International Crisis Behavior Data Codebook, Version 13

Michael Brecher, Jonathan Wilkenfeld, Kyle Beardsley, Patrick James and David Quinn

22 June 2020

Dataset: ICB 1 (System Level)

This dataset (ICB1) comprises the system level data of the International Crisis Behavior (ICB) Project. The data span the period 1918-2013, with data on 470 international crises. For an extensive discussion of the system level data, see Michael Brecher and Jonathan Wilkenfeld, A Study of Crisis. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2000.

Identifier Variables

Identifier Variable: 1

Name: ICB1

INTERNATIONAL CRISIS BEHAVIOR PROJECT - SYSTEM LEVEL DATASET

Identifier Variable: 2

Name: CRISNO

SEQUENCE NUMBER OF INTERNATIONAL CRISIS

Identifier Variable: 3

Name: CRISNAME

NAME OF INTERNATIONAL CRISIS

ICB List of States in the International System, 1918-2003

The three-letter actor codes and the three-digit identification numbers for states in the system correspond to those presented by Gleditsch and Ward, and are almost identical to the codes in the Correlates of War Project. See Kristian S. Gleditsch and Michael D. Ward (1999). "Interstate System Membership: A Revised List of the Independent States since 1816," *International Interactions* 25: 393-413.

NAME	CODE NAME (ACTOR)	NUMBER (CRACID)
Afghanistan	**AFG**	**700**
Albania	**ALB**	**339**
Algeria	**ALG**	**615**
Andorra	**AND**	**232**
Angola	**ANG**	**540**
Antigua & Barbuda	**AAB**	**058**
Argentina	**ARG**	**160**
Armenia	**ARM**	**371**
Australia	**AUL**	**900**
Austria	**AUS**	**305**
Azerbaijan	**AZE**	**373**
Bahamas	**BHM**	**031**
Bahrain	**BAH**	**692**
Bangladesh	**BNG**	**771**
Barbados	**BAR**	**053**
Belarus	**BLR**	**370**
Belgium	**BEL**	**211**
Belize	**BLZ**	**080**
Benin (Dahomey)	**BEN**	**434**
Bhutan	**BHU**	**760**
Bolivia	**BOL**	**145**
Bosnia	**BOS**	**346**
Botswana	**BOT**	**571**
Brazil	**BRA**	**140**
Brunei	**BRU**	**835**
Bulgaria	**BUL**	**355**
Burkina Faso (Upper Volta)	**BFO**	**439**
Burma (see Myanmar)		
Burundi	**BUI**	**516**
Cambodia	**CAM**	**811**
Cameroon	**CAO**	**471**
Canada	**CAN**	**020**
Cape Verde	**CAP**	**402**
Central African Republic	**CEN**	**482**
Chad	**CHA**	**483**
Chile	**CHL**	**155**

China	**CHN**	**710**
China-Taiwan-Formosa (see Taiwan)		
Colombia	**COL**	**100**
Comoros	**COM**	**581**
Congo Brazzaville	**CON**	**484**
Congo, Democratic Republic of (Congo Kinshasa) (Zaire)	**DRC**	**490**
Costa Rica	**COS**	**094**
Cote D'Ivoire	**CDI**	**437**
Croatia	**CRO**	**344**
Cuba	**CUB**	**040**
Cyprus	**CYP**	**352**
Czech Republic	**CZR**	**316**
Czechoslovakia	**CZE**	**315**
Dahomey (see Benin)		
Denmark	**DEN**	**390**
Djibouti (Somalia Fr.)	**DJI**	**522**
Dominica	**DMA**	**054**
Dominican Republic	**DOM**	**042**
Ecuador	**ECU**	**130**
Egypt (UAR)	**EGY**	**651**
El Salvador	**SAL**	**092**
Equatorial Guinea	**EQG**	**411**
Eritrea	**ERI**	**531**
Estonia	**EST**	**366**
Ethiopia	**ETH**	**530**
Federated States of Micronesia	**FSM**	**987**
Fiji	**FIJ**	**950**
Finland	**FIN**	**375**
France	**FRN**	**220**
Vichy France	**VFR**	**219**
French West Africa	**FWA**	**480**
Gabon	**GAB**	**481**
Gambia	**GAM**	**420**
Georgia	**GRG**	**372**
Germany (Prussia)	**GMY**	**255**
German Democratic Republic (East Germany)	**GDR**	**265**
Germany (German Federal Republic, West Germany)	**GFR**	**260**
Ghana	**GHA**	**452**
Great Britain (see United Kingdom)		
Greece	**GRC**	**350**
Grenada	**GRN**	**055**
Guatemala	**GUA**	**090**
Guinea	**GUI**	**438**
Guinea Bissau	**GNB**	**404**
Guyana	**GUY**	**110**
Haiti	**HAI**	**041**
Hijaz (Hejaz)	**HIJ**	**671**
Honduras	**HON**	**091**
Hungary	**HUN**	**310**

Iceland	**ICE**	**395**
India	**IND**	**750**
Indonesia	**INS**	**850**
Iran	**IRN**	**630**
Iraq	**IRQ**	**645**
Ireland (Eire)	**IRE**	**205**
Israel	**ISR**	**666**
Italy	**ITA**	**325**
Ivory Coast (see Cote D'Ivoire)		
Jamaica	**JAM**	**051**
Japan	**JPN**	**740**
Jordan	**JOR**	**663**
Kazakhstan	**KZK**	**705**
Kenya	**KEN**	**501**
Korea	**KOR**	**730**
North Korea (People's Republic of Korea)	**PRK**	**731**
South Korea (Republic of Korea)	**ROK**	**732**
Kuwait	**KUW**	**690**
Kyrgyz Republic	**KYR**	**703**
Laos	**LAO**	**812**
Latvia	**LAT**	**367**
Lebanon	**LEB**	**660**
Lesotho	**LES**	**570**
Liberia	**LBR**	**450**
Libya	**LIB**	**620**
Liechtenstein	**LIE**	**223**
Lithuania	**LIT**	**368**
Luxemberg	**LUX**	**212**
Macedonia	**MAC**	**343**
Madagascar (Malagasy Republic)	**MAG**	**580**
Malawi	**MAW**	**553**
Malaysia	**MAL**	**820**
Maldives	**MAD**	**781**
Mali	**MLI**	**432**
Malta	**MLT**	**338**
Marshall Islands	**MSI**	**983**
Mauritania	**MAA**	**435**
Mauritius	**MAS**	**590**
Mexico	**MEX**	**070**
Moldova	**MLD**	**359**
Monaco	**MNC**	**221**
Mongolia	**MON**	**712**
Morocco	**MOR**	**600**
Mozambique	**MZM**	**541**
Myanmar (Burma)	**MYA**	**775**
Najd (Nejd)	**NAJ**	**672**
Namibia (South West Africa)	**NAM**	**565**
Nepal	**NEP**	**790**
Netherlands	**NTH**	**210**
New Zealand	**NEW**	**920**

Nicaragua	**NIC**	**093**
Niger	**NIR**	**436**
Nigeria	**NIG**	**475**
Norway	**NOR**	**385**
Oman	**OMA**	**698**
Pakistan	**PAK**	**770**
Palau	**PAL**	**986**
Panama	**PAN**	**095**
Papua and New Guinea	**PNG**	**910**
Paraguay	**PAR**	**150**
Peru	**PER**	**135**
Philippines	**PHI**	**840**
Poland	**POL**	**290**
Portugal	**POR**	**235**
Qatar	**QAT**	**694**
Rhodesia (see Zimbabwe)		
Rumania	**RUM**	**360**
Russia (Soviet Union)	**RUS**	**365**
Rwanda	**RWA**	**517**
San Marino	**SNM**	**331**
Sao Tome-Principe	**STP**	**403**
Saudi Arabia	**SAU**	**670**
Senegal	**SEN**	**433**
Serbia (see Yugoslavia)		
Seychelles	**SEY**	**591**
Sierra Leone	**SIE**	**451**
Singapore	**SIN**	**830**
Slovakia	**SLO**	**317**
Slovenia	**SLV**	**349**
Solomons	**SOL**	**940**
Somalia	**SOM**	**520**
Somalia Fr. (see Djibouti)		
South Africa	**SAF**	**560**
South Sudan	**SSD**	**626**
South West Africa (see Namibia)		
Spain	**SPN**	**230**
Spanish Sahara (see Western Sahara)		
Sri Lanka (Ceylon)	**SRI**	**780**
St. Kitts-Nevis	**SKN**	**060**
St. Lucia	**SLU**	**056**
St. Vincent & The Grenadines	**SVG**	**057**
Sudan	**SUD**	**625**
Surinam	**SUR**	**115**
Swaziland	**SWA**	**572**
Sweden	**SWD**	**380**
Switzerland	**SWZ**	**225**
Syria	**SYR**	**652**
Taiwan (China-Taiwan-Formosa)	**TAW**	**713**
Tajikistan	**TAJ**	**702**
Tanzania	**TAZ**	**510**

Thailand	**THI**	**800**
Tibet	**TBT**	**711**
Togo	**TOG**	**461**
Trinidad & Tobago	**TRI**	**052**
Tunisia	**TUN**	**616**
Turkey	**TUR**	**640**
Turkmenistan	**TKM**	**701**
Uganda	**UGA**	**500**
Ukraine	**UKR**	**369**
Upper Volta (see Burkina Faso)		
United Arab Emirates	**UAE**	**696**
United Kingdom (Great Britain)	**UKG**	**200**
USA	**USA**	**002**
USSR (see Russia)		
Uruguay	**URU**	**165**
Uzbekistan	**UZB**	**704**
Vanuatu	**VAN**	**935**
Venezuela	**VEN**	**101**
Vietnam, Democratic Republic of (North Vietnam)	**DRV**	**816**
Vietnam, Republic of (South Vietnam)	**RVN**	**817**
Western Sahara (Spanish Sahara)	**SPA**	**605**
Western Samoa	**WSM**	**990**
Yemen (Arab Republic of Yemen, North Yemen)	**YEM**	**678**
Yemen, People's Republic of (South Yemen)	**YPR**	**680**
Yugoslavia (Serbia)	**YUG**	**345**
Zambia	**ZAM**	**551**
Zanzibar	**ZAN**	**511**
Zimbabwe (Rhodesia)	**ZIM**	**552**

ICB1 VARIABLES - TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. CRISIS DIMENSIONS

#	Name
1	Breakpoint (Trigger) to International Crisis (BREAK)
2	Triggering Entity of International Crisis (TRIGENT)
3	Date of Perception of Crisis Breakpoint (TRIGDATE)
4	Date of Crisis Termination (TERMDATE)
5	Duration of International Crisis (BREXIT)
6	Gravity of Value Threatened (GRAVCR)
7	Crisis Management Technique (CRISMG)
8	Centrality of Violence (CENVIOSY)
9	Intensity of Violence (SEVVIOSY)
10	Violence (VIOL)
11	Timing of Violence (TIMVIO)
12	Intra-War Crisis (IWCMB)
13	Number of Involved Actors (NOACTR)
14	Great Power Involvement in Crisis (GPINV)
15	Great Power Activity as Third Party (GPINVTP)
16	Effectiveness of Great Power Activity as Third Party (GPEFCTTP)
17	Most Effective Great Power Activity as Third Party (GPEFACTP)
18	Great Power Activity as Third Party and Pace of Abatement (GPPACETP)
19	Superpower Involvement in Crisis (POWINV)
20	Content of U.S. Activity (USINV)
21	Effectiveness of U.S. Activity (USEFCT)
22	Most Effective U.S. Activity (USEFAC)
23	U.S. Activity and Pace of Abatement (USPACE)
24	U.S. as Actor or Third Party (USACTOR)
25	Content of USSR Activity (SUINV)
26	Effectiveness of USSR Activity (SUEFCT)
27	Most Effective USSR Activity (SUEFAC)
28	USSR Activity and Pace of Abatement (SUPACE)
29	USSR as Actor or Third Party (SUACTOR)
30	Source of Global Organization Involvement (SOGLACT)
31	Global Organization Organ Most Important in Crisis (GLOBORG)
32	Content of Global Organization Involvement (GLOBACTM)
33	Effectiveness of Global Organization Involvement (GLOBEFCT)
34	Most Effective Global Organization Organ (GLOBEFOR)
35	Most Effective Global Organization Involvement (GLOBEFAC)
36	Global Organization Activity and Pace of Abatement (GLOBPACE)
37	Source of Regional/Security Organization Involvement (SORACT)
38	Regional/Security Organization Most Active in Crisis (REGORG)

