MIDs investigated for possible changes for MID data set version 3.02, but not changed (10/9/2003)

MID #	Problem investigated	Story/Detailed Changes	Sources	Change
0	Not related to a specific MID number: Why is there no hostility level "1" codings for dispute participants? 1 denotes "no codable response". Apparently they are exchanged for -9 (don't know) codes. In addition there was a report of having found -9 cding for hostility level in disputes that were reciprocated.	There is not specific MID reason for coding -9 instead of 1. A rationale assumed by Bremer in an e-mail is the following: As the researchers do not know what the states did if they did not threaten, display or use force, the code might have been replaced by the reciprocation variable. The report of finding -9 coding in reciprocated disputes is likely a result of merging data files A and B. There are no "disputes" (in MIDA data) that are reciprocated and have a hostilitylevel/hiact of -9. When merging, data for the whole incident (such as reciprocation) is multiplied to match the number of participants. In multistate disputes, some states can have -9 for hostility level, while the dispute as a whole has been reciprocated.	MIDA and MIDB 2.1	No change
0	Afghan-Russian war (1978/79): It can hardly be detected in MID. Is that correct?	War starting 1978/79 is coded as an intrastate war. USR coded as participating on request from Afghani government.	Intra-state war data set	No change
0	Occupation of Peking (1860): Langer reports UKG and FRN occupation of Peking to punish the Chinese. Not coded as a MID.	Occupation occurred October 12, 1860. China is recognized as an independent state October 25, 1860. The acts are before Chinese system membership.	Maoz's paper, Stearns and state system membership data.	No change
0	China - USSR (1960): Borderviolations were coded as a MID in earlier data set, but is not in MID 2.1.	Farmers on government orders entered Soviet territory. There were numerous borderviolations by civilians, allegedly some by officials as well. But this was uncontested because of traditionally nomadic peoples and undecided borders in the area. Recalled as a problem in the later 1969 dispute	Ginsburgs & Pinkele, Gittings, New York Times, www.encyclopedia.com	No change
0	First Moroccan crisis (1904): Not included in the 2.1 set, was in the old data set.	No militarized actions. Only diplomatic interaction.	Maoz's paper, internet sources and Langer/Stearns (2001)	No change

14	Armenian Massacres (1895): A tentative incident coding for the dispute shows ITA, FRN and AUH as participants but the states are not coded as participants in the dispute.	Only British presence proven.	Kohn, New York Times and Bridge	No change
21	Serbian territorial claims regarding Albania (1912): Discrepancy in the coding of revtype between side A and B. All other disputes have either 0 (n/a) or the same for both sides.	Serbia is the only one seeking territorial revision (access to the Adriatic sea - no establishment of Albania) Russia supports Serbia but does not have territory claims, rather policy claims. The issue at hand is the establishment of Albania, effectively shutting Serbia off from the Adriatic sea. Russia seeks revision in the other states policies.	Stearns and internet resources	No change
31	Boxer rebellion (1900): Starting and ending dates discrepancies between MID and COW warlist.	The date coded for beginning of interstate war is the same, the MID coding records incidents leading up to the war, thus an earlier start date.	Langer, New York Times, Duiker.	No change
51	Korean war (1950/53): Questions regarding Colombia and the Netherlands apparently coded on the side of North Korea. The war list do not have New Zealand as a participant, MID has it as a war participant.	No change regarding Colombia & the Netherlands. New Zealand fulfills criteria for being a war participant, but requires change in COW list, not MID.	MID 3.01 data set, www.nzhistory.net.nz based on McGibbon (1991&1996)	No change
55	Corfu incident (1923): Dispute coded as being between Italy, Greece and UK in earlier version, excludes UK now. Was the British pressure reported by langer military or diplomatic?	There was "considerable British pressure" (Stearns), but through League of Nations. No militarized actions.	Sources: Langer, Miller, Stavrianos, Woodhouse and internet resources.	No change
141	Treaty of Berlin/Dulcigno (1880): FRN is coded both actor and target of threat of force in tentative "incident" codings.	Incident coding must be erroneous. No recording of France threatening any state in the reviewed sources.	Langer, New York Times, Miller, Dakin, Keesing's.	No change
258	WWII: Several concerns about dyadic disputes based on the MID data. Involves UK and France against USSR in 1939 and are identified as a war dyad by Maoz. Not coded in the war list.	This is a dispute of UKG+FRN vs. USR after USR's invasion of Poland. The dispute is in the context of WWII. MID coding is correct according to MID coding rules.	Maoz and MID 2.1 data set.	No change
261	Seven weeks war (1865/66): Start date discrepancies between MID data set (1865) and Interstate War list (1866).	Date when war is coded is the same, MID codes some incidents before the war, thus different start dates.	Kohn, Friedjung	No change

