Belligerents in Battle Codebook

Rosella Cappella Zielinski
Boston University

Ryan Grauer
University of Pittsburgh

Last Updated December 2021

We ask users of this dataset to cite this data as follows:

Cappella Zielinski, Rosella and Ryan Grauer, 'A Century of Coalitions in Battle: Incidence, Composition, and Performance, 1900-2003.' *Journal of Strategic Studies*, doi: 10.1080/01402390.2021.2011233.

Table of Contents

1. **The Data Collection Process** 3
   - 1.1. The Goals of the Project
   - 1.2. Belligerents in Battle: 1900-2003
   - 1.3. Identifying Cases and Coalition Membership
   - 1.4. Coding Co-belligerents' Contributions
   - 1.5. Coding Co-belligerents' Casualties
   - 1.6. Coding Outcome
   - 1.7. Coding Preexisting Defense Relations
   - 1.8. Coding Home Turf

2. **Variables** 7
   - 2.1. Variables for Major Battles and the Presence of Battlefield Coalitions

3. **Coding Notes for World War I** 10

4. **Coding Notes for World War II** 30

5. **Coding Notes for Interstate Wars 1900-2003 (minus the World Wars)** 58

6. **Appendix I: Unit Size** 232

7. **Works Cited** 242

1. The Data Collection Process[1]

1.1. Goal of the Project

The goal of the Belligerents in Battle project is to understand how military coalitions fight together in wartime.[2] We hope the project will be useful in understanding (1) under what conditions coalitions fight together in battle (2) the frequency in which coalition partners fight as one on the battlefield; (3) coalition composition, including member contributions and casualties; (4) coalition size; (5); coalition effectiveness and combat power; and (6) the extent to which coalitions experience victory and defeat in battle.

1.2. Belligerents in Battle: 1900-2003

The *Belligerents in Battle: 1900-2003* dataset encompass all major land battles featuring a significant ground operation component in interstate wars identified in the Correlates of War Project Inter-State War Dataset v.4.0.

1.3. Identifying Battles and Coalition Participation

To identify battles, we distinguish major discrete combat actions in which there is significant ground activity on both sides from the many engagements fought during wartime. To identify coalition participants in individual battles, we distinguish belligerents fighting the larger war that then proceed to undertake an active role in the relevant combat engagements. Crucially, we limit coalition participation in particular battles to those belligerents that shared and fought in a common battlespace at the operational and tactical levels. When the co-belligerents engaged solely in strategic coordination – for example, fighting on geographically opposite sides of a two-front war or launching self-contained operations intended to achieve larger strategic objectives – participants were not coded as having fought *in that instance* as combined fighting forces. If a belligerent only conducted air strikes in support of ground operations during the battle, we designate it accordingly. If a belligerent is a non-state actor, we designate it accordingly.

As a first step in identifying both battles and coalition participants, we rely on Michael Clodfelter's (2007) reference book, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts: A*

[1] We would like to thank our research assistants: Alexander Halman, Wo Liu, Stephen Worman, Cesar Cedeno, Megan Canfield, Blaire Modic, Aki Nakai, Metehan Tekinirk, Nima Rahimi, David Damiano, Ruizhi Peng, Meghan Ayre, Yubin Lee, Seulah Choi, and Asako Mikami. We would also like to thank John Keeler and the Dean's Office at the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs at the University of Pittsburgh for financial support of this project.

[2] Following Morey, we define coalitions as groups of states, and occasionally non-state actors, that, regardless of their prewar relationship, coordinate military activity during war. Alliances, which are commitments of various forms entered into by states prior to the onset of hostilities, may result in the fielding of coalition forces during combat, but need not do so. See (Morey 2016, 3) For similar formulations, see (Weitsman 2013, 26; Graham, Gartzke, and Fariss 2015, 5).

Statistical Encyclopedia of Casualty and Other Figures, 1494-2007.[3] We then extensively revise, supplement, and improve upon Clodfelter's designations with primary and secondary sources including, where possible, official histories of the militaries engaged, and other military encyclopedia.

We code coalition participation for both sovereign state forces and independent non-state actor forces. We incorporate non-state actors in the 1900-2003 dataset to reflect the prevelence of nonstate actors in interstate wars. With the onset of the Cold War, superpower interventions in the domestic politics of allies and third world nations promoted non-state actors and their capacity to engage in armed conflict both within and between traditional states.[4] Additionally, since the 1960s, there has been an increasing international component to warfare, particularly a marked increase in the number of civil wars that are internationalized, involving interventions by outside states.[5] It should be noted, however, that nonstate actors have long been involved in coalition warfare prior to the Cold War. For example, the first battles in our dataset, from the Boxer Rebellion, include multiple instances in which the Boxers, a nonstate actor, and the Chinese government fought together.

We exclude colonial and attached free state forces. Colonial forces are subsumed under their empire state when their command was subordinated to the empire state; when such forces exercised independent command at the operational and tactical levels of warfighting activity, we treat them as separate from empire forces.

1.4. Coding Co-belligerents' Contributions

Co-belligerents' contributions are reported in various ways both within and across historical sources. At times, available histories provide figures for co-belligerents' contributions in troop numbers. At other times, histories note contributions in unit size (e.g. Army, Division, Corps, Battalion or Regiment). Because unit sizes vary across states as well as over time, we report all co-belligerent contributions in troop numbers.

When histories report co-belligerent contributions in units, we convert unit size to troop numbers reported maximum strength division size, when available.[6] For the

[3] ". . . those actions of which I try to provide casualty figures are the ones that were of some significance to the conflicts surrounding them. . ." (Clodfelter 2008, 1).
[4] (Sarkees, Wayman, and Singer 2003, 57). See also (Gleditsch, Wallensteen, Eriksson, Sollenberg, and Strand 2002, 624; Cunnningham, Gleditsch and Salehyan 2013).
[5] (Sarkees, Wayman, and Singer 2003, 62).
[6] Note on maximum unit size reporting: when using maximum strength division size to convert units into troop numbers, we are likely overstating co-belligerents' actual strength in battle. To the extent this coding decision introduces bias into our figures, any effect is consistent across the cases included. In addition, some states' maximum strength division sizes change over the course of the wars, especially in World War I. Because these division-size alterations are only inconsistently reported, we employ the original maximum strength division size throughout each war. Again, any bias introduced through this practice should not systematically favor or penalize any particular state.

World Wars, we rely on Clodfelter's reported division size and supplement using Ellis and Cox (2001) for World War I and Ellis (1993) for World War II. For non-World Wars we rely on various primary and secondary sources. All maximum unit sizes are documented in Appendix I.

Where available histories note troop count ranges rather than specific numbers, unless there are documented reasons to doubt the veracity of either sources noting or the value of the upper limit, we employ a middle figure.

Reported troop contributions only include those forces engaged in ground operations. Where a co-belligerent provided air strikes during those operations, its contribution is noted separately.

1.5. Coding Co-belligerents' Casualties

We use a broad definition of casualties, as there is inconsistent reporting across sources. Hence, casualties reported include killed, injured, and missing in action, as well as those taken prisoner. Where available histories note casualty ranges rather than specific numbers, unless there are documented reasons to doubt the veracity of either sources noting or the value of the upper limit, we employ a middle figure.

1.6. Coding Outcome

We use a dichotomous measure indicating whether the coalition forces won or lost each battle. We ascribe victory to the side that achieves most or all of its operational objectives while denying the same to its adversary.[7] We ascribe defeat to forces that do not achieve their operational objectives while their adversary does. When military historians' and our own assessments are that neither of the belligerent sides' achieved their battlefield objectives (a draw), both are coded as having lost and a separate dummy variable indicating a Draw outcome is coded as 1.

1.7. Coding Preexisting Defense Relations

We code preexisting defense relations in two ways. First, we use a dichotomous measure indicating whether at least two coalition participants in a specific battle had a preexisting *defense* alliance or *defense* obligation as defined by ATOP.[8] Second, we use a categorical measure indicating whether some or all of the coalition participants had previous experience fighting together in the period prior to a specific battle.

1.8. Coding Home Turf

[7] Grauer and Horowitz 2012, 96.
[8] Leeds, Ritter, Mitchell, and Long 2002, 238 and ATOP Codebook 2018, 11.

We code for the location of fighting. Here, we use a trichotomous measure to indicate if the fighting was done on a state's territory or territory of one of the coalition members on territory, the territory of the adversary, or on a territory that belong to neither side.

2. Variables

2.1 Variables for Major Battles and the Presence of Battlefield Coalitions

The unit of observation in the dataset is the belligerent side. Accordingly, there are two entries for every battle, one for each belligerent side.

WarNumber: Correlates of War identification number

WarName: Name of war.

BattleNumber: Identification number for individual battle

Battle: Name of battle.

OnsetDay: The day that the battle began.

OnsetMonth: The month that the battle began.

OnsetYear: The four-digit year that the battle began.

TerminationDay: The day that the battle ended.

TerminationMonth: The month that the battle ended.

TerminationYear: The four-digit day that the battle ended.

COWNumber: Correlates of War identification number for the belligerent, if the belligerent side is a single actor. If the belligerent is a nonstate actor, "-55" is used. If the belligerent side is a coalition, "." is used.

Belligerent: The name of the first belligerent. It could be a sovereign state, a nonstate actor, or a coalition.

Polity: Polity score of the belligerent, if the belligerent side is a single actor. If the belligerent side is a coalition, "." is used. If the belligerent is a nonstate actor, "-10" is used. "Polity2" values used.

COWNumberMemberX: Correlates of war identification number for coalition member X. If the belligerent is a nonstate actor, "-55" is used.

MemberX: Name of coalition member X.

PolityMemberX: Polity score of coalition member X. If the belligerent is a nonstate actor, "-10" is used. "Polity2" values used.

COWNumberAirstrikes: Correlates of War identification number for coalition member that provided air support ONLY. If multiple members provided only air support, the identification number of the state with the highest Polity score is used.

AirStrikesCoalitionMembers: Name(s) of coalition members that only provided air support.

PolityMemberAirstrikes: Polity score of coalition member that provided air support ONLY. "Polity2" values used. If multiple members provided only air support, the Polity score of the most democratic member is used.

BattlefieldCoalition: Dummy variable coded 1 if the belligerent side is a coalition, 0 if it is not.

CoalitionSize: A continuous variable that reflects the number of coalition participants. If no coalition was present, the variable is -99.

CoalitionRegimeType: Variable coded 0 if all coalition members are nondemocracies, 1 if coalition members are both democratic and nondemocratic, and 2 if all coalition members are democratic, where democracy is equivalent to a Polity2 score of 6 or greater

SoloRegimeType: Variable coded 0 if solo belligerent is a nondemocracy (Polity<6), 1 if solobelligerent is a democracy (Polity>5). If a coalition is present, the variable is -99.

USParticipation: Variable coded 0 if the United States was not a belligerent (either solo or in colalition) and 1 if the United States was a belligerent (either solo or in coalition).

CoalitionMemberAirstrikes: Binary variable coded 1 if BelligerentA is a coalition in which one or more members conducted only airstrikes, 0 if it is not. If no coalition participant conduced air strikes, the variable is -99.

CoalitionAirstrikesSize: A continuous variable that reflects the number of coalition participants that only conducted airstrikes. If no coalition participant conduced air strikes, the variable is -99.

PriorDefenseObligations: A binary variable coded 1 if at least two coalition participants are members were subject to prewar, formal joint defense obligations (as defined by ATOP) prior to battle onset, 0 if not. If no coalition was present, the variable is -99.

PriorFightingExperience: Categorical variable coded 0 if no members of the coalition have fought a major interstate war battle together in the previous 25 years, 1 if at least two coalition members have fought a major interstate war battle

together in the previous 25 years but not during the current interstate war, 2 if at least two coalition members have fought at least 1 major interstate war battle together during the current interstate war, and 3 if at least two coalition members have fought at least 3 major interstate war battles together during the current interstate war. If no coalition was present, the variable is -99.

Initiator: Binary variable coded 1 if the belligerent side (whether solo or coalition) initiated hostilities in the battle, 0 if the belligerent side (whether solo or coalition) was the target.

HomeTurf: Categorical variable coded 1 if the belligerent side was fighting on its own territory (or, if a coalition, on the territory of one of the members), 0 if the belligerent side was fighting on the territory of its adversary (or, if the adversary was a coalition, the territory of one of its members), or 2 if the belligerents sides (whether solo or coalition) fought on territory that either a) belonged to neither side, or b) was claimed by both sides.

AggregatedTroopNumbers: The number of troops the belligerent side fielded in battle. If the belligerent side is a coalition, the troop numbers are aggregated across all coalition members.

TroopShare: The relative proportion of all troops engaged in a battle that were fielded by the relevant belligerent side. It is calculated by dividing the AggregatedTroopNumbers of the belligerent side by the combined total of the AggregatedTroopNumbers of the belligerent side and its adversary in the battle.

AggregatedCasualties: The number of casualties sustained by the belligerent side. If the belligerent side is a coalition, the number of casualties is aggregated across all coalition members. Killed, wounded, captured, and missing are included in casualty counts.

CasualtyRatio: The percentage of a belligerent side's troops that suffered casualties. When a belligerent side's troop numbers or casualty figures are missing, this variable is coded as missing.

BattleOutcomeWL: Binary variable coded 1 if the belligerent side was victorious, 0 if not. If the battle was a draw, both sides are coded 0.

BattleDraw: Binary variable coded 1 if the battle outcome was a draw, 0 if not.

BattleNumberCoalitions: Count variable of the number of battlefield coalitions engaged in the battle.

NonStateActorDummy: Dummy variable coded 1 if at least one non-state actor was present on the belligerent side, 0 if not.

3. Coding Notes: World War I

Formatting for Coding Notes:

1. Warname (COW)
1.1. Major Battle Name (Page numbers for data drawn from Clodfelter 2008; Supplemental data citations located where appropriate)
  1.1.1. Battle Description
  1.1.2. Date of battle onset and termination (Day/Month/Year)
  1.1.3. Belligerents
  1.1.4. Belligerent A Contribution
  1.1.5. Belligerent A Casualties
  1.1.6. Belligerent B Contribution
  1.1.7. Belligerent B Casualties
  1.1.8. Battle Outcome

3.1. Battle of Liege (Clodfelter 2008, 417-9)
  3.1.1. The German First Army (320,000 men in 7 infantry corps, 3 cavalry divisions, and 3 Landwehr militia brigades, General Alexander von Kluck commanding) and Second Army (260,000 men in 6 infantry corps, 2 cavalry divisions, and 2 Landwehr brigades, General Karl von Bülow commanding) poured through the Liège Corridor and across the Meuse (Clodfelter, 2008, p. 417).
  3.1.2. Onset: 8/8/1914; Termination: 16/8/1914
  3.1.3. Belgium versus Germany
  3.1.4. Belgium – 25,000 troops
  3.1.5. Belgium – 15,000 casualties
  3.1.6. Germany – 60,000 troops
  3.1.7. Germany – Unknown casualties
  3.1.8. Outcome – German victory. The invaders occupied Brussels on 20 August, dispatched 5 divisions to take Namur, 20-25 August, with 27,000 POWs, and forced King Albert to pull his army back on Antwerp (Clodfelter, 2008, p. 417).

3.2. Battle of the Frontiers (Clodfelter 2008, 417-9)
  3.2.1. The French offensive had gotten under way in Alsace and Lorraine, bringing about four simultaneous actions collectively called the Battles of the Frontiers, 14-25 August. The first French offensive action had occurred on 8 August, when General Bonneau's 6-division VII Corps had marched to Mulhouse in Alsace against only limited opposition. A German Seventh Army counterattack drove the French corps back out the next day (Clodfelter, 2008, p. 417).
  3.2.2. Onset: 14/8/1914; Termination: 25/8/1914
  3.2.3. France versus Germany
  3.2.4. France – 1,250,000 soldiers

3.2.5. France – 300,000 casualties
3.2.6. Germany – 750,000 soldiers
3.2.7. Germany – 220,000 casualties
3.2.8. Outcome – German victory. (Clodfelter, 2008, p. 418).

3.3. Battle of Tannenberg (Clodfelter 2008, 436-7)

3.3.1. Ludendorff drew up operational plans that called for maximum use of the German advantage of interior lines by leaving only a single cavalry division to delay and deceive the Russian First Army, while the bulk of the Eighth Army was shifted south to join the XX Corps, which had been containing Samsonov's Second Army (Clodfelter 2008, 436).
3.3.2. Onset: 26/8/1914; Termination: 25/8/1915
3.3.3. Russia and Germany
3.3.4. Russia – 250,000 soldiers
3.3.5. Russia – 122,000 casualties
3.3.6. Germany – 200,000
3.3.7. Germany – 13,000 casualties
3.3.8. Outcome – The German plan of envelopment worked perfectly. The Battle of Tannenberg, 26-31 August, was an overwhelming Russian defeat (Clodfelter 2008, 436).

3.4. Battle of Mons (Clodfelter 2008, 418-9)

3.4.1. The BEF (100,000 men in 4 divisions under the command of Field Marshal Sir John French) fought its first battle at Mons on 23 August, when it was hit by Kluck's First Army (Clodfelter 2008, 418).
3.4.2. Onset: 23/8/1914; Termination: 23/8/1914
3.4.3. United Kingdom versus Germany
3.4.4. United Kingdom – 70,000 troops
3.4.5. United Kingdom – 4,244 casualties
3.4.6. Germany – 160,000 troops
3.4.7. Germany – 5,000 casualties
3.4.8. Outcome – German victory. The BEF retreated from Mons with 4,244 fallen, from 70,000 engaged (Clodfelter 2008, 419).

3.5. Battle of Galicia (Clodfelter 2008, 436-7)

3.5.1. The Russian war plan called for Nikolai Ivanov, the Russian commander of the Southwest Front, to counter an anticipated Austro-Hungarian offensive thrusting eastward from Lemberg. The Russian 3rd and 8th Armies mounted an offensive into eastern Galicia.
3.5.2. Onset: 23/8/1914; Termination: 26/9/1914
3.5.3. Russia versus Austria-Hungary
3.5.4. Russia – 750,000 troops
3.5.5. Russia – 250,000 casualties
3.5.6. Austria-Hungary – 500,000 troops
3.5.7. Austria-Hungary – 322,000 casualties

3.5.8. Outcome – Russian victory. The Austrian army evacuated Lemberg, 1-3 September, and fell back 100 miles into the Carpathian Mountains (Clodfelter 2008, 436).

3.6. Battle of First Marne (Clodfelter 2008, 418; Greenhalgh 2014, 48; Perris 1920, 104)

3.6.1. The Battle of First Marne was fought 5-9 September 1914 (See Edmonds 1937 for a detailed description of events). The battle continued Germany's advance into France.
3.6.2. Onset: 5/9/1914; Termination: 9/9/1914
3.6.3. Entente Coalition versus Germany
3.6.4. Entente Coalition – 1,080,000 soldiers
3.6.5. Entente Coalition – 250,000 casualties
3.6.6. Germany – 900,000 soldiers
3.6.7. Germany – 298,000 casualties
3.6.8. Outcome – Entente victory (Clodfelter 2008, 418; Greenhalgh 2014 48-9).

3.7. First Battle of the Masurian Lakes (Clodfelter 2008, 436)

3.7.1. The German Eighth Army and the Hindenburg-Ludendorff team concentrated against the Russian First Army (Clodfelter 2008, 436).
3.7.2. Onset: 5/9/1914; Termination: 13/9/1914
3.7.3. Russia and Germany
3.7.4. Russia – 200,000 troops
3.7.5. Russia – 125,000 casualties
3.7.6. Germany – 250,000 troops
3.7.7. Germany – 10,000 casualties
3.7.8. Outcome – German victory. Russian losses in the Battle of the Masurian Lakes, including 20,000 men lost in fighting prior to the battle itself, were 125,000, including 30,000 POWs, 150 guns, and 50 percent of their transport. German losses were about 10,000 (Clodfelter 2008, 436).

3.8. First Aisne

3.8.1. Following up their success in the Battle of First Marne, the Entente attempted to envelop the German right comprised of the First, Third and Seventh Armies (Clodfelter 2008, 419; Kendall 2012, 11 places four German Armies – First, Second, Third and Fourth – at the battle of Aisne as well as the VII Reserve Corps and 6th Infantry Division; Ellis and Cox 2001, 119-126, find a minimum of 15 divisions committed to the battle of First Aisne)
3.8.2. Onset: 13/9/1914; Termination: 27/9/1914
3.8.3. Entente Coalition versus Germany
3.8.4. Entente Coalition – 330,639 soldiers
3.8.5. Entente Coalition – 150,000 casualties
3.8.6. Germany – 255,000 soldiers
3.8.7. Germany – 150,000 casualties

3.8.8. Outcome – The Battle of First Asine resulted in a draw. Clodfelter (2007, 419) places casualties, on both sides.

3.9. Southwest Poland

3.9.1. The Battle of Southwest Poland was fought 28 September – 31 October 1914. German General Hindenburg's 18 Divisions drove into Poland against 60 Russian divisions of the Fifth, Fourth, and Ninth Armies on 28 September. The Germans reached the Vistula River on 9 October and got within 12 miles of Warsaw before their advanced was checked (Clodfelter 2008, 437; See also Herwig 2014, 106-7, Jukes 2002, 25 and Tucker 1998, 46).
3.9.2. Onset: 28/9/1914; Termination: 31/9/1914
3.9.3. Russia versus Central Power Coalition
3.9.4. Russia – 1,020,000 soldiers
3.9.5. Russia – Unknown casualties
3.9.6. Central Power Coalition – 1,106,000 soldiers
3.9.7. Germany – 100,000 casualties
3.9.8. Outcome – The result of the Battle of Vistula River was a draw as it was a Russian tactical victory but strategic defeat (Dowling 2015, 913).

3.10. Battle of Yser (Clodfelter 2008, 419)

3.10.1. On 18 October, the German offensive began and overran Allied troops from Nieuwpoort southwards to Arras. The German objective was to defeat the Belgian and French armies and to deprive the British of access to Calais, Boulogne, and Dunkirk.
3.10.2. Onset: 18/10/1914; Termination: 30/11/1914
3.10.3. Belgium versus Germany
3.10.4. Belgium – 150,000 troops
3.10.5. Belgium – 20,000 casualties
3.10.6. Germany – 1,360,000 troops
3.10.7. Germany – Unknown casualties
3.10.8. Outcome – Belgian victory. The Belgians held the line.

3.11. First Ypres

3.11.1. The Battle of First Ypres was fought 10 October – 24 November 1914. The battle was the culmination of the German Race to the Sea. The Kaiser's forces sought to envelop the north rank of the Entente's line in order to capture the ports of Dunkirk and Calais. At First Ypres, both the Germans and the Entente sought to turn the flank of the other before running out of space in the Race to the Sea (Edmonds 1929, 126-9).
3.11.2. Onset: 10/10/1914; Termination: 24/11/1914
3.11.3. Entente Coalition versus Germany
3.11.4. Entente Coalition – 234,000 soldiers
3.11.5. Entente Coalition – 126,677 casualties
3.11.6. Germany – 272,000 soldiers
3.11.7. Germany – 134,000 casualties

3.11.8. Outcome – The battle was an Entente victory as the allies successfully blocked German advances and secured the Entente position in Flanders (Liddell Hart 1963, 68).

3.12. Battle of Lodz (Clodfelter 2008, 437)

3.12.1. The Battle of Lódz broke out on 11 November, when the Ninth, commanded by General August von Mackensen, hit southeast between the Russian First and Second Armies (Clodfelter 2008, 437).
3.12.2. Onset: 11/11/1914; Termination: 6/12/1914
3.12.3. Russia and Germany
3.12.4. Russia – 550,000 troops
3.12.5. Russia – 95,000 casualties
3.12.6. Germany – 250,000 troops
3.12.7. Germany – 35,000 casualties
3.12.8. Outcome – German victory. The Russians called off their counterattack and evacuated Lódz on December 6 (Clodfelter 2008, 437).

3.13. Battle of Artois (Clodfelter 2008, 422-3)

3.13.1. The Germans in two widely separated lines of trenches turned back a French offensive in Artois (Clodfelter 2008, 422).
3.13.2. Onset: 17/12/1914; Termination: 4/1/1915
3.13.3. France versus Germany
3.13.4. France – 153,500 soldiers
3.13.5. France – 105,000 casualties
3.13.6. Germany – 238,000 soldiers
3.13.7. Germany – 75,000 casualties
3.13.8. Outcome – Draw.

3.14. First Battle of Champagne (Clodfelter 2008, 419-23)

3.14.1. The First Battle of Champagne began 20 December and continued into 1915, as the French tried unsuccessfully to open up the front but went nowhere (Clodfelter 2008, 419).
3.14.2. Onset: 20/12/1914; Termination: 17/3/1915
3.14.3. France versus Germany
3.14.4. France – 255,000 soldiers
3.14.5. France – 90,000 casualties
3.14.6. Germany – 110,500 soldiers
3.14.7. Germany – 45,000 casualties
3.14.8. Outcome – Draw. French efforts went nowhere (Clodfelter 2008, 419).

3.15. Second Battle of the Masurian Lakes (Clodfelter 2008, 437-8)

3.15.1. The Second Battle of the Masurian Lakes was the northern part of the Central Power Coalition' offensive on the Eastern Front in the winter of 1915. The German goal was to push beyond the Vistula River and inflict grievous costs on the Russians.
3.15.2. Onset: 7/2/1915; Termination: 21/2/1915

3.15.3. Russia and Germany
3.15.4. Russia – 250,000 troops
3.15.5. Russia – 146,000 casualties
3.15.6. Germany – 250,000 troops
3.15.7. Germany – 7,500 casualties
3.15.8. Outcome – Major German Victory

3.16. Gallipoli Campaign (Clodfelter 2008, 444-6)

3.16.1. After a failed naval attack intended to open the Dardenelles, the Entente launched an amphibious assault on Gallipoli, a small peninsula on the north side of the strait.
3.16.2. Onset: 19/2/1915; Termination: 9/1/1916
3.16.3. Entente Coalition plus Australia and New Zealand versus Turkey
3.16.4. Entente Coalition plus Australia and New Zealand – 489,000 soldiers (410,000 British, Commonwealth, Australian, and New Zealand; 79,000 French)
3.16.5. Entente Coalition plus Australia and New Zealand – 252,000 casualties
3.16.6. Turkey – 500,000 soldiers
3.16.7. Turkey – 251,309 casualties
3.16.8. Outcome – Turkey repelled the invasion attempt and won.

3.17. Neuve Chapelle (Clodfelter 2008, 422-3)

3.17.1. The British, with 48 battalions and 342 guns firing 100,000 shells, did break through for a time when they attacked 1,500 Germans at Neuve Chapelle on March 10 (Clodfelter 2008, 422).
3.17.2. Onset: 10/3/1915; Termination: 13/3/1915
3.17.3. United Kingdom versus Germany
3.17.4. United Kingdom – 48,000 troops
3.17.5. United Kingdom – 12,892 casualties
3.17.6. Germany – 17,500 troops
3.17.7. Germany – 8,600 casualties
3.17.8. Outcome – British victory, though a strong enough follow-up force had not been reserved and 16,000 Germans were able to reestablish their line by 13 March (Clodfelter 2008, 422).

3.18. Second Ypres

3.18.1. By 1915 the battle lines on the western front were static due to dug in trenches. The Germans undertook their one major attack of 1915 at Ypres from 22 April – 25 May 1915. In battle were 10 British, 2 French, and 1 Belgian division versus 4 German corps (Clodfelter 2008, 423; For a list of divisions by country see Dixon 2009, Appendix III).
3.18.2. Onset: 22/4/1915; Termination: 25/5/1915
3.18.3. Entente Coalition versus Germany
3.18.4. Entente Coalition – 215,003 soldiers
3.18.5. Entente Coalition – 71,505 casualties

3.18.6. Germany – 136,000 soldiers
3.18.7. Germany – 34,993 casualties
3.18.8. Outcome – Draw. By the end of the battle, British forces had withdrawn to a new, more defensible line 3 miles closer to Ypres.

3.19. Gorlice-Tarnow

3.19.1. The Battle of Gorlice-Tarnow was fought between 2 May – 17 June 1915. The Central Power Coalition, comprised of 126,000 German troops and 90,000 Austrians in two armies – Austrian Third and Fourth Armies – at the start of the battle, five more armies later joined (Clodfelter 2008, 438).
3.19.2. Onset: 2/5/1915; Termination: 27/6/1915
3.19.3. Russia versus Central Power Coalition
3.19.4. Russia – 749,000 soldiers
3.19.5. Russia – 440,000 casualties
3.19.6. Germany – 685,500 soldiers
3.19.7. Germany – 87000 casualties
3.19.8. Outcome – A victory for the Central Power Coalition. The Russian Third Army was obliterated. By 4 May, 140,000 Russians had laid down their arms. The whole Russian line in Galicia collapsed. Przemysl was retaken on 3 June, Lemberg on 22 June, and the Dniester River was reached and crossed on 23-27 June. In six weeks, Russia lost, besides over 200,000 killed and wounded, 240,000 of its soldiers taken prisoner for a total of 440,000 casualties (Clodfelter 2008, 438). The Central Power Coalition suffered 87,000 total casualties (Clodfelter 2008, 438).

3.20. Second Battle of Artois (Clodfelter 2008, 422-3)

3.20.1. The French struck again, on a 6-mile front, in Artois on 9 May. General Victor d'Urbal's Tenth Army, spearheaded by the Moroccan Division, attacked after a six-day bombardment by 1,160 guns (2,155,862 rounds were fired from 3 May – 18 June).
3.20.2. Onset: 9/5/1915; Termination: 30/6/1915
3.20.3. France versus Germany
3.20.4. France – 200,000 soldiers
3.20.5. France – 102,533 casualties
3.20.6. Germany – 60,000 soldiers
3.20.7. Germany – 39,446 casualties
3.20.8. Outcome – Draw. Fierce fighting on Vimy Ridge, near Souchez, from 16 May – 30 June, won for the French 3 miles of terrain and a limited tactical victory that was overwhelmed in terms of personnel losses.

3.21. Battle of Festubert/Aubers Ridge (Clodfelter 2008, 423)

3.21.1. The British supported the Second Artois Offensive by attacking on 9 May at Festubert (Clodfelter 2008, 423).
3.21.2. Onset: 9/5/1915; Termination: 26/5/1915
3.21.3. United Kingdom versus Germany

3.21.4. United Kingdom – 108,000 troops
3.21.5. United Kingdom – 28,267 casualties
3.21.6. Germany – 34,000 troops
3.21.7. Germany – 5,000 casualties
3.21.8. Outcome – British victory. Continued British assaults at Festubert and Aubers Ridge up to 26 May gained them some ground (Clodfelter 2008, 423)

3.22. First Battle of the Isonzo (Clodfelter 2008, 446-8)

3.22.1. The Italian commander in chief, General Luigi Cadorna, undertook his first offensive on 23 June by throwing two armies — the Second, commanded by General Pietro Frugoni, and the Third, commanded by the Duke of Aosta — totaling 200,000 men and 200 guns in 23 divisions, against the Austrian-held Isonzo salient on the east side of the 400-mile front (only 20 miles of which were not mountainous) (Clodfelter 2008, 446).
3.22.2. Onset: 23/6/1915; Termination: 7/7/1915
3.22.3. Italy versus Austria-Hungary
3.22.4. Italy – 200,000 troops
3.22.5. Italy – 13,500 casualties
3.22.6. Austria-Hungary – 100,000 troops
3.22.7. Austria-Hungary – 10,000 casualties
3.22.8. Outcome – Austro-Hungarian victory. The rugged terrain, limited stocks of artillery ammunition, and the formidable Austrian defenses stopped the Italians by 7 July (Clodfelter 2008, 446).

3.23. Second Battle of the Isonzo (Clodfelter 2008, 446-8)

3.23.1. The second Italian attack, by 18 divisions of the Third Army this time, on the Isonzo.
3.23.2. Onset: 18/7/1916; Termination: 10/8/1916
3.23.3. Italy versus Austria-Hungary
3.23.4. Italy – 255,600 troops
3.23.5. Italy – 42,000 casualties
3.23.6. Austria-Hungary – 135,000 troops
3.23.7. Austria-Hungary – 46,640 casualties
3.23.8. Outcome – Italian victory. The second Italian attack, by 18 divisions of the Third Army this time, on the Isonzo, 18 July – 10 August achieved small gains before being stopped by a reinforcement of two fresh Austrian divisions and a lack of shells for the Italian artillery (Clodfelter 2008, 446).

3.24. Second Battle of Champagne (Clodfelter 2008, 422-3)

3.24.1. On 25 September, the Entente again assumed the offensive, with the French striking in Artois and Champagne.
3.24.2. Onset: 25/9/1915; Termination: 7/10/1915
3.24.3. France versus Germany

3.24.4. France – 500,000 soldiers
3.24.5. France – 143,567 casualties
3.24.6. Germany – Unknown number of soldiers employed
3.24.7. Germany – 84,293 casualties
3.24.8. Outcome – Minor French victory.

3.25. Third Battle of Artois (Clodfelter 2008, 422-3)
3.25.1. French Tenth Army attacks Vimy Ridge.
3.25.2. Onset: 25/9/1915; Termination: 16/10/1915
3.25.3. France versus Germany
3.25.4. France – 285,000 soldiers
3.25.5. France – 48,230 casualties
3.25.6. Germany – 119,000 soldiers
3.25.7. Germany – 30,000 casualties
3.25.8. Outcome – Draw. There was little return on all the slaughter in Artois that went on until 16 October.

3.26. Loos (Clodfelter 2008, 423)
3.26.1. On 25 September, the Entente again assumed the offensive, with the British attacking in the north against Loos.
3.26.2. Onset: 25/9/1915; Termination: 14/10/1915
3.26.3. United Kingdom versus Germany
3.26.4. United Kingdom – 234,000 troops
3.26.5. United Kingdom – 62,713 casualties
3.26.6. Germany – 119,000 troops
3.26.7. Germany – 26,000 casualties
3.26.8. Outcome – German victory. Two hours after "going over the top," the British had lost more men than they did in all three services on D-Day 1944.

3.27. Third Battle of the Isonzo (Clodfelter 2008, 446-8)
3.27.1. The main Italian objectives were to take the Austro-Hungarian bridgeheads at Bovec (Plezzo in Italian), Tolmin, and (if possible) the town of Gorizia. Cadorna's plans failed, however, as Austria-Hungary made good use of its firepower to block the Italian advance.
3.27.2. Onset: 18/10/1915; Termination: 4/11/1915
3.27.3. Italy versus Austria-Hungary
3.27.4. Italy – 411,800 troops
3.27.5. Italy – 66,962 casualties
3.27.6. Austria-Hungary – 180,000 troops
3.27.7. Austria-Hungary – 41,847 casualties
3.27.8. Outcome – Austro-Hungarian victory. Although the 350,000 Italians in 29 divisions were backed by 1,372 guns this time, the attack again failed to break through (Clodfelter 2008, 446).

3.28. Fourth Battle of the Isonzo (Clodfelter 2008, 446-8)

3.28.1. The Italian Second Army, striking toward Gorizia, captured the hilly area around Oslavia and San Floriano del Collio overlooking the Soča (Isonzo) and Gorizia itself. The Italian Third Army, covering the rest of the front up to the sea, launched a series of large and bloody attacks which brought no significant gain. The fighting bogged down and eventually tapered off when neither side could change the slightly altered facts on the ground.
3.28.2. Onset: 10/11/1915; Termination: 1/12/1915
3.28.3. Italy versus Austria-Hungary
3.28.4. Italy – 312,400 troops
3.28.5. Italy – 49,000 casualties
3.28.6. Austria-Hungary – 195,000 troops
3.28.7. Austria-Hungary – 25,391 casualties
3.28.8. Outcome – Italian victory.

3.29. Verdun (Clodfelter 2008, 423-5)
3.29.1. With the exception of Second Ypres in the spring of 1915, Verdun was Germany's only major offensive on the Western Front from the fall of 1914 to March 1918 (Clodfelter 2008, 424).
3.29.2. Onset: 21/2/1916; Termination: 18/12/1916
3.29.3. France versus Germany
3.29.4. France – 990,000 soldiers
3.29.5. France – 309,998 casualties
3.29.6. Germany – 748,000 soldiers
3.29.7. Germany – 282,323 casualties
3.29.8. Outcome – Pyrrhic French victory. The Battle of the Somme forced the Germans to transfer 15 of their divisions before Verdun to oppose the British offensive. Falkenhayn lost his job on 29 August, and the team of Hindenburg and Ludendorff which replaced him decided to go on the defensive at Verdun (Clodfelter 2008, 424).

3.30. Fifth Battle of the Isonzo (Clodfelter 2008, 446-8)
3.30.1. The Fifth Battle of the Isonzo was undertaken in March 1916, like Russia's Brusilov Offensive, at the request of the French in the hopes of taking some of the pressure off Verdun (Clodfelter 2008, 446).
3.30.2. Onset: 11/3/1916; Termination: 16/3/1916
3.30.3. Italy versus Austria-Hungary
3.30.4. Italy – 255,600 troops
3.30.5. Italy – 2,700 casualties
3.30.6. Austria-Hungary – 150,000 troops
3.30.7. Austria-Hungary – 2,000 casualties
3.30.8. Outcome – Austro-Hungarian victory. The Italian attack ground to a halt in less than a week, 11-16 March, with no progress (Clodfelter 2008, 446).

3.31. Battle of Lake Naroch (Clodfelter 2008, 438)

3.31.1. In order to take some of the pressure off the French at Verdun, the Russians attacked the German Tenth Army in the Lake Naroch area on 18 March 1916 (Clodfelter 2008, 438).

3.31.2. Onset: 18/3/1916; Termination: 27/4/1916

3.31.3. Russia and Germany

3.31.4. Russia – 360,000 troops

3.31.5. Russia – 122,000 casualties

3.31.6. Germany – 75,000 troops

3.31.7. Germany – 20,000 casualties

3.31.8. Outcome – German victory. Bogged down in icy slush, the Russian assault progressed but a few hundred yards before it broke down by 26 March. A German counteroffensive in April regained the lost ground by the 27th (Clodfelter 2008, 438).

3.32. Battle of Asiago (Clodfelter 2008, 446-8)

3.32.1. On 15 May 1916, Field Marshal Conrad von Hotzendorf undertook Austria's first offensive on the Italian Front. The Eleventh and Third Armies, totaling 157,000 men and 1,977 guns in 18 divisions, attacked on a front of 30 miles in the Trentino region (Clodfelter 2008, 446).

3.32.2. Onset: 15/5/1916; Termination: 16/6/1916

3.32.3. Italy versus Austria-Hungary

3.32.4. Italy – Unknown number of troops

3.32.5. Italy – 147,000 casualties

3.32.6. Austria-Hungary – 157,000 troops

3.32.7. Austria-Hungary – 81,000 casualties

3.32.8. Outcome – Italian victory. The reinforcement of the Italian Fifth Army, the grueling terrain, and the necessity of dispatching units to stem the Brusilov Offensive in Galicia all combined to slow the attack by 10 June and finally to force the Austrians to pull back (Clodfelter 2008, 446).

3.33. Brusilov Offensive (Kovel-Stanislav)

3.33.1. In order to relive a hard-pressed ally, Italy, Russia attacked the Central Power Coalition. The Brusilov Offensive was fought 4 June – 20 September 1916. Against 61 Russian divisions were 54 Austrian and 24 German divisions (Clodfelter 2008, 439).

3.33.2. Onset: 4/6/1916; Termination: 20/9/1916

3.33.3. Russia versus Central Power Coalition

3.33.4. Russia – 1,220,000 soldiers

3.33.5. Russia – 620000 casualties

3.33.6. Central Power Coalition – 1,218,000 soldiers

3.33.7. Central Power Coalition – 764,000 casualties

3.33.8. Outcome – Russian victory. In spite of high Russian casualties, Russian General Brusilov had won the greatest Entente victory yet in the war. The offensive had forced the Austrians to halt their attacks against Italy, had

weakened the German drive against Verdun by forcing Germany to transfer 18 divisions from the Western Front, and had come close to knocking Austria out of the war (Clodfetler 2007, 438).

3.34. Battle of the Somme

3.34.1. In response to French pleas for a British offensive to divert German resources from Verdun, the British drew up a plan for a major push by the British Fourth and Third Armies in conjunction with Foch Army Group of the North, made up of the French Sixth and Tenth Armies (Clodfelter 2008, 425; See Also Greenhalgh 2005, 55).
3.34.2. Onset: 14/6/1916; Termination: 13/11/1916
3.34.3. Entente Coalition versus Germany
3.34.4. Entente Coalition – 1290000 soldiers
3.34.5. Entente Coalition – 618057 casualties
3.34.6. Germany – 1615000 soldiers
3.34.7. Germany – 434500 casualties
3.34.8. Outcome – Draw. The British called off the battle on 18 November 1916. The Entente had made minor territorial gains, but at exorbitant cost.

3.35. Sixth Battle of the Isonzo (Clodfelter 2008, 446-8)

3.35.1. On the Isonzo line, Cadorna took advantage of the depletion of the Austrian defenses for the Trentino Offensive, and in the Sixth Battle of the Isonzo, 6-17 August 1916, at last, with 16 divisions and 1,250 guns, succeeded in taking San Michele and Gorizia (Clodfelter 2008, 446-8).
3.35.2. Onset: 6/8/1916; Termination: 17/8/1916
3.35.3. Italy versus Austria-Hungary
3.35.4. Italy – 227,200 troops
3.35.5. Italy – 51,250 casualties
3.35.6. Austria-Hungary – 120,000 troops
3.35.7. Austria-Hungary – 41,850 casualties
3.35.8. Outcome – Italian victory. This was Italy's greatest victory on the Isonzo front, but still no major penetration was affected (Clodfelter 2008, 446-8).

3.36. Seventh Battle of the Isonzo (Clodfelter 2008, 446-8)

3.36.1. This Isonzo battle featured the Italian Third Army attacking toward Nova Vas. It was initially successful before bogging down.
3.36.2. Onset: 14/9/1916; Termination: 17/9/1916
3.36.3. Italy versus Austria-Hungary
3.36.4. Italy – Unknown number of troops
3.36.5. Italy – 17,500 casualties
3.36.6. Austria-Hungary – Unknown number of troops
3.36.7. Austria-Hungary – 15,000 casualties
3.36.8. Outcome – Minor Italian victory. Cadorna tied up of 35 Austrian divisions (Clodfelter 2008, 446-8).

3.37. Eighth Battle of the Isonzo (Clodfelter 2008, 446-8)

3.37.1. In Eighth Isonzo, the Italian Third Army attacks with 18 divisions.
3.37.2. Onset: 9/10/1916; Termination: 12/10/1916
3.37.3. Italy versus Austria-Hungary
3.37.4. Italy – 255,600 troops
3.37.5. Italy – 60,000 casualties
3.37.6. Austria-Hungary – 105,000 troops
3.37.7. Austria-Hungary – 32,000 casualties
3.37.8. Outcome – Draw.

3.38. Ninth Battle of the Isonzo (Clodfelter 2008, 446-8)

3.38.1. In Ninth Isonzo, 221 Italian battalions attack.
3.38.2. Onset: 1/11/1917; Termination: 4/11/1917
3.38.3. Italy versus Austria-Hungary
3.38.4. Italy – 347,900 troops
3.38.5. Italy – 36,000 casualties
3.38.6. Austria-Hungary – 150,000 troops
3.38.7. Austria-Hungary – 30,000 casualties
3.38.8. Outcome – Minor Italian victory.

3.39. Battle of Arras (Clodfelter 2008, 427-9)

3.39.1. The Canadian Corps, under British command, attacked Vimy Ridge to safeguard the left flank of the main advance either side of the Arras, which was carried out by General Sir Edmund Allenby's Third Army. The Germans fought from a well-defended position, but ultimately could not stop the advance.
3.39.2. Onset: 9/4/1917; Termination: 15/5/1917
3.39.3. United Kingdom versus Germany
3.39.4. United Kingdom – 350,000 troops
3.39.5. United Kingdom – 139,867 casualties
3.39.6. Germany – 230,000 troops
3.39.7. Germany – 137,867 casualties
3.39.8. Outcome – British victory. By 15 April, the British could claim a tactical victory, but no decisive breakthrough.

3.40. Second Battle of Aisne (Clodfelter 2008, 427-9)

3.40.1. This was the long-awaited Nivelle Offensive opened on 16 April with a French attack along the Aisne. Sometimes referred to as the Second Battle of the Aisne and the Third Battle of Champagne.
3.40.2. Onset: 16/4/1917; Termination: 9/5/1917
3.40.3. France versus Germany
3.40.4. France – 800,000 soldiers
3.40.5. France – 187,000 casualties
3.40.6. Germany – 650,000 soldiers
3.40.7. Germany – 161,815 casualties

3.40.8. Outcome – Draw. The offensive ended no differently than those that had come before it, except in its greater degree of disappointment and disillusionment.

3.41. Tenth Battle of the Isonzo (Clodfelter 2008, 446-8)

3.41.1. Tenth Isonzo mangled the mountains from 12 May – 5 June 1917 and featured a million-round barrage by 1,250 guns and 600 mortars on 23 May (Clodfelter 2008, 446-8).
3.41.2. Onset: 12/5/1917; Termination: 5/6/1917
3.41.3. Italy versus Austria-Hungary
3.41.4. Italy – 397,600 troops
3.41.5. Italy – 159,000 casualties
3.41.6. Austria-Hungary – 270,000 troops
3.41.7. Austria-Hungary – 76,000 casualties
3.41.8. Outcome – Italian victory. Neither the mountains nor the mountains' defenders would fold before the Italian steamroller (Clodfelter 2008, 446-8).

3.42. Battle of Trentino (Clodfelter 2008, 447-8)

3.42.1. Cadorna had tried his luck in the Trentino on 10 June against six Austrian-held mountain peaks (Clodfelter 2008, 447-8).
3.42.2. Onset: 10/6/1917; Termination: 28/6/1917
3.42.3. Italy versus Austria-Hungary
3.42.4. Italy – 170,400 troops
3.42.5. Italy – 37,000 casualties
3.42.6. Austria-Hungary – Unknown number of troops
3.42.7. Austria-Hungary – 9,000 casualties
3.42.8. Outcome – Minor Italian victory. After two and one-half weeks and securing some gains, the attacking forces — 12 divisions and 24 Alpine battalions — gave up (Clodfelter 2008, 447-8).

3.43. Battle of Messines Ridge (Clodfelter 2008, 428-9)

3.43.1. The target of the British offensive was the Messines Ridge, a natural stronghold southeast of Ypres, and a small German salient since late 1914. The attack was also intended to set up a larger subsequent battle at Ypres.
3.43.2. Onset: 7/6/1917; Termination: 14/6/1917
3.43.3. United Kingdom versus Germany
3.43.4. United Kingdom – 287,091 troops
3.43.5. United Kingdom – 24,562 casualties
3.43.6. Germany – 119,000 troops
3.43.7. Germany – 23,000 casualties
3.43.8. Outcome – British victory.

3.44. Kerensky Offensive

3.44.1. Russian Minister of War Alexander Kerensky ordered an offensive, fought 1-19 July 1917, that was the last major campaign of the war on the Eastern Front. The Russian Eleventh and Seventh Armies, with 31 divisions and 1,328 guns, penetrated the lines of Count Felix von Bothmer's South Army of 4 German, 3 Austrian, and 1 Turkish Divisions for 30 miles on a 100-mile front (Clodfelter 2008, 439; See also Tucker 1998, 873 and Ellis and Cox 2001, 37 and 109-113).
3.44.2. Onset: 1/7/1917; Termination: 10/11/1917
3.44.3. Russia versus Central Power Coalition
3.44.4. Russia – 1,680,000 soldiers
3.44.5. Russia – 100,000 casualties
3.44.6. Central Power Coalition– 558,300 soldiers
3.44.7. Central Power Coalition– 29,940 casualties
3.44.8. Outcome – Central Power Coalition victory. The Russian offensive ran out of steam, as revolutionary soldiers of the Russian army were reluctant to give further to a war entered into by a deposed czar. The German counterattack rolled up the Russian lines. Only a lack of reserves and a logistical breakdown forced the triumphant Germans to call a halt (Clodfelter 2008, 439).

3.45. Third Ypres (Passchendaele)

3.45.1. The Battle of Third Ypres was fought between 31 July – 10 November 1917. Prior to the Battle the French Army had just suffered (via the failed Nivelle Offensive) the heaviest losses proportional to its strength of any of the major combatants throughout the war, was near its breaking point (Clodfelter 2008, 429).
3.45.2. Onset: 31/7/1917; Termination: 10/11/1917
3.45.3. Entente Coalition versus Germany
3.45.4. Entente Coalition – 630,000 soldiers
3.45.5. Entente Coalition – 253,425 casualties
3.45.6. Germany – 255,000 soldiers
3.45.7. Germany – 260,000 casualties (Note: This figure overcounts battle casualties, as it represents total casualties in the Third Ypres area to the end of the year).
3.45.8. Outcome – Entente victory. The Passchendaele Ridge and village were secured on 6 November. By 10 November, the main battle was over.

3.46. Eleventh Battle of the Isonzo (Clodfelter 2008, 446-8)

3.46.1. The Second Army (now commanded by General Luigi Capello) and Third Army, totaling 530,000 Italians in 51 divisions and 5,200 artillery pieces, made some progress against Austrian General Boroevic von Bojna's Fifth Army of 20 divisions.
3.46.2. Onset: 18/8/1917; Termination: 15/9/1917
3.46.3. Italy versus Austria-Hungary
3.46.4. Italy – 530,000 troops
3.46.5. Italy – 256,000 casualties

3.46.6. Austria-Hungary – 300,000 troops
3.46.7. Austria-Hungary – 86,000 casualties
3.46.8. Outcome – Draw. Heavy losses and exhaustion halted the Italian offensive before any meaningful gains could be made.

3.47. Battle of Caporetto

3.47.1. The Battle of Caporetto was fought between 24 October – 12 November 1917. Austria's new Fourteenth Army, fielding 7 German and 8 Austrian divisions penetrated the lines of the Italian Second Army near Caporetto, on the northern end of the Isonzo line. The Germans and Austrians surged behind a rolling barrage to cut through enemy lines. Supported by the Austrian Tenth Army on the right flank and Fifth Army on the left, they mauled the Italian Second Army and uprooted the whole Italian line for a Central Power Coalition' victory (Clodfelter 2008, 447).
3.47.2. Onset: 24/10/1917; Termination: 12/11/1917
3.47.3. Italy versus Central Power Coalition
3.47.4. Italy – 482,800 soldiers
3.47.5. Italy – 308,640 casualties
3.47.6. Central Power Coalition – 539,900 soldiers
3.47.7. Central Power Coalition – Austria-Hungary unknown casualties; Germany suffered 35,400 casualties
3.47.8. Outcome – Central Power Coalition victory. Supported by the Austrian Tenth Army on the right flank and Fifth Army on the left, the Germans mauled the Italian Second Army and uprooted the whole Italian line for a Central Power Coalition' victory (Clodfelter 2008, 447).

3.48. Battle of Cambrai (Clodfelter 2008, 428-9)

3.48.1. The British attacked toward a significant German supply depot, using large numbers of tanks for the first time. Initial successes stalled and were eventually turned back when the new machines began breaking down.
3.48.2. Onset: 20/11/1917; Termination: 8/12/1917
3.48.3. United Kingdom versus Germany
3.48.4. United Kingdom – 360,000 troops
3.48.5. United Kingdom – 70,264 casualties
3.48.6. Germany – 360,000 troops
3.48.7. Germany – 54,000 casualties
3.48.8. Outcome – Draw. Two British cavalry divisions tried to exploit an initial penetration, but they were insufficiently backed by infantry and tank follow-up units.

3.49. Second Battle of the Somme

3.49.1. The Battle of Second Somme was fought 21 March – 5 April 1918. The German offensive was initially successful, taking 98.5 miles of British-held territory, but logistical difficulties, a lack of sufficient reserves and

mobile artillery combined to slow down the drives (Clodfelter 2008, 431; See also Grey 1991).

3.49.2. Onset: 21/3/1918; Termination: 5/4/1918
3.49.3. Entente Coalition versus Germany
3.49.4. Entente Coalition – 750,000 soldiers
3.49.5. Entente Coalition – 240000 casualties
3.49.6. Germany – 1,000,000 soldiers
3.49.7. Germany – 239,000 casualties
3.49.8. Outcome – German victory.

3.50. Battle of Lys

3.50.1. The second German offensive of 1918, Operation Georgette, took place father north in Flanders with the objective to capture Channel ports (Clodfelter 2008, 431).
3.50.2. Onset: 9/4/1918; Termination: 29/4/1918
3.50.3. Entente Coalition versus Germany
3.50.4. Entente Coalition – 642,000 soldiers
3.50.5. Entente Coalition – 118,600 casualties
3.50.6. Germany – 714,000 soldiers
3.50.7. Germany – 109,300 casualties
3.50.8. Outcome - Germany victory. The drive was stopped on 17 April after a ten-mile penetration that included the recapture of Messines Ridge (Clodfelter 2008, 431).

3.51. Battle of Aisne

3.51.1. The Third German offensive, Operation Blucher/Yorck, was meant to be a diversionary operation preparatory to a final blow against the British in Flanders (Clodfelter 2008, 431).
3.51.2. Onset: 27/5/1918; Termination: 4/6/1918
3.51.3. Entente Coalition versus Germany
3.51.4. Entente Coalition – 311,000 soldiers
3.51.5. Entente Coalition – 131,863 casualties
3.51.6. Germany – 510,000 soldiers
3.51.7. Germany – 5,000 casualties
3.51.8. Outcome – German victory. The Germans crossed the Aisne and reached the Marne (Clodfelter 2008, 431).

3.52. Battle of Belleau Wood

3.52.1. The Battle of Belleau Wood, fought 6 June – 1 July 1918, was part of an Entente effort to push the Germans across the Marne and clear the Germans out of the area. The United States 2nd Division and an attached Marine brigade totaled 28,059 troops and faced four German divisions.
3.52.2. Onset: 6/6/1918; Termination: 1/7/1918
3.52.3. United States versus Germany
3.52.4. United States – 28,059 soldiers
3.52.5. United States – 9,777 casualties

3.52.6. Germany – 68,000 soldiers
3.52.7. Germany – 11,187 casualties
3.52.8. Outcome – United States victory.

3.53. Battle of Noyon Montdidier

3.53.1. The Battle of Noyon Montdidier, 9-16 June 1918, was part of the fourth German 1918 offensive called Operation Gneisenau (Clodfelter 2008, 432 and 435).
3.53.2. Onset: 9/6/1918; Termination: 16/6/1918
3.53.3. Entente Coalition versus Germany
3.53.4. Entente Coalition – 300,000 soldiers
3.53.5. Entente Coalition – 3,946 casualties
3.53.6. Germany –391,000 soldiers
3.53.7. Germany – 30,000 casualties
3.53.8. Outcome – Entente victory. The French counterattack halted the German advance. (Clodfelter 2008, 432 and 435).

3.54. Battle of Piave River

3.54.1. After the Battle of Caporetto, the Entente sent reinforcements and the Battle of Piave River was fought 15-23 June 1918. On 15 June, 946,000 men in four armies, counting 58-Austro-Hungarian divisions attempted to deal Italy the knockout blow. The Six Allied Armies made up of 52 Italian, 3 British and 2 French divisions were ready (Clodfelter 2008, 447; See also Tucker 1998, 1249).
3.54.2. Onset: 15/6/1918; Termination: 23/6/1918
3.54.3. Entente Coalition versus Germany
3.54.4. Entente Coalition – 838,000 soldiers
3.54.5. Entente Coalition – 92,000 casualties
3.54.6. Germany – 946,000 soldiers
3.54.7. Germany – 118,475 casualties
3.54.8. Outcome – Entente victory. The Austrians withdrew on the night of 22-23 June, and the Italian followed to win a bridgehead on the east bank of the Piave (Clodfelter 2008, 448; Grey and Argyle 1991, 284).

3.55. Battle of Champagne-Marne

3.55.1. The Battle of Champagne-Marne was fought 15-18 July 1918. The fifth and final German offensive began on 15 July when the Seventh, First and Third Armies struck in an effort to pinch out the Entente-held Reims sector (Clodfelter 2008, 432).
3.55.2. Onset: 15/7/1918; Termination: 18/7/1918
3.55.3. Entente Coalition versus Germany
3.55.4. Entente Coalition – 662,000 soldiers
3.55.5. Entente Coalition – 45,001 casualties
3.55.6. Germany –799,000 soldiers
3.55.7. Germany – 50,000 casualties

3.55.8. Outcome – Entente victory. They knew of the impending battle and prepared a surprise artillery bombardment. They knew of the impending battle and prepared a surprise artillery bombardment. While the Germans made it across the Marne, they were held in check by the U.S. 3rd division. Entente air and artillery then collapsed bridges across the Marne disrupting Germany supply forcing a pull-back (Clodfelter 2008, 432).

3.56. Battle of Aisne-Marne (Soissons)

3.56.1. The Battle of Anise-Marne was fought 18 July – 6 August 1918. It was an Entente counteroffensive. Attacking the Germans in the Marne Salient were 23 French divisions (Clodfelter 2008, 432).
3.56.2. Onset: 18/7/1918; Termination: 5/8/1918
3.56.3. Entente Coalition versus Germany
3.56.4. Entente Coalition – 670,000 soldiers
3.56.5. Entente Coalition – 160,852 casualties
3.56.6. Germany –884,000 soldiers
3.56.7. Germany – 168,376 casualties
3.56.8. Outcome – Entente victory. The Marne Salient was eliminated and the Germans called off their planned Flanders offensive (Clodelter 2007, 432).

3.57. Battle of Amiens

3.57.1. The Battle of Amiens, an Entente offensive, was fought 8 August – 4 September 1918. At the start of the battle there were 17 Entente divisions and 3 tank brigades (Clodfelter 2008, 435; Ellis and Cox 2001 notes the Entente had 21 Divisions at the start of the battle).
3.57.2. Onset: 8/8/1918; Termination: 4/9/1918
3.57.3. Entente Coalition versus Germany
3.57.4. Entente Coalition – 421,000 soldiers
3.57.5. Entente Coalition – 47,215 casualties
3.57.6. Germany –306,000 soldiers
3.57.7. Germany – 78,873 casualties
3.57.8. Outcome – Entente victory. On the first day, the Entente penetrated 10 and the second phase of battle is considered Britain's greatest victory on the Western Front (Clodfelter 2008, 433).

3.58. Battle of St. Mihiel

3.58.1. The Battle of St. Mihiel was fought 12-16 September 1918. It was the American First Army's first offensive. (Clodfelter 2008, 435; Ferrell 2007, 33 has 230,000 American and 110,000 French against 23,000 Germans).
3.58.2. Onset: 12/9/1918; Termination: 16/9/1918
3.58.3. Entente Coalition versus Germany
3.58.4. Entente Coalition – 264,000 soldiers
3.58.5. Entente Coalition – 7,000 casualties
3.58.6. Germany – 75,000 soldiers
3.58.7. Germany – 15,551 casualties

3.58.8. Outcome – Entente victory. Germans in the salient put up only minimal resistance (Clodfelter 2008, 435).

3.59. Battle of Meuse-Argonne

3.59.1. The Battle of Meuse-Argonne was fought 20 September – 11 November 1918. French Marshal Foch planned a double envelopment of the Germans, with the AEF striking from Verdun and the British from Péronne and Lens (Clodfelter 2008, 433).
3.59.2. Onset: 26/9/1918; Termination: 11/11/1918
3.59.3. Entente Coalition versus Austria-Hungary
3.59.4. Entente Coalition – 1,391,478 soldiers
3.59.5. Entente Coalition – 177,063 casualties
3.59.6. Austria-Hungary – 470,000 soldiers
3.59.7. Austria-Hungary – 100,000 casualties
3.59.8. Outcome – Entente victory.

3.60. Battle of Vittorio Veneto

3.60.1. The Italians, supported by other Entente forces, attacked toward Vittorio Veneto in order to separate the Austro-Hungarian forces on the Adriatic plains from those in the mountains, which would allow the rolling up of the latter group.
3.60.2. Onset: 24/10/1918; Termination: 4/11/1918
3.60.3. Entente Coalition versus Austria-Hungary
3.60.4. Entente Coalition – 685,800 soldiers
3.60.5. Entente Coalition – 40,753 casualties
3.60.6. Austria-Hungary –780,000 soldiers
3.60.7. Austria-Hungary – 330,000 casualties
3.60.8. Outcome – Entente victory.

4. Coding Notes: World War II

Formatting for Coding Notes:

1. Warname (COW)
1.1. Major Battle Name (Page numbers for data drawn from Clodfelter 2008; Supplemental data citations located where appropriate)
  1.1.1. Battle Description
  1.1.2. Date of battle onset and termination (Day/Month/Year)
  1.1.3. Belligerents
  1.1.4. Belligerent A Contribution
  1.1.5. Belligerent A Casualties
  1.1.6. Belligerent B Contribution
  1.1.7. Belligerent B Casualties
  1.1.8. Battle Outcome

4.1. Battle of Flanders

4.1.1. The Battle of Flanders was fought between 10 May – 4 June 1940. In the spring of 1940 a German invasion force of 2,350,000 – organized into 104 infantry, 9 motorized, and 10 Panzer divisions and deployed in 3 army groups - concentrated on Germany's western boundaries (Clodfelter 2008, 467; Holmes 2001, Fall of France Entry, notes that on May 10, 1940 Germany had 136 divisions; Maier 1994, 279 notes Germany at 141 divisions; For German Forces Engaged see Ellis 2009b, Appendix II).
4.1.2. Onset: 10/5/1940; Termination: 4/6/1940
4.1.3. Allied Coalition versus Germany
4.1.4. Allied Coalition – 2,924,900 soldiers
4.1.5. Allied Coalition – 1,616,240 casualties
4.1.6. Germany –2,350,000 soldiers
4.1.7. Germany – 60,000 casualties
4.1.8. Outcome – German victory. France lost 30 divisions, with 750,000 captured (Clodfelter 2008, 469; Dear and Foot 2014 French losses estimated at 90,000 dead, 200,000 wounded and 1.9 million taken prisoners or missing).

