
Report on Recommendations to Merge Existing MIDs*

Douglas M. Gibler¹, Steven V. Miller², and Erin K. Little³

¹*Institute for Social Science Research, University of Alabama*

²*Department of Political Science, Clemson University*

³*Department of Political Science, University of Alabama*

Abstract

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

Version 2.0—July 2017

*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**—May 2014
- **Version 1.1**—December 2014: Added MID#3857 from the drop report.
- **Version 1.2**—June 2015: Added MID#2085.
- **Version 2.0**—July 2017: Added MID#0322, MID#0410, MID#2216, MID#2643, MID#2836, MID#3215, MID#3346, and MID#3656. Removed MID#1379.

MID#0251

MID#0251 describes an incident on April 9, 1965, in which American and Chinese jet fighters clashed near Hainan Island, China. One American fighter crashed after accidentally being hit by a missile from another American plane.

Fighter clashes continued between the two countries but were coded as a separate dispute for some reason: MID#2929 starts with the shooting down, on October 5, 1965, of an American plane by Chinese fighters. The participants are the same, the issues are the same, and the location is consistently near the Vietnamese border. These disputes should be merged. We recommend keeping MID#2929 because it contains other incidents as well; its beginning date should be changed to April 9, 1965.

MID#0266

MID#0266 should be merged with MID#1706. Both concern a series of border incidents between France and Tunisia following the latter's independence and French refusal to abandon its base at Bizerte. The issues in all incidents are the same, involving the same participants, and fought in the same general location. CoW source listings confirm this.

MID#0322

This dispute has the same actors and completely overlaps MID#0069. The dispute start date coincides with the occupation of the Dominican Republic by the United States, and the highest action lists an occupation. However, this occupation was not a separate issue but was part of the “regime” issue of instability in the Dominican Republic, covered by MID#0069. This dispute should be merged with MID#0069 and dropped.

MID#0410

On September 23rd, 1938, the Soviet government warned Poland that if it annexed part of Czechoslovakia, the Russians would abrogate the Soviet-Polish Non-Aggression Treaty. This came two days after Polish demands on Czechoslovakia. The Poles were threatening to take Tesin, effectively joining the German land-grab of the country. The Soviets announced on the 24th that they had placed thirty divisions on the Western frontier and that the aviation and tank forces were in “full readiness.” Poland ultimately yielded but still gained the railway junction city at Bohumin; this delighted the Germans because it softened international condemnation of their moves at Munich. On November 26th, 1938, the Poland and the Soviets renewed the non-aggression pact that the Soviets had threatened to abrogate several months before.

This was originally treated as two disputes—Soviets versus Poland (MID#0410) and Poland versus Czechoslovakia (MID#1244)—but the issue and location are the same. Further, the Soviets did consult with the Czechoslovak government during the dispute. These two cases are one militarized interstate dispute.

MID#1008

Based on JBS coding guidelines and the occurrence of border incidents between Jordan and Israel, it appears that this MID should be combined with MID#1006 that ends on August 4, 1955. The end of MID#1006 appears to be a ceasefire agreement, not a formalized end to hostilities (NY Times, Love 8/5/55). The article reports that Jordan was technically still at war with Israel, and that a liaison pact had been established to help communication along the border and prevent clashes along the truce line. MID#1008 is coded to begin on October 17, 1955, but this is less than three months after the August 5th date. Even if a cease-fire was not established in MID#1006, Israeli-Jordanian border incidents occurred on 6/23/55 and in mid-September 1955.

This dispute involves a string of hostile border incidents between Israeli and Jordanian forces, and it also involves diplomatic protests to the Mixed Armistice Commission regarding sabotage activities from both sides on civilians living near the Israel-Jordan border. On October 17, 1955, a small border incident was reported in which an Israeli patrol was fired on from Jordanian positions. Jordan and Israel reportedly negotiated a settlement of their complaints related to this issue, but in November, Israel issued a strong warning to Jordan over incidents in which Israeli homes were dynamited by Jordanian infiltrators. Israel said Jordan would face severe repercussions if these attacks continued. More severe border clashes began to be reported in March 1956, with one on March 13, 1956 lasting six hours between Israeli and Jordanian forces.

Other fatal clashes and incursions were reported with frequency in April and into August. In September 1956, Israel staged a raid on a Jordanian border post and killed 19. Other reprisal raids in October led to 66 deaths, and on October 12, Britain warned Israel that it would honor its defense pact with Jordan if raids continued. On October 26, 1956, Israel announced that it did not want war with Jordan, but that it would do whatever was necessary to defend itself if attacked. Israel reported border raids from the Jordanian side in mid-November, but news reports indicate that the Israeli government believed these to be staged by Egypt in an attempt to get Israel to attack Jordan (essentially they believed it was a passive-aggressive attempt by Egypt to get back at Jordan for not lending more support during British invasion).

MID#1020

MID#1020 should be merged with MID#1019. Both disputes concern exchanges of fire on the Israeli-Jordanian border near Jerusalem from August 1963 to September 1965. The last incident in MID#1019 on 29 October, in which two Israelis were injured after shots by Jordanian forces across the border, occurs less than three months before the the start of MID#1020. No ceasefire, withdrawal, or agreement exists in these three months to justify separating these disputes. Since these disputes are united by participants, issue, and location, we recommend merging MID#1020 with MID#1019 and dropping MID#1020. CoW source listings confirm this assessment.

MID#1134

MID#2112 concerns a series of militarized incidents between Iran and Iraq over the Shatt-al-Arab waterway. An agreed withdrawal from the disputed territory on 21 May 1974 originally separated these disputes. However, MID#1134 begins less than three months after the withdrawal, with clashes occurring in the first two weeks of August 1974. Therefore, we recommend folding MID#1134 into MID#2112 and dropping MID#1134. CoW's source listings confirm this assessment.

MID#1204

On June 11, 1907, a Nicaraguan warship attacked and captured the Salvadorian port of Acajutla. Martin contends that it was a few months after this that Honduras joined in the dispute on the side of Nicaragua. It was then announced on September 24, that Guatemala would support an uprising in Honduras, and the ouster of puppet President Davila, effectively taking sides with El Salvador. This is actually an extension of MID#1202. The same issues and participants are involved (with Guatemala joining in September of 1907), and there is only a two-month gap between the disputes, with no formal agreement ending the first dispute. This MID#1204 should be dropped and MID#1202 should be extended.

MID#1211

Bolivia and Paraguay signed a ceasefire on 12 June 1935. The peace talks were scheduled to begin in August, with both countries ready to compromise. However, cross-border recriminations began in earnest during this month, culminating in Bolivia threatening to stop demobilization if it didn't get its way at the peace

conference and Paraguay responding by threatening to militarily help two Bolivian-controlled territories secede. [Note that the original coding of MIDs had MID#1027 and MID#1211 as separate disputes because there was thought to be a three-month period of inactivity following the June 12th cease-fire, with the new dispute beginning three days after the 3-month rule came into effect. However, Bolivia's threat to use force and especially Paraguay's open threat to use military force against Bolivian territory, both in August, extend the original dispute (MID#1027) and force the deletion of the separate incident (MID#1211).]

The peace talks included agreements for a prisoner release and both countries demobilizing their militaries to a population of 5,000 each. Paraguay held 17,000 Bolivian POWs to the 2,500 Paraguayans held by Bolivia. Paraguay announced that it would release a certain number of prisoners as a quid pro quo with Bolivia and then release the rest once the peace agreement had been signed by Bolivia. Also, Paraguay refused to put the issue of a claim of ownership by Bolivia of a port on the River Paraguay on the table during the talks. Outraged, Bolivia threatened to suspend its demobilization efforts unless Paraguay released the Bolivian POWs immediately. Paraguay refused and in response actually mobilized its 18-21 year olds on September 15, 1935. [This was originally the start of MID#1211.]

On October 5, Bolivian officers were returned by Paraguay, and October 7, 1935, the neutral military mission returned from the Chaco to announce that both countries militaries had been successfully demilitarized down to 5,000 each. [The original coding had an end date of October -9, 1935.]

MID#1216

We recommend merging MID#1216 with MID#1213 and dropping MID#1216. CoW's source listings confirm this assessment. Both disputes concern allied United States and South Vietnamese attacks and incursions into Cambodian territory during the backdrop of the Vietnam War. Originally, these disputes, as well as MID#1217, were separated by 6-month counts. MID#1216 also added the participants of China and Thailand. However, both China and Thailand should be dropped as participants from the incidents in MID#1216. China's coded threat to use force was too vague to be considered a militarized action. People's Daily made a more aggressive statement: "the Chinese people will firmly support the Cambodian people to utterly defeat the U.S. aggressors." The actual Chinese government's statement read, "The Chinese Government and people resolutely support this solemn stand [of the Royal Government of Cambodia against the United States]." There is no evidence that Thailand was working with the U.S. and South Vietnam at this time, though Cambodia accused the U.S. of provoking Thai incursions. Incidents between Thailand and Cambodia are actually part of MID#1229.