39 Content of Regional/Security Organization Involvement (REGACTMB)
40 Effectiveness of Regional/Security Organization Involvement (ROEFCT)
41 Most Effective Regional/Security Organization (ROBODY)
42 Most Effective Regional/Security Organization Involvement (ROEFAC)
43 Regional/Security Organization Involvement and Pace of Abatement (ROPACE)
44 Content of Outcome (SUBOUT)
45 Form of Outcome (FOROUT)
46 Extent of Satisfaction With Outcome (EXSAT)
47 Escalation or Reduction of Tension (OUTESR)
48 Number of Crisis Actors (CRACTR)
49 Geostrategic Salience (GEOSTR)
50 Heterogeneity (HETERO)
51 Issues (ISSUES)
52 Change in Actors (CHACTS)
53 Change in Alliance Configuration (CHALL)
54 Change in Distribution of Power (POWCH)
55 Change in Rules of the Game (RUGACH)

II. CONTROLS

#	**Name**
56	Geographic Location of Crisis (GEOG)
57	Geographic Proximity of Principal Adversaries (GEOGREL)
58	Polarity (PERIOD)
59	System Level (SYSLEVSY)
60	Protracted Conflict (PROTRAC)
61	Protracted Conflict Code Number (PCID)
62	Power Discrepancy (POWDISSY)
63	Ethnicity Related Crisis (ETHNIC)
64	Ethnicity Driven Crisis (ETHCONF)
65	Level of Stress (STRESSAD)
66	Source of Data (SOURDT)

III. MEDIATION

67 Mediation of Crisis (MEDIATE)
68 Instances of Mediation (MEDNUM)
69 Primary Mediator (MEDWHO)
70 Timing of Mediation (MEDTIME)
71 Date of Mediation Start (MEDSTART)
72 Date of Mediation End within Crisis Period (MEDEND)
73 Date of Mediation End outside Crisis Period (MEDENDCO)
74 Goal of Mediator(s) (MEDGOAL)

75 Was Facilitative Mediation Used (MEDFACL)
76 Was Formulative Mediation Used (MEDFORM)
77 Was Manipulative Mediation Used (MEDMANIP)
78 Highest Mediation Style Used (MEDSTYLE)
79 Which Mediation Style Most Effective (MEDSTEFCT)
80 Effectiveness of Mediation (MEDEFCT)
81 Mediation Effect on Pace of Crisis Abatement (MEDPACE)

PART I - CRISIS DIMENSIONS

Variable: 1

Name: BREAK

BREAKPOINT (TRIGGER) TO INTERNATIONAL CRISIS

The breakpoint to an international crisis is that event, act or situational change which catalyzes a crisis for the earliest actor, that is, which leads decision makers to perceive a threat to basic values, time pressure for response and heightened probability of involvement in military hostilities. The date of the trigger for the first crisis actor thus is also the initiation date for the entire international crisis.

Breakpoint is an attribute of an international crisis as a whole. However, it is based upon the coding of the trigger for a particular crisis actor. Hence the user should refer to the treatment of this variable (TRIGGR) in the codebook for the Actor Level Dataset.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **Verbal act** - protest, threat, accusation, demand, etc. (Archbishop Makarios, President of the Cyprus, made proposals to amend the constitution to change Cyprus into a unitary state, triggering a crisis for Turkey on 30 November 1963, the onset of the Cyprus I Crisis).

(2) **Political act** - subversion, alliance formation by adversaries, diplomatic sanctions, severance of diplomatic relation, violation of treaties (On 8 October 1953 the U.K. and the U.S. announced their intention to relinquish their administration of Trieste to the Italian Government, triggering a crisis for Yugoslavia, beginning the Trieste II Crisis).

(3) **Economic act** - embargo, dumping, nationalization of property, withholding of economic aid (In response to the trials of Nazis in Kaunas, Lithuania, Germany closed the border and imposed economic sanctions, triggering a crisis for Lithuania on 28 March 1935, the start of the Kaunas Trials Crisis).

(4) **External change** - intelligence report, change in specific weapon, weapon system, offensive capability, change in global system or regional subsystem, challenge to legitimacy by international organization (The UN General Assembly vote on 29 November 1947, calling for the partition of Palestine into separate Arab and Jewish states, triggered a crisis for Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria, in the Palestine Partition-Israel Independence Crisis).

(5) **Other non-violent act** (A pre-election referendum in Poland showing the Peasant Party to be strongest triggered a crisis for the USSR on 30 June 1946, catalyzing the Communism in Poland Crisis).

(6) **Internal verbal or physical challenge to regime or elite** - incitement by media, proclamation of new regime, fall of government, **coup d'etat**, sabotage act, terrorism, assassination, riot, demonstration, strike, arrest, martial law, execution, mutiny, revolt (In the Congo, the National Liberation Committee established a Revolutionary Council in Stanleyville, triggering a crisis for the Congo Government on 4 August 1964, in the Congo II Crisis).

(7) **Non-violent military act** - show of force, war game or maneuvers, mobilization, movement of forces, change of force posture to offensive (A crisis was triggered for India on 7 July 1951, when Pakistan moved a brigade to 15 miles from the Kashmir district of Poonch, setting in motion the Punjab War Scare Crisis).

(8) **Indirect violent act** - revolt in another country; violent act directed at ally, friendly state, or client state; violent act by ally against adversary (Supporters of Juan Bosch overthrew the military junta in the Dominican Republic, triggering a crisis for the U.S. on 24 April 1965, the onset of the Dominican Intervention Crisis).

(9) **Violent act** - border clash, border crossing by limited forces, invasion of air space, sinking of ship, sea-air incident, bombing of large target, large-scale military attack, war (A Chinese ambush of Soviet forces on the Ussuri River on 2 March 1969 triggered a crisis for the USSR, the beginning of the Ussuri River Crisis).

Variable: 2

Name: TRIGENT

TRIGGERING ENTITY OF INTERNATIONAL CRISIS

Which entity triggered an international crisis, i.e., initiated the act(s) which was (were) perceived by the earliest crisis actor in the cluster as involving a threat to basic values, a heightened probability of military hostilities and finite time for response? In addition to states, crises may be internally-generated or catalyzed by more than one state or by non-state actors.

In the case of a single state as the triggering entity, the country code is assigned. If the trigger was internally generated, it was coded 995. If the triggering entity was a non-state actor (UN, regional organization, OPEC, PLO, rebel forces), it was coded 996. If the trigger was an event involving more than one state (military alliance or arms deal directed at a crisis actor; or a simultaneous trigger in which the culpability in the start of hostilities cannot be assessed), it was coded 997.

For the list of country-codes, see Table 1 above.

Variable: 3

Name: TRIGDATE (YRTRIG, MOTRIG, DATRIG)

DATE OF PERCEPTION OF CRISIS BREAKPOINT

When did the earliest actor in an international crisis perceive a crisis? This is identified from the decision makers' indication - in diaries, memoirs, speeches, etc., of the act(s) or event(s) which they perceived as generating threat, time pressure and the likelihood of military hostilities. If it was not possible to determine the exact day of the perception of the trigger, only part of the date is coded, that is, year and month without day.

This variable appears on the record as follows: year, month, day (19480607, the USSR's perception of a grave threat arising from the Allies recommendation that their zones in Germany be integrated, with the USSR, France, the U.K., and the US as crisis actors).

Variable: 4

Name: TERMDATE (YRTERM, MOTERM, DATERM)

DATE OF CRISIS TERMINATION

What was the date of termination for the international crisis, that is, for the last actor to perceive a decline toward the pre-crisis norm of threat, time pressure and probability of military hostilities? When it was not possible to pinpoint the precise day of termination, the month and year were coded.

This variable appears in the database as follows: year, month, day (19620129, the frontier between Pakistan and Afghanistan was opened thus ending the Pushtunistan III Crisis, with Pakistan and Afghanistan as crisis actors).

Variable: 5

Name: BREXIT

DURATION OF INTERNATIONAL CRISIS

The duration of an international crisis is the elapsed time in days between the first breakpoint and the last exitpoint. The first breakpoint is the date on which the first actor perceived itself in a crisis, and the last exitpoint is that date on which the last actor perceived crisis termination.

Variable: 6

Name: GRAVCR

GRAVITY OF VALUE THREAT

This variable identifies the most salient object of threat identified by any of the actors in the crisis. Coding is based on the mix of actor level coding for GRAVTY in Actor level Codebook. While some threats may be viewed as more serious than others, the values for this variable should not be viewed as a true scale. In particular, territorial threat can vary in its seriousness, depending on state, region, and other circumstances.

Values and Illustrations

(0) **Economic threat** (In the Mauritania/Senegal Crisis of 1989-91, economically driven tension between the people of the two countries was at the heart of the conflict).

(1) **Limited military damage** (In Aaland Islands Crisis of 1921, Sweden perceived a limited military threat from Finland in regard to the disputed islands).

(2) **Political threat** - threat of overthrow of regime, change of institutions, replacement of elite, intervention in domestic politics, subversion (Crises for Nicaragua, Panama, the Dominican Republic and Haiti, generated by Cuba-assisted invasions by exiles of these states, in the 1959 Cuba/Central America I Crisis).

(3) **Territorial threat** - threat of integration, annexation of part of a state's territory, separatism (A threat to Chinese territorial integrity resulted from Japanese military operations during the Mukden Incident Crisis of 1931-32).

(4) **Threat to influence** - threat of declining power in the global system and/or regional subsystem, diplomatic isolation, cessation of patron aid (In the Invasion of Panama Crisis of 1989-90, the U.S. perceived the proclamation of Noriega as head of government as a threat to its influence in the region).

(5) **Threat of grave damage** - threat of large casualties in war, mass bombings as a result of a threat of grave damage. (For Taiwan, in the 1958 Taiwan Straits II Crisis, the PRC build-up of forces in the coastal areas around Quemoy and Matsu).

(6) **Threat to existence** - threat of survival of population, genocide, threat to existence of entity, of total annexation, colonial rule, occupation (Ethiopia's existence was threatened as a result of Italy's invasion in the 1934-36 Ethiopia War Crisis).

(7) **Other**

Variable: 7

Name: CRISMG

CRISIS MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUE

A variety of crisis management techniques is used to cope with crises. This variable identifies the primary technique used in an international crisis.

The crisis management technique selected for the international crisis as a whole is the highest technique used by any actor along a scale from pacific techniques to violence. Hence the user should refer to the treatment of this variable (CRISMG) in the Codebook for the Actor Level Dataset.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **Negotiation** - formal, informal, bilateral, multilateral, international, diplomatic exchange (In the Poland Liberalization Crisis between Poland and the USSR in October 1956, negotiations took place between the parties attending the Polish Plenum).

(2) **Adjudication or arbitration**

(3) **Mediation** - by global or regional organization, ally, or alliance personnel (In the Rann of Kutch Crisis of 1965 between India and Pakistan, both parties agreed to mediation by Britain).

(4) **Multiple not including violence -** (In the Shatt-al-Arab I Crisis of 1959-60, Iran placed its troops on full alert, moved troops to the Iraqi border, and engaged in negotiation, the latter ultimately leading to resolution of the crisis).

(5) **Non-military pressure** -e.g., withholding of promised economic aid (In the Iran-Oil Concession Crisis of 1944, Soviet non-military pressure was decisive in prompting concessions from Iran).

(6) **Non-violent military** - physical acts (maneuvers, redisposition of forces); verbal acts (oral and written statements by authorized leaders threatening to use violence) (Yugoslavia placed its forces on alert and conducted military maneuvers, in response to a Soviet ultimatum threatening military invasion, in the Soviet Bloc/Yugoslavia Crisis of 1949).

(7) **Multiple including violence** - (In the 1951-52 Suez Canal Crisis, Britain reinforced its forces in Egypt and engaged in serious clashes with Egyptian troops; it also prohibited the export of arms to Egypt).

(8) **Violence** - (The U.S. and South Korea attempted to manage the 1950 Korean War I Crisis by full-scale military action).

Variable: 8

Name: CENVIOSY

CENTRALITY OF VIOLENCE

For those international crises in which violence was employed as a crisis management technique, this variable identifies the centrality of that violence, i.e., the relative importance which decision makers attached to violence in order to obtain their goals.

