State System Membership List
Codebook
Version 2004.1

February 2, 2005

Correlates of War Project
University of Illinois
The Pennsylvania State University
http://correlatesofwar.org

Overview

This data set contains the list of states in the international system as updated and distributed by the Correlates of War Project. Version 2004.1 extends the temporal domain of the collection to 2004.

Citation

We ask users of the data set to cite this data set as follows:

> Correlates of War Project. 2005. "State System Membership List, v2004.1." Online, http://correlatesofwar.org.

Files

The state system membership files include the following:

- State Codebook 2004.pdf – (this document) describes the content and format of the state system membership datasets.
- State FAQ.pdf - Contains answers to some Frequently Asked Questions about the state system membership datasets.
- states2004.csv - provides the entry and exit dates of states, country codes, and abbreviations.
- majors2004.csv - provides the entry and exit dates for states to be designated as major powers.
- system2004.csv - lists the composition of the state system year by year (providing a blank country-year dataset).

File Specific Documentation

All data files associated with state system membership are in .csv (comma-delimited) format. In this format, values are separated by commas, with string values (e.g. state names) in quotations. The first line of each data file is a header record containing the variable names.

states.csv

This file contains a list of the COW states, numbers, abbreviations, and their qualifying periods of tenure in the state system. Users of the data set should note that states that leave and reenter the state system have more than one record in the data set. It includes the following fields:

State Abb	COW state abbreviation
State Num	COW state number
State Name	Primary COW state name
Start Year	Beginning year of state tenure
Start Month	Beginning month of state tenure
Start Day	Beginning day of state tenure
End Year	Ending year of state tenure
End Month	Ending month of state tenure
End Day	Ending day of state tenure
Version	Data file version number

majors.csv

This file contains a list of the COW major powers and their qualifying periods of tenure. Users of the data set should note that major powers that leave and reenter the major power system have more than one record in the data set. It includes the following fields:

State Abb	COW state abbreviation
State Num	COW state number
Start Year	Beginning year of major power tenure
Start Month	Beginning month of major power tenure
Start Day	Beginning day of major power tenure
End Year	Ending year of major power tenure
End Month	Ending month of major power tenure
End Day	Ending day of major power tenure
Version	Data file version number

system.csv

This file contains a year-by-year list of state system membership (and so, is a base country-year data set). A state is listed as being a member of the state system if it is recorded in states.csv as present in the system at any time during the relevant year. It contains 13,212 records with the following fields:

State Abb	COW state abbreviation
State Num	COW state number
Year	Observation year
Version	Data file version number

Changes from prior versions

The only change from the 2002 to 2004 version of the System Membership List is that end dates for all countries in existence in 2002 were extended to 12/31/2004. No new states entered the international system in 2003 or 2004.

Users should note the following changes in the Interstate System Membership List from the 1997.1 version:

1. The membership dates of the following nations have changed:

267	BAD	Baden	End date, from 12/31/1870 to 1/18/1871
271	WRT	Wuerttemburg	End date, from 12/31/1870 to 1/18/1871
290	POL	Poland	Start date, from 1/1/1919 to 11/3/1918
310	HUN	Hungary	Start date, from 1/1/1919 to 11/16/1918

2. The following nations have joined the system since 1997:

860	ETM	East Timor	9/27/2002
947	TUV	Tuvalu	8/5/2000
946	KIR	Kiribati	9/14/1999
955	TON	Tonga	8/14/1999
970	NAU	Nauru	9/14/1999

3. The following names have been changed:

360	from Rumania to Romania
490	from Zaire to Democratic Republic of the Congo
580	from Malagasy to Madagascar
775	from Burma to Myanmar
990	from Western Samoa to Samoa

4. The following abbreviations have been changed:

360	from RUM to ROM
365	from USR to RUS
490	from ZAI to DRC

State Membership Definitions and Rationale

Correlates of War project criteria to identify actors as state members of the international system to the since 1816 include:

1) prior to 1920, the entity must have population greater than 500,000 and have had diplomatic missions at or above the rank of charge d'affaires with Britain and France;

2) after 1920, the entity must be a member of the United Nations or League of Nations, or have population greater than 500,000 and receive diplomatic missions from two major powers.

These criteria were defined (and refined) in a series of publications, as follows.

Bruce M. Russett, J. David Singer, and Melvin Small (1968). "National Political Units in the Twentieth Century: A Standardized List," American Political Science Review, 62(3):932-951.