MID#1213 ends on 24 October 1964 with Cambodia alleging and attack by U.S. and South Vietnamese forces on Anlong Kres. On 25 December 1964, Cambodia protested a South Vietnamese attack (including the participation of one American soldier) on Sctaum. On 9 August 1965, Cambodia issued a clear threat to use force in response to vague threats by South Vietnam. MID#1216, as originally coded, lasts from 12/26/1965 to 2/18/1966. On 1 May 1966, the U.S. pursued and attacked Viet Cong forces in Cambodia territory. Cambodia protested. On 20 September 1966, Cambodia accused the U.S. of another attack on Cambodian territory. MID#1217 begins on 1 February 1967 when Cambodia alleged an attack by 100 U.S. and South Vietnamese troops. These incidents connect disputes MID#1213, MID#1216, and MID#1217.

MID#1217

We recommend merging MID#1217 with MID#1213 and dropping MID#1217. CoW's source listings confirm this assessment. Both disputes concern allied United States and South Vietnamese attacks and incursions into Cambodian territory during the backdrop of the Vietnam War. Originally, these disputes, as well as MID#1216, were separated by 6-month counts. MID#1217 also added South Korea as a participant. However, South Korea should be dropped from the incidents in MID#1217. There is no evidence the South Korea carried out an attack against Cambodia in February 1967, much less in an allied action with the U.S.

and South Vietnam.

MID#1213 ends on 24 October 1964 with Cambodia alleging and attack by U.S. and South Vietnamese forces on Anlong Kres. On 25 December 1964, Cambodia protested a South Vietnamese attack (including the participation of one American soldier) on Setaum. On 9 August 1965, Cambodia issued a clear threat to use force in response to vague threats by South Vietnam. MID#1216, as originally coded, lasts from 12/26/1965 to 2/18/1966. On 1 May 1966, the U.S. pursued and attacked Viet Cong forces in Cambodia territory. Cambodia protested. On 20 September 1966, Cambodia accused the U.S. of another attack on Cambodian territory. MID#1217 begins on 1 February 1967 when Cambodia alleged an attack by 100 U.S. and South Vietnamese troops. These incidents connect disputes MID#1213, MID#1216, and MID#1217.

MID#1315

There are three disputes between India and Pakistan in 1964 and 1965 that need to be combined into one larger dispute. The issues are the same (Kashmir), the actors are the same (India and Pakistan), no formal agreements were respected for enough time to warrant different disputes, and continuous militarized incidents occurred, obviating the need for a six-month rule delimiter of dispute ending. This narrative keeps MID#1312 since it is most likely the Second Kashmiri War, and the two other MIDs (MID#1315 and MID#1316) should be dropped. Note that MID#1317 overlaps temporally, with the same actors, but the dispute concerns the Indian/East Pakistani border and is, therefore, a separate dispute.

In January 1964, Pakistan brought the unsettled Kashmir question before the UN Security Council again. Pakistan wanted to have Kashmiris vote to resolve the issue of state allegiance (as had been put forth by the UN several times), but which India had rejected saying that Kashmir had acceded to Indian control in 1947. Various clashes began on February 21 (MID#1316). Pakistan wanted to mediate the dispute, but India rejected the idea and called for negotiations without third-party intervention. The UN Council called for more Pakistani and Indian talks on the issue in May 1964. Shortly after this announcement, on May 19, 1964, Indian troops reportedly killed four civilians across the Pakistani border. Pakistan appealed this incident before the UN. Top state leaders were scheduled to meet in late May 1964, but these talks were cancelled upon the death of Prime Minister Nehru of India. Indian troops were reported to have killed numerous civilians during June of 1964, and Pakistan officially denounced India on these border violations in late July 1964 (Pakistan Scores India, 7/29/64). Deadly clashes took place from the summer of 1964 through the summer of 1965.

MID#1312 is the Second Kashmir War. On 30 June 1965 India and Pakistan signed a ceasefire in the Rann of Kutch dispute, after which Pakistani President Ayub Khan warned India that another MID would escalate to total war. Indian Prime Minister Shastri encountered some resistance to this agreement in the parliament, with some members calling for a similar warning for Pakistan. Moreover, the ceasefire reminded many Indians, including Cabinet ministers, of their 1962 border conflict with China, which dented Indian prestige (Lamb, 1967, 117-118). On 31 March 1965 Sheik Abdullah, a Kashmiri political leader, met with Chinese Premier Chou Enlai. They discussed the Kashmir question, then Abdullah accepted an invitation to visit China in the future. Indian authorities arrested Abdullah upon his return on 8 May. Riots and non-violent protests broke out in Indian Kashmir. Mujahedin began to cross the ceasefire line from Azad Kashmir. On 19 May Indian and Pakistani troops clashed at the border. Meanwhile, the mujahedin engaged in sabotage and hit-and-run attacks in Indian Kashmir. The leaders of both countries appeared to have little latitude in dealing with the crisis. Pakistanis wanted to support the rebels in Indian Kashmir, especially in light of the progress the mujahedin had seemingly made since 1947, and Shastri already smarted from the lashing he took from the ceasefire agreement for the Rann of Kutch. Then it comes as no surprise that the dispute escalated. On 25 August thousands of Indian troops crossed the ceasefire line to cut the infiltration of mujahedin.

On 4 September the UN passed Resolution 209, which called for a ceasefire, but India declined. Also, the Soviets offered to mediate the dispute, but both disputants declined. On 6 September Indian forces launched

an offensive toward Lahore, and the UN once again called on both parties to cease fire in Resolution 210. On 8 September the US announced it would stop supplying India and Pakistan with military equipment, which burdened Pakistan more because the US was its sole supplier. On 20 September the UN Security Council demanded a ceasefire and a return to pre-war positions (Resolution 211). Pakistan was running out of ammunition, and India agreed when China made a threat over the India-China border dispute. The two sides stopped firing on 23 September, but they did not fully implement the ceasefire (which is listed as MID#1315). Troops from both sides remained in the other's territory and continued to clash. In addition, Pakistan threatened to leave the UN unless the fundamental issue of sovereignty in Kashmir was addressed. In January 1966 Indian Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri and Pakistani President Ayub Khan met at Tashkent for mediation from Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin. On 10 January the participants signed the Declaration of Tashkent. On 22 January 1966 their army chiefs met at New Delhi and agreed to begin a 1000-yard withdrawal.

MID#1315 should merge with MID#1312, Ceasefire Violations. Although India and Pakistan signed a ceasefire on 23 September, "the ceasefire line separating the two armies continued for several months more to be the scene of continual incidents which served to keep alive the tensions which had resulted in the September crisis" (Lamb, 1967, 130; also see Keesings 1965, 21103). Because some of these incidents occurred within thirty days of the ceasefire agreement – which the MID data seem to recognize because MID#1315 begins the same day MID#1312 ends – and the same issue (Kashmir) was at the heart of both, one MID did not end and another begin; rather, the same MID continued.

MID#1316

See drop narrative for MID#1315.

MID#1349

Continuous action and the same issue links a series of seizures and conflicts between Japan and South Korea (MID#1347, MID#1349, MID#2839, MID#2874, MID#2889, MID#2895, MID#2905, and MID#3310). MID#1347 is recoded, and the remaining disputes should be dropped. Note that the following is an abridged list of incidents:

- On January 1, 1958 (MID#1347): South Korea seized Japanese fishing boats through February 12, 1959.
- On February 14, 1959 (MID#2838): South Korea was greatly angered by Japan's plan to repatriate Koreans in Japan to North Korea. The South Korean government hinted that it might intercept the transport ships. No specific threat was made, and there is no evidence that the South Koreans put their military on alert.
- On June 11, 1959 (MID#1349), South Korea warned Japan that it had suspended permits between the two countries due to a Japanese agreement with North Korea.
- On November 15, 1959 (MID#2839), a Japanese fishing boat inside of the disputed waters claimed by South Korea, was fired upon by a South Korean patrol boat.
- On February 12, 1960, a Japanese fishing boat was sunk, and its crew was seized. On March 7th, Japan lodged its second protest, demanded an apology, the return of the captured crew, and compensation for the damage.
- On May 8, 1960 (MID#2874), A South Korean patrol boat fired on two Japanese fishing boats.
- On November 2, 1960, there was a small arms attack on a Japanese boat.

- On August 22, 1961, a 99 ton Japanese fishing boat and its crew of 14 were seized by a South Korean patrol boat in the Japan Sea near the Rhee line. South Korea claims this to be the limit of their territorial waters and Japan does not recognize this line. This was the 7th seizure of this kind since January.
- On October 29, 1961 (MID#3310), a South Korean patrol boat fired on and captured a Japanese fishing boat within Japanese territorial waters. This was reported to have been the twelfth South Korean seizure of a Japanese fishing boat since January.
- On January 15, 1962, a South Korean patrol boat fired on a Japanese patrol boat. The Korea boat chased the Japanese boat for an hour and a half, but there were no casualties.
- On May 13, 1962 (MID#2889), The South Korean Navy seized three Japanese fishing boats for violating territorial waters.
- On October 15, 1962, two South Korean patrol boats seized a Japanese fishing vessel, the Shotoku Maru.
- In January, 1962, several Japanese fishing boats seized by South Korean patrols.
- On June 19, 1963, South Korea released 42 captured Japanese fishermen and five detained vessels. All had recently been seized for trespassing South Korea's fishing demarcation line. South Korea hoped this would normalize relations between the two countries.
- On September 27, 1963 (MID#2895), Japan protested the South Korean seizure of the Japanese fishing boat, Number One Fukuho Maru, and its 34 crew members which occurred that same morning.
- On January 29, 1964 (MID#2905): A South Korean patrol boat attacked and seized a Japanese fishing boat.