This variable identifies the most extensive use of violence as a crisis management technique by any of the crisis actors. The user should refer to the treatment of this variable (CENVIO) in the codebook for the Actor-Level Dataset.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **No violence**

(2) **Minor violence** - violence occurred but played a minor role relative to other, non-violent crisis management techniques (During the Uganda/Tanzania I Crisis of 1971 Ugandan Air Force jets bombed a Tanzanian military camp allegedly used for training anti-Amin forces).

(3) **Violence important** - violence was important, but was supported by other crisis management techniques (In the Ogaden I Crisis of 1964 Ethiopia responded to a Somali attack on a frontier post with military resistance, together with a declaration of a state of emergency, a call for a meeting of the OAU, and a protest to the USSR Charge d'Affaires in Addis Ababa).

(4) **Violence preeminent** (Violence was the preeminent crisis management technique in the Korean War crises of 1950-53).

Variable: 9

Name: SEVVIOSY

INTENSITY OF VIOLENCE

For those international crises in which violence was employed as a crisis management technique, this variable identifies the most intense use of violence as a crisis management technique by any of the crisis actors. The user should refer to the treatment of this variable (SEVVIO) in the Actor-Level Dataset.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **No violence**

(2) **Minor clashes** - (between troops of the Warsaw Pact and Czech forces in the Prague Spring Crisis of 1968).

(3) **Serious clashes** - (between India and Pakistan forces in 1965 Rann of Kutch Crisis)

(4) **Full-scale war** - (a Japanese attack and Chinese counter-attack at the Marco Polo Bridge in early July 1937, the initial moves in the long Sino-Japanese war (1937-45)).

Variable: 10

Name: VIOL

VIOLENCE

This variable identifies the extent of violence in an international crisis as a whole, regardless of its use or non-use by a specific actor as a crisis management technique. The user should refer to the treatment of this variable (VIOL) in the Actor-Level Dataset.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **No violence** (Cienfuegos Submarine Base Crisis 1970).

(2) **Minor clashes** (Amur River 1937).

(3) **Serious clashes** (Taiwan Strait I, 1954-55).

(4) **Full-scale war** (Bangladesh, 1971).

Variable: 11

Name: TIMVIO

TIMING OF VIOLENCE

This variable indicates the point at which violence (if any) occurred in an international crisis. It refers to violence in general, not necessarily to violence as a crisis management technique (see VIOL above).

Values and Illustrations

(1) **Violence did not occur** - (On 10 April 1973 Israel placed its forces on full alert, anticipating an attack by Egyptian forces. An attack did not occur then, and the Israel Mobilization Crisis subsided in late June of that year).

(2) **Violence prior to the crisis period** - (Violence between the French and Vietminh forces had been going on for seven years prior to the crisis over Dien Bien Phu which began on 13 March 1954).

(3) **Violence triggered the crisis period** - (The Bay of Pigs Crisis was triggered on 15 April 1961 by the bombing of Cuban military and civilian centers by U.S.-supplied B-26 aircraft).

(4) **Violence subsequent to initiation of the crisis period** - (In a crisis over the Chinese Eastern Railway, which began on 13 July 1929, violence between Soviet and Chinese troops broke out on 12 August with the Soviet occupation of three strategic towns in north China).

Variable: 12

Name: IWCMB

INTRA-WAR CRISIS

Intra-war crisis is an attribute of an international crisis as a whole; that is, it is characterized by an increase in the intensity of disruptive interaction and incipient change within the structure of an international system. It differs from all other international crises only in the setting in which it occurs, that is, during an ongoing war.

An international crisis is identified as an IWC when three conditions obtain: (1) the crisis must begin during a war; that is, the crisis is an integral part of an ongoing war; if the crisis begins before a war erupts or if the crisis begins simultaneously with the outbreak of a war, it is identified

as a non-
IWC; (2) at least one of the principal adversaries is a continuing actor in that war; and (3) it is an inter-state war, not a civil or purely guerrilla war.

The term, *initiation of a war* – see (2) below – means that the crisis and war began simultaneously. If a war occurs at any time after the eruption of an international crisis, the crisis cannot be coded (2); many crises lead to war, but leading to war at any time later is not synonymous with the initiation of war. While such cases are non-IWCs – they are coded (1) – they cannot be coded (2), initiation of a war, unless crisis and war occurred simultaneously.

Not every incident or battle during every war was designated an IWC; only "turning point" environmental changes were included in the dataset. The counterpart IWC at the actor-level is a situation in which an environmental change, during a war, generates a perceived threat to basic values, an awareness of finite time to respond and a perceived adverse change in one's military capabilities or the military balance. Hence the user should refer to the more elaborate treatment of this variable (IWC) in the codebook for the Actor Level Dataset.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **Not an intra-war crisis**.

(2) **Initiation of a war (not an intra-war crisis)** - (the outbreak of the first Korean War crisis occurred when North Korean forces invaded South Korea on 25 June 1950).

(3) **Entry of a major actor into an ongoing war** - (a World War II crisis in the Middle East (Middle East Campaign) occurred in 1941 with the entry of German and Italian forces into that region).

(4) **Perceived high probability that a major power will enter a war** - (Israel's intra-war crisis in November 1956 arose from the Soviet threat to intervene in the Suez Nationalization-War).

(5) **Perceived high probability that a major power will exit from a war** - (in the Christmas Bombing Crisis of 1972, South Vietnam learned of agreements reached between the U.S. and North Vietnam, perceived as signaling the exit of the U.S. from the war).

(6) **Technological escalation of a war** - any introduction of new weapons in a war (German aerial bombing of the U.K., between 10 July and 15 September 1940, constituted the Battle of Britain intra-war crisis).

(7) **Major non-technological escalation** - invasion, major battle (the North Vietnam spring offensive, in March 1972, initiating the Vietnam-Ports Mining intra-war crisis).

(8) **Defeat in a significant battle** - (an intra-war crisis in World War II was triggered by the Soviet

defeat of the German Army at Stalingrad).

(9) **Internal deterioration leading to reduced capability to wage war** - economic strength, political stability, social cohesion (Hungarian leaders' perception that German troops were about to invade triggered an IWC in March 1944).

(10) **Other**

Variable: 13

Name: NOACTR

NUMBER OF INVOLVED ACTORS

How many states were perceived by the crisis actors to be involved in an international crisis, including the crisis actors themselves? Where objective evidence existed of substantial involvement without an articulated perception by a crisis actor, these states were included as involved actors. Substantial involvement refers to any one of the following types of activity: direct military; semi-military; covert; economic; and political other than mere statements of approval or disapproval by officials. This variable is aggregated from the actor-level data (excluding overlaps).

Variable: 14

Name: GPINV

GREAT POWER INVOLVEMENT IN CRISIS

This scale assesses combined great power involvement in a crisis for the 1918-1945 period. Low involvement includes verbal, political and economic acts. High involvement includes covert, semi-military, and direct military acts.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **Post-1945 case**

(2) **More than two powers low or no involvement** (Most of the great powers remained aloof from the Leticia Crisis between Columbia and Peru in 1932-33).

(3) **One or more powers high involvement, the others low or no involvement** (Germany was highly involved in the Czech Annexation Crisis of 1939 while the other great powers did not participate or were marginally involved).

(4) **One or two powers as crisis actors, the others low or no involvement** (Japan was a crisis actor in the Mukden Incident of 1931-32 while three of the other great powers were politically involved).

(5) **One or two powers as crisis actors, the others high, low or no involvement** (Britain and France were crisis actors in the Remilitarization of the Rhineland Crisis in 1936, while Germany was highly involved).

(6) **More than two powers as crisis actors, the other low or no involvement** (Britain, France and Germany were crisis actors in the Czech May Crisis of 1938).

(7) **More than two powers as crisis actors, the other high, low or no involvement** (Britain, France, Japan and the Soviet Union were crisis actors in the 1939 crisis leading to World War II, while the other great powers manifested varying degrees of involvement).

Variable: 15

Name: GPINVTP

CONTENT OF GREAT POWER ACTIVITY AS THIRD PARTIES

This variable assesses great power activity as third parties in crises for the 1918-1939 period. Activity is defined as any substantive verbal or physical act. When great powers were themselves crisis actors, they were excluded. If more than one form of great power activity occurred, the most intense was identified.

The small number of international crises during the multipolar period (1918-39) did not justify a separate variable for each of the great powers - France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the U.K., the U.S. and the USSR (World War II cases were excluded). Therefore, these data have been collapsed such that the highest level of activity exhibited by any great power in a crisis was taken as the value for the entire crisis.

Coding of this variable was based upon the coding for individual actor-cases. Hence the user should refer to the treatment of these variables in the Actor Level Dataset (ICB2).

Values and Illustrations

(1) **Post-1939 case**

(2) **Great powers not active** - (None of the great powers was involved in the Bulgaria/Turkey Crises of March and August 1935).

(3) **Low-level great power activity** - political activity, including statements of approval or disapproval by authorized government officials; economic involvement, e.g., financial aid, or the withholding of aid from an actor; and propaganda involvement (There was low-level activity by France and Italy in the crisis over the assassination of Yugoslavia's King Alexander, from 9 October to 10 December 1934).

(4) **Great power covert or semi-military activity** - covert activity, e.g., support for anti-government forces; and military aid or advisors, without participation in actual fighting (Italy rushed troops to the border with Austria in the July 1934 Austria Putsch Crisis).

(5) **Great power direct military activity** - dispatch of troops, aerial bombing of targets or naval assistance to a party in a war (France intervened in the 1919 Hungarian War Crisis by issuing ultimatums to Budapest demanding its withdrawal from Slovakia).

Variable: 16

Name: GPEFCTTP

EFFECTIVENESS OF GREAT POWER ACTIVITY AS THIRD PARTY

This variable assesses the effectiveness of great power activity in abating crises. Effectiveness is understood in terms of preventing hostilities or otherwise contributing to the termination of an international crisis. This assessment refers to the role of the great powers from the first breakpoint (trigger) to the final exit point (termination) of an international crisis.

The small number of international crises during the multipolar period (1918-39) did not justify a separate breakdown for each of the great powers. Therefore an entire case is coded as the highest level of effectiveness exhibited by any of the great powers.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **Post-1939 case**

(2) **No great power activity**

(3) **Great power activity escalated the crisis** - (The USSR supplied China with military equipment during the Marco Polo Bridge Crisis of 1937-38).

(4) **Great power activity did not contribute to crisis abatement** -(In the Mukden Incident Crisis of 1931-32, the U.S. confined its action to non-recognition of Manchukuo).

(5) **Great power activity contributed marginally to crisis abatement** - great power activity was not a major factor (In the Shantung Crisis of 1927-29, although a U.S. offer of good offices was declined, the U.S. consul in Tsinan reportedly helped to wind down the hostilities).

(6) **Great power activity had an important impact on crisis abatement** - important impact, along with the actions of other international entities (The U.K. played a high-profile role in resolving the Rhenish Rebellion Crisis of 1920 between France and Germany).

(7) **Great power activity was the single most important contributor to crisis abatement** (British mediation efforts during the 1932 Shanghai Crisis between China and Japan).

Variable: 17

Name: GPEFACTP

MOST EFFECTIVE GREAT POWER ACTIVITY AS THIRD PARTY

This variable identifies the most effective type of activity engaged in by the great powers in those crises in which such activity was deemed to have been effective in crisis abatement. The cases coded for this variable are those in which great power activity was identified as the most important, an important, or a marginal contributor to crisis abatement.

The small number of international crises during the multipolar period (1918-39) did not justify a separate breakdown for each of the great powers. Therefore these data are collapsed so as to identify the activity associated with the most effective great power in a crisis.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **Post-1939 case**

(2) **Great power not involved or ineffective**

(3) **Effective low-level great power activity** - political, economic and propaganda activity (U.S. mediation, together with that of Costa Rica and Venezuela, during the Postage Stamp Crisis of 1937 between Nicaragua and Honduras, prevented armed hostilities between the parties).

(4) **Effective great power covert and semi-military activity** - (During the Saudi-Yemen War of 1933-34 the dispatch of British, French and Italian warships to the area had the effect of halting a Saudi advance).

(5) **Effective great power military activity** - (German military activity in the Baltic Independence Crisis of 1918-20).