4.2. Battle of France (Clodfelter 2008, 468-9)

4.2.1. The German assault continued into France, with the Allies drawn into Belgium, the attackers advanced around the Maginot Line into French territory. The Germans encircled Allied forces fighting on the right flank and swept through France, achieving complete victory three weeks into June.
4.2.2. Onset: 5/6/1940; Termination: 22/6/1940
4.2.3. France versus Germany
4.2.4. France – 65 Divisions or 1,137,500 troops

4.2.5. France- 200,000 killed, wounded, or missing and 1.2 million captured for 1,400,000 casualties (Casualties outnumber deployed troops due to the reinforcement of threatened positions by unknown numbers of French forces throughout the battle.)
4.2.6. Germany- 2,046,800 troops
4.2.7. Germany- 95000 casualties
4.2.8. Outcome – German victory. The capitulation, including some forces that did not fight in in the battle, came at Compiègne on 22 June, in the same railroad car parked in the forest where Germany had surrendered in 1918.

4.3. Battle of Sidi Barrani (Clodfelter 2008, 473, 477)
4.3.1. The Italians began their war in North Africa by advancing into Egypt on 13 September 1940, with 100,000 men in 5 divisions penetrating 60 miles to Sidi Barrani, where they erected a series of fortified camps on a 50-mile line.
4.3.2. Onset: 9/12/1940; Termination: 12/12/1940
4.3.3. United Kingdom versus Italy
4.3.4. United Kingdom – 31,000 troops
4.3.5. United Kingdom – 624 casualties
4.3.6. Italy – 75,000 troops
4.3.7. Italy – 38,000 casualties
4.3.8. Outcome – British victory. The Western Desert Force rolled up the Italian line and expelled the enemy from Egypt by 16 December.

4.4. Battle of Smolensk (Clodfelter 2008, 480, 496)
4.4.1. The German advance continued eastward, arriving east of Smolensk in mid-July; after three weeks of fighting in and around the city, including house-to-house fighting in the suburbs, the Germans secured the territory.
4.4.2. Onset: 16/7/1941; Termination: 6/8/1941
4.4.3. Russia versus Germany
4.4.4. Russia – 264,000 troops
4.4.5. Russia – 100,815 casualties
4.4.6. Germany – 518,784 troops
4.4.7. Germany – 155,000 casualties
4.4.8. Outcome – German victory

4.5. Battle of Kiev (Clodfelter 2008, 480, 496)
4.5.1. Guderian's Second Panzer Group from the north and Kleist's First Panzer Group from the south joined armored hands at Lohvitsa on 16 September.
4.5.2. Onset: 21/8/1941; Termination: 26/9/1941
4.5.3. Russia versus Germany
4.5.4. Russia – 677,000 troops

4.5.5. Russia – 450,000 casualties
4.5.6. Germany – 465,776 troops
4.5.7. Germany – 100,000 casualties
4.5.8. Outcome – German victory. The final Soviet capitulation, the biggest single mass surrender in history (prior to the end of a conflict), came on 26 September.

4.6. Battle of Bryansk-Vyazma (Clodfelter 2008, 481, 496)
4.6.1. Guderian's Second Panzer Group and the Second Army linked pincers at Bryansk, while Hoepner's Fourth Panzer Group and Hoth's Third Panzer Group encircled Vyazma.
4.6.2. Onset: 30/9/1941; Termination: 20/10/1941
4.6.3. Russia versus Germany
4.6.4. Russia – 800,000 troops (initial strength)
4.6.5. Russia – 252,600 killed or wounded and 673,000 captured for 925,600 casualties
4.6.6. Germany – 5,000,000 troops
4.6.7. Germany – 145,000 casualties
4.6.8. Outcome – German victory. The consequence was 45 Soviet divisions destroyed.

4.7. Siege of Leningrad (Clodfelter 2008, 480-2, 486-7, 489, 497)
4.7.1. German Army Group North advanced to Leningrad. The German plan called for capturing the city on the move, but due to Hitler's recall of 4th Panzer Group, did not have sufficient forces. A siege was laid, which lasted until the Red Army liberated the city in early 1944.
4.7.2. Onset: 4/9/1941; Termination: 25/1/1944
4.7.3. Russia versus Germany
4.7.4. Russia – 822,100 troops
4.7.5. Russia – 100,000 casualties
4.7.6. Germany – 741,000 troops
4.7.7. Germany – 500,000 casualties
4.7.8. Outcome – Ultimately a Soviet victory. Leningrad was very probably the deadliest siege in history.

4.8. Battle of Moscow (Clodfelter 2008, 482, 498)
4.8.1. In October, Hitler agreed to return the armored units to Army Group Center so that it could renew its interrupted advance on Moscow. The first result of the ensuing Operation Typhoon was an Axis victory nearly as overwhelming as Kiev. The Battle for Moscow (a continuation of Operation Typhoon) began on 15 November 1941.
4.8.2. Onset: 15/11/1941; Termination: 5/12/1941
4.8.3. Russia versus Germany
4.8.4. Russia – 760,000 troops
4.8.5. Russia – 300,000 casualties
4.8.6. Germany – 800,000 troops

4.8.7. Germany – 155,000 casualties
4.8.8. Outcome – Soviet victory. Third and Fourth Panzer Groups fought their way to within 25 miles of Moscow by 5 December but could get no farther.

4.9. Battle of Sidi Rezegh

4.9.1. The first attack of the British Empire offensive Operation Crusader was the Battle of Sidi Rezegh fought 18 November 1941 – 6 January 1942. British Empire troops were 118,000 men strong. Facing the British were 119,000 Axis forces (65,000 German, and 54,000 Italian) (Clodfelter 2008, 477; See Also Playfair 2004, 97).
4.9.2. Onset: 18/11/1942; Termination: 17/5/1942
4.9.3. United Kingdom versus Axis Coalition
4.9.4. United Kingdom – 118,000 soldiers
4.9.5. United Kingdom – 17,700 casualties
4.9.6. Axis Coalition –119,000 soldiers
4.9.7. Axis Coalition – 38,300 casualties
4.9.8. Outcome – British victory. Rommel was forced to retreat back to his original jump-off point at El Aghelia.

4.10. Battle of Hong Kong

4.10.1. The Japanese assault on the British holdings in Hong Kong was a swift and complete capture of the island and its surrounding territory (Clodfelter 2008, 532)
4.10.2. Onset: 8/12/1941; Termination: 25/12/1941
4.10.3. United Kingdom and Canada versus Japan
4.10.4. United Kingdom and Canada – 14,500 soldiers
4.10.5. United Kingdom and Canada – 12,703 casualties
4.10.6. Japan – 38th Division, 26,691 soldiers
4.10.7. Japan – 2,754 casualties
4.10.8. Outcome – Japanese Victory

4.11. Malaya and Singapore

4.11.1. Japan invaded Malaya on 8 December 1941 and quickly pushed through the Johore Line 25 miles north of the Singapore Straits, driving the British (including Indian and Malaya troops) and Australian forces before them. Singapore was invested and attacked; the British surrendered on 15 February 1942 (Clodfelter 2008, 532-3)
4.11.2. Onset: 8/12/1941; Termination: 15/2/1942
4.11.3. United Kingdom and Australia versus Japan
4.11.4. United Kingdom and Australia – Initially approximately 88,000, which grew to approximately 150,000 during the fighting.
4.11.5. United Kingdom and Australia – 138,708 casualties
4.11.6. Japan – Approximately 150,000 total soldiers involved
4.11.7. Japan – 9,824 casualties
4.11.8. Outcome – Decisive Japanese victory

4.12. Battle of Bataan

4.12.1. Japan invaded the Philippines in December 1941 and, after a series of smaller fights with the American and Philippine forces, drove the defenders onto the Bataan Peninsula. The Japanese assault on Bataan began in January 1942 and ended with the surrender of American and Philippine forces in early April (Clodfelter 2008, 536-7).
4.12.2. Onset: 7/1/1942; Termination: 9/4/1942
4.12.3. United States and Philippines versus Japan
4.12.4. United States and Philippines – Approximately 90,000 soldiers on the peninsula.
4.12.5. United States and Phillippines – A few escaped, with approximately 82,000 casualties including killed, wounded, and captured
4.12.6. Japan – Approximately 75,000 total soldiers after reinforcements arrived at Bataan
4.12.7. Japan – 8,000 casualties
4.12.8. Outcome – Decisive Japanese victory

4.13. Battle of Burma (Japanese Conquest)

4.13.1. The Japanese invasion of Burma began on 16 January 1942 and ended with the Japanese conquest of Burma on 17 May 1942 (Clodfelter 2008, 533).
4.13.2. Onset: 16/1/1942; Termination: 17/5/1942
4.13.3. Allied Coalition versus Germany
4.13.4. Allied Coalition – 142,000 soldiers
4.13.5. Allied Coalition – 53,463 casualties
4.13.6. Japan –85,000 soldiers
4.13.7. Japan – 6,500 casualties
4.13.8. Outcome – Japanese Victory

4.14. Battle of Java

4.14.1. The Japanese landed two divisions on Java as part of their larger assault on the Dutch East Indies in February 1942 and quickly defeated, and secured the complete surrender, of Allied forces on the island (Clodfelter 2008, 536).
4.14.2. Onset: 28/2/1942; Termination: 9/3/1942
4.14.3. Dutch Coalition versus Japan
4.14.4. Dutch Coalition – 60,000 soldiers
4.14.5. Dutch Coalition – 60,000 casualties (all either killed, wounded, or surrendered)
4.14.6. Japan – Approximately 53,000 soldiers in two divisions
4.14.7. Japan – Unknown casualties
4.14.8. Outcome – Japanese Victory

4.15. Battle of First Corregidor

4.15.1. After capturing Luzon, the Japanese assaulted Corregidor Island. A lengthy naval and aerial bombardment softened the American defenses and the Japanese capture the island, and all defenders, a day after launching the ground invasion (Clodfelter 2008, 537).
4.15.2. Onset: 5/5/1942; Termination: 6/5/1942
4.15.3. United States versus Japan
4.15.4. United States – 13,000 soldiers
4.15.5. United States – 13,000 casualties (all either killed, wounded, or surrendered)
4.15.6. Japan – Approximately 75,000 soldiers in two divisions
4.15.7. Japan – Approximately 2,000 casualties
4.15.8. Outcome – Japanese Victory

4.16. Battle of Kerch Peninsula

4.16.1. The Battle of Kerch Peninsula was fought May 8-15, 1942. Manstein's Eleventh Army of 6 German and 3 Romanian divisions renewed its offensive on the Crimean front of 3 Soviet armies (Clodfelter 2008, 483).
4.16.2. Onset: 8/5/1942; Termination: 15/5/1942
4.16.3. Russia versus Axis Coalition
4.16.4. Russia – 304,500 soldiers
4.16.5. Russia – 170,000 casualties
4.16.6. Axis Coalition –115,500 soldiers
4.16.7. Axis Coalition – 7,588 casualties
4.16.8. Outcome – Axis victory

4.17. Battle of Kharkov

4.17.1. The Russians attacked toward Kharkov, committing 23 infantry divisions, 2 cavalry corps, and 2 tank corps of which 239,000 were captured (Clodfelter 2008, 497).
4.17.2. Onset: 12/5/1942; Termination: 29/5/1942
4.17.3. Russia versus Axis Coalition
4.17.4. Russia – 765,300 soldiers
4.17.5. Russia – 106,232 casualties
4.17.6. Axis Coalition – 329,000 soldiers
4.17.7. Axis Coalition – 20,000 casualties
4.17.8. Outcome – Axis victory. The Russians surrendered at Kharkov on 29 May. Most of 22 infantry and 7 cavalry divisions, plus 14 armored or motorized brigades were lost. The figures, according to the Germans, were 239,000 POWS. Soviet records show 765,300 men engaged in battle, 170,958 killed or missing, 106,232 wounded or sick, and 18 divisions destroyed. The Axis sustained a combined 20,000 total casualties (Clodfelter 2008, 497).

4.18. Battle of Sevastopol

4.18.1. The Eleventh Army, 7 German and 2 Romanian divisions, with 175,000 combat troops and 28,000 logistical troops began its attack on Sevastopol (Clodfelter 2008, 483).
4.18.2. Onset: 7/6/1942; Termination: 4/7/1942
4.18.3. Russia versus Axis Coalition
4.18.4. Russia – 101,238 soldiers
4.18.5. Russia – 90,000 casualties
4.18.6. Axis Coalition – 203,000 soldiers
4.18.7. Axis Coalition – 27,000 casualties
4.18.8. Outcome – Axis victory. German and Romanian attackers secured victory, breaking the Soviet lines and took Sevastopol on 28 June (Clodfelter 2008, 484).

4.19. Battle of Gazala-Bir Hachem

4.19.1. The Axis troops made a decoy attack in the north as the main attack moved round the southern flank of the Gazala position. Unexpected French resistance slowed the German advance, but ultimately did not forestall the Axis victory.
4.19.2. Onset: 26/5/1942; Termination: 13/6/1942
4.19.3. United Kingdom versus Axis Coalition
4.19.4. United Kingdom – 125,000 soldiers
4.19.5. United Kingdom – 42,000 casualties
4.19.6. Axis Coalition –113,000 soldiers
4.19.7. Axis Coalition – 25,000 casualties
4.19.8. Outcome – Axis victory. By 13 June, the British gave up their line and retreated having suffered 42,000 casualties (Clodfelter 2008, 474).

4.20. Battle of Tobruk

4.20.1. After the British retreat at the Gazala-Bir Hachem line, the Tobruk garrison was isolated and was overrun by Rommel's assault (Clodfelter 2008, 474).
4.20.2. Onset: 19/6/1942; Termination: 21/6/1942
4.20.3. United Kingdom versus Axis Coalition
4.20.4. United Kingdom – 35,000 soldiers
4.20.5. United Kingdom – 33,000 casualties
4.20.6. Axis Coalition –62,000 soldiers
4.20.7. Axis Coalition – 2,490 casualties
4.20.8. Outcome – Axis victory.

4.21. Battle of Guadalcanal/Henderson Field

4.21.1. The Japanese attacked an American airfield on Guadalcanal and, after three days of ineffectual attacks, withdrew (Clodfelter 2008, 538).
4.21.2. Onset: 23/10/1942; Termination: 26/10/1942
4.21.3. United States versus Japan
4.21.4. United States – 23,000 soldiers
4.21.5. United States – 300 casualties

4.21.6. Japan – 20,000 soldiers
4.21.7. Japan – At least 2,200 casualties
4.21.8. Outcome – American victory

4.22. Battle of El Alamein

4.22.1. Battle of El Alamein was fought 23 October – 4 November 1942. The British fielded 150,000 men against 96,000 combined Axis troops (53,000 German and 43,000 Italian). The British suffered 11,300 casualties and the Axis a combined 59,000 casualties (34,000 Germans and 25,000 Italian) (Clodfelter 2008, 477).
4.22.2. Onset: 23/10/1942; Termination: 4/11/1942
4.22.3. United Kingdom versus Axis Coalition
4.22.4. United Kingdom – 150,000 soldiers
4.22.5. United Kingdom – 11,300 casualties
4.22.6. Axis Coalition –96,000 soldiers
4.22.7. Axis Coalition – 59,000 casualties
4.22.8. Outcome – British victory

4.23. Bougainville Campaign

4.23.1. The Allies struck Bougainville as part of the campaign to retake the Solomon Islands in late 1942. American and New Zealand forces secured a beach head at Empress Augusta Bay and ultimately drove their adversaries from the island after several ineffectual Japanese counterattacks (Clodfelter 2008, 539).
4.23.2. Onset: 1/11/1942; Termination: 25/3/1942
4.23.3. United States and New Zealand versus Japan
4.23.4. United States and New Zealand – 95,861 soldiers took part through the end of March 1942
4.23.5. United States – 2,263 casualties
4.23.6. Japan – 20,000 soldiers
4.23.7. Japan – At least 7,943 casualties
4.23.8. Outcome – Allied victory

4.24. Battle of Stalingrad (Operation Uranus)

4.24.1. While the Luftwaffe bombardment of the city began in late August 1942, the Russian counteroffensive began on 19 November. The Russians assembled a large force for a frontal attack. The fronts deployed 66 infantry divisions, 17 infantry brigades, 15 tank brigades, 5 tank corps, 3 cavalry corps and a single mechanized corps. Axis forces in the zone of the offensive numbered more than 1,000,000, approximately 600,000 of whom (280,000 Romanians, 260,000 Germans, and the remaining 60,000 comprised of Hungarian and Italian troops) were ultimately trapped in the pocket around the city. (Clodfelter 2008, 485; Boog et al. 2001: 6, 1106-1108).
4.24.2. Onset: 19/11/1942; Termination: 2/2/1943
4.24.3. Russia versus Axis coalition

4.24.4. Russia – 1,143,500 soldiers
4.24.5. Russia – 485,777 casualties
4.24.6. Axis Coalition –1,010,000 soldiers
4.24.7. Axis Coalition – 599,000 casualties
4.24.8. Outcome – Russian victory. The German Sixth Army commander surrendered on 2 February.

4.25. Battle of Gona

4.25.1. In the fall of 1942 the Allies began a counterattack to retake Papua from the Japanese. The Battle of Gona was fought 11 November – 9 December 1942. The Allies were comprised of 1 U.S. division and 1 Australian division and faced 3,000 Japanese (Clodfelter 2008, 541).
4.25.2. Onset: 20/11/1942; Termination: 9/12/1942
4.25.3. Allied Coalition versus Japan
4.25.4. Allied Coalition – 33,000 soldiers
4.25.5. Allied Coalition – 3,498 casualties
4.25.6. Japan – 3,000 soldiers
4.25.7. Japan – 2,537 casualties
4.25.8. Outcome – Allied victory. Gona was recaptured.

4.26. Battle of Buna

4.26.1. Whereas the Battle of Gona was a fairly quick victory for the Allies, Buna held firm against the American attacks on the right wing of the offensive. Converging assaults by U.S. and Australian units finally led to the fall of Buna, and the Allied victory, on 22 January 1943, after an agonizing yard-by-yard struggle (Clodfelter 2008, 539).
4.26.2. Onset: 20/11/1942; Termination: 22/1/1943
4.26.3. Allied Coalition versus Japan
4.26.4. Allied Coalition – 33,000 soldiers
4.26.5. Allied Coalition – 2,817 casualties
4.26.6. Japan – 2,200 soldiers
4.26.7. Japan – 1,400 casualties
4.26.8. Outcome – Allied victory. Converging assaults by U.S. and Australian units finally led to the fall of Buna on 22 January 1943 after an agonizing yard-by-yard struggle (Clodfelter 2008, 539).

4.27. First Battle of Arakan (Clodfelter 2008, 533)

4.27.1. The first Allied offensive in Burma was a limited strike launched, toward the end of 1942, against Arakan Province, a coastal region isolated from the rest of Burma by jungled heights.
4.27.2. Onset: 17/12/1941; Termination: 12/5/1943
4.27.3. United Kingdom versus Japan
4.27.4. United Kingdom – 22,000 troops
4.27.5. United Kingdom – 5,057 casualties
4.27.6. Japan – 26,691 troops
4.27.7. Japan – 1,500 casualties

4.27.8. Outcome – Japanese victory. On 12 May, the British gave up and withdrew their 27 battalions (in 9 brigades) from Arakan.

4.28. Battle of Kasserine Pass (Clodfelter 2008, 476-7)

4.28.1. On 14-15 February, Rommel faced about and sent his 10th and 21st Panzer Divisions, with 160 tanks, against Fredendall's U.S. II Corps, anchoring the south end of the Allied line approaching from the west.
4.28.2. Onset: 14/2/1943; Termination: 22/2/1943
4.28.3. United States versus Axis Coalition
4.28.4. United States – 30,000 troops
4.28.5. United States – 5,175 casualties
4.28.6. Axis Coalition – 100,000 troops
4.28.7. Axis Coalition – 1,597 casualties
4.28.8. Outcome – German victory. The green American tank troops of the 1st Armored Division at Sidi Bou Zid, hampered by poor air support, were badly battered by the veteran Afrika Corps

4.29. Battle of Tunis

4.29.1. The Battle of Tunis was fought 3-13 May 1943. The Allies committed a total of 20 divisions with 300,000 men and 1,400 tanks against the Axis 12 divisions of about 60,000 men and tanks split more or less evenly between German and Italian forces (Clodfelter 2008, 466; Tucker 2005, 1531).
4.29.2. Onset: 3/5/1943; Termination: 13/5/1943
4.29.3. Allied Coalition versus Axis Coaltion
4.29.4. Allied Coalition – 338,282 soldiers
4.29.5. Allied Coalition – Unknown casualties
4.29.6. Germany – 60,000 soldiers
4.29.7. Germany – Unknown casualties
4.29.8. Outcome – Allied victory. The Axis lines quickly gave in and, on 7 May, Tunis was captured. captured. On that same day, the US II Corps took Bizerte, rounded up some 40,000 Axis POWs. The British Eighth Army, with attached French forces, to the south cornered the Italians and forced surrender on 13 May (Clodfelter 2008, 476).

4.30. Battle of Salerno

4.30.1. On 24 July 1943 Benito Mussolini was overthrown and Italy's new leader, Marshal Pietro Badoglio, signed an armistice with the Allies on 3 September 1943. During that time, the Germans and the Allies prepared for an Allied invasion (Clodfelter 2008, 498). That invasion began with the Battle of Salerno.
4.30.2. Onset: 9/9/1943; Termination: 16/9/1943
4.30.3. Allied Coalition versus Germany
4.30.4. Allied Coalition – 65,658 soldiers
4.30.5. Allied Coalition – 10,219 casualties
4.30.6. Germany – 74,112 soldiers

4.30.7. Germany – 3,472 casualties
4.30.8. Outcome – Allied victory. Allied divisions at Salerno checked the German counterattack by 15 September (Clodfelter 2008, 498).

4.31. Battle of Tarawa

4.31.1. The United States invaded Tarawa as part of its campaign to retake the Gilbert Islands from the Japanese.
4.31.2. Onset: 20/11/1943; Termination: 24/11/1943
4.31.3. United States versus Japan
4.31.4. United States – 18,600 troops
4.31.5. United States – 3,485 casualties
4.31.6. Japan – 4,836 troops
4.31.7. Japan – 4,836 casualties
4.31.8. Outcome – American victory.

4.32. Second Battle of Arakan (Clodfelter 2008, 533-534)

4.32.1. The Second Arakan Campaign kicked off in December 1943, with the 5th and 7th Indian Infantry Divisions of Slim's XV Corps advancing
4.32.2. Onset: 1/12/1943; Termination: 25/2/1944
4.32.3. United Kingdom versus Japan
4.32.4. United Kingdom – 73,388 troops
4.32.5. United Kingdom – 7,951 casualties
4.32.6. Japan – 53,382 troops
4.32.7. Japan – 5,335 casualties
4.32.8. Outcome – British victory. This was Britain's first victory in Burma.

4.33. Battle of New Britain (Clodfelter 2008, 540-1)

4.33.1. The New Britain Campaign began on 15 December 1943, when part of the 1st Cavalry Division, from General Walter Krueger's Sixth Army, was put ashore at Arawe on the island's southern side.
4.33.2. Onset: 26/12/1943; Termination: 31/3/1944
4.33.3. United States versus Japan
4.33.4. United States – 27,852 troops
4.33.5. United States – 1,895 casualties
4.33.6. Japan – 26,691 troops
4.33.7. Japan – 4,929 casualties
4.33.8. Outcome – American victory. By the end of March 1944, U.S. losses on New Britain totaled 493 KIA, 1 ,402 WIA. Japanese combat casualties were 4,600 KIA, 329 POWs. Blamey's Aussies then relieved the Americans to take over the job of isolating and containing Rabaul.

4.34. Battle of Anzio

4.34.1. In December 1943 the Allies began a plan, Operation Shingle, to retake Rome. The Battle of Anzio was fought 22 January – 23 May 1944. Going ashore for Operation Shingle were the U.S. VI Corps – 3 Divisions of

the 509th Airborne RCT, and Ranger and Commando units. Some 36,000 men and 3,200 vehicles were landed on D-Day soon to be reinforced to 50,000 men and 5,200 vehicles, supported by 432 guns. German General Hans Georg Mackensen was given command of a newly created Fourteenth Army of 8 divisions – 3 infantry, 2 armored, 2 mechanized, and 1 airborne. Its ration strength on March 14, 1944 was 134,698, of whom 65,800 were combat troops. A month later, combat strength would be raised to 70,400 (Clodfelter 2008, 499).

4.34.2. Onset: 22/1/1944; Termination: 23/5/1944
4.34.3. Allied Coalition versus Germany
4.34.4. Allied Coalition – 110,000 soldiers
4.34.5. Allied Coalition – 29,400 casualties
4.34.6. Germany – 70,400 soldiers
4.34.7. Germany – 27,500 casualties
4.34.8. Outcome – Allied victory. The battle was ultimately an Allied victory, though after the German counterattacks of February had been contained by the narrowest of margins, the troops at Anzio were subjected to a numbing three-month siege, during which no part of the beachhead was safe from German artillery; losses were high (Clodfelter 2008, 500).

4.35. Battle of Cassino

4.35.1. While the allies were corralled at Anzio, they were equally slowed at the grinding, attritional fight for Monte Cassino (Clodfelter 2008, 500). Preliminary operations to liberate the right bank of the Dnieper began 24 December 1943.
4.35.2. Onset: 17/1/1944; Termination: 18/5/1944
4.35.3. Allied Coalition versus Germany
4.35.4. Allied Coalition – 122,641 soldiers
4.35.5. Allied Coalition – 12,000 casualties
4.35.6. Germany –12,352 soldiers
4.35.7. Germany – Unknown casualties
4.35.8. Outcome – Allied victory. Cassino fell on 18 May 1944 (Clodfelter 2008, 500).

4.36. Battle of Korsun (Clodfelter 2008, 489, 497)

4.36.1. While Leningrad was at last being delivered from its 900-day darkness, the Red Army was preparing for an even bigger offensive to liberate the Ukraine. The main attack fell on 29 January 1944, with Vatutin's First Ukrainian Front, Konev's Second Ukrainian Front, and Rotmistrov's Fifth Guards Tank Army driving from north and south to encircle 2 German corps, with 56,000 troops in the equivalent of 6 divisions, at Korsun.
4.36.2. Onset: 29/1/1944; Termination: 17/2/1944
4.36.3. Russia versus Germany
4.36.4. Russia – 464,000 troops
4.36.5. Russia – 80,188 casualties

4.36.6. Germany – 56,000 troops
4.36.7. Germany – 53,800 casualties
4.36.8. Outcome – Soviet victory. General Warner Stemmermann was ordered to attempt a breakout on February 17. The general was killed in the effort, but, according to German claims, 35,000 of the trapped troops escaped and 18,800 were lost.

4.37. Battle of Kwajalein (Clodfelter 2008, 542)
4.37.1. The United States assaulted Kwajalein as part of its attack on the Marshall Islands in early 1944, taking the island and decimating the defending force, which refused to surrender (Clodfelter 2008, 500).
4.37.2. Onset: 1/2/1944; Termination: 7/2/1944
4.37.3. United States versus Japan
4.37.4. United States – 41,446 soldiers
4.37.5. United States – 1,954 casualties
4.37.6. Japan – 8,675 soldiers
4.37.7. Japan – At least 7,870 casualties
4.37.8. Outcome – American victory

4.38. Battle of the Admiralty Islands (Clodfelter 2008, 540-1)
4.38.1. The 1st Cavalry Division was deposited ashore on Los Negros Island, in the Admiralty Islands chain north of New Guinea
4.38.2. Onset: 29/2/1944; Termination: 23/3/1944
4.38.3. United States versus Japan
4.38.4. United States – 13,926 soldiers
4.38.5. United States – 1,519 casualties
4.38.6. Japan – 4,500 soldiers
4.38.7. Japan – 3,369 casualties
4.38.8. Outcome – American victory. The island group was secured by 23 March.

4.39. Second Chindit Raid (Clodfelter 2008, 534)
4.39.1. The first Chindit raid opened 18 February 1943, when 3,000 commandos organized into the 77th Brigade crossed the Chindwin and split into small columns to cut enemy railroad transport.
4.39.2. Onset: 5/3/1944; Termination: 27/8/1944
4.39.3. United Kingdom versus Japan
4.39.4. United Kingdom – 12,000 troops
4.39.5. United Kingdom – 3,768 casualties
4.39.6. Japan – 26,691 troops
4.39.7. Japan – 5,311 casualties
4.39.8. Outcome – Minor British victory. The raid achieved only minimal success, and the raiders were withdrawn

4.40. Battle of Imphal-Kohima (Clodfelter 2008, 534-535)

4.40.1. The Japanese 31st Division marched on Kohima and the 15th and 33rd Divisions made for Imphal, both in Assam Province.
4.40.2. Onset: 6/3/1944; Termination: 30/6/1944
4.40.3. United Kingdom versus Japan
4.40.4. United Kingdom – 155,000 troops
4.40.5. United Kingdom – 16,700 casualties
4.40.6. Japan – 115,000 troops
4.40.7. Japan – 60,000 casualties
4.40.8. Outcome – British victory. Relief was affected on 22 June, after a siege of 88 days. The retreating Japanese were pursued relentlessly from July to September, through the monsoon season, and back across the Chindwin.

4.41. Battle of Crimea

4.41.1. The Battle of Crimea was fought 8 April – 12 May 1944; it was a Russian offensive to retake Crimea. The Russians fielded 462,400 troops and the Axis 267,484 (Clodfelter 2008, 496).
4.41.2. Onset: 8/5/1944; Termination: 12/5/1944
4.41.3. Russia versus Axis Coalition
4.41.4. Russia – 462,400 soldiers
4.41.5. Russia – 84,819 casualties
4.41.6. Axis Coalition –267,484 soldiers
4.41.7. Axis Coalition – 93,500 casualties
4.41.8. Outcome – Russian victory. A grand assault in early May by the Russians forced the Seventeenth Army out of Sevastopol for a Russian victory (Clodfelter 2008, 490).

4.42. Battle of Hollandia (Clodfelter 2008, 540-1)

4.42.1. On 22 April, with support from the naval gunfire of the Seventh Fleet and the Seventh Amphibious Force, the 52,000 men of Task Force Reckless, which included the 24th and 41st Infantry Divisions, were landed on two beaches 25 miles apart on either side of Hollandia.
4.42.2. Onset: 22/4/1944; Termination: 27/4/1944
4.42.3. United States versus Japan
4.42.4. United States – 27,852 soldiers
4.42.5. United States – 1,226 casualties
4.42.6. Japan – 11,000 soldiers
4.42.7. Japan – 5,130 casualties
4.42.8. Outcome – American victory. The Japanese airfields inland from Hollandia were captured by 27 April.

4.43. Battle of Myitkyina

4.43.1. The Battle of Myitkyina was fought 28 April – 3 August 1944. A provisional American regiment – the 5307th – called Merrill's Marauders about 1400 strong and accompanied by 2 Chinese regiments advanced on

Myitkyina on the Irrawaddy River 28 April – 17 May. The airfield there was captured 17-18 May, but the city held out (Clodfelter 2008, 535).

4.43.2. Onset: 28/4/1944; Termination: 3/8/1944
4.43.3. Allied Coalition versus Japan
4.43.4. Allied Coalition – 30,000 soldiers
4.43.5. Allied Coalition – 5,376 casualties
4.43.6. Japan –3,000 soldiers
4.43.7. Japan – 1,889 casualties
4.43.8. Outcome – Allied victory. On 3 August, the last 700 uninjured Japanese pulled out of Myitkyina leaving behind 790 of their slain comrades and 1,180 wounded (Clodfelter 2008, 534).

4.44. Breakout Campaign (Operation Diadem)

4.44.1. After two months of intense air campaign against Nazi supply and communication lines, the Allies opened a major offensive on 11 May 1944. The objective was to end the Gustav line stalemate and force a breakthrough (Clodfelter 2008, 500).
4.44.2. Onset: 11/5/1944; Termination: 4/6/1944
4.44.3. Allied Coalition versus Germany
4.44.4. Allied Coalition – 615,647 soldiers
4.44.5. Allied Coalition – 40,425 casualties
4.44.6. Germany –365,616 soldiers
4.44.7. Germany – 38,204 casualties
4.44.8. Outcome – Allied victory

4.45. Battle of Wakde-Sarmi (Clodfelter 2008, 540-1)

4.45.1. The American assault on the Japanese-held Wakde island group was part of the US drive toward the home islands. Following the capture of the island, fighting on the mainland continued until September as Allied troops advanced west towards Sarmi.
4.45.2. Onset: 17/5/1944; Termination: 30/6/1944
4.45.3. United States versus Japan
4.45.4. United States – 14,104 soldiers
4.45.5. United States – 2,413 casualties
4.45.6. Japan – 11,000 soldiers
4.45.7. Japan – 4,515 casualties
4.45.8. Outcome – American victory. Wakde was secured, with 734 of the 1,000 Japanese-man garrison killed.

4.46. Battle of Biak Island (Clodfelter 2008, 540-1)

4.46.1. Biak was the next target in this approach campaign to the Philippines.
4.46.2. Onset: 27/5/1944; Termination: 29/6/1944
4.46.3. United States versus Japan
4.46.4. United States – 13,926 soldiers
4.46.5. United States – 2,799 casualties
4.46.6. Japan – 11,100 soldiers

4.46.7. Japan – 6,585 casualties
4.46.8. Outcome – American victory. The 11,100 Japanese on Biak lost 6,125 KIA, 460 captured, and possession of the island.

4.47. D-Day

4.47.1. D-Day, an Allied victory, was fought 6 June 1944. Aboard the troopships were 153,000 troops including 58,000 in the U.S. First Army and 75,000 in the U.K. Second Army (Clodfelter 2008, 504).
4.47.2. Onset: 6/6/1944; Termination: 6/6/1944
4.47.3. Allied Coalition versus Germany
4.47.4. Allied Coalition – 154,000 soldiers
4.47.5. Allied Coalition – 10,274 casualties
4.47.6. Germany –70,000 soldiers
4.47.7. Germany – 6,500 casualties
4.47.8. Outcome – Allied victory

4.48. Battle of Caen (Clodfelter 2008, 504-5, 512)

4.48.1. The stiffest battle during the campaign to break out of Normandy took place in the Caen area. There, between 10 June and 1 July, Montgomery sent the VIII and XXI Corps—1 airborne, 2 infantry, and 3 armored divisions, plus 6 additional armored brigades, with a total tank strength of 1,350—in two unsuccessful attacks, Operations Epsom and Jupiter, on a 37-mile front against Panzer Group West.
4.48.2. Onset: 13/6/1944; Termination: 19/7/1944
4.48.3. United Kingdom versus Germany
4.48.4. United Kingdom – 96,550 soldiers
4.48.5. United Kingdom – 30,000 casualties
4.48.6. Germany – 123,520 soldiers
4.48.7. Germany – N/A
4.48.8. Outcome – British victory. After another air carpet of 8,000 tons of high explosives was laid by 2,100 planes, the attack, called Operation Goodwood, was renewed on July 18 and all of Caen secured by 19 July.

4.49. Battle of Saipan (Clodfelter 2008, 542)

4.49.1. The United States attacked Saipan, the second largest island in the Marianas in mid-1944 and, as in other island assaults, eliminated Japanese resistance after a bloody fight.
4.49.2. Onset: 15/6/1944; Termination: 11/7/1944
4.49.3. United States versus Japan
4.49.4. United States – 71,034 soldiers
4.49.5. United States – 16,912 casualties
4.49.6. Japan – 29,662 men of the Thirty-First Army and 6,160 of Nagumo's sailors for a total of 35,882 soldiers
4.49.7. Japan – All Japanese were killed (by American forces or suicide) or captured; 35,882 casualties
4.49.8. Outcome – American victory

4.50. Battle of Cherbourg (Clodfelter 2008, 505, 512)

4.50.1. While the British were being held up before Caen, the U.S. forces to the west, opposed by only 7 German divisions on a 55-mile front, made greater gains. Major General T. Lawton Collins's VII Corps, consisting of 6 divisions plus 2 armored brigades and 2 armored cavalry squadrons, fought its way across the Cotentin Peninsula, then turned north on 18 June toward Cherbourg.

4.50.2. Onset: 22/6/1944; Termination: 27/6/1944

4.50.3. United States versus Germany

4.50.4. United States – 42,759 troops

4.50.5. United States – 22,101 casualties

4.50.6. Axis Coalition – 49,408 troops

4.50.7. Axis Coalition – 25,000 casualties

4.50.8. Outcome – American victory. After a fierce struggle, 22-27 June, the port was secured.

4.51. Battle of Belorussia (Clodfelter 2008, 491-2, 497)

4.51.1. With the Ukraine reconquered and Finland knocked out of the war, the Red Army now focused its armed attention on the liberation of Belorussia. The campaign, called Operation Bagration, opened on 22 June (three years from the day Hitler had launched Operation Barbarossa).

4.51.2. Onset: 22/6/1944; Termination: 29/8/1944

4.51.3. Russia versus Germany

4.51.4. Russia – 2,331,700 soldiers

4.51.5. Russia – 765,815 casualties

4.51.6. Germany – 888,000 soldiers

4.51.7. Axis Coalition – 350,000 casualties

4.51.8. Outcome – Russian victory. By 10 July, the Battle of Belorussia had resulted in the destruction of 28 out of 38 German divisions engaged.

4.52. Battle of Noemfoor Island (Clodfelter 2008, 541)

4.52.1. Noemfoor (Numfoor) Island, west of Biak, was taken by amphibious assault.

4.52.2. Onset: 2/7/1944; Termination: 7/7/1944

4.52.3. United States versus Japan

4.52.4. United States – 7,100 soldiers

4.52.5. United States – 409 casualties

4.52.6. Japan – 2,000 soldiers

4.52.7. Japan – 1,886 casualties

4.52.8. Outcome – American victory. Noemfoor Island was taken.

4.53. Battle of Saint-Lô (Clodfelter 2008, 504-5, 512)

4.53.1. By 1 July 1944, the Allies had 27 combat divisions ashore, comprising 1 million troops, 500,000 tons of supplies and equipment, and 177,000

vehicles. However, they had occupied only 20 percent of the terrain initially projected to be liberated by that date.

4.53.2. Onset:3/7/1944; Termination: 18/8/1944
4.53.3. United States versus Germany
4.53.4. United States – 71,265 troops
4.53.5. United States – 11,000 casualties
4.53.6. Germany – 37,056 troops
4.53.7. Germany – 12,012 casualties
4.53.8. Outcome – American victory. It took from 3-18 July, but Bradley's First Army finally captured St.-Lo in what was called the Battle of the Hedgerows

4.54. Battle of Driniumor River (Clodfelter 2008, 540-1)

4.54.1. Back on New Guinea, Adachi, with 3 divisions, launched a counterattack from Wewak against the Allied base at Aitape. The fighting flared along the Driniumor River
4.54.2. Onset: 10/7/1944; Termination: 10/8/1944
4.54.3. United States versus Japan
4.54.4. United States – 16,280 soldiers
4.54.5. United States – 2,373 casualties
4.54.6. Japan – 20,000 soldiers
4.54.7. Japan – 8,919 casualties
4.54.8. Outcome – American victory.

4.55. Battle of Guam (Clodfelter 2008, 543)

4.55.1. The United States attacked Guam, the largest island in the Marianas in mid-1944 and, as in other island assaults, eliminated Japanese resistance after a bloody fight.
4.55.2. Onset: 21/7/1944; Termination: 10/8/1944
4.55.3. United States versus Japan
4.55.4. United States – 54,891 soldiers
4.55.5. United States – 7,083 casualties
4.55.6. Japan –18,500 soldiers
4.55.7. Japan – At least 11,000 casualties
4.55.8. Outcome – American victory

4.56. Battle of Tinian (Clodfelter 2008, 543)

4.56.1. The United States attacked Tinian in its last major effort to secure the Marianas Islands in mid-1944 and, as in other island assaults, eliminated Japanese resistance after a bloody fight.
4.56.2. Onset: 25/7/1944; Termination: 2/8/1944
4.56.3. United States versus Japan
4.56.4. United States – 16,000 soldiers
4.56.5. United States – 2,205 casualties
4.56.6. Japan –9,162 soldiers
4.56.7. Japan – At least 9,000 casualties

4.56.8. Outcome – American victory

4.57. Battle of Falaise-Argentan

4.57.1. The Allies, beginning 13 August, attempted a pincer movement in an effort to trap General Eberbach's Panzer Group West and the Seventh Army. While Patton wheeled his Third Army's XV Corps to the north at Argentan to strike at the left rear of the enemy Panzer group, the newly formed First Canadian Army struck south against Falaise (Clodfelter 2008, 506; See also McManus 2004, 417).
4.57.2. Onset: 10/8/1944; Termination: 19/8/1944
4.57.3. Allied Coalition versus Germany
4.57.4. Allied Coalition – 718,800 soldiers
4.57.5. Allied Coalition – 34,500 casualties
4.57.6. Germany –190,000 soldiers
4.57.7. Germany – 60,000 casualties
4.57.8. Outcome – Allied victory. However, Bradley's reining in of Patton's armored columns permitted most of the Fifth Panzer and Seventh Armies to escape before the pincers closed. 50,000 Germans were taken in the Falaise-Argentan pocket, and 10,000 killed (Clodfelter 2008, 506).

4.58. Battle of Romania

4.58.1. The Russians invaded Romania on 20 August along a 250-mile front.
4.58.2. Onset: 8/5/1944; Termination: 12/5/1944
4.58.3. Russia versus Axis Coalition
4.58.4. Russia – 886,491 soldiers
4.58.5. Russia – 61,730 casualties
4.58.6. Axis Coalition – 810,000 soldiers
4.58.7. Axis Coalition – 300,000 casualties
4.58.8. Outcome – Soviet victory. Axis defeat came quickly with Romanian dictator Ion Antonescu arrested on 23 August and the Russians occupied Bucharest on 1 September (Clodfelter 2008, 492).

4.59. Battle of Gothic Line

4.59.1. After the fall of Rome, the Allies pushed forward to the Arno River.
4.59.2. Onset: 26/8/1944; Termination: 26/10/1944
4.59.3. Allied Coalition versus Germany
4.59.4. Allied Coalition – 407,574 soldiers
4.59.5. Allied Coalition – 29,000 casualties
4.59.6. Germany – 321,152 soldiers
4.59.7. Germany – Unknown casualties.
4.59.8. Outcome – Draw. While the Germans were pushed back to the Gothic line, the Allies were unable to achieve the desired breakthrough.

4.60. Battle of Huertgen Forest (Clodfelter 2008, 508, 512)

4.60.1. The fiercest fighting of the campaign took place in the 50 square miles of the Hürtgen Forest, beginning 14 September, and in the nearby town of Schmidt, north of the Roer River dams.
4.60.2. Onset:14/9/1944; Termination: 1/12/1945
4.60.3. United States versus Germany
4.60.4. United States – 71,265 troops
4.60.5. United States – 23,000 casualties
4.60.6. Germany – Unknown number of soldiers involved
4.60.7. Germany – 30,000 casualties
4.60.8. Outcome – American victory. By 1 December, the First Army had pushed its way through the Hürtgen Forest to reach the Roer River.

4.61. Battle of Peleliu (Clodfelter 2008, 543)
4.61.1. The United States attacked Peleliu as its major effort during the fight to eject the Japanese from the Palau islands in the latter portion of 1944; capture of the islands was necessary to protect MacArthur's eastern flank as he prepared to return to the Philippines. As in other island assaults, the United States eliminated Japanese resistance after a bloody fight.
4.61.2. Onset: 15/9/1944; Termination: 24/11/1944
4.61.3. United States versus Japan
4.61.4. United States – Approximately 47,000 soldiers after the 1st Marine Division was reinforced by the 81st Division
4.61.5. United States – 7,099 casualties
4.61.6. Japan –10,200 soldiers
4.61.7. Japan – At least 10,200 casualties
4.61.8. Outcome – American victory

4.62. Battle of Arnhem (Operation Market Garden)
4.62.1. Operation Market Garden was an Allied offensive to turn the north flank of the Siegfried Line. It was fought 17-26 September 1944. The Allies committed 3 airborne, 1 armored, 2 infantry divisions, and 1 airborne brigade (Clodfelter 2008, 512; MacDonald 1993, 128, 139).
4.62.2. Onset: 17/9/1944; Termination: 26/9/1944
4.62.3. Allied Coalition versus Germany
4.62.4. Allied Coalition – 86,658 soldiers
4.62.5. Allied Coalition – 16,038 casualties
4.62.6. Germany – 61,760 soldiers
4.62.7. Germany – 10,000 casualties
4.62.8. Outcome – German victory. The effort was a failure, and the battle was a loss for the Allies.

4.63. Battle of Aachen (Clodfelter 2008, 508, 512)
4.63.1. The VII and XIX corps of Hodges's First Army pierced the Siegfried Line north of Aachen, 2-10 October.
4.63.2. Onset: 2/10/1944; Termination:21/10/1944
4.63.3. United States versus Germany

4.63.4. United States – 14,253 troops
4.63.5. United States – 3,100 casualties
4.63.6. Germany – 5,000 troops
4.63.7. Germany – 3,473 casualties
4.63.8. Outcome – American victory. US captured Aachen from its 5,000 defenders in house-to-house fighting, 10-21 October.

4.64. Battle of Leyte (Clodfelter 2008, 543-5)
4.64.1. The United States began its reconquest of the Philippines on 20 October 1944, with an amphibious landing on the southern Visayan island of Leyte.
4.64.2. Onset: 20/10/1944; Termination: 24/12/1944
4.64.3. United States versus Japan
4.64.4. United States – 148,028 troops
4.64.5. United States – 15,504 casualties
4.64.6. Japan – 61,800 soldiers
4.64.7. Japan – 48,790 casualties
4.64.8. Outcome – American victory. On Christmas Eve day, 1944, the Japanese capitulated, although holdout bands continued resistance up to the following spring.

4.65. Battle of Budapest (Clodfelter 2008, 492 and 497)
4.65.1. The Battle of Budapest, part of a Soviet Offensive, was fought 29 October 1944 – 13 February 1945.
4.65.2. Onset: 8/5/1944; Termination: 12/5/1944
4.65.3. Russia versus Axis Coalition
4.65.4. Russia – 719,500 soldiers
4.65.5. Russia – 320,082 casualties
4.65.6. Axis Coalition – 188,000 soldiers
4.65.7. Axis Coalition – 158,000 casualties
4.65.8. Outcome – Russian victory

4.66. Lorraine Campaign (Clodfelter 2008, 508, 512)
4.66.1. Part of the U.S. Third Army worked to capture the Metz area during the Siegfried line campaign.
4.66.2. Onset: 8/11/1944; Termination: 22/12/1944
4.66.3. United States versus Germany
4.66.4. United States – 250,000 troops
4.66.5. United States – 53,812 casualties
4.66.6. Germany – 87,000 troops
4.66.7. Germany – 75,000 casualties
4.66.8. Outcome – American victory. Metz was captured on 8 December by the 95th Infantry Division.

4.67. Third Battle for Arakan (Clodfelter 2008, 535)

4.67.1. British XV Corps launched the third campaign to retake Arakan, striking in force and capturing the major city of Akyab after a month of fighting.
4.67.2. Onset: 6/12/1944; Termination: 4/1/1945
4.67.3. United Kingdom versus Japan
4.67.4. United Kingdom – 130,000 soldiers (including one Commonwealth brigade and one East African brigade)
4.67.5. United Kingdom – 1,150 killed and 3,500 wounded, for 4,650 total casualties
4.67.6. Japan – 28th Army, totaling approximately 21,000 soldiers
4.67.7. Japan – Unknown casualties
4.67.8. Outcome – United Kingdom victory

4.68. Battle of Ardennes (Battle of the Bulge)
4.68.1. The Battle of Ardennes was a German offensive was fought 16 December 1944 – 16 January 1945. The German objective was to push through Belgium and reach Antwerp to seize Allied fuel dumps and then cut off those Allied units and destroy them (Clodfelter 2008, 509).
4.68.2. Onset: 16/12/1944; Termination: 16/1/1945
4.68.3. Allied Coalition versus Germany
4.68.4. Allied Coalition – 442,757 soldiers
4.68.5. Allied Coalition – 82,449 casualties
4.68.6. Germany – 200,000 soldiers
4.68.7. Germany – 103,900 casualties
4.68.8. Outcome – Allied victory. The Allies squeezed the bulge to extinction by 16 January (Clodfelter 2008, 509).

4.69. Battle of Alsace-Lorraine (Clodfelter 2008, 508)
4.69.1. The German attacks, code named Operation Nordwind, were the last major Wehrmacht offensive of the war. The First Army attacked in two directions, but only achieved minor gains before stalling.
4.69.2. Onset: 31/12/1944; Termination: 21/1/1945
4.69.3. United States versus Germany
4.69.4. United States – 213,795 troops
4.69.5. United States – 14,445 casualties
4.69.6. Germany – 98,816 troops
4.69.7. Germany – 23,000 casualties
4.69.8. Outcome – Minor German victory. The US Seventh Army of 15 divisions was pushed back to the Moder River, but the German offensive ran out of steam by 21 January.

4.70. Battle of Luzon (Clodfelter 2008, 544-5)
4.70.1. Defending Luzon in January 1945 were 250,000 Japanese under General Yamashita's command. They were deployed thus: the Shobu Group of 140,000 in the north; the Kembu Group of 30,000 in the center; and the Shimbu Group of 80,000 in the south.

4.70.2. Onset: 9/1/1945; Termination: 15/8/1945
4.70.3. United States versus Japan
4.70.4. United States – 155,540 troops
4.70.5. United States – 37,870 casualties
4.70.6. Japan- 250,000 soldiers
4.70.7. Japan – 201,700 casualties
4.70.8. Outcome – American victory. By 12 July, the Japanese were split into and surrounded in three pockets. But when the fighting in the Pacific ended on 15 August, there were still 50,000 Japanese soldiers resisting on Luzon against 4 U.S. divisions.

4.71. Battle of Poland-East Prussia (Clodfelter 2008, 493-4, 497)

4.71.1. The Polish front, some 300 miles in length, broke free from its long stalemate on 12 January 1945, as Konev's First Ukrainian Front punched out of its Baranon bridgehead (the one across the Vistula).
4.71.2. Onset: 12/1/1945; Termination: 25/4/1945
4.71.3. Russia versus Germany
4.71.4. Russia – 3,872,700 troops
4.71.5. Russia – 18,000 casualties
4.71.6. Germany – 876,992 troops
4.71.7. Germany – 22,000 casualties
4.71.8. Outcome – Soviet victory. Konev's First Ukrainian Front had made it all the way to the Oder-Neisse River line by the middle of February.

4.72. Battle of Colmar Pocket

4.72.1. The Battle of Colmar pocket was fought 20 January – 8 February 1945. The French First Army reinforced by an American armored division and 3 U.S infantry divisions of the XXI Corps, pinched Wiese's Nineteenth Army out of the Colmar Pocket (Clodfelter 2008, 510).
4.72.2. Onset: 20/1/1945; Termination: 9/2/1945
4.72.3. Allied Coalition versus Germany
4.72.4. Allied Coalition – 194,230 soldiers
4.72.5. Allied Coalition – 18,440 casualties
4.72.6. Germany – 50,000 soldiers
4.72.7. Germany – 22,000 casualties
4.72.8. Outcome – Allied victory

4.73. Battle of Manila (Clodfelter 2008, 544-5)

4.73.1. Rear Admiral Mitsuji Iwabuchi commanded 20,000 Japanese army and navy troops, who resisted the Americans with a tenacious determination.
4.73.2. Onset: 3/2/1945; Termination: 4/3/1945
4.73.3. United States versus Japan
4.73.4. United States – 41,778 troops
4.73.5. United States – 6,575 casualties
4.73.6. Japan- 18,000 soldiers

4.73.7. Japan – 16,665 casualties
4.73.8. Outcome – American victory. It took a month, 3 February – 4 March, to drive the Japanese out of Manila.

4.74. Battle of Rhineland

4.74.1. The Allies, from north to south, were comprised of Montgomery's 21st Army Group of 26 divisions [UK] in the north with Crerar's eight divisions in the First Canadian Army striking along the north axis in Operation Veritable, six divisions of Simpson's US Ninth Army forming the southern pincer in Operation Grenade, US First and Third armies pushing west on either side of the Mossel River, and US 6th Army Group at the southern tip of the line (Clodfelter 2008, 510; Tucker 2005, 1279; Stacey 1960, 490).
4.74.2. Onset: 8/2/1945; Termination: 24/3/1945
4.74.3. Allied Coalition versus Germany
4.74.4. Allied Coalition – 719,876 soldiers
4.74.5. Allied Coalition – 55,392 casualties
4.74.6. Germany – 321,152 soldiers
4.74.7. Germany – 310,000 casualties
4.74.8. Outcome – Allied victory.

4.75. Battle of Breslau (Clodfelter 2008, 494, 497)

4.75.1. German Silesia was invaded in February. All but 700,000 of the noncombatant population of 4.8 million fled before the raping, torching, looting columns of Konev's First Ukrainian Front.
4.75.2. Onset: 14/2/1945; Termination: 6/5/1945
4.75.3. Russia versus Germany
4.75.4. Russia – 101,500 troops
4.75.5. Russia - Unknown casualties
4.75.6. Germany – 500,000 troops
4.75.7. Germany – 29,000 casualties
4.75.8. Outcome – Russian victory. Breslau resisted seven Red divisions for three months before surrendering on 6 May.

4.76. Battle of Meiktila (Clodfelter 2008, 535-6)

4.76.1. While that fight was in progress, elements of three Japanese divisions were sent by General Tanaka to counterattack the 17th Indian Division at Meiktila, 15-21 March.
4.76.2. Onset: 18/2/1945; Termination: 21/3/1945
4.76.3. United Kingdom versus Japan
4.76.4. United Kingdom – 36,694 troops
4.76.5. United Kingdom – 8,099 casualties
4.76.6. Japan – 80,073 soldiers
4.76.7. Japan – 12,912 casualties
4.76.8. Outcome – British victory. The battle was a close-run affair, but the rest of the IV Corps managed to break through to relieve the 17th Indian Division and compel the Japanese to retreat.

4.77. Battle of Iwo Jima (Clodfelter 2008, 545-546)

4.77.1. The United States attacked Iwo Jima as it proceeded north toward the Japanese home islands. The battle was vicious—it was the deadliest battle in history for the US Marine Corps—but was ultimately won by the United States.
4.77.2. Onset: 19/2/1945; Termination: 26/3/1945
4.77.3. United States versus Japan
4.77.4. United States – 220,000 fought
4.77.5. United States – 24,733 casualties
4.77.6. Japan – 21,000 soldiers
4.77.7. Japan – 20,703 casualties
4.77.8. Outcome – American victory

4.78. Battle of Second Corregidor (Clodfelter 2008, 544-5)

4.78.1. While the Battle of Manila raged, an airborne-amphibious assault was made on Corregidor on February 16, 1945.
4.78.2. Onset: 16/2/1945; Termination: 27/2/1945
4.78.3. United States versus Japan
4.78.4. United States – 4,001 troops
4.78.5. United States – 995 casualties
4.78.6. Japan – 4,500 soldiers
4.78.7. Japan – 4,436 casualties
4.78.8. Outcome – American victory. The 2,000-man 503rd Airborne RCT and a 1,000-man battalion from the 34th RCT secured the island by 27 February, after the Japanese themselves blew up Malinta Hill tunnel, burying alive 500 Japanese soldiers.

4.79. Battle of Remagen (Clodfelter 2008, 510, 512)

4.79.1. On 7 March, two battalions of the 9th Armored Division found the Lüdendorff Railroad Bridge over the Rhine at Remagen still intact. The American armored troops rushed and seized the bridge before German sappers could blow it.
4.79.2. Onset: 9/3/1945; Termination: 24/3/1945
4.79.3. United States versus Germany
4.79.4. United States – 78,886 troops
4.79.5. United States – 7,400 casualties
4.79.6. Germany – 24,704 troops
4.79.7. Germany – 11,700 casualties
4.79.8. Outcome – American victory. By 21 March, the bridgehead was 20 miles long and 8 miles deep and was supplied by six pontoon bridges to replace the original Lüdendorff Bridge.

4.80. Battle of Mandalay (Clodfelter 2008, 535-6)

4.80.1. In central Burma, the decisive battle was shaping up. During February 1945, XXXIII Corps crossed the Irrawaddy to draw Kimura's attention toward Mandalay.
4.80.2. Onset: 9/3/1945; Termination: 21/3/1945
4.80.3. United Kingdom versus Japan
4.80.4. United Kingdom – 18,347 troops
4.80.5. United Kingdom – 10,096 casualties
4.80.6. Japan – Unknown number of soldiers engaged
4.80.7. Japan – Unknown casualties
4.80.8. Outcome – British victory. Covered by the XXXIII Corps, the 19th Infantry Division of the IV Corps took Mandalay in house-to-house fighting

4.81. Battle of the Ruhr Pocket (Clodfelter 2008, 511, 513)
4.81.1. Allied pincers, the Ninth Army on the north, the First Army on the south, and the newly formed U.S. Fifteenth Army, Lieutenant General Leonard Gerow commanding, in the center, trapped Model inside a 4,000-square-mile pocket
4.81.2. Onset: Termination:
4.81.3. United States versus Germany
4.81.4. United States – 256,554 troops
4.81.5. United States – 5,320 casualties
4.81.6. Germany – 18 divisions for 222,336 troops
4.81.7. Germany – 317,000 casualties (Casualties exceed troop deployment due to the capitulation of forces that did not fight in the battle.)
4.81.8. Outcome – American victory. Two American armies applied the pressure that ultimately forced a German capitulation of 30 generals and 317,000 armed men (including some that did not fight in the battle) on 18 April. Model followed his surrender with his suicide.

4.82. Battle of Okinawa (Clodfelter 2008, 547)
4.82.1. The United States attacked Okinawa as it proceeded north toward the Japanese home islands. The battle was the largest and costliest of the Pacific War for both the United States and the Japanese; vast numbers of Okinawan civilians were also killed as a result of the Japanese defensive strategy, which relied on retreating to positions among the population.
4.82.2. Onset: 1/4/1945; Termination: 22/6/1945
4.82.3. United States versus Japan
4.82.4. United States – 182,821 soldiers and Marines in Tenth Army
4.82.5. United States – 65,631 casualties incurred during ground operations (additional losses in the battle at sea)
4.82.6. Japan – 101,199 soldiers
4.82.7. Japan – 101,199 casualties; the entire Okinawa garrison was wiped out or captured.
4.82.8. Outcome – American victory

4.83. Battle of Po Valley

4.83.1. To break the stalemate at the Gothic Line, the British Eighth Army punched into the German lines on the front's eastern flank.
4.83.2. Onset: 9/4/1945; Termination: 2/5/1945
4.83.3. Allied Coalition versus Germany
4.83.4. Allied Coalition – 251,280 soldiers
4.83.5. Allied Coalition – 16,747 casualties
4.83.6. Germany – 222,336 soldiers
4.83.7. Germany – 67,000 casualties
4.83.8. Outcome – Allied victory. The German defenses, further harried by 50,000 Italians partisans, collapsed. In an Allied victory, Vietinghoff surrendered his remaining forces (Clodfelter 2008, 502).

4.84. Battle of Berlin (Clodfelter 2008, 495-7)

4.84.1. Berlin was reached by the Soviets on 22 April. In three days, the city was surrounded. Capture of the capital took several more days.
4.84.2. Onset: 16/4/1945; Termination: 2/5/1945
4.84.3. Russia versus Germany
4.84.4. Russia – 1,500,000 troops
4.84.5. Russia – 361,367 casualties
4.84.6. Germany – 1,000,000 troops
4.84.7. Germany – 937,378 casualties
4.84.8. Outcome – Russian victory. The shattered capital surrendered on May 2.

4.85. Battle of Mindanao (Clodfelter 2008, 544-5)

4.85.1. The most important battle took place on Mindanao, where, between 17 April and 15 August, the 24th and 31st Infantry Divisions and 2 RCTs (assisted by 40,000 Filipinos organized into 5 divisions) split the Japanese garrison.
4.85.2. Onset: 17/4/1945; Termination: 5/8/1945
4.85.3. United Kingdom versus Japan
4.85.4. United Kingdom – 253,022 troops
4.85.5. United Kingdom – 3,700 casualties
4.85.6. Japan – 55,850 soldiers
4.85.7. Japan – 13,465 casualties
4.85.8. Outcome – British victory. The 41st Division captured the Zamboanga Peninsula in March.

4.86. Battle of Sittang River (Clodfelter 2008, 535-6)

4.86.1. The Japanese Twenty-Eighth Army attempted a breakout over the Sittang River.
4.86.2. Onset: 3/7/1945; Termination: 4/8/1945
4.86.3. United Kingdom versus Japan
4.86.4. United Kingdom – Unknown number of troops engaged
4.86.5. United Kingdom – 417 casualties

4.86.6. Japan – 18,000 soldiers
4.86.7. Japan – 11,192 casualties
4.86.8. Outcome – British victory. The escape failed completely.