MID#1421

MID#1421 should be merged with MID#1423. Both disputes concern militarized incidents along the Ethiopia-Somalia border following British Somaliland's independence and unification with Somalia in June 1960. MID#1423 is an Ethiopian attack on a Somali patrol along the border, and Somalia's subsequent border reinforcements. Less than 6 months later, a series of incidents along the border continued the conflict (originally, MID#1421). As these disputes are connected by participants, issue, and location, we recommend merging MID#1421 with MID#1423 and dropping MID#1421. CoW's source listings confirm this assessment

MID#1467

This MID covers the same issue and has the same disputants as MID#1316. These clashes are part of the longer dispute between Pakistan and India.

MID#1523

MID#1523 is connected to MID#1506 and should be considered an extension of it. The issues are the same—how to deal with the overthrown Ecuadorian president, Juan Jose Flores, and the effects the regime change and Flores had on the region. The actors are the same, with Venezuela, a joiner in MID#1506 with a show of force, remaining a joiner to the overall dispute of Peru versus Colombia and Chile, and the location of the disputes are the same. (Note that the originally coding of MID#1523 also incorrectly labeled the dispute as Peru versus Chile and Colombia. Chile was suspicious of Peru's support of Flores, but Colombia was declaring war on the other two countries and Chile backed Peru.)

MID#1506 should have the following two changes:

- New start date for Peru, Colombia, and Chile is 4/13/1852.
- The end date should correspond with the negotiated settlement (3/16/1853)

MID#1617

MID#1617 should be merged with MID#1360. Both disputes concern Cambodian protests of incursions, clashes, and occupations of Cambodian territory led by North Vietnamese forces. The initiating incident of MID#1617 (a clash on 3/15/1970) occurs less than 6 months from the last incident of MID#1360 on 10/16/1970, with no agreement in between these dates. As these disputes are connection by participants, issue, and location, we recommend merging MID#1617 with MID#1360 and dropping MID#1617. CoW's source listings confirm this assessment.

MID#1624

This dispute occurred on February 14, 1842. The incidents within this dispute are within the six-month window of the prior dispute between Britain and Brazil, which was originally coded as ending on August 29, 1841. All incidents concern attempts by both states to occupy the Pirara region between British Guiana and Brazil.

MID#2004

We recommend connecting MID#2004 with MID#1764. Both are over the same issue of Italian national Ernesto Cerruti's arrest in Colombia. The earlier justification for separating MID#1764 from MID#2004 hinges on a negotiated settlement concluding MID#1764 being separated from the onset of MID#2004 by more than one month. This does not hold upon further review.

MID#1764 ends with an agreement that Colombia would allow Cerruti to board the *Flavio Gioia* (an Italian warship dispatched to the area) and communicate his full story to the Italian commander on the condition that the Italian commander would return Cerruti to mainland Colombia. Colombia, in turn, would further permit Cerruti to wander the streets peacefully while his conspiracy case was ongoing. Cerruti was to not break any additional laws. In short, Italy guaranteed him bail. This was accepted July 8th.

August 5th, Cerruti is arrested again and Italy renews its show of force with the *Flavio Gioia*. The negotiated bail did not end MID#1764. This information was gathered from Paul Bureau's (1896, 23-24) book that was available to us but apparently unknown to CoW. MID#2004 should be connected with MID#1764.

MID#2028

MID#2028 is actually part of MID#2030. MID#2028 codes a Laotian attack on two patrol boats on the Thai side of the Mekong River, as well as the seizure of two patrol guards near the Mekong River. The incidents were a response to a blockade issued by Thailand to protest the new Laotian government, put in place from a coup on August 9, 1960. This is also the issue surrounding MID#2030, which concludes with the announcement that Thailand would end its blockade. Since the same participants were involved in the incidents of both disputes, and both concerned the Thai blockade following Laos' coup, MID#2028 should be dropped.

MID#2073

MID#2073 refers to several Ethiopian air raids on Somalian towns, beginning on 30 January 1984. There was an ongoing dispute between Somalia and Ethiopia over the Ogaden region. The final raid occurred on 25 May 1984. This dispute is really an extension of MID#2072, which was originally coded as ending on August 13, 1983. The six-month rule requires that this dispute be dropped and the termination date of MID#2072 be amended to include these actions.

MID#2084

MID#2084 refers to the Chilean arrest of two Argentine officers on suspicion of actions “against national security” on 25 April 1981. They were released in June 1981. This event occurred only two months after MID#2083 and less than five months prior to MID#2085 over the same disputed border. We see no rationale supporting separate disputes here and suggest merging MID#2084 and MID#2085 with MID#2083 and changing the end date of that dispute to incorporate this case.

MID#2085

MID#2085 details several border violations and arrests between Chile and Argentina. These events occurred less than five months after MID#2084, which connects this dispute to MID#2083 by less than a six-month period over the same disputed border issue. We see no rationale supporting separate disputes here and suggest merging MID#2084 and MID#2085 with MID#2083 and changing the end date of that dispute to incorporate this case.

MID#2094

MID#2094 should be merged with MID#0199 (the Sino-Indian War). The Sino-Indian War is coded as ending with a ceasefire on 21 November 1962, providing also the end date for MID#0199. However, there was no formal agreement, and incidents concerning the same Himalayan border dispute driving the war occurred within 3 months (MID#2094). Since these disputes are connected by participants, location, and issue, and the incidents occurred within three months of the ceasefire, we recommend merging MID#2094 with MID#0199 and dropping MID#2094. CoW’s source listings confirm this assessment.

MID#2114

This dispute should be combined with MID#2115, the Iran-Iraq War. Escalation to war occurred less than six months after this dispute, there was no formal settlement, and the border issues were the same between these two countries. Abdulghani reports that Iran and Iraq returned to cold war relations after the fall of the Shah in Iran. While Iraq initially tried to make friendly diplomatic gestures towards the new regime, relations between the two states quickly deteriorated in the spring of 1979. Abdulghani reports that both governments accused the other of 500-600 territorial violations between February 1979 and September 1980 (p. 200-201), and he notes that “a war of inflammatory words” erupted between both sides shortly after the establishment of the Islamic Republic in Iran. While no reports by the NY Times or London Times were found related to militarized incidents between Iran and Iraq from Feb. 1979 to June 1979, Keesing’s (June 1980) notes that it was widely believed that Iraq was providing substantial arms to Arab rebels inside Iran who were fighting the Revolutionary Guard. Keesing’s goes on to state that this support led to border clashes in early 1980.

Keesing’s (August 1981) also reports that as early as February 1979, Iraq had been voicing discontent with the Algiers Accord signed by both countries in 1975 (defining the countries’ borders along the Shatt al-Arab waterway), and that the country’s dissatisfaction with Iran was aggravated by the latter’s internal upheaval. It seems that Iraq wanted to address the issue immediately, but Iran was concerned more with quelling

domestic unrest and establishing the Islamic Republic. The New York Times reports that in June 1979, Iran charged that Iraq had conducted an air attack on its territory twice that month and warned that it would take necessary measures to prevent other attacks. The NY Times also reports other border clashes beginning in October 1979 and lasting through April 1980. In February 1980, Iraq called for border revisions again, although Hussein maintained that he did not have territorial ambitions inside Iran. He wanted Iranian forces to withdraw from three disputed islands in the Shatt al-Arab waters. In March 1980, diplomatic relations between the two sides were reported to have deteriorated significantly. Abdulghani reports that June-September 1980 saw intensified and more frequent border clashes with heavy artillery and a reported 14 repelled Iranian attacks into Iraqi border towns. He goes on to report that a full-scale war had begun between the two sides on September 22, 1980 (p. 204), and it appears that this escalation to war ends the dispute on this date. The original CoW coding for MID#2115 lists the beginning of the 8-year Iran-Iraq war to begin on August 27, 1980, but most sources indicate that fighting escalated to war in mid-September.

The War (MID#2115) was fought over contested territory, specifically the Shatt al-Arab and Khuzestan bounded by the Khorramshahr-Ahvaz-Susangerd-Messian line. On 22 September 1980 Iraq invaded Iran, and on 23 September Iran bombed Iraqi air bases. The UN offered its first resolution calling for a ceasefire on 28 September 1980 (479). Iraq gained momentum, driving Iran toward the border. Iraq fortified the Iranian city of Khorramshahr, but on 9 June 1982 Iran seized control; Iraq subsequently implemented a unilateral ceasefire and withdrew from 5500 square kilometers of Iranian territory. Iran wanted to see Saddam Hussein gone, so it continued the fight. However, it got bogged down trying to cut Basra off. In 1983 Iran began to use human waves to attack Iraq, and Iraq used mustard gas against Iranian troops. In 1984 ships, including oil tankers, were attacked in the Gulf. In February 1986 Iran captured al-Faw and held it for two years. Iran lost the territory it had gained by the summer. On 20 July Iran and Iraq accepted a ceasefire as demanded by UN Resolution 598. The ceasefire went into effect on 20 August 1988.