This initial state list included a large set of potential entities, excluding those in existence for less than one month or with populations of less than 10,000. Entities with a reasonable degree of sovereignty were coded as independent, with other entities falling into the categories of: dependencies and colonies, mandates, trusts, or occupied.

J. David Singer and Melvin Small (1972). The Wages of War 1816-1965: A Statistical Handbook. John Wiley & Sons, pp. 19-30.

Wages of War developed the core of the current state system membership definition, by temporally expanding and substantively contracting the previous membership criteria. Two primary criteria were defined: 1) population greater than 500,000 and 2) "sufficiently unencumbered by legal, military, economic, or political constraints to exercise a fair degree of sovereignty and independence" (p. 20). For system members prior to 1920 this meant a state had to have formal relations with Britain and France and also exercise a fair degree of sovereignty. For system members after 1920, this meant a state had to be a member of the United Nations or League of Nations, or meet the 500,000 population threshold and receive diplomatic missions from two major powers (p.21)

Melvin Small and J. David Singer (1982). Resort to Arms: International and Civil Wars, 1816-1980. Sage Publications, pp. 38-46.

Resort to Arms elaborated on established coding rules and explained key exceptions. Because these are the most applicable rules for the 2002 data set, we quote the explanations below:

"Whether or not a national political entity qualifies as a member of the interstate system should be a function of two factors. First, was it large enough in

population or other resources to play a moderately active role in world politics, to be a player more than a pawn, and to generate more signal than noise in the system? Several criteria other than population come to mind (for example, territory, unity, self-sufficiency, and armed might), but it would be premature to screen out nations deficient on such grounds, even assuming the availability of reasonably accurate evidence. Some minimum population, on the other hand, is always a basic requirement of national survival; moreover, it frequently correlates highly with a number of other criteria of national power. Finally, it is one of the variables for which adequate data have existed over a long period of time.

Thus, our first criterion for treating a nation – no matter what its legal status – as an active member of the interstate system was gross population; and the threshold decided on was a minimum of 500,000 as opposed to only 10,000 for inclusion in our "national entity" list. This figure precluded the need to deal with such minor entities as the smaller of the pre-unification Italian or German states, and more recently, Monaco, Andorra, Liechtenstein, San Marino, or the like. An indication of the sensitivity of that particular threshold may be seen in the fact that if it had been raised to one million, the following would have been excluded during that specified period: Baden, 1816-1820; Greece, 1830-1845; Argentina, 1841-1850; Chile, 1839-1850; Ecuador, 1854-1860; El Salvador, 1875-1900; Guatemala, 1849-1862 and Hait, 1859-1897. Excluded during the entire 1816-1919 period would be Albania, Hanover, Hesse Electoral, Hesse Grand Ducal, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Modena, Parma, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Nicaragua, Paraguay and Uruguay.

"The second criterion for membership in the interstate system involves whether the entity was sufficiently unencumbered by legal, military, economic, or political constraints to exercise a fair degree of sovereignty and independence. The apparent pre-operational nature of this criterion is largely compensated for by the great consistency of diplomatic practice, such that almost all national governments tended to agree on the status of another national entity, at least prior to World War I. That agreement was manifested in a most operational fashion via the granting or withholding of diplomatic recognition, and it will be remembered that this was rarely used as a political weapon until after World War I. Such decisions were not based on one government's approval or disapproval of another, but strictly on the judgment as to whether it could and would effectively assume its international obligations.

"At first our criterion was to ask whether the nation in question was extended such recognition by the majority of the international community, but it soon became evident that so thorough an investigation was not necessary. For the period up to World War I, dominated as the system was by the major European powers, we found that as Britain and France went, so went the majority. Thus, we designated them our "legitimizers" and once both of these major powers had established diplomatic missions at or above the rank of charge d'affaires in the capital of any nation with the requisite half-million population, that nation was classed as a member of the interstate system. We used the establishment of the mission rather than the granting of recognition, since there were occasions on which one government might "recognize" another but delay sending its

representative for long periods. For example, during the 1820s most of the newly independent Latin American states were recognized by European powers, but few permanent missions were dispatched for several decades. This, then, provided us with a highly operational pair of criteria by which we could identify the composition of the interstate system from the Congress of Vienna to the Versailles Conference after World War I.