4.87. Manchurian Campaign (Clodfelter 2008, 549)
4.87.1. The Soviet Union, with Mongolian assistance, attacked and destroyed the Kwantung Army located in Manchuria at the United States pressed toward the home islands; the defeat helped convince Japan to surrender to the Allies.
4.87.2. Onset: 9/8/1945; Termination: 1/9/1945
4.87.3. Soviet Union and Mongolia versus Japan
4.87.4. Soviet Union and Mongolia – 1,593,725 soldiers (16,000 of which were Mongolian)
4.87.5. Soviet Union – 31,593 casualties
4.87.6. Japan – 750,000 soldiers
4.87.7. Japan – 677,737 casualties
4.87.8. Outcome – Decisive Soviet and Mongolian victory

5. Coding Notes: Interstate Wars 1900-1941 (minus the World Wars)

Formatting for Coding Notes:

2. Warname (COW)
2.1. Major Battle Name (Page numbers for data drawn from Clodfelter 2008; Supplemental data citations located where appropriate)
2.1.1. Battle Description
2.1.2. Date of battle onset and termination (Day/Month/Year)
2.1.3. Belligerents
2.1.4. Belligerent A Contribution
2.1.5. Belligerent A Casualties
2.1.6. Belligerent B Contribution
2.1.7. Belligerent B Casualties
2.1.8. Battle Outcome

5.1. Boxer Rebellion

5.1.1. Siege of Foreign Legations (Clodfelter 2008, 383)

5.1.1.1. Boxers besiege foreign legations in Peking.
5.1.1.2. Onset: 20/6/1900; Termination: 14/7/1900
5.1.1.3. Boxers versus Eight-Nation Alliance (United Kingdom, Russia, United States, Germany, France, Austria, Italy, and Japan)
5.1.1.4. Boxers and China – 10,000
5.1.1.5. Boxers and China – Unknown
5.1.1.6. Eight-Nation Alliance – Britian-82, Russian-75, American-63, German-50, French-45, Austrian-35, Italian-31, and Japanese-29.
5.1.1.7. Eight-Nation Alliance – 166 combatant casualties. The toll by nationality breaks down as follows: Britain – 3 killed, 16 wounded; Russia – 4 killed, 14 wounded, 2 dead of disease; United States – 7 killed, 10 wounded; Germany – 11 killed, 16 wounded; France – 11 killed, 21 wounded; Austria – 4 killed, 10 wounded; Italy – 7 killed, 12 wounded, and Japan – 5 killed, 13 wounded.
5.1.1.8. Outcome – Eight-Nation Alliance won (Preston 2000, 261).

5.1.2. Battles at Tang Tsu (Clodfelter 2008, 383)

5.1.2.1. Attempt to rescue the legations by General E. H. Seymour yet while in route ran into a host of Boxers at Tang Tsu.
5.1.2.2. Onset: 11/6/1900; Termination: 27/6/1900
5.1.2.3. Boxers and China versus Eight-Nation Alliance (United Kingdom, Russia, United States, Germany, France, Austria, Italy, and Japan)
5.1.2.4. Boxers and China – Between 4,000 and 5,000 (Davids 1981, 107)
5.1.2.5. Boxers and China – 400 to 500 dead (Davids 1981, 107; Silbey 2012, 104)

5.1.2.6. Eight-Nation Alliance: 2,129 men; British – 915, Germany – 512, Russian – 312, French – 157, Americans – 111, Japanese – 54, Italians – 42, Austrians – 26

5.1.2.7. Eight-Nation Alliance: 62 KIA, 232 WIA

5.1.2.8. Outcome – Boxers and China Won

5.1.3. Battle of Tientsin's (Tianjin) Chinese Quarter (Clodfelter 2008, 383)

5.1.3.1. Attempt by foreign allies to secure Tinstein.

5.1.3.2. Onset: 13/7/1900; Termination 14/7/1900

5.1.3.3. Boxers and China versus Eight-Nation Alliance (partial: United States, Japan, UK, France, Russia, Germany and Austria) (Preston 2000, 184; See also Navy Department 1900, 1165-1167)

5.1.3.4. Boxers and China – 30,000; See also (Navy Department 1900, 1165-1167).

5.1.3.5. Boxers and China – 5,000

5.1.3.6. Eight-Nation Alliance – 5,650; Russians, 2,300; Japanese, 1,600; Americans, 900; French, 600, and Germans, 250; total, 5,650; See also Thompson 1902.

5.1.3.7. Eight-Nation Alliance – 750 killed wounded or missing (of which 320 were Japanese; the 1021 Americans engaged lost 18 killed, 77 wounded); Navy Department 1900, 1165-1167 reports slightly lower figures: The casualties were as follows: American, killed 24, wounded 98, missing 1; English, killed 17, wounded 87, Japanese, killed and wounded, 320; French, killed 13, wounded 50; Russians and Germans, killed and wounded 140.

5.1.3.8. Outcome – Eight-Nation Alliance won.

5.1.4. Battle of Peitsang and Yangtsun (Clodfelter 2008, 383)

5.1.4.1. The Allies, in route to Peking, confronted 25,000 Boxers at Peitsang and a second Boxer blocking force at Yangtsun.

5.1.4.2. Onset: 5/8/1900; Termination 13/8/1900

5.1.4.3. China and Boxers versus Eight-Nation Alliance (Japan, Russia, United Kingdom, United States, France, Germany, Austria, Italy)

5.1.4.4. China and Boxers –25,000. Imperial Troops at Peitsang – 10,000 to 12,000. Imperial troops at Yangtsun – 4,000 (Leonhard, n.d.)

5.1.4.5. China and Boxers – 1,000 to 1,500 killed and wounded. (Silbey 2012, 179)

5.1.4.6. Eight-Nation Alliance – 20,911. Japan – 10,000; Russia – 4,800; Britain – 3,000 (including 1 Chinese regiment led by British officers); American – 2,100; French – 800; German – 100; Austrian – 58; and Italian – 53. (See also Spence 1991, 235 and US Army Center for Military History, n.d.)

5.1.4.7. Eight-Nation Alliance – At Peitsang, the Japanese…lost three hundred dead and two hundred wounded. The other forces did not

suffer substantial losses (Silbey 2012, 179). At Yangtsun, the Americans suffered seven killed and sixty-five wounded, with the British about forty casualties (Silbey 2012, 185). Total losses approximately 650.

5.1.4.8. Outcome – Eight-Nation Alliance won (Silbey 2012, 188).

5.1.5. Battle for Peking (Clodfelter 2008, 383)

5.1.5.1. Allied offensive to rid Peking from the Boxers.

5.1.5.2. Onset: 15/8/1900; Termination 28/8/1900

5.1.5.3. China and Boxers versus Eight-Nation Alliance (Japan, Russia, United Kingdom, United States); The German, Italian, Austrian, and French contingents elected to turn back for Tientsin (Leonhard, n.d.)

5.1.5.4. China and Boxers – 25,000

5.1.5.5. China and Boxers – Chinese casualties seem to have been relatively light. The Japanese reported that 'the enemy killed up to August 17th…number not less than 600.' Even assuming that number was replicated in the forces defending against the other allied attacks, that still suggested that the Chinese lost substantially fewer than five thousand dead (Silbey 2012, 212).

5.1.5.6. Eight-Nation Alliance – 20,911. Japan – 10,000; Russia – 4,800; Britain – 3,000 (including 1 Chinese regiment led by British officers); American – 2,100; French – 800; German – 100; Austrian – 58; and Italian – 53. See also Spence 1991, 235

5.1.5.7. Eight-Nation Alliance – Unknown

5.1.5.8. Outcome – Eight-Nation Alliance won. The Boxers fled Peking and the entire Imperial city was occupied on 28 August.

5.2. Sino-Russian War

5.2.1. Battle of Ongun (Lensen 1974, 166-171)

5.2.1.1. Two Russian infantry battaions and a Cossack regiment attack a division size Chinese formation on the left bank of the Hailar river

5.2.1.2. Onset: 28/7/1900; Termination: 1/8/1900

5.2.1.3. Russia versus China

5.2.1.4. Russia - 2 Cossacks Regiments; approximately 3,000 soldiers (Lensen 1974, 166)

5.2.1.5. Russia - 8 dead and 17 wounded (Lensen 1974, 170)

5.2.1.6. China – Approximately 10,000 soldiers (Lensen 1974, 166)

5.2.1.7. China - 800-900 dead (Lensen 1974, 171)

5.2.1.8. Outcome – Following a Russian artillery barrage, Russian Cossacks stormed the Chinese position and forced them into full retreat. The victory at Ongun left the city of Hailar defenseless and Russian forces occupied the city soon thereafter on 3 August (Lensen 1974, 169-172).

5.2.2. Battle of Hsing-an Mountains (Lensen 1974, 177-192)

5.2.2.1. After the Russian victory at Ya-k'o-shih gained them all Western Manchuria up to the greater Hsing-an mountains, Bulatovich and Orlov performed an envelopment maneuver to cut off defending Chinese forces under General Chou Mien.
5.2.2.2. Onset: 24/8/1900; Termination: 24/8/1900
5.2.2.3. Russia versus China
5.2.2.4. Russia - Hailar Detachment of 6th, 5th and 4th Battalion, totaling approximately 2,730 soldiers (Lensen 1974, 178)
5.2.2.5. Russia - 3 dead, 9 wounded (Lensen 1974, 192)
5.2.2.6. China – Unknown
5.2.2.7. China – The Chinese were trapped and most of them were killed, the remainder scattering to the nearby forests and swamps (Lensen 1974, 191)
5.2.2.8. Outcome – Russia won.

5.2.3. Battle of An-shan-chan and Sha-ho-p'u (Lensen 1974, 207-219)
5.2.3.1. Following their victory at Hai-Ch'eng, the Russian Cossacks ceased their offensives for forty-three days while they awaited reinforcements. Upon the arrival of General Subotich, the outnumbered Russian forces attacked the heavily fortified Chinese positions at An-shan. (Lensen 1974, 207)
5.2.3.2. Onset: 23/9/1900; Termination: 26/9/1900
5.2.3.3. Russia versus China
5.2.3.4. Russia – 9,000 (Lensen 1974, 208)
5.2.3.5. Russia – Unknown
5.2.3.6. China – 30,000 (Lensen 1974, 214)
5.2.3.7. China – Unknown
5.2.3.8. Outcome – Unable to stop the Russian offensive, the Chinese forces under General Shou retreated to the village of Sha-ho-p'u, where they attempted to regroup. There, the shaken Chinese troops were dislodged once more by a joint artillery and cavalry assault, sending them into full retreat toward Liao-yang (Lensen 1974, 214-218).

5.3. Russo-Japanese War

5.3.1. Battle of Yalu River (Clodfelter 2008, 386 and 384)
5.3.1.1. On 17 February the Japan landed at Chemulpo and set forward on its First Army of 42,500 men to advance to the Yalu. General Kuroki Tamemoto met Russian forces in the first land battle of the war.
5.3.1.2. Onset: 1/5/1904; Termination: 1/5/1904
5.3.1.3. Japan versus Russia
5.3.1.4. Japan – 42,500
5.3.1.5. Japan – 1,035
5.3.1.6. Russia – 7,000
5.3.1.7. Russia – 2,200 killed or wounded, 500 captured

5.3.1.8. Outcome – Japan won. Routed the Russians.

5.3.2. Battle of Nanshan Hill (Clodfelter 2008, 386 and 384)

5.3.2.1. On 5 May the Japanese Second Army landed on the Liaotung Peninsula. Their advance south was halted at Nanshan Hill. On 25 May they drove off the hill defenders.

5.3.2.2. Onset: 26/5/1904; Termination: 26/5/1904

5.3.2.3. Japan versus Russia

5.3.2.4. Japan – 30,000

5.3.2.5. Japan – 739 killed, 5,459 wounded

5.3.2.6. Russia – 3,000

5.3.2.7. Russia – 1,416

5.3.2.8. Outcome – Japan won.

5.3.3. Battle of Telissu (Clodfelter 2008, 386 and 384)

5.3.3.1. Japan's Second Army turned back around to the north to face a Russian attempt at relieving the naval base. The Russian force was checked by Japan at Telissu.

5.3.3.2. Onset: 14/6/1904; Termination: 15/6/1904

5.3.3.3. Japan versus Russia

5.3.3.4. Japan – 35,000

5.3.3.5. Japan – 217 killed, 946 wounded

5.3.3.6. Russia – 25,000

5.3.3.7. Russia – 477 killed, 2,240 wounded, 754 missing

5.3.3.8. Outcome – Japan won. Russian withdrawal.

5.3.4. Siege of Port Arthur (Clodfelter 2008, 386)

5.3.4.1. A yearlong Japanese attack on Russian Port Arthur.

5.3.4.2. Onset: 1/6/1904; Termination: 2/1/1905

5.3.4.3. Japan versus Russia

5.3.4.4. Japan – 80,000 (peak strength)

5.3.4.5. Japan – 57,780

5.3.4.6. Russia – 41,899 (peak strength)

5.3.4.7. Russia – 31,306 casualties

5.3.4.8. Outcome – Japan won.

5.3.5. Battle of Liao-yang (Clodfelter 2008, 386 and 385)

5.3.5.1. The Japanese First, Second, and Fourth armies in Manchuria converged against the Russian positions near Liao-yang. The Russians chose to strike first but attack fell short of victory.

5.3.5.2. Onset: 25/8/1904; Termination: 3/9/1904

5.3.5.3. Japan versus Russia

5.3.5.4. Japan – 125,000 (115,000 infantry and 10,000 cavalry)

5.3.5.5. Japan – 5,537 killed and 18,063 wounded

5.3.5.6. Russia – 158,000 (128,000 infantry and 30,000 cavalry)

5.3.5.7. Russia – 3,611 killed or missing, 14,301 wounded

5.3.5.8. Outcome – Japan won. Russians withdrew northward.

5.3.6. Battle of Sha Ho River (Clodfelter 2008, 386 and 385)

5.3.6.1. The Russian ordered an offensive against the Japanese.
5.3.6.2. Onset: 5/10/1904; Termination: 7/10/1904
5.3.6.3. Japan versus Russia
5.3.6.4. Japan – 170,000
5.3.6.5. Japan – 3,951 killed, 16,394 wounded
5.3.6.6. Russia – 200,000
5.3.6.7. Russia – 10,959 killed or missing, 30,392 wounded
5.3.6.8. Outcome – Japan won.

5.3.7. Battle of Sandepu (Clodfelter 2008, 386 and 385; Dowling 2015, 761-762)

5.3.7.1. Russians made one last effort to defeat the Japanese Third Army.
5.3.7.2. Onset: 26/1/1905; Termination: 27/1/1905
5.3.7.3. Japan versus Russia
5.3.7.4. Japan – 40,000
5.3.7.5. Japan – 9,000
5.3.7.6. Russia – 75,000
5.3.7.7. Russia – 12,000
5.3.7.8. Outcome – Japan won. Japanese counterattacks stopped the Russian assault.

5.3.8. Battle of Mukden (Clodfelter 2008, 386 and 385)

5.3.8.1. Japanese troops left their trenches in an attempt to envelop the three opposing Russian armies.
5.3.8.2. Onset: 21/2/1905; Termination: 10/3/1905
5.3.8.3. Japan versus Russia
5.3.8.4. Japan – 307,350
5.3.8.5. Japan – 15,892
5.3.8.6. Russia – 291,000
5.3.8.7. Russia – 20,000 killed or missing, 49,000 wounded, 20,000 captured.
5.3.8.8. Outcome – Japan won. Russians withdrew back on Harbin

5.4. Third Central American War

5.4.1. Battle of Ocos (Ortega Gaytan 2014)

5.4.1.1. This was the opening action that led to the Guatemalan-Salvadoran war of 1906. Former Guatemalan president Barillas invades Guatemala supported by Mexico which was allied with El Salvador. This action aimed at securing the locality of Ocos.
5.4.1.2. Guatemala vs El Salvador and Guatemalan rebels
5.4.1.3. Onset: 27/5/1906; Termination: 27/5/1906
5.4.1.4. Guatemala – 559 soldiers

5.4.1.5. Guatemala – Unknown
5.4.1.6. El Salvador and Guatemalan rebels – 250 soldiers (Gramajo 1937)
5.4.1.7. El Salvador and Guatemalan rebels – Unkown
5.4.1.8. Outcome – Guatemala won. Rebel assaults are repelled by Guatemalan forces.

5.4.2. Battle of Mongoy (Gramajo 1937, 79-86)
5.4.2.1. Under orders of Salvadoran Commanding General, Tomas Regalado, Guatemalan rebels advance towards Mongoy in order to reinforce a combined Salvadoran and rebel force there.
5.4.2.2. Guatemala vs El Salvador and Guatemalan rebels
5.4.2.3. Onset: 7/6/1906; Termination: 10/6/1906
5.4.2.4. Guatemala – 12000 soldiers
5.4.2.5. Guatemala – Unknown
5.4.2.6. El Salvador and Guatemalan rebels – 475 soldiers
5.4.2.7. El Salvador and Guatemalan rebels – Unknown
5.4.2.8. Outcome – Salvadoran and rebel allies are pushed out of Mongoy by Guatemalan government army.

5.4.3. Battle of Jicaro
5.4.3.1. Salvadoran Army push against the center of the Guatemalan Army which led to the death in combat of Salvadoran President and Commanding General, General Tomas Regalado.
5.4.3.2. Guatemala vs El Salvador and Guatemalan rebels
5.4.3.3. Onset: 10/7/1906; Termination: 11/7/1906
5.4.3.4. Guatemala – 8500 soldiers (Gonzalez 1998, 111)
5.4.3.5. Guatemala – Unknown
5.4.3.6. El Salvador and Guatemalan rebels – 8500 soldiers of which 510 were Guatemalan rebels (Gonzalez 1998, 112)
5.4.3.7. El Salvador and Guatemalan rebels – 80 casualties (Zamora 1925, 518)
5.4.3.8. Outcome – Guatemala won. With Regalado's death, the Salvadoran army was dealt a powerful blow to their campaign.

5.4.4. Battles of El Platanar and Las Escobas
5.4.4.1. This seemed to have been the last Salvadoran effort to salvage their campaign in Guatemala.
5.4.4.2. Guatemala vs El Salvador and Guatemalan rebels
5.4.4.3. Onset: 14/7/1906; Termination: 17/7/1906
5.4.4.4. Guatemala – 5 battalions of the Guatemalan Army right flank totaling 1875 soldiers based on Ortega's data for the Guatemalan battalions (Gonzalez 19998, 112)
5.4.4.5. Guatemala – Unknown
5.4.4.6. El Salvador and Guatemalan rebels – Unknown
5.4.4.7. El Salvador and Guatemalan rebels – Unknown

5.4.4.8. Outcome – Under US auspices, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras reach a peace settlement that puts an end to the war.

5.5. Fourth Central American War

5.5.1. Battle of San Marcos (Sierra 2012, 168-169)

5.5.1.1. After a series of Nicaraguan cavalry reconnaissance actions into the town of San Marcos, Nicaraguan and Honduran rebel forces invade Choluteca and engage with Honduran government forces in San Marcos.
5.5.1.2. Honduras vs Nicaragua and Honduran rebels
5.5.1.3. Onset: 22/02/1907; Termination: 25/02/1907
5.5.1.4. Honduras – 1 infantry brigade with 1800 soldiers
5.5.1.5. Honduras – 130 casualties
5.5.1.6. Nicaragua and Honduran rebels – 2 Nicaraguan Army Brigades with 7000 soldiers, and two Honduran Rebels' Battalions with 1000 soldiers
5.5.1.7. Nicaragua and Honduran rebels – 35 casualties
5.5.1.8. Outcome – Honduran forces pull out in disarray of San Marcos and retreat towards El Alto de la Joya.

5.5.2. Battle of Ococona-Dipilto (Sierra 2012, 172-173)

5.5.2.1. Honduran president and commanding general, General Manuel Bonilla, orders Honduran General Chamorro to move into offensive operations in the Segovias region in order to relief the Nicaraguan pressure to the Southern front. Chamorro moves into Ococona and engages Nicaraguan Army forces in the Ococona-Dipilto Area.
5.5.2.2. Honduras vs Nicaragua and Honduran rebels
5.5.2.3. Onset: 05/03/1907; Termination: 06/03/1907
5.5.2.4. Honduras – 1 infantry battalion totaling 500 soldiers
5.5.2.5. Honduras – 50 POWs
5.5.2.6. Nicaragua and Honduran rebels – 1 Nicaraguan infantry Battalion estimated at 500 soldiers
5.5.2.7. Nicaragua and Honduran rebels – 3 casualties
5.5.2.8. Outcome – Nicaraguan forces repeal General Chamorro's battalion who retreats towards Honduras.

5.5.3. First Battle of Namasigüe (Sierra 2012, 173)

5.5.3.1. Honduran General Bonilla's forces attack the Nicaraguan troops garrisoned at Namasigüe
5.5.3.2. Onset: 06/03/1907; Termination: 07/03/1907
5.5.3.3. Honduras – Unknown
5.5.3.4. Honduras –Unknown
5.5.3.5. Nicaragua and Honduran rebels – 2000 Nicaraguan soldiers
5.5.3.6. Nicaragua and Honduran rebels – Unknown

5.5.3.7. Outcome – Honduran pyrrhic victory due to Honduran troops failing at pursuing Nicaraguan troops that had been forced out of their trenches.

5.5.4. Battle of Maraita (Sierra 2012, 174-175)

5.5.4.1. Nicaraguan and Honduran rebels launch what seemed to be a secondary push towards Tegucigalpa and came into contact with a Honduran government force.

5.5.4.2. Honduras vs Nicaragua and Honduran rebels

5.5.4.3. Onset: 06/03/1907; Termination: 07/03/1907

5.5.4.4. Honduras – 2 infantry battalions totaling 1000 soldiers

5.5.4.5. Honduras – Unknown

5.5.4.6. Nicaragua and Honduran rebels – 200 Nicaraguan soldiers and 1 rebel Honduran infantry battalion totaling 250; 450 total

5.5.4.7. Nicaragua and Honduran rebels – 370 casualties

5.5.4.8. Outcome – Honduran defeat.

5.5.5. Second Battle of Namasigüe (Sierra 2012, 184)

5.5.5.1. President Zelaya of Nicaragua invades Honduras to support anti-Bonilla revolutionaries (Haggarety and Millet 1995, 20)

5.5.5.2. Onset: 17/3/1907; Termination: 23/3/1907

5.5.5.3. Nicaragua and Honduran Rebels versus Honduras and El Salvador

5.5.5.4. Nicaragua and Honduran Rebels – 22500

5.5.5.5. Nicaragua – 400 (Sarkees and Wayman 2010)

5.5.5.6. Honduras and El Salvador – 18000 soldiers

5.5.5.7. Honduras and El Salvador – 900 total

5.5.5.8. Outcome – Decisive victory for Nicaragua. By March, Zelaya defeated the Honduran army as well as some irregulars from El Salvador who had entered the fray. He then helped the revolutionists banish Bonilla and install a new president (Karnes 1976, 188). After the defeat, El Salvador called for Mexico to intervene and end the war (Salvador 1907).

5.6. Second Spanish Moroccan War

5.6.1. Battle at Sidi-Musa (Gallego 2005, 90-94)

5.6.1.1. Riffian forces attack Spanish Army units protecting mining and construction operations in Sidi-Musa. This is the opening battle of the war.

5.6.1.2. Onset: 09/07/1909; Termination: 09/07/1909

5.6.1.3. Riffian tribesmen vs Spain

5.6.1.4. Riffian tribesmen – Unknown

5.6.1.5. Riffian tribesmen – 40 casualties

5.6.1.6. Spain – 632 soldiers

5.6.1.7. Spain – 31 casualties

5.6.1.8. Outcome – Spanish units hold the positions on the Sidi-Musa, Sidi-Amet, and Sidi-Ali line.

5.6.2. Battle at Sidi-Amet (Gallego 2005, 105-109)

5.6.2.1. Riffian forces harass Spanish units defending Sidi-Amet that were protecting the construction of fortifications.
5.6.2.2. Onset: 18/07/1909; Termination: 18/07/1909
5.6.2.3. Riffian tribesmen vs Spain
5.6.2.4. Riffian tribesmen – 6000 soldiers
5.6.2.5. Riffian tribesmen – Unknown
5.6.2.6. Spain – 1746 soldiers
5.6.2.7. Spain – 59 casualties
5.6.2.8. Outcome – Spanish units hold the positions in Sidi-Amet.

5.6.3. General Riffian Offensive (Gallego 2005, 109-115)

5.6.3.1. Riffian forces launch an all-out attack against all Spanish positions on the eastern bank of the Gurugu.
5.6.3.2. Onset: 20/07/1909; Termination: 21/07/1909
5.6.3.3. Riffian tribesmen vs Spain
5.6.3.4. Riffian tribesmen – 3000 soldiers
5.6.3.5. Riffian tribesmen – Unknown
5.6.3.6. Spain – 574 soldiers
5.6.3.7. Spain – 131 casualties
5.6.3.8. Outcome – Spanish units hold the positions in the Gurugu but results cause public backlash against the war in Spain.

5.6.4. Battle at Ait-Aixa (Gallego 2005, 120-126)

5.6.4.1. Riffian troops catch a Spanish marching column off-guard while it was trying to take the Ait-Aixa heights. This was part of a plan devised by Spanish General Marina to preempt the concentration of Riffian troops that could have attacked Melilla from the south.
5.6.4.2. Onset: 23/07/1909; Termination: 23/07/1909
5.6.4.3. Riffian tribesmen vs Spain
5.6.4.4. Riffian tribesmen – Unknown
5.6.4.5. Riffian tribesmen – 1000 casualties
5.6.4.6. Spain – 1456 soldiers
5.6.4.7. Spain – 336 casualties
5.6.4.8. Outcome – Riffian concentration is preempted but the Spanish get dragged into a violent battle from which they had to organize their retreat to their original lines.

5.6.5. Battle of Barranco del Lobo (Gallego 2005, 131-140)

5.6.5.1. Under orders of General Marina, a Spanish force commanded by General Pinto moved to maintain observation over the exists of

the Lobo and Alfer passes on which it was suspected that a large Riffian force was concentrated.

5.6.5.2. Onset: 27/07/1909; Termination: 27/07/1909

5.6.5.3. Riffian tribesmen vs Spain

5.6.5.4. Riffian tribesmen – Unknown

5.6.5.5. Riffian tribesmen – Unknown

5.6.5.6. Spain – 6000 soldiers

5.6.5.7. Spain – 762 casualties

5.6.5.8. Outcome – General Pinto died in combat while its force had to give up any advances they had made on the passes due to the resistance of the Riffians. This was the deadliest battle of the entire war. Spanish defeat.

5.6.6. Spanish offensive against the Mahen and Moh Brahim (Gallego 2005, 178-182)

5.6.6.1. After Arkeman locals began harassing Spanish troops, General Marina orders Spanish General Aguilera to to advance to the towns of Mahen and Moh Brahim

5.6.6.2. Onset: 06/09/1909; Termination: 10/09/1909

5.6.6.3. Riffian tribesmen vs Spain

5.6.6.4. Riffian tribesmen – Unknown

5.6.6.5. Riffian tribesmen – 75 casualties

5.6.6.6. Spain – 5646 soldiers

5.6.6.7. Spain – 15 casualties

5.6.6.8. Outcome – General Aguilera successfully routes the main Riffian forces in Moh Brahim and advances into Riffian holdings to perform punitive actions.

5.6.7. Battle of Taxdirt (Gallego 2005, 183-196)

5.6.7.1. This battle was the culmination point in General Marina's maneuvers to cut off the Tres Forcas peninsula and force the submission of the Riffian rebels.

5.6.7.2. Onset: 20/09/1909; Termination: 20/09/1909

5.6.7.3. Riffian tribesmen vs Spain

5.6.7.4. Riffian tribesmen – 6000 soldiers

5.6.7.5. Riffian tribesmen – 1000 casualties

5.6.7.6. Spain – 6503 soldiers

5.6.7.7. Spain – 197 casualties

5.6.7.8. Outcome – Main Riffian force is broken and Spanish Army takes Taxdirt.

5.6.8. Battle of Beni-Buifror (Gallego 2005, 213-225)

5.6.8.1. General Marina, aware that the main Riffian force had yet to be defeated, plans an operation to draw it out to battle.

5.6.8.2. Onset: 30/09/1909; Termination: 30/09/1909

5.6.8.3. Riffian tribesmen vs Spain

5.6.8.4. Riffian tribesmen – 21000 soldiers
5.6.8.5. Riffian tribesmen – Unknown
5.6.8.6. Spain – 8200 soldiers
5.6.8.7. Spain – 164 casualties
5.6.8.8. Outcome – Spanish forces take Buguen-Zein but Spanish public opinion is disheartened by the Riffian resistance.

5.6.9. Battle of Nador (Gallego 2005, 232-236)
5.6.9.1. Spanish forces advance to Atlaten and the position of Taxuda.
5.6.9.2. Onset: 17/10/1909; Termination: 17/10/1909
5.6.9.3. Riffian tribesmen vs Spain
5.6.9.4. Riffian tribesmen – Unknown
5.6.9.5. Riffian tribesmen – 300
5.6.9.6. Spain – 2819 soldiers
5.6.9.7. Spain – 24 casualties
5.6.9.8. Outcome – Spanish victory.

5.7. Italian-Turkish War

5.7.1. Italian Invasion of Tripoli (Clodfelter 2008, 379)
5.7.1.1. On September 29 ten Italian battleships and cruisers bombarded Tripoli, Libya for two days, and a landing force of 20,000 occupied the city on October 5th.
5.7.1.2. Onset: 29/9/1911; Termination: 5/10/1911
5.7.1.3. Italy versus Turkey
5.7.1.4. Italy – 40,000 (Choate 2008, 175; See also Beehler 1913, 15)
5.7.1.5. Italy – 600
5.7.1.6. Turkey – According to Beehler, "at the outbreak of the war the trained (Turkish) troops numbered about 5,000 infantry and 400 cavalry with about 2500 to 3000 raw recruits; and "the garrison of the city of Tripoli" had "3000 trained troops with about 2000 raw recruits" (Beehler 1913, 13).
5.7.1.7. Turkey - Ottomans did not suffer more than 500-1000 casualties (Beehler 1913, 13). Approximately 750 total.
5.7.1.8. Outcome – Italy won. The entire Turkish garrison of 5,000 had evacuated Tripoli (Beehler 1913, 13).

5.7.2. Battle of Benghazi (Beehler, 1913, 27-29)
5.7.2.1. Naval landing and subsequent defeat of Benghazi's Turkish defenders.
5.7.2.2. Onset: 18/10/1911; Termination: 29/10/1911
5.7.2.3. Italy versus Turkey and Arab irregular forces
5.7.2.4. Italy – 6000 troops landed (Stephenson 2014)
5.7.2.5. Italy – 36 killed and 88 wounded
5.7.2.6. Turkey and Arab irregulars – 400-1000 regular troops and 2500-3000 irregular; approximately 3,450 total.
5.7.2.7. Turkey and Arab irregulars – 200 casualties

5.7.2.8. Outcome – Italy won.

5.7.3. Battle of Derna (Beehler, 1913, 30)

5.7.3.1. Naval landing, occupation of Derna, and eventual stalemate between Italians and Turks.

5.7.3.2. Onset: 15/10/1911; Termination: 28/10/1911

5.7.3.3. Italy versus Turkey and Arab irregulars

5.7.3.4. Italy – 1500 troops (Stephenson 2014).

5.7.3.5. Italy – 52 total. In an engagement of 8 hours the Italians lost 15 killed and 37 wounded (Beehler 1913, 49).

5.7.3.6. Turkey and Arab irregulars –3500 (Beehler 1913, 49).

5.7.3.7. Turkey and Arab irregulars – Unknown

5.7.3.8. Outcome – Italy won (Hermann 1989).

5.7.4. Attempt to Recapture of Tripoli (Clodfelter 2008, 379; Beehler 1913, 35)

5.7.4.1. The toughest battle of the Libyan campaign was fought, not against the 80,000-man regular Ottoman garrison, but against 20,000 pro-Turkish Senussi tribesmen who attempted to recapture the capital of Tripoli.

5.7.4.2. Onset: 23/10/1911; Termination: 26/10/1911

5.7.4.3. Italy versus pro-Turkish Senussi tribesmen; Note: A handful of Turkish officers secretly travelled to Libya to organize and guide them. Additionally, the indigenous people of Tripoli volunteered to join upon hearing of this attack on 23 October 1911 (Kurtcephe 1990, 361-376).

5.7.4.4. Italy – 1,540

5.7.4.5. Italy – 13 officers and 321 soldiers killed; 16 officers and 142 soldiers wounded (Kurtcephe 1990)

5.7.4.6. Senussi tribesmen – 20,000

5.7.4.7. Senussi tribesmen – 1,000

5.7.4.8. Outcome – Italy won – repulsed attacked.

5.8. First Balkan War

5.8.1. Battle of Lozengrad (Clodfelter 2008, 366; Hall 2000, 22-28)

5.8.1.1. Part of the allied invasion into Turkish territory. In Thrace 120,000 men and 262 guns of the Bulgarian First and Third Armies beat 110,000 Turks with 280 guns at Seliolu and Kirk Kilisse.

5.8.1.2. Onset: 22/10/1912; Termination: 24/10/1912

5.8.1.3. Bulgaria versus Turkey

5.8.1.4. Bulgaria – 217000

5.8.1.5. Bulgaria – 5745

5.8.1.6. Turkey – 138000

5.8.1.7. Turkey – 4500

5.8.1.8. Outcome – Bulgaria won (Hall 2000, 28).

5.8.2. Battle of Kumanovo (Clodfelter 2008, 366)

5.8.2.1. In northern Macedonia, 3 Serbian armies crossed the frontier and on 24 October the First Army of 5 divisions won a major victory at Kumanovo.

5.8.2.2. Onset: 19/10/1912; Termination: 24/10/1912

5.8.2.3. Serbia versus Turkey

5.8.2.4. Serbia – 110,000

5.8.2.5. Serbia – 1,126 KIA, 3,468 WIA. (Hall 2000, 47-48)

5.8.2.6. Turkey – Ottoman forces stood at 58,000 (Hall 2000, 47)

5.8.2.7. Turkey – 12,000

5.8.2.8. Outcome – Serbia won (Hall 2000, 48).

5.8.3. Battle of Lüle Burgas (Clodfelter 2008, 366)

5.8.3.1. From October 28-30 the same 2 Bulgar armies [Bulgarian First and Third] drove the Ottomans from the 20-mil line stretching from Lüle Burgas to Bunar Hisar.

5.8.3.2. Onset: 28/10/1912; Termination 30/10/1912

5.8.3.3. Bulgaria versus Turkey

5.8.3.4. Bulgaria – 80,000

5.8.3.5. Bulgaria – 18,136

5.8.3.6. Turkey – 120,000

5.8.3.7. Turkey – 28,000 (including 3,000 POWs)

5.8.3.8. Outcome – Bulgaria won (Hall 2000, 31).

5.8.4. Battle of Bitola (Clodfelter 2008, 366)

5.8.4.1. Squeezed into Monastir by the Serbians coming down from the north and the Greeks driving up from the south, the main Turkish army in Macedonia, 40,000 strong, was attacked there by the Serbians under Prince Alexander and routed form November 15-18.

5.8.4.2. Onset: 15/11/1912; Termination: 18/11/1912

5.8.4.3. Serbia versus Turkey

5.8.4.4. Serbia –The Serbian army that fought this battle is the 1st army. In the beginning of the western theater, it commanded 132,000 men (Hall 2000, 45). The main part of the 1st Army, strengthened with a division from the 3rd Army, came to Bitola, pursuing the Ottomans after the latter's defeat at Kumanovo (Hall 2000, 49). In sum, this advancing Serbian force was 108,544 men strong (Hall 2000, 51).

5.8.4.5. Serbia –Serbian casualties amounted to 539 dead, 2,121 wounded and 329 missing (Hall 2000,52).

5.8.4.6. Turkey – The principal Ottoman force fighting here was their main army in Macedonia, the Vardar army (which was the largest component of the 175k they began with in Macedonia and Albania). According to Hall, the strength of this Vardar army had dwindled to

only 38,350 soldiers and 100 artillery pieces at Bitola (Hall 2000, 51).

5.8.4.7. Turkey – Lost 1,000 men, 2,000 were wounded, and 5,600 taken as prisoners (Hall 2000, 51-52)

5.8.4.8. Outcome – Serbia won.

5.8.5. Battle of Chatalja (Clodfelter 2008, 366)

5.8.5.1. The Bulgarians [First and Third Armies] went on to storm the Chatalja lines covering Constantinople but were repulsed with heavy losses.

5.8.5.2. Onset: 17/11/1912; Termination 17/11/1912

5.8.5.3. Bulgaria versus Turkey

5.8.5.4. Bulgaria –176,081 at the time of the attack (Hall 2000, 35)

5.8.5.5. Bulgaria – 15,880

5.8.5.6. Turkey – 107,000 (See also Jowett 2011, 6 and Hall 2000, 37).

5.8.5.7. Turkey – 10,000 (Hall 2000, 37)

5.8.5.8. Outcome – Turkey (Hall 2000, 37).

5.8.6. Siege of Scutari (I) (Clodfelter 2008, 367)

5.8.6.1. On the Albanian-Epirus front, the only place where the Ottoman crescent still waved in Europe by 1913 was at Scutari. Besieged by the Montenegrins and Serbians, the fortress survived two major assaults, February 7-9 and March 31-April 1, but finally capitulated on April 22.

5.8.6.2. Onset: 7/2/1913; Termination 9/2/1913

5.8.6.3. Montenegrin and Serbian forces versus Turkey and Albanian Irregulars

5.8.6.4. Montenegro and Serbian forces – 33,000. Montenegro and Serbian forces – Zeta Division with 15,000 men and 40 guns, Coastal Division with 8,000 men, Eastern Division with 5,500 men, and 4,500 volunteers from Bosnia and elsewhere from Austria-Hungary (Hall 57)

5.8.6.5. Montenegro and Serbian forces – 5500 Montenegrins and 1800 Serbians (Hall 2000, 92)

5.8.6.6. Turkey and Albanian Irregulars - 24,000 Ottoman troops and around 5,000 Albanian irregulars (Hall 2000, 57)

5.8.6.7. Turkey and Albanian Irregulars – 1,338 (Hall 2000, 91)

5.8.6.8. Outcome – Turkey and Albanian Irregulars won (Hall 2000, 270)

5.8.7. Siege of Scutari (II)

5.8.7.1. On the Albanian-Epirus front, the only place where the Ottoman crescent still waved in Europe by 1913 was at Scutari. Besieged by the Montenegrins and Serbians, the fortress survived two major assaults, February 7-9 and March 31-April 1, but finally capitulated on April 22.

5.8.7.2. Onset: 31/3/1913; Termination 1/4/1913
5.8.7.3. Montenegrin and Serbian forces versus Ottoman Empire
5.8.7.4. Montenegrin and Serbian – 51,000 (Vachkov 2005, 38, 141)
5.8.7.5. Montenegrin and Serbian – 615 casualties (Ericksson 2007, 311)
5.8.7.6. Ottoman Empire – 27,662 (Vachkov 2005, 38, 141)
5.8.7.7. Ottoman Empire – 274 (Ericksson 2007, 311)
5.8.7.8. Outcome – Ottomans won (Hall 2000, 270).

5.8.8. Siege of Adrianople (Clodfelter 2008, 367)
5.8.8.1. On February 3 full-scale hostilities resumed. The siege of Adrianople was pressed by the Serbian Second Army and the Bulgar Second Army. An Ottoman attempt to debouch from the Chatalja lines to rescue Adrianople failed, and the 59,600-man garrison was left to its fate. By midday on March 26 the Turks gave up the fight.
5.8.8.2. Onset: 3/2/1913; Termination: 26/3/1913
5.8.8.3. Bulgaria and Serbia versus Turkey
5.8.8.4. Bulgaria and Serbia – Bulgaria: 83,754 and Serbia: 47,275
5.8.8.5. Bulgaria and Serbia – 9558 casualties
5.8.8.6. Turkey – 59,600
5.8.8.7. Turkey – 13000 combat casualties
5.8.8.8. Outcome – Bulgaria and Serbia won.

5.9. Second Balkan War

5.9.1. Battle of Kilkis-Lachanas-Doiran (Gedeon, 1998, 243-247)
5.9.1.1. King Constantine, with the Greek Army of Macedonia, counterattacked the Bulgarian Second Army at Kilkis and Lachans. Greeks then advanced north (to Doiran) only after defeating the Bulgarians at Kilkis. See also Cassavetti 1914, 327-332.
5.9.1.2. Onset: 22/6/1913; Termination: 3/7/1913
5.9.1.3. Greece versus Bulgaria
5.9.1.4. Greece - 121,544 (Clodfelter 2008, 367: See also Gedeon 1998, 243-247 and Hall 2000, 108)
5.9.1.5. Greece –8,700 casualties (Hall 2000, 113; See also Army History Directorate 1998, 291)
5.9.1.6. Bulgaria – 2nd Army, with two divisions and three brigades; approximately 36,000 (Hall 2000, 113)
5.9.1.7. Bulgaria - Half of forces reported to be killed, wounded, or captured; the Bulgarians admitted to casualties of 4,227 dead, 1,977 wounded, 767 missing plus the Greeks took more than 6,000 prisoners (Hall 2000, 113).
5.9.1.8. Outcome – Greece won (Army History Directorate 1998, 247).

5.9.2. Battle of Kresna (Gedeon, 1998, 253-256; Hall, 2000, 121-122)

5.9.2.1. Bulgarian counterattack against the advancing Greeks. After the Greeks defeated the Bulgarians at Doiran, the Bulgarians had to retreat north (toward Strumica/Strumnitza), which is on the way to the Kresna pass. This Kresna pass is a valley along which the Greeks would pursue the retreating Bulgarians to the north. However, the Bulgarians were able to establish a strong defensive position along the pass and ambushed the Greeks. Eventually, though, the Greeks would advance

5.9.2.2. Onset: 6/7/1913; Termination: 11/7/1913

5.9.2.3. Greece versus Bulgaria

5.9.2.4. Greece – 4 divisions totaling 144,000 (Price 1914, 883)

5.9.2.5. Greece – 21,880 casualties (Price 1914, 884)

5.9.2.6. Bulgaria – The Bulgarian forces "amounting probably to not less than from 12k to 15k men." There were "some 4,000 Bulgarians" retreating before the Greek 6th division. On the same day (July 25), Bulgarians brought up 20k fresh troops, with 5k of them attacking the Greek 7th division and the remaining 15k sent against the 6th division. (Cassavetti 1914, 330)

5.9.2.7. Bulgaria – As right, left, center wings of the Greek armies joined, "the Greeks took about 8,000 prisoners" (Cassavetti 1914,330); "The Greek offensive claimed to have taken 5,330 prisoners, eighty-four guns and 7,900 rifles, although the Bulgarians later stated that they had lost only seventy-three guns to them" (Hooton 2014)

5.9.2.8. Outcome – Stalemate.

5.9.3. Battle of Simitli (Gedeon, 1998, 256-261)

5.9.3.1. Greek forces attack defending Bulgarian forces in an attempt to force them out of Western Thrace (Hellenic Army General Staff 256)

5.9.3.2. Onset: 11/7/1913; Termination: 14/7/1913

5.9.3.3. Greece versus Bulgaria

5.9.3.4. Greece – Division I and V; approximately 24,000 soldiers (Hall 2000, 108)

5.9.3.5. Greece – Division I sustained the following casualties during the battle for Simitli: one officer and 40 enlisted men killed, seven officers and 336 enlisted men wounded and 102 enlisted men missing. Division V had very few casualties. (Army History Directorate 1998, 259); approximately 600 casualties.

5.9.3.6. Bulgaria – What was left of the depleted, retreating Bulgarian forces that were originally involved; approximately 27,000 troops.

5.9.3.7. Bulgaria – Unknown

5.9.3.8. Outcome – Greece won (Army History Directorate 1998, 259).

5.9.4. Bulgarian Counterattack toward Pehchevo and Mahomiye (Gedeon, 1998, 243-247)

5.9.4.1. "After reinforcing the 2nd Bulgarian Army with strong forces withdrawn from the Serbian front, on 15 July [Bulgaria] launched a counterattack against Divisions III and X at the heights of Beyaz Tepe and Zanoga, as well as against Division VII's covering detachmentin Mohomiye; this was a desperate attempt to block the Greek advance" (Hellenic Army General Staff 1998, 261)

5.9.4.2. Onset: 15/7/1913; Termination: 17/7/1913

5.9.4.3. Greece versus Bulgaria

5.9.4.4. Greece – Division III, X and VII; approximately 36,000 soldiers (Hall 2000, 108)

5.9.4.5. Greece – Division VII's casualties that day were very heavy: 11 officers and 238 enlisted men killed and 17 officers and 1062 enlisted men wounded. (Army History Directorate 1998, 264)

5.9.4.6. Bulgaria – 2ND Army, approximately 36,000 soldiers.

5.9.4.7. Bulgaria – Unknown

5.9.4.8. Outcome – Greece won. The Bulgarian attack was successfully repelled (Army History Directorate 1998, 261).

5.9.5. Battle of Kalimantsi (Hall, 2000, 120)

5.9.5.1. Serbian and Montenegrin forces attack the defending Bulgarians at Kalimantsi in northeastern Macedonia (Hall 2000, 120).

5.9.5.2. Onset: 18/7/1913; Termination: 18/7/1913

5.9.5.3. Bulgaria versus Serbian and Montenegrin Force

5.9.5.4. Serbia and Montenegrin Force – Serbian Third Army and an allied Montenegrin division, approximately 74,000 soldiers (Vachkov 2005, 131,139)

5.9.5.5. Serbia and Montenegrin Force – The Serbs and Montenegrins lost around 2700 dead and over 5000 wounded.

5.9.5.6. Bulgaria – Bulgarian Fourth Army, approximately 130,000 soldiers (Skoko 1982, 27)

5.9.5.7. Bulgaria – Approximately 7,700

5.9.5.8. Outcome – Bulgaria won (Hall 2010, 157). At Kalimantsi the Bulgarians won an important defensive battle. The Macedonian front held. This, together with the general defensive successes of the Bulgarian 1st and 3rd Armies to the north, protected western Bulgaria and Sofia from a Serbian invasion (Hall 2000, 121).

5.10. Estonian Liberation War

5.10.1. Soviet Russia's Offensive on Narva (Raun 2001, 107)

5.10.1.1. Soviet Russia stepped Soviet Russia in the second half of November and began a broad offensive to recover the areas of the former Russian empire that had been under German occupation. "With support from the Soviet Russian government, Bolshevik troops (overwhelmingly non-Estonians, chiefly Russians) began an

offensive in the second half of November 1918" (Plakans 2011, 300).

5.10.1.2. Onset: 22/11/1918; Termination: 28/11/1918

5.10.1.3. Russia versus Estonia and Germany

5.10.1.4. Russia – 6th Reb Rifle Division, 2800 infantry supported by a 700 strong naval party 49th Regiment-2nd Novgorod Division with 1500 infantry, and the 2nd Latvian Red Rifle Brigade with 2850 infantry. Total 7850 infantry (Estonian National Historical Committee 1968, 17, 19)

5.10.1.5. Russia – Unknown

5.10.1.6. Estonia and Germany – 4 regiments with sizes oscillating between 745 and 821 soldiers; 4000. German forces total 3000 men (Dowling 2015, 17, 19; Grimm1963, 42)

5.10.1.7. Estonia and Germany – Unknown

5.10.1.8. Outcome –Russia won. Having occupied Narva the Bolsheviks proclaimed an Estonian workers commune in November, 1918 (Palkans 2011, 300).

5.10.2. Estonian Counteroffensive (Raun 2001, 108; Estonian National Historical Committee 1968, 23)

5.10.2.1. In the first week of January, the Bolshevik advance was halted on all fronts, and the Estonian national forces began a counterattack on January 7 (Raun 2001, 108).

5.10.2.2. Onset: 7/1/1919; Termination: 1/2/1919

5.10.2.3. Russia versus Estonian troops and Finnish volunteers

5.10.2.4. Russia – 35 Soviet Regiments (600-700 men each); approximately 22,750

5.10.2.5. Russia – 5,600 casualties

5.10.2.6. Estonia – 15,000 Estonian troops, together with the 500 Finnish volunteers. See also Krepp 1980, 30.

5.10.2.7. Estonia – 7,500 casualties

5.10.2.8. Outcome – Estonia won.

5.10.3. Pskov Campaign (Raun 2001, 108)

5.10.3.1. Estonian forces planned to push the front out of Estonia in May 1919. "For the Soviets, one of the most bitter moments of the campaign came at the end of May 1919 near Pskov" (Raun 2001, 108).

5.10.3.2. Onset: ?/5/1919; Termination: ?/5/1919

5.10.3.3. Russia versus Estonian National Army and Latvians, Ingrians, Finns, Swedes and the Danes

5.10.3.4. Russia – 80,000 Red Army Forces

5.10.3.5. Russia – Unknown

5.10.3.6. Estonian National Army, Latvian, Ingrians, Finns, Swedes, Danes – 74,500 Estonian national army, including 2,750 Russians

of the White Army, 1,500 Latvians, 300 Ingrians, and 300 Finns, Swedes and the Danes (Raun 2001, 108).

5.10.3.7. Estonian National Army, Latvian, Ingrians, Finns, Swedes, Danes – Unknown

5.10.3.8. Outcome – Estonian coalition won.

5.11. Latvian Liberation War

5.11.1. **Marienburg Operation** (Maide 1933, 39)

5.11.1.1. As part of a general push towards Svanenburg-Jakobstadt, Latvian command sends Division II from Petseri with the objective of conquering Marienburg

5.11.1.2. Onset: 27/5/1919; Termination: 5/6/1919

5.11.1.3. Latvia versus Russia

5.11.1.4. Latvia – 1st Riding Regiment, 1st Latvian Volmar Regiment, 1st Regiment Battalion, Denmark company and 2nd riding regiment. Approximately 8,550 total (Maide 1933, 17, 22).

5.11.1.5. Latvia – Unknown

5.11.1.6. Russia – Unknown

5.11.1.7. Russia – Unknown

5.11.1.8. Outcome – Latvia won (Maide 1933, 25).

5.11.2. **Assault on Svaneburg** (Maide 1933, 21)

5.11.2.1. Latvian attack on Svaneburg led by 1st Cavalry Regiment in order to break out at the station from Svaneburg to Potalovo

5.11.2.2. Onset: 30/5/1919; Termination: 31/5/1919

5.11.2.3. Latvia versus Russia

5.11.2.4. Latvia – 1st riding regiment with two cannons, 1st Regiment I Battalion, Danes and the 3rd Artillery Regiment's 5th Battery. Unit Sizes Unknown

5.11.2.5. Latvia – Unknown

5.11.2.6. Russia – Unknown

5.11.2.7. Russia – Unknown

5.11.2.8. Outcome – Latvia won.

5.11.3. **Battle of Jakobstadt** (Maide 1933, 21-22)

5.11.3.1. Major General Laidoner, the Latvian C-in-C directs two divisions to press on the retreat of the Southern Army. His intention is to destroy this force and push from Svaneburg to Kreuzburg

5.11.3.2. Onset: 3/6/1919; Termination: 5/6/1919

5.11.3.3. Latvia and Estonia versus Russia

5.11.3.4. Latvia and Estonia – 580 Latvians, 1,270 Estonians; 1,850 total.

5.11.3.5. Latvia – Unknown

5.11.3.6. Russia – Unknown

5.11.3.7. Russia – Unknown

5.11.3.8. Outcome – Latvia won (Maide 1933, 26).

5.11.4. Battle of Vonnu (Maide 1933, 34)

5.11.4.1. German forces engage a joint Estonian and Latvian army with the intent of establishing a strong German foothold in the Baltics for future conflict against the Allies (Szlanta 2014)

5.11.4.2. Onset: 8/6/1919; Termination: 9/6/1919

5.11.4.3. Estonia and Latvia versus Germany

5.11.4.4. Estonia and Latvia – 7,000 soldiers, three armoured trains, thirty-two guns, and 250 machine guns and automatic rifles (Szlanta 2014)

5.11.4.5. Estonia and Latvia – The Estonian army had 110 killed and 405 wounded and missing soldiers; the Northern Latvian Brigade had thirteen killed and forty-three wounded soldiers (Szlanta 2014)

5.11.4.6. Germany – Iron Division' and the Baltische Landeswehr composed of 9,000 soldiers with sixty-six guns and 520 machine guns (Szlanta 2014).

5.11.4.7. Germany – The Landeswehr had sixty-five killed and fifteen missing soldiers. The losses among the soldiers of the Iron Division are not known but were likely significant as well (Szlanta 2014).

5.11.4.8. Outcome – Germany won (Maide 1933, 36).

5.11.5. Battle of Lemsalu (Maide 1933, 40-72; Von der Gotz 1920, 204)

5.11.5.1. Von der Goltz races to engage Latvian-Estonian forces in order to defeat them in preparation for a potential confrontation with Red Army forces operating in the Gulf of Riga.

5.11.5.2. Onset: 19/6/1919; Termination: 23/6/1919

5.11.5.3. Latvia and Estonia versus Germany

5.11.5.4. Estonia and Latvia – 4560 Estonian troops and 1430 Latvian troops

5.11.5.5. Estonia and Latvia – Unknown

5.11.5.6. Germany – 2,750 total

5.11.5.7. Germany – Unknown

5.11.5.8. Outcome – Estonia and Latvia won.

5.11.6. Koiva River Assault (Maide 1933, 73-77)

5.11.6.1. As part of a Latvian advance to Riga, the Latvian 9th Regiment takes position on the left bank of the Koiva River to cross it

5.11.6.2. Onset: 30/6/1919; Termination: 3/7/1919

5.11.6.3. Latvia versus Germany

5.11.6.4. Latvia – 9th Regiment. Unit Size Unknown.

5.11.6.5. Latvia – Unknown

5.11.6.6. Germany – Unknown

5.11.6.7. Germany – Unknown

5.11.6.8. Outcome – Latvia won.

5.12. Russo-Polish War

5.12.1. Polish Invasion of Ukraine (Clodfelter 2008, 370; Zamoyski 2008, 35-36)

5.12.1.1. General Pilsudski invaded Ukraine and captured Kiev. The primary purpose of the gambit was to destroy the menacing Twelfth Army concentrated in the Ukraine, and cut off from one of her primary sources of bread, iron, and coal. In the meantime the Petlura regime was to settle down, consolidate its hold on the country, set up administrative bodies, and strengthen its armed forces (Dziewanowski 1969, 294).

5.12.1.2. Onset: 25/4/1920; Termination: 7/5/1920

5.12.1.3. Poland versus Russia

5.12.1.4. Poland – 52,000

5.12.1.5. Poland – 150 killed and 300 wounded

5.12.1.6. Russia – 200,000 from the Twelfth and Fourteenth Armies

5.12.1.7. Russia – 30,000 POWs

5.12.1.8. Outcome – Poland won. On 25 April 1920, Polish forces advanced to capture Kiev. The audacity of this offensive surprised the Red Army and started a general widrawl along the entire front. The Red Army avoided battle, and by 8 May Polish forces had occupied the city. Tactically the operation was a success, but operationally and strategically it was a failure. The Poles extended their front and spread their forces, but failed to defeat the Red Army. Politically, Poland's offensive on Kiev turned European support against them. (Worrell 1994, 25).

5.12.2. Battle of Berezina (Davies, 1972, 133-134; Zamoyski 2008, 40)

5.12.2.1. An improvised, preventative operation that took place around the Berezina River in Nothern Belarus/Poland (Davies 1972, 133)

5.12.2.2. Onset: 15/5/1920; Termination: 1/6/1920

5.12.2.3. Poland versus Russia

5.12.2.4. Poland – Polish Fourth Army and First Army, with 95,000 total

5.12.2.5. Poland – Unknown

5.12.2.6. Russia – The XV army with six divisions of infantry crossed the Dvina. It was joined soon afterwards by the XVI Army's siege of Borisov. Approximately 115,000 total.

5.12.2.7. Russia – Unknown

5.12.2.8. Outcome – Russia won. The Red Army pushed the Polish forces back 70 miles from the initial starting point, yet were unsuccessful in capturing the city of Borisov (Davies 1972, 133)

5.12.3. Soviet Offensive of Byelorussia (Davies, 1972, 145-146)

5.12.3.1. Red Army forces commanded by Marshal Tukhachevsky attacked Polish forces in Belarus with the intent of pushing them

back to Warsaw and encircling and destroying the Polish First Army.

5.12.3.2. Onset: 04/7/1920; Termination: 19/7/1920

5.12.3.3. Poland versus Russia

5.12.3.4. Poland – 60,000 (Zamoyski 2008, 83)

5.12.3.5. Poland – Approximately 44,000 killed, wounded, captured, missing, or deserted (Zamoyski 2008, 91).

5.12.3.6. Russia - 10th Infantry Division, 8th Infantry Division; 120,000 (Zamoyski 2008, 83)

5.12.3.7. Russia – Unknown

5.12.3.8. Outcome – Russia won. Polish forces were forced out of Belarus and assumed defensive positions along the old German trenches from World War I. While the offensive was a victory for Tukhachevsky, it was hardly decisive despite his assurances to Kamenev that the 'main forces of the shattered enemy are fleeing . . . in complete disorder (Zamoyski 2008, 90).

5.12.4. Battle of Grodno (Davies, 1972, 148; Zamoyski 2008, 51-56)

5.12.4.1. General Szeptycki, commander of the Polish First Army, attempted to exploit the fact that his own spearheads had drifted southward in the retreat while the Russian spearheads, which had reached Grodno, were far ahead of the rest and decided to mount an attack in a northerly direction . . . to cut them off (Zamoyski 56).

5.12.4.2. Onset: 19/7/1920; Termination: 31/7/1920

5.12.4.3. Poland versus Russia.

5.12.4.4. Poland – Polish First Army, 36,000 strong (Zamoyski 2008, 52) including two companies of tanks . . . some thirty vehicles in all (Davies 1972, 148).

5.12.4.5. Poland – Grodno yielded 5,000 [Polish] prisoners . . . 300 uhlans were sabred. Another 500, an entire Polish regiment, were drowned when they tried to swim their laden mounts in panic across the swift-flowing Niemen (Davis 147-148); 500 killed (Nowik 2004, 546)

5.12.4.6. Russia – 3rd Cavalry Corps (Konkorpus III) consisting of two divisions of horse and an infantry brigade; approximately 16,300 total (Weygand 1957, 113; Zamoyski 2008, 51)

5.12.4.7. Russia – Unknown

5.12.4.8. Outcome – Russia won. The 3rd Cavalry Corps under the command of Gai Dmitrevich Bzhishkian seized Grodno before Szeptycki could launch his counter-attack. While the First Army did reclaim the fortress briefly, Gai's forces reestablished control over the city by July 24, casuing the Poles to retreat back to the natural line of defense, along the rivers Bug and Narew (Zamoyski 2008, 56).

5.12.5. Russian Counteroffensive for Ukraine (Clodfelter 2008, 370)

5.12.5.1. Russia launched a counteroffensive to retake Kiev and push the Poles out of Ukraine

5.12.5.2. Onset: 27/5/1920; Termination 25/7/1920

5.12.5.3. Poland versus Russia

5.12.5.4. Poland – 94,000

5.12.5.5. Poland – Unknown

5.12.5.6. Russia – Konarmiya consisting of two infantry divisions and four cavalry divisions amounting to 18,000 sabres, 52-field guns, 5 armored trains, 8 armored cars, and a squadron of fifteen planes. Approximately 42,000 total (Weygand 1957, 114; Zamoyski 2008, 59)

5.12.5.7. Russia – Unknown

5.12.5.8. Outcome – Russia won. Budyonny's Konarmiya routed the Polish army in Ukraine, retaking Kiev and forcing the Poles back to Poland. While Budyonny has been criticized in retrospect for being unable to fully capitalize on the victory, the Konarmiya's victory in Ukraine left 'the whole structure of the [Polish] Ukrainian Front . . . soundly shaken and . . . momentarily perched on the edge of fiasco. Moreover, after forcing the Poles out of Ukraine, the invasion of the Ukraine . . . rapidly [turned] into an invasion of Poland (Zamoyski 2008, 80).

5.12.6. Battle of Warsaw (Clodfelter 2008, 370)

5.12.6.1. Tukhachevsky's forces launched a final assult on Warsaw with the intent of destroying Pilsudski's army and overrunning Poland.

5.12.6.2. Onset: 20/8/1920; Termination: 25/8/1920

5.12.6.3. Poland versus Russia

5.12.6.4. Poland – 180,000

5.12.6.5. Poland – 4,362 KIA and 21,751 WIA

5.12.6.6. Russia – 150,000 (Clodfelter 2008, 370); Worrell 1994 reports a slightly higher figure of 200,000 divided into four armies with four divisions each, a cavalry corps with two divisions, and the Mozyer Group consisting of two division equivalents (Worrell 1994, 30).

5.12.6.7. Russia – 100,000 including 66,000 POWs; Another 30,000 Russians were interned in East Prussia

5.12.6.8. Outcome – Poland won.

5.12.7. Battle of the Zamosc Ring (Davies, 1972, 228-231)

5.12.7.1. Polish and Russian forces engage in what has been called the greatest cavalry battle since 1813 and the only one in the 20th century near Zamosc in southeastern Poland (Davies 1972, 226).

5.12.7.2. Onset: 30/8/1920; Termination: 2/9/1920

5.12.7.3. Poland versus Russia

5.12.7.4. Poland - Third Army consisting of the 7th Infantry Division, 2nd Legionary Division, 6th Ukrainian Division, and Kuban Cavalry

Brigade. Elements of the Sixth Army including the 13th Infantry Division and 1st Cavalry Division. The city of Zamosc was garrisoned by three local battalions hurriedly reinforced by the 10th Infantry Division. Approximately 35,600 total (Davies 1972, 227; Palij 1995, 100)

5.12.7.5. Poland - 500 killed

5.12.7.6. Russia - 17500 men, 20 regiments; Konarmiya consisting of four cavalry divisions. (Davis 1972, 227) Cavalry divisions were 16500 strong. Total 34000. (Palij 1995, 115)

5.12.7.7. Russia - 400 killed

5.12.7.8. Outcome – Poland won. Polish forces defeated Budyonny's Konarmiya, yet allowed Budyonny's forces to escape and consequently "the Konarmiya lived to fight again." The victory, however, was crucial for Poland in consolidating its victory at Warsaw a week prior (Davies 1972, 230-231).