MID#2183

MID#2183 should be merged with MID#0136. The issue in both disputes concerns tensions between the United States and Mexico after General Huerta seized power in a coup d'etat in February 1913. Temporarily, MID#0136 overlaps with the end of MID#2183. Therefore, we recommend merging MID#2183 with MID#0136 and dropping MID#2183. CoW's source listings confirm this assessment.

MID#2189

MID#2189 should be merged with MID#2188. Originally, these disputes seem to have been separated by a 6-month count. However, the actual dates connect these disputes by just under 6 months, with MID#2188 ending on 11/20/1962 and MID#2189 beginning on 5/17/1963. As both disputes concern incidents of clashes between the U.S. (and South Korea) and North Korea related to the demilitarized zone following the Korean War, we recommend merging MID#2189 with MID#2188 and dropping MID#2189. CoW's source listings confirm this assessment.

MID#2190

MID#2190 should actually be incorporated into MID#1379, which was originally coded as ending on October 19, 1969. The start of this incident, over the same issue as MID#1379, is March 13, 1970, less than six months later. The United States joins MID#1379 on 11/25/1964.

MID#2210

MID#2210 is an extension of MID#2209 and should be dropped. MID#2210 begins on May 5, 1927), less than two months after the end date of MID#2209 (April 3, 1927). The incidents involve the same

participants (China and Japan), and all incidents concern Japanese involvement in the Shandong province of China following Chinese targeting of Japanese nationals.

MID#2209 should be changed to have an end date of August 30, 1927. Its outcome should be stalemate, and its settlement should be none.

MID#2213

MID#2213 is a bilateral dispute between China and Russia in June of 1935. It is actually an extension of MID#2212, which is coded as ending three days prior to the start of this dispute. We recommend dropping this case because the original coders likely separated the militarized incidents following an agreement to end the dispute that was made on June 9, 1935. MID#2212 is coded as ending June 10th, and MID#2213 is coded as beginning on June 13th. In actuality, the agreement was signed by Chinese authorities on July 6th, which should mark the end of MID#2212. MID#2213 concerns the same participants, issues, and location (control of Manchuria) as MID#2212 and, therefore, should be dropped.

A separate dispute between Japan and China follows in November (MID#0616), after the signing of the agreement to Japan's demands.

MID#2216

MID#2216 should be merged with MID#2215. Both occur less than six months apart in 1958, and both involve Soviet attacks on American military aircraft. In MID#2215 Soviet fighters shot down an American transport plane that flew into Soviet Armenia on June 6th, 1958. The crew survived and was detained by Soviet authorities. The United States denied charges that the violation was intentional, and the crew was released on July 7th. Then, on November 7th (MID#2216), Soviet fighter jets attacked United States reconnaissance planes in two separate incidents, one over the Baltic Sea and the other over the Sea of Japan. The American planes did not return fire.

MID#2243

We argue MID#2243 is actually part of MID#1623 and that MID#1623 was erroneously coded as ending with a negotiated settlement because the MID in the data set that followed it was concluded with negotiation.

MID#2243 is actually part of MID#1623. Joseph Russell, the British proconsul to Panama, was attacked in a crowded city street by a local named Justo Paredes, apparently following a dispute. To defend himself, Mr. Russell unsheathed his concealed sword-cane and began to repel Paredes. He succeeded in his defense but was badly wounded himself. He was taken, under military guard, to a hospital. However, Russell was arrested and imprisoned under a charge of "premeditated assassination" brought forward by Paredes (MID#1623). Since the charge of assassination lacked credibility, the local court instead convicted him of violating an archaic 1761 Spanish conceal-carry statute and sentenced Russell to six years in jail. On August 31 (and again on November 28) Lord Palmerston threatened Colombia, demanding immediate release of Russell, the sacking of all local authorities involved with his trial and imprisonment, an apology and 1000 pound sterling. The Granadians (Colombians) refused and Cartagena was blockaded on January 10, 1837 as a result (it was declared official 10 days later) (MID#2243). On January 4th, 1837, Russell was released after the Granadian Supreme Court referred the case back to the Court of First Instance, which found that the consul could not be tried. The 1000 pounds sterling was also paid. Britain ended its blockade on January 31 and released all ships it had detained in the process.

Justification for separating MID#2243 from MID#1623 hinges on a negotiated settlement in MID#1623. This did not happen. Our review of the British Foreign Office papers allowed for a more comprehensive timeline on this issue than one would gather from using just the one source that CoW says it used.

- 01/20/1836: Russell and Paredes get into that fight, badly injuring both men.
- 01/31/1836: Russell tells Palmerston of his ordeal. Palmerston sends a new consul, Thomas Turner, to Panama while Russell recovers.
- 03/01/1836: Turner arrives in Panama and sees that a Colombian military force had occupied the consulate.
- 03/03/1836: An alcalde (or “mayor” in this context) seizes the consulate outright, seals it up, and removes the British seal. A Panamanian judge upheld it and the regional governor affirmed it as well.
- 05/20/1836: Russell loses his court case on that aforementioned technicality.
- 08/31/1836: Palmerston threatens Colombia.

The dispute continues from there, though this timeline underscores our argument that MID#1623 and MID#2243 are not separate disputes. There was no negotiation to conclude MID#1623.

MID#2340

MID#2340 was originally coded as Nicaraguan troops moving into Costa Rican territory and taking “strategic frontier positions” to prevent the civil war from spilling over into Nicaragua. Costa Rica later reinforced its troops on the border after a Nicaraguan National Guard plane entered Costa Rican airspace (on 5/31). Border events continued over the summer of 1948 as Nicaragua seized (and released) Costa Rican planes and both states fortified their border (in October). The original six-month count that ended on May 31, 1948, should be extended past October. Since MID#2339 was originally coded as beginning on December 11, 1948, when Nicaraguan troops and Nicaraguan-backed insurgents invaded Costa Rica, the two disputes should be merged into one dispute. Therefore, we extended MID#2339’s start date to 4/19/1948 and coded its end date as 2/21/1949, when both states signed the Pact of Amity in Washington, DC.

MID#2362

MID#1109 concerns a series of militarized incidents including Egyptian attacks into Saudi Arabian territory surrounding Najran on the Yemeni-Saudi border. Amid civil unrest in Yemen, Egypt supported the Republican forces in Yemen, while Saudi Arabia supported the Royalists. Originally, these disputes were separated by participants, with MID#2362 only involving Egypt and Saudi Arabia. (MID#1109 also includes Yemen.) However, both disputes concern the same issue, and the incident that coincides with the end date of MID#1109 on 14 May 1967 duplicates the incident for MID#2362. As these dispute are connected by participants, issue, and location, we recommend folding MID#2362 into MID#1109 and dropping MID#2362. CoW’s source listings confirm this assessment. Yemen remains a joiner to MID#1109.

MID#2595

MID#2595 should be merged with MID#2584. Both disputes concern Iraqi attacks on Cypriot shipping vessels during the Tanker War. Originally, these disputes were separated by a 6-month gap. However, an incident on 6 May 1986 in which Iraqi forces attacked the Cypriot tanker, the Superior, connects these disputes by less than 6 months. Therefore, we recommend merging MID#2595 with MID#2584 and dropping MID#2595. CoW’s source listings confirm this assessment.

MID#2617

MID#2617 should be merged with MID#1362, which is coded as ending fourteen days earlier. Both cases concern a rivalry between the minority-led Tutsi government of Burundi and Hutu rebels and refugees,

allegedly acting with the support of the Tanzanian and Rwandan governments. Between 15 March and 22 July 1973, several confirmed reports of clashes between Burundi and Tanzanian troops occurred along the border. In May 1973, according to the Africa Contemporary Record, Burundi also alleged that Rwanda had directly provoked Hutu rebels by amassing troops along the border and was working in concert with Tanzania. However, Rwanda had no additional militarized incidents in the conflict. The dispute ended on 22 July 1973, when Burundi and Tanzania issued a joint communique. Burundi accepted responsibility for an incident on 29 June 1973 and agreed to pay indemnities, while Tanzania withdrew its protest against Rwanda and agreed to re-open its borders. Since these disputes are connected by participants, location, and issue, we recommend merging these two and dropping MID#2617.