Variable: 18

Name: GPPACETP

GREAT POWER ACTIVITY AS THIRD PARTY AND PACE OF ABATEMENT

This variable assesses the impact of great power activity on the timing of crisis abatement.

The small number of international crises during the multipolar period (1918-39) did not justify a separate breakdown for each of the great powers. Therefore an entire case was coded as the highest value exhibited by any of the great powers.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **Post-1939 case**

(2) **No great power activity** (There was no great power activity in the Bulgaria/Turkey I Crisis of 1935).

(3) **Great power activity delayed termination** (The U.K. provided military aid to the Greeks in the Greece/Turkey War I Crisis of 1920, thereby prolonging the duration of the crisis).

(4) **Great power activity had no effect on the timing of termination** (Great power activity in the Anschluss Crisis of 1938 had no effect on crisis termination).

(5) **Great power activity contributed to more rapid termination** (Major power activity -- France, Germany, Italy, and the U.K. -- contributed to the termination of the Aaland Islands Crisis of 1920-21).

Variable: 19

Name: POWINV

US AND USSR/RUSSIA JOINT INVOLVEMENT IN CRISIS

This variable assesses combined U.S. and USSR (or Russia after 1991) involvement in crises for the post-World War II period. The U.S. and the USSR were superpowers from 1945-1989. Thereafter, the U.S. was the sole superpower. However, we continue to code joint U.S. and USSR (later Russian) involvement in crises because Russia remained, by virtue of its nuclear stockpile, the second power in the global system. Low level includes verbal, political and economic acts. High involvement includes covert, semi-military, and direct military acts.

This variable replaces SPINVMB in earlier releases of the ICB datasets.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **Pre-end World War II case**

(2) **Both powers low or no involvement** (The U.S. was politically involved in, and the USSR/Russia remained aloof from, the Punjab War Scare between India and Pakistan in 1951).

(3) **One power high involvement, the other power low or no involvement** (The USSR engaged in direct military activity in the Catalina Affair in 1952, shooting down a Swedish flying boat, with U.S. involvement limited to verbal criticism of the Soviet act).

(4) **One power a crisis actor, the other power low or no involvement** (The U.S. was a crisis actor in the Taiwan Strait Crisis of 1954-55, supporting Taiwan, while USSR activity was confined to political support for the PRC).

(5) **Both powers high involvement** (The U.S. provided military aid to Ethiopia, the USSR to Somalia, in the Ogaden I Crisis of 1964).

(6) **One power a crisis actor, the other high involvement** (The U.S. was a crisis actor in the Guatemala Crisis of 1953-54 while the USSR was highly involved, dispatching military aid to Guatemala).

(7) **Both powers crisis actors** (The U.S. and USSR were engaged in a direct confrontation in the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962).

Variable: 20

Name: USINV

CONTENT OF U.S. ACTIVITY

This variable assesses U.S. activity in international crises. Activity is defined as any substantive verbal or physical act, regardless of whether the United States was itself a crisis actor. If more than one form of U.S. activity occurred, the most intense was identified.

The coding of this variable was based upon the coding for individual actor-cases. Hence the user should refer to the treatment of this variable (USINV Variable #16) in the Actor Level Dataset.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **U.S. not active**

(2) **Low-level U.S. activity** - political activity, including statements of approval or disapproval by authorized government officials; economic involvement, e.g., financial aid, or the withholding of aid from an actor; and propaganda involvement (The U.S. was involved politically in the Congo I: Katanga Crisis of 1960-62).

(3) **U.S. covert or semi-military activity** - covert activity, e.g., support for anti-government forces; and military aid or advisors, without participation in actual fighting (U.S. activity in the October-Yom Kippur War of 1973 was semi-military, by virtue of their arms shipments to Israel).

(4) **U.S. direct military activity** - dispatch of troops, aerial bombing of targets or naval assistance to a party in a war (U.S. activity in the various Vietnam crises between 1964 and 1973).

Variable: 21

Name: USEFCT

EFFECTIVENESS OF U.S. ACTIVITY

This variable assesses the effectiveness of U.S. activity in abating crises. Effectiveness in crisis abatement is understood in a "positive" sense, in terms of preventing hostilities or otherwise contributing to the termination of an international crisis. Cases in which U.S. activity was deemed to be effective are coded as marginally effective, important, or most important in terms of the impact of that activity on crisis abatement. This refers only to the role of the U.S. from the first breakpoint (trigger) to the final exit point (termination) of an international crisis.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **No U.S. activity**

(2) **U.S. activity escalated the crisis** (The U.S./U.K. announcement on 8 October 1953 of their intention to withdraw their troops and relinquish the administration of Trieste to the Italian Government, in the Trieste II Crisis between Yugoslavia and Italy).

(3) **U.S. activity did not contribute to crisis abatement** (The U.S. decision not to send troops to Vietnam, in the Dien Bien Phu Crisis of 1954).

(4) **U.S. activity contributed marginally to crisis abatement** (The U.S. action of withholding the Dominican Republic sugar quota and breaking off diplomatic relations in the crisis resulting from the assassination attempt on the Venezuelan President in June-September 1960).

(5) **U.S. activity had an important impact on crisis abatement** (U.S. activity in the Lebanon Crisis of 1958, including the landing of Marines in July).

(6) **U.S. activity was the single most important contributor to crisis abatement** (The U.S. action of moving the Seventh Fleet into the area of the Taiwan Strait Crisis of 1958 between the PRC and Taiwan).

Variable: 22

Name: USEFAC

MOST EFFECTIVE U.S. ACTIVITY

This variable identifies the most effective type of activity by the U.S. in those crises in which such activity was deemed to have had a positive effect on crisis abatement. Only those cases in which U.S. activity was identified as the most important, an important, or marginal contributor to crisis abatement, as reported in USEFCT above, were coded as "effective" for this variable.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **U.S. not involved**

(2) **U.S. ineffective**

(3) **Effective low-level U.S. activity** - political, economic and propaganda activity (On 7 August 1970 the acceptance by Egypt and Israel of U.S. Secretary of State Rogers' Peace Plan brought the War of Attrition Crisis to an end).

(4) **Effective U.S. covert and semi-military activity** (During the Central America/Cuba I Crisis of 1959 the U.S. organized a naval mission to patrol the Caribbean waters in order to bar any Communist-led invasion attempt).

(5) **Effective U.S. military activity** (The U.S. and Belgium dispatched paratroops who occupied Stanleyville and handed control back to Central Government forces on 19 November 1964 during the Congo II Crisis).

Variable: 23

Name: USPACE

U.S. ACTIVITY AND PACE OF ABATEMENT

This variable assesses the impact of U.S. activity on the timing of crisis abatement.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **No U.S. activity** (The U.S. was not involved in Guyana's Essequibo II Crisis of 1981-83).

(2) **U.S. activity delayed termination** (U.S. activity delayed the pace of abatement in the Invasion of Laos II Crisis of 1971).

(3) **U.S. activity had no effect on the timing of termination** (U.S. activity had no effect on the pace of abatement of the Yemen War I Crisis of 1962-63, involving Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Yemen).

(4) **U.S. activity contributed to more rapid termination** (The U.S. mediated a ceasefire between Israeli and Hizbullah forces in the Operation Accountability Crisis of 1993).

Variable: 24

Name: USACTOR

U.S. AS ACTOR OR THIRD PARTY

This variable differentiates between cases in which the U.S. was an actor in the crisis, and those in which it functioned as a third party.

Values

(1) U.S. not an actor in crisis

(2) U.S. actor in crisis

Variable: 25

Name: SUINV

CONTENT OF USSR/RUSSIA ACTIVITY

This variable assesses USSR activity (and Russian activity after 1991) in international crises. Activity is defined as any substantive verbal or physical act, regardless of whether the Soviet Union/Russia was itself a crisis actor. If more than one form of USSR activity occurred, the most intense was identified.

The coding of this variable was based upon the coding for individual actor-cases. Hence the user should refer to the treatment of this variable (SUINV Variable #18) in the Actor Level Dataset.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **USSR/Russia not involved**

(2) **Low-level USSR/Russia activity** - political activity, including statements of approval or disapproval by authorized government officials; economic involvement, e.g., financial aid, or the withholding of aid from an actor; and propaganda involvement (The USSR was involved politically in the Dominican Republic Crisis of 1965).

(3) **USSR/Russia covert or semi-military activity** - covert activity, e.g., support for anti-government forces; and military aid or advisors, without participation in actual fighting (USSR activity in the October-Yom Kippur War was semi-military, by virtue of their arms shipments to Egypt and Syria).

(4) **USSR/Russia direct military activity** - dispatch of troops, aerial bombing of targets or naval assistance to a party in a war (USSR planes were active in the 1969-70 War of Attrition between Egypt and Israel).

Variable: 26

Name: SUEFCT

EFFECTIVENESS OF USSR/RUSSIA ACTIVITY

This variable assesses the effectiveness of USSR/Russian activity in abating crises. Effectiveness in crisis abatement is understood in a "positive" sense, in terms of preventing hostilities or otherwise contributing to the termination of an international crisis. Cases in which USSR/Russian activity was deemed to be effective are coded as marginally effective, important, or most important in terms of the impact of that activity on crisis abatement. This refers only to the role of the USSR/Russia from the first breakpoint (trigger) to the final exit point (termination) of an international crisis.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **No USSR/Russian activity**

(2) **USSR/Russian activity escalated the crisis** (The USSR emplacement of missiles in Egypt in the 1969-70 War of Attrition Crisis between Egypt and Israel).

(3) **USSR/Russian activity did not contribute to crisis abatement** (USSR activity in the Baghdad Pact Crisis of 1955).

(4) **USSR/Russian activity contributed marginally to crisis abatement** (The USSR warning Israel and the Arab states against the use of force in the 1963-64 Jordan Waters Crisis).

(5) **USSR/Russian activity had an important impact on crisis abatement** (USSR pressure on India to accept the Chinese proposal for talks to end the 1962 Sino-Indian border crisis).

(6) **USSR/Russian activity was the single most important contributor to crisis abatement** (Soviet conciliatory moves in the 1957 Syria/Turkey Border Crisis).

Variable: 27

Name: SUEFAC

MOST EFFECTIVE USSR/RUSSIAN ACTIVITY

This variable identifies the most effective type of activity engaged in by the USSR/Russia in those crises in which such activity was deemed to have had a positive effect on crisis abatement. Only those cases in which USSR/Russian activity was identified as the most important, an important, or marginal contributor to crisis abatement, as reported in SUEFCT above, were coded as "effective" for this variable.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **USSR/Russia not involved**

(2) **USSR/Russia ineffective**

(3) **Effective low-level USSR/Russian activity** - political, economic and propaganda activity (The USSR announcement that construction had been halted at the Cienfuegos Naval Base in Cuba on 23 October 1970 contributed to crisis abatement).

(4) **Effective USSR/Russian covert and semi-military activity** (The USSR provided massive

amounts of arms and equipment to Egypt and Syria during the 1973 October-Yom Kippur War).

(5) **Effective USSR/Russian military activity** (USSR military action terminated the October-November 1956 crisis in Hungary).

Variable: 28

Name: SUPACE

USSR/RUSSIAN ACTIVITY AND PACE OF ABATEMENT

This variable assesses the impact of USSR/Russian activity on the timing of crisis abatement.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **No USSR/Russian activity** (There was no USSR activity in the Libya/Malta Oil Dispute Crisis of 1980).

(2) **USSR/Russian activity delayed termination** (USSR activity in the China Civil War Crisis of 1948-49 delayed termination of the crisis).

(3) **USSR/Russian activity had no effect on the timing of termination** (USSR activity in the Jordan Waters Crisis of 1963-64 had no effect on the pace of crisis abatement).

(4) **USSR/Russian activity contributed to more rapid termination** (USSR activity contributed to more rapid termination in the Vietnam-Ports Mining Crisis of 1972).

Variable: 29

Name: SUACTOR

Location: Record 2, Column 29

USSR/RUSSIA AS ACTOR OR THIRD PARTY

This variable differentiates between cases in which the USSR/Russia was an actor in the crisis, and those in which it functioned as a third party.

Values

(1) **USSR/Russia not an actor in crisis**

(2) **USSR/Russia actor in crisis**

Variable: 30

Name: SOGLACT

SOURCE OF GLOBAL ORGANIZATION INVOLVEMENT

This variable addresses the basic question: which party(ies) (if any) approached the League or Nations/United Nations during a crisis? The initial request may have occurred prior to the crisis period (i.e., from the first breakpoint (trigger) to the last exit point (termination)).