5.12.8. Battle of the Niemen (Davies, 1972, 234-235; Nowik 2004, 1054)

5.12.8.1. Pilsudski conceived a plan of classic simplicity. The Red Army's frontal sector was to be engaged and held round Grodno and Woklowyski; its flanks were to be turned by cavalry leading a strike force round the rear; its centre could then be sandwiched and munched at leisure (Davies 1972, 233).

5.12.8.2. Onset: 20/9/1920; Termination: 1/10/1920

5.12.8.3. Poland versus Russia

5.12.8.4. Poland – About 96,300; Eleven divisions with 90,000-100,000 troops (Zamoyski 2008, 183).

5.12.8.5. Poland – 7000

5.12.8.6. Russia – About 100,000; 100,000-120,000 (Zamoyski 2008, 183)

5.12.8.7. Russia – About 40,000

5.12.8.8. Outcome – Poland won. The combined effect of the Zamosc Ring and the Battle of the Niemen was to facilitate a general Polish advance on all sectors of the front . . . By the end of September, Galicia was cleared; the XII and XIV Armies were in full fight; the Konarmiya had been withdrawn (Davies 1972, 235).

5.13. Hungarian Adversaries War

5.13.1. Romanian Intervention (Szilassy 1971, 37)

5.13.1.1. In April, Romanian forces invaded Hungary with Allied support in an attempt to dislodge the nascent Communist regime in Budapest and secure territory which it claimed from Hungary. Czechoslovak troops invaded simultaneously from the north.

5.13.1.2. Onset: 16/4/1919; Termination: 3/5/1919 (Szilassy 1971, 39; Nagy 1973, 441)

5.13.1.3. Hungary versus Romanin

5.13.1.4. Hungary – 25,000 (Romsics 2002, 97)
5.13.1.5. Hungary – unknown
5.13.1.6. Romania – 50,000 soldiers organized in 7 divisions (Szilassy 1971, 37)
5.13.1.7. Romanian – Unknown
5.13.1.8. Outcome – Romania won. By the end of April, [the Romanians] were successful, they reached the Tisza [river], and the territory which they had claimed was secured (Balogh 1975, 298). The Hungarian Red Army was unable to put up serious resisteance to the Romanians because they were still int eh process of being organized (Nagy 1973, 441).

5.13.2. Tiza Offensive (Clodfelter 2008, 370)
5.13.2.1. Hungary reorganized and increased the size of its military in May. Following a successful offensive against Czechoslovak forces in Slovakia, Hungary turned its attention to Romanian troops which were still stationed on the Tisza River.
5.13.2.2. Onset: 10/7/1919; Termination: 31/7/1919
5.13.2.3. Hungary versus Romania
5.13.2.4. Hungary – 31,000; 78 divisions, 3 cavalry divisions, and 91 artellierty batteries (Szilassy 1971, 45)
5.13.2.5. Hungary – unknown
5.13.2.6. Romania – 96,000; 92 infantry divisions and 58 cavlry divisions.
5.13.2.7. Romania – unknown
5.13.2.8. Outcome – Romania won. In spite of the Rumanian military superiority the Hungaian units crossed the Tisza river and forced the enemy to retreat until July 23, but on July 24 the Rumanians took over the initiative. On July 30 they established beachheads on the right bank of the Tisza and their advancement toward Budapest could no longer be checked. The Hungarian Red Army, demoralized earlier by the forced retreat in the north [from Czechoslovak occupied Slovakia], streamed back disorderly (Szilassy 1971, 45).

5.13.3. Romanian Counteroffensive (Clodfelter 2008, 370)
5.13.3.1. Following the failed Tisza offensive, Hungarian forces retreated in the face of the advancing Romanian army which had crossed the Tisza and were only 100 kilometers from Budapest (Nagy 1973, 441).
5.13.3.2. Onset: 31/7/1919; Termination: 4/8/1919
5.13.3.3. Hungary versus Romania
5.13.3.4. Hungary – 6 divisions. Unit Size Unknown.
5.13.3.5. Hungary – Over 40,000 Hungarians in 6 divisions laid down their arms.
5.13.3.6. Romania – unknown
5.13.3.7. Romania – 3,000

5.13.3.8. Outcome – Romania won (Szilassy 1941, 46 and Macartney 1962, 205)

5.14. Second Greco-Turkish War

5.14.1. **Battle of Eskisehir** (Clodfelter 2008, 371)

5.14.1.1. Attempt by the Greeks to take Eskishehir, repulsed by Turkey.
5.14.1.2. Onset: ?/1/1921; Termination: ?/3/1921
5.14.1.3. Greece versus Turkey
5.14.1.4. Greece – 37,000
5.14.1.5. Greece – 5,000
5.14.1.6. Turkey – 35,000
5.14.1.7. Turkey – 5,000
5.14.1.8. Outcome – Turkey won.

5.14.2. **First Battle of Inonu** (Shaw and Shaw 1976, 357-358)

5.14.2.1. Greek offensive which met strong Turkish resistance
5.14.2.2. Onset: 06/01/1921; Termination: 10/01/1921
5.14.2.3. Greece versus Turkey
5.14.2.4. Greece – 18,000 soldiers (Vere-Hodge 1950, 30, 34)
5.14.2.5. Greece – 51 killed, 130 wounded (History Department of the Army 1967)
5.14.2.6. Turkey – 6,000 soldiers (Vere-Hodge 1950, 30, 34)
5.14.2.7. Turkey – 95 killed, 183 wounded, and 211 prisoners (History Department of the Army 1967)
5.14.2.8. Outcome – Turkey won. Successful Turkish defense and Greek retreat

5.14.3. **Second Battle of Inonu** (Shaw and Shaw 1976, 359)

5.14.3.1. Greek offensive.
5.14.3.2. Onset: 27/03/1921; Termination: 01/04/1921
5.14.3.3. Greece versus Turkey
5.14.3.4. Greece – 30,000
5.14.3.5. Greece – 707 killed, 3075 wounded and 503 missing (History Department of the Army 1967, 116)
5.14.3.6. Turkey – 15,000 (History Department of the Army 1967, 116)
5.14.3.7. Turkey – 681 killed, 1822 wounded, 1369 prisoners and missing
5.14.3.8. Outcome – Turkey won. Successful Turkish defense and Greek retreat

5.14.4. **Second Battle of Eskisehir** (Clodfelter 2008, 371)

5.14.4.1. Greek offensive at Afyon and Eskiehir; Drove Turks back 30 miles to the northeast along the Sakarya River.
5.14.4.2. Onset: 16/7/1921; Termination 28/7/1921
5.14.4.3. Greece versus Turkey
5.14.4.4. Greece – 126,000

5.14.4.5. Greece – 1,491 KIA, 6,454 WIA, 110 MIS
5.14.4.6. Turkey – 122,000
5.14.4.7. Turkey – 11,000
5.14.4.8. Outcome – Greece won.

5.14.5. Battle of Sakarya (Clodfelter 2008, 371; Shaw and Shaw 1976, 360)
5.14.5.1. The Greek army advances to Sakarya on August 13th with Ankara being its final objective. Once the Greek army reached Sakarya.
5.14.5.2. Onset: 24/8/1921; Termination 16/9/1921
5.14.5.3. Greece versus Turkey
5.14.5.4. Greece – 50,000
5.14.5.5. Greece – 3,897 killed, 19,000 wounded, 15,000 missing or captured
5.14.5.6. Turkey – 52,000
5.14.5.7. Turkey – 3,700 killed, 18,000 wounded, 1,000 missing
5.14.5.8. Outcome – Turkey won.

5.14.6. Turkish Offensive of 1922 (Clodfelter 2008, 371; Shaw and Shaw 1976, 362)
5.14.6.1. Turkish offensive in Anatolia
5.14.6.2. Onset: 18/8/1922; Termination 3/9/1922
5.14.6.3. Greece versus Turkey
5.14.6.4. Greece – 255,000
5.14.6.5. Greece – 50,000
5.14.6.6. Turkey – 208,000
5.14.6.7. Turkey – 13,000 killed in battle and 35,000 wounded
5.14.6.8. Outcome – Turkey won.

5.15. Franco-Turkish War

5.15.1. Siege of Aintab (Shepard, 1921, 590)
5.15.1.1. French siege to Turks occupying Aintab which resulted in Turkish surrender after French reinforcements arrived in August 1921
5.15.1.2. Onset: 04/01/1920; Termination: 02/08/1921
5.15.1.3. France versus Turkey
5.15.1.4. France – 12,000 French soldiers, and 1500 of them part of the French Armenian Legion (Kerr 1973, 222)
5.15.1.5. France – 1,200 French killed (Akçora 1995)
5.15.1.6. Turkey – 2,920 militia fighters (Akçora 1995)
5.15.1.7. Turkey – Unknown
5.15.1.8. Outcome – Turks surrender.

5.16. Lithuanian-Polish War

5.16.1. Battle of Sejny (Borzecki 2008, 105)

5.16.1.1. As the Russians retreated from Warsaw, Pilsudski devised a plan to push them out of Polish territory entirely. In an attempt to outflank the Russians from the north, Polish troops crossed into Lithuanian territory near Sejny and engaged Lithuanian troops which had infiltrated that territory since the summer of 1920 (Davies 1972, 233).

5.16.1.2. Onset: 8/28/1920; Termination: 9/13/1920

5.16.1.3. Poland versus Lithuania

5.16.1.4. Poland – 1st Legionary Division, 1st Lithuanian-Byelorussian Division, and two cavalry brigades (Davies 1972, 235; Borzecki 2008, 106). Unit Size Unknown.

5.16.1.5. Poland – Unknown

5.16.1.6. Lithuania – Two divisions; The Poles faced a considerably smaller Lithuanian force which included seventeen infantry battalians, three caverly squadrons, six artillery batteries, and two armed cars. Approximately 11,279 total (Lescius 2004, 36, 313, 315; Balkelis 2018)

5.16.1.7. Lithuania – 1700-2000 captured (Vikelis 2006, 66-68); As the remnants of the Lithuanian troops reeled back, their losses grew to 34 killed, 103 wounded, and more than 2,000 soldiers captured by the enemy during the Polish offensive (Balkelis 2018)

5.16.1.8. Outcome – Poland won (Borzecki 2008, 106).

5.16.2. Battle of Vilnius (Clodfelter 2008, 370; Snyder 2003)

5.16.2.1. The city of Vilnius was claimed by both Poland and Lithuania. On October 9, 1920, General Lucian Zeligowski tried to settle the dispute by force. At the head of a division of 20,000 Belo-Russian volunteers from the Polish army, he seized the city.

5.16.2.2. Onset: 9/10/1920; Termination: 16/10/1920

5.16.2.3. Poland versus Lithuania

5.16.2.4. Poland – 20,000

5.16.2.5. Poland – Unknown

5.16.2.6. Lithuania – 24,700 (Lescius 2004, 349)

5.16.2.7. Lithuania – Unknown

5.16.2.8. Outcome – Poland.

5.17. Manchurian War

5.17.1. Manzhouli-Chalainor Offensive (Patrikeeff 2002, 83; Lensen 1974, 60)

5.17.1.1. The opening action of the Manchurian War, a relatively small infantry division assaulted the Maznhouli-Chalainor line.

5.17.1.2. Onset: 17/08/1929; Termination: 17/08/1929

5.17.1.3. Russia versus China and Mongolian mercenaries

5.17.1.4. Russia – 10,000 soldiers and 30 guns

5.17.1.5. Russia – Unkown; Heavy casualties

5.17.1.6. China and Mongolian mercenaries – Approximately 50 (Patrikeeff 2002, 83)
5.17.1.7. China and Mongolian mercenaries – Unknown
5.17.1.8. Outcome – Chinese forces retreated some 400 yards to an entrenchment which was well-supported by machine gun emplacements, and as a consequence inflicted heavy losses on the Russian forces. Pyrrhic Russian victory.

5.17.2. Soviet raid on Chalainor (Walker 2017, 173, 201)
5.17.2.1. A contact between Soviet cavalry and a Chinese patrol led to an assault against the main elements of the Chinese 38th regiment.
5.17.2.2. Russia vs China
5.17.2.3. Onset: 17/08/1929; Termination: 17/08/1929
5.17.2.4. Russia – elements of the 5th Cavalry Brigade with an estimated total of 1,200 soldiers.
5.17.2.5. Russia – 20 dead
5.17.2.6. China – 1 infantry regiment totaling 1,700 soldiers dividing brigade size by its triangular formation without factoring support personnel
5.17.2.7. China – Unknown
5.17.2.8. Outcome – Soviet assaulted is stopped by Chinese 38th infantry regiment

5.17.3. Battle of Poltavka (Walker 2017, 161, 173, 202)
5.17.3.1. Soviet battle against Chinese border regiment.
5.17.3.2. Russia vs China
5.17.3.3. Onset: 18/08/1929; Termination: 19/08/1929
5.17.3.4. Russia – 1 rifle division estimated at 190 troops
5.17.3.5. Russia – Unknown
5.17.3.6. China – Kirin Regiment totaling 1,700 soldiers
5.17.3.7. China – Unknown; Heavy casualties
5.17.3.8. Outcome – Soviet forces rout Kirin regiment and land an irregular cavalry force near Lopeh that advance 200 km before pulling back.

5.17.4. Battle of Abagaitevskya (Walker 2017, 161, 173, 202)
5.17.4.1. Soviet army and border forces units engage Chinese Chailanor (Dalainor) garrison near the village of Abagaitevskya.
5.17.4.2. Russia vs China
5.17.4.3. Onset: 20/08/1929; Termination: 22/08/1929
5.17.4.4. Russia – 108th Rifle Regiment estimated at 190 troops with undetermined support from GPU border guards; 5th Cavalry Brigade (Walker 2017, 202).
5.17.4.5. Russia – Unknown
5.17.4.6. China-38th Infantry regiment totaling 1,700 soldiers
5.17.4.7. China – Unknown

5.17.4.8. Outcome – The Soviet offensive was halted and on the 22nd, the Soviets were permitted to recover their dead in front of the 38th Regiment's trench lines (Walker 2017, 202).

5.17.5. Battle of Suifenho (Walker 2017, 161, 173, 200)

5.17.5.1. Soviet army offensive against the Suifenho railway yards and stores

5.17.5.2. Russia vs China

5.17.5.3. Onset: 24/08/1929; Termination: 10/09/1929

5.17.5.4. Russia – 1 battalion and 1 rifle Division estimated at 3,000 soldiers

5.17.5.5. Russia – Unknown

5.17.5.6. China – 21st Kirin Mixed Brigade made up of 5,200 soldiers

5.17.5.7. China – Unknown

5.17.5.8. Outcome – Although most of the Red Army's ground assaults failed, eventually railhead is eliminated through sheer air bombardment of locality.

5.17.6. October Trans-Baikal District offensive (Walker 2017, 163, 173, 221-222)

5.17.6.1. Elements of the 19th Rifle Corps of the Trans-Baikal military district launch an offensive against Chinese infantry Brigade.

5.17.6.2. Russia vs China

5.17.6.3. Onset: 02/10/1929; Termination: 03/10/1929

5.17.6.4. Russia – 12,000 soldiers in three rifle divisions of the 19th Corps

5.17.6.5. Russia – 314 killed and wounded (Walker 2017, 222)

5.17.6.6. China – 5200 soldiers

5.17.6.7. China – at least 40 killed (Walker 2017, 222)

3.1.1.1. Outcome – Russian troops captured the Chinese trench positions but were later expelled by a counterattack; draw.

5.17.7. Battle of Teheiho (Walker 2017, 163, 173, 223-224)

5.17.7.1. 12th Corps attack in the Northern front over the froze waters of the Amur

5.17.7.2. Onset: 08/10/1929; Termination: 12/10/1929

5.17.7.3. Russia vs China

5.17.7.4. Russia – 12th Corps totaling 12,000 troops

5.17.7.5. Russia – Unknown

5.17.7.6. China – 5,200 troops of the 3rd Brigade

5.17.7.7. China – Unknown

5.17.7.8. Outcome – Successful Chinese defense of Teheiho

5.17.8. Sungari River Amphibious Operation (Walker 2017, 163, 173, 226-231)

5.17.8.1. Soviet amphibious landings to raid Tungchiang and Fuchin in order to threaten Harbin; featured the largest naval engagement up to that time since the end of World War I (Walker 2017, 228).
5.17.8.2. Onset: 12/10/1929; Termination: 2/11/1929
5.17.8.3. Russia vs China
5.17.8.4. Russia – 2nd Rifle Division with 2,400 soldiers
5.17.8.5. Russia – 272 casualties
5.17.8.6. China – 9th Kirin Mixed Brigade at 5,200 soldiers
5.17.8.7. China – 373 casualties
5.17.8.8. Outcome – 2nd Rifle Division routs Chinese Brigade; Soviet victory.

5.17.9. The Mishan Operation
5.17.9.1. Attack was to take Mishan, render mines useless, and return across the border. It was a punitive operation
5.17.9.2. Onset: 17/11/1929; Termination: 18/11/1929
5.17.9.3. Russia vs China
5.17.9.4. Russia – 1st Pacific Infantry Division plust a Cavalry Brigade. Division was at 2,400 men strength and I estimate Cavalry Brigade at 1,200 men, totaling troops at 3,600 men.
5.17.9.5. Russia – Unknown
5.17.9.6. China – 1 Cavalry Division and an independent cavalry Brigade. Later an infantry regiment joined them. Unit Sizes Unknown.
5.17.9.7. China – 1,500 killed
5.17.9.8. Outcome – Soviets inflicted heavy casualties on Chinese defenders and seemed to have accomplished their punishment

5.17.10. OVDA (Special Far East Army) offensive (Patrikeeff 2002, 84; Walker 2017, 195)
5.17.10.1. General offensive against the Chalainor-Manzhouili line. A preemptive Russian offensive to prevent the massing of Chinese troops in the border which would have later outnumbered the former by a 3 to 1 ratio (Lensen 1974, 61).
5.17.10.2. Onset: 17/11/1929; Termination: 20/11/1929
5.17.10.3. Russia versus China and White Russians
5.17.10.4. Russia – Ten divisions made up of 8,000 infantry soldiers, 1,599 cavalry soldiers, 9 tanks, 32 aircraft, and 3 broneviki (Bisher 2005, 358; Patrikeeff 2002, 84, 98).
5.17.10.5. Russia – 123 dead and 605 wounded (Lensen 1974, 69)
5.17.10.6. China and White Russian Forces – 12,000 soldiers (Walker 2017, 247)
5.17.10.7. China and White Russian Forces – 1,500 dead, 8,000 captured, 1,000 wounded (Bisher 2005, 359; Lensen 1974, 69)
5.17.10.8. Outcome – Soviet invasion was a significant success in just 48 hours and routed the Chinese Army to the East which ultimately had to be put down by General Wan Fulin to prevent it from

entering and plundering Harbin. On 26 November, Zhang Xueliang accepted Soviet terms of July.

5.18. Second Sino-Japanese War

5.18.1. Defense of Nenjiang Railway Bridge (Coogan 1994, 285)

5.18.1.1. A Japanese force is deployed to cover the repairs of Nenjiang railway bridge and came into clash with Chinese troops commanded by Chinese General Ma Chan-Shan
5.18.1.2. Onset: 4/11/1931; Termination: 9/11/1931
5.18.1.3. Japan versus China
5.18.1.4. Japan – 30000
5.18.1.5. Japan – Around 11000
5.18.1.6. China – Around 20000
5.18.1.7. China – 2000
5.18.1.8. Outcome – Japan won.

5.18.2. Battle of Harbin (Coogan 1994, 284-285)

5.18.2.1. Harbin is sieged and falls in Japanese hands under the command of General Jiro Ta-mon.
5.18.2.2. Onset: 25/1/1932; Termination: 4/2/1932
5.18.2.3. Japan versus Republic of China
5.18.2.4. Japan – Around 5,500
5.18.2.5. Japan – 96 killed, 80 wounded and 64 captured
5.18.2.6. China – Around 12,000-13,000
5.18.2.7. China – 1,500
5.18.2.8. Outcome – Japan won.

5.18.3. Battle of Shanghai (Burkman 2007, 167; Zhou 2011)

5.18.3.1. After the Japanese Consul General in Shanghai demanded a formal apology from the city mayor due to the death of Japanese citizens, which was not fully met, Tokyo sent a power naval force which would end on Japanese marines moving to Chapei and clashing with Chinese soldiers of the Nineteenth Route Army (Hoyt 1986, p. 99).
5.18.3.2. Onset: 28/1/1932; Termination: 3/3/1932
5.18.3.3. Japan versus Republic of China
5.18.3.4. Japan – Around 70,000
5.18.3.5. Japan – 10,000
5.18.3.6. China – 50,000
5.18.3.7. China – 14,000
5.18.3.8. Outcome – Japan won.

5.19. Chaco War

5.19.1. Battle of Boquerón (Clodfelter 2008, 413 and 414)

5.19.1.1. On September 9, Paraguay struck with 7,565 men against the Bolivia I corps. In 21 days of fighting, the Paraguayans captured Boquerón from its 711-man garrison.
5.19.1.2. Onset: 9/9/1932; Termination: 30/9/1932
5.19.1.3. Paraguay versus Bolivia
5.19.1.4. Paraguay – 7,565
5.19.1.5. Paraguay – 1,513
5.19.1.6. Bolivia – 3,900
5.19.1.7. Bolivia – 1,200 killed or wounded, 844 captured
5.19.1.8. Outcome – Paraguay won.

5.19.2. Battle of Nanawa (first assault) (Clodfelter 2008, 413-414; Casabianca 1999, 9-55)
5.19.2.1. The first assault of Bolivia's 4th and 7th Divisions [on a Paraguayan fortress], delivered in a heavy downpour on January 19th was repulsed by Paraguay's 2,500-man 5th Division.
5.19.2.2. Onset: 9/1/1933; Termination: 31/1/1933
5.19.2.3. Paraguay versus Bolivia
5.19.2.4. Paraguay – 2,500
5.19.2.5. Paraguay – 248 casualties
5.19.2.6. Boliva – 6,000
5.19.2.7. Bolivia – 500
5.19.2.8. Outcome – Paraguay won.

5.19.3. Battle of Nanawa (second assault) (Clodfelter 2008, 413-414; Casabianca 1999, 287-316)
5.19.3.1. Bolivia launched a grand assault on the Paraguayan fortress, now defended by 9,000 Paraguayans along the extended front, 6,000 of them at Nanawa itself. The five-day battled ended again in Bolivian failure.
5.19.3.2. Onset: 4/7/1933; Termination: 8/7/1933
5.19.3.3. Paraguay versus Bolivia
5.19.3.4. Paraguay – 6,592
5.19.3.5. Paraguay – 159 killed and 400 wounded; 636 total casualties
5.19.3.6. Bolivia – 6,818
5.19.3.7. Bolivia – 2,000
5.19.3.8. Outcome – Paraguay won.

5.19.4. Battle of Campo Via (Clodfelter 2008, 413 and 414)
5.19.4.1. Paraguayan offensive that retook Alihuata and Saaverda.
5.19.4.2. Onset: 23/10/1933; Termination 13/12/1933
5.19.4.3. Paraguay versus Bolivia
5.19.4.4. Paraguay – 26,500
5.19.4.5. Paraguay – 8,000
5.19.4.6. Bolivia – 17,000
5.19.4.7. Bolivia – 2,686 killed and 4,856 captured

5.19.4.8. Outcome – Paraguay won.

5.19.5. Battle of Cañada El Carmen (Clodfelter 2008, 414)
- **5.19.5.1.** Paraguayan attack against Bolivia at Cañada el Carmen.
- **5.19.5.2.** Onset: 11/11/1934; Termination 16/11/1934
- **5.19.5.3.** Paraguay versus Bolivia
- **5.19.5.4.** Paraguay – 4,500 engaged (of 11,000 in the battle zone)
- **5.19.5.5.** Paraguay – 668 (Casabianca 2000, 161; English 2018, 234)
- **5.19.5.6.** Bolivia – 9,000
- **5.19.5.7.** Bolivia – 2,669 killed or died of thirst, 4,000 captured
- **5.19.5.8.** Outcome – Paraguay won.

5.20. Saudi-Yemeni War

5.20.1. Conquest of Sa'da (Kostiner 1993, 170-171)
- **5.20.1.1.** Saudi forces under command of Prince Sa'ud manage to conquest Sa'da and cutoff Yemeni forces
- **5.20.1.2.** Onset: 03/04/1934; Termination: 07/04/1934
- **5.20.1.3.** Saudi Arabia vs Yemen
- **5.20.1.4.** Saudi Arabia – 30,000 (8,000 regulars) (Kostiner 1993, 170)
- **5.20.1.5.** Saudi Arabia – Unknown
- **5.20.1.6.** Yemen- 37,000 (12,000 regulars) (Kostiner 1993, 170)
- **5.20.1.7.** Yemen – Unknown
- **5.20.1.8.** Outcome – Prince Sa'ud and Faysal's forces successfully block the retreat of Yemeni forces from Najran which falls to them on April 21

5.20.2. Siege of Midi (Kostiner 1993, 171)
- **5.20.2.1.** Saudi commander Ibn Shuwwayr, reinforced later by Prince Faysal, lay siege to the coastal city of Midi
- **5.20.2.2.** Onset: 11/04/1934; Termination: 25/04/1934
- **5.20.2.3.** Saudi Arabia vs Yemen
- **5.20.2.4.** Saudi Arabia – Unknown
- **5.20.2.5.** Saudi Arabia – Unknown
- **5.20.2.6.** Yemen – Unknown
- **5.20.2.7.** Yemen – Unknown
- **5.20.2.8.** Outcome – Saudi's capture Midi and three days later enter in Hudayda

5.20.3. Battle at Najran
- **5.20.3.1.** Saudi forces fight to control city of Najran
- **5.20.3.2.** Onset: ?/04/1934; Termination: 21/04/1934
- **5.20.3.3.** Saudi Arabia vs Yemen
- **5.20.3.4.** Saudi Arabia – Unknown
- **5.20.3.5.** Saudi Arabia – Unknown
- **5.20.3.6.** Yemen – Unknown
- **5.20.3.7.** Yemen – Unknown

5.20.3.8. Outcome – Iman orders retreat on April 18 but Saudi forces having cutoff Yemenis seemed to have inflicted heavy damage and defeated them three days later.

5.20.4. Battle at Samtah (Advertiser 1934, 17)

5.20.4.1. Yemeni forces claimed to have engaged Saudi forces inflicting heavy damages on them, reports were not corroborated by Saudi sources

5.20.4.2. Onset: ?/04/1934; Termination: ?/04/1934

5.20.4.3. Saudi Arabia vs Yemen

5.20.4.4. Saudi Arabia – Unknown

5.20.4.5. Saudi Arabia – 400

5.20.4.6. Yemen – Unknown

5.20.4.7. Yemen – Unknown

5.20.4.8. Outcome – Saudi Arabia won.

5.21. Conquest of Ethiopia / Italian-Ethiopian War

5.21.1. Italian Invasion of Ethiopia (Clodfelter 2008, 381; Brody 1999)

5.21.1.1. On October 3, Italian forces struck from Eritrea in the northeast, while other columns invaded from Italian Somaliland in the southeast.

5.21.1.2. Onset: 3/10/1935; Termination: 11/10/1935

5.21.1.3. Italy versus Ethiopia

5.21.1.4. Italy – 160,000 (Barker 1968, 173; Marcus 2002, 142)

5.21.1.5. Italy – Unknown

5.21.1.6. Ethiopia – 350,000

5.21.1.7. Ethiopia - Unknown

5.21.1.8. Outcome – Italy won.

5.21.2. Ethiopian Counteroffensive in Tigre Province (Clodfelter 2008, 381; Baer 1976, 176)

5.21.2.1. Ethiopian forces of Ras Imru and Ras Kassa attempted a counteroffensive in Tigre Province

5.21.2.2. Onset: 15/12/1935; Termination: 20/1/1936

5.21.2.3. Italy versus Ethiopia

5.21.2.4. Italy – 70,000 (Mockler 2003, 84)

5.21.2.5. Italy – Unknown

5.21.2.6. Ethiopia – 100,000

5.21.2.7. Ethiopia – 5,000

5.21.2.8. Outcome – Ethiopia won.

5.21.3. Battle of Tembien Mountains (Clodfelter 2008, 381; Barker 1968, 246-248)

5.21.3.1. Anxious to get on with his armed reconstruction of the Roman Empire, Mussolini dispatched reinforcements. On Janruary 20,

Marshal Pietro Badoglio, with 7 Italian and 2 Eritrean divisions, resumed the offensive in the north, narrowly winning a close-fought battle in the Tembien Mountains.

5.21.3.2. Onset: 20/1/1936; Termination: 24/1/1936
5.21.3.3. Italy and Eritrea versus Ethiopia
5.21.3.4. Italy and Eritrea – 7 Italian and 2 Eritrean divisions; approximately 70,000 total (Barker 1971, 62)
5.21.3.5. Italy and Eritrea – 1,082 casualties
5.21.3.6. Ethiopia – 150,000 troops
5.21.3.7. Ethiopia – 8,000 casualties
5.21.3.8. Outcome – Italy and Eritrea Won.

5.21.4. Battle of Enderta (Amba Aradam) (Clodfelter 2008, 382)
5.21.4.1. Marshal Badoglio launches a flank and rear assault against the Ethiopian troops under Mulugeta in the Amba Aradam area
5.21.4.2. Onset: 10/2/1936; Termination 19/2/1936
5.21.4.3. Italy versus Ethiopia
5.21.4.4. Italy – 4 Italian Divisions. Unit Size Unknown.
5.21.4.5. Italy – 800
5.21.4.6. Ethiopia – Army of Ras Mulugueta. Unit Size Unknown.
5.21.4.7. Ethiopia – 6,000 Ethiopian were killed and twice that number wounded.
5.21.4.8. Outcome – Italy won.

5.21.5. Second Battle of Tembien (Clodfelter 2008, 382)
5.21.5.1. Italian Eritrean and Thid Corps converge on Abi Addi and outnumber and outmaneuver Ethiopian defenders leaving Tembien in their hands and Ras Imru's army as the last Ethiopian force between Badoglio and Addis Ababa.
5.21.5.2. Onset: 27/2/1936; Termination: 29/2/1936
5.21.5.3. Italy and Eritrea versus Ethiopia
5.21.5.4. Italy and Eritrea – 180,000 Italians and Askaris
5.21.5.5. Italy and Eritrea – 600
5.21.5.6. Ethiopia – 60,000
5.21.5.7. Ethiopia – 8,000
5.21.5.8. Outcome – Italy and Eritrea won.

5.21.6. Second Battle in Tigre Province (Clodfelter 2008, 382)
5.21.6.1. To the west, the last of the Ethiopian armies in the northern province of Tigre was attacked.
5.21.6.2. Onset: 29/2/1936; Termination: 3/4/1936
5.21.6.3. Italy versus Ethiopia
5.21.6.4. Italy – 47,000
5.21.6.5. Italy – 1,000 killed, wounded or missing (only 12 of them askaris).
5.21.6.6. Ethiopia – 25,000-man force of Ras Imru

5.21.6.7. Ethiopia – 4,000
5.21.6.8. Outcome – Italy won.

5.21.7. Battle at Mai Ceu (Clodfelter 2008, 382)
5.21.7.1. Now only Emperor Haile Selassie's personal army of 31,000 stood between the Italians and the Ethiopian capital at Addis Ababa. On March 31, this army, with support from two smaller columns, struck the Italian forward positions around Mai Ceu.
5.21.7.2. Onset: 31/3/1936; Termination: 4/4/1936
5.21.7.3. Italy and Eritrea versus Ethiopia
5.21.7.4. Italy and Eritrea – 40,000
5.21.7.5. Italy and Eritrea – 400 Italian solider and 873 Eritrean askaris KWM.
5.21.7.6. Ethiopia – 31,000
5.21.7.7. Ethiopia – 8,000
5.21.7.8. Outcome – Italy and Eritrea won.

5.21.8. Battle of Ogaden (Clodfelter 2008, 382)
5.21.8.1. In the south, Graziani's progress had been slow until April 15, 1936. On that day, he smashed 38,000 Italians, Somalis, and Libyans against a fortified line manned by 28,000 Ethiopians under the command of Ras Nasibu.
5.21.8.2. Onset: 15/4/1936; Termination 25/4/1936
5.21.8.3. Italy, Somalia, and Libya versus Ethiopia
5.21.8.4. Italy, Somalia, and Libya – 38,000, 15,600 of which were Italian (Barker 1968, 113)
5.21.8.5. Italy, Somalia, and Libya – 2,000
5.21.8.6. Ethiopia – 28,000
5.21.8.7. Ethiopia – 5,000 KWM
5.21.8.8. Outcome – Italy, Somalia, and Libya won.

5.22. Third Sino-Japanese War

5.22.1. Battle of P'inghsingkuan (Clodfelter 2008, 392 and 395)
5.22.1.1. On September 25, at P'ing-hsingkuan in the Wu Tai Mountains of the Shansi Province, the Chinese won their first victory of the war. The 115th Division of the Communist Eighth Route Army ambushed and shattered a brigade from Japan's 5th Division.
5.22.1.2. Onset: 25/9/1937; Termination: 25/9/1937
5.22.1.3. China versus Japan
5.22.1.4. China – 1 Division. Unit Size Unknown.
5.22.1.5. China – 400
5.22.1.6. Japan – 1 brigade. Unit Size Unknown
5.22.1.7. Japan – 3,000
5.22.1.8. Outcome – China.

5.22.2. Battle of Shanghai (Clodfelter 2008, 392 and 395)

5.22.2.1. The Japanese campaign against Shanghai opened on August 13, 1937. Japanese amphibious landings broke the stalemate in early November. The Chinese lines cracked and broke apart. The 8 divisions directly garrisoning Shanghai were destroyed. The three-month battle ended on November 19th.

5.22.2.2. Onset: 13/8/1937; Termination: 19/11/1937

5.22.2.3. China versus Japan

5.22.2.4. China – 450,000

5.22.2.5. China – 240,000

5.22.2.6. Japan – 225,000

5.22.2.7. Japan – 9,000 killed and 31,000 wounded

5.22.2.8. Outcome – Japan won.

5.22.3. Battle of Taierhcüang (Clodfelter 2008, 395)

5.22.3.1. The Japanese invasion of China continued. They received a very sharp check at Taierhcüang when General Li Tsung-jen and his army of 200,000 Chinese succeeded in isolating 60,000 Japanese. One Japanese division and a brigade was trapped by 11 Chinese divisions and destroyed.

5.22.3.2. Onset: 24/3/1938; Termination: 8/4/1938

5.22.3.3. China versus Japan

5.22.3.4. China – 200,000

5.22.3.5. China – 15,000 killed and 20,000 wounded

5.22.3.6. Japan – 60,000

5.22.3.7. Japan – 8,000 killed and 12,000 wounded or missing

5.22.3.8. Outcome – China won.

5.22.4. Battle of Hankow (Wuhan) (Clodfelter 2008, 392 and 395)

5.22.4.1. On June 10, 1938, japan's campaign against Hankow began. The Central China Expeditionary Force led by General Shunroku Hata fielded 14 divisions with 380,000 troops. Opposing the attackers were 790,000 Chinese deployed in 107 divisions. The Japanese first attempted to march on Hankow from the north, but this was thwarted on June 20 by the cutting of the Yellow River dikes in Honan Province by the Chinese. Eleven cities and 4,000 villiages were flooded and as many as 440,000 people drowned, with up to 450,000 more dying in the coming months from hunger and disese attributable to the destruction of the dikes. The Japanese were forced to shift the axis of their advance to the east, marching westward up the Yangtze. What was followed was the bloodiest fighting of the war. Finally, on October 25, Hankowand the nearby cities of Wuchang and Hanyang fell to the Japanese.

5.22.4.2. Onset: 10/6/1938; Termination: 25/10/1938

5.22.4.3. China versus Japan

5.22.4.4. China – 790,000

5.22.4.5. China – 1,000,000 total military and civilian casualties (unclear distribution)
5.22.4.6. Japan – 380,000
5.22.4.7. Japan – 200,000 total casualties, including the sick
5.22.4.8. Outcome – Japan won.

5.22.5. Battle of First Ch'ang-sha (Clodfelter 2008, 393 and 395)
5.22.5.1. The rare specimen of a Chinese victory came in the First Battle of Ch'angsha, however, IN a campaign from April 13-October 8, Gneeral Naiji Okamura and his 11th Corps of 5 divisions tried without success to capture the city in the lake region south of the Yangtze, defended by the Ninth War Area Commander General Ch'en Ch'eng in 47 divisions.
5.22.5.2. Onset: 13/4/1939; Termination: 8/10/1939
5.22.5.3. China versus Japan
5.22.5.4. China – 365,000
5.22.5.5. China – unknown
5.22.5.6. Japan – 120,000
5.22.5.7. Japan – 50,000
5.22.5.8. Outcome – China won.

5.22.6. Battle of I-ch'ang (Clodfelter 2008, 393 and 395)
5.22.6.1. The next major Japanese campaign occurred from mid-April to mid-June 1940. About 75,000 Japanese moved against Shaoyang and I'ch'ang in the Yangtze Valley of Hupei Province. I-ch'ang was captured on June 12.
5.22.6.2. Onset: 15/4/1940; Termination: 10/6/1940
5.22.6.3. China versus Japan
5.22.6.4. China – 350,000
5.22.6.5. China – 60,000 total casualties
5.22.6.6. Japan – 75,000
5.22.6.7. Japan – 2,700 killed and 7,800 wounded
5.22.6.8. Outcome – Japan won.

5.22.7. Battle of Second Ch'ang-sha (Clodfelter 2008, 393 and 395)
5.22.7.1. In 1941, the Japanese launched a series of punitive expeditions to keep the Chinese at bay and to secure their lines of communication. Japanese biggest effort during the year was against Ch'ang-sha. Japan unsuccessfully attacked the city from the north. These Chinese drew the Japanese into a trap in which, according to the Chinese, 41,000 Japanese were slain, wounded or missing.
5.22.7.2. Onset: 7/9/1941; Termination: 8/10/1941
5.22.7.3. China versus Japan
5.22.7.4. China – 300,000
5.22.7.5. China – unknown
5.22.7.6. Japan – 125,000

5.22.7.7. Japan – 41,000 total casualties
5.22.7.8. Outcome – China won.

5.22.8. Battle of Third Ch'ang-sha (Clodfelter 2008, 395; Hsi-Scheng 1991, 158)
5.22.8.1. The Japanese army for the third time attacked Gh'ang-sha. General Yuiki Anami's 11th Corps of 4 divisions and 2 brigades began the offensive on December 19, 1941 against 37 divisions defending the city. Ch'angsha was finally taken, but intensive Chinese counterattacks forced the Japanese to evacuate the prize on January 4, 1942.
5.22.8.2. Onset: 19/12/1941; Termination: 4/1/1942
5.22.8.3. China versus Japan
5.22.8.4. China – 37 divisions (222,000 troops)
5.22.8.5. China – Unknown
5.22.8.6. Japan – 120,000
5.22.8.7. Japan – 6,000 killed and 44,000 wounded or missing
5.22.8.8. Outcome – China won.

5.22.9. Battle of Western Hunan (Clodfelter 2008, 394 and 395)
5.22.9.1. Another 80,000 soldiers of the emperor pushed into western Hunan in April, aiming for Ch'ang-te and Chihkiang. Their advance was checked by a May 8 Chinese counterattack.
5.22.9.2. Onset: 9/4/1945; 6/6/1945
5.22.9.3. China versus Japan
5.22.9.4. China – Unknown
5.22.9.5. China – 6,832 killed and 11,727 wounded
5.22.9.6. Japan – 80,000
5.22.9.7. Japan – 1,500 killed and 5,000 wounded
5.22.9.8. Outcome – China won.

5.23. Changkufeng War (Russo-Japanese Border War)

5.23.1. Battle of Changkufeng Hill (Clodfelter 2008, 396; Coox 1985, 199, 248)
5.23.1.1. For two weeks in the summer of 1938 Japanese troops attempted to dislodge Russian soldiers from tehri fortifications atop Changkufeng Hill, near Lake Khasan and the mouth of the Tumen River, in the region where Siberia, Korea, and Manchuria met along poorly drawn and bitterly disputed borders. The Russian remained king of the hill.
5.23.1.2. Onset: 29/7/1938; Termination: 11/8/1938
5.23.1.3. Russia versus Japan
5.23.1.4. Russia – 22,950 infantry in 27 battalions
5.23.1.5. Russia – 717 KIA, 2,752 WIA, 75 MIA
5.23.1.6. Japan – 10,000-man 19th infantry Divisions organized into 12 battalions

5.23.1.7. Japan – 562 KIA, 913, WIA
5.23.1.8. Outcome – Soviet Union won.

5.24. Nomonhan War (Russo-Japanese Border War)

5.24.1. **Battle of Nomonhan** (Clodfelter 2008, 396; Drea 1981, 4)

5.24.1.1. In late May 1939, the Japanese diverted several of their divisions from their ongoing rape of China to attack Soviet forces along the Khalkin Gol River and the village of Nomonhan on the equally disputed border of Outer Mongolia, long a satellite of the Soviet Union.
5.24.1.2. Onset: 11/05/1939; Termination: 14/05/1939
5.24.1.3. Russia versus Japan
5.24.1.4. Russia – 928
5.24.1.5. Russia – 30
5.24.1.6. Japan – 2,576
5.24.1.7. Japan – 21
5.24.1.8. Outcome – Russia won

5.24.2. **Initial Skirmish on the Halha** (Coox 1985, 183)

5.24.2.1. A contingent of Mongolian horsemen crossed the Halha river into Manchukuo territory on the 11th of May. Japanese sources claim that the Mongolian intruders were belligerent whereas the Mongolian and Soviet account differs, insisting that "its horses were merely grazing on the eastern shores of the Halha when attacked by the Japaneses and Manchurians, who penetrated as far as the river." The ambiguity about the location of the border – whether it be at the river itself or 20 to 25 km eastward – precipitated the conflict.
5.24.2.2. Onset: 11/05/1939; Termination: 15/05/1939
5.24.2.3. Mongolia versus Japan
5.24.2.4. Mongolia – 100 horsemen, 200 border guards of the 7th Border Guard Post.
5.24.2.5. Mongolia – 30
5.24.2.6. Japan – 300 "Bagrut"/Manchukuoan horsemen, two regiments of the 23rd Infantry Division supported by the 2nd Air Division (9 light bombers and 19 fighters).
5.24.2.7. Japan – Unknown
5.24.2.8. Outcome – The Japanese 23rd Division cleared the eastern shore of the Halha River and forced the Mongolian intruders back. Azuma's troops then retreated back to headquarters in Hailar.

5.24.3. **Second Skirmish on the Halha** (Peck 2015)

5.24.3.1. After the Azuma unit returned to Hailar, Mongol and Soviet troops recrossed the Halha. General Komatsubara of the 23rd Infantry Division decided to send a larger task force commanded by Colonel Yamagata Takemitsu to confront the intruders in spite

of a call for restraint from the Kwantung Army leadership in Hsinking.

5.24.3.2. Onset: 27/05/1939; Termination: 28/05/1939

5.24.3.3. Russia and Mongolia versus Japan

5.24.3.4. Russia and Mongolia – 1,450 Soviet-Mongolian troops, of whom 250 were MPRA cavalry.

5.24.3.5. Russia and Mongolia – Unknown

5.24.3.6. Japan – 2,050 troops

5.24.3.7. Japan – 105 killed, 34 wounded.

5.24.3.8. Outcome – Japan Won. Immediately after this engagement, both sides built up strength in the area. The Japanese moved 30,000 men toward Mongolia Area, while Moscow dispatched corps commander Lieutenant General Georgy Zhukov to lead an offensive.

5.24.4. 23rd Infantry Division offensive (Peck 2015; Moses 1967)

5.24.4.1. Under the advice of the Kwantung Army HQ, Lt. Gen Komatsubara decides an enveloping maneuver against Soviet forces in Hill 721

5.24.4.2. Onset: 01/07/1939; Termination: 03/07/1939

5.24.4.3. Russia and Mongolia versus Japan

5.24.4.4. Russia and Mongolia – 12,500 total

5.24.4.5. Russia and Mongolia – 10,000

5.24.4.6. Japan – 1 Division with 70 tanks; 21,945

5.24.4.7. Japan – 17,000

5.24.4.8. Outcome – Soviet Union and Mongolia won.

5.24.5. Battle of Holsten River (Drea, 1981)

5.24.5.1. From July 8 to July 12th the Japanese tried repeatedly to gain a footholdon the western bank (Khalkha river) but were unsuccessful (Moses 1967).

5.24.5.2. Onset: 07/07/1939; Termination: 22/07/1939

5.24.5.3. Russia versus Japan

5.24.5.4. Russia – Likely, 300 infantryman, 5 tanks, and a dozen artillery guns, of the 149th rifle regiment

5.24.5.5. Soviet Union – At least 100

5.24.5.6. Japan – 2/28th infantry battalion (at least 5th, 6th and 7th company). Unite Sizes Unknown.

5.24.5.7. Japan – The 64th Infantry lost 77 killed, 29 missing, and 160 wounded

5.24.5.8. Outcome – Soviet Union won.

5.24.6. Soviet Counterattack (Clodfelter 2008, 396; Coox 1985, 739)

5.24.6.1. On the ground, the Japanese offensive won some immediate success in early July, but the Russians soon checked their advance and prepared for a counteroffensive.

5.24.6.2. Onset: 20/8/1938; Termination: 31/08/1939
5.24.6.3. Russia and Mongolia versus Japan
5.24.6.4. Russia and Mongolia – 3 divisions, 5 armored brigades, and several brigades of Mongolian troops, altogether some 57,000 men commanded by General Georgi Zhukov.
5.24.6.5. Russia and Mongolia – Approximately 9,000 (Moses 1967, 81)
5.24.6.6. Japan – Approximately 70,000
5.24.6.7. Japan – 55,000, including 25,000 killed (Moses 1967, 79-81)
5.24.6.8. Outcome – Russia won. Pushed the Japanese back 20 miles to the border. A truce on September 15 ended the war.

5.25. Russo-Finnish War

5.25.1. **Russian Attack on the Mannerheim Line** (Clodfelter 2008, 465)

5.25.1.1. Russian attack launched on the Mannerheim line that was beaten back by Finnish defenders.
5.25.1.2. Onset: 30/11/1939; Termination: 15/12/1939
5.25.1.3. Finland versus Russia
5.25.1.4. Finland – 125,000 soldiers (Edwards 2008, 113)
5.25.1.5. Finland – Unknown
5.25.1.6. Russia – 200,000 soldiers (Edwards 2008, 113)
5.25.1.7. Russia – Unknown
5.25.1.8. Outcome – Finland won.

5.25.2. **Battle of Suomussalmi** (Clodfelter 2008 465-466)

5.25.2.1. On the eastern border, Finland's 9th Division won a major victory at Suomussalmi.
5.25.2.2. Onset: 11/12/1939; Termination 8/1/1940
5.25.2.3. Finland versus Russia
5.25.2.4. Finland – 14,200
5.25.2.5. Finland – 900 killed and 1,770 wounded
5.25.2.6. Russia – 2 Russian Divisions, 163rd Infantry and 44th Infantry; approximately 48,000 soldiers (Tillotson 1993, 138)
5.25.2.7. Russia – 16,000 Russians were killed or froze to dead, 11,500 wounded, and 1,800 POWs
5.25.2.8. Outcome – Finland won.

5.25.3. **Battle of Tolvajarvi** (Clodfelter 2008, 465; Trotter 2000)

5.25.3.1. Finnish counterattack on the Mannerheim line at Tolvajarvi.
5.25.3.2. Onset: 10/12/1939; Termination: 23/12/1939
5.25.3.3. Finland versus Russia
5.25.3.4. Finland – 20,000 soldiers (Tillotson 1993, 131)
5.25.3.5. Finland – 630 killed, 1,320 wounded (Trooter 1991, 121)
5.25.3.6. Russia – 24,000 soldiers in the 155th Division (Trotter 1991, 117)
5.25.3.7. Russia – 10,600 casualties (Trotter 1991, 121)

5.25.3.8. Outcome – Draw. Offensive ran out of steam.

5.25.4. Second Russian Attack on the Mannerheim Line (Clodfelter 2008, 465-466)

5.25.4.1. In February 1940 Russia began renewed attacks on the Mannerheim Line

5.25.4.2. Onset: 1/2/1940; Termination: 13/3/1940

5.25.4.3. Finland versus Russia

5.25.4.4. Finland – 150,000 (Van Dyke 1997, 137)

5.25.4.5. Finland – Unknown

5.25.4.6. Russia – Initially 54 divisions; By March 1 Soviet strength on the Finnish front reached 760,578

5.25.4.7. Russia – Unknown

5.25.4.8. Outcome – Russia won.

5.26. Franco-Thai War

5.26.1. Thai Invasion of Northern Laos

5.26.1.1. Until early January 1941, the Franco-Thai war is a campaign of skirmishes. The tension gradually increases until around January 10th, a moment chosen by Thailand to launch its offensive, namely a series of operations that compel the French command to react in a more marked manner (Mercer-Bernadet 2001, 35).

5.26.1.2. Onset: 10/1/1941; Termination: 12/1/1941

5.26.1.3. Thailand versus France

5.26.1.4. Thailand – 3 Battalions; approximately 2,274 total (Gosa 2008, 50)

5.26.1.5. Thailand – Unknown

5.26.1.6. France – 1 infantry battalion estimated strength at 987 soldiers

5.26.1.7. France – Unknown

5.26.1.8. Outcome – Thailand won.

5.26.2. Thai Invasion of Sothern Laos

5.26.2.1. In southern Laos on 12 January the Siamese attack began in the direction of Pakse; on the 15th, supported by artillery fire and aerial bombing, three battalions of infantry dislodged the Vichy defenders who retired across the Mekong and by the 19th ceded control of the western side of the river as far south as the Cambodian border

5.26.2.2. Onset: 12/1/1941; Termination: 19/1/1941

5.26.2.3. Thailand/Siam versus Vichy France

5.26.2.4. Thailand – 3 Battalions; approximately 3,790 total (Gosa 2008, 50)

5.26.2.5. Thailand – Unknown

5.26.2.6. France – 1 Battalion totaling 995 soldiers

5.26.2.7. France – Unknown

5.26.2.8. Outcome – Thailand won.

5.26.3. Thai Offensive of the Poipet

5.26.3.1. The strongest Siamese force – nine battalions and two groups of artillery supported by tanks – attacked on 10 January in the Poipet sector on the road to Battambang. The Vichy covering force proved unable to halt the advance which continued in the direction of Sisophon. Here, however, the Vichy masse de maneuver waited.

5.26.3.2. Onset: 10/1/1941; Termination: 15/1/1941

5.26.3.3. Thailand versus France

5.26.3.4. Thailand – 9 battalions and two groups of artillery supported by tanks; 9,854 total (Gosa 2008, 50)

5.26.3.5. Thailand – 320 (Mahe 2008, 23)

5.26.3.6. France – 4 infantry battalions totaling 5651

5.26.3.7. France – 15 (Mahe 2008, 23)

5.26.3.8. Outcome – Thailand won.

5.26.4. French Counteroffensive of the Sisophon

5.26.4.1. On the night of 15/16 January the Vichy spearhead (four battalions, each from a different regiment) and supporting tanks and guns moved into position to mount their counter-offensive; it was launched from northwest of Sisophon against the left flank of the Siamese advance on the morning of the 16th. By the end of the day, Vichy attackers had withdrawn.

5.26.4.2. Onset: 16/1/1941; Termination: 16/1/1941

5.26.4.3. Thailand/Siam versus Vichy France

5.26.4.4. Thailand – 9,854 total (Gosa 2008, 50)

5.26.4.5. Thailand – 1,000

5.26.4.6. France – 4 infantry Battalions, 1 mechanized cavalry troop, 2 artillery batteries totaling at least 3039 soldiers

5.26.4.7. France – 200 (Tully 2003, 336)

5.26.4.8. Outcome – Thailand won.

5.27. First Kashmir War: 1947-1949

5.27.1. **Operation Gulmarg** (Showalter 2014, 869; Clodfelter 638)

5.27.1.1. Pakistani forces crossed into Kashmir through the Jhelum valley and hit the road to Muzaffarabad, Domel, and Baramula en route to the capital Srinagar (Nawaz 2009, 48-49). The plan was first to split the Pakistani's army into tiny groups by means of hit-and-run attacks all along the long frontier with Pakistan (Prasad and Pal 1987, 16) The broad outline of the operational plan was for six Lashkars to advance along the main road from Muzaffarabad to Srinagar via Domel, Uri and Baramula, with the specific task of capturing the aerodrome and subsequently advancing to the Bahihal Pass. A similar force of two Lashkars was to advance from Tithwal through the Nastachhun Pass for capturing Sopore, Handwara and Bandipur. Anotehr force of 10 Lashkars was to

operate in the Punch, Bhimbar and Rawalkot area with the intention of capturing Punch and Rajauri and then advancing to Jammu (Prasad and Pal 1987, 18-19).

5.27.1.2. Onset: 22/10/1947; Termination: 22/10/1947

5.27.1.3. India versus Pakistan

5.27.1.4. India – 2,500. 161st Brigade of India's 5th Infantry Division

5.27.1.5. India – 21 casualties (Prasad and Pal 1987, 32); 1 SIKH had suffered casualties including their commanding officer, Lt Col Raghunath Rai who was killed near Baramula. The Brigade commander had wounded and relieved by a new commander (Sarkar 2000, 21).

5.27.1.6. Pakistan – 10,000 Pathan (Pashtun) tribesmen of the Northwest Frontier Providence. Note: Clodfelter's numbers are notably higher than other reported figures. Showalter 2014 reports 5,000 Pakistan-supported rebels and Nawaz 2009, 48-49 reports 2,000. Additional note on irregulars: Pakistan sent an initial force of its own state-sponsored irregulars from the North West Frontier Province (NWFP) across the newly established border, as part of a tribal invasion' against India. These irregulars were largely para-military and local militias, who were then followed shortly afterwards by a second wave of regular Pakistani soldiers. In 1947, the initial invasion by irregular forces was codenamed *Operation Gulmarg*, with their attack acting as the precursor to the Pakistani army's formal intervention. In addition, the Pakistani authorities denied any links between the two invading forces, with the former being commonly cast as a liberation or freedom movement (Ogden 2013, 39; See also Nawaz 2009, 49-50).

5.27.1.7. Pakistan – 0 (Sarkar 2000, p13)

5.27.1.8. Outcome – Pakistan won.

5.27.2. Battle of Shalateng (Clodfelter 2008, 638)

5.27.2.1. The 161st Brigade of India's 5th Infantry division attempted to stop the forward movement of Pakistani invasion.

5.27.2.2. Onset: 7/11/1947; Termination: 07/11/1947

5.27.2.3. India versus Pakistan

5.27.2.4. India – 2,500; The official Indian history has a lower troop strength listed in the Kashmir Valley—One Brigade (161st), Three Infantry Battalions (1Sik, 1 Kumaon, elements of 4 Kamaon and 1 Mahar), One battery of artillery (13 Battery Royal Indian Artillery), One field ambulance and other administrative units, totaling 2000 men (Prasad and Pal 1987, 35)

5.27.2.5. India – 1 killed and 2 wounded (Prasad and Pal 1987, 41)

5.27.2.6. Pakistan – 10,000 Pathan tribesmen

5.27.2.7. Pakistan – 472 killed in battle, and 146 more in pursuit.

5.27.2.8. Outcome – India won

5.27.3. Battle of Naushera (Clodfelter 2008, 638)

5.27.3.1. Pakistani troops attacked entrenched Indian forces at Naushera (Clodfelter 2008, 638; See also Nawaz 2008, 131)

5.27.3.2. Onset: 06/02/1948; Termination: 07/02/1948

5.27.3.3. India versus Pakistan

5.27.3.4. India – 50th Parachute Brigade; approximately 6,550 (Subramaniam 2017; Kiss 2013; Prasad 2005, 99); The orbat of 50 Para Briagde were as under: 3 (PARA) Maratha light infantry, 1 Rajput, 3 (PARA) Rajput, 2/2 Punjab, 1 Patiala (Skakar 2016, 32)

5.27.3.5. India – 33 killed and 102 wounded (Nawaz 2008, 131 and Nawaz 2009, 54)

5.27.3.6. Pakistan – 12,000 (Nawaz 2008, 131 has higher figures at 15,000, see Also Nawaz 2009, 54, Sarkar 2000, 33 has the range of 11,000 to 15,000)

5.27.3.7. Pakistan – 2,000 (See also Nawaz 2009, 54; For slightly higher figures see Prasad and Pal 1987, 121-122, Sarkar 2000, 33 has 2000.)

5.27.3.8. Outcome – India won (Nawaz 2008, 133)

5.27.4. Battle of Jhanger (Showalter 2014, 869)

5.27.4.1. Indian offensive to retake Jhangar (Nawaz 2009, 61); In the second phase (1-4 March), a double thrust was made—one directed against Ambli Dhar and the other against Kaman Gosha Gala. In the third phase (5-18 March), Operation 'Vijay' was carried out, resulting in the recapture of Jhangar on 18 March" (Prasad and Pal 1987, 123; See also Prasad and Pal 1987, 132).

5.27.4.2. Onset: 15/03/1948 (Nawaz 2009, 62; Prasad and Pal 1987, 123); Termination: 18/03/1948

5.27.4.3. India versus Pakistan

5.27.4.4. India – Jammu and Kashmir division of the infantry (Showalter 2014, 869); The Indian plans to retake Jhangar called for 19th Infantry Brigade to establish a bridgehead at Noashera and the 50 Para Brigade to breakout for Jhangar (Nawaz 2009, 61; See also Prasad and Pal 1987, 128-129). 19 Infantry Brigade consisted of the following troops: 2 Rajputana Rifles, 4 Dogra, 1 Kumaon, 37 Assault field company (Sarkar 2000, 34). Unit Size Unkown.

5.27.4.5. India – 21 (Prasad and Pal, 1987, 132-134); The enemy kept shelling Jhangar. On the night of April 3, Brigadier Osman, Commander 50 Para Brigade was killed during shelling (Sarkar 2000, 34).

5.27.4.6. Pakistan – Op Vijay was launched on 15 March. An enemy Brigade held Pir Thil Nakka which was attacked by 3 Mahratta and 1 Patiala of 50 Brigade with artillery support. Approximately 200 troops. (Prasad 2005, 106; Singh 2012)

5.27.4.7. Pakistan – 60 (Prasad 2005, 106)

5.27.4.8. Outcome – India won (Prasad and Pal 1987, 136).

5.27.5. Battle of Lumber Nullah (Clodfelter 2008, 638)

5.27.5.1. Pakistan attempts to cut of the 161st Indian Brigade from its Srinagar base in the Uri sector.

5.27.5.2. Onset: ??/04/1948; Termination: ??/04/1948

5.27.5.3. India versus Pakistan

5.27.5.4. India – 161st Brigade. Unit Size Unknown.

5.27.5.5. India – Unknown

5.27.5.6. Pakistan – the 4th Azad Kashmir Battalion. Unit Size Unknown. 2,500 tribesmen; approximately 2,763 total (Marston 2014, 248; Pakistan Army Museum)

5.27.5.7. Pakistan – Unknown

5.27.5.8. Outcome – India won

5.27.6. Tithwal Offensive (Clodfelter 2008, 638)

5.27.6.1. Indian offensive aiming for Tithwal, Muzaffarabad, and Domel, on the border 45 miles away; Capture Domel and prevent enemy invasion of Pakistan, Secure Srinagar and hold essential outposts (Prasad and Pal 1987, 154).

5.27.6.2. Onset: 18/05/1948; Termination: 05/06/1948

5.27.6.3. India versus Pakistan

5.27.6.4. India – 2 Indian divisions in theatre, the 19th Sri Division consisting of the 161st and 163rd Infantry and the 77th Parachute Brigade in Kashmir proper; the 26th Jammu Division defending Jammu and Pooch regions to the south. For the Tithwal offensive, 161st and Sri Division used (See also Nawaz 2008, 140 and 144-145; Prasad and Pal 1987, 154-155). Unit Size Unknown.

5.27.6.5. India – 209 casualties (Prasad and Pal 1987, 183)

5.27.6.6. Pakistan – 3 battalions of a Pakistani army brigade (See also Nawaz 2008, 145); In May 1948, Indian official history places enemy strength at 6,150 (Prasad and Pal 1987, 156)

5.27.6.7. Pakistan – at least 67 (Singh 2005, 334)

5.27.6.8. Outcome – Draw. The Indians achieved some advances, but did not secure their intended objectives (Clodfelter 2008, 638; Singh 2012).

5.27.7. Poonch Offensive (Clodfelter 2008, 638)

5.27.7.1. Indian offensive to relieve Poonch (Prasad and Pal 1987, 154; Nawaz 2009). The Indian forces made another attempt to relieve Poonch in June 1948. The 101 Brigade broke out of the city at the same time as the 19 Infantry Brigade advanced on the besiegers from the direction of Rajauri. The attempt failed. The next attempt in October-November 1948 was a far more thoroughly prepared operation by three infantry brigades, supported by an armoured squadron and airstrikes (Kiss 2013).

5.27.7.2. Onset: 01/01/1948; Termination: 20/11/1948

5.27.7.3. India versus Pakistan

5.27.7.4. India – Jammu Division. 3 Infantry Brigades. Unit Size Unknown.

5.27.7.5. India – approximately 200 (Prasad and Pal 1987 p245-263)

5.27.7.6. Pakistan – Two Pakistani brigades deployed near Poonch (based on the operation map drawn by Peter Kiss 2013). Unit Size Unknown.