MID#2624

MID#2624 should be folded into MID#1229, as the same participants, locations, and issues are driving both disputes. MID#2624 concerns allegations that Cambodia had attacked and seized a fishing boat in Thai territorial waters in the Gulf of Siam. While on the surface this could be considered an isolated incident, Cambodia responded directly to Thailand's allegations with its own accusations that Thai forces had attacked border guards in Siemreap Province. Given the contemporary border dispute between the two states captured in MID#1229, coupled with the Cambodian government's counter-allegations regarding incidents described in MID#1229, the incidents of MID#2624 seem directly related to the ongoing dispute. A review of CoW's listed sources corroborates this assessment.

MID#2628

MID#2628 should be merged with MID#1302. All incidents concern the disputed borders between India and East/West Pakistan. The first set of incidents in MID#1302 concludes with a ceasefire on August 26, 1958, followed by a formal agreement on September 11th that resolved 8 of the 15 disputed territories. Some conditions of the agreement regarded the Bengali region of Assam on the East Pakistani border, though this portion of the dispute was not entirely resolved. Less than 3 months after the ceasefire and subsequent agreement, the Bengali-East Pakistan border became the site of the Pakistani raid into Indian territory on November 10th which begin MID#2628. Subsequent incidents took place in other locations along the disputed border discussed in the September 11th agreement. As these disputes are connected by participants, location, and common territorial issue, and MID#2628 begins less than three months after the ceasefire which ends MID#1302, we recommend merging these disputes.

MID#2643

MID#2643 describes continued fighting over the Siachin Glacier by Pakistani and Indian troops. The dispute was presumably separated from MID#2642 because of the six-month rule of no militarized incidents in the dyad. However, a review of newspaper sources suggest fighting in the Himalayas in September 1984 and additional incidents in January and February of 1985 (extending through October). The incidents for this dispute should be dropped and added to MID#2642.

MID#2709

MID#0343 concerns militarized incidents between the Soviet Union and China during China's Cultural Revolution. Incidents include border fortifications, shows of force, and clashes. MID#2709, from 1/26/1967 - 2/12/1967, also applies to the ongoing issues in MID#343 and occurs within its temporal domain. As these disputes are connected by participants, location, and issue, we recommend folding MID#2709 into MID#0343 and dropping MID#2709. CoW's source listings confirm this assessment.

MID#2766

MID#2766 should be merged with MID#2823. Though MID#2766 concerns more specifically a French threat to use force against Iran, rather than the explicit Iranian attack on French tankers during the Tanker War, the threat clearly followed Iran's attacks on merchant vessels during the Tanker War. The threat comes five months after the last incident of Iranian attacks on French-flagged merchant vessels during the Tanker War, and thus may be considered a response to the same issue. As these disputes are united by participants, issue, and location in the Persian Gulf, we recommend merging MID#2766 with MID#2823 and dropping MID#2766. CoW source listings confirm this assessment.

MID#2797

MID#2797 should be merged with MID#2594. Both disputes concern militarized incidents between Iran and Kuwait regarding Iranian attacks on Kuwaiti oil fleets. Originally, these disputes were separated by a 6-month count. However, the attack on a Kuwaiti oil tanker on 22 October 1986 in MID#2594 occurs less than 6 months before the start of MID#2797. MID#2797 begins on 11 May 1987, with another Iranian attack on Kuwaiti oil tanker, and continues with Iran's militarized responses to Kuwait seeking US and Soviet protections of its oil fleets. Since these disputes are connected by participants, issue, and location, we recommend merging MID#2797 with MID#2594 and dropping MID#2797. CoW's source listings confirm this assessment.

MID#2836

This dispute began as bilateral when a new Greek government took power and had the goal of exacting territorial concessions from the Ottomans. The Ottomans mobilized their forces, and Greece responded with renewed threats of attack. The Great Powers intervened and blockaded Greece, preventing additional actions (MID#0096). CoW originally treated these as separate disputes, but they are linked in terms of issues, location, and original actors.

MID#2839

Continuous action and the same issue links a series of seizures and conflicts between Japan and South Korea (MID#1347, MID#1349, MID#2839, MID#2874, MID#2889, MID#2895, MID#2905, and MID#3310). MID#1347 is recoded, and the remaining disputes should be dropped. See the drop recommendation for MID#1349 for an abridged list of incidents linking each of the MIDs into one, longer dispute.

MID#2844

MID#2844 should be merged with MID#3218. Both disputes concern British violations of Saudi Arabian airspace during the same three-month period. As the same participants, issue, and location are present, we recommend merging MID#2844 with MID#3218 and dropping MID#2844. CoW's source listings confirm this assessment.

MID#2874

Continuous action and the same issue links a series of seizures and conflicts between Japan and South Korea (MID#1347, MID#1349, MID#2839, MID#2874, MID#2889, MID#2895, MID#2905, and MID#3310). MID#1347 is recoded, and the remaining disputes should be dropped. See the drop recommendation for MID#1349 for an abridged list of incidents linking each of the MIDs into one, longer dispute.

MID#2889

Continuous action and the same issue links a series of seizures and conflicts between Japan and South Korea (MID#1347, MID#1349, MID#2839, MID#2874, MID#2889, MID#2895, MID#2905, and MID#3310). MID#1347 is recoded, and the remaining disputes should be dropped. See the drop recommendation for MID#1349 for an abridged list of incidents linking each of the MIDs into one, longer dispute.

MID#2895

Continuous action and the same issue links a series of seizures and conflicts between Japan and South Korea (MID#1347, MID#1349, MID#2839, MID#2874, MID#2889, MID#2895, MID#2905, and MID#3310). MID#1347 is recoded, and the remaining disputes should be dropped. See the drop recommendation for MID#1349 for an abridged list of incidents linking each of the MIDs into one, longer dispute.

MID#2905

Continuous action and the same issue links a series of seizures and conflicts between Japan and South Korea (MID#1347, MID#1349, MID#2839, MID#2874, MID#2889, MID#2895, MID#2905, and MID#3310). MID#1347 is recoded, and the remaining disputes should be dropped. See the drop recommendation for MID#1349 for an abridged list of incidents linking each of the MIDs into one, longer dispute.

MID#2941

MID#2941 overlaps temporally, and both concern clashes and border incursions between the U.S. (and South Korea) and North Korea in the demilitarized zone following the Korean War. Therefore, we recommend merging MID#2941 with MID#1379 and dropping MID#2941. CoW's source listings confirm this assessment.

MID#2943

MID#2943 refers to the detainment of two US ships by Cuba beginning 5 December 1971 near the Bahamas. Castro claimed the captains of these ships were participants in counter-revolutionary activities. The ships were held, but the crew was released 27 December 1971.

This dispute occurs five months after the US seizure of Cuban fishing vessels and represents a response to that dispute (MID#2946). The participants and issues are the same, and the two disputes should be combined. We recommend dropping MID#2943 and extending the end date of MID#2946 to December 27, 1971.

MID#2979

MID#2979 should be merged with MID#2971. Both disputes concern North Korean-alleged airspace violations by U.S. reconnaissance planes and are connected by less than 6 months, with MID#2971 ending on 8/14/1981 and MID#2979 beginning on 1/9/1982. Therefore, we recommend merging MID#2979 with MID#2971 and dropping MID#2979. CoW's source listings confirm this assessment.

MID#2993

MID#2993 is a continuation of MID#0409, both of which describe (maritime) territorial divisions between Japan and the Soviet Union. MID#0409 codes Soviet harassment of Manchurian and Japanese boats on the Amur River that escalated to clashes between the two militaries after the Soviets occupied two islands on the river. After the USSR withdrew its troops, Japan withdrew its own. These incidents were followed

by the Soviets seizing ships at the mouth of the same river. The last seizure in this dispute took place on September 11, 1937.

MID#2993 should be dropped, and MID#0409 should end on September 11, 1937, with an outcome of stalemate.

MID#3124

MID#1333 concerns ongoing incursions and attacks by the Rhodesian (Zimbabwean) government into Botswana amid civil conflict in Rhodesia. Rhodesia alleged that Botswana had housed and supported Rhodesian nationalist forces fighting against white minority rule. MID#3124 is an incident in September 1977, within the temporal domain of MID#1333, in which Rhodesian forces attacked a village in Botswana's Pandamatenga territory on the Rhodesia-Botswana border regarded by Rhodesia as a central infiltration point for nationalist insurgents. As these disputes are connected by participants, issue, and location, we recommend folding MID#3124 into MID#1333 and dropping MID#3124. CoW's source listings confirm this assessment.

MID#3215

MID#3215 is listed as a bilateral dispute between South Africa and Zambia. The dispute occurs entirely within the temporal span of a similar dispute that also includes Rhodesia (MID#1397). Both White-minority-led states were fighting rebels based in Zambia. The common issues, incidents, and timing suggest these two disputes should be merged.

MID#3310

Continuous action and the same issue links a series of seizures and conflicts between Japan and South Korea (MID#1347, MID#1349, MID#2839, MID#2874, MID#2889, MID#2895, MID#2905, and MID#3310). MID#1347 is recoded, and the remaining disputes should be dropped. See the drop recommendation for MID#1349 for an abridged list of incidents linking each of the MID#s into one, longer dispute.

