Israeli-Egyptian Militarized Interstate Disputes

Abstract

The Quantitative History Israeli-Egyptian Interstate Military Disputes data-set contains data regarding individual incidents of military confrontation between Israel and Egypt. The data-set presents a chronological evolution of incidents of militarized confrontation between the two states between 1948 and 1988 and is currently being updated to cover incidents through 1997. The categories included in the data-set are constructed so as to reflect both basic information (initiator, respondent, number of casualties, etc.) and to provide an assessment of each incident in terms of the severity of the incident, the 'score' of the initiator and the 'score' of the respondent in terms of obtaining their objectives, the form of dispute termination, etc. The Israeli-Egyptian Interstate Military Disputes data-set is a zipped file of an Excel 7 workbook and may be downloaded.

Code book

Definitions and Selection Criteria

The Israeli-Egyptian Interstate Military Disputes data set presents those interstate disputes between Israel and Egypt that were serious enough to become militarized. Such incidents are defined as interactions between the two states which involved threats to use military force, displays of military force, or actual uses of military force. To be included, these acts had to meet the criteria of being explicit, overt, nonaccidental, and government sanctioned.[1]

Variables and Code List

The data set variables appear in the following sequence:

Variable	Explanation and variable codes
Dispute number	The disputes are recorded chronologically. Each dispute is given an index number and may include either one or more incidents, which are also ordered numerically. Incidents that occur no more than six months apart and concern the same issue(s) are included in the same dispute index number. If either the issues are different or six months pass before the next incident takes place, they do not belong to the same dispute.
Incident number	Chronological incident number in a specific dispute. Incident number 1 is the first act involving threat, display, or use of force within a given dispute. The initiator of the incident (if one can be identified) is designated as the initiator of the dispute. The target of this incident is designated as the primary target of the dispute. Subsequent incidents are numbered in accordance with their temporal sequence, such that incident #2 is the next incident in the historical sequence of the dispute, and so forth.
Start year	the year during which the incident was initiated.
Start month	the month during which the incident was initiated.
Start day	the day during which the incident was initiated. (If no precise day could be identified, the code is –9.)
Initiator country code	The state which initiated the incident: 651 = Egypt 666 = Israel

[1]The criteria for data inclusion are based on the Correlates of War Project under the direction of J. David Singer at Michigan University. A detailed description of definitions and selection criteria for the dispute data set is presented in Charles S. Gochman and Zeev Maoz, Militarized Interstate Disputes, 1816-1976, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 28 (4) 585-615 (December, 1984). A more recent version that describes the Militarized Interstate Disputes data is given in Daniel M. Jones, Stuart Bremer, and J. David Singer. Militarized Interstate Disputes, 1816-1992. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 15(2): 163-213 (December, 1996).

Severity of initiator's Military Confrontation Action (MCA)	Description of the incident type[2] and assessment of the incident's degree of severity on a scale of 1-100[3]: 1 = threat to blockade: threat by one state to use ships or troops to seal off territory of another state so as to prevent either entry or exit. 8 = threat to occupy territory: threat by one state to use military force to occupy the whole or part of another state's territory. 20 = alert: a reported increase in the military readiness of a state's regular armed forces, directed at another state. 29 = threat to declare war: threat by one state to issue an official declaration of war against another. 30 = threat to use force: threat by one state to use its regular armed forces to fire upon the armed forces or territory of another state. 49 = show force: a public demonstration by a state of its military capabilities, not involving combat operations, directed at another state. 55 = border violation: crossing of a recognized land, sea or air boundary for a period of less than twenty-four hours by official forces of one state, without any force being used on the territory (or population) of the targeted state or any significant public demonstration of military force capability. 65 = other use of force: use of regular armed forces of a state to fire upon the armed forces, population, or territory of another state or to enter the territory of another state for a period of less than 24 hours. 75 = clash: military hostilities between the regular armed forces of two or more states for less than 24 hours in which the initiator of the hostilities cannot be identified clearly. 81 = seizure: the seizure by one state of material or personnel from another state for a period of at least 24 hours. 82 = mobilization: the activation by a state of previously inactive armed forces. 84 = occupy territory: use of military force by one state to occupy the whole or part of another state's territory for a period of at least 24 hours. 96 = blockade: use of ships or troops by one state to seal off the territory of another state so as to prevent entry or exit. 99 = declare war: an official statement by one state that it is in a state of war with another state. 100 = war: sustained military hostilities between the regular armed forces of two or more states, resulting in 1000 or more battle fatalities; a minimum of 100 battle fatalities or 1000 troops in active combat is required before a state is considered to be a participant in a war.
Joint initiation	Indicates whether or not additional parties were involved in the initiation of the confrontation. Codes are: 1 = Yes 0 = No
Fatalities – initiator	Number of fatalities suffered by initiating country during the incident (-9 is

[2]The typology of military acts listed here is consistent with the coding scheme for events data used in the COW project and Leng and Singer (1977), Maoz (1982: Appendix 1).

