Interstate War Data, version 1.1
Dan Reiter, Allan C. Stam, and Michael C. Horowitz
Contact: dreiter@emory.edu
November 15, 2016

Interstate War Data (IWD) v1.1 contains five sets of changes over IWD v1.0 (IWD v 1.0 is described in Dan Reiter, Allan C. Stam, and Michael C. Horowitz, "A Revised Look at Interstate Wars, 1816-2007," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 60(5): 956-976). First, it adds some wars and war participants that were omitted in IWD 1.0. These are conflicts involving Correlates of War (COW) member states that qualify for inclusion under IWD and COW coding rules. Note that for IWD 1.0, the mission was more focused on correcting COW errors and collecting information on conflictual dyads within multistate wars than searching for omitted conflicts. For IWD 1.1, we embraced the more ambitious mission of seeking to identify conflicts that COW might have missed. In pursuit of that goal, we consulted a variety of sources, including a preliminary list of wars from Jason Lyall's "Paths to Ruin" project, the list of conflicts in Clodfelter (2008), the list of older Central American conflicts in Chiozza and Goemans (2011), and the conflicts listed in the Uppsala Conflict Data Program project. We stress that we used the above sources to identify possible candidates, and we engaged in independent research to verify whether each conflict qualified for inclusion in IWD. Also note that the addition of one new war participant led to the deletion of two IWD 1.0 wars (this issue is discussed in detail in the sixth part of this memo).

Second, IWD 1.1 provides the first list of conflicts between COW member states that generated between 500 and 1000 battle dead. IWD 1.1 includes a new variable, five_hun, coded 1 if the listed war experienced between 500 and 1000 battle dead, and 0 if it experienced 1000 or more battle dead. Note that COW includes only those conflicts that produced 1000 or more battle dead. Third, IWD 1.1 extends the temporal range forward to the year 2013 (the temporal coverage in IWD 1.0 ended in 2007). Fourth, IWD 1.1 corrects a few minor errors in IWD 1.0. Fifth, IWD 1.1 includes a new variable, COW_v4_id. This variable contains the COW 4.0 WarNum variable. If there is an IWD war that does not correlate with a COW war, then that war gets a COW_v4_id score of -9 (missing).

The remainder of this memo contains seven sections. The first section lists the new wars of 1000 or more battle dead. The second section lists new joiners of IWD 1.0 wars with at least 1000 or more battle dead. The third section lists wars that experienced between 500 and 1000 battle dead. The fourth section lists a few wars that some may view as generating 500 or more battle dead, but do not reach the 500 threshold. That is, it lists a few cases that might arguable deserve inclusion in IWD, and we explain why we did not include them. The list in this section is nowhere close to being comprehensive. The fifth section describes a few minor errors that were discovered and corrected, such as typographical errors. The sixth section explains why two IWD 1.0 wars, the Changkufeng and Nomonhan Wars, are not included in IWD 1.1 (they are subsumed by the addition of Soviet participation in the 1937 Sino-Japanese War). The seventh section strives to improve the documentation in IWD 1.0. Specifically, it returns to all of the factual claims made in the memo for IWD 1.0 that are supported only by Clodfelter (2008), and provides additional documentation of those factual claims.

All sources used for coding decisions are cited. Note that this memo relies on English, Russian, Chinese (Mandarin), Spanish, and French language sources.[1] When using this data set, please cite Dan Reiter, Allan C. Stam, and Michael C. Horowitz, "A Deeper Look at Interstate War Data: Interstate War Data version 1.1," *Research and Politics* (forthcoming).

I. New Wars With 1000 or More Battle Dead

1. 1890 Central American War.

This conflict involves Guatemala and El Salvador.[2] On June 28, 1890, Guatemala declared war on El Salvador, invading on July 16, aiming to overthrow the new Salvadoran leader, Carlos Ezeta (Chiozza and Goemans 2011, 181).[3] A peace treaty was signed on August 18 ("Treaty Signed" 1890). Because the war did not cause Ezeta to fall from power, nor did El Salvador suffer territorial or other losses, we code Guatemala as losing the war.

Information on battle deaths in this war is quite thin. Scheina (2003, vol 1, 257-8) and Bustamante (1951, 85-87) describe the conflict, but neither mentions casualty counts.[4] Newspaper reports provide some casualty estimates. Reports indicated 200-400 killed on July 23, 1890 when fighting broke out ("Latest Intelligence" 1890, 5; "Salvador is Victorious" 1890, 1). Further reports indicated that on July 25, 500 Guatemalans were killed and 150 Salvadorans were killed, near San Miguel, and that on July 26, 60 Salvadorians were killed ("San Salvadorans Victorious" 1890, 1). On August 1, there was more fighting, with one estimate of 500 killed and wounded ("Guatemala and San Salvador," August 6, 1890, 5). Another estimate for the August 1 fighting is 400 killed (*Appletons' Annual Cyclopaedia and Register of Important Events 1890* 1891, 411). Under the conservative assumptions that of the 500 casualties on August 1 100 were killed and that in the July 23 fighting there were only 200 killed, this produces a total killed in action estimate of just over 1000. In short, we assess that there is enough evidence to code this conflict as experiencing at least 1000 battle deaths.

2. Lapland War, 1944-1945.

Finland fought alongside Germany against the Soviet Union from 1941-1944. After Finland signed a peace treaty with the Soviet Union in 1944, Germany and Finland fought a small war, sometimes called the Lapland War. Germany initiated the war by invading the Finnish island of Suursaari on September 15. 1400 German troops landed on the island, of whom 700 were taken

---

[1] Beyond the individual translators named below, for further research assistance thanks to Kathryn Dura, Karen Whisler, Laura Huber, and Andrew Wagstaff.

[2] Honduran participation was limited to permitting the recruitment of mercenaries within Honduras, and to allowing its territory to be used for attacks on Ezeta (*Appletons' Annual Cyclopaedia and Register of Important Events 1890* 1891, 411-412). Because Honduras does not contribute 1000 troops or suffer 100 battle dead, it is not coded as a participant.

[3] From looking at the Chiozza and Goemans (2011, 139-147) lists of Central American wars, this is the only possible IWD candidate, that is, it is the only war from this list involving COW member states in which there were as least 500 battle dead.

[4] Thanks to Miguel Rueda for translation of Bustamante from original Spanish.

prisoner (Ziemke 1959, 296). Soviet forces were fighting German forces on Finnish territory at the time, but this was a continuation of the ongoing German-Soviet war (eg Ziemke 1959, 296; 304). The war ends in Finnish victory when German troops evacuated Finnish territory completely on April 27, 1945. Information on killed in action is limited. Perhaps the best source, citing another Finnish language source, claims that each side suffered 1000 killed or missing in action, aside from wounded (Tuunainen 2012, 172). It seems reasonable to assess that of 2000 killed or missing in action (again, the 2000 figure excludes wounded), at least 1000 were killed.