Values and Illustrations

(0) **Global organization not in existence (1918-10 January 1920)**

(1) **Global organization not approached**.

(2) **Crisis actor(s)** (In the Mukden Incident Crisis, China appealed to the League of Nations following a Japanese invasion on 18 September 1931).

(3) **Third party** - non-crisis actor or actor involved in a crisis, other than a superpower (In the Moroccan March Crisis of 1975/76, Spain appealed to the UN for action).

(4) **United States** (The U.S. requested a Security Council meeting during the Gulf of Tonkin Crisis of August 1964).

(5) **Soviet Union** (The USSR called for a UN Security Council Resolution on OAS sanctions during the crisis between Venezuela and the Dominican Republic in 1960).

(6) **Initiated by global organization** (During the crisis resulting from the invasion of Laos by North Vietnam in 1971, UN Secretary-General U Thant appealed for negotiation).

(7) **Multiple** (Gulf of Syrte I, 1981).

Variable: 31

Name: GLOBORG

GLOBAL ORGANIZATION ORGAN MOST IMPORTANT IN CRISIS

Which organ of the global organization was the most important in a crisis? Where more than one organ was active, perhaps during different stages of a crisis, the highest organ was chosen, according to the ranking below. For example, if the Security Council and another organ are both involved, the Security Council is coded for this variable even if it was not as active as the other organ, with one exception: if the Security Council only meets and discusses the crisis but does not reach a formal resolution, the other organ that was more involved would be coded instead. The user should refer to the treatment of this variable (GLOBORG) in the codebook for the Actor-Level Dataset.

Values and Illustrations

(0) **GO not in existence (1918-10 Jan. 1920)**

(1) **No global organization activity**

(2) **General/other global organization activity** - no data about specific involvement or through a specific organ, or sub-organs subject to the (General) Assembly, specialized agencies such as UNESCO (In the Punjab War Scare Crisis of 1951 between India and Pakistan, the UN Representative for Kashmir was in the area and had discussions with Indian and Pakistani officials).

(3) **Secretary-General** (During the Cambodia/Thailand Crisis of 1958-59 UN Secretary-General Hammarskjold appointed a retired Swiss diplomat as a mediator).

(4) **(General) Assembly** (During the Suez Nationalization-War Crisis, July-November 1956, the UN General Assembly voted to send an emergency military force to the region).

(5) **(Security) Council** (on 27 June 1980, the Security Council passed a resolution condemning South Africa's attack on Angola's Southern provinces in the Operation Smokeshell Crisis).

Variable: 32

Name: GLOBACTM

CONTENT OF GLOBAL ORGANIZATION INVOLVEMENT

This variable identifies the content of global organization involvement during the course of an international crisis, the activity which was the basis of the coding of GLOBORG (above). The user should refer to the treatment of this variable (GLOBACT) in the codebook for the Actor-Level Dataset.

Values and Illustrations

(0) **GO not in existence (1918-10 Jan. 1920)**

(1) **No global organization involvement**

(2) **Discussion without resolution** (During the crisis which resulted from the Israeli retaliatory raid on the Jordanian village of Karameh in March 1968, the UN Security Council discussed the matter but failed to pass a resolution).

(3) **Fact-finding** (UN Under-Secretary-General Ralph Bunche visited Yemen on a fact-finding mission in the Yemen War I Crisis in 1963).

(4) **Good offices** - minimal involvement in both the content and process of resolving a dispute (In the Mayaguez Crisis between the U.S. and Cambodia in May 1975 the UN Secretary-General offered his good offices to settle the dispute).

(5) **Condemnation** - includes an implied or explicit demand to desist, a request for member aid to the victim of hostile activity (UN Secretary-General Boutros Ghali condemned Israel on 28 July 1993 during the Operation Accountability Crisis).

(6) **Call for action by adversaries** - includes call for cease-fire, withdrawal, negotiation, member action to facilitate termination (The UN Security Council censured South Africa for its military operation in Angola in the Operation Askari Crisis of 1983).

(7) **Mediation** - includes proposing a solution, offering advice, and conciliation of differences (Secretary-General Waldheim's mediation efforts in the Moroccan March Crisis of 1975 contributed substantially to crisis abatement).

(8) **Arbitration** - formal binding settlement by arbitral body (The League Council, in January 1937, placed Alexandretta under Syrian control and drafted a Statute of Fundamental Law of the Sanjak).

(9) **Sanctions** (The League of Nations adopted a resolution to maintain an arms embargo against Paraguay and to lift it from Bolivia, on 16 January 1935 during the second Chaco Crisis).

(10) **Observer group** (During the Lebanon/Iraq Crisis of 1958 the Security Council adopted a resolution dispatching an observer group to Lebanon to ensure that there was no infiltration across its border).

(11) **Authorization of military force by members** – cases in which the organization authorized the use of force by member states to enforce a resolution but did not commit organization forces (On November 1990, at US urging, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 678, authorizing the "use (of) all necessary means" by member-states to secure Iraq's compliance with all its earlier resolutions).

(12) **Emergency military forces** (In July 1960 the Security Council passed a resolution establishing a UN emergency military force for the Congo in the Congo: Katanga Crisis).

(13) **General-other**

Variable: 33

Name: GLOBEFCT

EFFECTIVENESS OF GLOBAL ORGANIZATION INVOLVEMENT

This variable assesses the effectiveness of global organization (GO) activity in abating international crises. Effectiveness is understood in a "positive" sense, in terms of preventing hostilities or otherwise contributing to the termination of a crisis. Cases in which global organization activity was deemed to be effective are coded as marginally effective, important, or most important in terms of the impact of that activity on crisis abatement. This assessment refers to the role of the GO from the first breakpoint to the final exitpoint of an international crisis.

Values and Illustrations

(0) **GO not in existence (1918-10 Jan. 1920)**

(1) **No global organization activity**

(2) **Global organization involvement escalated crisis** (The dispatch of a UN Observer Group to Lebanon in 1958 exacerbated that crisis and delayed its termination, since the group was too small to cover the entire border area).

(3) **Global organization involvement did not contribute to crisis abatement** (The UN Security Council became involved in the 1945-47 Indonesia Independence I Crisis but its activity did not contribute to the resolution of that crisis).

(4) **Global organization involvement contributed marginally to crisis abatement** (During the War of Attrition Crisis in 1969-70, UN Observer Forces and Big Four talks under UN auspices

contributed marginally to crisis abatement).

(5) **Global organization involvement had an important impact on crisis abatement** (The active participation of the UN Secretary-General (and the U.S. Government) in the West Irian Crisis of 1961-62 had an important impact on crisis abatement).

(6) **Global organization involvement was the single most important contributor to crisis abatement** (The Caprivi Strip Crisis in 1971 terminated when the UN Security Council passed a resolution condemning South Africa and calling on it to respect the sovereignty of Zambia).

Variable: 34

Name: GLOBEFOR

MOST EFFECTIVE GLOBAL ORGANIZATION ORGAN

. This variable identifies the most effective organ in those crises in which the global organization (GO) was deemed to have had a positive effect on crisis abatement. Only those cases in which global organization activity was identified as marginally effective, important, or most important in terms of crisis abatement, as reported in GLOBEFCT above, were coded as "effective" for this variable.

Values and Illustrations

(0) **GO not in existence (1918-10 Jan. 1920)**

(1) **No global organization involvement**

(2) **GO ineffective**

(3) **Secretary-General** (During the Burundi-Rwanda Crisis of 1963-64 the UN Secretary-General appointed a Representative to investigate the refugee problem).

(4) **(General) Assembly** (In the Suez Nationalization-War Crisis of 1956-57 the General Assembly decided to send an emergency military force to the region).

(5) **(Security) Council** (In the Cyprus III Crisis of 1974-75, the Security Council arranged and supervised cease-fires and facilitated talks among the parties to the crisis).

(6) **Other**

Variable: 35

Name: GLOBEFAC

MOST EFFECTIVE GLOBAL ORGANIZATION INVOLVEMENT

This variable identifies the most effective activity in those crises in which the global organization (GO) was deemed to have had a positive effect on crisis abatement. Only those cases in which global organization activity was coded as marginally effective, important and most important in terms of crisis abatement, as reported in GLOBEFCT above, were coded as "effective" for this variable. This variable is coded for the most effective activity used by the most effective organ, as reported in GLOBEFOR above.

Values (for illustrations, see GLOBACTM above)

(0) **GO not in existence (1918-10 Jan. 1920)**
(1) **No global organization involvement**
(2) **GO involvement ineffective**
(3) **Discussion without resolution**
(4) **Fact-finding**
(5) **Good offices**
(6) **Condemnation**
(7) **Call for action by adversaries**
(8) **Mediation**
(9) **Arbitration**
(10) **Sanction**
(11) **Observer group**
(12) **Authorization of military force by members**
(13) **Emergency military force**
(14) **General-other**

Variable: 36

Name: GLOBPACE

GLOBAL ORGANIZATION ACTIVITY AND PACE OF ABATEMENT

This variable assesses the impact of global organization activity on the timing of crisis abatement.

Values and Illustrations

(0) **GO not in existence (1918-10 Jan. 1920)**

(1) **No global organization activity** (The UN was not involved in the Mocoron Incident Crisis of 1957 between Honduras and Nicaragua).

(2) **GO activity delayed termination** (UN activity delayed termination of the Guatemala Crisis of 1953-54 involving Guatemala, Honduras and the USA).

(3) **GO activity had no effect on the timing of termination** (UN activity had no impact on the timing of termination of the Falklands/Malvinas Crisis of 1982 between the U.K. and Argentina).

(4) **GO activity contributed to more rapid termination** (UN activity contributed to the more rapid termination of Lebanon's Litani Operation Crisis of 1978).

Variable: 37

Name: SORACT

SOURCE OF REGIONAL/SECURITY ORGANIZATION INVOLVEMENT

The following seven variables refer to the activity and effectiveness of regional/security organizations (RSOs) in international crises. Since RSO involvement was virtually non-existent prior to 1945, the data reported here pertain only to the post-World War II period.

The first variable addresses the following question: which party(ies) (if any) approached a regional/security organization during a crisis? (The initial approach may have occurred prior to the first breakpoint of the crisis period.)

Values and Illustrations

(0) **RSO not in existence**

(1) **RSO no approached**

(2) **Crisis actor(s)** (In January 1955 Costa Rica appealed to the OAS in an international crisis triggered by the arrival of Costa Rican rebels in Nicaragua via Venezuela).

(3) **Third party** - non-crisis actor or actor involved in a crisis, other than superpower (In the Guinea Crisis of 1970 Ethiopia, Egypt, Libya and Sudan called for action by the OAU, which ultimately

passed a resolution condemning Portugal and demanding reparations for Guinea).

(4) **U.S.** (In the Nam Tha Offensive II Crisis of 1962 the U.S. initiated action by SEATO forces).

(5) **USSR** (In the Ussuri River Crisis of 1969 the Warsaw Treaty Organization met at the request of the USSR).

(6) **Initiation by regional/security organization** (In the Berlin Deadline Crisis of 1957-58 NATO initiated action).

(7) **Multiple**

Variable: 38

Name: REGORG

REGIONAL/SECURITY ORGANIZATION MOST ACTIVE IN CRISIS

Which regional/security organization was most active in a crisis, regardless of form, substance or alignment? The user should refer to the treatment of this variable (REGORG) in the codebook for the Actor-Level Dataset.

Values and Illustrations

(0) **RSO no in existence**

(1) **No RSO involvement**

(2) **League of Arab States** (During the Palestine Partition-Israeli Independence Crisis of 1947-49 the Arab League announced the decisions to keep Palestine as an Arab state and to set up an army of volunteers).

(3) **North Atlantic Treaty Organization** (In the Syria/Turkey Border Crisis of 1957, NATO's commander issued a warning to the USSR concerning its intentions regarding Turkey).

(4) **Organization of American States** (During the Mocoron Incident Crisis of April-May 1957 between Honduras and Nicaragua, an OAS investigating committee succeeded in getting both parties to sign a cease-fire).

(5) **Organization of African Unity** (In the Kenya/Somalia Crisis of 1963-64, the OAU Council of Ministers passed a resolution calling for steps to settle the dispute).

