.

## **MID#3866**

A submarine sank a Brazilian freighter. Survivors suspected that it was Italian (based on the stature and "swarthisness" of four of its crew, but there was no proof and the sub had no markings). Reports of the incident phrase the attack as "possibly by an Italian submarine." Brazil launched an inquiry but did not protest.

## **MID#3870**

Hungary placed special Iron Guard controllers in charge of units along its border with Rumania in January of 1941. While border fortification is not routine, and the action was government-

authorized, this action was not necessarily an explicit threat toward Romania. Romania was neutral and Hungary was an Axis state. It is possible that the fortification actions were general in nature, and more likely in response to moves beginning in the Eastern front of the war.

### **MID#3874**

MID#3874 describes one incident—the sinking of a Portuguese ship by a German Uboat in October of 1941—of the larger dispute described by MID#0421. MID#3874 is a double count and should be dropped.

### **MID#3879**

The Cuban Navy Department received a report that a ship was torpedoed off the Cuban coast. However, they were unable to find any supporting confirmation or even identify the ship by the name given. The NYT dismissed the authenticity of the original report.

### **MID#3880**

MID#3880 is a declaration of war by Cuba against Germany. This declaration is already part of MID#3519.

### **MID#3886**

MID#3886 is a double count of MID#1789 which codes a German attack on a Colombian vessel in 1943 and Colombia's entry into WWII. This case is actually counted three times in the dataset (see also, MID#3517). Both MID#3517 and MID#3886 should be dropped.

### **MID#3903**

The US warned Iran that it bore some responsibility for the fate of American hostages in Lebanon in 1989. There was not a specific threat of military action, and Iran did not respond.

### **MID#3918**

A Sri Lankan soldier accidentally fired upon 20-30 Indian “peacekeepers” who were invited into the country. At least two Sri Lankan and two Indian soldiers were killed in the attack. Because the firing was accidental, and Indian soldiers were invited into the country, this incident is not a dispute. From the LA Times:

“A soldier in Sri Lanka mistook Indian peacekeeping troops for rebels and opened fire, sparking a gun battle that left at least two Sri Lankan soldiers and two Indian soldiers dead and wounded at least five others, an Indian government spokesman said Saturday. The clash, which occurred early Friday, was the first of its kind since Indian troops were sent to Sri Lanka nearly two years ago, but the spokesman called the incident a mistake and said both countries consider the matter closed. The Sri Lankan soldier fired on an Indian patrol of between 20 and 30 soldiers passing a remote jungle

camp, setting off a brief fire fight, said the spokesman, who requested anonymity. The shooting occurred near Vavuniya, about 140 miles northeast of the capital. The exchange of fire between the two sides “lasted for a short while. It was stopped when the mistake was realized,” the New Delhi spokesman said. “It was decided to treat the matter as closed and not to publicize it.”

## **MID#3950**

On January 31st 1990, the Cuban boat, *The Herman*, registered in Panama refused to allow boarding from the American ship, *The Chincoteagu*, in the Gulf of Mexico just outside of Mexican territorial waters. The American ship was trying to board to check for suspect drugs. Panama okayed the use of ‘disabling fire’ to stop the ship. Cuba had told the ship not to allow boarding. After following the Cuban vessel for twenty hours, the American ship fired on and damaged the vessel. *The Herman* made it to Mexican waters without injuries. Mexican authorities checked the ship, and there were no drugs. The boat was a Panamanian registered craft, and Panama gave permission to disable. This is a drop.

## **MID#3951**

A French warship fired shots to halt a North Korean freighter, the *Sam Il Po*, as part of the trade embargo against Iraq. The ship was eventually boarded and its cargo verified before being allowed to proceed. There was no protest from North Korea, and the incident lasted less than 24 hours.

## **MID#3975**

On September 23rd, 1991, approximately 3,000 Zairian paratroopers mutinied near the Kinshala’s international airport and soon began to loot inside the capital; the troops had not been paid some time. Troops loyal to the regime forced the looters out of the city, but civilians continued the looting as it spread south to Kolwezi and Lubumbashi. The looters attacked the homes of some foreigners (French, Belgian, and Portuguese especially), which led many to take refuge in their embassies or in the Intercontinental Hotel.

On September 25th, with President Mobutu Sese Seko’s permission, 450 French paratroopers entered Zaire and seized the Kinshala airport while 500 Belgian troops moved to Kolwezi and Lubumbashi. The rioting in Kinshala ended by the 28th, although unrest continued in provincial towns. Four days later Mobutu agreed to form a coalition government for the first time but then quickly sacked his prime minister, Etienne Tshisekedi, an opposition member who had joined the government the previous month. Tshisekedi attempted to occupy the office but troops blocked his way. The next day Mobutu’s special militia confronted crowds that had gathered to support Tshisekedi and smashed Tshisekedi’s vehicle.