3. Japan-France, March 1945.

On March 9, 1945, Japanese forces attacked French forces in French Indochina, establishing effective control of all of the main lowland areas of Indochina by March 12 (Smith 1978, 282). On March 13, Japan claimed to have captured some 8,500 French troops, and killed another thousand (Hastings 2008, 431). A 1947 French government study estimated 1,262 French killed, and another 857 missing (Hesse D'Alzon 1985, 250). One World War II encyclopedia estimated 1,700 French killed (Dear and Foot 1995, 418). We code Japan as initiating and winning.[5]

4. China-Taiwan Island Clashes, 1950.

The Chinese Civil War ended in 1949, with the Nationalists fleeing to the island of Formosa. The nation of Taiwan (the Republic of China) enters the COW data set as a member state in 1949. The People's Republic of China (PRC) and Taiwan experience violent conflict in 1950, which we code as an interstate conflict rather than as an extension of the Chinese Civil War because by 1950 China and Taiwan are both COW member states. This approach is similar to the COW/IWD coding of the 1950 North Korean invasion of South Korea as an interstate war rather than an extension of the Korean Civil War, and the 1948 War of Israeli Independence as an interstate war rather than an extension of the pre-independence civil/extra-systemic war between Jewish, British, and Palestinian forces.

The 1950 conflicts center on Chinese invasions of two Taiwanese held islands, Hainan and Wanshan. On March 5, 1950, the PRC launched an amphibious invasion of Hainan. Taiwan withdrew its forces from Hainan in late April (Huang 2003, 253-254). Sources differ on exactly when the withdrawal occurred, with one source (Huang 2003, 253-4) indicating April 22, and another source indicating April 27 (*Foreign Relations of the United States 1950* 1976, 335n). Considerable numbers of troops were involved. Taiwan had 160,000 Nationalist troops stationed on Hainan. On April 16, China launched 400 vessels containing perhaps 17,000 troops to invade Hainan, and following major naval battles 7,000 or so landed on Hainan. Those invading troops were aided by 10,000 or so Communist guerrillas located on Hainan (Marolda 1990, 129-130; Huang 2003, 254). One source reports that in total the PRC landed 100,000 troops on April 17 (Westad 2003, 304-305).

[5] One question is whether the Japan-France war should be coded as beginning earlier, perhaps when France declared war on Japan on June 25, 1944. However, France and Japan experienced no consequential combat until March 9, 1945. There was also limited cooperation between French and Japanese authorities in Indochina prior to the attack (Smith 1978).

As the Hainan campaign was winding down, PRC forces began attacks on the Taiwan-controlled Wanshan Islands. On May 25, PRC naval forces launched a major attack on Taiwanese naval forces and headquarters based at Lajiwei Island, located near Wanshan. Attacks continued until Taiwanese withdrawal from Wanshan in June (Huang 2003, 254-6). We code the war as ending on June 27, the day that Chinese forces invaded Sanmen, the last island in the Wanshan chain held by Taiwan ("Chiang Orders Air Attacks on Red-Held China Stopped" 1950). We code China as initiating and winning.

Casualty data is scarce for these battles, but even accounting for bias and imprecision it seems safe to conclude that there were at least 1,000 killed in action, given the size of forces involved and official reports. In April 1950, Taiwan claimed to have killed 2000-4000 PRC troops in battles on Hainan ("Chinese Claim Full Defeat of Reds on Hainan" 1950). Official Chinese military histories claim Taiwanese dead in the thousands, and PRC dead in the hundreds.[6]

5. China-Vietnam, 1984.

On April 2, 1984, China launched an artillery attack against Vietnamese positions in the mountains near Laoshan (also known as Lao Son). On April 28, China launched a ground attack, seizing three hills. On June 11, Vietnam launched its first counterattack, and the final Vietnamese counteroffensive ended unsuccessfully on July 13 (Li 2007, 259-260; Zhang 2015, 149-156; Taylor 1985, 357-358). China is coded as initiating and winning.[7]

The reliability of battle dead figures is uncertain, as essentially the only source is from the Chinese government. Vietnam has provided no official assessments of battle dead (Zhang 2015, 243n), though at the time of the conflict Hanoi made likely exaggerated claims of putting "out of action" 5,500 Chinese troops (Quinn-Judge 1984). That said, it seems reasonable to conclude that there were at least 1000 killed in action. There were tens of thousands of Chinese troops deployed, and some 40,000 Vietnamese troops (Zhang 2015, 155; O'Dowd 2007, 101). One Chinese source noted that 939 Chinese soldiers were killed in action during the Chinese offensive alone (Li 2007, 260). Given the incentive of a government source to underestimate friendly casualties, that figure may be even higher. Chinese sources estimate at least hundreds of Vietnamese killed, including 220 killed in the capture of the hilltops, and an additional 550 killed in the nearby Zheyinshan area during the same offensive (Zhang 2015, 152-153).

II. New Joiners to IWD Wars

1. Soviet Union Joins 1937 Sino-Japanese War.

[6] For example, one source (Liu 1994, 505-517) claims 5416 Taiwanese dead and 784 PRC dead. Thanks to Alan Shen for translation from original Chinese.

[7] O'Dowd (2007, 100) views the conflict as more of a stalemate, as China "failed to seize Ha Giang and at no point penetrated deeper than about five kilometers into Vietnam. And, once again, the Chinese attacks did not draw off any Vietnamese forces from Cambodia, and they did not force any change in Vietnamese policy toward the Cambodian resistance." Given the very limited information on the motives for the Chinese attacks, we lean to coding the war as a Chinese victory because China captured Vietnamese territory.

Japan initiates war against China in 1937; both COW and IWD v1.0 include this war. Though both of those data sets code this as a bilateral war, the Soviet Union should be coded as joining China in its fight against Japan. The Soviet Union never declared war on Japan, and declined to make public its assistance to China. The Soviets secretly informed China they would not start providing assistance to China until the signature of a China-Soviet non-aggression pact, an event that occurred on August 21, 1939 (Haslam 1992, 92; Garver 1988, 20). There are indications that Soviet assistance began to arrive in September 1937; we date Soviet participation as beginning on September 1, 1937 (Haslam 1992, 93). We date Soviet participation as ending on April 13, 1941, when the Soviet Union and Japan signed a neutrality pact. Soon after the agreement was signed, the Soviets began to redeploy forces from China to European sectors of Soviet territory (Haslam 1992, 162).