(6) **Southeast Asia Treaty Organization** (During the Vietcong Attack Crisis of 1961, SEATO military advisors met and issues a communique).

(7) **Warsaw Treaty Organization** (Warsaw Pact forces invaded Czechoslovakia in August 1968 during the Prague Spring Crisis).

(8) **CENTO**

(10) **Other (including SADC, ECCAS/COPAX, SAARC, CIS, and Gulf Cooperation Council)**

(11) **Multiple**

(12) European Union

(13) ASEAN

(14) CSCE/OSCE

(15) ECOWAS/ECOMOG

Variable: 39

Name: REGACTMB

CONTENT OF REGIONAL/SECURITY ORGANIZATION INVOLVEMENT

This variable identifies the content of regional/security organization activity during the course of a crisis, the activity which was the basis of the coding of REGORG (above). The user should refer to the treatment of this variable (REGACT) in the codebook for the Actor-Level Dataset.

Values and Illustrations

(0) **RSO not in existence**

(1) **No RSO involvement**

(2) **Discussion without resolution** (During the West Irian I Crisis the NATO Council met in December 1957 but took no action).

(3) **Fact-finding** (In the Dominican Republic/Haiti Crisis of 1963 an OAS fact-finding mission shuttled between the two countries in an attempt at de-escalation).

(4) **Good offices** (The President of the Union Africaine et Malgache offered his good offices in the settlement of a territorial dispute between Niger and Dahomey in 1963-64).

(5) **Condemnation** (In the crisis resulting from the assassination attempt on the Venezuelan President in 1960 the OAS passed a resolution condemning the Government of the Dominican Republic).

(6) **Call for action** (During the Indonesian Independence III Crisis of 1948-49 the Arab League passed a resolution calling for Dutch acceptance of a cease-fire).

(7) **Mediation** (In the Black September Crisis of 1970 the Arab League played a mediating role in producing a cease-fire between Jordan and Syria).

(8) **Arbitration** (The OAS arbitrated the dispute between Honduras and El Salvador in the Football War of 1969).

(9) **Sanctions** (In the Soviet Bloc/Yugoslavia Crisis of 1949, the COMECON imposed sanctions on Yugoslavia).

(10) **Observer group** (The League of Arab States adopted a resolution to supervise the implementation of a cease-fire between North and South Yemen in 1979).

(11) **Emergency military force** (In the Dominican Republic Crisis of 1965 an OAS Resolution called for the dispatch of an Inter-American Peace Force to the Dominican Republic).

(12) **Multiple activity** (In the Berlin Wall Crisis of 1961 Khrushchev's demand for a settlement of the Berlin problem elicited NATO consultations and WTO endorsement).

(13) **General-other**

Variable: 40

Name: ROEFCT

EFFECTIVENESS OF REGIONAL/SECURITY ORGANIZATION INVOLVEMENT

This variable assesses the effectiveness of regional/security organization activity in abating

an international crisis. Effectiveness is understood in a "positive" sense, in terms of preventing hostilities or otherwise contributing to the termination of a crisis. Cases in which regional/security organization activity was deemed to be effective are coded as marginally effective, important, or most important in terms of the impact of that activity on crisis abatement. This assessment refers to the role of the RSO from the first breakpoint to the final exit point of an international crisis.

Values and Illustrations

(0) **RSO no in existence**

(1) **No RSO activity**

(2) **RSO involvement escalated the crisis** (Warsaw Treaty Organization military exercises at the height of the Prague Spring Crisis of 1968 exacerbated that crisis).

(3) **RSO involvement did not contribute to crisis abatement** (A joint OAU/Arab League effort to abate the 1975-76 Moroccan March Crisis did not have any effect on that crisis).

(4) **RSO involvement contributed marginally to crisis abatement** (The passage of an OAU resolution calling for a settlement of the Kenya/Somalia Crisis of 1963-64 contributed marginally to crisis abatement).

(5) **RSO involvement had an important impact on crisis abatement** (During the Dominican Republic/Haiti Crisis of 1963, OAS activity, including shuttle diplomacy between the two states and a report, had an important impact on crisis abatement).

(6) **RSO involvement was the single most important contributor to crisis abatement** (The OAS Council played a critical role in abating the second Costa Rica/Nicaragua Crisis in 1955, including the sending of observers to the area).

Variable: 41

Name: ROBODY

MOST EFFECTIVE REGIONAL/SECURITY ORGANIZATION

This variable identifies the most effective regional/security organization in those crises in which regional/security organization activity was deemed to have had a positive effect on crisis abatement. Only those cases in which regional/security organization activity was coded as marginally effective, important, or most important in terms of crisis abatement, as reported in ROEFCT above, were coded as "effective" for this variable.

Values (for illustrations, see REGORG above)

(0) **RO no in existence**
(1) **No activity**
(2) **RO ineffective**
(3) **LAS**
(4) **NATO**
(5) **OAS**
(6) **OAU**
(7) **SEATO**
(8) **WTO**
(9) **CENTO**
(11) **Other**
(12) **Multiple**
(13) European Union
(14) ASEAN
(15) CSCE/OSCE
(16) ECOWAS/ECOMOG

Variable: 42

Name: ROEFAC

MOST EFFECTIVE REGIONAL/SECURITY ORGANIZATION INVOLVEMENT

This variable identifies the most effective activity in those crises in which regional/security organization activity was deemed to have had a positive effect on crisis abatement. Only those cases in which regional/security organization activity was coded as marginally effective, important, or most important in terms of crisis abatement, as reported in ROEFCT above were coded as "effective" for this variable. This variable is coded for the most effective activity used by the most effective regional/security organization, as reported in ROBODY above.
Values (for illustrations, see REGACTMB above)

(0) **RSO not in existence**
(1) **NO RSO involvement**
(2) **RSO ineffective**
(3) **Discussion without resolution**
(4) **Fact-finding**
(5) **Good offices**
(6) **Condemnation**
(7) **Call for action**

(8) **Mediation**
(9) **Arbitration**
(10) **Sanctions**
(11) **Observer group**
(12) **Emergency military force**
(13) **General-other**

Variable: 43

Name: ROPACE

REGIONAL/SECURITY ORGANIZATION INVOLVEMENT AND PACE OF ABATEMENT

This variable assesses the impact of regional/security organization activity on the timing of crisis abatement.

Values and Illustrations

(0) **RSO not in existence**

(1) **No RSO activity** (RSO's were not involved in the Mayaguez Crisis of 1975 involving the USA and Cambodia).

(2) **RSO activity delayed termination** (RSO activity delayed termination of the Lebanon/Iraq Upheaval Crisis in 1958).

(3) **RSO activity had no effect on the timing of termination** (RSO activity had no effect on the pace of termination of the Syria/Turkey Border Crisis of 1957).

(4) **RSO activity contributed to more rapid termination** (RSO activity in the Chad/Libya VI Crisis of 1983-84, involving Chad, Libya, and France, contributed to more rapid termination).

Variable: 44

Name: SUBOUT

CONTENT OF OUTCOME

Content of outcome refers to whether or not the outcome of an international crisis was perceived by the actors to have been definitive or ambiguous. A definitive outcome is one in which all actors perceive victory or defeat in terms of the achievement of basic goals in the context of a specific crisis. An ambiguous outcome occurs when at least one of the crisis actors perceives either stalemate or compromise at the termination point of a crisis.

This variable is based upon the coding for individual crisis actors. Hence the user should refer to OUTCOM in the Actor-Level Codebook.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **Ambiguous outcome** - at least one actor coded as stalemate -- no effect on basic goals, no clear outcome to a crisis, no change in situation -- or compromise --partial achievement of basic goals (In the crisis over the formation of the UAR in 1958 both Jordan and Iraq perceived the substance of outcome as stalemate).

(2) **Definitive outcome** - all actors coded as victory -- achievement of basic goals -- or defeat -- non-achievement of basic goals (In the Cyprus II Crisis of 1967 Cyprus and Greece perceived the outcome as defeat, while Turkey perceived victory).

Variable: 45

Name: FOROUT

FORM OF OUTCOME

This variable refers to the form of the outcome of an international crisis at its termination point. Form of outcome is determined by the configuration of forces operative during a crisis, and has an important bearing on the subsequent relations among the parties to a crisis.

In most cases the form of outcome was common to all crisis actors. Where it was not, the form closest to consensus by the actors was coded for the entire crisis. Hence, the user should consult the coding of this variable (OUTFOR) in the Actor Level Dataset.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **Formal agreement** - formal agreement, including treaty, armistice, cease-fire (The Postage Stamp Crisis terminated when Nicaragua and Honduras signed a Pact of Reciprocal Agreement in December 1937).

(2) **Semi-formal agreement** - semi-formal agreement, including letter, oral declaration (A meeting

between the foreign ministers of Ecuador and Peru led to an agreement to withdraw forces from the border, in the Ecuador/Peru Border IV Crisis of 1991).

(3) **Tacit understanding** - mutual understanding by adversaries, neither stated nor written (The 1993-94 Kenya/Somalia Crisis terminated in a tacit understanding between the parties).

(4) **Unilateral act -** an act by a crisis actor, without the voluntary agreement of its adversary(ies), which terminates a crisis, e.g., military intrusion into a adversary's territory, severance of diplomatic relations, quelling of riots (Israel's rescue of hostages in Uganda in July 1976 terminated the Entebbe Raid Crisis).

(5) **Imposed agreement** (In the Cairo Agreement-PLO Crisis of 1969, the PLO was granted wide-ranging rights to operate in southern Lebanon, thus effectively curtailing Lebanon sovereignty in its own territory).

(6) **Other**

(7) **Crisis faded** (The Able Archer Crisis of 1983 faded with the end of the NATO nuclear exercise on 11 November).

Variable: 46

Name: EXSAT

EXTENT OF SATISFACTION ABOUT OUTCOME

The extent of satisfaction with the outcome of an international crisis refers to the evaluation of the outcome from the point of view of the individual crisis actors when a crisis terminates. Hence the user should refer to the data on OUTEVL in the Actor-Level Dataset.

For this variable, the distribution of satisfaction among crisis actors should only be coded in international crises with two or more adversarial crisis actors. Single-actor cases and multiple-actor cases in which the two or more crisis actors were not adversaries are coded as (6) and (7), respectively.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **All satisfied** - cases in which all parties perceived themselves as satisfied with the content of the outcome (India and Pakistan were satisfied with the outcome of the Rann of Kutch Crisis in 1965).

(2) **Mostly satisfied** - cases in which more crisis actors were satisfied than dissatisfied (France, the

U.K. and the USA were satisfied, the USSR was dissatisfied, with the outcome of the Berlin Blockade Crisis of 1948-49).

(3) **Equally mixed** - cases with an identical number of states which were satisfied and dissatisfied with the crisis outcome (The USSR was satisfied and Hungary was dissatisfied with the outcome of the Hungarian Uprising Crisis of 1956).

(4) **Mostly dissatisfied** - cases in which more crisis actors were dissatisfied than satisfied (Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria were dissatisfied, Israel was satisfied, with the outcome of the Palestine Partition/Israel Independence Crisis of 1947-49).

(5) **All dissatisfied** - cases in which all parties perceived themselves as dissatisfied with the content of the outcome (Angola, Rhodesia and Zambia were all dissatisfied with the outcome of the Raids on ZIPRA Crisis of 1979).

(6) **Single-actor case**

(7) **No adversarial actor**

Variable: 47

Name: OUTESR

ESCALATION OR REDUCTION OF TENSION

This variable assesses the effect of a crisis outcome on the tension level among the adversaries. The user should consult the coding of this variable (OUTESR) in the Actor Level Dataset.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **Tension escalation** - crisis recurred among the principal adversaries during the subsequent five-year period (The Gaza Raid-Czech Arms Crisis of 1955-56 between Israel and Egypt was followed in 1956 by the Suez Nationalization-War Crisis).

(2) **Tension reduction** - crisis did not recur among the principal adversaries during the subsequent five-year period (The Panama Flag Crisis of 1964 involving the U.S. and Panama was not followed by a subsequent crisis between these two adversaries within five years).

(3) **Recent case**

Variable: 48

Name: CRACTR

NUMBER OF CRISIS ACTORS

This variable reports the number of crisis actors in an international crisis.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **One actor** (Kaunas Trials 1935).

(2) **Two actors** (Football War 1969).

(3) **Three actors** (Trieste I 1945).