375	First Schleswig-Holstein War, first phase (1848/49): Questions reported regarding Maoz's dyadic version. Does the questions have any impact in MID coding?	BAV-SWD starting in 1848, when Bremer's data set says 1849. 1849 seems right based on participant and incident records. This is a comment on Maoz's dyadic data set. Maoz has changed dyadic data set to fit comment.	Maoz's dyadic data set.	No change
397	Bulgarian entry into WWI (1914): Both UKG and BUL are coded to join interstate war, but the MID is called Bulgaria joins interstate war	UKG was already in the war, the coding is correct	New York Times, Langer and Internet resources.	No change
1110	Saudi Arabia - South Yemen (YPR) (1969): Langer discusses a clash between Saudi Arabia and South Yemen. There is a MID corresponding to that period #1110, but can find no source for the North Yemen dispute.	Dispute correct as coded.	New York Times, Nov 27, 1969 and Dec 12, 1969.	No change
1232	Cambodia - Thailand (1976/87): Should it be so long or rather a series of shorter ones?	Continuous action. No 6 months without an incident.	Maoz and Keesing's.	No change
1353	Laos-North Vietnam (1962/73): The old MID data coded a series of disputes and repeated clashes. In the new data, these are coded as one long conflict (62-73). Should it be one long or a series of shorter ones?	Continuous action. No 6 months without an incident.	Maoz	No change
1535	First Central American War (1885): Question whether the dispute is cored with incorrect dates. Ecuador's dates do not overlap with Bolivia's.	A print of the dispute does not have Bolivia as a participant at all.	Inconclusive. This might refer to another dispute (none found) or to an earlier version of the data set. A search (internet sources) does not reveal Ecuador or Bolivia involvement	No change
1552	Mexican-American War (1843/48): Discrepancies in start dates between MID (1843) and COW (1846) Interstate War list.	Coding for start of war (May 12, 1846) and end-date same. MID also recodes incidents prior to the war, thus differences in start date.	MIDB 2.1	No change

2373	Saudi Arabia - North & South Yemen (1969/70): Langer discusses a clash between (p. 1307-08) Saudi Arabia and South Yemen. There is a MID corresponding to that period (MID 1110), but reporter can find no source for the North Yemen dispute. Are these two different disputes?	MID 1110 and MID 2373 have somewhat overlapping dates. But two separate disputes is confirmed. Correct as coded.	Gause, Keesing's, New York Times.	No change
2840	Chile-Norway (1948): Question about whether Norwegian involvement is correct.	Review of original sources and government sources online in Norwegian has not turned up evidence for Norwegian involvement in the MID. Left as is because Norwegian non-involvement cannot be proved.	New York Times, Keesing's, www.odin.no	No change
2941	USA North Korea (1969): What is the involvement of USSR in the case?	USSR protested buildup of US naval forces near its territory. The naval forces were aimed at North Korea, but USSR saw it as a threat and protested.	Foot notes to the original case coding.	No change
3957	Gulf war (1990-91): Is the US coded on the wrong side? Seemingly in one version of the data, US had dispute with 20 states, mostly its own allies. Also question regarding Turkey-Oman.	Only IRQ and JOR is coded on side A, the rest on side B. USA is not coded on the wrong side. Correct as coded.	MIDB 2.1	No change
115	Italian unification (1850): MID has France fighting Italy, COW Interstate war list (Interstate war #28) has them fighting AUH.	Correct coded in both data sets.	MID 2.1B and Stearns (Langer)	No change
235	United Kingdom - France (1940): The MID refers to a sinking of a French fleet resulting in the death of at least 1300 French sailors. The French response is coded as 23, when it seems the scale only goes to 22.	The discrepancy has only to do with differences in numeric representation of the 22-point scale in the MID 2.1 coding. 23 is the code for joining interstate war. Correct as coded.	Langer, New York Times and MID 2.1 and 3.01 codebooks.	No change.
1804	United Kingdom, Zimbabwe and Zambia (1965/66): Involves dispute behavior during 1965 involving Zimbabwe, while an early version of the system member list indicates that Zimbabwe first enters the international system in 1966.	In the most recent system membership list, Zimbabwe is included as a member since Nov 11, 1965. Coding correct.	2001 version of system membership data.	No change.