Soviet involvement in the China-Japan War qualifies it as a joiner according to IWD (and COW) rules, both because the Soviet Union contributed at least 1000 troops, and because it suffered at least 100 killed in action (note that formal declaration of war is not a criterion for inclusion in either IWD or COW). One source estimates that by January 1939 the Soviet Union had sent 3665 military experts to China, along with massive amounts of military aid, including several hundred aircraft and artillery pieces ("The Letters Exchanged between Chiang Kai-shek, Stalin and Voroshilov During 1937-1939" 1996, 59).[8] By the end of 1937, the Soviet Union had sent 450 pilots to China (Sladkovskii 1977, 128).Though it is not completely clear how many of the thousands of Soviets who were dispatched to China actually saw combat as compared with advising, sources suggest that at least 1000 did see combat, qualifying the Soviet Union as a joiner. Hsü (2000, 600; see also Young 1963, 125 and Bowden 1966, 54) claims that the Soviet Union provided 2,000 pilots and 500 other military advisers. One source suggested that between 1938 and 1942 5000 Soviets saw combat in China (Chudodeev 1974, 8; see also Shmatov 2016, 120). Further, Deborin (1974, 74; see also Levine 1983, 11) writes that more than 200 Soviet "volunteers" died in combat.[9] One 1957 Soviet historian claimed that more than 100 Soviet pilots were killed in combat (quoted in Bowden 1966, 54).

2. South Africa joins Italy-UK War in 1940. Italy declared war on Britain on June 10, 1940, and South African forces started attacking Italian forces in Africa on June 11. South African forces fought against Italian forces up through and including the 1943 Allied invasion of Italy (Keene 1995, 51, chapter 9).[10]

3. South Africa joins UK-France War in 1942. South Africa qualifies as a joiner because it contributed more than 1000 troops. For example, some 4206 South African troops sailed for Madagascar in June 1942 as part of the South African Brigade Group. We code South African participation as beginning on May 31, 1942, when South African planes attacked French targets in Madagascar (Keene 1995, 100-102). The South Africa-France war ends on November 11, 1942.

[8] Thanks to Alan Shen for translation from the original Chinese.
[9] The original Chudodeev, Shmatov, Sladkovskii, and Deborin sources are in Russian. Thanks to Ekaterina Koposova for translation to English.
[10] In IWD 1.0, the UK-France 1942 row of data accurately lists South Africa as an ally of the UK, given South African troop contributions to the Madagascar campaign in which British forces fought French forces. However, IWD 1.0 did not list a separate South Africa-France joiner dyad. IWD 1.1 lists such a dyad.

4. US Joins UK-France War in 1942.

IWD 1.0 codes the UK and (Vichy) France as fighting a war from July 3, 1940 up through November 11, 1942, with the UK winning. IWD 1.1 codes the US as joining that war on November 8, 1942, when American forces landed in Oran, Morocco, commencing Operation Torch. American forces fought Vichy French forces when they landed. American battle deaths by November 11 easily surpassed the 100 minimum COW and IWD coding rules require for a state to qualify as a war participant. Nearly 200 were killed when the American vessel *Walney* was sunk by French guns on November 8, for example (see Atkinson 2002, especially 76-77). We code the US as joining on November 8, and the US as experiencing victory on November 11.

5. Canada joins UK-France War in 1942. Canada agreed to send 17 corvettes to assist the November 8, 1942 Operation Torch landing in French-occupied North Africa (two of which were lost) (Stacey 1970, 321-323). Because each corvette has a crew of about 85, this qualifies Canada as a joiner to the UK-France War, because it is contributing at least 1000 troops.

III. Conflicts With 500-1000 Battle Dead

1. Italy-Albania, 1939

Italy invaded Albania on April 7, 1939. COW codes Albania as exiting the COW interstate system on April 7. However, there is evidence that even on that first day of combat, there were between 500 and 1000 battle dead. Fischer (1999, 22) estimates 200 Italian dead in April 7 fighting at Durrës, and perhaps as many as 700 Italian dead overall. He also estimates that Albanian casualties may have been even higher. Italian propaganda claimed 25 Italian KIA and 160 Albanian KIA at Durrës, though the Italians may have sought to give a low estimate of Italian casualties, as they quickly carried away Italian dead, and washed away blood on the streets of Durrës. Locals estimated 400 Italian KIA at Durrës (Pearson 2004, 445). We code Italy as initiating and winning.

2. Tunisia-France, 1961.

French troops controlled the military base at Bizerte, located inside Tunisian territory. Tunisia wanted France to withdraw from the base, and France refused. Tunisian troops and civilians began to besiege the base. Each side claimed the other initiated. Most likely, Tunisian forces probably initiated force by attacking French aircraft attempting to land at Bizerte, starting on July 19 ("Tunisia" 1962, 432). The conflict culminated with France remaining at the base, though in 1963 France withdrew from the base by agreement with Tunisia ("France to Quit Base at Bizerte by Oct. 15" 1963). Fighting ended with a UN-brokered ceasefire, on July 23 (Borowiec 1961). At the time, the Tunisian government estimated 1,300 Tunisian soldiers and civilians killed (Brady 1961). Chneguir (2004, 81) estimates 670 Tunisians killed in action

(KIA) and 13 French KIA. Renaud (2004) estimated 25 French KIA and approximately 555 Tunisian KIA.[11] We code Tunisia as initiating and France as winning.

3. Malaysia, 1963-1966.

Indonesia did not recognize the new state of Malaysia, formed from former British colonial possessions and emerging as independent in 1963. Indonesia initiated force against Malaysia, using mostly guerrilla tactics, beginning with an attack on a police station on April 12, 1963 ("Attack of Borneo Rebels Erupts Within Sarawak" 1963). Britain is coded as a joiner, intervening on behalf of Malaysia with as many as 30,000 troops (Tuck 2004, 93). Indonesia's attempt to subvert Malaysia ultimately failed, and Britain and Indonesia are coded as winning. The conflict ends on August 11, 1966, when Indonesia and Malaysia sign a peace treaty ("Indonesia, Malaysia Sign Pact to End 3-Year Undeclared War" 1966). Battle dead estimates are 114 British and Commonwealth (including Malaysians) dead, and 590 Indonesian dead (Tuck 2004, 95-96).

4. Falklands War, 1982.

As described in the August 2016 *Journal of Conflict Resolution* article, the Falklands War experienced battle dead in the low 900s.