(4) **Four actors** (Basra-Kharg Island 1984).

(5) **Five actors** (Jordan Waters 1963-64).

(6) **Six actors** (Berlin Wall 1961)

(7) **More than six actors** (Entry into World War II (21 actors)).

Variable: 49

Name: GEOSTR

GEOSTRATEGIC SALIENCE

This variable refers to the significance of the location of an international crisis in terms of its natural resources, distance from power centers, etc., measured by the level and number of international systems that are affected by a crisis.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **One subsystem** (The Chaco II Crisis from 1932 to 1935 was salient to the South American subsystem only).

(2) **More than one subsystem** (The Indonesian Independence crises of 1945-47, 1947-48, and 1948-49 were salient to the Southeast Asian and West European subsystems).

(3) **Dominant system and one subsystem** (The Marshall Plan Crisis of 1947 was directly relevant to the East European subsystem, along with the dominant East/West system).

(4) **Dominant system and more then one subsystem** (The Munich Crisis of 1938 was highly salient to the dominant international system, as well as Eastern and Western Europe).

(5) **Global system** (The German attack on the Soviet Union in 1941, the Barbarossa Crisis, was salient to the global system).

Variable: 50

Name: HETERO

HETEROGENEITY

Heterogeneity among adversarial actors is measured by the number of attribute differences between the most heterogeneous pair of adversaries within an international crisis. The attributes are military capability, political regime, economic development, and culture (belief system, ideology, language).

Values and Illustrations

(1) **None** (The adversaries in the 1959-60 crises ensuing from Cuba-inspired invasions of several Caribbean and Central American states were all small powers, with underdeveloped economies, authoritarian regimes and the inheritance of Spanish-American culture).

(2) **One attribute** (There was only one attribute difference between India and Pakistan in their post-partition crises; the former was primarily influenced by Hindu culture, the latter by Islam).

(3) **Two attributes** (In the 1947 Marshall Plan Crisis there were adversary difference in two attributes: political - Western democracy versus Soviet communism; and military - a small power versus a superpower).

(4) **Three attributes** (In the Trieste II Crisis of 1953 Italy and Yugoslavia differed on all but one attribute of heterogeneity: an economically developed versus a developing economy; a Western democratic versus a Communist political regime; and cultural differences embracing language, religion and history. Both states were middle powers militarily).

(5) **All four attributes** (In the 1956-57 Suez Nationalization-War Crisis the U.K. and France were major powers in global terms, while Egypt was a small power. The former were economically advanced, the latter had a poor developing economy. The adversaries also differed in political regime and in culture).

Variable: 51

Name: ISSUES

ISSUES

This variable was coded according to the principal issue-area for the crisis actors (military-security, political-diplomatic, economic-developmental, and cultural-status), and any change during a crisis. The user should consult the coding of the variables ISSUE and CHISSU in the Actor Level Dataset.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **One issue other than military-security** (In the Panama Flag crisis of 1964, the issues included sovereignty and U.S. payments to Panama).

(2) **Two issues other than military-security** (Turkey's status in the Middle East was undermined by France's cession of the port of Alexandretta to Syria in 1936).

(3) **Military-security issue alone** (In the Ogaden I Crisis of 1964 Ethiopia and Somalia focused their attention exclusively on that territory).

(4) **Two issues, including military-security** (In the 1967 Cyprus II Crisis both territory and influence in the eastern Mediterranean were issues between Greece and Turkey).

(5) **Three or more issues** (Austria's status as an independent state was challenged when members of the Austrian Nazi Party assassinated Chancellor Dollfuss in 1934; the danger of a German takeover of Austria created a military-security crisis for Czechoslovakia and a political-diplomatic crisis for Italy).

Variable: 52

Name: CHACTS

CHANGE IN ACTORS

Change in actors comprises regime change, whether in orientation or type, and more basic structural shifts for one or more independent states as a result of an international crisis. If 5 years have not elapsed between the trigger date and the date of the coding of the case, code the case (9).

Values and Illustrations

(1) **No change** (Ogaden I 1964).

(2) **Change in regime orientation** (regime change in Lebanon, following the Lebanon War 1982).

(3) **Change in regime type** (from Marxism to democratic in Grenada, after the Invasion of Grenada 1983).

(4) **Creation/preservation/elimination of one or more state actors** (the creation of Israel, as a result of the Palestine Partition-Israel Independence Crisis 1947-49).

(5) **Interim case** - case was not the final (or most recent) crisis between a set of adversaries (Chad/Libya VII 1986).

(9) **Missing or recent case (5 years).**

Variable: 53

Name: CHALL

CHANGE IN ALLIANCE CONFIGURATION

This variable refers to a shift in the structure or pattern of alliances as a result of an international crisis. If 5 years have not elapsed between the trigger date and the date of the coding of the case, code the case (9).

Values and Illustrations

(1) **No change in alliance configuration** (Sino-Vietnam Clashes 1984).

(2) **Increase/decrease of cohesiveness within an existing alliance** (Ogaden II 1977-78).

(3) **Entry/exit of actor(s) into/from a formal or informal alliance** (Azerbaijan 1945-46).

(4) **Formation/elimination of an alliance** (Libya/Malta Oil Dispute 1980).

(5) **Interim case** (see CHACTS - Variable 52 - above).

(9) **Missing or recent case (5 years).**

Variable: 54

Name: POWCH

CHANGE IN DISTRIBUTION OF POWER

This variable refers to change in the number of power centers and/or the hierarchy of power. If 5 years have not elapsed between the trigger date and the date of the coding of the case, code the case (9).

Values and Illustrations

(1) **No change in relative power among adversaries** (Gulf of Syrte I 1981).

(2) **Change in relative power of adversarial crisis actors** (Kenya/Somalia 1963-64).

(3) **Change in ranking of states among the five most powerful within the dominant system or a subsystem** (Formation of the United Arab Republic 1958).

(4) **Change in composition of states at the apex of the power pyramid** (Palestine Partition/Israel Independence 1947-49).

(5) **Interim case** (see CHACTS - Variable 52 - above).

(9) **Missing or recent case (5 years).**

Variable: 55

Name: RUGACH

CHANGE IN RULES OF THE GAME

This variable refers to those norms derived from law, custom morality or self-interest that serve as guidelines for legitimate behavior by the actors of a system. These rules may be informal or formally codified. If 5 years have not elapsed between the trigger date and the date of the coding of the case, code the case (9).

Values and Illustrations

(1) **No change in rules of the game** (Falklands/Malvinas War 1982).

(2) **Decline in consensus** (Iraq Nuclear Reactor 1981).

(3) **Breakdown in consensus** (Raid on Angola 1979).
(4) **Creation/elimination of codified or tacit rules of the game** (al-Biqa Missiles I 1981).

(5) **Interim case** (See CHACTS - Variable 52 - above).

(9) **Missing or recent case (5 years).**

PART II - CONTROLS

Variable: 56

Name: GEOG

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF CRISIS

International crises were grouped into regions according to where they took place. If crises occurred in multiple regions, this variable identifies the primary region in which the crisis took place. The user should consult the coding of this variable (GEOG) in the Actor Level Dataset. Definitions of these regional categories come from the UN Stats Division, with exceptions noted in parentheses.

Values

(9) **Central Asia**
(10) West Asia (Turkey, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Cyprus)
(11) **East Asia**
(12) **South-East Asia**
(13) **South Asia**
(15) **Middle East** (countries from the UN's West Asia category not listed above)
(20) **West Africa**
(21) **North Africa**
(22) **East Africa**
(23) **Southern Africa**
(24) **Central Africa**
(30) **Euro-Asia** (Russia)
(31) **East Europe**
(32) **Central Europe** (Germany, East Germany, Austria, Switzerland)
(33) **West Europe**
(34) **North Europe**
(35) **South Europe**
(41) **North America**
(42) **Central America** (including Caribbean countries)
(43) **South America**
(51) **Australasia** (including Oceania countries)

Variable: 57

Name: GEOGREL

GEOGRAPHIC PROXIMITY OF PRINCIPAL ADVERSARIES

Variables

(1) **Contiguous** (Thailand and Burma, the adversaries in the 1992 Sleeping Dog Hill Crisis, shared a common border).

(2) **Near neighbors** (Iraq and Israel, the adversaries in the Iraq Nuclear Reactor Crisis of 1981, were near neighbors).

(3) **Distant** (Turkey and the U.K. were distant adversaries in the Chanak Crisis of 1922).

Variable: 58

Name: PERIOD

POLARITY

Each international crisis was coded according to the polarity structure of the global system at the time of the crisis.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **Multipolarity: 1918-1939** (Munich 1938)**.**

(2) **World War II: 1939-1945** (Battle of Britain 1940)**.**

(3) **Bipolarity: 1945-1962** (Cuba Missiles 1962)**.**

(4) **Polycentrism: 1963-1989** (Bangledesh 1971)**.**

(5) **Unipolarity: 1990-** (North Korea Nuclear Crisis 1993-94)**.**

Variable: 59

Name: SYSLEVSY

SYSTEM LEVEL

This variable identifies the system level at which an international crisis occurred.

Values

(1) **Subsystem** (Chaco I 1928-29).

(2) **Mainly subsystem** (Angola 1975-76).

(3) **Mainly dominant system** (Ussuri River 1969).

(4) **Dominant system** (Berlin Blockade 1948-49).

Variable: 60

Name: PROTRAC

PROTRACTED CONFLICT

Protracted conflict refers to conflict situations of extended duration, fluctuating interaction, spillover of hostility into all aspects of relations, strong forces tending to restore equilibrium, and indefinite continuation. The user should consult the coding of this variable (PC) in the Actor Level Dataset.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **Non-protracted conflict** (The Ussuri River Crisis between the USSR and China, 1969).

(2) **Non-long-war protracted conflict** (The Cyprus II Crisis of 1967, involving Turkey, Greece and Cyprus).

(3) **Long-war protracted conflict** (The Basra-Kharg Island Crisis of 1984, which occurred during the Iran-Iraq War, involving Iraq, Iran, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia).

Variable: 61

Name: PCID

PROTRACTED CONFLICT CODE NUMBER

Each actor case is identified by a protracted conflict number, according to the values below. The user should consult the coding of this variable (PCID) in the Actor Level Dataset. At the system level, crises that are not part of protracted conflicts are assigned a code between (40) and (44), depending on the region in which the crisis occurs.

Africa
PC Number
(1) Angola
(2) Chad/Libya
(3) Ethiopia/Somalia
(4) Rhodesia
(5) Western Sahara
(35) DRC (Zaire)-Rwanda

Americas
PC Number
(6) Costa Rica/Nicaragua
(7) Ecuador/Peru
(8) Honduras/Nicaragua

Asia
PC Number
(9) Afghanistan/Pakistan
(10) China/Japan
(11) China/Vietnam
(12) India/Pakistan
(13) Indochina
(14) Indonesia
(15) Korea
(34) North Korea Nuclear

Europe
PC Number
(16) Czechoslovakia/Germany
(17) Finland/Russia
(18) France/Germany
(19) Italy/Albania/Yugoslavia
(20) Lithuania/Poland
(21) Poland/Russia
(33) Yugoslavia
(36) Georgia/Russia

Middle East
PC Number
(23) Arab/Israel
(24) Iran/Iraq
(25) Iraq/Kuwait
(26) Yemen

Multiregional
PC Number
(27) East/West
(28) Greece/Turkey
(29) Iran/USSR
(30) Taiwan Strait
(31) World War II
(32) Iraq Regime

(40) **Africa non-protracted conflicts**
(41) **Americas non-protracted conflicts**
(42) **Asia non-protracted conflicts**
(43) **Europe non-protracted conflicts**
(44) **Middle East non-protracted conflicts**

Variable: 62

Name: POWDISSY

POWER DISCREPANCY

This variable refers to the capability gap between adversaries in an international crisis, whether individual states or coalitions. Capability is measured by six components: size of population, GNP, alliance relationships vis-a-vis major powers, territorial size, military capability, and nuclear capability.

The extent of power discrepancy in a crisis ranges from none, when all adversaries are at the same level of capability (e.g., Rwanda-Burundi Crisis 1964), to maximal discrepancy, when the principal adversaries are a superpower and a small power (e.g., Mayaguez Crisis 1975 between the U.S. and Cambodia).