MID#3346

An armistice with Bolshevik Russia was signed on December 15th, 1917. However, final peace negotiations with Russia broke down quickly, and Germany renewed its fighting with a force of 53 divisions that pushed into Russian territory beginning on February 18th, 1918. German forces quickly took territory in the Baltics, Belarus, and Ukraine, with fatalities numbering over 10,000 troops on both sides, and Russia was forced back to negotiations. They signed the second Brest-Litovsk treaty on March 3rd, 1918. Russia gave up the Baltics, Poland, Belarus, and Ukraine. This case should be merged with World War I (MID#0257) since fighting recurred less than three months after the armistice, and all issues and participants are included in that dispute.

MID#3407

MID#3407 is a series of militarized incidents in the month of August 1962 between the two regarding Israel's Kinneret-Negev water diversion project. Overlapping issues and connecting incidents will merge MID#3407, MID#3408, MID#3423 and MID#3424 into MID#3434. Our summary of MID#3434 follows.

MID#3434 (11/1/61 - 4/19/64) documents a series of militarized incidents between Syria and Israel in the aftermath of the war in 1956. There is no 6-month gap in the series from November 1, 1961, until February 13, 1966. However, per Zeev Maoz's analysis of the issues at work during this time period, we argue to form three MIDs regarding each of the principle issues driving these incidents. The first issue, encompassed in MID#3434, concerns Israel's water diversion project (the Kinneret-Negev project), which served not only to draw from scarce water resources, but also to increase the margin of superiority in material capabilities which became apparent after the 1956 war. It begins with the first incident following a regime change in Syria on September 28, 1961, and ends with the last incident prior to the successful conclusion of Israel's Kinneret-Negev project in June 1964.

CoW's Specific Sources documentation supports merging MIDs between Israel and Syria during this time period, as they do not clearly reveal a new issue at work other than what we argue is driving the incidents, and because no 6-month gap exists to justify keeping them separate. Therefore, MID#3407, MID#3408, MID#3423, and MID#3424 should be merged with MID#3434. An abridged incident history for MID#3434 is included below:

MID#3434 is coded as a border violation by Syria and a show of force by Israel on September 27, 1961, one day after the leader of Syria resigned from the UAR and one day before a group of officers took control of the country. There are reports that the Israelis quite purposefully avoided antagonizing Syria at all costs because the UAR split was such a beneficial outcome for them. Further, Syria did not have control over its military, especially to the point of having a border violation over Israeli territory. Thus, the coded actions seem extraordinary events for both sides, and there is no historical evidence that suggests this incident occurred.

The border along the Sea of Galilee was calm for a few months thereafter, but on November 1, 1961, Israel reported that Syrian forces had fired on a tractor plowing on Israel's side of the border. Israeli and Syrian forces exchanged fire in the incident, and Israel also reported the incident to the MAC in protest of the firing. A number of other incidents were reported in March 1962, including an Israeli reprisal raid on Syrian villages that was condemned by the UN Security Council. A cease-fire was brokered on March 17, only to be broken by firing between the two sides on March 18. Shootings between the two sides were also reported on June 15 and June 26. Another clash was reported in August 1962 (MID#3407), after which the Israeli government asked the UN for help with the Syrian aggression. A cease-fire was also brokered after this incident on August 29, but it too was broken on September 11, 1962 when Syrian forces fired on Israeli tractor crews that it claimed were planning aggressive action and had made territorial violations. Israel protested this incident to the MAC. 12/4/62: Fire was exchanged between Israeli and Syrian forces in the demilitarized zone along the southeastern shore of the Sea of Galilee. This began with Israeli tractors moving into the disputed area with the support of armed Israeli police (MID#3423). Syria's government assured Israel that a similar incident would not happen again. 12/16/62: Syria mobilized troops along the Israeli line. 3/15/63: Israel diplomatically protests against alleged Syrian aggression against Israeli fishermen in the Sea of Galilee, as well as harassment of other Israelis; Syria denied this charge and accused Israel of harassing Syrian citizens. 6/9/63: Syria accuses Israel of jet attacks on villages near the Sea of Galilee and lodges a complaint with both the Palestinian Truce Commission and the UN Security Council. 7/13/63: Syria captured a man and two women whose motorboat was blown against the north eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee. 7/15/63: Israel complained to the UN Truce Supervisory Organization about the seizure of six people from a boat on the Sea of Galilee by Syrian authorities; the complaint claimed that Syrian boats had crossed the sea border and abducted the three Israelis and three Belgians from Israeli territory (MID#3424) 8/11/63: Israel expressed concern over 'Syria's aggression' which included incidents of fire along the border, and the refusal to release the captured man and women. 8/19/63: Israeli and Syrian forces clashed both in the air and on land, and both charged the other with aggression. 8/18/63: Syria accused Israel of building up its troops along the Israeli-Syrian border; Syria warned major powers that it would use aggression to counter any Israeli aggression. 8/20/63: Israel and Syria clash in air and land battles despite UN cease-fire attempts. 8/24/63: Israel and Syria agree to a UN cease-fire, but Israel issues a warning three days later that it will take whatever measures it needs to secure its northeastern border along the Sea of Galilee (this warning occurred after Israeli youth were killed in a Syrian ambush). 8/21/63: Israeli and Syrian forces clashed in

both the air and on land. Both sides reported aggression by the other side, there were no reported Syrian casualties but there were said to most likely to have been Israeli deaths. Israel charged that on 8/29/63: the Syrians once again violated the U.N. truce by ring on Israeli farms.

Israeli forces did not return the fire. 9/3/63: the Soviet Union vetoed a resolution condemning Syria for the 'wanton murder' of two Israeli farmers at the Sea of Galilee, which had occurred on August 19th. Late October/early November 1963: Israel holds Syrians hostage to put added pressure on the release of the Israelis held by Syria 11/6/63: there was a clash between Israeli border patrol and three Syrians. Israeli forces shot and killed one Syrian, and the other two escaped. Israel led a complaint for the border violations by Syrian citizens (MID#3408). 11/11/63: Israeli Army reports shooting across the Syrian-Israeli border, in which two Israelis were wounded. 2/10/64: an Israeli plane was red upon by Syrian forces but was not hit. According to Israeli sources, the plane was flying over Israeli territory. 4/17-19/64: six seamen aboard Lebanese vessels were seized by Israeli forces, two were Egyptian and four were Syrian. Israel had been asking both countries for the return of twenty of its citizens, and the capture of the seamen was supposed to add to Israels bargaining power.

MID#3408

MID#3434 (11/1/61 - 4/19/64) documents a series of militarized incidents between Syria and Israel in the aftermath of the war in 1956. CoW's Specific Sources documentation supports merging MIDs between Israel and Syria during this time period, as they do not clearly reveal a new issue at work other than what we argue is driving the incidents, and because no 6-month gap exists to justify keeping them separate. Therefore, MID#3407, MID#3408, MID#3423, and MID#3424 should be merged with MID#3434. See the drop recommendation for MID#3407 for an abridged incident history.

MID#3409

MID#3425 (7/2/64 - 2/13/66) documents a series of militarized incidents between Syria and Israel in the aftermath of the war in 1956. CoW's Specific Sources documentation supports merging MIDs between Israel and Syria during this time period, as they do not clearly reveal a new issue at work other than what we argue is driving the incidents, and because no 6-month gap exists to justify keeping them separate. Therefore, MID#3409, MID#3410, and MID#3435 should be merged with MID#3425. Our summary of MID#3425 follows.

MID#3425 (7/2/64 - 2/13/66) documents a series of militarized incidents between Syria and Israel in the aftermath of the war in 1956. There is no 6-month gap in the series from November 1, 1961 until February 13, 1966. However, per Zeev Maoz's analysis of the issues at work during this time period, we argue to form two MIDs regarding each of the principle issues driving these incidents. The second issue, encompassed in MID#3425, regards a counter-water diversion project Syria instituted, the Headwater Diversion Plan, which was approved by the Arab League in 1964. Understanding the Israel's military capabilities were superior and apparent following the 1956 war and concerned with the implications of this arrangement, Syria attempted to upset the status quo by thwarting Israel's acquisition of another material resource, water, recently ensured with the conclusion of the Kinneret-Negev project. MID# begins with the first incident following the conclusion of the Kinneret-Negev project and ends with the another regime change in Syria to government control by the military junta in February 1966.