5. Kargil War, 1999.

As described in the August 2016 *Journal of Conflict Resolution* article (see above for citation), the Kargil War experienced battle dead in the low 900s. The Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) Battle-related Deaths Dataset version 5.0 essentially concurs, estimating battle dead at 866.[12]

IV. Conflicts Below 500 Battle Dead

IWD 1.1 excludes interstate conflicts that experience less than 500 battle dead. We list below a few violent interstate conflicts that did not experience at least 500 battle dead, according to the best available evidence. Note that IWD 1.0 also identified some conflicts that did not reach 500 battle dead that had been included in COW 4.0. We stress that the below list is a very incomplete list of interstate conflicts of less than 500 dead.

1. Czech-Polish War, 1919

[11] The estimates of French losses come from pp. 193-194. The estimate of Tunisian losses is the aggregate of discussion of Tunisian losses for several clashes discussed across the course of the book. Thanks to [redacted] for translation from the original French.

[12] UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset v.5-2016, Uppsala Conflict Data Program, www.ucdp.uu.se, Uppsala University.

In January 1919, Czechoslovakia attacked Poland over the territorial possession of Teschen. One report dated January 29, 1919, claimed that, "The rumors regarding the number killed run as high as 300 on the Polish side (British and French soldiers confirm this report). There were two Czecho-Slovak officers and a French captain killed, and also 18 Czecho-Slovak soldiers" (*FRUS* 1919, vol 12, 325). Note the armistice did not take hold until February 4. One historical work estimated 200 dead on both sides, inclusive of both soldiers and civilians (Buttin 2006, 65). Another work, citing a Czech language historical article, estimates 150 dead and over 1000 wounded (Hannan 1996, 45).

2. Japan-France, 1940

On September 22, 1940, Japanese forces attacked Vichy French forces in French Indochina (note that at this time France is a COW member state). Japanese forces achieved clear military victory by September 25, but by October 5 through diplomacy Japan agreed to withdraw its forces and return captured troops (Dreifort 1982, 294; Hammer 1954, 22-23). Estimates vary on battle dead estimates. World War II encyclopedias tend to present a number of 800 French killed as the Japanese seized two towns (Dear and Foot 1995, 417; Sandler 2001, 203), a number perhaps coming from an undocumented estimate provided by Bernard Fall in a 1961 book (Fall 1961, 23-24). However, other, better sources place the number lower. Citing French diplomatic traffic, Hesse D'Alzon (1985, 79) estimates 40 French dead. Dommen (2001, 51) also records 40 French and Indochinese dead at Dong Dang and Lang Son. Macri (2012, 228), citing American and British diplomatic traffic, estimates about 30 French dead, though this estimate may be from the attack on one fort, at Dong Dang. Jennings (2001, 139) cites a 1941 French source in his estimate of 150 French dead in the province of Lang Son. It is difficult to imagine Japanese killed in action greatly exceeding French killed in action because of local Japanese military superiority. Drea (2009, 212) describes French forces at the time in Indochina as "too weak to resist militarily," and Japanese success in the course of combat (see also Hata 1980). In short, the best available evidence suggests less than 500 battle dead.

4. Mongolia-Germany, 1941.

Glantz and House (1995, 83) make reference to the 44th Mongolian Cavalry Division fighting German forces alongside Soviet forces in November 1941, and being annihilated. However, information on this division is extremely scant, and the adjective "Mongolian" may refer to forces drawn from the eastern portion of the Soviet Union rather than to Mongolian nationals. Mongolia did not declare war on Germany, nor did it send troops or volunteers (Rupen 1982, 176). Voadens (2007, 275) suggests that the only Mongolian national who fought against Germany during World War II was a single fighter pilot.

5. Peru-Ecuador, 1941

In the 1941 clashes between Peru and Ecuador, Wood (1978, 107) estimates a total of 550 wounded and killed, with 20-25% of that number being battle dead.[13] That said, there is some variance on casualty estimates. Wood (1978, 107n) notes: "Again, figures differ greatly, as do

[13] Note that this is lower than earlier casualty estimate Woods (1966, 323) made, of 80-100 Peruvians killed and Ecuadoran deaths "as high as 500-600."

categories. Mariátegui y Cisneros, 1968, dedicates his book to 9 Peruvian officers and 155 men who died in the 1941 conflict; Delgado, 1944, I, p. 175, gives 148 Peruvian dead and 235 wounded, while Ecuadoran 'losses' came to a total of 1,600—dead, wounded, and disappeared. The United States naval attaché in Lima stated that the Surgeon General of the Peruvian Army told him that 'Peru had lost eighty officers and men (killed) and that Ecuador had lost over three hundred.' Intelligence Report, October 10, 1941, Lima. DS. 722.2315/2608."[14] Zook (1964, 186) also recognizes uncertainty about numbers killed: "While figures vary, a reasonably accurate estimate would place Ecuadorian losses at about 150 killed and wounded and Peruvian totals at less than 400." Zook refers to a variety of Spanish language sources. Masterson (1991, 86n) estimates 400 Ecuadorian killed and wounded, and 107 Peruvian army, air force, and civil guard killed. His estimate of Peruvian dead comes from a list of 107 names of those killed. In short, the best guess would be that battle dead numbered in the hundreds, but probably did not reach 500.

6. Iran 1941.

The UK and USSR intervened in Iran in August 1941. No reliable, comprehensive counts exist of battle dead. Probably the best modern account (Stewart 1988) does not provide a comprehensive count, but does describe individual episodes of combat that produce battle dead. Unfortunately, several times that source provides soft estimates, such as "several" killed. Aggregating all of these combat events together produces an estimate of perhaps a few hundred battle dead, but there is not quite enough evidence to merit a confident coding of more than 500 killed.

7. Sino-Soviet War, 1969

In 1969, there were two clashes between China and the Soviet Union, on March 2 and March 15. Some sources have estimated as many as 800 battle dead. These estimates may have come from official statements from the Chinese and Soviet governments made around the time of the conflict. For example, regarding the March 2 fighting, Robinson (2003, 198) estimates "several score dead and wounded." For March 15, Robinson (2003, 198) estimates nearly a thousand "killed or wounded" on both sides. Of the March 15 battle, Burr (2001, 81) estimates 800 Chinese dead and 60 Soviet dead. The Robinson and Burr estimates appear to originate with estimates provided in Robinson (1972) of 60 Russian dead and 800 Chinese dead, which in turn come from official Soviet and Chinese government statements made at the time. Interestingly, Robinson (1972, 1190n) conceded that the Soviet and Chinese estimates may include wounded and killed.