Belgium announced it would protect foreigners and Zairians if they were attacked. Mobutu asked the opposition to nominate a replacement for Tshisekedi, but they instead renominated Tshisekedi. Mobutu responded by appointing Bernardin Mungul-Diaka to the post. Opposition members protested Mobutu outside the Belgian embassy and met with the French ambassador. Fighting erupted between opposition groups in Lubumbashi on October 24th and quickly spread. France and Belgium announced plans to withdraw their troops as soon as possible, but Mobutu demanded

they leave the country immediately. Belgium completed final evacuations on November 5th, and requested Organization of African Union peacekeepers about two weeks later. However, the OAU declined.

## **MID#4017**

This dispute describes a conflict between Italy and Slovenia. Italian officials sent troops to its border with Slovenia. The Italian government claimed that troops were assembled because of Serbian threats to retaliate against nations involved in a NATO operation in Bosnia, as well as to prevent weapons from being transported from the former Yugoslavia into Italy. This dispute did not escalate past the fortification of the Italian border and was not directed against Slovenia. The border fortifications also seem directed at intervention rather than a display of force against Serbia.

## **MID#4023**

The MID narrative for this dispute describes the incident:

“This dispute consists of one incident in which China placed its forces on alert in response to its concern that Taiwan was beginning to increase moves toward independence. China placed its air, naval, and land forces on alert. This dispute consists of one incident in which China placed its forces on alert in response to its concern that Taiwan was beginning to increase moves toward independence. China placed its air, naval, and land forces on alert.”

However, neither the CoW listed sources, nor any other newspaper sources, describe an alert in January 1993. Relations were tense, and China’s desire to enforce reunification high, but China was still solidly taking the policy of not striking until Taiwan acted first. Taiwan also arranged to purchase 150 American F-16 Fighting Falcons and 60 French Mirage 2000-5 fighter planes, but this was not explicitly directed at China.

## **MID#4025**

According to the Deutsche Presse-Agentur:

“Taiwan admitted Wednesday that one of its coastal police vessels intruded in Japanese waters on January 8 while pursuing a smuggling vessel. The National Police Administration made the statement in response to the Japanese Maritime Police Agency’s accusation that a Taiwanese police vessel invaded Japanese territorial waters and fled after taking photos of five Japanese fishing boats. ‘The coastal police vessel was chasing the smuggling vessel in Taiwan waters, then crossed into Japanese waters,’ the statement said, promising to further investigate the incident.”

There was no Japanese protest of this incident which would be required in this case of an accidental crossing.

## **MID#4026**

From UPI:

“A Taiwanese lawmaker who was sailing toward a disputed islet in the East China Sea Friday was turned back by Japanese patrol ships, prompting calls in Taipei for a military solution to the dispute. Taipei County Council member Chin Chieh-shou and his 18-member party were sailing to one of the Diayu islands just 200 kilometers northeast of Taiwan and 300 kilometers southwest of Okinawa when they were stopped by three Japanese patrol boats, state television reported. After unfurling Taiwan’s national flag and burning the flag of the Japanese navy, Chin’s group aboard the Yi Long No. 6 fishing boat was forced to return to Taiwan. The incident was the latest in a string of failed attempts by Taiwanese civilians to destroy a lighthouse built by the right-wing Japan Youth Federation on the main islet of Diayu, or Senkaku.”

The lawmaker was acting as a private citizen and did not represent Taiwan in the incident. This is not a militarized dispute.

## **MID#4032**

This case began with riots over shops and markets not wanting to accept soldier’s wages paid in new banknotes. When the violence erupted on January 28, troops were sent immediately on January 29 and 30 to evaluate foreign citizens who were in danger as violence grew. There were deaths in the dispute, but an official death count of citizens or troops were never confirmed. This dispute was in the capital of the Republic of Congo, Kinshasa and Zaire. The Republic of Congo allowed a limited number of French and Belgian troops in to evacuate their citizens. Belgium stated that it 500 paratroopers on standby to help an evacuation, but this was not a threat to use force against the DRC. Even if a clear threat was ever made, it would not be against the DRC but, rather, against the rioting soldiers.

## **MID#4153**

This case describes the detention of a Nicaraguan boat by the Salvadoran navy. The lone source for this possible seizure in Xinhua:

“the bodies of two Nicaraguan naval servicemen who had disappeared in the Pacific Ocean on March 7 were spotted Friday, one week after the shipwreck, military sources said today. The other four bodies, already located in the sea, are expected to be recovered today. The six crew members of the Nicaraguan navy’s rapid boat no. 004 disappeared when they were ordered to assist a Nicaraguan boat. The Nicaraguan boat was detained by the Salvadoran naval force in the Gulf of Fonseca shared by Nicaragua, Honduras, and El Salvador. Naval investigations indicated that the incident was caused by boat engine problems and high waves.”

According to the story, any detention would have had to occur in February, not March. Further, there is no indication that the detention lasted more than 24 hours. That and the lack of additional evidence documenting a seizure recommends that this case be dropped.

## **MID#4163**

MID#4163 is a double count of MID#4116. Both involve Togo’s claims of guerilla activity along its border with Ghana in 1994 and Togo’s subsequent closure of the border.