CoW's Specific Sources documentation supports merging MIDs between Israel and Syria during this time period, as they do not clearly reveal a new issue at work other than what we argue is driving the incidents, and because no 6-month gap exists to justify keeping them separate. Therefore, MID#3409, MID#3410, and MID#3435 should be merged with MID#3425. An abridged incident history for MID#3425 is included below:

7/2/1964: A clash broke out between Israeli and Syrian forces after Syria attacked a motorized patrol near Ashmora. 8/6/64: Israel accused Syria of carrying out a night raid in Israeli territory. (MID#3425) 11/3/64: Fighting broke out along the Israeli-Syrian border. In one clash, five Israeli soldiers and seven Syrian soldiers were killed. (MID#3409) 11/13/64: Israeli and Syrian forces engaged in a two hour battle that resulted in casualties. It began when Israeli jet fighters attacked Syrian positions along the northeastern frontier. 5/14/65: Israeli and Syrian forces exchanged heavy gun fire for 45 minutes in the Jordan Valley after Syrian positions had opened fire at a motorized Israeli patrol. The patrol reciprocated and added to by Israeli tanks. 9/11/65: Syria called for the creation of a joint Arab liberation army to crush Israel, at a conference of the Arab League states. During this time there was immense tension over water, specifically the diversion of the Jordan River. Israel had proposed to pump water from the Sea of Galilee into the Jordan to irrigate the Nagev desert. (MID#3435) 12/2/65: Syrian posts opened fire on Israeli soldiers that were guarding a tractor in northeast Israel. (MID#3410) 12/16/65: Egypt, Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon approved a plan to divert the water of the Jordan River before it reached Israel. 2/13/66: Israeli and Syrian forces clashed for an hour and a half along the border in the Huleh Valley demilitarized zone. Both sides said the other had started the fighting, and their forces had just returned fire. Israel stated that the Israelis had been given the right to cultivate in that area, and Syrian forces shelled the Israeli tractors. Syria said that the tractors entered a prohibited area and were escorted by tanks, artillery and automatic weapons which began ring at Syrian positions and villages. There were injuries on both sides, but no report of casualties.

MID#3410

MID#3425 (7/2/64 - 2/13/66) documents a series of militarized incidents between Syria and Israel in the aftermath of the war in 1956. CoW's Specific Sources documentation supports merging MIDs between Israel and Syria during this time period, as they do not clearly reveal a new issue at work other than what we argue is driving the incidents, and because no 6-month gap exists to justify keeping them separate. Therefore, MID#3409, MID#3410, and MID#3435 should be merged with MID#3425. Our summary of MID#3425 follows.

MID#3423

MID#3434 (11/1/61 - 4/19/64) documents a series of militarized incidents between Syria and Israel in the aftermath of the war in 1956. CoW's Specific Sources documentation supports merging MIDs between Israel and Syria during this time period, as they do not clearly reveal a new issue at work other than what we argue is driving the incidents, and because no 6-month gap exists to justify keeping them separate. Therefore, MID#3407, MID#3408, MID#3423, and MID#3424 should be merged with MID#3434. See the drop recommendation for MID#3407 for an abridged incident history.

MID#3424

MID#3434 (11/1/61 - 4/19/64) documents a series of militarized incidents between Syria and Israel in the aftermath of the war in 1956. CoW's Specific Sources documentation supports merging MIDs between Israel and Syria during this time period, as they do not clearly reveal a new issue at work other than what we argue is driving the incidents, and because no 6-month gap exists to justify keeping them separate. Therefore, MID#3407, MID#3408, MID#3423, and MID#3424 should be merged with MID#3434. See the drop recommendation for MID#3407 for an abridged incident history.

MID#3431

This dispute is a series of militarized incidents that should be folded into MID#3419. The participants are the same – Israel, Egypt, and Syria, the issues are the same, and the dates are within the longer temporal range of MID#3419.

MID#3435

MID#3434 (11/1/61 - 4/19/64) documents a series of militarized incidents between Syria and Israel in the aftermath of the war in 1956. CoW's Specific Sources documentation supports merging MIDs between Israel and Syria during this time period, as they do not clearly reveal a new issue at work other than what we argue is driving the incidents, and because no 6-month gap exists to justify keeping them separate. Therefore, MID#3407, MID#3408, MID#3423, and MID#3424 should be merged with MID#3434. See the drop recommendation for MID#3407 for an abridged incident history.

MID#3442

MID#3442 should be folded into MID#3444. MID#3444 is coded as the First Lebanon War between Israel, Syria, and Lebanon. Lebanon was not coded as an active participant in the incidents between Israel and Syria in MID#3442, which likely justified the original separation of these disputes. However, the incidents in MID#3442 duplicate incidents ongoing as part of the First Lebanon War, and Lebanon became a joiner to the conflict. Additionally, according to JBS's qualification number 4 for the aggregation of incidents, all incidents between Israel and Syria in MID#3442 should be coded as part of their concurrent wartime involvement in MID#3444. Therefore, we recommend merging these two disputes.

MID#3500

This case (and MID#3501) should be merged with MID#1272. The description for MID#1272 is below:

MID#3500 is a Polish-Lithuanian conflict that occurred shortly after both states became independent in the aftermath of World War I. Poland's new independence led Jozef Pilsudski, then leader of the fledgling republic, to attempt restoration of the former status of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Lithuania, now independent as well, felt any union with Poland as it had previously would be a simple subjugation and loss of cultural autonomy and refused all overtures. Poland opted to restore its pre-partition territories by force. Vilnius was the heart of the conflict. The predominantly Polish city in Lithuania was under siege by Russia's Red Army, who moved west after Germany retreated from the area. Poland, who despised the Russians for their role in Poland's elimination from the interstate system, moved against Russia. Lithuania, for whom Vilnius was a capital, was caught in the middle of this power struggle. Lithuania was forced to withdraw from Vilnius on January 3, 1919 under threat from the Soviets (see: MID#2603). The Lithuanian government relocated to Kaunas. Russian occupation was tenuous and both the Poles and Lithuanians seized the opportunity to expel the Bolsheviks from Vilnius. The Poles got to Vilnius first. Arriving on April 18th, the Poles occupied Vilnius, effecting the call to occupy the city and unify it with Poland that the Sejm passed on April 4th. Pilsudski had complete control of Vilnius by April 21st, prompting the Lithuanians to declare Poland as an invading force that did not cooperate with the government in Kaunas. Worse yet, with the Russians expelled and the Germans maintaining a hands-off approach that did not want to upset Poland, Lithuania had little recourse. Definitely the junior power to Poland at the time, no direct negotiation with Poland would result in a favorable settlement that included a Lithuanian Vilnius. Tensions ran high, even resulting in minor clashes early in May (beginning of MID#3500).

Poland and Lithuania attempted negotiation of their predicament from May into June, materializing in no agreement. As a result, Poland began occupying other territories in Lithuania on June 6th, which prompted Lithuania to agree to a line of demarcation on June 18th, 1919. Lithuania was trying to limit Poland to what it had already acquired. This line was short-lived. It did not satisfy the territorial ambitions of either side. Poland had violated the line of demarcation by July 12th. Ferdinand Foch on July 26th proposed a new line that was more favorable to the Poles. It assigned Suwalki and Sejny to Polish domain. The Lithuanians agreed to the line, but maintained an occupying force in Sejny. An uprising from the predominantly Polish population followed in August, resulting in Poland's eventual occupation of the territory by September 7, 1919.

Polish cell in Lithuania had unsuccessfully attempted a coup in Kaunas, aiming to overthrow the existing government in favor of one that would support a union with Poland. This coup was discovered in late August, 1919. A purge of Polish activists residing in Kaunas (and in the military) followed when the Lithuanian government discovered the plot. The Lithuanian government eventually got their hands on the full list of conspirators on September 22nd and executed a purge.

Both Lithuania and Poland were beset with domestic turmoil at the end of 1919, but skirmishes over this very issue (formalizing borders between them) still appeared to occur. Lescius (2004, 280-284 [in Lithuanian]) notes that Polish raids on Gelvonys, Ukmerge, and Vepriai, followed through September and October 1919. The Poles seized Salakas on October 5th and attacked Kapciamietis on October 12th. Small-scale shows of force against Lithuania continued into early 1920, including attacks on Kalkuni (Latvian side of Lithuanian/Latvian border) and Turmantas in March 1920. No real change of position resulted. However, these latest developments, and Lithuania's growing domestic problems, allowed the Poles to focus their efforts against the Soviets. This led to the Kiev offensive in April 1920.

The major change that took place in late 1919 and early 1920 was the relationship between Lithuania (and the other Baltic states) and Soviet Russia. The coup attempt, combined with the Western powers delayed recognition of Lithuania, led Lithuania to see a new opportunity to cooperate with the Soviets. The Soviets, whose greatest regional threat was Poland, was more than happy to start normalizing relations with a meek Lithuanian state. Discussions between Lithuania and Russia were slow going but ultimately led to a breakthrough on July 12th, 1920. The Lithuanians signed a peace treaty with Russia and, three days later on July 15th, the Russians offered to return Vilnius to Lithuania in exchange for Lithuania's cooperation with the Red Army. Duplicitous of the Soviets or not, Lithuania accepted this offer and provided free passage of troops through Lithuanian territory in order to fight the Polish army.