More contemporary research done by scholars using a variety of Chinese and Russian sources has arrived at much lower battle dead estimates. For example, one source using Soviet archival documents estimates 58 Soviet soldiers killed (Ryabushkin 2012, 161). There is a memorial in China listing the names of 20 Chinese soldiers killed in the March 2 clash. The Chinese government has officially stated that 12 Chinese were killed in the March 15 battle (Ryabushkin 2012, 164). Gobarev (1999, 44) on the basis of interviews with Soviet military officers who participated in the fighting, states that the Soviets suffered 31 dead in the March 2 fighting.

[14] The sources Wood refers to are in the references section at the end of this memo.

Arguably the most thorough attempt to catalogue Soviet casualties in all conflicts across the 20th century estimates a total of 62 Soviet dead (Krivosheev 1997, 284). Perhaps the definitive Chinese language source, probably using official Chinese government sources beyond statements made at the time of the fighting, estimates 30 Chinese dead (including one missing), and 250 Soviets killed or wounded (Yan 1994,7-8).[15] Fravel (2008, 201-202) estimates a total of 30 Chinese killed, and 91 Soviet killed.

One source estimates higher battle dead numbers. In 1970, a Chinese defector reported that there were three mass graves from the battle each of which contained hundreds of corpses (Ryabushkin 2012, 164), which, if correct, safely puts the Chinese dead at greater than 500. We judge that based on this variety of different kinds of evidence, the best choice is to classify the conflict as experiencing less than 500 battle dead. The Chinese defector report of hundreds of Chinese dead seems unlikely given the small scale and low intensity of the battle. All agree that perhaps 1000 Chinese troops fought. Assuming that Soviet killed in action (KIA) were in the several dozens, there would have had to have been at least 400 or so Chinese KIA in order to get to the 500 minimum threshold, a number that would have indicated a 40% KIA rate on the Chinese side, an extraordinarily high and improbable fatality rate given the relatively limited nature of the clashes (Wang 2007, 379, n12-13). By comparison, the fatality rate at Omaha Beach on the 1944 D-Day landing was only 8.8%, and Omaha experienced by far the highest fatality rate among the five D-Day beaches (Zaloga 2013, 13).

8. Yemen War, 1979

Casualty data for the 1979 conflict between North and South Yemen are extremely scarce. In early March 1979, North Yemen claimed that 3,000 people (presumably, only on the North Yemen side) had been killed or wounded since the start of hostilities (Gueyras 1979, 21). Notably, there were few independent observers on the ground during fighting, meaning that at least at the time the only available information regarding matters such as casualties (and perhaps initiation) came from government sources (*Middle Eastern Contemporary Survey* 1980, 249). Cordesman (1984, 470) comments, "Up to 7,000 deaths have been reported, but the actual figure was probably much lower and most casualties seem to have been civilians or tribal irregulars" (Cordesman does not provide a citation for these claims). Though it is possible that this war experienced more than 500 or perhaps more than 1000 battle dead, we view casualty figures as so poorly documented as to recommend excluding the conflict as the least objectionable course of action, unless better documentation of casualties appears.

9. Heglig Crisis, 2012

There was a border clash between Sudan and South Sudan in 2012. Casualty estimates are extremely scarce, but there is not enough evidence to suggest greater than 500 battle dead. The Sudanese government claims to have killed 400 South Sudanese, and the South Sudanese government claims to have killed 240 Sudanese and suffered 19 battle dead. Another source claims 500 casualties total, but does not indicate whether "casualties" includes wounded as well as killed (Check and Mdlongwa 2012). One Sudanese commander claimed that 1200 South Sudanese troops were killed ("Over 1,000 S. Sudanese Killed at Heglig: Commander,"

[15] Thanks to Alan Shen for translation from the original Chinese.

Hindustan Times, April 23, 2012), but this lone claim from one commander is not enough to merit classifying this case as exceeding 500 battle dead. UCDP estimates 367 battle dead.

V. Minor Errors

1. IWD 1.0 codes Ethiopia as joining the UK-Italy War in January 1941. However, membership in the COW nation-state system is a requirement for participation in an IWD (or COW) war, and Ethiopia does not reenter the COW nation-state system until May 5, 1941. Hence, the start date in IWD 1.1 is now May 5, 1941. Also, the end date of Ethiopian participation in IWD 1.0 was marked in IWD 1.0 as July 3, the date of Italian defeat at Jimma. However, combat between Ethiopian and Italian forces continued during 1941, ending when British and Ethiopian forces defeated Italian forces at Gondar on November 27, 1941. IWD 1.1 codes Ethiopian participation as ending on November 27, 1941. While Ethiopian battle dead figures are scarce, Ethiopia certainly contributed more than 1000 troops, such as 1500 Ethiopian troops among others defending against an Italian attack on May 20 near Uogghidi, and thousands participating in the Gondar campaign (Shirreff 1994, 205, 234, 246, 272).

2. COW codes Portugal as entering World War I on March 1, 1916. IWD 1.0 contained this coding decision. However, this appears to be a typographical error, as Germany declared war on Portugal on March 9, 1916 (Cann 2001b, 163). IWD 1.1 codes the Germany-Portugal World War I dyad as beginning on March 9, 1916.

3. There were some minor errors in listing allies fighting among the various dyads between Italy and commonwealth nations during World War II, and some minor typographical errors regarding the joiner variable. They have been corrected.

4. The date of the beginning of the Canada-Italy World War II dyad was changed, from November 1940 to February 8, 1943. Canada declared war on Italy on June 10, 1940, but declaration of war is insufficient to begin an IWD dyad (note that Britain declared war on Finland in World War II, but because those two countries experienced no consequential combat, there is no Anglo-Finnish World War II dyad in IWD). Though Canada had been involved in military operations against Germany as early as September 1939 (Cook 2004, 98) and Japan as early as December 1941, the Canadian government was hesitant to dispatch its forces to North Africa or the Middle East, to aid Britain in its fight against Italian and German forces there. The Canadian Cabinet War Committee specifically ruled out sending Canadian forces to the Mediterranean theater in an October 1, 1940 meeting, reaching a similar decision on November 14. This attitude did not start to shift until fall 1942 (Stacey 1970, 40-42). Note that the lack of Italian participation in resisting the November 1942 Operation Torch landings means there was essentially no Canada-Italian combat during those landings, so the Canada-Italy dyad does not start at this point.

We code the Canada-Italy dyad as starting on February 8, 1943, the first documented instance of combat between Canadian and Italian forces. Specifically, on that date the Canadian *Regina* sunk the Italian submarine *Avorio*, in the Mediterranean (Cafferky 1993, 10). Canadian ground

forces likely received their first combat clash with Italian forces on February 25, 1943, in Tunisia ("166th of Newfoundland Upholds Dads' Records" 1943). Canada contributed thousands of troops to the Allied invasions of Sicily and Italy (Cook 2004, chapters 14-15), so we code the Canada-Italy dyad as enduring until Italian surrender later in 1943.