Variable: 63

Name: ETHNIC

ETHNICITY RELATED CRISIS

This variable assesses ethnicity in terms of the presence or absence of an ethnic component in a crisis. Crises that are determined to have an ethnic component are coded as either secessionist or irredentist, depending on the nature of that component. The basic coding for this variable is reported in D. Carment, AThe International Politics of Ethnic Conflicts,@ Ph.D. Diss. McGill University, Montreal 1993. Coding for a number of cases has been revised, and new codes for the cases beyond 1989 have been added.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **Secessionist conflict** - one or more ethnic groups seek a reduction of control or autonomy from a central authority (Afghanistan and Pakistan in the Pushtunistan I Crisis of 1949-50).

(2) **Irredentist conflict** - a claim to the territory of an entity -- usually an independent state -- wherein an ethnic in-group is in a numerical minority (Burkina Faso and Mali in their 1985-86 border crisis).

(3) **Non-ethnic conflict** (The U.K. and Iceland in Cod War I 1973).

Variable: 64

Name: ETHCONF

ETHNICITY DRIVEN CONFLICT

This variable identifies crises in which ethnicity was the dominant factor in causing or exacerbating a crisis. Crises in which ethnicity was determined to be a dominant factor in causing or exacerbating a crisis are coded as either secessionist or irredentist, depending on the nature of the ethnic component.

Values and Illustrations

(1) **Secessionist conflict** (Yugoslavia and Austria in the Austrian Separatists Crisis of 1921).

(2) **Irredentist conflict** (Ethiopia and Somalia in the Ethiopia/Somalia Crisis of 1960-61).

(3) **Other**

(4) **Non-ethnicity-driven conflict**

Variable: 65

Name: STRESSAD

LEVEL OF STRESS IN CRISIS

This variable reports the highest level of stress experienced by any of the actors in a crisis. This index combines the type of threat perceived by decision makers with the difference in power status between actors and adversaries. For a detailed discussion of the computation of this variable, see Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997: 55-56.

Variable: 66

Name: SOURDT

SOURCES USED FOR CODING DATA

This variable provides information on the mix of sources used for coding an international crisis. For specific information on actual sources, see Brecher and Wilkenfeld 2000, Part II.

Values

(1) **Combined (chronological archives, scholarly articles, books, memoirs and documents.**

(2) **Combined excluding documents.**

(3) **Combined excluding memoirs.**

(4) **Combined excluding scholarly articles.**

(5) **Combined excluding documents and memoirs.**

(6) **Chronological archives.**

(7) **Chronological archives and memoirs.**

III. MEDIATION

Variable: 67

Name: MEDIATE

MEDIATION IN CRISIS

Variable Description: Did mediation occur in this crisis?

Coding Information: Did mediation occur in this international crisis at some point between onset (trigger date) and termination (termination date)? Coded regardless of whether or not such mediation was effective.

The following conditions must be true/present in order for it to be a case of mediation.

____ intervention by a third-party in a new or on-going negotiation process
____ mediation is either offered by the mediator and accepted by the disputing parties or requested by the disputing parties and accepted by the mediator
____ mediator is not a direct party to crisis
____ all disputing parties must agree to mediator's involvement
____ mediator's results are non-binding. Disputing parties determine the outcome of the crisis. The mediator does not have decision-making powers (i.e., is not an arbitrator).
____ mediation is a non-violent form of intervention
____ mediator's presence is voluntary; that is, mediator can leave the negotiations
____ mediation does not require assistance in implementing agreements, unless mandated to do so

[Warning - the coding of this variable replaces that of previous versions of ICB]

Values:

(1) No mediation

(2) Mediation requested, not supplied

(3) Mediation offered, not accepted

(4) Mediation occurred

(9) Cannot be determined, missing data

Variable: 68

Name: MEDNUM

INSTANCES OF MEDIATORS

Variable Description: How many mediators were there?

Coding Information: Was there a single mediator or mediation team, or were there multiple instances of mediation by different actors or teams during the course of the crisis?

Values:

(1) No mediation, or not supplied, or not accepted

(2) Single mediator or mediation team

(3) Multiple instances of mediation

(9) Cannot be determined, missing data

Variable: 69

Name: MEDWHO

PRIMARY MEDIATOR

Variable Description: Who was the primary mediator?

Coding Information: This variable coded only for the mediator who was the most active in this crisis.

Values:

(1) No mediation, or not supplied, or not accepted

(2) International governmental organization

(3) Regional governmental organization

(4) Private transnational organization

(5) Single state

(6) Group of states

(7) Private individual

(9) Cannot be determined, missing data

Variable: 70

Name: MEDTIME

TIMING OF MEDIATION

Variable Description: If mediation occurred, when did it begin?

Coding Information: Was there ongoing mediation involving the crisis actors prior to the onset of the crisis, or did mediation begin once the crisis had begun? Coded for the primary mediator identified in Variable 69.

Values:

(1) No mediation, or not supplied, or not accepted.

(2) Mediation began prior to onset of crisis

(3) Mediation began subsequent to onset of crisis

(9) Cannot be determined, missing data

Variable: 71

Name: MEDSTART

DATE OF MEDIATION START

Variable Description: If mediation occurred, on what date did it begin?

Coding Information: Specifies the year, month, and day on which the most active form of mediation began. In some cases, the mediation start date is earlier than the trigger date for the crisis. If it was not possible to determine the exact day when mediation began, only part of the date is coded – see earlier timing variables for coding rules for missing data. Coded for the primary mediator identified in Variable 69.

Variable: 72

Name: MEDEND

DATE OF MEDIATION END WITHIN CRISIS PERIOD

Variable Description: If mediation occurred, when did it end during the crisis?

Coding Information: Specifies the year, month, and day on which the most active form of mediation ended during the crisis. If it was not possible to determine the exact day, only part of the date is coded. Coded for the primary mediator identified in Variable 69. If the primary mediator continued the mediation effort after the crisis ended, the final day of the *crisis* was coded as the end of the mediation effort, and see Variable 73.

Variable: 73

Name: MEDENDCO

DATE OF MEDIATION END OUTSIDE CRISIS PERIOD

Variable Description: If mediation continued after the crisis ended, when did this mediation end completely?

Coding Information: Specifies the year, month, and day on which the most active form of mediation ended if it continued after the crisis ended. If it was not possible to determine the exact day, only part of the date is coded. Coded for the primary mediator identified in Variable 69.

Variable: 74

Name: MEDGOAL

GOAL OF MEDIATOR(S)

Variable Description: What was the goal of the mediator in this crisis?

Coding Information: Coded for the primary mediator identified in Variable 69. The following definitions are applied when making coding decisions:

crisis management: attempting to control events during a crisis to prevent significant and systematic violence from occurring or escalating, or to put an end to such already-existing hostilities; also conceived of as "conflict management" in a crisis situation.

conflict resolution: attempting to get parties in conflict to redefine their relationships in such a way as to perceive either that they can realize their goals without conflict or that they can redefine their relationship so that their goals no longer conflict; differs from "conflict management," which only entails an attempt to avoid or terminate violence between parties.

Values:

(1) No mediation, or not supplied, or not effective

(2) Crisis management

(3) Conflict resolution

(4) Other

(9) Cannot be determined, missing data

Variable: 75

Name: MEDFACL

WAS FACILITATIVE MEDIATION USED

Variable Description: Was a facilitative style of mediation used?

Coding Information: Coded for the primary mediator identified in Variable 69. Indicates whether any facilitative forms of mediation were used. Facilitative forms of mediation include any of the following actions (adapted from Jacob Bercovitch 1997, "Mediation in International Conflict," in I.W. Zartman and J.L. Rasmussen (eds.), *Peacemaking in International Conflict*, Washington DC: US Institute of Peace).

Facilitation:

1. Made contact with parties
2. Gained the trust and confidence of the parties
3. Arranged for interactions between the parties
4. Identified underlying issues and interests
5. Clarified the situation
6. Supplied missing information
7. Transmitted messages between parties
8. Fact-finding
9. Offered positive evaluations
10. Allowed the interests of all parties to be discussed

Values:

(1) No mediation, or not supplied, or not accepted

(2) No facilitative mediation occurred

(3) Facilitative mediation

(9) Cannot be determined, missing data

Variable: 76

Name: MEDFORM

WAS FORMULATIVE MEDIATION USED

Variable Description: Was a formulative style of mediation used?

Coding Information: Coded for the primary mediator identified in Variable 69. Indicates whether any formulative forms of mediation were used. Formulation mediation includes any of the following (adapted from Jacob Bercovitch 1997, "Mediation in International Conflict," in I.W. Zartman and J.L. Rasmussen (eds.), *Peacemaking in International Conflict*, Washington DC: US Institute of Peace).

Formulation:

11. Controlled the pace and formality of the meetings
12. Controlled the physical environment
13. Ensured the privacy of mediation
14. Highlighted common interests
15. Controlled timing
16. Helped devise a framework for an acceptable outcome
17. Helped parties save face
18. Kept the process focused on the issues
19. Made substantive suggestions and proposals
20. Suggested concessions parties could make

Values:

(1) No mediation, or not supplied, or not accepted

(2) No formulative mediation occurred

(3) Formulative mediation

(9) Cannot be determined, missing data

Variable: 77

Name: MEDMANIP

WAS MANIPULATIVE MEDIATION USED

Variable Description: Was a manipulative style of mediation used?

Coding Information: Coded for the primary mediator identified in Variable 69. Indicates whether any manipulative forms of mediation were used. Manipulative forms include any of the following (adapted from Jacob Bercovitch 1997, "Mediation in International Conflict," in I.W. Zartman and J.L. Rasmussen (eds.), *Peacemaking in International Conflict*, Washington DC: US Institute of Peace).

Manipulative:

21. Kept parties at the table
22. Changed parties' expectations
23. Took responsibility for concessions
24. Made parties aware of the costs of non-agreement
25. Supplied and filtered information
26. Helped negotiators to undo a commitment
27. Rewarded concessions made by the parties
28. Pressed the parties to show flexibility
29. Promised resources
30. Threatened withdrawal of resources
31. Offered to verify compliance with the agreement
32. Added incentives
33. Threatened punishments
34. Threatened to withdraw mediation

Values:

(1) No mediation, or not supplied, or not accepted

(2) No manipulative mediation occurred

(3) Manipulative mediation

(9) Cannot be determined, missing data

Variable: 78

Name: MEDSTYLE

HIGHEST MEDIATION STYLE USED

Variable Description: What was the highest mediation style used in the crisis, based on the coding of Variables 75, 76, and 77?

Coding Information: Coded for the primary mediator identified in Variable 69. Highest is coded on a scale from facilitation through formulation to manipulation.

Values:

(1) No mediation, or not supplied, or not accepted

(2) Facilitation

(3) Formulation

(4) Manipulation

(9) Cannot be determined, missing data

Variable: 79

Name: MEDSTEFCT

WHICH MEDIATION STYLE MOST EFFECTIVE

Variable Description: Which **style** of mediation had the greatest effect on the outcome of the crisis?

Coding Information: Coded for the primary mediator identified in Variable 69.

Values:

(1) No mediation, or not supplied, or not accepted

(2) Facilitative

(3) Formulative

(4) Manipulative

(5) Mediation ineffective

(9) Cannot be determined, missing data

Variable: 80

Name: MEDEFCT

EFFECTIVENESS OF MEDIATION

Variable Description: What was the effectiveness of mediation on crisis abatement?

Coding Information: This variable assesses the effectiveness of mediation on crisis abatement. Effectiveness is understood here in terms of easing tensions or otherwise contributing to the termination of the crisis. Coded for the primary mediator identified in Variable 69.

Values:

(1) No mediation, or not supplied, or not accepted

(2) No effect

(3) Had effect, crisis escalated

(4) Had effect, marginal decrease in tensions

(5) Had effect, mediation was important factor in easing tensions

(6) Had effect, mediation was the most important factor in easing tensions

(9) Cannot be determined, missing data

Variable: 81

Name: MEDPACE

MEDIATION EFFECT ON PACE OF CRISIS ABATEMENT

Variable Description: What was the impact of mediation on the pace of crisis abatement?

Coding Information: This variable assesses the impact of mediation on the pace of crisis abatement. Coded for the primary mediator identified in Variable 69.

Values:

(1) No mediation, or not supplied, or not accepted

(2) Delayed termination of crisis

(3) No effect on pace

(4) Contributed to more rapid termination of crisis

(9) Cannot be determined, missing data