"Interstate System Membership Criteria, 1920-1980

"For the post-Versailles era, however, the problem was not solved quite so easily. France and England may have emerged victorious from the war, but they found their supremacy somewhat less secure. Their capacity to extend or withhold legitimacy became increasingly a perquisite to be shared with other nations directly, as well as through international organizations. In this latter period, then, a nation was classified as a system member if it either (a) was a member of the League or the United Nations at any time during its existence, or (b) met the half-million population minimum and received diplomatic missions from any two (rather than the specific two) major powers; membership in the latter oligarchy is defined below. We could no longer find two specific legitimizers to replace France and Britain, and even if we could, the norms of recognition had so changed that too many obviously qualified states would have been excluded; hence the reliance on any two major powers. Moreover, with the appearance of the League and then the United Nations, we were provided with an institutionalized legitimization procedure by which the comity of nations told us, in effect, which national entities satisfied the requirements for inclusion in the interstate system and which did not. (While the principle of universality of membership was neither explicitly stated in the League Covenant nor practiced in effect, the United Nations Charter not only asserts the fundamental aim, but has moved increasingly toward its realization.) Thus, the post-World War I period is one in which we utilize either of two different sets of criteria. Even though the results of either set would be quite similar, it is worth noting that if we had not used international organization membership as an alternative route to inclusion in our interstate system, such low population nations as Panama, Costa Rica, Iceland, Matla, Kuwait, Gambia and the Maldives would have been excluded. In our judgment, it would be wrong to exclude from the interstate system any nation that belonged to the League or its successor.

"Despite their apparent reasonableness, however, these rules nevertheless required us to make several exceptions. First, among those entities which qualified by one or both of the above criteria but which we excluded were India, Slovakia, and Manchukuo. India did not qualify for system membership during the 1920s and 1930s because it did not control its own foreign policy. India's membership in the League, as well as its representation at Versailles, was a concession to the British, in much the same way that the inclusion of the Ukraine and Byelorussia (two exceptions for the post-1945 period) in the United Nations was a concession to the Russians.

"Both Manchukuo and Slovakia were puppet states that also did not control their own foreign policies in any meaningful sense. Established by Japan and ruled by Emperor Henry Pu Yi from 1932 to 1945, Manchukuo never

achieved League membership (not surprising, considering the ramifications of the Lytton Report), although it did receive its requisite second major power mission in 1937. Slovakia, on the other hand, posed a more difficult problem. More than 25 states recognized it, including three major powers before the start of World War II. Yet a careful analysis of the sources suggests that when Monseigneur Tiso placed his country under the protection of Germany some days after Germany took over Bohemia and Moravia, Slovakia signed over its freedom of action in foreign policy (Mikus, 1963; Lettrich, 1955). In other words, Slovakia resembled occupied Poland more than Rumania or Bulgaria, two of Germany's "independent" allies.

"As for states that we *included* even though they did not meet our admission rules, Outer Mongolia, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen are the outliers. We have treated Outer Mongolia as an independent system member from 1921 to the present, despite the fact that it was not a League member and enjoyed recognition from only one major power, the Soviet Union. Our inquiries have led us to conclude that that the remote republic was at least as independent as Panama and Nicaragua during the interwar period, for example. For conflicting interpretations, see Friters (1949), Tang (1959) and Rupen (1964). Nepal, even more remote than Outer Mongolia in terms of relationship to the system, and thus without major power recognition, was nevertheless considered independent by almost all observers. Both Saudi Arabia and Yemen existed as independent entities prior to Versailles but were not treated as system members until they were recognized by Italy and Britain in "legitimizing" treaties of the mid-1920s.

"In the post-1945 period, aside from the aforementioned cases of the Ukraine and Byelorussia, China posed a problem. While not represented in the United Nations until 1971, the mainland regime was recognized promptly by both the USSR and England; Taiwan, conversely qualified via UN membership. Thus, we classify China as a continuing system member after 1949, at which time Taiwan was added to the list as a new member.

"An additional consideration in determining whether or not a political entity qualified as a system member in either of the periods – and, therefore, as a war participant – was that of governments that may have been forced by war into exile or into a small salient of their own national territory. The rule we adopted here was that as long as a government could field, and maintain in active combat, an independent fighting force of 100,000 or more, it continued to exist as a system member and war participant and therefore to contribute to our computations of the war's magnitude, severity and intensity. For example, Belgium and Serbia were almost completely overrun and occupied in 1914 and 1915, respectively, but each managed to keep relatively large forces fighting against the Central Powers. On the hand, in World War II, even though contingents identified with their home countries were maintained by the Dutch, the Poles, and the French, neither the Dutch nor the Polish air, ground, and naval forces met the 100,000 threshold, and the Free French did not meet it until De Gaulle and his troops helped to liberate Paris in 1944."