VI. Subsumed Wars.

IWD 1.1 codes the Soviet Union as being a belligerent with Japan from 1937-1941, because it joins the 1937 Sino-Japanese War. IWD 1.0 did not recognize Soviet participation in the Sino-Japanese conflict. It did, however, code two separate wars between Japan and the Soviet Union, the 1938 Changkufeng War and the 1939 Nomonhan War.

By IWD coding rules, while two states are at war, a new war between states A and B cannot be coded (this is also generally the approach of COW). For example, in 1900 a Sino-Russian border conflict flares up while the Boxer Rebellion is ongoing, but IWD 1.0 does not recognize the border conflict as a new war initiation. Similarly, IWD 1.0 codes France as initiating war against Germany in September 1939, and accordingly it does not code the commencement of a new Franco-German war dyad when Germany invades France in May 1940. Britain declares war on Germany in September 1939, and there is not a separate "joiner" dyad marking British intervention in the 1940 Germany-Norway war or the 1940 German-Belgian War. Further, when the War of the Communist Coalition breaks out in 1970, IWD 1.0 does not include separate, new North Vietnam-South Vietnam or North Vietnam-US joiner dyads, because South Vietnam and the US are already at war with North Vietnam as part of the Vietnam War.

Removing the Changkufeng and Nomonhan Wars because of the addition of the Soviet Union has a belligerent in the 1937 Sino-Japanese War, therefore, has the advantage of being consistent with how IWD treats other, similar cases. That said, a possible critique is that this approach inappropriately deletes separate conflict initiation events, namely the initiations of the Changkufeng and Nomonhan conflicts.

IWD justifies the coding rule that recommends these omissions by proposing that there is a qualitative distinction between conflict initiation between states at peace and conflict initiation between states at war (that is, the Changkufeng and Nomonhan events are conflict initiations between two states already at war), as conflict initiation between states already war is better classified as conflict escalation. The distinction between conflict escalation and conflict initiation is important because there are different theories for conflict initiation and escalation, meaning that effective testing of these theories requires data sets that separate the two classes of events. The democratic peace theory, for example, makes predictions as to war initiation but not war escalation, whereas the "gamble for resurrection" theory described in Goemans (2000) makes predictions as to war escalation but not initiation.

Further, including Changkufeng and Nomonhan would require a reconceptualization of conflict initiation, as it would mean that in general if two states are at war, then if one initiates conflict in a new geographic area (the Changkufeng and Nomonhan clashes were in geographic areas far

from the location of Soviet participation in fighting between China and Japan), then this new conflict initiation would need to be included as a separate case. This would in turn require the inclusion of a substantial new set of war initiation events. For example, geographically dispersed conflicts such as the world wars would require the inclusion of many more "wars," such as the German deployment of forces to North Africa in 1941, the initiation of Allied bombing campaigns against Germany in World War II, the June 1944 D-Day landings, the August 1944 Allied landings in the south of France, etc. A data set certainly could create a list of all reasonably discrete geographical campaigns across all wars, but such a data set would be a qualitatively different undertaking from the central goals of IWD.

VII. Additional Source Material

The memo describing IWD 1.0 sometimes supports a factual claim about a coding decision with reference only to a military encyclopedia such as Clodfelter (2008). Military encyclopedias are not always reliable, and often do not indicate the sources of their factual claims. In this section, we bolster the source material for IWD 1.0, providing additional sources supporting coding decisions in IWD 1.0.

1. Regarding Portugal in World War I. Portugal was officially neutral until 1916, as noted in IWD 1.0 (see above). There were limited clashes between Portuguese and German forces in Africa in 1914. For example, German forces attacked the Portuguese fort at Maziua in the south of the Portuguese colony of Angola on August 25, 1914. In October, a small German force of about 20 crossed the border into Angola, was detained, and in a misunderstanding three Germans were ultimately killed. In retaliation, on October 31 Germany launched an attack on the Portuguese fort of Cuangar, killing some six Portuguese soldiers. Soon after, German forces began to clear other Portuguese forts in the area. It seems that these aggressive actions were not necessarily authorized by Berlin, and on December 8 the German government officially apologized. German forces captured the Portuguese fort at Naulila on December 18, leaving 81 German and Portuguese battle dead (Cann 2001a). However, due to the small scale of these clashes far short of inflicting 500 or 1000 battle dead, we code the Portugal-Germany war as not starting until Germany officially declares war on March 9, 1916. This approach is consistent with the IWD approach of coding the Russo-Polish War as starting in 1920 rather than 1919, when there were small scale clashes.

2. Soviet participation in 1939 invasion of Poland. The Soviet Union qualifies as an intervenor both on the basis of the number of troops it dispatched, and its losses. Regarding battle dead, Vyacheslev Molotov informed the Supreme Soviet on October 31, 1939 that the campaign had cost 737 Soviet battle dead. Some Polish observers claimed as many as 3000 Soviet dead (Sanford 2005, 23).

3. On French combat with Germany as early as fall 1939. France sent two cruisers in the fall to help Britain chase the *Graf Spee* (Churchill 1948, 517).

4. On the 1940-1942 Anglo-French War. On July 3, 1940, British naval forces attacked French forces at Mer-el-Kebir, sinking or damaging the *Bretagne* (977 dead), the *Mogador* (42 dead), and the *Dunkerque* (42 dead) among other vessels (Rohwe and Hummelchen 1972, 41).

5. On the 1937-1945 Japan-China War. On December 13, 1941, Japan mobilized 120,000 troops for an offensive against Chinese forces that became known as the Third Battle of Changsha (Ch'i 1992, 158).

6. On Ethiopia-Italy 1941, see the discussion and sources provided above, in the previous section.

References

"166th of Newfoundland Upholds Dads' Records." 1943. *Hamilton Spectator*, June 29.

Appletons' Annual Cyclopaedia and Register of Important Events 1890. 1891. New York: D. Appleton and Company.

"Attack of Borneo Rebels Erupts Within Sarawak." 1963. *New York Times*, April 12, 3.

Atkinson, Rick. 2002. *An Army at Dawn: The War in North Africa, 1942-1943*. New York: Picador.

Borowiec, Andrew. 1961. "New Clash Reported in Bizerte." *Washington Post, Times Herald*, September 6, A14.

Bowden, James C. 1966. "Soviet Military Aid to Nationalist China, 1923-41." In Raymond L. Garthoff, ed., *Sino-Soviet Military Relations*, 44-56. New York: Frederick A. Praeger.

Brady, Thomas F. 1961. "Bourguiba Predicts New Bizerte Battle Unless French Yield." *New York Times*, October 13, 1.