While the Russians pushed back the Poles and crossed the border into Poland proper, Lithuania occupied towns that were vacated by retreating Polish forces. The Lithuanians joined present Soviet forces in reoccupying Vilnius, the heart of the dispute between Lithuania and Poland on July 18th, 1920. This turning point was ephemeral. The Battle of Warsaw, aka "The Miracle at the Vistula" of August 20th, 1920, abruptly changed the dynamic in Eastern Europe. The Soviets suddenly found themselves in a full scale retreat, providing no assurances to Lithuania of protection by the Soviets. Poland used the turn of events at first to negotiate with Lithuania regarding their border in order to focus on the Soviets. When this failed, Poland attacked at the end of August, 1920. Fighting between both sides continued. Lithuania still held a favorable position because of the previous Soviet advances. Further, a League of Nations intervention on September 20th, 1920, was thought to ultimately lead to a peace whereby Lithuania kept Vilnius. This did not happen. Poland turned up the heat on Vilnius with attacks on the Niemen River in the Suwalki Region that left Vilnius vulnerable. A surprise attack on Vilnius occurred on October 9th, under the guise of a mutiny led by Polish general Zeligowski. Vilnius was in Polish domain once more, though nominally a new entity called the "Republic of Central Lithuania" that served as a buffer state between Poland and Soviet Russia. This appears to be the end of the conflict. Lithuania protested, obviously, but could not get a sympathetic audience that would restore Vilnius to Lithuania. Poland and Lithuania began negotiations again over the issue of Vilnius, with Poland rejecting any measure that would abolish the new puppet state it had created. The only agreement that followed from this negotiation was an agreement to end hostilities on November 29th, 1920. This also set up a neutral zone that lasted until 1923. Further, the Riga Conference ultimately settled the Polish-Soviet War turnaround in Warsaw in August 1920 in March 1921. Herein, Russia acknowledged the current situation in Vilnius and that Vilnius was essentially under Polish domain. The Republic of Central Lithuania was formally annexed into Poland in 1922. The borders for Poland and Lithuania remained until the beginning stages of World War II.

MID#3501

This case should be merged with MID#1272. The disputes are over the same issue, and evidence of clashes between the two countries bridge the previous 3-month rule following a cease-fire that separated the dispute

into two cases. See the summary for MID#3500 for a full description of these three cases.

MID#3541

MID#3541 should be merged with MID#3071. Both disputes concern militarized actions between Iran and the United States over issues in the Persian Gulf, specifically Iran's threats to block oil resources from passing through the Strait of Hormuz. Originally, these disputes were separated by a 6-month count. However, newspaper reports indicate that in December 1983, Iran was conducting unconventional airspace maneuvers over U.S. naval ships stationed in the Persian Gulf, presumably for reconnaissance in relation to the U.S.'s efforts to prevent Iran from closing the Strait of Hormuz. Connected by this show of force, we recommend merging MID#3541 with MID#3071 and dropping MID#3541. CoW's source listings confirm this assessment.

MID#3656

MID#3656 is coded as an unreciprocated Soviet attack on China beginning sometime in September 1937. The Soviets were actually working with China at this time, arming them against the Japanese, and the date corresponds with a move by two Soviet gunboats 31 miles into the far northeast Manchukuoan province of Sankiang. The gunboats attacked and captured Manchukuoans and took them into Siberia. This was Japanese controlled territory and, hence, an attack on the Japanese living there. The disputant should be Japan, not China, and as such should be merged with MID#0409 which already describes conflict between the Soviets and Japan during this time period.

MID#3808

This dispute should be combined with MID#0337. British authorities refused to hand over four Chinese accused of assassinating a pro-Japanese customs inspector to the Japanese military. In response, the Japanese army began to blockade French and British concessions in Tientsin on June 14, 1939.

On November 25th 1939, the British went forward with their plans for instituting a blockade to seize German exports. There were protests by six neutral nations, and Japan threatened Britain that it would reciprocate seizures.

The seizure of this dispute is really part of the British blockade that began much earlier. For example, on January 21st 1940, British forces seized twenty-one German seamen off of a Japanese liner, Asama Maru, off of Yokohama; a second seizure (the Tatsuta Maru) occurred two days later. On January 30th Japan lodged a second complaint and stiffened their stance to stressing that the return of the Germans was essential.

On February 6th, Britain agreed to release nine of the twenty-one Germans, but the Japanese refused the offer and wanted all of the German passengers released to Japan.

On February 17th, it was reported that the Japanese government forbid Japanese shipping lines and ferries to carry "nationals of belligerent powers of military age." The German press criticized Tokyo for accepting British demands.

MID#3811

MID#3811 should be combined with MID#3542, the Soviet occupation of Bessarabia. The Soviet occupation began on June 26, 1940, and should be coded as a six-month count. MID#3811 details the Soviet massing of troops on Romania's border as well as a Soviet attack on a Romanian ship. These incidents should be folded into the larger dispute concerning Soviet acquisition of land at Romania's expense.

MID#3832

This case was a separate incident of the seizure of the Tacoma, a German cargo ship, by Uruguay. However, that seizure was part of the incident involving the sinking of the German battleship Graf Spree by Argentine forces, which is MID#3834. This case should be joined with MID#3834.

MID#3857

This case codes one incident—the Bulgarian reinforcement of its frontier with Turkey—that is part of the larger dispute between Germany and Bulgaria against Turkey. It should be merged with MID#3850.

MID#4043

MID#4043 was originally coded as beginning seven months after MID#3554. However, we have evidence of several border incidents in the interim, including a clear border fortification by Serbia in March of 1993. We therefore recommend dropping MID#4043 and extending the end date of MID#3554 to August 14, 1994, since multiple incidents and the same issue connect the two disputes.

MID#4087

MID#4087 should be merged with MID#4022. According to the CoW's narratives and sources, the primary participants in both disputes are North Korea, South Korea, and the US. MID#4022 includes two additional participants involved in naval exercises directed towards North Korea - Canada, Japan, and Australia. Japan was also involved in MID#4087, however these incidents are already accounted for in the participant data for MID#4022. Therefore, the additional participants should be included as joiners to the original dispute (MID#4022). All incidents in both MID#4022 and MID#4087 from November 1993 to September 1999 concern challenges to the 1953 Korean War armistice agreement and challenges to the established borders with North and South Korea. Therefore, we argue that Canada and Australia should remain participants in MID#4022, and since the issues surrounding their participation are the same as in MID#4087, we do not find sufficient support for keeping these disputes separate based on the participants involved. Additionally, since the end of MID#4022 and the beginning of MID#4087 overlap by 6-months, and no other justification exists to keep these disputes separate, we recommend merging MID#4087 with MID#4022 and dropping MID#4087. CoW's source listings confirm this assessment.

MID#4157

MID#4157 is an extension of MID#4156. The disputes involve the same members, concern the same issue, and take place in the same geographic area. We recommend dropping MID#4157 and extending the end date of MID#4156 by three months.

Both these disputes concern the boundaries near the Corentyne River. MID#4156 directly concerns Guyana permitting Toronto-based oil consortium CGX Energy, Inc., to drill in the contested territory. Though CGX withdrew and moved its drilling operations elsewhere, no settlement was reached. Relations between both states were favorable prior to the incident, in spite of the unresolved boundary dispute, until tensions escalated in September, resulting in the incidents of MID#4157 during which Surinamese soldiers violated Guyanese maritime boundaries.

Guyana tried to argue that both countries could benefit from the arrangement with CGX, but Suriname did not want to cede any part of its position over the territory. Since CGX withdrew before MID#4157 took place, the original coders may have believed the issue was terminated. However, the incidents in MID#4157 occurred because the issue from MID#4156 was still ongoing, even if CGX withdrew, due to a lack of settlement and continued tensions over the issue.

It is also possible that the original coders thought a settlement was reached after MID#4156. Some sources mentioned an agreement to meet and form a settlement, but later sources stated that a settlement was never reached.

MID#4233

MID#4233 should be merged with MID#4210. Both disputes concern incidents of Turkish violations of Greek airspace over the Aegean Sea from February 2000 to January 2001. The incident on 31 January 2001 (MID#4233) occurs about three months after the last incident in MID#4210. As these disputes are united by participants, issue, and location, we recommend merging MID#4233 with MID#4210 and dropping MID#4233. CoW source listings confirm this assessment.

MID#4336

The Correlates of War narrative describes MID#4336 with this summary: “This dispute consists of one incident in which a Chinese warship chased a U.S. Navy ship from international waters near the Chinese coast. China regards the waters as its own territory, but the claimed maritime boundary is not recognized internationally. This dispute represents another case in which Chinese forces challenged American surveillance activities along its coast.”

The surveillance activities of the US were challenged less than one month later in MID#4280. CoW describes that dispute as “5 incidents between the US & China that center around American reconnaissance near the Chinese coast. On 4/1/2001 an American spy plane crash-landed on China’s Hainan Island after colliding with a Chinese fighter over international waters. The Chinese pilot was killed in the accidental collision. China, after the crash, seized both the American crew and plane. The United States responded to the crash and seizure by demanding release of the crew and return of the plane. The US also responded by moving 3 destroyers to the waters off China. China scrambled 10 fighters on 4/5/01 when it detected a US spy plane off the China coast. The dispute was resolved on 7/3/01 after the US expressed regret and the plane was returned to the US. The crew was released on 4/11/01.”

The participants are the same in each dispute, and the issue is obviously the surveillance of China by the United States. The close temporal proximity of these incidents—less than eight days apart—only adds to the connectedness argument. We suggest merging these two cases, making MID#4280 contain six incidents, beginning on March 23, 2001.