5.27.7.7. Pakistan – approximately 520 (Prasad and Pal 1987 p245-263)

5.27.7.8. Outcome – Draw. An attempt to relieve Poonch by the Jammu Division broke through to the blockaded garrison but failed to drive the Pakistanis from the area. (Clodfelter 2008, 638)

5.28. Arab-Israeli War 1948

5.28.1. **Egyptian Invasion** (Clodfelter 2008, 610)

5.28.1.1. The goal of the Egyptian offensive was twofold. The stronger arm was to drive up the coast to capture Tel Aviv, while a smaller force, mostly Egyptian irregulars, pushed through the central Negev Desert, through Beersheba and Hebron, towards Jerusalem to stake Cairo's claim to the Holy City and prevent Transjordan's King Abdallah from seizing it. This eastern column advanced fairly quickly because it met little Israeli resistance until it reached the settlement of Ramat Rachel south of Jerusalem. There the Egyptians linked up with elements of Transjordan's Arab Legion. On 21 May the two forces launched a combined assault against the small Israeli force defending the village . . . Later that day a company of the Haganah's Etzioni Brigade reinforced the Israelis, who then counterattacked and retook the village. The Egyptians and Jordanians launched repeated attacks for the next four days but were unable to retake Ramat Rachel. The Egyptians dug-in south of the town and never moved farther north (Pollack 2004, 16)

5.28.1.2. Onset: 14/05/1948; Termination: 26/05/1948

5.28.1.3. Israel versus Egypt

5.28.1.4. Israel – The Jewish forces facing the invasion consisted of the armed settlers in each settlement plus initially the Negev Brigade …joined by the Givati Brigade . . . Because of the sparseness of the settlements in the area form which it was recruited, the Negev Brigade, with three battalions, was one of the smaller brigades of the Haganah, with only about 1,500 men. The Givati, on the other hand, was one of the largest, consisting of five battalions, totaling some 3,200 men. On May 14, with invasion imminent, two battalions of the Negev Brigade, consisting of about 800 men were deployed. Shortly after the invasion began, the third battalion was moved to the front, along with a battery of 65mm guns, and two companies of jeep-mounted infantry, giving Sarig a front-line strength of amore than 1,500 men (Dupuy 1978, 55-56). At the

time that the Egyptians crossed the international border, the Israeli 12th brigade, which was responsible for the southern Negev, was a brigade in name only, as most of the brigade's 800 soldiers were dispersed among the 30 or so Negev settlements, which were scattered over a broad area: a platoon size force in each settlement (Tal 2004, 173).

5.28.1.5. Israel – 70 dead and 50 wounded (Dupuy 1978, 57).

5.28.1.6. Egypt – Egypt sent a total of 5,500 troops organized into a two-brigade division force. An Egyptian division that was encamped at Rafah began moving across the international border . . . It contained three regular infantry battalions (the 1st, 6th, and 9th), four reserve battalions (the 2nd, 4th, and 7th), and a scout battalion, field artillery battalion, medium sized machine-gun battalion, and six fighter planes. …The core of the expeditionary force was forced by three regular battalions . . . Three reserve battalions sent in after invasion launched (Tal 2004, 171-172); Egyptian expeditionary force with some 6,000 troops (Morris 2008, 232); 7,000 men with 5,000 advancing (Dupuy 1974, 55).

5.28.1.7. Egypt – On May 15 the Egyptian infantry withdrew leaving some 30 dead behind them (Dupuy 1978, 56)

5.28.1.8. Outcome – Egypt won

5.28.2. Egyptian Northern Advance (Clodfelter 2008, 610)

5.28.2.1. The goal of the Egyptian offensive was twofold. The stronger arm was to drive up the coast to capture Tel Aviv. . ." Pollack 2004, 16); At that stage, the Egyptian force split into two: the regular army moving north and the irregulars pushing east" (Tal 2004, 177); The most urgent task was to occupy Yad Mordechai. Located on the main road to the north, the kibbutz could become a means to cut off the advancing Egyptian forces from their rear. The other target was Negba, which could serve as a departure point for the Israeli forces to attack the strategic Iraqi Suwaydan garrison (Tal 2004, 177-178).

5.28.2.2. Onset: 16/05/1948; Termination 7/06/1948

5.28.2.3. Israel versus Egypt

5.28.2.4. Israel – At the time that the Egyptians crossed the international border, the Israeli 12th brigade, which was responsible for the southern Negev, was a brigade in name only, as most of the brigade's 800 soldiers were dispersed among the 30 or so Negev settlements, which were scattered over a broad area: a platoon size force in each settlement (Tal 2004, 173; Herzog 1982, 69). Approximately 2000 soldiers.

5.28.2.5. Israel – 400 at Ashdod (See also Dupuy 1978, 59).

5.28.2.6. Egypt – 12,000

5.28.2.7. Egypt – 400 casualties (300 at Yad Mordechai and 100 in an Israeli counterattack) (Pollack 2004, 17-18; See also Tal 2004, 178)

5.28.2.8. Outcome – Egypt won. Egypt never made its way to Tel Aviv but did force an Israeli surrender at Nitzanim before the UN ceasefire was imposed on June 11, 1948 (Pollack 2004, 18).

5.28.3. Battle of Latrun (Clodfelter 2008, 610)

5.28.3.1. The Israeli's fought to keep the lines of communication and supply open to the Holy City. The major strong point held by the Arab Legion which blocked the route to Jerusalem was located at Latrun. See also Tal 2004, 218 and 224-225 and Dupuy 1978, 63-64.

5.28.3.2. Onset: 25/05/1948; Termination 10/06/1948

5.28.3.3. Israel versus Transjordan (Arab Legion)

5.28.3.4. Israel – 3 Brigades – 7th Brigade, Harel Brigade [700 soldiers (Tal 2004, 223)], Yiftach Brigade; approximately 6,700 total (See also Dupuy 1978, 64)

5.28.3.5. Israel – 140 casualties of the 7th Brigade; Harel Brigade suffered 50 percent casualties; at least 600 casualties. (Clodfelter 2008, 610; Morris 2008, 230)

5.28.3.6. Transjordan – 2 Battalion size regiments (Each battalion consisted of about 1,000 soldiers, Tal 2004, 206.)

5.28.3.7. Transjordan – At least 300 casualties

5.28.3.8. Outcome – Transjordan won (Tal 2004, 240)

5.28.4. Operation Yitzhak (Tal 2004, 233).

5.28.4.1. Israel wanted to occupy Jenin, conduct diversionary harassment operations against various targets in the Triangle, and conduct a major and sustain attack on Tulkarm to draw forces there.

5.28.4.2. Onset: 01/06/1948; Termination: 03/06/1948 (Tal 2004, 234-235)

5.28.4.3. Israel versus Iraq

5.28.4.4. Israel – Approximately 3,000 soldiers. Four battalions participated in the major part of the operation: the occupation of Jenin – two of the 2nd Brigade (21st and 22nd), the 1st Brigade's 13th Battalion, and three companies that formed a battalion-size force (Tal 2004, 233; El-Edroos 1980, 242).

5.28.4.5. Israel – 34 killed, 100 wounded (Tal 2004, 235)

5.28.4.6. Iraq – Israeli intelligence reports claimed that the total force placed in the Jenin-Nablus-Tulkarm triangle amounted to 5,000 soldiers (Tal 2004, 233).

5.28.4.7. Iraq – Israel claims 200 casualties (Malovany 2017, 43)

5.28.4.8. Outcome – Iraq won (Tal 2004, 235)

5.28.5. Battle of Isdud (Operation Pleshet) (Showalter 2014, 870)

5.28.5.1. Given that a truce may come into effect, the Israeli's decided to, by order of the General Staff to the Givati Brigade, launch an all-out

attack on the Egyptian force at Isdud with the aim of destroying it (Tal 2004, 185). Goal was to tie up the Egyptian column to then free forces that could be rushed to assist in the battle for the road to Jerusalem (Tal 2004, 185). The aim of Operation Pleshet was to destroy the enemy force by means of frontal attacks on the Egyptian concentration in the Isdud area and to occupy the territory held (Tal 2004, 186).

5.28.5.2. Onset: 02/06/1948 (Tal 2004, 187); Termination: 3/06/1948

5.28.5.3. Israel versus Egypt

5.28.5.4. Israel – 1,150; The Israelis had exactly half that number [of Egyptian's at 2,300] of combat personnel. Givati Brigade reinforced by the Negev Brigade's 7th Battalion and by companies from its command battalion (Tal 2004, 186).

5.28.5.5. Israel – 45 (See also Tal 2004, 187).

5.28.5.6. Egypt – 2,300 (Tal 2004, 186).

5.28.5.7. Egypt – 15

5.28.5.8. Outcome – Egypt won. Operation Pleshet . . . failed. The Egyptians repulsed the Israeli forces and in some cases pursued them as they retreated (Tal 2004, 187 and 191-192).

5.28.6. Operation Dekel (Showalter 2014, 870)

5.28.6.1. Operation Dekel, which was the code name for the occupation of the central Galilee (Tal 2004, 334). Establish control of the costal route; occupation of the territory stretching from the west to the center of the Galilee, to cut the ALA's supply routes, to encircle them and finally destroy them (Tal 2004, 336).; Destroy the ALA Dupuy 1978, 84-85)

5.28.6.2. Onset: 9/07/1948; Termination 18/07/1948

5.28.6.3. Israel versus Arab Liberation Army and Syria (no Lebanese activity; Dupuy 1978, 85)

5.28.6.4. Israel – 7th Armored Brigade; The forces of Operation Dekel consisted of the 7th Brigade's infantry battalion—the 71st and mechanized battalion—the 79th, and one battalion of the 2nd brigade—the 21st (Tal 2004, 336); 3 battalions from the 7th Brigade and 1 battalion from the Carmeli brigade. . . Golani Brigade supporting the operation (to distract the ALA along the Afula Corridor); approximately 3,000 total. (Dupuy 1978, 85)

5.28.6.5. Israel – During these ten days the Israelis lost 838 soldiers killed, an unknown reported number of wounded (estimated at perhaps 3,000) (Dupuy 1978, 87).

5.28.6.6. Arab Liberation Army and Syria - The ALA was organized at this stage into three brigade-like formations, which were actually enhanced battalions. The 1st al-Yarmuk Brigade . . . the 2nd Yarmuk Brigade . . . and the 3rd al Yarmuk Brigade . . . Another battalion, a Syrian battalion, the 'Alawi . . . consisting of two companies, was placed in the Sfad-Jish area, and was under the direct command of

the ALA in Syria. There were also artillery, tanks, and engineering forces, and they acted interpedently of the forces in Galilee, being under the direct command of the ALA in Syria (Tal 2004, 334; Herzog 1982, 89). Approximately 4,000 soldiers.

5.28.6.7. ALA and Syria- Arab losses are unknown but were probably at least double those of the Israelis, and most of them had been suffered by Kaukji's ALA. Approximately 1,600 casualties. (Dupuy 1978, 86)

5.28.6.8. Outcome – Israel won (See also Dupuy 1978, 86).

5.28.7. Battle of Lydda and Ramle (Operaiton Dani) (Showalter 2014, 870)

5.28.7.1. Israel wants to seize al-Ramla and Lydda as they could serve the Arab Legion as a departure point from which to attack Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, the areas around the two cities and the road to Jerusalem. Conquest would also cut Arab communication lines (Tal 2004, 236). "The General Staff issued a platform for a plan entitled Operation Larlar—the name reflected its goals: Lydda, Al-Ramla, Latrun, Ramallah, and it was to be carried out in two stages. The goal of the operation was 'to attack and destroy the enemy forces bases at the Lydda-al-Ramla-Latrun-Ramallah area, to occupy those bases and by that to relieve Jerusalem and the road leading to the city from enemy pressure.' At the heart of the first stage with the occupation of Lydda and al-Ramla. This would be active through the isolation of the northern outskirts of the two cities, namely, by the occupation of Ras al-Ayn, Yehudia and Wilhelma, and then attack and conquest of Lydda, and the placing of al-Ramla under siege to force it to surrender" (Tal 2004, 304). "The isolation of Al-Ramla and Lydda was intended to put pressure on them and to prevent the intervention of external forces during the breakthrough to Lydda. This would be achieved through a pincer-formation attack achieved by the 8th Brigade moving along the north-east line, while the 11th Brigade approached along the west-south line. At the same time the 4th Brigade would isolate the whole theater of operations from the area to the west, while the 10th Brigade would isolate the eastern sector" (Tal 2004, 306).

5.28.7.2. Onset: 10/07/1948; Termination: 14/07/1948

5.28.7.3. Israel versus Transjordan

5.28.7.4. Israel – The forces that took part in the operation, directly or indirectly, comprised about 9,000 soldiers in total (Tal 2004, 305); Three brigades (Dupuy 1978, 76)

5.28.7.5. Israel – The ten days of fighting came to an end the morning of 19 July. The Legion sustained during that period 80 soldiers killed, while over the same period and Front the Israeli's suffered some 180 killed. In spite of these unequal figures, Alon's conclusion from the ten days of fighting was positive: 'We should not forget that the

operation also bore fruits: all of the Uno Valley, al Ramla—Lydda and its area, the liberation of Ben Shemen, and most important, the extensive widening of the Jerusalem corridor (Tal 2004, 328).

5.28.7.6. Transjordan – Approximately 750. "The Arab Legion order of forces was as follows: The Arab Legion's 5th Battalion . . . 1st Battalion … 2nd Battalion . . . Three battalions were thus placed in the area stretching from Latrun through Bab al-Wad to Bidu and Radar Hill along the way to Ramallah . . . The Arab Legion's 5th company was deployed in al-Ramla and Lydda, along with about 500 lightly armed Jordanian Bedouins." (Tal 2004, 328; Yitzhak 2012, 44)

5.28.7.7. Transjordan – Approximately 100-150 Arab were killed during the raid and the subsequent fighting" (Tal 2004, 208); "The ten days of fighting came to an end the morning of 19 July. The Legion sustained during that period 80 soldiers killed, while over the same period and Front the Israeli's suffered some 180 killed. In spite of these unequal figures, Alon's conclusion from the ten days of fighting was positive: 'We should not forget that the operation also bore fruits: all of the Uno Valley, al Ramla—Lydda and its area, the liberation of Ben Shemen, and most important, the extensive widening of the Jerusalem corridor (Tal 2004, 328).

5.28.7.8. Outcome – Israel won

5.28.8. Battle for Mishmar Hayarden (Clodfelter 2008, 610)

5.28.8.1. Part of an Israeli offensive; Israeli Operation Brosh - encircle and destroy the Syrians in the bridgehead around Mismar Hayarden (Dupuy 1978, 83)

5.28.8.2. Onset: 9/07/1948; Termination 14/07/1948

5.28.8.3. Israel versus Syria

5.28.8.4. Israel – 1,200 Israelis in 2 battalions

5.28.8.5. Israel – 150 killed and 500 wounded

5.28.8.6. Syria – Approximately 2,000. 2 Syrian Infantry battalions backed by a 25-tank armored battalion; 1 brigade (Dupuy 1978, 83; Morris 2008, 251)

5.28.8.7. Syria – 800

5.28.8.8. Outcome – Draw. Ended in a standoff.

5.28.9. Operation Kedem (Showalter 2014, 870)

5.28.9.1. Operation Kedem, the capture of the Old City, by frontal attack. Some and Irgun units managed to advance a few yards into the Old City through the New Gate but could not capture the College des Freres, which dominated their wedge, before dawn and had to withdraw. Despite a heavy preparatory artillery barrage joined by *Davidka* mortars and machine guns, Hish military units attacking the Zion Gate were equally unsuccessful. The explosive charge laid beside the four-foot-thick outer wall of the Old City failed to make

more than a dent. Thus, Operation Kedem, hastily attempted at the last minute, was a failure. Although bitter fighting continued for two more days around the Mandlebaum Houses despite the new cease-fire, the second truce stabilized the front line to the east of Jerusalem where it had been on July 9, before the ten days of fighting had begun. Jerusalem remained divided; but with the broadening of the corridor, the clearing of the railroad, and the rapid construction of alternative highways, the city was no longer cut from the coast (Bell 2006, 235). See also Tal 2004, 327.

5.28.9.2. Onset: 16/07/1948; Termination 17/07/1948

5.28.9.3. Israel versus Transjordan

5.28.9.4. Israel – Irgun battalion and one battalion of the HISH forces (Dupuy 1978, 79-80; Herzog 1982, 69). Approximately 800 soldiers.

5.28.9.5. Israel – 83

5.28.9.6. Transjordan – 730 (Yitzhak 2012, 44)

5.28.9.7. Transjordan – 36 (Tal 2004, 327)

5.28.9.8. Outcome – Transjordan Success

5.28.10. Operation Yoav (Showalter 2014, 870)

5.28.10.1. Egyptians were aiming to consolidate a strong line that will cut off the Negev from the south; Egyptians wanted to establish their control of the Negev in order to lay claim to sovereignty there (Tal 2004, 375). Operation Yoav was the first two [Israeli] operations whose goal was the expulsion of the Egyptian forces from Palestine. The idea was to cut off the Egyptian brigades one from the other, and in the area designated for combat—against the Egyptians' 4th Brigade along the al-Majdal-Bayt Jibrin road—the line along with the Egyptian Brigade was deployed would be cut, thus creating three isolated sectors that would then be destroyed one by one (Tal 2004, 376-377, see also 379-380; See also Sela 1992, 667-668, 670 and Dupuy 1978, 93)

5.28.10.2. Onset: 15/10/1948; Termination: 22/10/1948

5.28.10.3. Israel versus Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Libya, Muslim Brotherhood, Palestinian Irregulars

5.28.10.4. Israel – The IDF deployed four brigades-Giv'ati, the Eight, Yiftah, and the Negev-later joined by elements of the Ninth Brigade (Oded), as well as assorted supporting units, including three battalions of artillery and mortars (Morris 2008, 321-323 see also Dupuy 1978, 93-95). Approximately 12,000 total.

5.28.10.5. Israel – On 16 October, the IDF's Eighty-second and Seventh battalions failed to take the village of 'Iraq al-Manshiya, roughly midway between Majdal and Beit Jibrin, suffering more than a hundred casualties (Morris 2008, 325). The Giv'ati troops suffering twenty-eight dead and seventy wounded (Morris 2008, 326). On 21 October the three battalions stormed into Beersheba, taking only a

handful of casualties, though the town was defended by a regular infantry battalion (the First) with artillery and mortar batteries and hundreds of North African, Egyptian, and Palestinian auxiliaries (Morris 2008, 328).

5.28.10.6. Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Libya, Muslim Brotherhood, Palestinian Irregulars – "The Egyptians were deployed in division strength on the Southern Front . . . The divisions' three brigades (1st, 2nd and 4th) were made up of nine regular battalions, which were deployed along the entire front" (Tal 2004, 373). The 2nd Battalion was composed of 400 Palestinian Arabs with low motivation (Tal 2004, 375). Saudis – Guard positions, manned by Saudi and local forces, were erected along the Rafah-Gaza road, and forward defensive emplacements were built around the large base in Gaza" (Tal 2004, 375 and 376). Sundanese and Libyans in the Hebron-Bethlehem sector (Tal 2004, 384); On the eve of Yoav, the Egyptian expeditionary force consisted of the equivalent of four brigades, with nine regular infantry battalions, three artillery battalions, and two armored battalions, and assorted auxiliary formations, including Saudi and Sudanese battalions and companies, several Egyptian reserve infantry battalions, and hundreds of Muslim Brotherhood and Palestinian irregulars. Approximately 18,000, including 2,000 Muslim Brotherhood (Morris 2008, 321-323; Herzog 1982, 69, 96-98)

5.28.10.7. Arab Coalition Casualties – Unknown

5.28.10.8. Outcome – Israel won; Operation Yoav was officially over. It had ended in significant Israeli achievement, if not in a decisive victory (Morris 2008, 330; See also Dupuy 1978, 98-99)

5.28.11. Operation Hiram (Clodfelter 2008, 610)

5.28.11.1. Israeli offensive in the North; ALA forces threatened Manara, Israel launches operation in response (Tal 2004, 421). The goal of Operation Hiram was to destroy the enemy forces at the central Galilee pocket to take over whole of Galilee and to establish a defensive line along the northern border of Palestine. This goal would be achieved through a pincer maneuver (Tal 2004, 423). See also Morris 2008, 338-340 and Dupuy 1978, 101.

5.28.11.2. Onset: 20/10/1948; Termination 31/10/1948

5.28.11.3. Israel versus Syria, Lebanon, and the Arab Liberation Army

5.28.11.4. Israel – 4 Israeli brigades; 2nd, 1st, 7th, and 9th (Tal 2004, 422; see also Dupuy 1978, 101); 12000 soldiers.

5.28.11.5. Israel – The number of casualties among the 7th Brigade soldiers were amazingly low: as against hundreds of Arab Liberation Army and Syrian soldiers killed, the Israeli forces sustained less than half a dozen killed" (Tal 2004, 424). 9th Brigade: against nearly 500 killed Arabs, the Israeli forces that took part in

Operation Hiram sustained less than two dozen killed (Tal 2004, 424). Approximately 60 casualties in total.

5.28.11.6. Arabs – The ALA in defense positions – organized in 3 brigades—1st, 2nd, and 3rd—which in all consisted of about 2000-3000 soldiers. 1st brigade consisted of 1500 men in southern part of the area along Safad-Acre road; 2nd brigade, 700-800 men, deployed in northeastern sector to the left of the 1st Brigade's rear. 3rd Brigade consisted of 850 men held defensive positions in the northwestern sector (Tal 2004, 419). "Al-Qawuqji's provocation at Sheikh 'Abd made little military sense, considering that his 'army' consisted of three undersized 'brigades,' each, in fact, amounting to a battalion, totaling some three thousand troops, who were backed by two or three companies of regular Syrian troops and several hundred local militiamen and foreign Moroccan volunteers. At the end of October, the Syrians sent two battalions to reinforce the ALA, perhaps with an eye to eventual Syrian annexation of central Galilee. But only one of these, the Ninth, ended up in Galilee, fighting the Israelis. Al-Qawuqji's troops suffered from acute shortages of supplies, especially ammunition; on 25 October one battalion informed him that it was down to seventeen rounds per rifle and lacked food" (Morris 2008, 340). Note: According to Tal 2004, 418 – The Lebanese provided professional and administrative services but not troops. The forces responsible for defending Galilee were the ALA.

5.28.11.7. Arab Casualties: 400 killed and 550 captured; including 200 killed in a Syrian battalion which was ambushed on October 28; – "Nearly 200 Syrian soldiers were killed and the survivors fled back toward the boarder . . . the number of casualties among the 7th Brigade soldiers were amazingly low: as against hundreds of Arab Liberation Army and Syrian soldiers killed, the Israeli forces sustained less than half a dozen killed" (Tal 2004, 424; see also Dupuy 1978, 103). "The ratio between the number of Israeli and Arab casualties was: as against nearly 500 killed Arabs, the Israeli forces that took part in Operation Hiram sustained less than two dozen killed" (Tal 2004, 424). The Israelis estimated that the Arabs had suffered four hundred dead-half of them Syrians and the rest ALA and local militiamen-and 550 prisoners, most of them ALA." (Morris 2008, 348)

5.28.11.8. Outcome – Israel won (Tal 2004, 424)

5.28.12. Operation Horev (Showalter 2014, 870)

5.28.12.1. Israel's goal was to move the Egyptians from the international boundary line (Tal 2004, 435-436); Conquest of the Gaza Strip (Tal 2004, 437).

5.28.12.2. Onset: 19/12/1948; Termination: 07/01/1949

5.28.12.3. Israel versus Egypt

5.28.12.4. Israel – Five brigades – 1st, 8th, 10th, 12th and 3rd (Tal 2004, 438). 15000 soldiers total.

5.28.12.5. Israel – 135 casulties. 13th Battalion suffered 23 soldiers killed (Tal 2004, 440); 82nd Battalion suffered six dead (Tal 2004, 442); 36th Battalion – 70 Israeli soldiers killed (Tal 2004, 444); 12 Brigade – about three dozen Israeli soldiers killed via friendly fire (Tal 2004, 445)

5.28.12.6. Egypt – Egyptians had between 10,000 and 13,000 men in the field in the arc extending from Rafah to Bir 'Asluj via 'Awja al-Hafir (Tal 2004, 435). Two regular battalions to the Rafah-Gaza area.

5.28.12.7. Egypt – Unknown

5.28.12.8. Outcome – Israel won

5.29. Korean War

5.29.1. Battle of Osan (Clodfelter 2008, 698 and 712)

5.29.1.1. The U.S. troops tried to stand in the way of North Korean troops rushing south (Clodfelter 2008, 698).

5.29.1.2. Onset: 05/07/1950; Termination: 05/07/1950

5.29.1.3. United States versus North Korea

5.29.1.4. United States – 540 troops and a 5-gun 105mm battery

5.29.1.5. United States – 20 killed, 130 wounded or missing (40 of the missing later died as POWs)

5.29.1.6. North Korea – 1,000 troops and 33 tanks

5.29.1.7. North Korea – 42 killed, 85 wounded, 4 tanks lost

5.29.1.8. Outcome – North Korea won (Clodfelter 2008, 698).

5.29.2. Battle of Taejon (Clodfelter 2008, 698 and 712)

5.29.2.1. North Korean forces attempted to take the city of Taejon while U.S. forces attempted to defend it (Clodfelter 2008, 698).

5.29.2.2. Onset: 19/07/1950; Termination: 20/07/1950

5.29.2.3. United States versus North Korea

5.29.2.4. United States – 3,933 troops (24th Infantry Division)

5.29.2.5. United States – 638 killed, 228 wounded, 284 missing

5.29.2.6. North Korea – 2 divisions (3rd and 4th Divisions); General Dean and his 24th Division staff had a fairly clear idea of the situation facing them. On 13 July, the division intelligence officer estimated that two enemy divisions at 60 to 80 percent strength with approximately fifty tanks were closing on the 24th Division (Appleman 1992, 123). Approximately 17,600 forces.

5.29.2.7. North Korea – At Taejon the KPA Third Division became a half-strength, second-rate force, and the KPA Fourth Division had begun to lose its troops in serious numbers (Millett 2010, 194). Approximately 7,000 casualties.

5.29.2.8. Outcome – North Korea won; the 24th Division's GI's suffered a major defeat (Clodfelter 2008, 698).

5.29.3. Battle of Hadong Pass (Clodfelter 2008, 699 and 712)

5.29.3.1. North Korea continued their push toward Pusan and the Communist North drove on Masan, in a move to take Pusan from the west and outflank the whole UN line. The battle of Hadong Pass is a part of this North Korean move (Clodfelter 2008, 699).

5.29.3.2. Onset: 27/07/1950; Termination: 27/07/1950

5.29.3.3. United States versus North Korea; Note: There were South Korean officers guiding the American forces through the pass. However, there were no South Korean Troops directly engaged in battle (Appleman 1992, 215).

5.29.3.4. United States – 757 troops (3rd Battalion of the U.S. 29th Regiment)

5.29.3.5. United States – 313 killed, 52 wounded, 100 captured

5.29.3.6. North Korea – 1 regiment (part of the 6th Division). Per Rottman (2002, 163), approximately 2,500 troops. Note: Japanese Society of the Study of the History of Land Warfare 2000 report's lower numbers.

5.29.3.7. North Korea – Unknown

5.29.3.8. Outcome – North Korea won. The 757-man 3rd Battalion of the U.S. 29th RCT . . . was ambushed and all but destroyed at Hadong Pass on July 27 (Clodfelter 2008, 699).

5.29.4. First Naktong Bulge (Clodfelter 2008, 699 and 712)

5.29.4.1. The battle is a part of Naktong Bulge Campaign (Pusan Perimeter). The two sides fought the most punishing battle of the war along the bulge of the Naktong River. North Korean attempted to take Pusan by crossing the Pusan Perimeter and the UN side attempted to defend the Perimeter (Clodfelter 2008, 699).

5.29.4.2. Onset: 05/08/1950; Termination: 18/08/1950 (Millett 2010, 221)

5.29.4.3. United Nations versus North Korea

5.29.4.4. United Nations – Two weak regiments of the 24th Infantry Division" (34th and 19th); reinforced over the battle with elements of the 23rd and 27th Infantry brigades and the 1st Marine Brigade (Millett 2010, 221-222). Authorized forces for units employed is 21,630 (Rottman 2002, 18, 62); given the noted weakness and partial nature of the forces employed, approximately 15,000 total troops fought.

5.29.4.5. United States – The Marine brigade took 245 casualties, the 24th Division 1,330 (Millett 2010, 222); 1,575 total casualties.

5.29.4.6. North Korea – KPA 4th Division…pre-battle strength of 7,000 (Millett 2010, 221-222).

5.29.4.7. North Korea – The KPA 4th Division lost more than half of its prebattle strength of 7,000 (Millett 2010, 222); Approximately 3,700 casualties.

5.29.4.8. Outcome – South Korea and United States won. The Communist push across the Naktong at the bulge was halted by August 26 . . . by the 24th Division and the Marines. The North Korean 4th Division was destroyed (Clodfelter 2008, 699-700).

5.29.5. Second Naktong Bulge (Clodfelter 2008, 700 and 712)

5.29.5.1. The battle is a part of Naktong Bulge Campaign (Pusan Perimeter) (Clodfelter 2008, 699).

5.29.5.2. Onset: 31/08/1950; Termination: 15/09/1950

5.29.5.3. United States versus North Korea

5.29.5.4. United States – US 2nd Infantry Division, US 24th Infantry Division, and, between 3-6 September, US 1st Marine Brigade (Millett 2010, 226-228). Total American forces were approximately 44,142 (Rottman 2002, 16, 62).

5.29.5.5. United States – 7,000 casualties

5.29.5.6. North Korea – A two-pronged attack, with one prong featuring 4 divisions (28,000 men) and one featuring 2 divisions (19,000 men). Total attacking forces numbered approximately 47,000 (Millett 2010, 226)

5.29.5.7. North Korea –The North Korean 2nd (6000 troops) and 9th Divisions (9350 troops) were almost completely destroyed in the battles. Only a few hundred from each division returned to North Korea after the fight (Appleman 1998, 603-604). Estimated casualties:15,000. Note, Japanese Society of the Study of the History of Land Warfare 2000 record 7000 casualties.

5.29.5.8. Outcome – United States won. The Pusan Perimeter had held, though it had been a costly close-run affair (Clodfelter 2008, 700).

5.29.6. In'chon (landing) (Clodfelter 2008, 700 and 712)

5.29.6.1. The battle is a part of In'chon-Seoul Campaign. General MacArthur's amphibious stroke at In'chon reversed the fortunes of the Korean War (Clodfelter 2008, 700)

5.29.6.2. Onset: 15/09/1950; Termination: 15/09/1950

5.29.6.3. United States versus North Korea

5.29.6.4. Approximately 18,000 forces (Rottman 2002, 59-60: see also Blair 1987, 223; Millett 2010 244-245)

5.29.6.5. United States – 22 killed, 174 wounded

5.29.6.6. North Korea – 2,000 troops (18th Division) (See also Appleman 1992, 508).

5.29.6.7. North Korea – 300 killed, 1,350 wounded

5.29.6.8. Outcome – United States won (Clodfelter 2008, 700)

5.29.7. In'chon-Seoul (Clodfelter 2008, 700 and 712)

5.29.7.1. The battle is a part of In'chon-Seoul Campaign; The United Nations coalition attempted to liberate Seoul.

5.29.7.2. Onset: 15/09/1950; Termination: 27/09/1950

5.29.7.3. United Nations Coalition (South Korea and the United States) versus North Korea

5.29.7.4. United Nations – 71,339 troops; After a two-day air and naval prep, the X Corps, commanded by Major General Edward Almond, were ashore on September 15 on the In'chon beaches (Clodfelter 2008, 700); The major ground units of the X Corps were the 1st Marine Division (25,040 troops including 2,786 South Korean marines), the 7th Infantry Division (24,845 troops including unknown numbers of South Koreans), the 92d and 86th Field Artillery Battalions (both 155-mm. howitzers), the 50th Antiaircraft Artillery (Automatic Weapons) Battalion, the 56th Amphibious Tank and Tractor Battalion, the 19th Engineer Combat Group, and the 2d Engineer Special Brigade. (Appleman 1992, 492-493 and 503 n44). "The X corps expeditionary troops arriving off Inch'on on 15 September numbered nearly 70,000 men. The major units were the 1st Marine Division, the 7th Infantry Division, the 92d and 96th Field Artillery Battalions (both 155-mm. howitzers), the 50th Antiaircraft Artillery (Automatic Weapons) Battalion (SP), the 56th Amphibious Tank and Tractor Battalion, the 19th Engineer Combat Group, and the 2d Engineer Special Brigade. The 1st of 25,040 men—19,494 organic to the Marine Corps and the Navy, 2,760 Army troops attached, and 2,786 Korean marines attached. Later, after the 7th Marines arrived, the organic Marine strength increased about 4,000 men. On invasion day the GHQ UNC reserve consisted of the 3d Infantry Division and the 187th Airborne Regimental Combat Team (composed of troops from the nth Airborne Division). The ROK 17th Regiment was in the act of moving from Eighth Army to join X Corps (Appleman 1992, 503; See also Appleman 1992, 492).

5.29.7.5. United Nations – 3,500 casualties (United States – 536 killed, 2,550 wounded, 65 missing: these figures include the losses of South Korean who were assigned to the U.S. 7th Infantry Division.; South Korea – 29 killed, 96 wounded)

5.29.7.6. North Korea – 20,000 troops

5.29.7.7. North Korea – 13,666 killed, 4,692 captured, 44 tanks and 23 guns lost

5.29.7.8. Outcome – UN won; North Korea could not prevent the liberation of Seoul" (Clodfelter 2008, 700); Enemy resistance in Seoul had ended—the North Korean forces were withdrawing northward in the direction of Uijongbu just ninety days after they had victoriously entered the city in their bid for conquest of South Korea (Appleman 1992, 536).

5.29.8. Ch'ongch'on River (Kunu-ri) (Clodfelter 2008, 701 and 712)

5.29.8.1. After the U.S. divisions reached the Yalu River and continued advancing toward the border with China, a Chinese offensive fell on

the UN coalition. China engaged in an offensive pushing the UN forces to the 38th parallel

5.29.8.2. Onset: 30/11/1950; Termination: 01/12/1950

5.29.8.3. United Nations Coalition (South Korea, Turkey, United States) versus China

5.29.8.4. United Nations – 3 South Korean divisions (6th, 7th, and 8th Divisions in the ROK II Corps); "1 U.S. division (2nd Infantry Division with 15,000 troops on November 15th, 1950. (Mossman 1990, 126), 1 Turkish brigade (5,051 troops as a part of the UN ground forces on November 23, 1950. (Mossman 1990, 24)). Per Rottman (2002), ROK forces totaled 25,676 (p. 150), US forces totaled 18,804 (p. 16), and Turkish forces totaled 5,400 (p. 119); total forces were approximately 49,880.

5.29.8.5. United Nations – 11,000 killed

5.29.8.6. China – 60,000 forces (Rottman 2002, 175, 177-178). For Chinese official history figures see Zhanzheng 2000, 90.

5.29.8.7. China – Different scholars have different estimations of casualty figures. Shuang Shi (2004, 201) estimates over 10000 casualties and Xu Yan (1990, 60) estimates 30700 casualties. Given the range, we estimate a middle figure of 20,000 casualties.

5.29.8.8. Outcome – China won (Clodfelter 2008, 702)

5.29.9. Chosin Reservoir (Clodfelter 2008, 702 and 712)

5.29.9.1. The battle of Chosin Reservoir is a part of the Chinese Intervention to push back the UN army toward the 38th Parallel; China – Pushing the UN forces to the south; UN – Defending the positions

5.29.9.2. Onset: 27/11/1950; Termination: 10/12/1950

5.29.9.3. United Nations Coalition (South Korea, United States) versus China

5.29.9.4. United Nations – 2 South Korean divisions (3rd and Capital Divisions (Mossman 1990, 147)), 3 U.S. divisions (X Corps' 3rd and 7th Infantry Divisions and 1st Marine Division. Per Rottman (2002), ROK forces totaled 14,120 (p. 150) and US forces totaled 59,963 (pp. 16, 59); total forces were 74,083.

5.29.9.5. United Nations – 10,495 killed, wounded, or missing; Total number of battle casualties is 8,735 in the X Corps; 1st Marine Division - 394 killed, 2,154 wounded, 77 missing including 4 U.S. army casualties; U.S. 3rd Division - 67 killed, 282 wounded, 241 missing including 187 South Korean casualties; U.S. 7th Division - 71 killed, 226 wounded, 4,065 missing including 1,602 South Koreans casualties; ROK 3rd Division - 15 killed, 127 wounded, 6 missing; ROK Capital Division - 126 killed, 318 wounded, 334 missing (Mossman 1990, 147).

5.29.9.6. China – 72,000 troops in 6 divisions

5.29.9.7. China – 12,000 killed, 7,500 wounded to ground fire, plus 10,300 killed or wounded to air attack

5.29.9.8. Outcome – China won. The Chinese divisions overran the UN army (Clodfelter 2008, 702).

5.29.10. Hoengsong (Massacre Valley) (Clodfelter 2008, 703 and 712)

5.29.10.1. The battle of Hoengsong (Massacre Valley) is a part of the Chinese Communists New Year's Offensive beginning on January 1, 1951. The Chinese attempted to cross the 38th Parallel once again.

5.29.10.2. Onset: 11/02/1951; Termination: 13/02/1951

5.29.10.3. United Nations Coalition (Netherlands, South Korea, United States) versus China

5.29.10.4. United Nations – 3 South Korean divisions (3rd, 5th, and 8th Divisions), 1 U.S. regiment (38th Infantry Regiment of the 2nd Division), 1 Dutch battalion (636 troops as a part of the UN ground forces on November 23, 1950. (Mossman 1990, 24) or 742 troops (Fox 1952, 214) Per Rottman (2002), ROK forces totaled 21,201 (p. 150), US forces totaled 3,781 (p. 18), and Dutch forces totaled 636 (p. 121); total UN forces were 25,618.

5.29.10.5. United Nations – United States – 2,018 losses including 726 killed or died as prisoners, and 19 howitzers lost; South Korean losses – 16,914; Dutch losses – 112

5.29.10.6. China – 2 armies (40th and 66th Armies); approximately 60,000 forces (Rottman 2002, 175, 177). For Chinese official history figures see Zhanzheng 2000, 237.

5.29.10.7. China – 4,141 casualties (Zhanzheng Shi 2000, 237).

5.29.10.8. Outcome – China won. The ROK 8th Division was . . . destroyed; the ROK 3rd and 5th Divisions were mauled . . . A battalion of the U.S. 2nd Division's 38th Regiment was caught in Massacre Valley . . . the heaviest single day battle loss for the United States in the entire war (Clodfelter 2008, 703).

5.29.11. Chipyong-ni (Clodfelter 2008, 703 and 712)

5.29.11.1. The battle of Chipyong-ni is a part of the Chinese New Year's Offensive beginning on January 1, 1951. The Chinese attempted to cross the 38th Parallel once again.

5.29.11.2. Onset: 13/02/1951; Termination: 15/02/1951

5.29.11.3. United Nations (France and United States) versus China

5.29.11.4. United Nations – 4,660 in 1 U.S. regiment (23rd Infantry Regiment of the 2nd Division) and 1 French battalion (1,150 French troops (Fox 1952, 218)

5.29.11.5. United Nations – 64 killed, 299 wounded, 61 missing

5.29.11.6. China – 18,000 in 3 divisions

5.29.11.7. China – 4,946 casualties including 79 captured

5.29.11.8. Outcome– United Nations won. For the first time in the Korean War, the Chinese attacked in human waves; always before they had

fought by infiltration, encirclement, and ambush. But . . . China did not defeat the small but sturdy force of 2nd Division and French Battalion soldiers (Clodfelter 2008, 703).

5.29.12. Chinese Communist Spring Offensive (first phase)
(Clodfelter 2008, 703-704 and 712)

5.29.12.1. Onset: 22/04/1951; Termination: 01/05/1951

5.29.12.2. United Nations (United States, South Korea, United Kingdom, Philippines, Turkey, New Zealand, Belgium, Australia, and Canada) versus China and North Korea

5.29.12.3. United Nations – South Korea – 1st, 3rd and 6th Divisions; United Kingdom – 27th and 29th Brigades for a total of 11,186 troops as a part of the UN ground forces on November 23, 1950 (Mossman 1990, 24). Fox cites 2,730 and 6,000 troops respectively (Fox 1952, 218-219); Philippines – 10th Battalion (1,349 troops as a part of the UN ground forces on November 23, 1950. (Mossman 1990, 24). Fox cites 1,363 troops (Fox 1952, 213); Turkey – Brigade for a total of 5,051 troops as part of the UN ground forces on November 23, 1950 (Mossman 1990, 24). Fox cites 4,567 troops (Fox 1952, 216); New Zealand – Artillery Battalion for a total of 837 troops (Fox 1952, 216-217); Belgium – Infantry Battalion for a total of 672 troops (Fox 1952, 214)); Australia – 3rd Battalion of Royal Australian Regiment for a total of 1,002 troops as a part of the UN ground forces on November 23, 1950 (Mossman 1990, 24). Fox cites 1,030 troops (Fox 1952, 217); Canada – 2nd Battalion, Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry totaling 959 troops (Fox 1952, 216; Mossman 1990, 379, 381-382, 391). Approximately 197,000 total forces fought during the 1st impulse (Grauer 2016, 144).

5.29.12.4. United Nations –15,813 total casualties, with 825 KIA, 3,958 WIA, and 11,030 MIA (Grauer 2016, 143).

5.29.12.5. China/North Korea – 270,000 in 3 Chinese Army Groups: III Army Group (3 Armies); IX Army Group (2 Armies); XIX Army Group (3 Armies), plus Chinese XIII Army Groups (2 Armies); North Korean I Corp (2 divisions); III Corps (at least 17,200 in 3 divisions); V Corps (3 divisions) (Mossman 1990, 379, 381). Approximately 337,000 of the Chinese and North Korean forces fought (Grauer 2016, 144).

5.29.12.6. China/North Korea – 15,000 killed, 55,000 wounded or missing

5.29.12.7. Outcome – United Nations won. By May 1, the PLA offensive had lost momentum, after limited gains. The powerful defensive fires of the Eighth Army and its air force support had claimed about 70,000 Chinese, including 15,000 MIA (Clodfelter 2008, 703-704).

5.29.13. Chinese Communist Spring Offensive (second phase) or the Battle of the Soyang River (Clodfelter 2008, 704 and 712)

5.29.13.1. China/North Korea – Attempted to cross the 38th Parallel once again; UN – Defending from the Chinese Communist offensive and stopping the further communist advances

5.29.13.2. Onset: 16/05/1951; Termination: 23/05/1951

5.29.13.3. United Nations Coalition (United States, South Korea) versus China and North Korea

5.29.13.4. United Nations – Approximately 101,000 forces fought during the 2nd impulse (Grauer 2016, 144); 4 U.S. divisions (e.g., 2nd and 3rd Divisions, 1st Marine Division; not clear in terms of the troops number, but "on 29 November 1950, set the authorized war strength of an infantry division at 18,855, more than 4,000 greater than that of a World War II division." (Mossman 1990, 30), 1 U.S. regiment (187th Airborne Regiment), 6 South Korean divisions (e.g., 5th, 7th Divisions, not clear in terms of the troops number, but a ROK division varied in size from 6,900 to 9,700 men. (Clodfelter 2008, 698)

5.29.13.5. United Nations – 12,129 casualties, including 483 KIA, 1,864 WIA, and 9,782 MIA (Grauer 2016, 143).

5.29.13.6. China and North Korea total – 175,000; 137,000 Chinese (21 divisions), 38,000 North Koreans (9 divisions)

5.29.13.7. China and North Korea total – 90,609 killed, wounded or missing

5.29.13.8. Outcome – United Nations won. The Chinese offensive was halted by May 20 . . . The Chinese were by now overextended, their supplies exhausted, and their lines of communication interdicted by U.S. air power (Clodfelter 2008, 704).

5.29.14. Bloody Ridge (Clodfelter 2008, 704-705 and 712)

5.29.14.1. The battle of Bloody Ridge is a part of the UN Counter-Offensive starting in August 1951. Two important pieces of terrain (i.e., Bloody Ridge and Heartbreak Ridge) became the scene of vicious hill battles in summer and fall 1951 (Clodfelter 2008, 704-705)

5.29.14.2. Onset: 18/08/1951; Termination: 05/09/1951

5.29.14.3. United Nations Coalitions (South Korea and United States) versus North Korea

5.29.14.4. United Nations – 1 U.S. division (2nd Infantry Division), 1 South Korean regiment. Per Rottman (2002), US forces totaled 18,804 (p. 16) and ROK forces totaled approximately 2,500 (p. 150); total forces were approximately 21,300.

5.29.14.5. United States – 326 killed, 2,032 wounded, 414 missing; South Korea – 1,000 losses

5.29.14.6. North Korea – 2 divisions; North Korean divisions were authorized up to 12,000 soldiers during the war (Rottman 2002, 163). Approximately 24,000 total forces.

5.29.14.7. North Korea – 5,677 killed, 9,422 wounded, 264 captured (Similar to Hermes 1992, 86)

5.29.14.8. Outcome – United Nations won. It took the 2nd [Infantry Division] from August 18-September 5 to take the ridge (Clodfelter 2008, 705).

5.29.15. Heartbreak Ridge (Clodfelter 2008, 704-705 and 712)

5.29.15.1. The battle of Heartbreak Ridge is a part of the UN Counter-Offensive starting in August 1951.

5.29.15.2. Onset: 13/09/1951; Termination: 15/10/1951

5.29.15.3. United Nations (France and United States) versus China and North Korea

5.29.15.4. United States – 1 U.S. division (2nd Infantry Division); France – 1 French battalion attached to the U.S. 2nd Division Per Rottman, total US forces were 18,804 (p. 16) and French forces were 1,100 (p. 121); total forces were 19,904.

5.29.15.5. United Nations – 597 killed, 3,064 wounded, 84 missing.

5.29.15.6. China and North Korea – 3 North Korean divisions (6th, 13thand 12th Divisions), 1 Chinese division (Communist Chinese Forces (CCF) 204th Division; Chinese divisions were authorized up to 10,000 soldiers during the war (Rottman 2002, 175) and North Korean divisions were authorized up to 12,000 soldiers during the war (Rottman 2002, 163). Approximately 46,000 total forces.

5.29.15.7. China and North Korea – 9,862 killed, 14,204 wounded, 606 captured (See also Hermes 1992, 96)

5.29.15.8. Outcome – United Nations won. It required of the 2nd [Infantry Division] nearly five weeks, from September 13-October 15, to capture the ridge from its defenders (Clodfelter 2008, 705).

5.30. Off-Shore Islands War

5.30.1. Battle of Yikiangshan Island (Clodfelter 2008, 673)

5.30.1.1. As the last step of unifying China, Communist China attempted the conquest of the offshore islands in the Taiwan Strait.

5.30.1.2. Onset: 18/01/1955; Termination: 21/01/1955

5.30.1.3. China versus Taiwan

5.30.1.4. China – 5,500 troops, 30 small warships and 210 aircraft

5.30.1.5. China – 416 killed, 1,176 wounded, one frigate sunk, one frigate damaged, 2 aircraft shot down

5.30.1.6. Taiwan – 1,086 troops

5.30.1.7. Taiwan – 567 killed, 519 surrendered

5.30.1.8. Outcome – China won. Taiwan surrendered and lost Yikiangshan Island.

5.31. Sinai War

5.31.1. Battle of Mitla Pass (Clodfelter 2008, 611)

5.31.1.1. The war opened with an airborne drop of 395 paratroopers on strategic Mitla Pass, which they held against a counterattack by an Egyptian battalion (Clodfelter 2008, 611)

5.31.1.2. Onset: 29/10/1956; Termination: 1/11/1956 (Laffin 1982b, 3)

5.31.1.3. Israel versus Egypt

5.31.1.4. Israel – 395 paratroopers; 202d Paratroop Brigade (Dupuy 1978, 148-151).

5.31.1.5. Israel – 38 killed, 120 wounded (Laffin 1982a, 8)

5.31.1.6. Egypt – 1 battalion; approximately 2,000

5.31.1.7. Egypt – 200 killed, wounded, or missing

5.31.1.8. Outcome – Israel won. The Egyptians heavily engaged the Mitla force, but by the evening of 30 October the Israelis held the pass (Laffin 1982b, 13; 1982a, 8).

5.31.2. Battle of Rafa

5.31.2.1. After the Battle of Milta Pass, Israeli armored columns pushed through Egyptian concentrations at Rafah, on the coast, and at Abu Ageila, in the central sector (Clodfelter 2008, 611; See also Dupuy 1978, 184-185)

5.31.2.2. Onset: 31/10/1956; Termination: 01/11/1956 (Herzog 1982, 130)

5.31.2.3. Israel versus Egypt

5.31.2.4. Israel – 1st Infantry (Golani) Brigade with 12 anti-tank guns, 27th Armored Brigade with additional artillery unit; approximately 6,000. (See also Dupuy 1978, 184)

5.31.2.5. Israel – 100 (Varble 2008, 41)

5.31.2.6. Egypt – 5th Infantry Brigade plus tank company, one artillery battalion, anti-tank guns, ant-aircraft weapons, with a Palestine volunteers' unit attached; approximately 8,000. (Dupuy 1978, 146 and 184)

5.31.2.7. Egypt – Unknown

5.31.2.8. Outcome – Israel won. The Egyptian garrison in the Sinai withdrew to the western bank of the Suez Canal on November 1 (Herzog 1982, 132-133; See also Dupuy 1978, 188).

5.31.3. Battle of Abu Ageila

5.31.3.1. After the Battle of Milta Pass, Israeli armored columns pushed through Egyptian concentrations at Rafah, on the coast, and at Abu Ageila, in the central sector (Clodfelter 2008, 611)

5.31.3.2. Onset: 30/10/1956; Termination: 02/11/1956 (Gawrych 1990, 64)

5.31.3.3. Israel versus Egypt

5.31.3.4. Israel – 1 armored and 2 infantry brigades with at least 12,000 men and 100 tanks (Gawrych 1990, 25)

5.31.3.5. Israel – The 4th Brigade finally took Kusseima early in the morning of October 30 without any great difficulty. Four Israeli soldiers . . . died in the battle (Henkin 2015, 136).

5.31.3.6. Egypt – 1 infantry brigade with 3,000 men with no tank but with antitank guns (Gawrych 1990, 14 and 25)

5.31.3.7. Egypt – The whole area of Abu-Agelia, from Kusseima in the east to the Mount Libni junction a few miles to the southwest, was protected by more than three thousand soldiers from the 6th Infantry Brigade group" (Henkin 2015, 136)

5.31.3.8. Egypt – 405 total; 35 Egyptian soldiers died in the battle; 370 Egyptian soldiers became prisoners of war.

5.31.3.9. Outcome – Israel won. Ultimately, Egypt suffered a major defeat (Gawrych 1990, 65); Col. Uri Ben-Ari took his 7th Armd. Bde. Through the Isareli infantry at Kusseima and rapidly enveloped the key Egyptian position at Abu Ageila (Laffin 1982b, 13); Henkin 2015, 136.

5.31.4. Battle of Sharm el-Sheikh (Clodfelter 2008, 611)

5.31.4.1. The battle of Sharm el-Sheikh is a part of the Israeli blitzkrieg against an impending Egyptian attack (See also Dupuy 1978, 194 and 198)

5.31.4.2. Onset: 04/11/1956; Termination: 06/11/1956

5.31.4.3. Israel versus Egypt

5.31.4.4. Israel – the 9th Infantry Brigade; approximately 1,800 soldiers (Herzog 1982, 135)

5.31.4.5. Israel – 10 killed, 32 wounded (See also Dupuy 1978, 199)

5.31.4.6. Egypt – 3 battalions manning 6 cannon and 10 antiaircraft guns; approximately 1,500 soldiers (Herzog 1982, 135)

5.31.4.7. Egypt – 100 killed, 31 wounded, and 864 taken prisoner (See also Dupuy 1978, 199)

5.31.4.8. Outcome – Israel won (Israel captured Sharm el-Sheikh)

5.31.5. Operation Musketeer (Port Said and Port Fuad) (Clodfelter 2008, 612)

5.31.5.1. The Anglo-French force attempted to occupy the Suez Canal (Clodfelter 2008, 612; See also Dupuy 1978, Chapter 9)

5.31.5.2. Onset: 05/11/1956; Termination: 07/11/1956

5.31.5.3. Britain and France versus Egypt

5.31.5.4. Britain – 600 paratroopers, 13,500 landing troops; France – 500 paratroopers, 8,500 landing troops

5.31.5.5. Britain – 22 killed, 96 wounded; France – 10 killed, 33 wounded, 1 missing

5.31.5.6. Egypt – The Egyptian garrison at Port Said in October 1956 consisted of two battalions of infantry reservists, plus some regular antiaircraft and coastal defense batteries. When it became clear that an Anglo-French invasion was imminent, Nasser augmented

these forces with three National Guard battalions, and a third battalion of reservists. Approximately 6,000. (Dupuy 1978, 204).

5.31.5.7. Egypt – 921 killed, 950 wounded, 185 taken prisoner

5.31.5.8. Outcome – Britain and France won. The Anglo-French forces had won control of the northern half of the canal, from Port Said to Ismailia, when the cease-fire took effect on November 7 (Clodfelter 2008, 612).

5.32. Soviet Invasion of Hungary

5.32.1. Battle of Budapest (Clodfelter 2008, 576-577; See also United States Central Intelligence Agency. 1 February 1957 and United States Central Intelligence Agency. 8 Feburary 1957.)

5.32.1.1. On October 23, 1956, the people of Budapest took the frustrations and fears of a decade of Stalinist oppression out into streets and liberated the capital. But the Soviets came back on November 4 and crushed the rebellion in the heaviest fighting in Europe since the end of WWII (Clodfelter 2008, 576)

5.32.1.2. Onset: 04/11/1956; Termination: 10/11/1956

5.32.1.3. Hungary versus Russia

5.32.1.4. Hungary – Unknown

5.32.1.5. Hungary – 1,945 killed, 16,700 wounded

5.32.1.6. Russia – 75,000 Red Army troops. 40 Russian tanks, 11 armoured cars and more than 30 trucks of infantry men; Two soviet tank and two air divisions

5.32.1.7. Russia – 669 killed, 1,540 wounded, 51 missing, 320 armored vehicles lost

5.32.1.8. Outcome – Soviet Union won. Soviet Union retook Budapest.

5.33. Ifni War

5.33.1. Battle of Ifni, 21 November – 12 December 1957 (Clodfelter 2008, 589)

5.33.1.1. After obtaining independence from France in March 1956, Morocco laid claim to all Spanish possessions in northwest Africa (plus all of Mauritania, which was a French overseas territory from 1946 to 1958). Although Spain returned its protectorate in the north to Morocco in April 1956, it refused to relinquish Tarfaya, Ifni, and especially Spanish Sahara. During the late 1950s, armed resistance to Spanish control in the Sahara erupted. (Damis 1983, 11)

5.33.1.2. Onset: 21/11/1957; Termination: 12/12/1957

5.33.1.3. Spain and Ifni Soldiers versus Morocco and Army for Liberation of the Sahara (ALS)

5.33.1.4. Spain and Infi Soldiers – 6,000 troops (1 garrison); The resident Spanish forces in Sidi Ifni: 3 infantry battalions, the native police, 3 batteries of field artillery in total 1,500 Spanish and 500 Ifni soldiers on 23 November (Mercer 1976, 220-221); By 9

December the Spanish troops were reinforced and they were 7,500 men. (Mercer 1976, 221)

5.33.1.5. Spain and Infi Soldiers – 62 killed, 100 wounded

5.33.1.6. Morocco and ALS – 12,000 Moroccan Liberation Army (Saharan tribesmen and soldiers of the regular Moroccan armed forces; Moroccan irregular forces (the Army for Liberation of the Sahara, ALS, a group of former resistance fighters from the Moroccan Army of Liberation) with 3,000 to 5,000 supported by Reguibat and Tekna nomads (Damis 1983, 11)); On 23 October 1957 the Army of Liberation talked to the Moroccan government in Rabat and then drafted 1,500 *moukhahidines*, freedom figheters, to Goulimine, and 600 to Bou Izarguen, towns near Ifni. (Mercer 1976, 220)

5.33.1.7. Morocco and ALS – Unknown

5.33.1.8. Outcome – Morocco and ALS won. Spain had been forced to give up all of its outlying posts in Ifni and had fallen back to a 6-mile-long defense perimeter around the capital of Sidi Ifni (Clodfelter 2008, 589); The ALS attacked the Spanish military forces in the territory (and in Ifni) and forced them back to the coastal cities – Dakhala, Boujdour, and El Ayoun (or El Aaiun) (Damis 1983, 11).

5.33.2. Battle of Ifni, 19 February – 10 April 1958 (Clodfelter 2008, 589); (or Operation Ouragan or Ouragon) (Ruf 1987, 66; and Pazzanita 2006, 325-327)

5.33.2.1. Under the threat of the growing strength of the Liberation Army which started to attack almost everywhere (in southern Morocco, in the Western Sahara and in Mauritania), France and Spain agreed to a joint military action, Operation Ouragan. In February, the two armies smashed the guerrillas in heavy ground arracks supported by air cover. A few days later, regular Moroccan troops entered Southern Morocco. For many Saharawis, this is regarded as proof that the palace knew about the operation and had let the colonial powers do its dirty work in order to take military control over the region north of the border of Western Sahara (Ruf 1987, 66); By February 24, 1958, France had largely withdrawn its soldiers into its colonies of Algeria and Mauritania, leaving it to Spain to set up permanent bases in the Western Sahara (Pazzanita 2006, 327).

5.33.2.2. Onset: 19/02/1958; Termination: 10/04/1958

5.33.2.3. Spain and France versus Army for Liberation of the Sahara (ALS) and Morocco

5.33.2.4. Spain and France – Spain – 500 paratroopers, warships and aircraft bombardment; Spain – 9,000 troops and 60 aircraft; and France – 5,000 troops, 600 vehicles, 70 aircraft (Pazzanita 2006,

326); 427 paratroopers were dropped from 31 Spanish planes. (Mercer 1976, 223)

5.33.2.5. Spain and France – Spain – 5 killed and 27 wounded as of March 2, 1958; France – 7 killed and 25 wounded

5.33.2.6. Morocco and ALS – Estimated 12,000 tribesmen from Ifni, Spanish Southern Morocco, Spanish Sahara, Mauritania and Tindouf (Mercer 1976, 223)

5.33.2.7. Morocco and ALS – 132 guerrillas killed and 51 prisoners based on the French government (Pazzanita 2006, 327)

5.33.2.8. Outcome – Morocco and ALS won. On April 10, 1958, Spain gave up Ifni to Morocco, along with a 10,000-square-mile piece of desert called the Southern Protectorate, a region between southern Morocco and the Spanish Sahara (Clodfelter 2008, 589); After Operation Ouragan, Spain returned the Tarfaya zone to Morocco on 10 April 1958, and the enclave of Ifni was handed over to Morocco only in 1969 (Ruf 1987, 66).

5.33.3. Battle of El Aaiun Area, 1958 (Clodfelter 2008, 589)

5.33.3.1. In 1958, backed by French air strikes from Mauritania and Algeria, the Spanish Foreign Legion began a major operation that drove the irregulars out of Spanish West Africa (Clodfelter 2008, 589); A Spanish governor-general stationed I El Ayoun (El Aaium) exercised local administrative responsibilities. (Damis 1983, 11) January 1958 saw continued fighting around the towns, and on the 12th El Aaium was openly attacked by the ALS. One of the war's major battles was fought at Edchera, about 20 km southeast of El Aaium, between the Spanish Foreign Legion and the ALS, on 13 January 1958 (Pazzanita 2006, 106; and Mercer 1976, 222).

5.33.3.2. Onset: 13/01/1958; Termination: ?/?/1958

5.33.3.3. Spain and France versus Morocco

5.33.3.4. Spain and France – the Spanish Foreign Legion [not clear in terms of its size]; France – air strikes from Mauritania and Algeria; "Early in 1958 the Spanish and French mounted a joint counter-offensive: using 9,000 [Spanish] and 5,000 [French] men supported by 60 to 70 aircraft, respectively, they advanced eastwards from the coast and westwards from the Route Imperiale, soon retaking the desert" (Mercer 1976, 503).

5.33.3.5. Spain and France – Spain had at least 51 killed, 200 wounded; Spanish claimed: 51 killed during the daylong battle (Pazzanita 2006, 106; Mercer 1976, 222. France – 0 as they were only engaging with airstrikes.

5.33.3.6. Morocco – Unknown

5.33.3.7. Morocco – Spanish claimed: 241 guerrillas killed (Pazzanita 2006, 106; Mercer 1976, 222)

5.33.3.8. Outcome – Spain won. On the 12th El Aaiun was openly attacked. The incensed Legion was let loose….and…inflicted severe

defeat. Killing 241 against their own losses of fifty-one dead (Mercer 1976, 222).

5.34. Assam War

5.34.1. Battle of Ladakh (Clodfelter 2008, 639)

5.34.1.1. The Chinese assault in the Chip Chap Valley, as the forward section of the DBO was also known, actually began about six hours earlier than the attack in the Namka Chu Valley. The PLA's first target was a post on Red Peak that was manned by members of the 14th J&K Militia Bn. Using the 4th Inf Div 11th Regt 3rd Bn 7th and 8th Companies, as well as three squads of engineers in support, the Chinese surrounded the post and launched a heavy bombardment on the already weak defenses. Before the assault began, the 7th Co dispatched a strengthened squad to implement a feint as the other companies moved in against the post. The use of overwhelming manpower, heavy machine guns and mortars, grenades, satchel charges, engineering weaponry, and several flamethrowers ultimately dislodged the Indian defenders. The Chinese quickly followed up the capture of Red Peak by moving on to other individual posts and using the same techniques to wipe out resistance at each, while also skipping certain posts to cut off the escape route for fleeing Indian soldiers (Arostegui 2013, 83-86).