Burr, William. 2001. "Sino-American Relations, 1969: The Sino-Soviet Border War and Steps Towards Rapprochement." *Cold War History* 1(3): 73-112.

Bustamante Maceo, Gregorio. 1951. *Historia Militar de El Salvador*. 2nd ed. San Salvador: Imprenta Nacional.

Buttin, Félix. 2006. "The Polish-Czechoslovak Conflict over Teschen Silesia (1918–1920): A Case Study." *Perspectives* 25: 63-78.

Cafferky, Shawn. 1993. "'A Useful Lot, These Canadian Ships:' The Royal Canadian Navy and Operation Torch." *The Northern Mariner* 3(October): 1-17.

Cann, John P. 2001a. "Angola and the Great War." *Small Wars and Insurgencies* 12(Spring): 144-165.

Cann, John P. 2001b. "Mozambique, German East Africa, and the Great War." *Small Wars and Insurgencies* 12(Spring): 114-143.

Check, Nicasius Achu and Thabani Mdlongwa. 2012. "The Heglig Oil Conflict: An Exercise of Sovereignty or an Act of Aggression." *Africa Institute of South Africa*. Briefing no. 78.

Ch'i, His-sheng. 1992. "The Military Dimension, 1942-1945." In James C. Hsiung and Steven I. Levine, eds., *China's Bitter Victory: The War With Japan 1937-1945*. Armong, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 157-184.

"Chiang Orders Air Attacks on Red-Held China Stopped." 1950. *The Sun* (Baltimore), June 28, 11.

"Chinese Claim Full Defeat of Reds on Hainan." 1950. *Chicago Tribune*, April 22, pt.1, 4.

Chiozza, Giacomo and H. E. Goemans. 2011. *Leaders and International Conflict*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chneguir, Abdelaziz. 2004. *La politique extérieure de la Tunisie: 1956-1987*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Chudodeev, Iu. V., ed. 1974. *Na Kitaiskoi Zemle*. Moscow: Vostochnoi Literaturi.

Churchill, Winston S. 1948. *The Gathering Storm*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Clodfelter, Michael. 2008. *Warfare and Armed Conflicts: A Statistical Encyclopedia of Casualty and Other Figures, 1494-2007*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Cook, Tim. 2004. *The Necessary War: Canadians Fighting the Second World War 1939-1943*. Vol. 1. Toronto: Allen Lane.

Cordesman, Anthony H. 1984. *The Gulf and the Search for Strategic Stability: Saudi Arabia, the Military Balance in the Gulf, and Trends in the Arab-Israeli Military Balance*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
Dommen, Arthur J. 2001. *The Indochinese Experience of the French and Americans: Nationalism and Communism in Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
Dear, I. C. B. and M. R. D. Foot. 1995. *The Oxford Companion to World War II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Deborin, G. 1974. *Istoriya Vtoroi Mirovoi Voimy 1939-1945*. Volume 2. Moscow.
Delgado, Luis Humberto. 1944. *Las Guerras del Perú: Campaña del Ecuador—Grandeza y Miseria de la Victoria*. Vol. I. Lima: Imp. Torres Aguirre.
Drea, Edward J. *Japan's Imperial Army: Its Rise and Fall, 1853-1945*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
Dreifort, John. 1982. "Japan's Advance into Indochina, 1940: The French Response." *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 13, no. 2: 279-295.
Fall, Bernard B. 1961. *Street Without Joy: Indochina at War, 1946-54*. Harrisburg, PA: Stackpole Books.
Fischer, Bernd J. 1999. *Albania at War, 1939-1945*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.
Foreign Relations of the United States, Paris Peace Conference 1919. 1919. Washington: Department of State.
Foreign Relations of the United States 1950. 1976. Vol. 6, East Asia and the Pacific. Washington: Government Printing Office.
"France to Quit Base at Bizerte by Oct. 15." 1963. *New York Times* October 5.
Fravel, M. Taylor. 2008. *Strong Borders, Secure Nation: Cooperation and Conflict in China's Territorial Disputes*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Garver, John W. 1988. *Chinese-Soviet Relations 1937-1945: The Diplomacy of Chinese Nationalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Glantz, David M. and Jonathan M. House. 1995. *When Titans Clashed: How the Red Army Stopped Hitler*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Lansas.
Gobarev, Viktor M. 1999. "Soviet Policy Toward China: Developing Nuclear Weapons 1949-1969." *Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 12(4): 1-53.
Goemans, H. E. 2000. *War and Punishment: The Causes of War Termination and the First World War*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
"Guatemala and San Salvador." 1890. *Times* (London), August 6, 5.
Gueyras, Jean. 1979. "North Yemen Faces Embryonic Civil War." *MERIP Reports* 81 (October): 21-2.
Hammer, Ellen J. 1954. *The Struggle for Indochina*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Hannan, Kevin. 1996. *Borders of Language and Identity in Teschen Silesia*. New York: Peter Lang.
Hastings, Max. 2008. *Retribution: The Battle for Japan, 1944-45*. New York: Knopf.
Hata, Ikuhiko. 1980. "The Army's Move into Northern Indochina." Robert A. Scalapino, trans. In James William Morley, ed., *The Fateful Choice: Japan's Advance into Southeast Asia, 1939-1941*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Hesse D'Alzon, Claude. 1985. *La Presence Militaire Française en Indochine (1940-1945)*. Chateau de Vincennes, France: Publications du Service Historique de l'Armée de Terre.