## MID#4178

The CoW narrative provides this description: "This dispute consists of one incident in which Chinese border forces shot a Mongolian national that crossed the border into China. Mongolia protested the incident."

It is based on one BBC report, which cannot now be found. No other news sources are available for this incident.

Subsequent research by CoW found the following:

"MID#4178 is coded as an attack by China against Mongolia, October 10 to October 13, 1999. Source document in Mandarin confirms that Chinese soldiers shot at Mongolians on Chinese land crossing into Mongolia." ([link](#))

There are problems with this interpretation. The Mongolians were not official forces—they were alcohol runners—and were shot on Chinese soil. It cannot be a Chinese attack if the forces were on Chinese soil. Border violations only involve official forces, too.

## MID#4264

An Australian peacekeeping force was sent to East Timor by the UN and was immediately harassed, and Australian warships and jets were placed on alert. On September 13th 1999, Indonesia said that they would not allow Australian forces to have a role in the peacekeeping operations in East Timor. On September 22nd, President Habibie of Indonesia gave a speech to Parliament expressing that it was necessary to allow foreign troops into East Timor. He added that the government had no choice, but also that Australia had 'overreacted and had breached the terms of a defense agreement.' Indonesia and Australia were working together, albeit reluctantly on the part of Indonesia, on peacekeeping operations in East Timor. This is not a militarized dispute. It is a diplomatic dispute, if anything.

## MID#4265

On July 28th 2001, New Zealand peacekeepers exchanged gunfire with suspected militiamen in West Timor. An Indonesian soldier was shot four times in West Timor, 65 feet from the border with East Timor. The soldier had fired, was carrying a weapon, and was in civilian clothing not uniform. The peacekeepers returned the fire and the soldier was killed. The soldier did not represent the Indonesian government. New Zealand was not attacking Indonesia or its representative.

## MID#4270

This MID is the boarding of two Iraqi ships, a tanker and a tug boat, which were suspected of trying to violated the UN imposed embargo and smuggle oil from the country by the United States Navy in the Persian Gulf. The Iraqi boats refused to be boarded and navy commandos and Marines took the boats by force. No shots were fired, although one crew member was hit by a rifle butt as he resisted the boarding party and three other Iraqis were temporarily handcuffed when they put up a fight. After it was determined that the boats were not operating in violation of any UN

sanctions because the tanker was carrying water, not oil, they were released. The incident did not last more than the required 24 hours.

## **MID#4274**

MID#4274 and MID#4215 code two troop alerts by Kuwait in response to Iraqi moves in 1999. The alerts are ten days apart (in January) and concern the same border issue. These incidents should be aggregated. We recommend dropping MID#4274 and extending the end date of MID#4215 to January 21, 1999.

## **MID#4311**

The Tanzanian military was strengthening its presence along the border but to control the refugee situation in Burundi. There was also no protest from Burundi's government. In fact, the Burundian defense minister commended Tanzania's actions along the border. This is not a dispute between the two countries.

## **MID#4327**

This dispute is a double count of MID#4259. The participants, issues, and location of conflict all overlap, and even the incident data uses much of the same set of incidents to aggregate into a dispute. MID#4327 should be dropped.

## **MID#4344**

"Russia sent a group of eight ships through the Dardanelles beginning on April 3rd, 1999. Russia asked Turkey for permission to pass as required by existing conventions. Turkey granted the request. The group of ships was headed to the Adriatic as nominal support for Slobodan Milosevic, a move the United States considered "unhelpful." This is not a show of force against Turkey nor could we find any other militarized incidents between the two proximate to this incident. We recommend dropping this MID from the data set.

## **MID#4413**

A show of force against civilian fishing vessels is not a militarized incident. The CoW narrative reads: "On 08/06/2002 a Croatian coast guard vessel escorts Slovenian fishing vessels, accompanied by a Slovenian police boat, out of what Croatia claims was its territorial waters. Slovenia protested the incident and claims that the Croatian vessel was actually in Slovenian waters. In the time preceding the incident, each side had claimed its territorial waters had been frequently violated by foreign fishing vessels. The two sides came to an agreement on the demarcation of maritime borders in July 2001, but the settlement was not ratified by Croatian parliament. On 8/23/2002, the Croatian foreign minister agreed to meet with his/her Slovene counterpart to reduce the tension over maritime borders."

## **MID#4415**

A show of force against civilian aircraft is not a militarized incident. From the CoW narrative: “On 11/08/2002, two Turkish fighter jets harass Greek civilian aircrafts in the air corridor connecting Cyprus to Greece. The Greek government protested the incident, which came preceding a peace plan on Cyprus that had been submitted to the UN. Given the location and timing of this dispute relative to the issuance of the peace plan, this action was coded as being part of the dispute over Cyprus and not the dispute over competing maritime claims in the Aegean.”

## **MID#4421**

CoW codes MID#4421 as an Uzbek attack on Tajik civilians, implying that a protest from Tajikistan would create a militarized incident. However, the civilians had crossed the border and were in Uzbek territory when attacked. No militarized incident occurred. This was a domestic matter at that point.