5.34.1.2. Onset: 20/10/1962; Termination: 22/10/1962

5.34.1.3. China versus India

5.34.1.4. China –1 division. In response to Indian troop deployments, China had deployed about 6,300 troops, including two infantry regiments, some independent battalions, and supporting artillery units, forces that operated under the command of the Kangxiwa Headquarters of the Xinjiang Military Region" (Wortzel 2003, 340); In response to the massive buildup, the PRC increased their troop presence in the months leading up to October. To prepare for battle against the Indian Army, the Chinese deployed the Border Defense Ali Sub-Formation 2nd Inf Div provided four companies from the artillery regiment, the AAA battalion, the engineer battalion, the signals battalion, the recon company, and the flamethrower company. Finally, the 21st Base 109th Construction Regt 1st Bn was in the area to support combat operations and build infrastructure if needed. While the total manpower available for combat was more than 6,300, there were also more than 5,500 support personnel prepared for transportation, logistics, medical operations, storage, and meal preparation to the rear. All of these troops fell under the Xinjiang MR Kangxiwar Forward Command Post (Arostegui 2013, 83); Compile Group of History of Sino-Indian Border Self-defense Counterattack War records Chinese contributions of 11,800 (Compile Group of History of Sino-Indian Border Self-defense Counterattack War 1994, Chapter 4, section 5, subsection 3 and 5).

5.34.1.5. China – 34 (Arostegui 2013, 86).

5.34.1.6. India – 2 brigades. As per Chinese estimates, Indian had deployed HQ 114 Infantry Brigade consisting of four battalions (14 J&K Militia, 1/8 GR, 5 JAT and 7 J&K Militia) for defense of Ladakh. Around September / beginning of October 1962, this Brigade was reinforced by 1 JAT and 13 KUMAN ex 70 Infantry Brigade, i.e. a total of six infantry battalions with a total strength of about 5600 men (Sandhu, Shankar, and Dwivedi 2015, 51); By October 1962, India had deployed about 6,000 troops to Ladakh, including the 114th Inf Bde and its four battalions. Of those forces, approximately 1,300 Indian troops were stationed in some forty strongholds or outposts placed in what China viewed as its territory" (Arostegui 2013, 82).

5.34.1.7. India –290 killed or missing in Ladakh

5.34.1.8. Outcome – China won. (Clodfelter 2008, 639; Arostegui 2013, 83-86).

5.34.2. Battle of Northeast Frontier Agency (NEFA) I, (Clodfelter 2008, 639)

5.34.2.1. The Chinese incursion into Subansiri and Siang in the central NEFA commenced on 21 October, with a main offsensive being launched on 16 November (Lintner 2018, 242).

5.34.2.2. Onset: 20/10/1962; Termination: 25/10/1962

5.34.2.3. China versus India

5.34.2.4. China – The Chinese assembled a smaller force of about 10,000 troops on the eastern sector, under the command of the Tibetan Military Region and consisting of five infantry regiments and some artillery units (Wortzel 2003, 339-40; See also Jiang and Li 1994, Chapter 4).

5.34.2.5. China – 785 (Jiang and Li 1994, Chapter 4)

5.34.2.6. India – By October India had deployed the Fourth Division, three other brigades under the command of the Fourth Army, and some garrison forces on the eastern sector of the boundary – a total of about 16,000 troops (Wortzel 2003, 339).

5.34.2.7. India – 90% of Indian casualties 1,423 killed, 3,078 wounded, 1,655 missing and presumed dead, 3,968 captured (these figures are the total numbers of the Assam War; 90% of Indian casualties suffered in NEFA). After accounting for losses sufferend in NEFA II, approximately 6,660 casualties in this battle.

5.34.2.8. Outcome – China won. China overwhelmed the Indian defenses in NEFA in two surges. China called a unilateral ceasefire on November 21 and later withdrew from most of the conquered terrain, having taught India a harsh lesson (Clodfelter 2008, 639).

5.34.3. Battle of Northeast Frontier Agency (NEFA) II, (Clodfelter 2008, 639)

5.34.3.1. The PLA began maneuvering its numerous regiments in the eastern sector on 15 November for the upcoming attack. Over five days, each unit solidified its position while awaiting CMC approval to initiate the second phase of combat. Se La and Senge Dzong were the first targets, and similar in manner to their attack on the Namka Chu, the PLA used extensive reconnaissance and concentration of forces to prepare for a massive assault on the outmatched Indian Army. Beginning on 14 November and finishing the next day, the 415th Budui crossed the Tawang River and headed southeast. The ultimate goal of the 155th Inf Regt was to position itself 8-km west of Senge Dzong by 17 November. The other two regiments of the 415th Budui, the 154th and the 155th, departed with similar goals of flanking the Indian positions. The 154th moved into positions on the west side of one of the two small lakes outside of Se La on the morning of the 17th, while the 155th followed suit, but also sent its 3rd Battalion further south to support the 157th. By the morning of the 17th, the entire 415th Budui had completed its initial maneuvers and awaited the signal to begin its assault" (Arostegui 2013, 96-98).

5.34.3.2. Onset: 17/11/1962; Termination: 21/11/1962

5.34.3.3. China versus India

5.34.3.4. China – The GSD-directed deployment increased Chinese troop strength on the eastern sector of the border to five somewhat understrength divisions – in total, about 25,000 soldiers (Wortzel 2003, 341). Other sources have lower figures – 18,000 (Zhao 2001, 145). Action waged on in the central region of the eastern sector during the second phase, but like the first, it was in a much smaller scale than the other two regions. During the lull, the CMC instructed the Shannan, Linzhi, and Lhasa military sub-districts to bring up another three battalions, approximately 2,200 men, to the front by 18 November. Those men would then be distributed across the area to participate in the next round of assaults against Indian positions (Arostegui 2013, 112-113).

5.34.3.5. China – 697 (Zhao 2001, 145); At Thembang, for example, where the Guards made their stand on November 17th, Indian intelligence later concluded that the Chinese had suffered between three and four hundred killed. (Maxwell 1970, 424-425)

5.34.3.6. India – The focus was still on the eastern sector where the Indian Army deployed about 22,000 troops, commanded by the Corps headquarters; they made up three divisions, with a total of eight brigades. In all, India deployed 28 battalions to the border (Wortzel 2003, 341).

5.34.3.7. India – By that evening, Chinese troops had seized Walong and wiped out more than 1,200 Indian troops. Then on November 18 the PLA launched a second successful eastern sector counteroffensive in the Se La-Bomdi La area. This effectively

eliminated the strength and combat capability of most of three Indian brigades and recovered a great deal of Chinese territory south of the McMahon Line (Wortzel 2003, 342). According to Chinese officials, Pang and his crew killed seven Indian soldiers and captured seven 87.6-mm howitzers" (Arostegui 2013, 103). According to Chinese records, the division killed 750 Indian soldiers and captured 502 prisoners, including two battalion commanders. The amount of supplies left behind after the 11th Bde fell apart was enormous, with the PLA taking control of 62 artillery pieces, 94 light machine guns, 715 rifles, 10,000 artillery shells, over a million rounds of ammunition, 5,400 grenades, and 1,400 landmines (Arostegui 2013, 112). Approximately 2,452 casualties.

5.34.3.8. Outcome – China won. China overwhelmed the Indian defenses in NEFA in two surges. China called a unilateral ceasefire on November 21 and later withdrew from most of the conquered terrain, having taught India a harsh lesson (Clodfelter 2008, 639).

5.35. Vietnam War

5.35.1. Battle of Dong Xoai (Clodfelter 2008, 717 and 724)

5.35.1.1. On June 10, 1,500 men of the Viet Cong 9th Division, now 3 regiments strong, attacked the [Untied States] Special Forces camp at Dong Xoai, then ambushed ARVN relief forces (Clodfelter 2008, 717).

5.35.1.2. Onset: 10/06/1965; Termination: 13/06/1965

5.35.1.3. South Vietnam and United States versus Viet Cong

5.35.1.4. South Vietnam – 4 battalions (1400 total using United States Central Intelligence Agency 29 June 1965, 13] battalion strength of 350 effectives per battalion). Government forces at Dong Xoai include three understrength battalions and the remnants of the airborne battalion hit on 12 June (United States Central Intelligence Agency 14 June 1965); United States – Unknown. The camp is held by Special Forces Detachment A-342 with 24 US Seabees (Tucker 2013, 1979). 1,000 tons of bombs dropped in 644 combat sorties.

5.35.1.5. South Vietnam – 416 killed, 174 wounded, 233 missing (plus 7 Americans killed, 15 Americans wounded, 12 Americans missing, 2 UH-1B gunships destroyed). See also Tucker 2013, 1979-1980

5.35.1.6. Viet Cong – 1,500 troops. See also (United States Central Intelligence Agency 10 June 1965).

5.35.1.7. Viet Cong – 350 killed

5.35.1.8. Outcome – Viet Cong won. Nearly destroyed in the battle were the ARVN 52nd Ranger Battalion and a battalion of the 7th Regiment (Clodfelter 2008, 717).

5.35.2. Battle of Van Tuong or Operation Starlite (Clodfelter 2008, 718 and 724)

5.35.2.1. The first major battle between American forces and the Viet Cong took place August 18-21, 1965 (Clodfelter 2008, 718).
5.35.2.2. Onset: 18/08/1965; Termination: 21/08/1965
5.35.2.3. United States versus Viet Cong
5.35.2.4. United States – 5,000 troops (3 Marine battalions from III Marine Amphibious Force)
5.35.2.5. United States – 54 killed, 203 wounded
5.35.2.6. Viet Cong – 2,000 troops (1st Regiment)
5.35.2.7. Viet Cong – 573 killed
5.35.2.8. Outcome – United States won. In this first U.S. regiment-size operation since the Korean War, the 5,000 Marines engaged pinned the Viet Cong regiment against the sea and severely punished it (Clodfelter 2008, 718).

5.35.3. Battle of Ia Drang (Clodfelter 2008, 718-719 and 724)
5.35.3.1. Later in September, the 1st Cavalry Division . . . landed at Qui Nhon and deployed inland to the An Khe area. The 15,955-men 1st Cavalry was the U.S. Army's first airmobile division. It was equipped with 434 helicopters and light airplanes and had 1,600 land vehicles . . . It was the most mobile military force in the world, and was picked . . . and company to blunt Hanoi's Dong Xuan (Winter-Spring) Campaign, a 3-division North Vietnamese Army offensive. . . to split South Vietnam at its Central Highlands waist (Clodfelter 2008, 718).
5.35.3.2. Onset: 23/10/1965; Termination: 26/11/1965
5.35.3.3. United States and South Vietnam Versus North Vietnam
5.35.3.4. United States – 1 division (16,000 troops: 1st Cavalry Division; An AVRN relief column of 1,200, spearheaded by an armored cavalry squadron, fought its way through the 32nd Regiment's ambush at dusk on October 23 (Clodfelter 2008, 719).
5.35.3.5. United States – 305 killed (including 1 USAF), 524 wounded; South Vietnam – Unknown
5.35.3.6. North Vietnam – 3 regiments (32nd Regiment, 33rd Regiment (2,200 troops), and 66th Regiment (2,000 troops)). Using the 1967 *Military Balance* figures for North Vietnamese regimental size, this totals 8100 troops (International Institute for Strategic Studies 1967, 13)
5.35.3.7. North Vietnam – 1,519 killed by body count, 2,042 additional estimated killed, 1,178 estimated wounded, 157 captured
5.35.3.8. Outcome – United States won. The Battle of the Ia Drang was a distinct victory for American firepower and mobility (Clodfelter 2008, 719).

5.35.4. Landing Zone X-Ray (Clodfelter 2008, 719 and 724)
5.35.4.1. The Battle of LZ X-Ray is a part of Ia Drang Campaign. General [Chu Huy] Man . . . attempted to regain the initiative by attacking

Lieutenant Colonel Harold Moore's 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment, as it was helilanded at LZ X-Ray at the foot of Chu Pong on November 14 . . . This first battle between North Vietnamese and American regulars was also among the fiercest (Clodfelter 2008, 719).

5.35.4.2. Onset: 14/11/1965; Termination: 16/11/1965

5.35.4.3. United States versus North Vietnam

5.35.4.4. United States – 2 battalions. 1st Cavalry Battalion: The division's maneuver battalions . . . were smaller than their counterparts in a standard infantry division because of the need to stay as lean and light as possible. Each battalion, trained in airmobile tactics and techniques, had an authorized strength of 767 officers and men, significantly fewer than the 849 in a standard infantry battalion (Carland 2000, 62); and 7th Cavalry Battalion had 633 troops.

5.35.4.5. United States – 79 killed, 121 wounded

5.35.4.6. North Vietnam – 2 regiments (4,200 troops: 33rd Regiment (2,200 troops), and 66th Regiment (2,000 troops))

5.35.4.7. North Vietnam – 634 killed by body count, 1,000 additional estimated total casualties

5.35.4.8. Outcome – United States won. The 1/7th Cavalry. . . held X-Ray and forced the battered 66th and 33rd Regiments to withdraw by the morning of November 16" (Clodfelter 2008, 719).

5.35.5. Battle of Landing Zone Albany (Clodfelter 2008, 719 and 724)

5.35.5.1. The Battle of Landing Zone Albany is a part of Ia Drang Campaign. On November 17 another airmobile battalion, the 450-men 2nd of the 7th Cavalry, ran into a giant ambush set by the 8th Battalion of the 66th Regiment [of North Vietnam] (Clodfelter 2008, 719).

5.35.5.2. Onset: 17/11/1965; Termination: 17/11/1965

5.35.5.3. United States versus North Vietnam

5.35.5.4. United States – 1 battalion (2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment: 450 troops)

5.35.5.5. United States – 155 killed, 121 wounded

5.35.5.6. North Vietnam – 1 battalion (8th Battalion, 66th Regiment). Approximately 600 troops.

5.35.5.7. North Vietnam – 403 killed, 150 estimated wounded

5.35.5.8. Outcome – United States won. The air cavalry battalion was nearly overrun, but just managed to repel the North Vietnamese Army assault (Clodfelter 2008, 719).

5.35.6. Battle of Bong Son-An Lao Valley (Operation Masher-White Wing) (Clodfelter 2008, 721-722 and 724)

5.35.6.1. Part of Operation Masher to locate and destroy Viet Cong and North Vietnamese Army units.

5.35.6.2. Onset: 25/01/1966; Termination: 06/03/1966

5.35.6.3. United States, South Vietnam, and South Korea versus North Vietnam and the Viet Cong

5.35.6.4. United States, South Vietnam, and South Korea – 10,000 total. Some 10,000 US, South Vietnamese, and South Korean troops involved in Operation Masher (United States Central Intelligence Agency 31 January 1966).

5.35.6.5. United States, South Vietnam, and South Korea – 522 total allied casualties as of 3 February. United States – 228 killed, 834 wounded; On 3 February CIA reports allied casualties: 154 killed (103 US, 48, ARVN, 3 ROK), 367 wounded (192 US, 168 ARVN, 7 ROK), 1 US missing (United States Central Intelligence Agency 31 January 1966; United States Central Intelligence Agency 1 February 1966; United States Central Intelligence Agency 3 February 1966).

5.35.6.6. North Vietnam – 2 regiments (12th Regiment and 22nd Regiment (Carland 2000, 206); Viet Cong – 1 regiment (2nd Regiment (Carland 2000, 209). Approximately 4400 total (1st Cavalry Division 1966, 7, 10).

5.35.6.7. North Vietnam and Viet Cong – 2,389 killed, 1,700 additional estimated killed (United States Central Intelligence Agency 29 January 1966; United States Central Intelligence Agency 31 January 1966; United States Central Intelligence Agency 1 February 1966; United States Intelligence Agency 3 February 1966; United States Central Intelligence Agency 10 March 1966).

5.35.6.8. Outcome – U.S.-led allied forces won. In 1966 U.S. ground combat units increasingly took over the conduct of the war . . . The year's most successful operation, by the measurement of the body count, was Masher-White Wing (Clodfelter 2008, 721-722).

5.35.7. Operation Hastings (Clodfelter 2008, 723-724)

5.35.7.1. After it was discovered that the North Vietnamese Army 324B Division had infiltrated into an area north of Cam Lo (Quang Tri) in late June 1966—the first instance of a North Vietnamese Army division recorded crossing the DMZ—operation HASTINGS/LAM SON 217 was launched. It was a major combined operation conducted by the ARVN 1st Infantry Division reinforced by general reserve units and the reinforced US 3d Marine Division.

5.35.7.2. Onset: 15/07/1966; Termination: 03/08/1966

5.35.7.3. Republic of Vietnam and United States versus North Vietnam

5.35.7.4. United States – 8,000 troops (6 battalions of the 3rd Marine Division); South Vietnam – 3,000 troops (5 battalions)

5.35.7.5. United States – 126 killed, 448 wounded; South Vietnam – 21 killed, 40 wounded

5.35.7.6. North Vietnam – 1 division (324th B Division). The number of North Vietnamese regulars engaged probably equaled the total American and South Vietnamese strength. During the battle, the Marines fought elements from all three regiments of the 324B Division: the 90th, the 803d, and the 812th (Shulimson 1982, 176). Approximately 10,000 soldiers (Bowman 1985, 144). United States Central Intelligence Agency (31 January 1968) reports 324th Division at 9,500 troops.

5.35.7.7. North Vietnam – 882 killed

5.35.7.8. Outcome – United States and South Vietnam won. The action of 28 July was the last significant sighting of a large body of enemy troops during Hastings. The 324B Division either had crossed into the DMZ or was hiding in the inaccessible jungle to the west (Shulimson 1982, 175).

5.35.8. Battle of Dau Tieng (Operation Attleboro) (Clodfelter 2008, 723-724)

5.35.8.1. The Battle of Dau Tieng is a part of Operation Attleboro a search and destroy operation (Department of the Army, 25th Infantry Division 1967).

5.35.8.2. Onset: 03/11/1966; Termination: 11/11/1966

5.35.8.3. South Vietnam and the United States versus North Vietnam and Vietcong

5.35.8.4. South Vietnam and the United States – United States – 2 divisions (1st and 25th Divisions), 2 brigades (196th Light Infantry Brigade and 173rd Airborne Brigade); South Vietnam – 2 battalions (of the ARVN 5th Infantry Division). For Operation Attleboro – the allied force, comprising more than 15,000 men, had been in the field on sustained combat operations for nearly a month, approximately 1,500 of which were South Vietnamese. (United States Central Intelligence Agency 14 November 1966; United States Central Intelligence Agency 14 December 1966.)

5.35.8.5. South Vietnam and the United States – 649 casualties (Tucker 2011, 81)

5.35.8.6. North Vietnam and Viet Cong – North Vietnam – Approximately 5,500 total. 1 regiment (North Vietnamese Army 101st Regiment) [Operation Attleboro, September]; Viet Cong – 1 division (Viet Cong 9th Division; approximately 3,995 troops [United States Central Intelligence Agency 31 January 1968]); See also (United States Central Intelligence Agency 18 November 1966; Niles 2015, 82).

5.35.8.7. North Vietnam and Viet Cong combined – 991 killed (The breakdown between North Vietnam and Viet Cong is not clear) (For similar figures see (United States Central Intelligence Agency 14 November 1966) For total Operation Attleboro figures see (United States Central Intelligence Agency 27 November 1966).

(Department of the Army, 25th Infantry Division 1967, 18) has lower figures: VC KIA 254 (BC), VC KIA (Poss) 237; VCC 6; VCS 60; Detainees 19.

5.35.8.8. Outcome – United States and South Vietnam won. The main action took place . . . near Dau Tieng and resulted in a major American victory (Clodfelter 2008, 723).

5.35.9. Battle of Suoi Tre (FSB Gold) (Clodfelter 2008, 725-726 and 743)

5.35.9.1. The American troops attempted to defend the FSB Gold from Viet Cong's attack. On March 21, 1967, the two sides clashed in one of the fiercest one-day engagements of the war. The site of the battle was FSB (Fire Support Base) Gold, near the hamlet of Suoi Tre (Clodfelter 2008, 725-726).

5.35.9.2. Onset: 21/03/1967; Termination: 21/03/1967

5.35.9.3. United States versus Viet Cong

5.35.9.4. United States – 450 troops (2/77th Artillery Battalion)

5.35.9.5. United States – 31 killed, 109 wounded

5.35.9.6. Viet Cong – 2,500 troops (272nd Regiment of the 9th Division)

5.35.9.7. Viet Cong – 647 killed, 7 captured

5.35.9.8. Outcome – United States won. Some 2,300 rounds of direct artillery fire . . . plus 1,741 more rounds fired by artillery pieces from nearby supporting firebases . . . held the Viet Cong at bay . . . The broken 272nd [Regiment of the Viet Cong 9th Division] left 647 of their soldiers lying dead on the battlefield (Clodfelter 2008, 726).

5.35.10. Battle of Ap Gu (Clodfelter 2008, 726 and 743)

5.35.10.1. The Viet Cong tried to overrun an American position at Ap Gu.

5.35.10.2. Onset: 01/04/1967; Termination: 01/04/1967

5.35.10.3. United States versus Viet Cong

5.35.10.4. United States – 2 battalions (1/26th Infantry Battalion and 1/6th Infantry Battalion of the 1st Division), 15,000 artillery rounds fired, 103 air sorties. 1,698 total troops (Ney 1969, 170).

5.35.10.5. United States – 17 killed, 102 wounded

5.35.10.6. Viet Cong – 1 regiment (3 battalions of the 271st Regiment, the Viet Cong 9th Division) (Rogers 1974, 147). Approximatey 1,800.

5.35.10.7. Viet Cong – 609 killed, 5 captured

5.35.10.8. Outcome – United States won. Again U.S. firepower won the day, and another Communist regiment faded back into the bush 614 men poorer . . . many of them killed by the 15,000 artillery rounds fired and the 103 tac air sorties flown during the battle (Clodfelter 2008, 726).

5.35.11. Battle of Khe Sanh Hills (Clodfelter 2008, 727 and 743)

5.35.11.1. The American troops fought North Vietnamese troops for possession of the hills near Khe Sanh, located on an infiltration route from Laos.
5.35.11.2. Onset: 24/04/1967; Termination: 09/05/1967
5.35.11.3. United States versus North Vietnam
5.35.11.4. United States – 3 battalions (2nd and 3rd Battalions of the 3rd Marine Regiment and 4 companies of the 9th Marine Regiment; 25,000 artillery rounds fired, 1,100 tac air sorties (1,900 tons of bombs), B-52s (1,750 tons of bombs). Approximately 3,600 troops.
5.35.11.5. United States – 168 killed, 443 wounded, 2 missing
5.35.11.6. North Vietnam – 1 regiment (of the North Vietnamese Army 325thC Division); approximately 2,700 troops (IISS 1967, 13)
5.35.11.7. North Vietnam – 824 killed, 551 additional estimated killed
5.35.11.8. Outcome – United States won. The Marines captured Hills 881 North, 881 South, and 861 (Clodfelter 2008, 727).

5.35.12. Battle of Con Thien (Operation Buffalo) (Clodfelter 2008, 727 and 743)
5.35.12.1. Con Thien was the scene of another ambush on July 2, when 2 companies of the 1st Battalion, 9th Marine Regiment blundered into a North Vietnamese Army snare (Clodfelter 2008, 727).
5.35.12.2. Onset: 02/07/1967; Termination: 08/07/1967
5.35.12.3. United States versus North Vietnam
5.35.12.4. United States – 4 battalions (1st Battalion of the 9th Marine Regiment, 3/9th Marines, 2 battalions of the 3rd Marine Regiment; 40,000 artillery rounds fired, 1,066 tons of USMC air ordnance dropped, 1,500 naval gun shells fired. Total 4,800 troops.
5.35.12.5. United States – 159 killed, 345 wounded
5.35.12.6. North Vietnam – 1 regiment (90th Regiment of the 324B North Vietnamese Army Division (Telfer et al 1984, 102); 1,600 artillery rounds fired (On July 6 alone). Approximately 2,700 troops (International Institute for Strategic Studies 1967, 13).
5.35.12.7. North Vietnam – 1,290 killed
5.35.12.8. United States won. Finally, the addition of 2 more battalions from the 3rd Marine Regiment turned the tide (Clodfelter 2008, 727).

5.35.13. Battle of Con Thien (Clodfelter 2008, 727 and 743)
5.35.13.1. In September, Con Thien was again the scene of major action as part of Operation Kingfisher. While ambushes and firefights flickered across the surrounding terrain, the red-dirt base itself came under North Vietnamese artillery siege (Clodfelter 2008, 727).
5.35.13.2. Onset: 04/09/1967; Termination: 04/10/1967
5.35.13.3. United States fought North Vietnam

5.35.13.4. United States – 1 battalion in garrison (3rd Battalion of the 9th Marines); 4 battalions in area of operations (2nd and 3rd Battalions of the 4th Marines, 3rd Battalion of the 26th Marines, 2nd Battalion of the 9th Marines). Total 6,000 troops.

5.35.13.5. United States – 196 killed, 1,917 wounded

5.35.13.6. North Vietnam – 1 regiment (812th North Vietnamese Army Regiment (Telfer et al 1984, 132-133); approximately 2,700 troops (International Institute for Strategic Studies 1967, 13).

5.35.13.7. North Vietnam – 850 killed; The Communists were driven off with perhaps 2,000 killed (Jaques 2007 1:259).

5.35.13.8. Outcome – Draw. The North Vietnamese Army bombardment was a mist within a monsoon compared to the U.S. defensive fires . . . Fighting continued in the Con Thien-Gio Linh area into the following year (Clodfelter 2008, 727).

5.35.14. Battle of Loc Ninh (Clodfelter 2008, 727-728 and 743)

5.35.14.1. The battle of Loc Ninh is a part of the North Vietnamese Army –Viet Cong campaign along the Cambodian and Laotian frontiers. The Communist forces in the south suffered a serious loss in the summer of 1967, when the North Vietnamese Army commander in South Vietnam . . . was killed in a B-52 strike . . . But planning continued in the Communist high command for an offensive that was intended to sweep the National Liberation Front to victory in 1968. Phase One of the North Vietnamese Army – Viet Cong plan called for a series of attacks along the Cambodian and Laotian frontiers to draw U.S. combat forces away from the nation's population centers, which would then be attacked in Phase Two of the plan by the Viet Cong's main force units during the Vietnamese New Year holiday of Tet (Clodfelter 2008, 727-728).

5.35.14.2. Onset: 29/10/1967; Termination: 08/11/1967

5.35.14.3. United States and South Vietnam versus Viet Cong

5.35.14.4. United States – 1 brigade (1st Infantry Brigade of the U.S. 1st Infantry Division; South Vietnam – 1 brigade; approximately 5,000.

5.35.14.5. United States and South Vietnam – 50 killed, 200 wounded

5.35.14.6. Viet Cong – 1 regiment (273rd Regiment of the VC 9th Division); approximately 1,800 troops (Lanning and Cragg 2008, 83).

5.35.14.7. Viet Cong – 852 killed

5.35.14.8. Outcome – United States won. The Viet Cong persisted their attacks until November 8. Then they disengaged and faded back toward the Cambodian border (Clodfelter 2008, 728). Americans and South Vietnamese arrived to drive [VC] off with up to 850 killed (Jaques 2007 2:594).

5.35.15. Battle of Dak To (Clodfelter 2008, 727-728 and 743)

5.35.15.1. The Battle of Dak To is the biggest battle of 1967 as a part of the North Vietnamese Army – Viet Cong campaign along the

Cambodian and Laotian frontiers. North Vietnam moved 4 regiments onto the surrounding hills to threaten Dak To, and the U.S.-South Vietnam fought North Vietnam for possession of these hills (Clodfelter 2008, 728).

5.35.15.2. Onset: 03/11/1967; Termination: 01/12/1967

5.35.15.3. United States and South Vietnam fought North Vietnam and Viet Cong (Hay 1989)

5.35.15.4. United States and South Vietnam – Untied States – 9 battalions (from the 4th Infantry Division, 1st Cavalry Division, and 173rd Airborne Brigade; South Vietnam – 6 battalions; United States 7,533; ARVN – 4,284.

5.35.15.5. United States and South Vietnam – United States– 376 killed, 1,441 wounded, 18 missing; South Vietnam – 73 killed (United States Central Intelligence Agency 24 November 1967b).

5.35.15.6. North Vietnam and Viet Cong – 4 regiments (24th, 32nd, 66th, and 174th) Regiments: 7,000 troops. International Institute for Strategic Studies place total NVA presence at 11,000.

5.35.15.7. North Vietnam and Viet Cong – 1,644 killed; Enemy losses were placed at 1,264 dead (United States Central Intelligence Agency 24 November 1967b)

5.35.15.8. Outcome – United States and South Vietnam won. Intense fighting, supported by heavy US bombing and artillery, made the NVA withdraw with perhaps 1,500 dead, while the US lost almost 300 killed (Jaques 2007 1:283).

5.35.16. Battle of Hill 875 (Dak To) (Clodfelter 2008, 727-728 and 743)

5.35.16.1. Hill 875 is the fiercest in the battle of Dak To as a part of the North Vietnamese Army – Viet Cong campaign along the Cambodian and Laotian frontiers

5.35.16.2. Onset: 19/11/1967; Termination: 23/11/1967

5.35.16.3. United States fought North Vietnam (Scott 1988)

5.35.16.4. United States – 2 battalions (from the 173rd Airborne Brigade) and 4th Infantry Division; See also (United States Central Intelligence Agency 22 November 1967; United States Central Intelligence Agency 24 November 1967a). Total 1,674.

5.35.16.5. United States – 115 killed, 253 wounded, 7 missing.

5.35.16.6. North Vietnam – 1 regiment (North Vietnamese Army 174th Regiment); approximately 2,700 forces (International Institute for Strategic Studies 1967, 13).

5.35.16.7. North Vietnam – 322 killed

5.35.16.8. Outcome – United States won. United States seemed to succeed the possession of Hill 875 (Clodfelter 2008, 728; United States Central Intelligence Agency 24 November 1967a).

5.35.17. Battle of Khe Sanh (Clodfelter 2008, 728-729 and 743)

5.35.17.1. Early in 1968, the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong continued operations to draw U.S. and ARVN attention away from the populated areas of the country and to the border zones . . . As part of General [Vo Nguyen] Giap's strategy, 2 North Vietnamese Army divisions . . . mustering in all about 22,000 men, began concentrating around the Marine outpost at Khe Sanh, where the hill battles had raged so fiercely in the spring of 1967 . . . The siege of Khe Sanh began on January 21, 1968 (Clodfelter 2008, 728-729).

5.35.17.2. Onset: 21/01/1968; Termination: 06/04/1968

5.35.17.3. United States and South Vietnam versus North Vietnam

5.35.17.4. United States and South Vietnam – United States – 6,808 troops (5,905 Marines (3 battalions of the 26th Regiment and the 1st Battalion of the 9th Regiment) and artillery support units with 46 artillery pieces, 6 tanks; 24,000 tac air and 2,548 B-52 sorties during the siege of Khe Sanh – Operation Niagara); South Vietnam – 650 troops (the 37th Ranger Regiment and a Civilian Irregular Defense Group company, a local minorities militia)

5.35.17.5. United States and South Vietnam – United States – 205 killed, 1,668 wounded

5.35.17.6. North Vietnam – 22,000 troops (the 325th and the 304th Divisions [10,000 in the 304th, per United States Central Intelligence Agency 31 January 1968]), 96 artillery pieces, 5,800 shells and 5,000 122mm rockets hit the Marine base during the siege of Khe Sanh.

5.35.17.7. North Vietnam – 1,602 killed by body count

5.35.17.8. Outcome – United States won. In the immediate area around Khe Sanh itself the Americans found the bodies of 1,602 North Vietnamese…. Heavy actions continued around Khe Sanh after the siege was broken (Clodfelter 2008, 729); Determined not to suffer a symbolic defeat, America responded with heavy reinforcements and some of the most intense bombing ever. Giap eventually abandoned the bloody siege but the Americans also withdrew (Jaques 2007 2:526).

5.35.18. Battle of Saigon (Clodfelter 2008, 730-731 and 743)

5.35.18.1. On the night of January 29-30, 1968, the National Liberation Front launched the first phase of a countrywide offensive, as Vietnam began its New Year's Tet festivals and as half of South Vietnam's military forces were absent on pass . . . Their objective was the ignition of the general uprising by the South Vietnamese population that would, they hoped, bring about the final victory of the Vietnamese Revolution . . . The most dramatic of the attacks in III Corps were those on Saigon . . . (Clodfelter 2008, 730-731l See also United States Central Intelligence Agency 30 January 1968).

5.35.18.2. Onset: 31/01/1968; Termination: 05/02/1968

5.35.18.3. United States and South Vietnam versus Viet Cong (Traas 2017)

5.35.18.4. United States and South Vietnam – United States – 7 infantry battalions (5,000 troops from III Corps), 1 military police battalion. Total United States 5837; South Vietnam – 15 ARVN battalions, 17,000 South Vietnamese National Police. Total South Vietnam 27,710

5.35.18.5. United States and South Vietnam – United States – at least 16 killed, 21 wounded; South Vietnam – at least 80 killed, 200 wounded

5.35.18.6. Viet Cong – 11 battalions (4,000 troops from the VC 165-A Regiment and the 11th Regiment)

5.35.18.7. Viet Cong – 1,200 killed

5.35.18.8. Outcome – United States and South Vietnam won. By February 6, there were only 1,000 VC remaining in the capital . . . Within another week, these holdouts too had been either exterminated or expelled (Clodfelter 2008, 731).

5.35.19. Battle of Hue (Clodfelter 2008, 731 and 743)

5.35.19.1. On the night of January 29-30, 1968, the National Liberation Front launched the first phase of a countrywide offensive, as Vietnam began its New Year's Tet festivals and as half of South Vietnam's military forces were absent on pass . . . Their objective was the ignition of the general uprising by the South Vietnamese population that would, they hoped, bring about the final victory of the Vietnamese Revolution . . . The biggest battle of Tet took place at Hue in I Corps of the United States (Clodfelter 2008, 730-731).

5.35.19.2. Onset: 31/01/1968; Termination: 24/02/1968

5.35.19.3. United States and South Vietnam versus North Vietnam and Viet Cong

5.35.19.4. United States and South Vietnam – United States – 3 battalions (plus 5 more battalions outside the city from the 1st and 5th Marine Regiments of the 1st Marine Division). Total United States 9,600 (8 marine infantry battalioin at 1200); South Vietnam – 13 ARVN battalions (from the ARVN 1st Division, the Vietnamese Airborne Task Force, and the Vietnamese Marines). Total South Vietnam 9,282

5.35.19.5. United States and South Vietnam – United States – 147 Marines killed, 857 Marines wounded (plus 74 Army soldiers killed, 507 Army soldiers wounded outside the city); South Vietnam – 384 killed, 1,800 wounded

5.35.19.6. North Vietnam and Viet Cong – North Vietnam – 2 regiments (7,500 troops from the NVA 4th and 6th Regiments); Viet Cong – 2 battalions; approximately 10,000 total.

5.35.19.7. North Vietnam and Viet Cong – 5,113 killed

5.35.19.8. Outcome – United States and South Vietnam won. By the middle of February, the Communist offensive had begun to trail off . . . By the end of the month, the Tet Offensive had ended in a massive military defeat for the National Liberation Front (Clodfelter 2008, 732).

5.35.20. Battle of A Shau Valley or Operation Delaware/Lam Son 216 (Clodfelter 2008, 732-733 and 743)

5.35.20.1. After Tet, Westmoreland attempted to regain the tactical initiative, repeating more of the old search-and-destroy campaign but on a greater scale. On April 19, 1968, 8 American battalions and 6 South Vietnamese battalions conducted a reconnaissance-in-force into the A Shau Valley, the enemy's main logistical base.

5.35.20.2. Onset: 19/04/1968; Termination: 17/05/1968

5.35.20.3. United States and South Vietnam versus North Vietnam

5.35.20.4. United States and South Vietnam – United States – 8 battalions (5 battalions from the 1st Cavalry Division and 3 battalions from the 101st Airborne Division). Total United States 6,996 US Troops; South Vietnam – 6 battalions (3 battalions from the ARVN 1st Division and 3 battalions from the Vietnamese Airborne Division). Total South Vietnam 4,284.

5.35.20.5. United States and South Vietnam – United States – 142 killed, 731 wounded, 1 C-130 transport lost, 60 helicopters lost; South Vietnam – 26 killed, 132 wounded

5.35.20.6. North Vietnam – 1 regiment; approximately 2,700 troops (International Institute for Strategic Studies 1967, 13).

5.35.20.7. North Vietnam – 869 killed

5.35.20.8. Outcome – United States and South Vietnam won. The raiders into the A Shau Valley took 2,319 individual and 93 crew-served weapons (Clodfelter 2008, 733).

5.35.21. Battle of Hamburger Hill (Ap Bia) (Clodfelter 2008, 735-736 and 743)

5.35.21.1. The main targets of the Post-Tet Offensive of 1969 were not ARVN units, as in the Tet Offensive of 1968, but were, instead, American forces . . . Meanwhile, U.S. and ARVN offensive operations continued . . . U.S. forces stormed up Hamburger Hill (Hill 937 – Ao Bia), a 3,704-foot-high peak in the A Shau Valley, where the 101st Airborne Division was conducting Operation Apache Snow (Clodfelter 2008, 735-736).

5.35.21.2. Onset: 11/05/1969; Termination: 20/05/1969

5.35.21.3. United States and South Vietnam versus North Vietnam

5.35.21.4. United States and South Vietnam – United States – 3 battalions (2,000 troops from the 3/187th Airborne Infantry Battalion and 2 other battalions of the 101st Airborne Division), 272 air sorties,

21,372 artillery rounds fired, 152,000 pounds of napalm dropped. Total US Troops 2,511; South Vietnam – 1 battalion (400 troops)

5.35.21.5. United States and South Vietnam – United States – 70 killed, 372 wounded; South Vietnam – Unknown.

5.35.21.6. North Vietnam – 1,500 troops

5.35.21.7. North Vietnam – 633 killed

5.35.21.8. Outcome – United States and South Vietnam won. The American and South Vietnamese forces attacked the hill ten times, May 11-20, before the 1,500 North Vietnamese on or around the mountain withdrew (Clodfelter 2008, 736).

5.35.22. Battle of Cambodian Incursion (Clodfelter 2008, 737 and 743)

5.35.22.1. The Vietnam War became truly a Second Indochina War early in 1970, when the conflict expanded into Cambodia. On April 29, the South Vietnamese launched a full-scale attack against the North Vietnamese Army-Viet Cong sanctuaries on the Cambodian side of the border. The following day, the American forces joined in this Cambodian incursion in search of the National Liberation Front headquarters in Cambodia.

5.35.22.2. Onset: 01/05/1970; Termination: 30/06/1970

5.35.22.3. United States, South Vietnam, and Cambodian Army versus North Vietnam, Viet Cong, and Khmer Rouge (Shaw 2005)

5.35.22.4. United States, South Vietnam, and Cambodian Army – United States – 30,000 troops (from the 1st Cavalry and 25th Infantry Divisions and the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment), 586,519 artillery rounds fired; South Vietnam – 48,000 troops, 261,039 artillery rounds fired; Cambodian Army – Unkown (United States Central Intelligence Agency 28 May 1970)

5.35.22.5. United States, South Vietnam, and Cambodian Army – United States – 338 killed, 1,525 wounded, 45 aircrafts lost; South Vietnam – 638 killed, 3,009 wounded, 35 missing

5.35.22.6. North Vietnam, Viet Cong, and Khmer Rouge – NVA forces in Cambodia, which was estimated at about 40,000 men (Tho 1979, 182).

5.35.22.7. North Vietnam, Viet Cong, and Khmer Rouge – 11,349 killed, 2,328 captured, 155 tons of weapons, 1,786 tons of ammunition, and 6,877 tons of rise taken or destroyed

5.35.22.8. Outcome – United States, South Vietnam, and Cambodian Army won. The NVA-VC in the sanctuaries largely evaded contact with the invaders, choosing instead to flee westward deeper into Cambodia (Clodfelter 2008, 737). The US/SV forces captured massive quantities of weapons and food. While the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese attempted to avoid major battles, there was some intense fighting, with over 350 Americans and perhaps 4,000

Communists killed, before the controversial incursion" came to an end (Jaques 2007).

5.35.23. Battle of Laotian Incursion (Operation Lam Son 719) (Clodfelter 2008, 737-738 and 743)

5.35.23.1. The year 1971 continued the ground war's trend toward geographical expansion. At the beginning of the year, there were an estimated 63,000 NVA-VC troops in Cambodia and 96,000 North Vietnamese and Pathet Lao in Laos . . . In preparation for an ARVN strike into Laos against the Ho Chi Minh Trail, 9,000 U.S. troops . . . undertook Operation Dewey Canyon II, beginning January 30, to secure the border areas adjacent to the planned invasion route (Clodfelter 2008, 737-738). Their [South Vietnamese with American support] objective was the seizure of the important crossroads town of Tchepone, a strategic point on the infiltration network in Base Area 604, west of Khe Sanh (Clodfelter 2008, 738).

5.35.23.2. Onset: 08/02/1971; Termination: 24/03/1971

5.35.23.3. United States and South Vietnam versus North Vietnam

5.35.23.4. United States and South Vietnam – United States – 10,000 troops in support (2,600 of whom were in 600 helicopter crews; troops from the 101st Airborne, 5th Infantry, and 23rd Infantry Divisions (Hinh 1979, 129)), 8,000 tac air sorties, 1,358 B-52 sorties; South Vietnam – 21,000 troops (from the ARVN 1st Infantry Division and 1st Armored Brigade)

5.35.23.5. United States and South Vietnam – United States – 219 killed, 1,149 wounded, 38 missing, 107 helicopters lost, 618 helicopters damaged, 6 U.S. Air Force and 1 U.S. Navy aircraft lost; South Vietnam – 3,800 killed, 5,200 wounded, 775 missing, 96 artillery pieces lost, 54 tanks lost, 198 crew-served weapons and 3,000 individual weapons lost;

5.35.23.6. North Vietnam – 36,000 troops (1 armored regiment, 2 artillery regiments, 12 infantry regiments)

5.35.23.7. North Vietnam – 13,668 killed, 167 captured (South Vietnamese figures); 16,224 total casualties (North Vietnamese figures)

5.35.23.8. Outcome – North Vietnam won. A series of NVA counterattacks against the ARVN….quickly caused the collapse of the South Vietnamese invasion force….By March 25, the remnants of all 34 battalions of the South Vietnamese invasion force were back across the border (Clodfelter 2008, 738).

5.35.24. Battle of An Loc (Operation Lam Son 719) (Clodfelter 2008, 738-740 and 743)

5.35.24.1. The Vietnamization of the ground war was now complete. The DMZ line had been turned over to the South Vietnamese on July 9, [1971] and August 11 all offensive ground combat operations had

been assigned to ARVN. U.S. combat troops were now restricted solely to the defensive role of providing security for American military bases . . . The first real test of Vietnamization came in 1972. . . . In two important battles continuing to rage, ARVN held its ground and finally repulsed the northern attacks. At An Loc, in Binh Long Province, the siege that had begun on April 13 went on until June 8 (Clodfelter 2008, 738-740).

5.35.24.2. Onset: 13/04/1972; Termination: 08/06/1972

5.35.24.3. South Vietnam and United States versus North Vietnam and Viet Cong

5.35.24.4. South Vietnam – 1 garrison (6,800 troops from the 5th Division), 1 division (21st Division), 1 regiment in relief columns; U.S. air support. The Communists suffered many of their losses to the 262 B-52 bomber and 9, 203 tactical air sorties carried out during the Battle of An Loc (Clodfelter 2008, 740). Approximately 14,800 troops (International Institute for Strategic Studies 1972, 55).

5.35.24.5. South Vietnam – 2,960 killed or missing, 6,500 wounded (plus 5,000 civilians killed or wounded in An Loc)

5.35.24.6. North Vietnam and Viet Cong – 50,470 troops in 3 divisions (the 5th VC, 9th VC, and 7th NVA Divisions, approximately 13,500 troops), 2 tank regiments, 3 artillery regiments, 78,000 artillery, rocket, and mortar rounds (United States Central Intelligence Agency 31 January 1968)

5.35.24.7. North Vietnam and Viet Cong – 10,000 killed, 15,000 wounded

5.35.24.8. Outcome – South Vietnam won. North Vietnamese tanks several times penetrated into the town [An Loc], but the ARVN garrison . . . beat them back out (Clodfelter 2008, 740).

5.35.25. Battle of Kontum (Clodfelter 2008, 738-740 and 743)

5.35.25.1. In two important battles continuing to rage, ARVN held its ground and finally repulsed the northern attacks . . . The second of South Vietnam's two successful stands was at Kontum, in the Highlands, where senior U.S. adviser, John Paul Vann had organized a strong defense (Clodfelter 2008, 738-740).

5.35.25.2. Onset: 25/05/1972; Termination: 07/06/1972

5.35.25.3. South Vietnam and United States fought North Vietnam

5.35.25.4. South Vietnam – 3 regiments (the 44th, 45th, and 53rd Regiments of the ARVN 2nd and 23rd Infantry Divisions (Truong 1980, 96-97, 102); South Vietnam received the U.S. air support including B-52 (Truong 1980, 104). Approximately 8,000 troops (Bowman 1985, 187).

5.35.25.5. South Vietnam – 1,000 killed, wounded or missing

5.35.25.6. North Vietnam – 4 regiments (the 48th and 64th Regiments of the NVA 320th Divisions (approximately 4,000 troops), the 28th Regiment of the 3rd Division, and the 1st Regiment of the 2nd

Division (United States Central Intelligence Agency 31 January 1968; Truong 1980, 96-97, 102). Approximately 10,800 troops (International Institute for Strategic Studies 1967, 13).

5.35.25.7. North Vietnam – 3,000 killed, 24 tanks lost

5.35.25.8. Outcome – South Vietnam won. Some 3,000 North Vietnamese died and 24 tanks were destroyed in an unsuccessful attempt to capture that city (Clodfelter 2008, 740).

5.35.26. Battle of Quang Tri (Clodfelter 2008, 740-741 and 743)

5.35.26.1. With the impetus of the North Vietnamese Army attack diminished by American fire from the sky and by growing ARVN resolve on the ground, the South Vietnamese military decided to undertake a counteroffensive in late June. On June 28 the ARVN began the campaign to reconquer Quang Tri City.

5.35.26.2. Onset: 28/06/1972; Termination: 15/09/1972

5.35.26.3. South Vietnam and United States fought North Vietnam

5.35.26.4. South Vietnam – 20,000 troops (peak strength; the Marine and Airborne Divisions; the U.S. support including 28 Marine Corps CH-53 helicopters)

5.35.26.5. South Vietnam – 977 killed, 4,370 wounded

5.35.26.6. North Vietnam – 15,000 troops (peak strength; the 325th Division and the 27th Independent Regiment)

5.35.26.7. North Vietnam – 8,135 killed

5.35.26.8. Outcome – South Vietnam won. The red-striped, yellow flag of the Republic of Vietnam was raised over the rubble of Quang Tri's Citadel for the first time in four and one-half months (Clodfelter 2008, 741).

5.35.27. Battle of Xuan Loc (Clodfelter 2008, 741-743)

5.35.27.1. The strength of the North Vietnamese Army continued to grow in 1974 . . . Units of the ARVN were at the same time being slowly starved of arms and ammunition, as a war-weary U.S. Congress greatly reduced the flow of war material to South Vietnam . . . The ARVN was using only one-fifth as much ammunition and one-tenth as much gasoline as when the United States fully backed it . . . The ARVN's desertion rate by then was 24,000 a month. That appalling figure was indicative of the low state of ARVN morale by the end of 1974….The North Vietnamese recognized the immanency of an ARVN collapse and rushed reinforcements south to give impetus to that collapse….The United States began evacuation flights in early April, ferrying out many dependents of top South Vietnamese officials from Saigon….As the Communist forces pressed down toward Saigon, the army of South Vietnam put up its only real fight…[at Xuan Loc, north of capital] (Clodfelter 2008, 741-742).

5.35.27.2. Onset: 09/04/1975; Termination: 21/04/1975

5.35.27.3. South Vietnam fought North Vietnam

5.35.27.4. South Vietnam – 25,000 troops (the ARVN 18th Division, the 1st Airborne Brigade, and the 81st Airborne Ranger Group (Vien 1985, 130-131)).

5.35.27.5. South Vietnam – 7,500 killed, wounded or missing

5.35.27.6. North Vietnam – 3 divisions (the NVA 6th, 7th, and 341st Divisions (Vien 1985, 130-131)). Approximately 30,000 troops (International Institute for Strategic Studies 1974, 61).

5.35.27.7. North Vietnam – 5,000 killed, 37 tanks lost

5.35.27.8. Outcome – North Vietnam won. The day Xuan Loc fell, President [of South Vietnam] Thieu resigned and flew into exile (Clodfelter 2008, 742).

5.36. Second Kashmir

5.36.1. **Operation Grand Slam** (Clodfelter 2008, 639-640)

5.36.1.1. Pakistan, determined to incorporate Indian Kashmir into Pakistan, began an armed infiltration into Indian Kashmir

5.36.1.2. Onset: 01/09/1965; Termination: 05/09/1965

5.36.1.3. India versus Pakistan

5.36.1.4. India – Approximately 13,600 (Bajwa 2013, 168-169; Subramaniam 2017). Infantry brigade with the meagre armour at its disposal, 191 Brigade was in no position to stem the three-pronged assult for long. 41 Mtn Brigade and 28 Infantry Brigade joined the defense at Sep. 3 (Chakravorty 1992, 116).

5.36.1.5. India – Approximately 1,800.

5.36.1.6. Pakistan – Approximately 26,000. 2 army armored brigades with 90 tanks, 2 infantry brigades, Azad ["Free"] Kashmir forces, F-86 Saberjets

5.36.1.7. Pakistan – Approximately 2,500 (Ganguly 1995, 173)

5.36.1.8. Outcome – Draw. Pakistan overran the Indian defenses and penetrated 18 miles to Jaurian, on the Tawi River, by September 5 (Clodfelter 2008, 640); Grand Slam did achieve surprise, and Chhamb fell on the first day (Chakravorty 1992); However, Pakistan was unable to achieve its primary objective of capturing Akhnoor (Bajwa 2013, 159; Pandey and Singh 2017).

5.36.2. **Lahore Offensive** (Clodfelter 2008, 639-640)

5.36.2.1. India, on September 6, took the war beyond the disputed borders of Kashmir by opening an offensive against Lahore in the Pakistan Punjab

5.36.2.2. Onset: 06/09/1965; Termination: 23/09/1965

5.36.2.3. India versus Pakistan

5.36.2.4. India – 50,000 troops (3 infantry divisions with 2 more infantry divisions in reserve), 1 armored brigade (Brines 1968, 336).

5.36.2.5. India –64 killed and 155 wounded at Dograi; at least 12 tanks lost and 17 tanks captured at Khem Karan approximately 1,800

casualties.; Based on Chakravorty 1992, 136: from 1 September to 10 October 1965, 10 Infantry Division of the Indian Army suffered about 2,006 casualties. With the casualties we know in Lahore Offensive, we assign 1787 (2006-219) to the Grand Slam.

5.36.2.6. Pakistan – 1 infantry division, 1 armored division with 225 tanks, 1 armored regiment; approximately 52,000.

5.36.2.7. Pakistan – Not clear in terms of the whole battle; 300 killed and 100 captured at Dograi; at least 12 tanks lost and 17 tanks captured at Khem Karan; On 18 September, the Force captured an enemy stronghold at Thil, in the Kalidhar sector, about 4000 meters deep in the enemy held territory after killing 50 persons and wounding 70 (Chakravorty 1992, 127).

5.36.2.8. Outcome – Draw. On September 6, India began an offensive against Lahore in the Pakistan Punjab. A Pakistani counterattack was launched on the night of September 7. In the end India checked a Pakistani advance but Pakistan retained possession of a 3-mile-wide, 10-mile-long strip of Indian territory around Khem Karan" (Clodfelter 2008, 640). "Thereafter, the campaign in this sector [Lahore] settled down to hard and continuous fighting for strategic waterways, bridges and fortified villages. Combat was continual from D-day until the cease-fire on September 23, swirling from the border to the canal and involving all types of heavy weapons (Brines 1968, 336).

5.36.3. Battle of Sialkot (Clodfelter 2008, 640)

5.36.3.1. Sialkot was the scene of the second major battle of the war and one of the largest armored battles since WWII. Indian I Corps launched fifteen separate attacks on the defending Pakistani IX Corps.

5.36.3.2. Onset: 11/09/1965; Termination: 12/09/1965

5.36.3.3. India versus Pakistan

5.36.3.4. India – 50,000 troops (1 armored division, 3 infantry divisions)

5.36.3.5. India – Casualties in personnel were heavy. … The total number of killed, wounded, and missing were 575; 2880; and 427 respectively (Chakravorty 1992, 222).

5.36.3.6. Pakistan – 2 infantry divisions, 6 regiments of light and median tanks, 1 armored division, 1 parachute brigade; Approximately 78,000.

5.36.3.7. Pakistan – The number of enemy troops killed was placed at 693, while the prisoners of war with the Corps numbered 448 including 310 civilians (Indian History Division of Ministry of Defence 1992, 198, 221). Total casualties 1,141.

5.36.3.8. Outcome – Draw (Clodfelter 2008, 640).

5.36.4. Sind Offensive (Clodfelter 2008, 640)

5.36.4.1. India attacked Sind, almost 500 miles to the south, and took Gadra, 5 miles deep into Pakistan. Pakistan launched several small counterattacks and took Munabao, 5 miles inside India

5.36.4.2. Onset: 08/09/1965; Termination: 23/09/1965

5.36.4.3. India versus Pakistan

5.36.4.4. India – Approximately 13,600. 1 brigade. APakistani infantry division was located in Hyderabad (Sind), which could create trouble in Rajasthan or in Gujarat. In order to engage this division, India opened a new front in the Rajasthan Sector, and Indian troops of 30 Inf Bde under 11 Inf Div entered West Pakistan in Sind on 8 September 1965 (Chakravorty 1992, 228).

5.36.4.5. India – Capture of Gadra City: Indian troops suffered casualties of one Officer and five ORs wounded; Skirmishes around Munabao: as a result of 4 air raids carried out by the PAF on 10 September, Indian troops suffered 2 ORs killed and 4 wounded (Chakravorty 1992, 232-233)

5.36.4.6. Pakistan – This town was held by a weak battalion of Indus Rangers who did not offer much of a fight (Chakravorty 1992, 232). Unit Size Unknown.

5.36.4.7. Pakistan – Approximately 91. Capture of Gadra City: In this action eight Pakistani ORs were killed and four captured; Pakiastani attempt to Recapture Sakarbu: in this action Pak troops suffered about 25 men, killed and approximately 50 wounded, while 1 Garh Rif casualty was 4 ORs wounded (Chakravorty 1992, 232, 237).

5.36.4.8. Outcome – Draw; each side achieved some operational objectives

5.37. Six Day War

5.37.1. **Battle of Gaza Strip** (Clodfelter 2008, 613-614)

5.37.1.1. Threatened with attack from Egypt, Jordan and Syria, the Israelis decided to strike first.

5.37.1.2. Onset: 05/06/1967; Termination: 07/06/1967 (Dupuy 1978, 254)

5.37.1.3. Israel versus Egypt and PLA

5.37.1.4. Israel – Approximately 11,500 soldiers. 1 airborne brigade, 2 tank brigades, 300 tanks, 100 half-tracks, 50 field pieces; "Standard Israeli infantry brigade which had been reinforced with a battalion of AMX-13 tanks and a paratroop battalion with some halftracks. To assist him [Col. Rshef] in his task, Col. Eitan's paratroop brigade form General Tal's division was to be attached to Reshef's command as soon as Rafah was secure" (Dupuy 1978, 254; O'Ballance 1972, 43)

5.37.1.5. Israel – Seventy Israelis would be killed in some of the war's heaviest fighting (Oren 2003, 202).

5.37.1.6. Egypt and PLA – Egypt – Approximately 27,500. 1 infantry division of approximately 17,500 (Oren 2003, 178 and 204); Palestine – 20th Palestinian Division (approximately 10,000) led by Gaza's military governor (Oren 2003, 63, 179)

5.37.1.7. Egypt and PLA – Egypt –Approximately 100 of Egypt's 350 qualified air-combat pilots were dead, and many more had been injured, mostly in strafing attacks. (Hammel 2010, 171)

5.37.1.8. Outcome – Israel won. The Egyptian defeat was complete (Clodfelter 2008, 614).

5.37.2. Battle of Rafah (Clodfelter 2008, 613-614)

5.37.2.1. The First task of General Ta's division was to break through in the Rafah-El Arish sector, held by some six brigades of the 20th Palestinian Liberation Army (PLA) and Egyptian 7th Division, with the support of about 70 tanks" (Dupuy 1978, 248); Israeli's to envelop Egyptian and Palestinian forces (Dupuy 1978, 249).

5.37.2.2. Onset: 05/06/1967; Termination: 05/06/1967

5.37.2.3. Israel fought Egypt

5.37.2.4. Israel – Approximately 11,500 soldiers. Ugdah Tal (Tal Armored Division – two armored brigades, one parachute brigade) (Hammel 1992, 191-192; see also Dupuy 1978, 248; O'Ballance 1972, 43)

5.37.2.5. Israel – In all, the Israelis lost twenty-eight tanks; ninety-three men were wounded and sixty-six killed (Oren 2003, 181); Israeli losses were less than 500 killed and wounded (Dupuy 1978, 252).

5.37.2.6. Egypt – Approximately 17,500. 1 infantry division (Oren 2003, 180 and 204); 7th Infantry Division controlling the Rafah area (Hammel 1992, 180).

5.37.2.7. Egypt – 2,000 casualties (see also Dupuy 1978, 252); 40 tanks destroyed (Oren 2003, 180)

5.37.2.8. Outcome – Israel won. The Egyptian defeat was complete (Clodfelter 2008, 614).

5.37.3. Battle of Jerusalem (Clodfelter 2008, 613-615)

5.37.3.1. Israel attempted to capture East Jerusalem and West Bank, and the Israeli struggle to conquer them was much tougher than the Israeli-Egyptian front. (Clodfelter 2008, 615; See also Dupuy 1978, Chapter 10)

5.37.3.2. Onset: 05/06/1967; Termination: 06/06/1967

5.37.3.3. Israel versus Jordan and Palestine militiamen

5.37.3.4. Israel – Approximately 21,500 soldiers. 1 armored brigade, 1 infantry brigade, 1 airborne brigade; Etzioni infantry brigade (almost a division strong: 7 infantry battalions, 1 tank battalion, artillery and support elements) and one paratroop brigade under the command of Uzi Narkiss (Mutawai 1987, 131; See also Dupuy 1978, 290; O'Ballance 1972, 43).

5.37.3.5. Israel – 553 killed, 2,442 wounded, 112 tanks lost (these figures seem to include the numbers from Latrun, Ramallah, and Jericho); 200 killed and 600 wounded just in Jerusalem (Mutawi 1987, 135)

5.37.3.6. Jordan and Palestinian militia – 5,000 troops (1 infantry brigade, defending East Jerusalem); 3rd (Talal) brigade (Mutawi 1987, 132) with 5,000 Legionnaires and 1,000 Palestinian militiamen and with no tanks. Talal's general Ata 'Ali Haza,' an England's Camberley College graduate, believed that the Israeli forces outnumbered his own by at least three-to-one (Oren 2003, 206); At Opening of hostilities the total strength of Ata Ali's force was about 5,000 men. In addition, he had the assistance of the small Palestine militia force of East Jerusalem, less than 1,000 men. In the support of the Jerusalem garrison, to the north, to the east, and to the south, were forces totaling perhaps another 5,000 men (Dupuy 1978, 293).

5.37.3.7. Jordan – 100 casualties (Mutawi 2002, 125)

5.37.3.8. Outcome – Israel won. On Thursday morning [June 8], King Hussein admitted that his Arab Legion was beaten and accepted a cease-fire (Clodfelter 2008, 615).

5.37.4. Battle of Latrun (Clodfelter 2008, 613-615)

5.37.4.1. The Kiryati Brigades storms Latrun and later liases with IDF armored forces West of Ramallah

5.37.4.2. Onset: 05/06/1967; Termination: 05/06/1967

5.37.4.3. Israel versus Jordan and Egypt

5.37.4.4. Israel – Approximately 9,000 soldiers. 4th Infantry Brigade (Hammel 1992, 360-1); one motorized infantry brigade (Mutawi 1987, 131; O'Ballance 1972, 43)

5.37.4.5. Israel – 200 (Oren 2003, 227)

5.37.4.6. Jordan and Egypt – Approximately 740. Facing the [Israeli] 4th Infantry Brigade was the southernmost battalion of the Jordanian El Hashimi Infantry Brigade and the two Egyptian commando battalions. The Egyptian units, which numbered only 120 men apiece, had broken themselves down into small groups and had begun infiltrating into Israel late in the morning (Hammel 1992, 361; Mutawi 1987, 132)

5.37.4.7. Jordan and Egypt – Unknown

5.37.4.8. Outcome – Israel won. Latrun was taken by Israel by June (Clodfelter 2008, 615)

5.37.5. Battle of Ramallah (Clodfelter 2008, 613-615)

5.37.5.1. Israel attacks Ramallah.

5.37.5.2. Onset: 06/06/1967; Termination: 07/06/1967

5.37.5.3. Israel versus Jordan and Egypt

5.37.5.4. Israel – Approximately 9,000 soldiers. By the time the lead task force of the 4th Infantry Brigade reached the outskirts of Ramallah in the late afternoon, Colonel Uri Ben-Ari was approaching the city from the direction of Jerusalem with three armored-infantry companies, a French Sherman company, and his brigade reconnaissance company (Hammel 1992, 372). One infantry brigade and one mechanized brigade (Mutawi 1987, 129 and 135; O'Ballance 1972, 43)

5.37.5.5. Israel – 800 (Mutawi 2002, 135)

5.37.5.6. Jordan and Egypt – Approximately 5,045. It appears the Jordanian El Hashimi Infantry Brigade was ostensibly arrayed in defense of Ramallah, after the defeat at Latrun (Hammel 1992, 372). The Hashimi brigade was assigned in the Ramallah sector and it was badly over-stretched in line defensive positions including Latrun. (Mutawi 1987, 132); Egypt – The 53rd Egyptian commando battalion had been appointed to the [Jordanian] Hashimi brigade in the Ramallah sector. Although they did not reach their assigned position until 5 June (Mutawi 1987, 129). The 53rd failed to accomplish their missions (i.e., attacking Ein Shamer airfield in Israel) and was ordered to withdraw on 6 June, but some of the commandos were caught by the Israeli mechanized brigade that entered Ramallah on 6 June and were either captured, or forced to retreat to the east. (Mutawi 1987, 129; Mutawi 2002, 120)

5.37.5.7. Jordan and Egypt – 900 (Mutawi 2002, 135)

5.37.5.8. Outcome – Israel won. Ramallah was taken by Israel by June 7. (Clodfelter 2008, 615); Ramallah fell with little resistance. (Mutawi 1987, 135)

5.37.6. Israeli Attack on Golan Heights (Clodfelter 2008, 613 and 615)

5.37.6.1. After knocking out Egypt and Jordan, Israel prepared for the final round against Syria and attempted to capture Golan Heights (Clodfelter 2008, 615); See also Dupuy 1978, 321.