Hsü, Immanuel C. Y. 2000. *The Rise of Modern China*. 6th ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
Huang, Alexander C. 2003. "The PLA Navy at War, 1949-1999: From Coastal Defense to Distant Operations." In Mark A. Ryan, David M. Finkelstein, and Michael A. McDevitt, eds., *Chinese Warfighting: The PLA Experience Since 1949*, 241-269. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
"Indonesia, Malaysia Sign Pact to End 3-Year Undeclared War." 1966. *Washington Post, Times-Herald*, August 12, A1.
Jennings, Eric T. 2001. *Vichy in the Tropics: Pétain's National Revolution in Madagascar, Guadeloupe, and Indochina, 1940-1944*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Keene, John, ed. 1995. *South Africa in World War II: A Pictorial History*. Cape Town, South Africa: Human and Rousseau.
Krivosheev, Colonel-General G. F., general editor. 1997. *Soviet Casualties and Combat Losses in the Twentieth Century*. London: Greenhill Books.
"Latest Intelligence." 1890. *Times* (London), July 24, 5.
"The Letters exchanged between Chiang Kai-shek, Stalin and Voroshilov During 1937-1939." *Minguo dang an* 3, no. 45: 58-64.
Levine, Steven I. 1983. "Introduction." In Aleksandr Ya. Kalyagin, *Along Alien Roads*. Steven I. Levine, ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 1-17.
Li, Xiaobing. 2007. *A History of the Modern Chinese Army*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.
Liu, Zhenhua. 1994. *Hainan Zhi Zhan*. 2nd ed. Shenyang, China.
Macri, Franco David. 2012. *Clash of Empires in South China: The Allied Nations' Proxy War With Japan, 1935-1941*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
Mariátegui y Cisneros, Capt. de Fragata. 1968. *Conflicto Peruano-Ecuatoriano 1941*. Lima: Ed. Minerva.
Marolda, Edward John. 1990. "The U.S. Navy and the Chinese Civil War, 1945-1952." Ph.D. diss., George Washington University.
Masterson, Daniel M. 1991. *Militarism and Politics in Latin America: Peru from Sánchez Cerro to* Sendero Luminoso. New York: Greenwood Press.
Middle Eastern Contemporary Survey. 1980. Vol. 3. New York: Holmes and Meier.
O'Dowd, Edward C. 2007. *Chinese Military Strategy in the Third Indochina War: The Last Maoist War*. London: Routledge.
Pearson, Owen. 2004. *Albania and King Zog*. Vol 1. London: I. B. Tauris.
Quinn-Judge, Paul. 1984. "Borderline Cases." *Far Eastern Economic Review*, June 21, 26.
Renaud, Patrick-Charles. 1996. *La Bataille de Bizerte*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
Robinson, Thomas W. 1972. "The Sino-Soviet Border Dispute: Background, Development, and the March 1969 Clashes." *American Political Science Review* 4 (December): 1175-1202.
Robinson, Thomas. 2003. "The Sino-Soviet Border Conflicts of 1969: New Evidence Three Decades Later." In Mark A. Ryan, David M. Finkelstein, and Michael A. McDevitt, eds., *Chinese Warfighting: The PLA Experience Since 1949*, 198-216. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
Rohwer, J. and G. Hummelchen. 1972. *Chronology of the War at Sea, 1939-1945, Volume One: 1939-1942*. Derek Masters, trans. London: Ian Allen.
Rupen, Robert A. 1982. "The Mongolian Army." In Jonathan R. Adelman, ed., *Communist Armies in Politics* (Boulder, Colo: Westview Press), 167-186.

Ryabushkin, Dmitri S. 2012. "New Documents on the Sino-Soviet Ussuri Border Clashes of 1969." *Eurasia Border Review* 3 (Summer): 161-159.
"Salvador is Victorious." 1890. *Chicago Daily Tribune*, July 26, 1.
"San Salvadorians Victorious." 1890. *Sun* (Baltimore), July 30, 1.
Sanford, George. 2005. *Katyn and the Soviet Massacre of 1940: Truth, Justice, and Memory*. London: Routledge.
Sandler, Stanley, ed. 2001. *World War II in the Pacific: An Enyclopedia*. New York: Garland.
Scheina, Robert L. 2003. *Latin America's Wars: The Age of the* Caudillo, *1791-1899*. Washington: Brassey's.
Shirreff, David. 2009. *Bare Feet and Bandoliers: Wingate, Sanford, the Patriots and the Part They Played in the Liberation of Ethiopia*. South Yorkshire, UK: Pen and Sword.
Shmatov, V. G. 2016. "Xinjiang in the System of Actions by the Soviet Union to Assist China Economically, Militarily, and Technologically During the Period of Japanese Aggression in 1931-1943." Ph.D. diss, Altai State University.
Sladkovskii, M. 1977. *Istoriya Torgovo-Ekonomicheskikh Otnoshenii SSSR s Kitaem (1917-1974)*. Moscow.
Smith, Ralph B. 1978. "The Japanese Period in Indochina and the Coup of 9 March 1945." *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 9 (September): 268-301.
Stacey, C. P. 1970. *Arms, Men and Governments: The War Policies of Canada 1939-1945*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada.
Stewart, Richard A. 1988. *Sunrise at Abadan: The British and Soviet Invasion of Iran, 1941*. New York: Praeger.
Taylor, K. W. 1985. "Vietnam in 1984: Confidence Amidst Adversity." *Southeast Asian Affairs*, 349-363.
Treaty Signed. 1890. *Daily Alta California*, August 22, 5.
Tuck, Christopher. 2004. "Borneo 1963-66: Counter-insurgency Operations and War Termination." *Small Wars and Insurgencies* 15, no. 3 (2004): 89-111.
Tuunainen, Pasi. 2012. "The Finnish Army at War Operations and Soldiers, 1939-1945." In Tiina Kinnunen and Ville Kivimäki, eds., *Finland in World War II: History, Memory, Interpretations*, 139-188. Boston: Leiden.
"Tunisia." 1962. *The American Jewish Year Book* 63: 432-437.
Voaden, Denys J. 2007. "Mongolian and Tuvan Aid to Wartime Russia." In Michael Gervers, Uradyn E. Bulag, and Gillian Long, eds., *Traders and Trade Routes of Central and Inner Asia: The 'Silk Road,' Then and Now*. Toronto: Asian Institute, University of Toronto.
Wang, Dong. 2007. "From Enmity to Rapprochement: Grand Strategy, Power Politics, and U.S.-China Relations, 1961-1974." Ph.D. diss., University of California at Los Angeles.
Westad, Odd Arne. 2003. *Decisive Encounters: The Chinese Civil War, 1946-1950*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Wood, Bryce. 1966. *The United States and Latin American Wars 1932-1942*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Wood, Bryce. 1978. *Aggression and History: The Case of Ecuador and Peru*. New York: Institute of Latin American Studies, Columbia University, and University Microfilms International.
Yan, Xu. 1994. "1969 nian ZhongSu bianjie de wuzhuang chongtu" [The 1969 Armed Conflict on the Chinese-Soviet Border]. *Dangshi yanjiu ziliao* no. 5 (1994): 2-13.

Young, Arthur N. 1963. *China and the Helping Hand, 1937-1945*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Zaloga, Steven. 2013. *The Devil's Garden: Rommel's Desperate Defense of Omaha Beach on D-Day*. Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books.
Zhang, Xiaoming. 2015. *Deng Xiaoping's Long War: The Military Conflict Between China and Vietnam, 1979-1991*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina.
Ziemke, Earl F. 1959. *The German Northern Theater of Operations, 1940-1945*. Washington: US Government Printing Office.
Zook, David H. Jr. 1964. *Zarumilla-Marañón: The Ecuador-Peru Dispute*. New York: Bookman.