[3]The procedures entailed in the scaling of the severity of military confrontation were generated by Zeev Maoz . A full description of the scaling procedure is presented in Zeev Maoz (1982: Appendix 1). Note that this is an interval severity scale, and the incident codlings differ from the nominal incident identifier number given in the Gochman and Maoz (1984) and Jones, Bremer, and Singer (1996) sources. However, each incident code in one source has one-to-one conversion capacity to another incident code.

	missing value).
Result – initiator	The incident's 'score' on the nation level from the initiator's side[4]: 1 = Initiator of incident wins 2 = Initiator of incident loses 3 = draw 4 = unknown/missing data
Target.-country code	The target state/respondent of the incident: 651 = Egypt 666 = Israel
Severity of Target's Military Confrontation Action (MCA)	Description of the target's action type and assessment of the its degree of severity on a scale of 1-100: 0 = no action 1 = threat to blockade: threat by one state to use ships or troops to seal off territory of another state so as to prevent either entry or exit. 8 = threat to occupy territory: threat by one state to use military force to occupy the whole or part of another state's territory. 20 = alert: a reported increase in the military readiness of a state's regular armed forces, directed at another state. 29 = threat to declare war: threat by one state to issue an official declaration of war against another. 30 = threat to use force: threat by one state to use its regular armed forces to fire upon the armed forces or territory of another state. 49 = show force: a public demonstration by a state of its military capabilities, not involving combat operations, directed at another state. 55 = border violation: crossing of a recognized land, sea or air boundary for a period of less than twenty-four hours by official forces of one state, without any force being used on the territory (or population) of the targeted state or any significant public demonstration of military force capability. 65 = other use of force: use of regular armed forces of a state to fire upon the armed forces, population, or territory of another state or to enter the territory of another state for a period of less than 24 hours. 75 = clash: military hostilities between the regular armed forces of two or more states for less than 24 hours in which the initiator of the hostilities cannot be identified clearly. 81 = seizure: the seizure by one state of material or personnel from another state for a period of at least 24 hours. 82 = mobilization: the activation by a state of previously inactive armed forces. 84 = occupy territory: use of military force by one state to occupy the whole or part of another state's territory for a period of at least 24 hours. 96 = blockade: use of ships or troops by one state to seal off the territory of another state so as to prevent entry or exit. 99 = declare war: an official statement by one state that it is in a state of war with another state. 100 = war: sustained military hostilities between the regular armed forces of two or more states, resulting in 1000 or more battle fatalities; a minimum of 100 battle fatalities or 1000 troops in active combat is required before a state is considered to be a

[4]The nation level results (for both initiator and respondent) reflect the 'score' of the actor in terms of the actor's objectives in the dispute and on historians' accounts regarding the extent to which these demands were met by the opponent. The 'score' also reflects success or failure of military operations. For a full account of the coding rules for dispute outcomes see Zeev Maoz (1982), pp.226-230.

	participant in a war.
Joint response	Indicates whether or not additional parties were involved on the target's action (yes/no)
Fatalities – respondent	Number of fatalities suffered by respondent (target) country
Result – respondent	The incident's 'score' on the nation level from the respondent's side[5]: 1 = win 2 = lose 3 = draw 4 = unknown
Result - general	The incident's 'score' from an objective point of view[6]: 1 = win 2 = lose 3 = draw 4 = unknown
Settlement	Describes the form of dispute termination: 1 = formal agreement 2 = stalemate 3 = imposed agreement 0 = none
End year	Year during which the incident ended.
End month	Month during which the incident ended.
End day	The day during which the incident ended (-9 = missing).

Sources

The above data set is based on information taken from the Israeli daily newspaper "Ha'aretz".

Methodology References

Charles S. Gochman and Zeev Maoz, Militarized Interstate Disputes, 1816-1976, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 28 (4) 585-615 (December, 1984).

Daniel M. Jones, Stuart Bremer, and J. David Singer. Militarized Interstate Disputes, 1816-1992. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 15(2): 163-213 (December, 1996).

Maoz, Z. (1982) Paths to Conflict. Boulder, CO: Westview.

[5]See fn 4.

[6]An assessment of the dyadic-level outcome score takes into account the balance of operational demand satisfaction and the balance of victory in military operations. See Zeev Maoz (1982), p. 231