5.37.6.2. Onset: 09/06/1967; Termination: 10/06/1967

5.37.6.3. Israel versus Syria

5.37.6.4. Israel – Approximately 33,000 soldiers (3 armored brigades, 5 infantry brigades), 250 tanks (O'Ballance 1972, 43)

5.37.6.5. Israel – 127 killed, 625 wounded, 4 missing, 160 tanks lost (See also Dupuy 1978, 326) (these figures seem to include the numbers from El Quneitra); 127 killed, 600 wounded (Hammel 1992, 424)

5.37.6.6. Syria – 40,000 troops (3 tank brigades, 5 infantry brigades), 260 tanks and self-propelled guns; 3 brigade groups on the Golan Heights: (1) the 35th Brigade Group in the south (3 infantry brigades, 1 mechanized infantry brigade); (2) the 12th Brigade Group in the north (1 infantry brigade, 1 tank brigade, 2 reserve infantry brigades); and (3) the 42nd Brigade Group along the

highway linking Damascus and Kuneitra (i.e., El Quneitra) (1 tank brigade, 1 infantry brigade, 2 reserve infantry brigades) (Hammel 1992, 389 and 434)

5.37.6.7. Syria – 600 killed, 700 wounded, 570 missing or prisoners, 86 tanks lost (Hammel 1992, 424)

5.37.6.8. Outcome – Israel won. El Quneitra, the major town on the Golan Heights, had fallen and the Syrian called for a cease-fire (Clodfelter 2008, 615).

5.38. War of Attrition

5.38.1. Israeli Raid (Clodfelter 2008, 616)

5.38.1.1. The Suez front heated up in March 1969, when President Nasser declared a War of Attrition against Israel. Thereafter, almost continuous artillery duels and commando raids flashed back and forth across the canal (Clodfelter 2008, 616)

5.38.1.2. Onset: 09/09/1969; Termination: 09/09/1969

5.38.1.3. Israel versus Egypt

5.38.1.4. Israel – Approximately 2,000. 1 armored battalion. (Moores 1991, 24; Hammel 2010, 63)

5.38.1.5. Israel – 1 Israeli soldier lost (Editors 1970, 48)

5.38.1.6. Egypt – 2,500 (Ayres 1969)

5.38.1.7. Egypt – 100 killed or wounded, 2 torpedo boats and 12 outposts destroyed

5.38.1.8. Outcome – Israel won. The most spectacular of many Israeli ground raids was the September 9, 1969, landing on the western shore of the Gulf of Suez (Clodfelter 2008, 616).

5.38.2. Battle of Shadwan Island (Clodfelter 2008, 616)

5.38.2.1. The Suez front heated up in March 1969, when President Nasser declared a War of Attrition against Israel. Thereafter, almost continuous artillery duels and commando raids flashed back and forth across the canal. Supported by Naval and Air Force units, Israeli paratroopers attacked Shadwan Island. (Clodfelter 2008, 616)

5.38.2.2. Onset: 22/01/1970; Termination: 22/01/1970

5.38.2.3. Israel versus Egypt

5.38.2.4. Israel – Unknown

5.38.2.5. Israel – 3 killed, 6 wounded

5.38.2.6. Egypt – Approximately 100

5.38.2.7. Egypt – 30 killed, 62 captured, 2 torpedo boats destroyed

5.38.2.8. Outcome – Israel won. Israel captured Shadwan Island in the Gulf of Suez on January 22, 1970 (Clodfelter 2008, 616).

5.39. Football War

5.39.1. Battle of Nacaome (Clodfelter 2008, 682-683)

5.39.1.1. The main catalyst of conflict was the pressure of Salvadoran overpopulation encroaching on and spilling across the Honduran border, and the Salvadoran army struck on July 14, 1969, at three different points: near Nacaome in the south; toward Marcala in the center; and against Nueva Ocotepeque in the northwest (Clodfelter 2008, 682).

5.39.1.2. Onset: 14/07/1969; Termination: 18/07/1969

5.39.1.3. El Salvador versus Honduras

5.39.1.4. El Salvador – 5 battalions one at least being a motorized or mechanized battalion. Using a National Guard battalion type of 700 troops as a reference, the force is estimated at 3500 troops (Anderson 1984, 124).

5.39.1.5. El Salvador – 700 casualties including 107 killed (these figures seem to include the numbers from Marcala and Neuva Ocotepeque)

5.39.1.6. Honduras – three infantry battalions plus a combat engineer company and two troop detachments. This totals approximately 1500 troops (Elvir Sierra 2002, 157-158).

5.39.1.7. Honduras – Honduras admitted to military casualties of only 99 killed and 66 wounded

5.39.1.8. Outcome – El Salvador won. While the victorious Salvadorans had seized several hundred square miles of Honduran territory (Clodfelter 2008, 682), the Hondurans stopped in their defensive positions ahead of Nacaome (Anderson 1984, 128).

5.39.2. Battle of Nueva Ocotepeque (Clodfelter 2008, 682-683)

5.39.2.1. The main catalyst of conflict was the pressure of Salvadoran overpopulation encroaching on and spilling across the Honduran border, and the Salvadoran army struck on July 14, 1969, at three different points: near Nacaome in the south; toward Marcala in the center; and against Nueva Ocotepeque in the northwest. (Clodfelter 2008, 682). This was the opening action of the war (05:00 of the 15th) and it was meant to cut off this location from the Nueva Ocotepeque-Santa Rosa de Coplan highway (Anderson 1984, 124).

5.39.2.2. Onset: 14/07/1969; Termination: 18/07/1969

5.39.2.3. El Salvador versus Honduras

5.39.2.4. El Salvador – 1 brigade, comprised of 2 infantry battalions plus a commando company and a national guard battalion-type unit of 700 men. This totals approximately 2200 forces (Anderson 1984, 124).

5.39.2.5. El Salvador – 18 killed, 3 air fighters lost

5.39.2.6. Honduras – Two battalions, totaling approximately 1,000 troops (Elvir Sierra 2002, 166-167).

5.39.2.7. Honduras – 400 killed

5.39.2.8. Outcome – El Salvador won. Salvadorans had seized several hundred square miles of Honduran territory (Clodfelter 2008, 682), the Salvadorean battalions would be stopped by a Honduran

battalion that was deployed a few miles beyond from Nuevo Ocotepeque thus denying their adversaries of the speedy advance they were relying on for their campaign plan (Anderson 1984, 124).

5.40. Bangladesh War

5.40.1. **Operation Windfall** (Clodfelter 2008, 642-645)

5.40.1.1. The Bangladesh War of Independence from Pakistan pushed India and Pakistan almost inexorably toward war. India felt a natural sympathy toward the Bengalis suffering so greatly at the hands of Pakistan. India also needed a Bengali victory to relieve the onerous burden of feeding 10 million Bengali refugees who had fled across the border to escape the Pakistani columns. Motivating India just as strongly toward war, was the opportunity the Pakistani civil war presented to cut Pakistan's strength and resources in half; to strike a decisive blow at Pakistan and gain a decisive military superiority on the subcontinent. On December 4, India began to attempt to take East Bengal (Clodfelter 2008, 642 and 645).

5.40.1.2. Onset: 04/12/1971; Termination: 16/12/1971

5.40.1.3. India versus Pakistan

5.40.1.4. India – 160,000 troops including 65,000 support troops (8 infantry division, 3 infantry brigades), 180 tanks, 12 bombers, 150 fighters, 1 aircraft carrier capable of launching 10 aircraft, 8 destroyers or frigates, 3 LSTs

5.40.1.5. India – at least 742 killed, 2,257 wounded, 5 missing, 19 tanks destroyed

5.40.1.6. Pakistan – 73,000 troops (4 infantry divisions, 1 infantry brigade), about 100 tanks, 18 F-86 Saberjets, 4 sea-going gunboats, 20 river gunboats

5.40.1.7. Pakistan – 229 killed, 20 wounded, 42 captured.

5.40.1.8. Outcome – India won. East Bengal had fallen in just twelve days . . . Pakistani troops and civilian officials surrendered (Clodfelter 2008, 645).

5.40.2. **Battle of Chamb** (Clodfelter 2008, 642-645)

5.40.2.1. Chamb was a part of operations in the West (Jammu and Kashmir front; Punjab front; and the Sind-Rajasthan front) and was the bitterest battle of the war.

5.40.2.2. Onset: 03/12/1971; Termination: 10/12/1971

5.40.2.3. India versus Pakistan

5.40.2.4. India – 10 infantry battalions, 1 armored brigade. Unit Size Unknown.

5.40.2.5. India – 440 killed, 723 wounded, 190 missing, 17 tanks destroyed

5.40.2.6. Pakistan – 1 infantry division, 1 infantry brigade, 3 armored regiments. Unit Size Unknown.
5.40.2.7. Pakistan – 1,350 killed, 4,130 wounded, 36 tanks destroyed
5.40.2.8. Outcome – Pakistan won. Pakistan took Chamb but when Pakistan followed the retreating Indians, and Pakistan was repulsed (Clodfelter 2008, 645).

5.40.3. Battle of Shakargarh Salient (Clodfelter 2008, 642-645)
5.40.3.1. Shakargarh Salient was a part of operations in the West (Jammu and Kashmir front; Punjab front; and the Sind-Rajasthan front) and was the biggest action along the Punjab front. India attempted to pinch off the Shakargarh Salient, southeast of SialkotOnset.
5.40.3.2. 08/12/1971; Termination: 16/12/1971
5.40.3.3. India versus Pakistan
5.40.3.4. India – 3 divisions. Unit Size Unknown.
5.40.3.5. India – 301 killed, 15 tanks destroyed
5.40.3.6. Pakistan – 1 brigade, 2 regiments. Unit Size Unknown.
5.40.3.7. Pakistan – 285 killed, 45 tanks destroyed
5.40.3.8. Outcome – India won. India captured 750 square miles in the Shakargarh Salient (Clodfelter 2008, 645).

5.40.4. Battle of Sind (Clodfelter 2008, 642-645)
5.40.4.1. Sind was a part of operations in the West (Jammu and Kashmir front; Punjab front; and the Sind-Rajasthan front). The Pakistani forces in Sind were dispatched across the Indian frontier on December 4 (Clodfelter 2008, 642 and 645).
5.40.4.2. Onset: 04/12/1971; Termination: 15/12/1971
5.40.4.3. India versus Pakistan
5.40.4.4. India – 2 divisions and 1 brigade. Unit Size Unknown.
5.40.4.5. India – 107 killed, 252 wounded, 8 tanks destroyed
5.40.4.6. Pakistan – 3,000 troops (1 infantry brigade, 1 armored regiment)
5.40.4.7. Pakistan – Unknown
5.40.4.8. Outcome – India won. India claimed capture of 4,715 square miles in Sind and Kutch (Clodfelter 2008, 645).

5.41. Yom Kippur War

5.41.1. Syrian Offensive (Clodfelter 2008, 618 and 620)
5.41.1.1. The Yom Kippur War began with simultaneous and coordinated attacks by Syrian and Egyptian forces on the Golan Heights and on the Bar Lev Line along the Suez Canal 300 miles to the southwest on October 6, 1973. Syrian and Egyptian minimum goal was to erase the shame of the 1967 military debacle. Their maximum goal was the reconquest of all those Arab lands lost to Israel in the Six Day War. On October 6, Syria attacked the Israeli

position atop Mount Herman at the northern anchor of the Golan Heights (Clodfelter 2008, 620; See also Dupuy 1978, 422).

5.41.1.2. Onset: 06/10/1973; Termination: 07/10/1973

5.41.1.3. Israel versus Syria and Morocco

5.41.1.4. Israel – 12,000

5.41.1.5. Israel – Unknown

5.41.1.6. Syria – 60,000

5.41.1.7. Syria – Unknown

5.41.1.8. Outcome – Syria won. The Israeli position was swamped (Clodfelter 2008, 620; CIA 1975 Intelligence Report, The Arab-Israeli War and Analysis of the Conflict, 11-12).

5.41.2. Battle of Mount Hermon, 8 October 1973 (Clodfelter 2008, 618 and 620)

5.41.2.1. On October 6, Syria swamped the Israeli position atop Mount Herman at the northern anchor of the Golan Heights. Two days later, Israel attempted to retake Mount Herman (Clodfelter 2008, 620).

5.41.2.2. Onset: 08/10/1973; Termination: 08/10/1973

5.41.2.3. Israel versus Syria

5.41.2.4. Israel – Approximately 600. 2 battalions. Once the approval was given, the brigade commander, decided that the forces to carry out the attack would be: the 51st battalion with its battalion commander CCP, Company B and a Medical Evacuation Unit; the 17th battalion with its battalion commander CCP and two additional squad commander course companies with one reduced squad; two tanks from the 71st battalion platoon, under Deputy Company Commander Lt. David Teeni, appended to the 1st Brigade and the brigade commander's CCP (Hofi et al 2016, 227; Rabinovich 2007).

5.41.2.5. Israel – 22 killed, 50 wounded; During the battle, twenty-three commanders and combatants were killed and fifty-five were injured. At the end of the battle, the bodies of four combatants, from the 17th Battalion remained in the field; a combatant was left behind with the consent of the brigade commander and the bodies of the officer and two combatants, who stormed elevation point 2027 and whose absence was only verified in the gathering area in the Banias, were left behind, as well. The brigade commander consented that the bodies of the four combatants from the reconnaissance company be left behind as well since heavy Syrian fire made evacuation impossible (Asher and Hammel 2014, 238).

5.41.2.6. Syria – 2800. 82nd battalion, 1 reinforment force, and 183rd battalion (Hofi et al 2016, 478; O'Ballance 1978, 35)

5.41.2.7. Syria – Two killed and four wounded in the 82nd Battalion of the upper ski lift station blocking force, and at least seven were killed and seven wounded, three of them officers from the

reinforcement force. About twenty soldiers were killed in the 183rd Battalion. Approximately 40 casualties (Hofi et al 2016).

5.41.2.8. Outcome – Syria won. The Israeli assault was thrown back (Clodfelter 2008, 620).

5.41.3. Battle of Nafah

5.41.3.1. On October 6, Syria began to attack Nafah (or Nafakh) where the Israeli base was located (Clodfelter 2008, 620; Rabinovich 2004, 199)

5.41.3.2. Onset: 06/10/1973; Termination: 10/10/1973

5.41.3.3. Israel versus Syria

5.41.3.4. Israel – 250 tanks (Rabinovich 2004, 197); Ugda Raful (36th Armoured Division) with two armoured brigades and Ugda Laner (240th Reserve Armoured Division) with two armoured brigades (Dunstan 2007, 144-145); 188th Armoured 'Barak' Brigade with 72 tanks under the command of Ugda Raful (Dunstan 2007, 120). Approximately 8,000 soldiers (Hussein 2002).

5.41.3.5. Israel – Unknown

5.41.3.6. Syria – Approximately 25,000 soldiers; 9th Infantry Division with 5,000 troops and approximately 100 tanks, 1st Armoured Division with 10,000 troops and more than 250 tanks, 3rd Armoured Division with 10,000 troops and more than 250 tanks. (Dunstan 2007, 127 and 144-145; O'Ballance 1978, 35)

5.41.3.7. Syria – Unknown

5.41.3.8. Outcome – Israel won. The main Syrian force had pulled back under the pressure of [Ori] Orr's tanks (Rabinovich 2004, 205-206).

5.41.4. Israeli Counterattack (Golan) (Clodfelter 2008, 618 and 620-621)

5.41.4.1. By October 10, the Syrian offensive had been pushed back and the Israeli troops began a counterattack on the Golan Heights. (Clodfelter 2008, 621; CIA 1975 Intelligence Report, The Arab-Israeli War and Analysis of the Conflict, 18); "An advance from the north part of the Golan directly toward Damascus" (Dupuy 1978, 463).

5.41.4.2. Onset: 11/10/1973; Termination: 12/10/1973

5.41.4.3. Israel versus Syria and Morocco

5.41.4.4. Israel – Approximately 36,000 soldiers (Hofi et al 2016, 348); Ugda Raful (36th Armoured Division), Ugda Laner (240th Rserve Armoured Division), Ugda Musa (146th Reserve Armoured Division) (Dunstan 2007, 188-189); On Thursday morning, October 11, Eitan's and Laner's divisons were to drive abreast to the northeast, while on their right Peled consolidated along the Purple Line" (Dupuy 1978, 463).

5.41.4.5. Israel – 0 casualties

5.41.4.6. Syria and Morocco – Syria – 7th Infantry Division, 5th Infantry Division, Elements of the 9th Infantry Division, 3rd Armoured Division, 1st Armoured Division; Morocco – Moroccan Expeditionary Brigade (Dunstan 2007, 188-189); Moroccan Expeditionary Force in brigade strength backed by some forty tanks (Herzog 1975, 130); Moroccan brigade was deployed near the Syrian 1st Armoured Division but it is not clear that this brigade actually joined the fighting. Were given limited objectives and orders not to advance further without orders from the Syrian High Command (Dunstan 2007, 123); A Moroccan infantry brigade, about eighteen hundred strong, was in position…When the Syrian order came to advance, the Moroccans declined to move….A Syrian staff officer later told me that the Moroccans "were not well disciplined, or trained for conventional war, and so were of little use. They remained in the battle area for political reasons, but they were not used again in the fighting (O'Ballance 1979, 133); Facing Lt. Col. Khalny's 77th Battalion in front of Hader was the Moroccan Brigade supported by about 40 Syrian tanks. Just to the south of the Moroccons were the scattered remnants of the two brigades of the Syrian 7th Division, only partially reorganized (Dupuy 1978, 464). Approximately 40,000 total after losses from earlier fighting.

5.41.4.7. Syria and Morocco – 867 tanks left behind

5.41.4.8. Outcome – Israel won. The Israelis advanced onward into Syria, penetrating 6 miles in the north and 12 miles in the south (Clodfelter 2008, 621).

5.41.5. Operation Badr (Clodfelter 2008, 618, 621-622)

5.41.5.1. The Egyptian assault along the 110-mile Suez Canal began on October 6 (Clodfelter 2008, 620-621).

5.41.5.2. Onset: 06/10/1973; Termination: 08/10/1973

5.41.5.3. Israel versus Egypt

5.41.5.4. Israel – 18,000 troops (2 infantry brigades, 3 armored brigades), 277 tanks, 70 field pieces

5.41.5.5. Israel – 436 (Herzog 1984, 242)

5.41.5.6. Egypt – 80,000 troops (5 divisions), 500 tanks, 240 MIGs (See also Dupuy 1978, 414).

5.41.5.7. Egypt – On October 7 Israeli claimed 250-300 Egyptian casualties from knocking down helicopters caring troops; 280 casualties (Rabinovich 2007)

5.41.5.8. Egypt won. "15 of the Israeli posts on the edge of the canal fell on October 6, and in the next ten days, 10 more posts surrendered and another 10 more evacuated" (Clodfelter 2008, 621).

5.41.6. Israeli Counterattack (Sinai) (Clodfelter 2008, 618, 621-622)

5.41.6.1. On October 8, Israel attempted the first major counterattack in the southern theater (Clodfelter 2008, 620-622; See also Dupuy 1978, 422-435)

5.41.6.2. Onset: 08/10/1973; Termination: 8/10/1973

5.41.6.3. Israel versus Egypt

5.41.6.4. Israel –2 armored divisions (143rd Armored Division and 162nd Armored Division); 162nd Armored Division with 183 tanks; approximately 16,000 soldiers (Gawrych 1996, 43, 47)

5.41.6.5. Israel – Approximately 4,000 soldiers, 85 tanks lost (Gawrych 1996, 50)

5.41.6.6. Egypt – Approximately 36,000 soldiers. 2 infantry divisions (2nd Infantry Division and 16th Infantry Division) (Gawrych 1996, 47); "Adan – now under attack from the Egyptian 18th, 2nd, and 16th Divisions-believed that he could hold his positions until Sharon arrives" (Dupuy 1978, 432; Gawrych 1996 43, 46; O'Ballance 1978, 76)

5.41.6.7. Egypt – Unknown

5.41.6.8. Outcome – Egypt won. The first major Israeli counterattack failed disastrously (Clodfelter 2008, 622; See also Dupuy 1978, 434).

5.41.7. Egyptian Strike to Gidi and Mitla Passes

5.41.7.1. On October 9, Egypt began to attack the Gidi and Mitla Passes, which run through a mountainous and hilly ridge (Herzog 1982, 231-232, 248; See also Dupuy 1978, 416).

5.41.7.2. Onset: 09/10/1973; Termination: 10/10/1973

5.41.7.3. Israel versus Egypt

5.41.7.4. Israel – Colonel Dan Shomron's armored brigade, Shomoron's brigade, with just 23 tanks; approximately 4,000 soldiers (Herzog 1984, 248; Gawrych 1996, 32)

5.41.7.5. Israel – Unknown

5.41.7.6. Egypt – 2 mechanized brigades; approximately 7,000 soldiers (Herzog 1982, 248; O'Ballance 1978, 76)

5.41.7.7. Egypt – 20 tanks lost, many armored personnel vehicles lost (Herzog 1982, 248)

5.41.7.8. Outcome – Israel won. The Egyptians withdrew in disarray (Herzog 1982, 248; See also Dupuy 1978, 416).

5.41.8. Egyptian Attack (Clodfelter 2008, 618, 621-622)

5.41.8.1. In an attempt to take the pressure off the Syrians, now in retreat from the Golan, and to break out of their 5-mile-deep bridgeheads and towards the strategic Mitla and Bir Gifgafa passes, the Egyptians launched a major attack against Israel on October 14. The largest tank battle since Kursk in 1943 erupted. (Clodfelter 2008, 620-622)

5.41.8.2. Onset: 14/10/1973; Termination: 14/10/1973

5.41.8.3. Israel versus Egypt

5.41.8.4. Israel – 1 division, 800 tanks; approximately 12,000 soldiers (Gawrych 1996, 58-59)

5.41.8.5. Israel – 656 killed, wounded or missing, 40 tanks lost

5.41.8.6. Egypt – 6 armored brigades, 1,000 tanks, 5,000 infantry troops; approximately 21,000 total (O'Ballance 1978, 76)

5.41.8.7. Egypt – 1,000 killed, wounded or missing, 264 tanks lost, 200 other armored vehicles lost (See Also Dupuy 1978, 487)

5.41.8.8. Outcome – Israel won. The victors [Israel] lost 40 tanks (Clodfelter 2008, 622).

5.41.9. Operation Strongheart

5.41.9.1. On October 16, Egypt commenced Operation Strongheart, massive counterattacks in an effort to close the corridor that Israel had opened on the east bank. Israel agreed to the UN's October 22 call for a cease fire (Clodfelter 2008, 620-622; See also Dupuy 1978, 492-493).

5.41.9.2. Onset: 15/10/1973; Termination: 16/10/1973

5.41.9.3. Israel versus Egypt.

5.41.9.4. Israel – Approximately 24,000 soldiers. 2 divisions. The initial crossing operation was to be carried out by General Sharon's division of three armored brigades, wit h a fourth brigade of paratroopers attached . . . Meanwhile, the rest of Sharon's division (more than two brigades) was to hold open a corridor north of the Great Bitter Lake and simultaneously make diversionary attacks . . . Adan's division was to begin crossing as soon as the bridges were installed. Now back to full strength, with three brigades of about 100 tanks each. . . Once Adan had broken out, General Magen's division (formerly Mendler's) of one infantry and two armored brigades would relieve Sharon's division (Dupuy 1978, 492-493).

5.41.9.5. Israel – at least 221 killed and 300 wounded, 134 tanks lost; "And according to Israeli estimates, Sharon had already lost one hundred dead and three hundred wounded (The Insight Team of the London Sunday Times 1974, 335).

5.41.9.6. Egypt – 2 Egyptian Divisions – 21st and 16th from the Egyptian Second Army; approximately 28,000 (Dupuy 1978, 495)

5.41.9.7. Egypt – at least 300 killed, 236 tanks lost

5.41.9.8. Israel won (Dupuy 1978, 497)

5.41.10. Battle of Chinese Farm (Clodfelter 2008, 618, 621-622)

5.41.10.1. On October 16, Egypt commenced operation Strongheart, massive counterattacks in an effort to close the corridor that Israel had opened on the east bank. The fiercest battle was fought out around the Chinese Farm (Clodfelter 2008, 620-622; See also Dupuy 1978, 503).

5.41.10.2. Onset: 16/10/1973; Termination: 19/10/1973

5.41.10.3. Israel versus Egypt

5.41.10.4. Israel – Approximately 4,600 soldiers (Gawrych 1996, 62) "Three brigades Herzog 1975, 212); 14th Armoured Brigade, 421st Erez Armoured Brigade, BARAM Armoured Brigade, AMIR Armoured Brigade, 600th Reserve Armoured Brigade, 217th Reserve Armoured Brigade, 500th Reserve Armoured Brigade (Dunstan 2007, 104-105).

5.41.10.5. Israel – 400 casualties (Gawrych 1996, 62)

5.41.10.6. Egypt – Approximately 37,000 (O'Ballance 1978, 76). At least 2,000 paratroopers, 30 tanks; 16th Infantry Division, 21st Armoured Division, 25th Armoured Brigade (Herzog 1975, 212); 16th Infantry Division, 21st Armoured Division, 25th Armoured Brigade (Herzog 1975, 212), and 116th Infantry Brigade (Dunstan 2007, 104).

5.41.10.7. Egypt – More than one hundred Egyptian tanks were destroyed

5.41.10.8. Outcome – Israel won

5.41.11. Arab Counterattack in Syria October 16 (Clodfelter 2008, 618 and 620-621)

5.41.11.1. On October 16, Jordan and Iraq began a counterattack against the Israeli forces in Syria (Clodfelter 2008, 621; CIA 1975 Intelligence Report, The Arab-Israeli War and Analysis of the Conflict, 18). Forces from the Arab armies gathered in the Syrian arena carried out their first offensive on IDF forces on the morning of October 16. It was carried out from the south and east and was mainly aimed at the 210th Division forces. The Iraqi and the Jordanian expeditionary forces were supposed to coordinate the offensive between them. The task was assigned to the Iraqi 3rd Armored Division the Jordanian Brigade was subordinated to. In effect, however, the Iraqi 6th Armored Brigade and the Jordanian 40th Armored Brigade carried out an uncoordinated, split offensive. The IDF forces were aware of the impending offensive, achieved through surveillance reports, and the two divisions within the Syrian enclave were in a high alert level at dawn. The 210th Division deployed with the 679th and the 179th Brigades in front. The 9th Brigade was concentrated as a reserve force and a division counter offensive force from the rear (Asher 2014, 412).

5.41.11.2. Onset: 16/10/1973; Termination: 16/10/1973

5.41.11.3. Israel versus Syria, Jordan, and Iraq

5.41.11.4. Israel – Approximately 24,000; Ugda Raful (36th Armoured Division), Ugda Laner (240th Rserve Armoured Division) (Dunstan 2007, 192-193; Herzog 1984, 151)

5.41.11.5. Israel – Unknown

5.41.11.6. Syria, Jordan, and Iraq – Syria – Approximately 12,000 (Hussain 2012); 1 brigade; Jordan – 1 armored brigade (40th Jordanian Armoured Brigade: Herzog 1975, 139), 150 tanks; Iraq –

Iraqi 3rd Armoured Division (Dunstan 2007, 192-193); On 16 October the Jordanians moved on to the attack supported by an attached Saudi contingent and a Syrian brigade (Dunstan 2007, 197); The first Iraqi battalion arrived in the front on 9 October while the first full armoured brigade arrived only two days later…there was little communication with the Syrian command….The Iraqis failed to employ any battle formations larger than brigade, even when such option was available (Sela 2000, 59); On 12 October, the [Jordanian] King sent an armoured Jordanian brigade to Syria. As of 16 October, this brigade took part in containing the Israeli counterattack, together with the Iraqi forces, both sustaining heavy losses (Sela 2000, 60); Iraqi 3rd Armoured Division with two armoured brigades with 130 tanks per armoured brigade, and one mechanized brigade with 50 tanks (Herzog 1975, 137); On the 14th the Jordanian 40th armored brigade entered the front lines on the south face of the Isareli salient, just north of El Hara, between the Iraqi 3rd Armored Division and the 8th Syrian Division, holding the left shoulder of the Salient. Jordanian Col. Majali was placed under the command of the 3rd Iraqi Division commander, BG Lafta. On Oct 15th the Iraqi 3rd Armored Division was ordered to to plan for a major counterattack . . . told to include the Jordanian brigade in his counterattack planes. He was told the that the right flank brigade of the 9th Division [Syrian] would join the attack at H-Hour-5:00am on the 16th . . . As scheduled, the Jordanians, an attached Saudi Arabian contingent, and a Syrian brigade near Um Bune launched their attacks at 5:00am on the 17th, only to discover the Iraqis were not taking part . . . At about 10am the Iraqis belatedly began their counterattack (Dupuy 1978, 533).

5.41.11.7. Syria, Jordan, and Iraq – Jordan – 28 tanks lost; Iraq – 60 tanks lost; Syria – Unknown; Saudi Arabia – Unknown

5.41.11.8. Outcome – Israel won. The attack was repelled (Clodfelter 2008, 621).

5.41.12. Arab Counterattack in Syria October 18-19 (Clodfelter 2008, 618 and 620-621)

5.41.12.1. On October 16, Jordan and Iraq began a counterattack against the Israeli forces in Syria. Another Arab counterattack was conducted on October 18-19 (Clodfelter 2008, 621). The heads of government in Damascus declared that Syria was not going to request a ceasefire, due to the Soviet overwhelming support with weapons and fighting gear. On the night of October 16–17, the IDF long-range artillery bombed bases south of Damascus again, this time in Artouze and Katana. Some 130mm towed guns, from the GHQ's re-serves, were advanced to Syrian positions and fired captured Syrian ammunition. Before dawn, October 17, forces from the Iraqi Special Forces Brigade attacked the 205th Brigade, 125

Battalion night camp on the south slope of Tel Antar with anti-tank rocket grenades, suffered losses and were repelled. During these days, the Syrians attacked repeatedly with battalion size forces of tanks and infantry. A Syrian force managed to break through Mazraat Beit Jann and was halted by infantry anti-tank fire and a parallel counter attack. At the same time the Golani Brigade captured the village of Beit Jann and the ridge north of it. The Syrians attacked Tel Shams on the road to Damascus, Tel Merai on the road to Khankar, and Tel Aris between them, with infantry and tank forces once again. On October 16-17, a Saudi AML battalion participated in the attack on Tel Merai. Most of it was destroyed. In order to improve the command and control of the Tel Shams sector the Castel force was established under the command of Col. Yosef Castel, including the 13th Infantry Battalion form Golani and the 74th Tank Battalion. On the 17th and 18th of the month, the Syrians deployed the 62nd Mechanized Brigade in Khankar and reinforced the Iraqi sector by placing the Syrian 85th Infantry Brigade in Deir el Ades and the Iraqi 12th Mechanized Brigade in Ghabaghib. At dawn October 18, the Iraqis attempted to carry out a night raid from the direction of the Shams and Deir el Ade's villages with the Special Forces brigade but the raiding forces were discovered and retreated after suffering losses, leaving two soldiers behind. The IDF carried out initiated operations which included the Golani Brigade operated ambushes in the region of the Arna village and Mazraat Beit Jann, and appending frontal observation officers in the Hina region to range artillery at the Syrian outposts. At night, October 17–18th, the 317th Paratrooper Brigade placed two ambushes, south and east of Khankar, and struck a jeep. A force raiding an artillery battery discovered that the battery had skipped (Asher 2014, 416-417).

5.41.12.2. Onset: 18/10/1973; Termination: 19/10/1973

5.41.12.3. Israel versus Syria, Jordan, Iraq. On the 19th the Syrian front again erupted in considerable activity with a series of Arab counterattacks. The principal Arab effort was against the south face of the Israeli salient with Iraqi, Jordanian, and Syrian forces all taking part (Dupuy 1978, 534).

5.41.12.4. Israel – Approximately 4,000 (Rabinovich 2007)

5.41.12.5. Israel – Unknown

5.41.12.6. Syria, Jordan, and Iraq– Approximately 36,600 (Rabinovich 2007; Hussein 2002); Syria – one division; 40th Jordanian Armoured Brigade (Herzog 1975, 142); Iraq – one division ("An Iraqi attack in divisional strength was being mounted." (Herzog 1975, 141); "The Iraqis operated about ninety tanks in two battalions, two infantry and eight artillery battalions" (Asher 2014, 415).

5.41.12.7. Syria, Jordan and Iraq. Jordan – 20 tanks lost; Iraq – 60 tanks lost; During the battle the Iraqi Brigade lost about 25 percent of its fighting force, including several dozen tanks. In the evening it retreated to tend to its dire defeat. Lt. Col. Tuvia Toren, the commander of the 125th Battalion of the 205th Brigade was killed (Asher 2014, 415). Approximately 77 casualties (Rabinovich 2007)

5.41.12.8. Outcome – Israel won. Another major effort by the Arabs was similarly unsuccessful (Clodfelter 2008, 621).

5.41.13. Battle of Mount Hermon (Clodfelter 2008, 618 and 620-621)

5.41.13.1. The Israeli troops attempted to retake Mount Herman on October 21-22 (Clodfelter 2008, 620); The Golani Brigade completed the task it had been assigned—conquering the Hermon shoulder and recapturing the Israeli outpost (Asher 2014, 477-478).

5.41.13.2. Onset: 21/10/1973; Termination: 22/10/1973

5.41.13.3. Israel versus Syria

5.41.13.4. Israel – Approximately 8,000 soldiers; the Golani Brigade and 31st Paratroop Brigade (Dupuy 1978, 535)

5.41.13.5. Israel – 52 killed, 100 wounded; The toll was very high. Fifty-six combatants were killed and seventy-nine were injured in the battle. From the 51st Battalion forty-two combatants were killed and fifty-two injured, from the 17th Battalion five combatants were killed and six injured, from the reconnaissance company four combatants were killed, from brigade Training Base No. 1 two combatants were killed and fifteen injured, from the 74th Battalion one combatant was killed and six injured, from the 405th Battalion one combatant was killed, from the 606th Battalion one combatant was killed, and from the brigade, command the brigade commander was injured (Asher 2014, 477).

5.41.13.6. Syria – Approximately 2,800 soldiers; two elite formations, one of paratroops and the other of special forces troops (Dunstan 2007, 198)

5.41.13.7. Syria – The Syrian losses in the battle were estimated at about 50 to 60 killed. Israeli forces took captive sixty-two Syrian soldiers: 45 from the 82nd Paratrooper Battalion and seventeen from the 133rd Commando Battalion. Several dozen Syrian soldiers who escaped the battle zone were killed in the Bolaan Valley by the 269th Unit combatants. Most of the Syrians were killed by the Golani combatants' small arm fire and only a few were killed by the Israeli Air Force bombings and artillery shelling (Asher 2014, 478).

5.41.13.8. Outcome – Israel won. On the evening of October 22, Syria agreed to the cease-fire called by the United Nations . . . Israel had conquered another 300 square miles of Syrian territory, in addition to recovering the Golan . . ." (Clodfelter 2008, 621).

5.41.14. Egyptian 3rd Army Encirclement

5.41.14.1. On October 22, Sharon's division struck north and Magen's division turned south to completely seal off the Egyptian Third Army (Clodfelter 2008, 620-622; See also Dupuy 1978, 523-529).

5.41.14.2. Onset: 23/10/1973; Termination: 23/10/1973

5.41.14.3. Israel versus Egypt

5.41.14.4. Israel – 24th Division; approximately 12,000 soldiers (O'Ballance 1978, 126)

5.41.14.5. Israel – The reporting procedure on the Arab side had been notably more negligent. Egypt had reported only 48 Israelis captured, and Syria, which had exhibited captured Israeli soldiers on television, had reported none. Israel's estimate of its missing presumed captured numbered almost 400 (The Insight Team of the London Sunday Times 1974, 429).

5.41.14.6. Egypt – Third Army,30,000 to 40,000 troops and 300 tanks (Gawrych 1996, 73)

5.41.14.7. Egypt – 600 (Shazly 1980, 270)

5.41.14.8. Outcome – Israel won

5.42. Turco-Cypriot

5.42.1. **First Turkish Offensive** (Clodfelter 2008, 580)

5.42.1.1. To forestall a union with Greece and to protect the Turkish minority on the island of Cyprus, Turkey decided to intervene on July 20, 1974 (Clodfelter 2008, 580); Secure a bridgehead in the northern part of the island, after which negotiations would begin for a new constitutional settlement (Hale 2013, 112).

5.42.1.2. Onset: 20/07/1974; Termination: 20/07/1974

5.42.1.3. Turkey versus Cyprus

5.42.1.4. Turkey – 8,000 troops, 5 naval destroyers, 2 transports, 25 landing craft

5.42.1.5. Turkey – 57 killed, 184 wounded, 242 missing

5.42.1.6. Cyprus – 1 Greek army battalion (950 troops), Greek Cypriot militia (8,000 active and 4,000 reserve troops led by 650 Greek officers), 32 tanks

5.42.1.7. Cyprus – Between 20 and 22 July the Greek forces had suffered 215 killed and 223 missing, and an unknown number of wounded [Published casualty lists, as per the decision No.12/2000 of the Ministerial Council (Republic of Cyprus Government) of 4 May 2000]

5.42.1.8. Outcome – Turkey won. After Attila 1, the Turkish forces controlled 7% of the island's area. They had successfully connected their beachhead in the north with the big Turkish Cypriot enclave north of Nicosia. They controlled the harbour of Kyrenia, which enabled them to increase the rate of reinforcements arriving from to Turkey, something essential for the second offensive (Kalotsa, The 1974 Turkish Invasion in Cyprus)

5.42.2. Second Turkish Offensive (Clodfelter 2008, 580)

5.42.2.1. To forestall a union with Greece and to protect the Turkish minority on the island of Cyprus, Turkey decided to intervene on July 20, 1974. Ashore on Cyprus, Turkey built up their invasion force. (Clodfelter 2008, 580). Considering Turkey's geographical position, her rivalry with Greece, and Cyprus's non-alignment, it is possible to argue that at the worst of times Turkey could become isolated. On such an occasion, occupation of Cyprus could become a lever in the hands of Turkish diplomats. Turkey's acts could also be interpreted as an attempt to ensure that Cyprus would never be incorporated into Greece (Kassimeris 2008).

5.42.2.2. Onset: 14/08/1974; Termination: 16/08/1974

5.42.2.3. Turkey versus Cyprus

5.42.2.4. Turkey – 40,000 troops, 200 tanks

5.42.2.5. Turkey – 300 killed, 1,200 wounded (See also Jentleson and Paterson 1997, 556, and Cakmak 2008, 668)

5.42.2.6. Cyprus – Unknown

5.42.2.7. Cyprus – at least 4,500 Greek Cypriots, soldiers, civilians killed, 1,614 missing and believed dead.

5.42.2.8. Outcome – Turkey won. Turkey overran the northern two-fifths of the island, and a pro-Greek government fell. Turkey established a separate Turkish Cypriot republic (Clodfelter 2008, 580).

5.43. War over Angola

5.43.1. Battle of Luanda

5.43.1.1. The Carnation Revolution of April 1974 in Portugal took place and led to the independent movements in the Portuguese colonies in Africa including Mozambique and Angola. The former regained the independence in 1975 but the latter's control remained disputed among three rival independent movements: MPLA (People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola), FNLA (National Liberation Front of Angola), and UNITA (National Union for the Total Independence of Angola). While Cuba and the Soviet supported MPLA, the U.S., China, Romania, Democratic Republic of the Congo, and South Africa supported FNLA. UNITA received a support from Portugal and South Africa. Rivalry between these three independent movements erupted in open warfare and in October 1975, South Africa launched Operation Savannah to attack left-wing MPLA and the next month Cuba launched Operation Carlota to defend MPLA as an intervention to the Angolan Civil War. Often the focus of the fighting was Luanda, Angola's political and economic capital. There was a major battle in Quifangondo near Luanda in November 1975 (George 2005, 49-86).

5.43.1.2. Onset: 10/11/1975; Termination: 10/11/1975

5.43.1.3. Cuba and Angola (MPLA) versus South Africa, Angola (FNLA), and Democratic Republic of the Congo

5.43.1.4. Cuba and Angola (MPLA) and Kataguan Forces – 1,000 troops (George 2005, 89); Quifangondo was (p. 310) defended by 850 FAPLA, 200 Katangans, 88 Cubans, and Yuri, the Soviet adviser (Gleijeses 2002, 310-311).

5.43.1.5. Cuba and Angola (MPLA) and Kataguan Forces – Cuba – 2 wounded; Angola (MPLA) – 1 killed and 3 wounded

5.43.1.6. South Africa, Angola (FNLA), and Democratic Republic of the Congo – Angola (FNLA) – 2,000 troops, Democratic Republic of Congo – 1,200 men, 120 Portuguese mercenaries, South Africa provided three 140 mm howitzers and a preliminary aerial bombardment (George 2005, 89); A final assault was ordered for 10 November, and at Roberto (Holden Roberto, a founder and leader of FNLA)'s request the SADF provided three 140 mm howitzers to support the attack (these were flown to Ambriz on 8 November) as well as a preliminary aerial bombardment by Canberra bombers. While the defences were being softened up, commandos under Colonel Santos e Castro (a former officer in the Portuguese colonial army) would capture the bridge over the Bengo river. Then, the main force would advance down the road towards Luanda, with the South African guns following them as soon as was practical (George 2005, 89); He [Roberto] had confidence in his army of 2,000 Angolans, 1,200 Zairean soldiers supplied by his Zairean patron Mobutu, 120 Portuguese mercenaries, and a few South African and CIA advisers (Gleijeses 2002, 310).

5.43.1.7. South Africa, Angola (FNLA), and Democratic Republic of the Congo – Angola (FNLA) – at least 120 killed (George 2005, 90); Total FNLA–Zairian casualties at Quifangondo were 100–150 killed and c.200 wounded. Roberto (in interview) admitted that up to 120 men were killed, with twice as many wounded (George 2005, 90n11)

5.43.1.8. Outcome – Cuba and Angola (MPLA) and Kataguan Forces won. The defeat at Quifangondo was a devastating blow to FNLA and cemented the MPLA's grip on Luanda (George 2005, 90).

5.43.2. Battle of Cabinda (George 2005, 82-86)

5.43.2.1. The fighting in Cabinda and Quifangondo occurred simultaneously.

5.43.2.2. Onset: 11/8/1975; Termination: 11/13/1975

5.43.2.3. Cuba and Angola (MPLA) versus Angola (FLEC), Zairian forces

5.43.2.4. Cuba and Angola (MPLA) – 600 troops. In the end, the fighting in Cabinda and Quifangondo occurred simultaneously, forcing Espinosa to mount his defence with only one battalion of FAPLA, a handful of experienced guerillas, five artillery batteries and the

reduced contingent of Cubans (a total of around 600 troops) (George 2005, 82-83).

5.43.2.5. Cuba and Angola (MPLA) – 80. While FAPLA and Cuba losses probably did not exceed thirty killed and fifty wounded (George 2005, 86).

5.43.2.6. Angola (FLEC) and Zairian forces – 2000. The invading army was reportedly made up of four infantry battalions (c. 2000 men). French and American mercenaries – 150 (George 2005, 83).

5.43.2.7. Angola (FLEC) and Zairian forces – 600. Over 600 casualties had been inflicted on the invading forces George 2005, 86).

5.43.2.8. Outcome – Cuba and Angola (MPLA) won. Fighting on three fronts simultaneously, Espinosa had used limited forces to great effect, and in five days had secured the MPLA's future economic line – Cabinda oil – which has kept it in power to this day (George 2005, 86).

5.43.3. Battle of Novo Redondo

5.43.3.1. In November 1975, South Africa ordered the commander of Zulu Force to continue its advance along the coast and attack Novo Redondo (Sumbe) and Porto Amboim (George 2005, 49-93).

5.43.3.2. Onset: 11/11/1975; 13/11/1975 (George 2005, 93 and Gleijeses 2002, 314)

5.43.3.3. Cuba and Angola (MPLA) versus Angola (Zulu Force: anti-MPLA Angolan forces trained by South Africa)

5.43.3.4. Cuba and Angola (MPLA) – at least 150. The reason for this sudden change of furtune was the arrival in Porto Amboim of the first 150 reinforcements from the Cuban special forces battalion, even as Zulu Force was completing its capture of Novo Redondo only forty miles to the south (George 2005, 94)

5.43.3.5. Cuba and Angola (MPLA) – at least 1 killed and 17 wounded (George 2005, 94)

5.43.3.6. Angola (Zulu Force) – 500 troops commanded by 14 South African officers (George 2005, 71 and 93)

5.43.3.7. Angola (Zulu Force) – approximately 15 casualties (Liebenberg et al. 2016, 62)

5.43.3.8. Outcome – Angola (Zulu Force) won. Bravo, a part of the Zulu Force, occupied Novo Redondo with only light resistance (George 2005, 94).

5.43.4. Battle of Ebo

5.43.4.1. The Cubans set ambush at Ebo on Novermber the 23rd (George 2005, 97).

5.43.4.2. Onset: 11/23/1975; Termination: 11/23/1975 (George 2005, 97).

5.43.4.3. Cuba and Angola (MPLA) versus Angola (Zulu Force) and South Africa

5.43.4.4. Cuba and Angola (MPLA) – 70 Cubans and 140 FAPLA troops. (George 2005, 97)

5.43.4.5. Cuba – 1 killed and 5 wounded. Angola (MPLA) – 0 (George 2005, 97)

5.43.4.6. Angola (Zulu Force) – 499 (The same troop participated in the battle of Novo Redondo and the battle of Ebo. Because the causalties of South Africa side in battle of Novo Redondo is estimated as 15, the size of troop is given 499 in this battle.

5.43.4.7. Angola (Zulu Force) – 30 killed and 60 wounded (George 2005, 97)

5.43.4.8. Outcome – Cuba and Angola (MPLA) won. The ambush at Ebo was the South Africans' first major setback of the Angolan campaign George 2005, 97).

5.43.5. Operation Carlota

5.43.5.1. In October 1975, South Africa launched Operation Savannah to attack left-wing MPLA and the next month Cuba launched Operation Carlota to defend MPLA as an intervention to the Angolan Civil War (George 2005, 49-86).

5.43.5.2. Onset: 4/11/1975; Termination: 27/3/1976 (George 2005, 112)

5.43.5.3. Cuba and Angola (MPLA) versus South Africa, Angola (FNLA), and Democratic Republic of the Congo

5.43.5.4. Cuba – 36,000 forces (George 2005, 114), 628 special forces (George 2005, 81); Angola (MPLA) – 1,000 troops (George 2005, 89)

5.43.5.5. Cuba and Angola (MPLA) – 110 total

5.43.5.6. Angola (FNLA) – 2,000 troops, Democratic Republic of Congo – 1,200 men (George 2005, 89), South Africa – at least 4,000 to 5,000 troops (George 2005, 106)

5.43.5.7. Angola (FNLA), Democratic Republic of Congo, and South Africa – 1,055

5.43.5.8. Outcome – Cuba and Angola (MPLA) won. The South Africa withdrawal was the final turning point and was followed by the immediate collapse of FNLA and UNITA. After January 1976, the Angolan Civil War became a one-sided affair, favoring the MPLA-Cuban forces (George 2005, 106).

5.44. Second Ogaden War, Phase 2

5.44.1. Somali Invasion (Clodfelter 2008, 594-595)

5.44.1.1. After several months of insurgency conducted by the 6,000-man Western Somali Liberation Front in the desert-like Ogaden region of southeastern Ethiopia, Somalia sent its army into the fight on July 23, 1977 (Clodfelter 2008, 594). The objective was to annex the Ogaden, an elusive goal since the establishment of Somalia, and a first step into the expansion of Somalia (Tareke 2000, 635).

5.44.1.2. Onset: 13/07/1977; Termination: 15/08/1977
5.44.1.3. Somalia versus Ethiopia
5.44.1.4. Somalia – 39,450. The Ethiopian official sources are speculative but precise in their estimates. One source indicates that by July 1977 some 39,450 fighters had entered Ehiopia (Tareke 2000, 640).
5.44.1.5. Somalia – 174. With the backing of the air force, they were able to throw back the attackers at the cost of 79 dead and eight wounded against twice as many Somali casualties.
5.44.1.6. Ethiopia – 47,000 (Tareke 2000, 644)
5.44.1.7. Ethiopia – 1,948 (Tareke 2000, 644)
5.44.1.8. Outcome – Somalia won. The invaders quickly conquered considerable territory and isolated three crucial Ethiopian positions (Tareke 2000, 644-645).

5.44.2. Battle of Dire Dawa (Clodfelter 2008, 594-595)
5.44.2.1. This assault was part of the second phase of the Somali conventional effort with a previous assault on the city having failed in July. The Somali intent was to take the position in order to threaten Ethiopian troops and supply lines in the eastern portion of the theater of operations (Tareke 2000, 646).
5.44.2.2. Onset: 16/08/1977; Termination: 17/08/1977
5.44.2.3. Somalia versus Ethiopia
5.44.2.4. Somalia – 2,500 troops. Two motorized brigades, one tank battalion, two artillery battalions, one air defense battery, and one BM 13 battery were deployed in what turned out to be a diasasterous operation (Tareke 2000, 645).
5.44.2.5. Somalia – 900. The Ethiopian sources said 500 regular Somali troops had been killed in the engagement and at least 400 wounded." (Kaufman 1977). 700 killed, 4 captured, 32 tanks lost (Ethiopia claimed these figures.) The fighting for Dire Dawa was especially savage, resulting in extreme losses for both sides … the 15th Somali Brigade later reported suffering over 40% casualties to air attacks alone (Cooper 2015).
5.44.2.6. Ethiopia – One militia division, 2 infantry battalions, a mechanized company, and a tank platoon; approximately 6,300 total (Tareke 2000, 645).
5.44.2.7. Ethiopia – 450. The Ethiopians said 150 of their own men had been killed and 300 wounded (Kaufman 1977).
5.44.2.8. Outcome – Ethopia won. The defenders repelled Somali attack successfully causing them a significant operational setback.

5.44.3. Battle of Jijiga (Clodfelter 2008, 594-595)
5.44.3.1. This was the third, and final, stage of the Somali offensive.
5.44.3.2. Onset: 15/09/1977; Termination: 15/09/1977
5.44.3.3. Somalia versus Ethiopia

5.44.3.4. Somalia – 8,000 (Tareke 2000, 647); The latest Somali offensive on Jijiga that began a week ago was the biggest battle of the war, reportedly involving several thousand men on each side (Kaufman 1977).

5.44.3.5. Somalia – 3000. The front says that about 3,000 Ethiopian soldiers were killed in the battle for Jijiga. Somali losses are not known, but are believed to be similarly heavy (Kaufman 1977).

5.44.3.6. Ethiopia – 4,000. Two mechanized brigades (Tareke 2000, 647). Another Western diplomat in Addis Ababa scoffed at reports from Mogadishu, the Somali capital, that Jijiga, which is the major tank base for the Ethiopian forces, had been captured. The fall of that garrison, now said to be defended by more than 20,000 Ethiopian troops and militiamen, would be a crushing blow for the Government in Addis Ababa (Kaufman 1977). The latest Somali offensive on Jijiga that began a week ago was the biggest battle of the war, reportedly involving several thousand men on each side (Kaufman 1977).

5.44.3.7. Ethiopia – around 3,000 killed, wounded or missing, 43 tanks lost

5.44.3.8. Outcome – Somalia won. The biggest Somali victory came with the capture of Jijiga on September 15, when the last 1,000 survivors of Ethiopia's 10th Mechanized Brigade and 3rd Infantry Division abandoned the city (Clodfelter 2008, 594).

5.44.4. Battle of Harar (Clodfelter 2008, 594-595)

5.44.4.1. In late November, Somalia attempted to take Harar, and this is the peak of the Somali offensive. (Clodfelter 2008, 594); Military analysts say that if the insurgents do not quickly capture Harar and the other Ethiopian stronghold, Diredawa, they probably will not be able to do so because the Soviet Union has switched its support and supply of arms from Somalia to Ethiopia…. Earlier this month, Somalia expelled all Soviet advisers, closed Soviet bases and abrogated a 1974 friendship treaty because of Soviet backing of Ethiopia. Despite appeals to the West for aid, Somalia has been unable to find alternative sources of advanced weapons. It does receive some small arms from Arab countries (The New York Times November 24, 1977).

5.44.4.2. Onset: 21/09/1977; Termination:31/01/1978

5.44.4.3. Somalia versus Ethiopia

5.44.4.4. Somalia – about 10 brigades; approximately 10,000 total (Tareke 2000, 652)

5.44.4.5. Somalia – 3,194 (Tareke 2000, 653-654)

5.44.4.6. Ethiopia –1 Division, 1 Brigade, about 7 Batttalions; approximately 9,500 total

5.44.4.7. Ethiopia – Unknown

5.44.4.8. Outcome – Ethiopia won. The 3rd Division of Ethiopia's army held its ground (Clodfelter 2008, 584); A brigade that was originally directed to the south of Harer in a diversionary move actually succeeded in occupying a section of the town for several days in November before being pushed back. Harer was besieged for two months (De Waal 1991, 75).

5.44.5. Cuban-Ethiopian Counterattack (Clodfelter 2008, 594-595)

5.44.5.1. Ethiopia received the Cuban support and Cuba sought the second victory in Africa after their first success in Angola in 1975-76 (Clodfelter 2008, 594); In late January, the Ethiopian counter-offensive began, directed by Soviet advisors and spearheaded by Cuban troops (De Waal 1991, 76).

5.44.5.2. Onset: 22/01/1978; Termination: 28/02/1978

5.44.5.3. Somalia versus Ethiopia, Cuba, and South Yemen

5.44.5.4. Somalia – 35,000 to 50,000 troops; approximately 42,500 total

5.44.5.5. Somalia – 2,000 killed (Ethiopian estimates)

5.44.5.6. Ethiopia, Cuba, South Yemen – 113,000 troops; 100,000 Ethiopians, 10,000 Cubans, and 3,000 South Yemenis

5.44.5.7. Ethiopia, Cuba, South Yemen – 700 killed, 1,500 wounded

5.44.5.8. Outcome – Somalia won. (Clodfelter 2008, 594-595).

5.44.6. Battle of Second Jijiga (Clodfelter 2008, 594-595)

5.44.6.1. In late February, Ethiopia and Cuba moved to recapture Jijiga (Clodfelter 2008, 594-595). The effort featured a vertical envelopment of the Somali positions in Jijiga and the Kara Marda Pass (Urban 1983, 45).

5.44.6.2. Onset: 28/02/1978; Termination: 08/03/1978

5.44.6.3. Somalia versus Ethiopia and Cuba

5.44.6.4. Somalia – 8,000 (Urban 1983, 45)

5.44.6.5. Somalia – 6,800 (Urban 1983, 45)

5.44.6.6. Ethopia and Cuba – Ethiopia – 68,000 troops; Cuba – 7,000 troops

5.44.6.7. Ethopia and Cuba – Ethiopia – Unknown; Cuba – Unknown

5.44.6.8. Outcome – Ethiopia and Cuba won. The Somalia army was destroyed as a fighting force (Clodfelter 2008, 595).

5.45. Vietnamese-Cambodian

5.45.1. Vietnamese Invasion (Clodfelter 2008, 668-669)

5.45.1.1. Ethnic antipathy, poorly drawn 600-mile border lines, and an historical paranoia on the part of Cambodia toward Vietnamese imperialism all surfaced to sever their Marxist bonds and to create the world's first all-out war between Communist countries. Initially fighting was restricted to border skirmishes for more than two years and on December 26, 1977, Vietnam lost its patience and sent its army into Cambodia (Clodfelter 2008, 668).

5.45.1.2. Onset: 26/12/1977; Termination: 07/01/1978
5.45.1.3. Vietnam versus Cambodia
5.45.1.4. Vietnam – 60,000 troops (8 divisions); Note Khoo 2011, 124 also estimates it between 30-60k troops, but says 6 divisions.
5.45.1.5. Vietnam – 1,000 casualties
5.45.1.6. Cambodia – 25,000 troops
5.45.1.7. Cambodia – 2,500 casualties
5.45.1.8. Outcome – Cambodia won. By the end of the first week of January 1978, the Vietnamese offensive had bogged down, and the invading divisions were gradually withdrawn from their forward-most salient (Clodfelter 2008, 668; See also Heder 1978, 172-173 and O'Dowd 2007, 36-37).

5.45.2. Battle of Snoul (Clodfelter 2008, 668-669)
5.45.2.1. After having moved two divisions into Eastern Cambodia during the first two weeks of December, Vietnamese forces penetrated 70 miles into Southeastern Cambodia. The assault on Phnom Penh followed this penetration (Morris 1999, 111).
5.45.2.2. Onset: 18/11/1978; Termination: 19/11/1978
5.45.2.3. Vietnam versus Cambodia
5.45.2.4. Vietnam – 10,000 troops
5.45.2.5. Vietnam – Unknown
5.45.2.6. Cambodia – 4,000 to 5,000 troops (1 division)
5.45.2.7. Cambodia – 2,000 to 2,500 casualties, hundreds of prisoners taken
5.45.2.8. Outcome – Vietnam won. Vietnam routed a Cambodian division of 4,000 to 5,000 men near Snoul, inflicting 50% casualties (Clodfelter 2008, 668; See also Tanca 1993, 173)

5.45.3. Battle of Phnom Penh (Clodfelter 2008, 668-669)
5.45.3.1. Vietnam launched a full-scale invasion of Cambodia. Initially sent two Vietnamese divisions supported by aircraft to attack Highway 19 (Leading from Pleiku to Stung Treng), and moving two more divisions into Kratie province along Highway 7. These initial offensives were accompanied by multiple Vietnamese air raids. The encirclement of Phnom-Penh was virtually completed by Jan 6, when it was reported that road and rail links between the capital and Kompong Som had been cut, and that Highway 5 was the only road out of Phnom-Penh still uncut. The establishment of a People's Revolutionary Council to act as provisional government was announced in Phnom-Penh on January 8. (Keesing's 1979)
5.45.3.2. Onset: 25/12/1978; Termination: 07/01/1979
5.45.3.3. Vietnam and Pro-Vietnemese Kampuchean Force versus Cambodia

5.45.3.4. Vietnam and Pro-Vietnemese Kampuchean Force – Vietnam – 100,000 troops (12 divisions), 18,000 troops of the former Khmer Rouge; Note Khoo 2011,127 has this (total number) at 150,000

5.45.3.5. Vietnam and Vietnam and Pro-Vietnemese Kampuchean Force – 10,000 Vietnamese died (O'Dowd 2007, 39; Khoo 2011, 127).

5.45.3.6. Cambodia – 40,000 troops

5.45.3.7. Cambodia – 15,000 (See also Tucker 1998, 195)

5.45.3.8. Outcome – Vietnam won. Vietnam captured Phnom Penh on January 7, 1979 (Clodfelter 2008, 668)

5.45.4. Battle of Siem Reap (Clodfelter 2008, 668-669)

5.45.4.1. On January 8, Vietnamese forces attacked along Highway 6, north of Tonle Sap (O'Dowd 2007, 39).

5.45.4.2. Onset: 08/01/1979; Termination: 15/01/1979

5.45.4.3. Vietnam versus Cambodia

5.45.4.4. Vietnam – Unknown

5.45.4.5. Vietnam – Unknown

5.45.4.6. Cambodia – Unknown

5.45.4.7. Cambodia – Unknown

5.45.4.8. Outcome – Vietnam won. Vietnam captured Siem Reap on January 15, 1979 (Clodfelter 2008, 668). Additional cities captured Kompong Thom City (Jan 9 enroute to Siem Reap) including Pursat City (Jan 14), Battambang City (Jan 12) (Pribbenow 2006)

5.46. Ugandan-Tanzanian

5.46.1. Ugandan Invasion (Clodfelter 2008, 605)

5.46.1.1. Claiming that Tanzanian President Julius Nyerere was guilty of stirring up unrest and mutiny among the Ugandan tribes and military near the border between the two countries, Uganda's dictator, Idi Amin, sent his troops into Tanzania (Clodfelter 2008, 605).

5.46.1.2. Onset: 28/10/1978; Termination: 14/11/1978

5.46.1.3. Uganda versus Tanzania and Mozambique

5.46.1.4. Uganda – 3,000 troops; (35 tanks, 20 armoured cars, 120 APCs, numerous artillery pieces, mortars, and anti-tank weapons, 50 anti-aircraft guns, and an indeterminate number of SA-7 SAM (surface-to-air missiles). The air-force had 2 MIG-15UTI, 10 MIG-17, and 25 high performance MIG-21 - all of Soviet make) (Kiyaga-Nsubuga 1995); more than 2,000 troops (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 58)

5.46.1.5. Uganda – 0 (Avirgan and Honey 1982).

5.46.1.6. Tanzania and Mozambique – Tanzania –One brigade on the border -202nd Brigade (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 53); later all four brigades were mobilized. (Avirgand and Honey 1982, 63); Mozambique – 800 troops (one battalion), The Mozambicans were dispatched to Tanzania in a matter of days and were immediately sent to the Kagera. Aside from eight-hundred Mozambicans, no

foreign troops were ever involved in the war on the Tanzanian side (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 67). In the border area itself was the 3rd Battalion, which was so understrength that it should not have been called a battalion at all. It was commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Morris Singano. . . . Singano was in Kyaka with nineteen soldiers. The reinforcement of TPDF Southern Brigade (around four-thousand soldiers) has not positioned at the border area until the second week of November (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 61-67). Unit Sizes Unknown.

5.46.1.7. Tanzania and Mozambique –Tanzania – approximately 30 casualties. On the morning of October 30, thousands of Ugandan troops crossed into Tanzania … The only resistance they encountered was rifle fire from a few dozen civilian members of the Tanzania People's Militia who bravely but vainly tried to stand up to Amin's tanks and APCs. Those who tried to fight were quickly killed (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 61)

5.46.1.8. Outcome – Uganda won. Uganda drove some 20 miles deep into Tanzanian territory and claimed 710 square miles of Tanzania annexed to Uganda (Clodfelter 2008, 605; Darnton 1978); Ugandan formations performed incompetently, but since Tanzanians only had that light infantry battalion, they were able to conquer the small chunk of Tanzanian territory north of the Kagera River before their invasion ground to a halt (Pollack 2002, 368-73)

5.46.2. Tanzanian Streak (Clodfelter 2008, 605)

5.46.2.1. On January 21, 1979, Tanzania sent its army, deeper into southwestern Uganda (Clodfelter 2008, 605). Phase two involved attacking Masaka and Mbarara, the major towns in the south (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 78).

5.46.2.2. Onset: 21/01/1979; Termination: 25/02/1979 [not clear]

5.46.2.3. Uganda versus Tanzania and the Ugandan National Liberation Army (UNLA, an anti-Amin Ugandan solders in Tanzania: In January 1979, these anti-Amin Ugandans in Tanzania began to be trained. Thousands of anti-Amin Ugandan soldiers were already in Kampala and Jinja (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 74-75); The Ugandan National Liberation Army (UNLA) was officially formed as the result of the Moshi Conference (24-26 March 1979), but soldiers who became a UNLA member were already organized and sent to the front (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 74-75; Omara-Otunnu 1987, 141-142)

5.46.2.4. Uganda – approximately 3,000

5.46.2.5. Uganda – 100-200 were killed (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 81)

5.46.2.6. Tanzania and UNLA – 8,500. In all about forty thousand militia were brought into the army, which grew to seventy-five thousand. Eventually, forty-five thousand Tanzanians went into Uganda. The Ugandan fighters were organized into battalions. Ojok had eight

hundred soldiers and Museveni had between eighty and ninety. (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 72-75) The TPDF and its allies invaded Uganda in January 1979 and advanced slowly so as to provide time for Amin to be toppled internally. The invasion force consisted of five TPDF brigades of around 1000-1500 men each, around 1000 Ugandan exiles and some artillery from Mozambique (Stapleton 2018)

5.46.2.7. Tanzania and the UNLA – approximaely 60. Boma's battalion suffered three dead and several dozen wounded (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 70). On the shore of Lake Nakivale, … the Tanzanians had walked into a classic ambush… when the firing stopped, twenty-four Tanzanian soldiers were dead. It was to be the highest toll of Tanzanians in any battle of the war.

5.46.2.8. Outcome – Tanzania and the UNLA won (Clodfelter 2008, 605)

5.46.3. Battle of Lukaya (Clodfelter 2008, 605)

5.46.3.1. The Tanzanian force first encountered the Libyan army at Lukaya. Though initially the Tanzanian 201st Brigade was forced back from Lukaya on 10 March, the Tanzanians launched a counterattack on the night of 11-12 March, which was successful; Libyan leader Colonel Gaddafi held the view that Uganda was an Islamic republic being invaded by a Christian army (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 89).

5.46.3.2. Onset: 10/03/1979; Termination: 12/03/1979 (Stapleton 2013, 136)

5.46.3.3. Uganda, Libya, and PLO guerrillas versus Tanzania and the UNLA. There were Tanzanians, Ugandan liberation forces, Aim soldiers and Libyans all over the road in and around Lukaya (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 91).

5.46.3.4. Uganda, Libya, and PLO guerrillas – Several battalions (Pollack 2004, 369) Libya – 2,700 troops, Gaddafi also sent 2,000 troops, although, as Tanzania later found out through interrogation of prisoners, these were not soldiers of the Libyan Army. They were instead ill-trained members of the Libyan militia. Most had been told they were going to Uganda for joint training exercises with the Ugandan army and were startled to find themselves being shot at soon after arrival (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 93); Several hundred Palestinians in training facilities in Uganda. Tanzanian soldiers found dead bodies who were wearing PLO scarfs and carrying ID cards, but PLO denied the involvement and Tanzania did not criticize it (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 89-90); A large force of Libyan and Amin soldiers was assembled on the north side of the swamp … more than 1,000 Libyan troops, a sprinkling of PLA guerrillas, 15 tanks (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 90).

5.46.3.5. Uganda, Libya, and PLO guerrillas. Ugandan – 200 killed; Libya – 200 killed. Only one Libyan prisoner, a wounded lance-corporal, was taken (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 91).

5.46.3.6. Tanzania and the UNLA – 3000-4500. three brigades (the 201th, 207th, and 208st) (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 90); UNLA – one battalion of the UNLA forces: 201st was composed almost exclusively of militia members. One battalion of the UNLA forces was attached to the 201st at this time. (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 90). 201st and 208th Brigades involved in Battle of Lukaya. Infantry brigades were composed of 1,000-1,500 troops. (Stapleton 2013, 136)

5.46.3.7. Tanzania and the UNLA – 0. Amazingly, no one was killed as Amin's army occupied Lukaya (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 91). During Tanzanian counterattack of Lukaya, most of Amin's troops didn't fire back.

5.46.3.8. Outcome – Tanzania and the UNLA won. Libyan and Sudanese help offered any real resistance to the Tanzanian advance (Clodfelter 2008, 605; See also Avirgan and Honey 1982, 92).

5.46.4. Battle of Sembabule (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 92-93)

5.46.4.1. At the same time as the Lukaya troubles, the Tanzanian army was facing even greater difficulties at Sembabule. The battalion lasted three weeks (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 92).

5.46.4.2. Onset: 10/03/1979; Termination: 31/03/1979 (Tanzania Bombs 1979; Honey 1979b; See also Pollack 2004, 368-373)

5.46.4.3. Uganda versus Tanzania

5.46.4.4. Uganda – Tiger Regiment. Unit Size Unknown.

5.46.4.5. Uganda – 25 (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 93)

5.46.4.6. Tanzania – 1,000-1,500. 205th Brigade (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 92)

5.46.4.7. Tanzania – 20 (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 92)

5.46.4.8. Tanzania won. "Eventually the Tiger Regiment was driven away."

5.46.5. Battle of Entebbe (Clodfelter 2008, 605)

5.46.5.1. Tanzania assumed that Amin would concentrate his forces at Kampala, and the original Tanzanian plan called for a drive straight to the capital, bypassing the Entebbe peninsula. But Tanzania could see that Entebbe was a hive of enemy military activity. Libyan planes were flying in and out, and large numbers of Libyan and Ugandan troops crowded the town. If Kampala was taken without Entebbe first being secured, the Tanzanians would be faced with a large enemy force at their backs. Tanzania decided to go for Entebbe first. (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 121); See also Pollack 2004, 368-373.

5.46.5.2. Onset: 1/04/1979; Termination: 3/04/1979 (Tanzania Bombs 1979; Honey 1979b; See also Pollack 2004, 368-373)

5.46.5.3. Uganda and Libya versus Tanzania

5.46.5.4. Uganda and Libya – Uganda – 2,500. All indications are that while the forces opposed to Ugandan leader Idi Amin grow in numbers each day, Amin's army is falling increasingly into disarray. A variety of sources indicate that large numbers of Ugandan soldiers are deserting. Western intelligence sources stated late last week that Amin has only two battalions or about 2,500 soldiers left out of his army of 20,000 at the beginning of the war. (Honey 1979a); Libya – sent 2,000 reinforcements (Pollack 2004, 371).

5.46.5.5. Uganda and Libya – Uganda –540; Libya – [120 killed, several dozen captured] (Honey 1979b); over 300 Libyans killed, more than 40 taken prisoners (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 122); At a church near the shore of Lake Victoria, they found two-hundred soldiers from Amin's air force huddled together, dressed in civilian clothes, waiting to surrender. (Ibid., 123) 300 Libyans killed (Pollack 2004,368-373)

5.46.5.6. Tanzania – 1,000-1,500; 208th Brigade (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 121)]

5.46.5.7. Tanzania – 0. It was late afternoon before Boma's battalion had secured Entebbe. There was no real fight in the town itself (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 123).

5.46.5.8. Outcome – Tanzania won. The 208th secured Entebbe. There was no real fight in the town itself. Ugandan soldiers had run away when the first artillery shells landed, leaving their Libyan allies behind to suffer (Avirgan and Honey 1982, 123). After a two-day battle for Entebbe in early April, most of the Libyans were airlifted out of the country [Uganda] . . . (Clodfelter 2008, 605).

5.47. Sino-Vietnamese Punitive

5.47.1. **Chinese Invasion** (Clodfelter 2008, 669)

5.47.1.1. Provoked by Vietnam's conquest of Cambodia, by Hanoi's expulsion of the ethnic Chinese population of Vietnam, and by a series of border incidents, China launched a punitive strike across the border (Clodfelter 2008, 669)

5.47.1.2. Onset: 17/02/1979; Termination: 25/02/1979

5.47.1.3. China versus Vietnam

5.47.1.4. China – at least 75,000 troops by February 25

5.47.1.5. China – 7,886 casualties with 2,812 KIA (Zhang 2015, 104). The Chinese invasion forces suffered their worst losses during the first four days of the war at Soc Giang (Zhang 2015, 93); The first encounter ended with 122 Chinese troops killed and 66 wounded, including a deputy regiment commander; the second battle lasted for a little over ten minutes, but six Chinese tanks were damaged and 108 soldiers were either killed or injured" (Zhang 2015, 93);

But according to Chinese accounts, only one battalion assaulted Tham Mo, sustaining 40 dead and 152 wounded during the three days and four nights of fighting (Zhang 2015, 99). On the early morning of 23 February, Dong Dang fell into Chinese hands, but only after the 55th Army suffered 2,220 casualties, including 531 killed (Zhang 2015, 99). Furthermore, from the Beijing leadership's perspective-especially Deng Xiaoping's-the battlefields across the Yunnan border were a brutal training ground in which the Chinese forces could gain combat experience. True, they had paid a heavy price, losing 7,886 troops, including 2,812 killed. But the Vietnamese forces suffered heavy losses as well (Zhang 2015, 104).

5.47.1.6. Vietnam – approximately 80,000 (Clodfelter 2008, 669). In addition to PAVN (three independent regiments); With a combined total of 15,000 troops. These local units had been well trained and well equipped, and they possessed formidable combat capabilities. One Chinese source later concluded that they even might have been superior to some of the Chinese regular units (Zhang 2015, 93). Chinese planners thought that they had assembled an overwhelming force in the Cao Bang area, but they failed to account for the tens of thousands of PAVN militia soldiers (Zhang 2015, 93); On 27 February, at the PAVN 2nd Corps (30,000 soldiers) in Cambodia received orders to go defend the northern border of Vietnam (Zhang 2015, 110).

5.47.1.7. Vietnam – 13,500 casualties according to Chinese claims (Zhang, 2015, 104). According to the Vietnamese 3rd Division history, its 12th Regiment lost all reserves during the first five days of battles, and by the final hours of its defense of Tham Mo, only 10 soldiers remained alive. Such Custer's Last stand-type stories reinforce Chinese claims that the PLA annihilated the entire 12th Regiment and its affiliated units, killing a total of 3, 973 enemy troops in the Dong Dang and Ban Rahn areas (Zhang 2015, 99). Furthermore, from the Beijing leadership's perspective- especially Deng Xiaoping's-the battlefields across the Yunnan border….But the Vietnamese forces suffered heavy losses as well. According to Chinese claims, the invasion ended with the defeat of one Vietnamese division, five Vietnamese regiments, and eight Vietnamese battalions, amounting to more than 13,500 Vietnamese troops, a figure dwarfing the PLA's own fatalities by nearly a factor of five (Zhang 2015, 104).

5.47.1.8. Outcome – Chinese won. China captured Lao Cai, a provisional capital in the northwestern Vietnam on February 20 (Clodfelter 2008, 669).

5.47.2. Battle of Lang Son (Clodfelter 2008, 669)

5.47.2.1. The ultimate target of the 1979 war against Vietnam was Lang Son, whose capture would endanger Hanoi itself. Immediately after

the seizure of Dong Dang, Beijing had urged the PLA forces in Guangxi to initiate the attack on Lang Son. The Guangzhou Military Region Forward Command responded that it would take three days to regroup its forces for the assault. At a 25 February meeting, the forward command determined that pursuant to the CMC's order, it would commit seven divisions totaling 80,000 troops. Taking the main axis of advance would be the 55th Army, supported by the 161st Division of the 54th Army and striking from the north. Two divisions of the 43rd Army (assisted by two regiments from the 50th Army) formed a secondary attack axis that would conduct a flanking assault on Loc Binh and then press on toward Lang Son from the southeast. Drawing lessons from the battle for Dong Dang, the Guangzhou Military Region Forward Command decided to first clear out Vietnamese defensive positions around Lang Son while moving the main attacking forces along Highway 4A toward the city. General Xu ordered his force to commence the attacks early on 27 February. The Battle of Lang Son began with a four-pronged attack on Khau Ma Son, Hill 417, Pa Vai Son, and Khau Khao Son. This attack bought time for other units to outflank Lang Son from the southeast and southwest, respectively. For the first two days, the Chinese forces mounted multicompany assaults, each of which incurred heavy casualties. One company of the 163rd was almost entirely depleted in the battle for Hill 417, located 1 kilometer south of Tham Lung, on Highway 4 to Lang Son (Zhang 2015, 104-105).

5.47.2.2. Onset: 27/02/1979; Termination: 02/03/1979

5.47.2.3. China versus Vietnam

5.47.2.4. China – At a 25 February meeting, the forward command determined that pursuant to the CMC's order, it would commit seven divisions totaling 80,000 troops. Taking the main axis of advance would be the 55th Army, supported by the 161st Division of the 54th Army and striking from the north (Zhang 2015, 104).

5.47.2.5. China – The 55th Army's after-action report admitted that 1,271 Chinese troops had been killed and 3,779 wounded at Dong Dang and Lang Son. In addition, thirty tanks and thirty artillery pieces had been lost (Zhang 2015, 108).

5.47.2.6. Vietnam – Approximately 12,000. The 3rd Division; 42nd Regiment of 327th Division; 155th Regiment of 327th Division. However, the Chinese credited themselves with having inflicted 10,401 casualties on the Vietnamese defenders, most of them from the PAVN's 3rd Division and the local units under its command along with a small force of the PAVN's 327th Division (Zhang 2015, 95, 104, 106, 107).

5.47.2.7. Vietnam – 10,401 casualties, per Chinese After Action Report estimate (Zhang 2015, 108); By the afternoon of 28 February, the PLA controlled all of these positions and claimed to have killed 252

Vietnamese soldiers at Pa Vai Son alone (Zhang 2015, 106). At Lam Truang (about two kilometers northwest of Lang Son), the PLA's 165th Division broke through the defensive line held by the PAVN's 42nd Regiment and an element of the 166th Artillery Regiment, claiming to have killed more than 300 Vietnamese troops and captured eleven trucks (Zhang 2015, 106). The PLA claimed the PAVN lost 350 soldiers and had three tanks and six armored vehicles destroyed or captured (Zhang 2015, 107). However, the Chinese credited themselves with having inflicted 10,401 casualties on the Vietnamese defenders, most of them from the PAVN's 3rd Division and the local units under its command along with a small force of the PAVN's 327th Division. This number did not include those killed by gasoline, explosives, and flamethrowers in the tunnel complex of the French Fort and caves at Lang Son. The 55th Army also recorded the destruction of forty-four PAVN tanks and six armored vehicles and the capture of a significant number of weapons, including 3 tanks, 3 armored vehicles, 29 trucks, 32 motorcycles, 99 artillery pieces, 2,200 small arms, 17,000 artillery rounds, and tons of other military supplies. Prior to withdrawing from Lang Son, the 55th destroyed 2,920 military and public facilities, literally turning the city into a ruin (Zhang 2015, 108).

5.47.2.8. Outcome – Chinese won. China captured Lang Son, site of a major 1950 Viet Minh victory over the French, on March 2 (Clodfelter 2008, 669). General Xu's forces returned to China convinced that the combination of artillery fire and fierce ground combat at Lang Son had taught Vietnam a harsh and unforgettable lesson (Zhang 2015, 108). However, the General staff in Hanoi did plan on conducting a massive counterattack against the Chinese after Lang Son, but before they were able to, Beijing declared its withdrawal from Vietnam on March 5th (Zhang 2015 110-111). On 5 March, Beijing announced that its counterattack in self-defense had achieved the expected objectives, and that it was beginning to withdraw all troops back to Chinese territory (Zhang 2015, 112).

5.48. Iran-Iraq

5.48.1. **Iraqi Invasion** (Clodfelter 2008, 627)

5.48.1.1. The long-standing dispute between Iraq and Iran over control of the vital Shatt-al-Arab waterway leading to the Persian Gulf, plus the Shi'ite zeal of the Islamic revolutionary regime of Iran, brought the two Middle Eastern nations to conflict in September 1980. After months of border skirmishes, threats, and counter threats, Iraq decided to take advantage of Iran's instability by launching a full-scale invasion of the oil-rich southwestern Iranian province of Khuzistan. The four main targets of the aggressors were the ports of Khorramshahr and Abadan in the south, the provincial capital of Ahwaz to the north, and the vital pipe-line terminal at Dizful,

farther north yet (Clodfelter 2008, 627). The main invasion objective was to seize the Khuzestan which contained the bulk's of Iran's oil industry and a significant part of Shi'ah population group which Saddam thought could be instigated to rise up against Iran and help the incoming Iraqi army (Pollack 2004, 183).

5.48.1.2. Onset: 23/09/1980; Termination: 30/09/1980

5.48.1.3. Iraq versus Iran

5.48.1.4. Iraq – 150,000 troops (Pollack 2004, 192); The initial Iraqi thrust into Iran had 70,000 troops and 2,000-plus tanks, augmented with another 35,000 men (Farrokh 2011, 350); Iraq's army at 200,000 was larger than its rival's at (nominally) 150k (Hiro 1991, 48).

5.48.1.5. Iraq – 8000 casualties, of which 1500 were KIA, and 100 MBTs and APCs (Pollack 2004, 192; Pelletiere 1992, 37)

5.48.1.6. Iran – Approximately 100,000 troops (Pollack 2004, 187).

5.48.1.7. Iran – 7000 KIA (Karsh 2002, 27)

5.48.1.8. Outcome – Iraq won. Though costly, Iraq, advancing behind heavy artillery bombardments, slowly and methodically advanced, surrounding Khorramshahr and taking that city's port by October 5 (Clodfelter 2008, 627).

5.48.2. Battle of Abadan (Clodfelter 2008, 627-628)

5.48.2.1. On October 10, Iraq had crossed the Karun River to attack Abadan, 30 miles downstream from Khorramshahr (Clodfelter 2008, 627-628); The Iraqis flanked Abadan from the north by ferrying their forces to the eastern side of the Karun River on Oct.12. They were now poised to storm Abadan, but the task would not prove easy (Farrokh, 2011, 354).

5.48.2.2. Onset: 10/10/1980; Termination: 29/09/1981

5.48.2.3. Iraq versus Iran

5.48.2.4. Iraq – One armored division (Pollack 2004, 189). Such divisions comprised approximately 12,000 troops (Al-Marashi and Salama 2008).

5.48.2.5. Iraq – 1,500 killed, 2,500 captured

5.48.2.6. Iran – 2 divisions; approximately 26,500 troops (Hoffapuir 1991, 54-55). The regular troops belonged to a naval marine battalion, a mechanized battalion, and an armored brigade of the 92nd Armored Division fielding 50-60 Chieftain tanks (Farrokh 2011, 360).

5.48.2.7. Iran – 3,000 killed

5.48.2.8. Outcome – Iran won. In the face of Iranian attack on September 27-29, Iraq pulled back from Abadan, ending the eleven-month siege of the petroleum port (Clodfelter 2008, 628).

5.48.3. Battle of Susangard (Clodfelter 2008, 627-628)

5.48.3.1. The fiercest battle yet of Iran-Iraq War flared for four days, November 15-18, at Susangard, 40 miles north of Ahwaz (Clodfelter 2008, 627-628).
5.48.3.2. Onset: 14/11/1980; Termination: 17/11/1980
5.48.3.3. Iraq versus Iran
5.48.3.4. Iraq – 60,000 troops
5.48.3.5. Iraq – Unknown
5.48.3.6. Iran – Approximately 15,000 (Ward 2009, 292)
5.48.3.7. Iran – Unknown [Note: Both sides of battle deaths totaled 1,400.]
5.48.3.8. Outcome – Iraq won

5.48.4. Kurdistan Invasion (Clodfelter 2008, 627-628)
5.48.4.1. On December 8, Iraq opened a new front in the war by pushing an invasion column into Kurdistan on the northern end of the Iran-Iraq border. (Clodfelter 2008, 627-628)
5.48.4.2. Onset: 08/12/1980; Termination: 30/03/1981
5.48.4.3. Iraq versus Iran
5.48.4.4. Iraq – Unknown
5.48.4.5. Iraq – 20,000 killed or wounded, 215 MIGs or Tupolev bombers, 30 helicopters, 3,000 tanks, 1,800 other vehicles [These figures are based on the Iranian claims.]
5.48.4.6. Iran – Unknown
5.48.4.7. Iran – 8,413 killed, 964 captured, 558 warplanes, 147 naval ships, 1,089 tanks or armored cars, 1,270 APCs, 115 rocket launchers, 44 radar stations. These figures are based on the Iraqi claims.
5.48.4.8. Outcome – Iran won. (Farrokh 2011, 357)

5.48.5. Iran Counteroffensive (Clodfelter 2008, 627-628)
5.48.5.1. On January 5, 1981, Iran commenced its first major counteroffensive, with a three-pronged attack in the Susangard-Ahwaz area (Clodfelter 2008, 627-628).
5.48.5.2. Onset: 05/01/1981; Termination: 10/01/1981
5.48.5.3. Iraq versus Iran
5.48.5.4. Iraq – Unknown
5.48.5.5. Iraq – 2,057 killed, 50 tanks lost. These figures are based on the Iranian claims. See also Farrokh 2011, 358.
5.48.5.6. Iran – Unknown
5.48.5.7. Iran – 1,878 killed, 140 tanks lost. These figures are based on the Iraqi claims.
5.48.5.8. Outcome – Iraq won. The failure of the Iranian counteroffensive in January 1981 (Clodfelter 2008, 628).

5.48.6. Susa-Dizful Iranian Counteroffensive (Clodfelter 2008, 627-628)

5.48.6.1. After the failure of the Iranian counteroffensive in January 1981, the Iranians launched a massive counteroffensive in the Susa-Dizful area on March 19, 1982 (Clodfelter 2008, 627-628).
5.48.6.2. Onset: 19/03/1982; Termination: 27/03/1982
5.48.6.3. Iraq versus Iran
5.48.6.4. Iraq – 45000 troops, 550 MBTs, 180 artillery pieces (Pelletiere 1992, 42; Al-Marashi and Salama 2008, 138).
5.48.6.5. Iraq – The Iraqi 4th Army Corps had been decimated, with 10k Iraqi troops killed and another 15k injured. Iran captured 15k toops (Farrokh, 2011, 364)
5.48.6.6. Iran – 65000 troops, 200 MBTs, 180 artillery pieces plus approximately 40000 Pasdaran troops and 30000 Basij militia; the total was 140000 troops (Pelletiere 1992, 42; Karsh 2002, 35).
5.48.6.7. Iran – 15000 killed and 1000 prisoners (Pelletiere 1992, 42)
5.48.6.8. Outcome – Iran won. In eight days, the Iraqis were driven back 24 miles. Iran recovered 800 square miles of its territory (Clodfelter 2008, 628).

5.48.7. Operation Sacred House (Clodfelter 2008, 627-628)
5.48.7.1. Iran commenced another offensive on April 30. (Clodfelter 2008, 627-628)
5.48.7.2. Onset: 30/04/1982; Termination: 24/05/1982
5.48.7.3. Iraq versus Iran
5.48.7.4. Iraq – 35,000 troops
5.48.7.5. Iraq – 15,000 casualties, 12,000 captured
5.48.7.6. Iran – 65,000 troops, 200 tanks
5.48.7.7. Iran – 15,000 casualties
5.48.7.8. Outcome – Iran won. Except for a few small salients, Iraq had been completely driven from its 1980 conquests in Iran (Clodfelter 2008, 628).

5.48.8. Operation Ramadan al Mubarak (First Battle of Basra) (Clodfelter 2008, 627-628)
5.48.8.1. On July 13, Iran opened a series of five massed attacks on the Iraqi defense lines protecting Basra. This is the first Iranian offensive into Iraq (Clodfelter 2008, 627-628).
5.48.8.2. Onset: 13/07/1982; Termination: 01/08/1982
5.48.8.3. Iraq versus Iran
5.48.8.4. Iraq – 8 divisions of which the 3 armored ones were kept as tactical reserve; approximately 70000 troops (Pollack 2004, 204; Al-Marashi and Salama 2008, 141; Karsh 2002, 37).
5.48.8.5. Iraq – 3,000 killed, 4,000 wounded, 1,400 captured
5.48.8.6. Iran – 100,000 (Karsh 2002, 37)
5.48.8.7. Iran – 10,000 killed, 20,000 wounded or missing
5.48.8.8. Outcome – Iraq won. Iran's first offensive into Iraq ended in failure by August 1 (Clodfelter 2008, 628).

5.48.9. Battle of Wal Fajr 4 (Clodfelter 2008, 627-628)

5.48.9.1. In 1983, the war was locked in stalemate, and a series of Iranian offensives resulted in failure (Clodfelter 2008, 627-628); Up to 100,000 men were to deploy from Khuzistan's Fakeh region to sever the Baghdad-Basra highway and possibly capture the Iraqi town of Amara (Farrokh 2011, 373).

5.48.9.2. Onset: 19/10/1983; Termination: 19/11/1983

5.48.9.3. Iraq versus Iran

5.48.9.4. Iraq – Approximately 72,000 troops (Al-Marashi and Salama 2008, 132, 142).

5.48.9.5. Iraq – 400 tanks and APCs and 1,800 prisoners (Farrokh 2011, 375).

5.48.9.6. Iran – 100,000 (Farrokh 2011, 373).

5.48.9.7. Iran – 7,000 to 10,000 killed

5.48.9.8. Outcome – Iraq won. A series of Iranian offensives in 1983 resulted in failure (Clodfelter 2008, 628).

5.48.10. Battle of Majnoon Islands (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629)

5.48.10.1. In 1983, the war was locked in stalemate, and a series of Iranian offensives resulted in failure (Clodfelter 2008, 627-628)

5.48.10.2. Onset: 22/02/1984; Termination: 27/02/1984 (On February 27. The Iranians captured Majnoon Island (Hiro 1991, 104))

5.48.10.3. Iraq versus Iran

5.48.10.4. Iraq – 100,000 (Al-Marashi and Salama 2008, 157)

5.48.10.5. Iraq – 9,000 (Al-Marashi and Salama 2008, 158)

5.48.10.6. Iran – Unknown

5.48.10.7. Iran – 40,000 (Al-Marashi and Salama 2008, 158)

5.48.10.8. Outcome – Iran won. Iran seized the Majnoon Islands in the Hawizah marshes of southern Iraq on February 22, but Iraq stopped further Iranian penetration with the aid of poison gas, both mustard and nerve gas (Clodfelter 2008, 629)

5.48.11. Operation Khaiber (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629)

5.48.11.1. The bloodiest of the Iranian offensives in 1984 was Operation Khaiber (Clodfelter 2008, 627-628)

5.48.11.2. Onset: 14/02/1984; Termination: 06/03/1984

5.48.11.3. Iraq versus Iran

5.48.11.4. Iraq – 250,000; the offensive was the largest engagement in the war until then, with some 500,000 men under arms pitted against each other along a 150-mile front (Karsh 2002, 41).

5.48.11.5. Iraq – 6,000 killed, 10,000 wounded

5.48.11.6. Iran – 250,000 troops

5.48.11.7. Iran – 20,000 killed, 30,000 wounded

5.48.11.8. Outcome – Iraq won.

5.48.12. Operation Badr (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629)

5.48.12.1. On March 11, 1985, Iran tried to cross the Tigris to attack Basra. (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629)

5.48.12.2. Onset: 11/03/1985; Termination: 23/03/1985

5.48.12.3. Iraq versus Iran

5.48.12.4. Iraq – 60,000 troops, chemical weapons, 250 combat air sorties

5.48.12.5. Iraq – Approximately 11,000 (Karsh 2002, 47)

5.48.12.6. Iran – 60,000 troops

5.48.12.7. Iran –Approximately 15,000 (Karsh 2002, 47)

5.48.12.8. Outcome – Iraq won. Iran was repulsed by March 23, 1985 (Clodfelter 2008, 629).

5.48.13. Battle of Faw Peninsula (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629)

5.48.13.1. On February 1986, Iran crossed the Shatt el-Arab in a night attack. (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629)

5.48.13.2. Onset: 09/02/1986; Termination: 20/03/1986

5.48.13.3. Iraq versus Iran

5.48.13.4. Iraq – 18,648 sorties (compared to 20,011 for all of 1985). Two corps, or approximately 72,000 troops (Hiro 1989, 168)

5.48.13.5. Iraq – 5,000 to 8,000 casualties

5.48.13.6. Iran – Approximately 200,000 troops (Pelletiere 1992, 96; Al-Marashi and Salama 2008, 132)

5.48.13.7. Iran – 27,000 to 30,000 casualties

5.48.13.8. Outcome – Iran won. By March 20, Iran occupied the Faw Penisula and this was the most significant victory of the war (Clodfelter 2008, 629).

5.48.14. Operation Karbala 4 (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629)

5.48.14.1. On December 24, 1986. Iran launched its most massive attack of the war in an attempt to take Basra (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629).

5.48.14.2. Onset: 24/12/1986; Termination: 30/12/1986

5.48.14.3. Iraq versus Iran

5.48.14.4. Iraq – One corps; approximately 36,000 troops (Pelletiere 1992, 118)

5.48.14.5. Iraq – 1,000 to 2,000 casualties; 3000 according to Hiro 1991, 180

5.48.14.6. Iran – Approximately 60,000. "Four divisions of revolutionary guards and Basij militiamen crossed the waterway near Abu Khasib…". "one [more] division which tried to capture Umm Rassas and three smaller islands further south" (Hiro 1991, 180; Cordesman 1990).

5.48.14.7. Iran – 9,000 to 12,000 casualties

5.48.14.8. Outcome – Iraq won. Iran was repulsed (Clodfelter 2008, 629).

5.48.15. Operation Karbala 5 (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629)

5.48.15.1. After the failure of Operation Karbala 4, Iran persisted in their assaults and launched Operation Karbala 5 near Fish Lake on January 6, 1987 (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629).
5.48.15.2. Onset: 06/01/1987; Termination: 25/02/1987
5.48.15.3. Iraq versus Iran
5.48.15.4. Iraq – Approximately 140,000 troops (Hoffapuir 1991, 91-93)
5.48.15.5. Iraq – 6,000 killed, 15,000 wounded
5.48.15.6. Iran – Approximately 140,000 troops (Hoffapuir 1991, 91-93)
5.48.15.7. Iran – 17,000 killed, 45,000 wounded; All told Karbala 5 cost Iran the lives of 20-25,000 Revolutaionary Guards, and severe injuries to an equal number (Hiro 1991, 184).
5.48.15.8. Outcome – Stalemate. Iran penetrated three of five defensive lines around Basra but Operation Karbala 5 fell short (Clodfelter 2008, 629).

5.48.16. Iranian Northern Offensive (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629)
5.48.16.1. Iran undertook its last offensive in March 1988, pushing through the Iraqi defenses in the Zagros Mountains, in the north, and into Kurdistan (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629).
5.48.16.2. Onset: 04/03/1987; Termination: 15/05/1987
5.48.16.3. Iraq versus Iran and Kurdish guerrillas
5.48.16.4. Iraq – 5th Army Corps. Unit Size Unknown.
5.48.16.5. Iraq – Unknown
5.48.16.6. Iran – Unknown
5.48.16.7. Iran – Unknown
5.48.16.8. Outcome – Iran won. Desperate to stop Iranian drive, Iraq released poison gas on the enemy-occupied Kurdish village of Halabjah on March 16, killing at least 3,200 people (Clodfelter 2008, 629).

5.48.17. Battle of Faw Peninsula (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629)
5.48.17.1. By March 20, 1986, Iran occupied the Faw Peninsula. Iraq countered the Iranian drive in the north by launching on a surprise attack on the Faw Peninsula on April 17, 1988 (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629).
5.48.17.2. Onset: 17/04/1988; Termination: 20/04/1988
5.48.17.3. Iraq versus Iran
5.48.17.4. Iraq – 100,000 troops
5.48.17.5. Iraq – Unknown
5.48.17.6. Iran – 15,000 troops
5.48.17.7. Iran – Unknown
5.48.17.8. Outcome – Iraq won. The Iraqi reconquest of Faw was the decisive battle of the war (Clodfelter 2008, 629).

5.48.18. Battle of Fish Lake (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629)

5.48.18.1. By March 20, 1986, Iran occupied the Faw Penisula. Iraq countered the Iranian drive in the north by launching on a surprise attack on the Faw Peninsula on April 17, 1988. Another Iraqi attack was launched at Fish Lake on May 25 (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629).
5.48.18.2. Onset: 25/05/1988; Termination: 25/05/1988
5.48.18.3. Iraq versus Iran
5.48.18.4. Iraq – 200,000; Once again, Iraq had quickly brought overwhelming forces…although precise numbers are difficult to ascertain, the Iraqis were more than capable of quickly assembling up to 200k men for action. The attacking force was composed of Iraq's III and VII Corps, commando units and the Republican guard (Farrokh 2002, 409).
5.48.18.5. Iraq – Unknown
5.48.18.6. Iran – Unknown; Iran had assembled nearly all of its 50 operational naval vessels, marines, commandos, and army units (incl. airborne brigades). Against the Iraqi tanks, they could muster at most 100 tanks (Farrokh 2002, 409).
5.48.18.7. Iran – 100 tanks captured, 150 guns captured
5.48.18.8. Outcome – Iraq won. Iraq cleared the approaches to Basra and recaptured almost all of the territory lost to Iran in the south (Clodfelter 2008, 629).

5.48.19. Battle of Majnoon Island (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629)
5.48.19.1. On June 26, Iraq struck on the central front against Iran (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629).
5.48.19.2. Onset: 26/06/1988; Termination: 26/06/1988
5.48.19.3. Iraq versus Iran
5.48.19.4. Iraq – 600 guns, 1,500 armored vehicles
5.48.19.5. Iraq – Unknown
5.48.19.6. Iran – 6 divisions. Unit Size Unknown.
5.48.19.7. Iran – 4,060 total casualites; approximately 2,115 prisoners captured (Cordesman 1990; Farrokh 2011, 410)
5.48.19.8. Outcome – Iraq won. Iraq recaptured Majnoon Island, lost to Iran in 1984 (Clodfelter 2008, 629).

5.48.20. Iraqi Kurdistan Offensive (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629)
5.48.20.1. On July 11 Iraq struck on the Iranians in Kurdistan. (Clodfelter 2008, 627-629)
5.48.20.2. Onset: 11/07/1988; Termination: 11/07/1988
5.48.20.3. Iraq and Iranian Exiles versus Iran
5.48.20.4. Iraq and Iranian Exiles – Unknown
5.48.20.5. Iraq and Iranian Exiles – Unknown
5.48.20.6. Iran – Unknown
5.48.20.7. Iran – Unknown
5.48.20.8. Outcome – Iraq and Iranian Exiles won. The Iranians were driven from Kurdistan by the Iraqis, with the help of 15,000 exiled

Iranians enlisted in Massoud Rajavi's National Liberation Army (Clodfelter 2008, 629).

5.49. Falkland Islands

5.49.1. Argentine Invasion of Falklands (Clodfelter 2008, 695)

5.49.1.1. The most significant naval action since the end of WWII took place in the seas and the sky overhead around the Falkland Islands, 450 miles east of the South American mainland. Determining to settle a 149-year-old dispute with the United Kingdom for possession of the island by force, Argentina dispatched an invasion force to seize the 4,700-square-mile territory, the Falkland Islands (Clodfelter 2008, 695).

5.49.1.2. Onset: 02/04/1982; Termination: 02/04/1982

5.49.1.3. United Kingdom versus Argentina

5.49.1.4. United Kingdom – 84 Royal Marine Commandos. Defence was the responsibility of the small Royal Marines detachment, NP 8901. Major Gary R H Noott, the outgoing commanding officer, and his replacement, Major Mike J Norman, were halfway through the administrative handover when the first hints of the impending invasion were received. The handover meant that the defending force was about twice what might otherwise have been expected, but it was still only 69 all ranks, together with 11 Royal Navy personnel from HMS Endurance's survey parties and one ex-Royal Marine then living on the Falklands who re-enlisted. Their firepower consisted of a few rocket launchers (Carl Gustav and 66mm). In addition, twenty-three men from the Falkland Islands Defence Force did report for duty and they were sent to observation posts. These were stationed on Sapper Hill and in Cape Pembroke Lighthouse, and a reaction section was held at immediate notice at Moody Brook by day, and deployed to the airport at night. At 0900 local time on 1 April, Norman assumed operational command (Freedman 2004, 4).

5.49.1.5. United Kingdom – 0 (Middlebrook 2012; Freedman 2004, 7)

5.49.1.6. Argentina – 874 troops; Early in the morning of 2 April the Santisima Trinidad put 90 Marines in inflatables in the water off Seal Point. The Marines split into two groups, the larger making for the Royal Marine barracks at Moody Brook, and the smaller for Government House. The submarine Santa Fe launched special force swimmers east of Cape Pembroke, bound for Yorke Bay. The other ships of the amphibious landing force, the Landing Ship Tank (LST) Cabo San Antonio, the transports Almirante Irizar and Isla de los Estados, the destroyer Hercules, and the corvettes Drummond and Granville were to the northeast off Stanley. Warships prepared to protect the Cabo San Antonio and provide supporting gunfire for the landing force if required. The aircraft carrier, 25 de Mayo, escorted by the destroyers Hipolito Bouchard, Piedra Buena, Segui

and Comodoro PY, was well to the north in support. Some 1,000 troops were available— largely Marines but with some Army. Such a large force against such a puny enemy suggested that the main purpose was to make a show of overwhelming strength (Freedman 2004, 6). Busser made it clear that he already had some 800 men ashore with more to come, and that the British position was hopeless (Freedman 2004, 7).

5.49.1.7. Argentina – 5 killed, 17 wounded

5.49.1.8. Outcome – Argentina won. The British garrisons at the islands' capital at Port Stanley were easily overwhelmed (Clodfelter 2008, 695).

5.49.2. Battle of South Georgia I (Clodfelter 2008, 695)

5.49.2.1. Another Argentine troops landed on South Georgia Island, 800 miles farther east (Clodfelter 2008, 695).

5.49.2.2. Onset: 03/04/1982; Termination: 03/04/1982

5.49.2.3. United Kingdom versus Argentina

5.49.2.4. United Kingdom – 22 Royal Marine Commandos

5.49.2.5. United Kingdom – 1 Royal Marine wounded (Middlebrook 2012; Freedman 2004, 11)

5.49.2.6. Argentina – 80 troops

5.49.2.7. Argentina – 4 killed, 1 wounded, 1 helicopter lost

5.49.2.8. Outcome – Argentina won. The British garrisons were forced to surrender (Clodfelter 2008, 695)

5.49.3. Battle of South Georgia II (Clodfelter 2008, 695)

5.49.3.1. On April 25, the British began their reconquest of South Georgia Island (Clodfelter 2008, 695).

5.49.3.2. Onset: 25/04/1982; Termination: 25/04/1982

5.49.3.3. United Kingdom versus Argentina

5.49.3.4. United Kingdom – 120 Royal Marine Commandos

5.49.3.5. United Kingdom – 0 (Middlebrook 2012)

5.49.3.6. Argentina – 200. The British view up to 21 April was that Argentina had neither reinforced the garrison nor detected the Task Group. There was fluctuating intelligence on the strength of the Argentine Garrison in South Georgia. As American sources warned of from 100 to 200 Argentine naval infantry, a Chilean report suggested that the Argentines had evacuated all military and civilian personnel from South Georgia. These reports were all treated with reserve. The British stuck to their view that the 50 Argentine Marines known to have landed at the start of hostilities were still there. Another 20 might be at Leith, along with some 15 'scrap metal workers Argentine press reports that its South Georgia garrison was as large as 350 were dismissed (Freedman 2004, 200).

5.49.3.7. Argentina – 1 killed, 1 wounded, 156 captured, 1 submarine lost

5.49.3.8. Outcome – United Kingdom won. The British forces swiftly forced an Argentine capitulation (Clodfelter 2008, 695).

5.49.4. Battle of Port San Carlos (Clodfelter 2008, 695-696)

5.49.4.1. On May 21, the British commenced their main landing and invasion of the Falklands (Port San Carlos, on the northwest coast of East Falkland Island) (Clodfelter 2008, 695-696)

5.49.4.2. Onset: 21/05/1982; Termination: 28/05/1982

5.49.4.3. United Kingdom versus Argentina

5.49.4.4. United Kingdom – 4,500 troops, 3,500 troops in reserve

5.49.4.5. United Kingdom – 334. At this time British loses were put at 76 military and three civilians killed, 33 military and seven civilians missing, about 132 wounded with one prisoner in custody and 92 repatriated (Freedman 2004, 416)

5.49.4.6. Argentina – 11,000 (Freedman 2004, 395)

5.49.4.7. Argentina – 850. Argentina had lost about 500 killed and 200 wounded, with five in custody and 150 repatriated (Freedman 2004, 416)

5.49.4.8. Outcome – United Kingdom won. The Argentine resistance was minimal, and the British forces quickly fanned out to establish a firm beachhead (Clodfelter 2008, 696).

5.49.5. Battle of Darwin/Goose Green (Clodfelter 2008, 695-696)

5.49.5.1. On May 28-29, the British pushed south and east from their Port San Carlos beachhead (Clodfelter 2008, 695-696).

5.49.5.2. Onset: 28/05/1982; Termination: 29/05/1982

5.49.5.3. United Kingdom versus Argentina

5.49.5.4. United Kingdom – 650 paratroopers

5.49.5.5. United Kingdom – 17 killed, 35 wounded

5.49.5.6. Argentina – 642 troops

5.49.5.7. Argentina – 50 killed, 121 wounded, 600 captured

5.49.5.8. Outcome – United Kingdom won. The British stormed and captured both Darwin and Goose Green south of the beachhead (Clodfelter 2008, 696).

5.49.6. Battle of Mount Kent (Clodfelter 2008, 695-696)

5.49.6.1. On June 1-2, the British pressed east to take strategic high ground at Mount Kent (Clodfelter 2008, 695-696).

5.49.6.2. Onset: 29/05/1982; Termination: 31/05/1982

5.49.6.3. United Kingdom versus Argentina

5.49.6.4. United Kingdom – 5,000 troops, 45 howitzers

5.49.6.5. United Kingdom – 3 (Freedman 2004, 499).

5.49.6.6. Argentina – 65

5.49.6.7. Argentina –32 casualties

5.49.6.8. Outcome – United Kingdom won.

5.49.7. Battle of Port Stanley (Clodfelter 2008, 695-696)

5.49.7.1. On July 11, the British began to attack Two Sisters Ridge, Mount Longdon, and the hills 12 miles west of the capital, Port Stanley (Clodfelter 2008, 695-696).

5.49.7.2. Onset: 11/07/1982; Termination: 14/07/1982

5.49.7.3. United Kingdom versus Argentina

5.49.7.4. United Kingdom – 6,000 troops, 6,000-round artillery barrage

5.49.7.5. United Kingdom – 48 killed, 119 wounded (these figures are added from Clodfelter's book) on the ground, 13 crewmen killed, 17 crewmen wounded when the cruiser Glamorgan was hit by a land-based Exocet (Clodfelter 2008, 696)

5.49.7.6. Argentina – 8,400 troops, 34 guns, 12 armored cars

5.49.7.7. Argentina – 31 killed, 120 wounded, 50 captured

5.49.7.8. Outcome – United Kingdom won. On July 14, Argentina asked for a cease-fire (Clodfelter 2008, 696).

5.50. War over Lebanon

5.50.1. Israeli Invasion (Operation Peace for Galilee) (Clodfelter 2008, 629-630)

5.50.1.1. On June 3, 1982, Palestinian hitmen in London gravely wounded Israeli ambassador to the U.K. Using this incident as a pretext to launch its long planned invasion of PLO-controlled southern Lebanon, Israel sent waves of Israeli fighter-bombers to strike PLO targets in Beirut and other cities in Lebanon on June 4. Then, on June 6, the Israeli ground forces crossed the Lebanese borders, while the Israeli air force and navy bombarded the PLO all across Lebanon (Clodfelter 2008, 629-630).

5.50.1.2. Onset: 06/06/1982; Termination: 09/06/1982

5.50.1.3. Israel versus Syria

5.50.1.4. Israel – 76,000 troops, 1,250 tanks, 1,500 other armored vehicles, 90 F-15s and F-16s

5.50.1.5. Israel – 34 casualties (Cordesman and Wagner 1990, 137)

5.50.1.6. Syria – 30,000 troops (additional 35,000 troops were rushed into Lebanon.), 300 tanks, 60 MIG-21s and MIG-23s, 19 SAM-6 missile batteries

5.50.1.7. Syria – 29 jets lost, 17 SAM-6 missile batteries lost, 150 tanks lost; 4,496 casualties suffered in fighting apart from the Siege of Beirut (Gabriel 1984, 121)

5.50.1.8. Outcome – Israel won. The Syrian armored division was smashed by Israel, and on June 11, Syria and Israel agreed to a cease-fire in Lebanon (Clodfelter 2008, 630).

5.50.2. Siege of Beirut (Clodfelter 2008, 629-630)

5.50.2.1. On June 11, Syria and Israel agreed to a cease-fire in Lebanon, but the fighting continued in Lebanon. The Israelis pressed their drive to the outskirts of Beirut by June 14, where they quickly surrounded the Palestine Liberation Organization troops and Yasir Arafat himself (Clodfelter 2008, 629-630).

5.50.2.2. Onset: 14/06/1982; Termination: 21/08/1982

5.50.2.3. Israel versus Palestine Liberation Organization

5.50.2.4. Israel – 78,000 (Gabriel 1984, 81)

5.50.2.5. Israel – 88 killed, 750 wounded

5.50.2.6. Palestine Liberation Organization – 30,000 (Schiff 1984, 210)

5.50.2.7. Palestine Liberation Organization – 1,000 killed

5.50.2.8. Outcome – Israel won. The Palestine Liberation Organization agreed to evacuate Beirut, beginning August 21, and disperse to several Arab host nations (Clodfelter 2008, 630)

5.51. War over the Aouzou Strip

5.51.1. Chadian Invasion (Clodfelter 2008, 595)

5.51.1.1. On January 2, 1987, Chad launched an offensive to drive the Libyans from the long occupied Azou Strip (Clodfelter 2008, 595).

5.51.1.2. Onset: 02/01/1987; Termination: 15/02/1987

5.51.1.3. Chad and People's Armed Forces (FAP) versus Libya, Sudan, and Lebanese forces

5.51.1.4. Chad – 10000 troops plus 2000 FAP irregulars (Pollack 2002, 391)

5.51.1.5. Chad – Unknown

5.51.1.6. Libya and Sudan – mostly drawn from the mercenary Islamic Legion, made up Sudanese, West Africans, and 1,700 Druz militiamen from Lebanon (Clodfelter 2008, 595); 8000 total troops with 300 MBTs, artillery, Mi-24s, and 60 combat aircraft (Pollack 2002, 391).

5.51.1.7. Libya – 700 (Pollack 1996, 705)

5.51.1.8. Outcome – Chad won. (Clodfelter 2008, 595).

5.51.2. Battle of Wadi Doum (Clodfelter 2008, 595; Pollack 1996, 705)

5.51.2.1. The capture of Fada led quickly to the fall of the main Libyan stronghold in central Chad at Ouadi Doum.

5.51.2.2. Onset: 15/03/1987; Termination: 22/03/1987

5.51.2.3. Chad and FAP versus Libya, Sudan, and Lebanese forces

5.51.2.4. Chad – Approximately 3,000 troops (Pollack 2002, 393)

5.51.2.5. Chad – 29 killed, 58 wounded

5.51.2.6. Libya –Approximately 7,000 troops (Pollack 2002, 392).

5.51.2.7. Libya – 1,269 killed, 438 captured

5.51.2.8. Outcome – Chad won. After 2 Libyan armored columns were destroyed, the Libyan air base at Wadi Doum fell in March (Clodfelter 2008, 595).

5.51.3. Battle of Azou Village (Clodfelter 2008, 595)

5.51.3.1. The Chadians launched their offensive against the Aouzou strip in late July. The FANT began by retaking the Libyan-held positions in the Tibesti (Pollack 1996, 706)

5.51.3.2. Onset: 30/07/1987; Termination:31/08/1987 (Pollack 2002, 395-396)

5.51.3.3. Chad and FAP versus Libya, Sudan, and Lebanese forces

5.51.3.4. Chad –3,000 (Pollack 2002, 395)

5.51.3.5. Chad – 17 killed, 54 wounded

5.51.3.6. Libya –15,000 (Pollack 2002, 395)

5.51.3.7. Libya – 650 killed, 147 captured; 1,487 (Pollack 2002, 396)

5.51.3.8. Outcome – Chad victory. In August, Libyans were routed from Azou village by Chadians, but Libya was able to retake Azou village in September; Chad built on its success elsewhere (Clodfelter 2008, 595).

5.51.4. Battle of Matan es Sarra (Clodfelter 2008, 595)

5.51.4.1. While the Libyans sent a brigade to attack Ounianga Kebir and thus repeat their previous limited success at Aouzou, the Chadians sent several thousand soldiers 200 kilometers into Libya to wreck the Maatan as-Sarrah airbase (Pollack 2002, 396)

5.51.4.2. Onset: ?/09/1987; Termination: ?/09/1987

5.51.4.3. Chad and FAP versus Libya, Sudan, and Lebanese forces

5.51.4.4. Chad – 2,000 troops

5.51.4.5. Chad – 65 KIA, 112 WIA, 177 total (Pollack 2002, 397)

5.51.4.6. Libya – 2,500 troops (Pollack 2002, 396)

5.51.4.7. Libya – 1,713 killed

5.51.4.8. Outcome – Chad won. Chadian raiding force penetrated 60 miles into Libya itself to smash the Libyan base at Matan es Sarra (Clodfelter 2008, 595).

5.52. Gulf War

5.52.1. Iraqi Invasion of Kuwait (Clodfelter 2008, 632)

5.52.1.1. On August 2, 1990, Iraq sent its troops into Kuwait and rapidly overran the oil-rich sheikhdom. (Clodfelter 2008, 632)

5.52.1.2. Onset: 02/08/1990; Termination: 08/08/1990 (Warbrick 1991, 483)

5.52.1.3. Iraq versus Kuwait

5.52.1.4. Iraq – 100,000 troops, at least 500 tanks

5.52.1.5. Iraq – no more than 200 killed

5.52.1.6. Kuwait – 25,000 troops

5.52.1.7. Kuwait – 200 troops (Murphy 1990)

5.52.1.8. Outcome – Iraq won. The Kuwaiti defense forces put up only minimal resistance, and many units fled into Saudi Arabia (Clodfelter 2008, 632).

5.52.2. Battle of Khafji (Clodfelter 2008, 632 and 635)

5.52.2.1. The international response to the Iraqi conquest was a defensive concentration of armed forces from 28 nations, led by the U.S. and code-named Operation Desert Shield. Economic sanctions and diplomacy failed to budge Iraq from its conquest. The U.S. set January 15, 1991, as a deadline for an Iraqi withdrawal. Operation Desert Shield ended on January 17, 1991, with the commencement of a military offensive called Operation Desert Strom, aimed at the forced ejection of Iraq from Kuwait. Iraq launched its only ground offensive operation of the war on January 29, 1991, sending its troops into an assault on the Saudi border town of Khafji (Clodfelter 2008, 632-635).

5.52.2.2. Onset: 29/01/1991; Termination: 30/01/1991

5.52.2.3. United States, Qatar, and Saudi Arabia versus Iraq

5.52.2.4. United States, Qatar, and Saudi Arabia –Approximately 6,500 troops (Stanton 1996, Jamieson 2001, Williams 2002)

5.52.2.5. United States – 11 Marines killed and 2 light armored vehicles destroyed by the friendly fire of U.S. A-10, 14 airmen killed and 1 AC-130 gunship shot down; Qatar – [not clear]; Saudi Arabia – 18 killed, 32 wounded, 11 missing, 2 tanks lost, 6 armored fighting vehicles lost. For slightly higher Saudi numbers see Stanton 1996, "Saudi forces suffered 18 dead and 50 wounded in the battle with most of the dead coming from the two killed V150s" (Stanton 1996, 10). Approximately 86 casualties.

5.52.2.6. Iraq – 2,000 troops, 100 armed vehicles

5.52.2.7. Iraq – 32 killed, 35 wounded, 463 captured, 33 tanks lost, 29 APCs lost; The enemy lost approximately 60 dead and 400(+) prisoners. (Stanton 1996, 10)

5.52.2.8. Outcome – United States/Saudi Arabia/Qatar won. Iraq initially seized Khafji but Saudi Arabia and Qatar drove the Iraqis out 36 hours later with considerable help from the U.S. forces (Clodfelter 2008, 635).

5.52.3. Coalition Attack on the "Saddam Line" (Clodfelter 2008, 632-635)

5.52.3.1. Operation Desert Shield ended on January 17, 1991, with the commencement of a military offensive called Operation Desert Strom, aimed at the forced ejection of Iraq from Kuwait. The all-out land offensive commenced on February 24, attacking the Saddam Line defending Kuwait (Clodfelter 2008, 632-635).

5.52.3.2. Onset: 24/02/1991; Termination: 25/02/1991

5.52.3.3. Coalition (United States, United Kingdom, France, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates) versus Iraq (US Army Center of Military History 2010)

5.52.3.4. Coalition – Saudi Arabia – 45,000 troops, 200 tanks, 180 combat planes; Qatar – 1,000 troops, 18 combat planes; UAE – 4,000 troops, 200 tanks, 80 combat planes; Oman –2,500 troops, 63 airplanes; Kuwait – 11,000 troops; Syria –15,000 troops, 270 tanks Egypt –35,000 troops, 400 tanks; United States – 17,000 Marines of the 2nd Marine Expeditionary Force; 5th Marine Expeditionary Brigade; 2 Marine divisions. Approximately 190,000 total. Three commands held the eastern one-third of the front. Joint Forces Command–North, made up of formations from Egypt, Syria, and Saudi Arabia and led by His Royal Highness Lt. Gen. Prince Khalid ibn Sultan, held the portion of the line east of the VII Corps. To the right of these allied forces stood Lt. Gen. Walter E. Boomer's I Marine Expeditionary Force, which had the 1st (Tiger) Brigade of the Army's 2d Armored Division as well as the 1st and 2d Marine Divisions. Joint Forces Command–East on the extreme right, or eastern, flank anchored the line at the Persian Gulf. This organization consisted of units from all six member states of the Gulf Cooperation Council [i.e., Bahrain, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Oman, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates.]. Like Joint Forces Command–North, it was under General Khalid's command." (Stewart 2010, 34-35)

5.52.3.5. Coalition – Saudi Arabia – [not clear]; Qatar – [not clear]; UAE – [not clear]; Oman – [not clear]; Kuwait – [not clear]; Syria – [not clear]; Egypt – [not clear]; United States – [not clear] "The U.S. Army had contributed the bulk of the ground combat power that defeated and very nearly destroyed the Iraqi ground forces. The Iraqis lost 3,847 of their 4,280 tanks, over half of their 2,880 armored personnel carriers, and nearly all of their 3,100 artillery pieces. Only five to seven of their forty-three combat divisions remained capable of offensive operations. In the days after the cease-fire, the busiest soldiers were those engaged in the monumental task of counting and caring for an estimated sixty thousand prisoners. And these surprising results came at the cost of 148 Americans killed in action." (Stewart 2010, 63) [Note: These figures are total for the U.S. ground operations.] "The Americans had suffered one hundred forty-eight battle deaths and their allies another ninety-nine, versus something upwards of twenty thousand for the Iraqis. Another sixty thousand Iraqis were wounded or captured." (Stewart 2010, 67)

5.52.3.6. Iraq – 9 divisions; approximately 180,000 troops

5.52.3.7. Iraq – 26,000 (Stewart 2010, 67)

5.52.3.8. Outcome – U.S.-led Coalition won. The Saddam Line was effectively breached by February 25 (Clodfelter 2008, 635).

5.52.4. Battle of Kuwait City (Clodfelter 2008, 635)

5.52.4.1. After breaching the Saddam Line, the U.S.-led coalition forces pushed on to the Kuwait International Airport by February 27. (Clodfelter 2008, 635)

5.52.4.2. Onset: 25/02/1991; Termination: 27/02/1991

5.52.4.3. Coalition (United States, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, Oman, Qatar, United Arab Emirates) versus Iraq

5.52.4.4. Coalition – Kuwait – 1 armored brigade [not clear if this figure is total]; United States – 2nd Armored Division's 1st "Tiger" Brigade, the Marines; approximately 30,000 troops (Moore 1991). To the east, the Marine advance resumed on the twenty-sixth with the two Marine divisions diverging from their parallel course of the first two days. The 2d Marine Division and the Army's Tiger Brigade, the 1st Brigade of the 2d Armored Division, continued driving directly north while the 1st Marine Division turned northeast toward Kuwait International Airport (Stewart 2010, 55)

5.52.4.5. Coalition – Kuwait and United States – During four days of combat, Tiger Brigade task forces destroyed or captured 181 tanks, 148 armored personnel carriers, 40 artillery pieces, and 27 antiaircraft systems while killing an estimated 263 enemy and capturing 4,051 prisoners of war, all at a cost of 2 killed and 5 wounded. (Stewart 2010, 63)

5.52.4.6. Iraq – Unknown

5.52.4.7. Iraq – During four days of combat, Tiger Brigade task forces destroyed or captured 181 tanks, 148 armored personnel carriers, 40 artillery pieces, and 27 antiaircraft systems while killing an estimated 263 enemy and capturing 4,051 prisoners of war, all at a cost of 2 killed and 5 wounded. (Stewart 2010, 63)

5.52.4.8. Outcome – U.S.-led Coalition won. Just 77 hours after the start of the offensive, the U.S.-led coalition forces entered Kuwait City. (Clodfelter 2008, 635).

5.52.5. "Left Hook" (Clodfelter 2008, 635-636)

5.52.5.1. After breaching the Saddam Line, the U.S.-led coalition forces pushed on to the Kuwait International Airport by February 27. Meanwhile, the main attack came far to the west, where General Schwarzkopf had secretly swung 260,000 men of the US VII Corps and XVIII Airborne Corps 100 miles beyond the original left flank of the Allied army. (Clodfelter 2008, 635)

5.52.5.2. Onset: 24/02/1991; Termination: 27/02/1991

5.52.5.3. Coalition (United States; United Kingdom; France) versus Iraq

5.52.5.4. Coalition – United States – 97,000; United Kingdom – 15,000; France – 10,000; approximately 122,000 total. "On 24 February, when ground operations started in earnest, coalition forces were poised along a line that stretched from the Persian Gulf westward three hundred miles into the desert. The XVIII Airborne Corps, under General Luck, held the left, or western, flank and consisted of

the 82d Airborne Division, the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), the 24th Infantry Division (Mechanized), the French 6th Light Armored Division, the 3d Armored Cavalry Regiment, and the 12th and 18th Aviation Brigades. The VII Corps was deployed to the right of the XVIII Airborne Corps and consisted of the 1st Infantry Division (Mechanized), the 1st Cavalry Division (Armored), the 1st and 3d Armored Divisions, the British 1st Armoured Division, the 2d Armored Cavalry Regiment, and the 11th Aviation Brigade. These two corps covered about two-thirds of the line occupied by the larger multinational force." (Stewart 2010, 34)

5.52.5.5. Coalition – France – 2 killed, 25 wounded; United States – 4 killed. At the same time, the best Iraqi divisions destroyed only 7 Abrams tanks, 15 Bradleys, 2 armored personnel carriers, and 1 Apache helicopter. And, while killing unknown thousands of enemy troops, the VII Corps lost twenty-two soldiers killed in action (Stewart 2010, 62); Just as surprising as these large enemy losses were the small numbers of American casualties (of the 24th Infantry Division (Mechanized)): 8 killed in action, 36 wounded in action, and 5 nonbattle injuries. And in the entire XVIII Airborne Corps, combat equipment losses were negligible: only 4 MlA1 tanks, 3 of which were repairable (Schubert and Kraus 1995, 196).

5.52.5.6. Iraq – 60,000 soldiers in three divisions (48th, 26th, and 45th divisions) (AUSA 2001, 13)

5.52.5.7. Iraq – 2,500 captured, 414 tanks, 16 APCs and 127 other armored vehicles destroyed; Along the way they [the 24th Infantry Division (Mechanized)] knocked out over 360 tanks and armored personnel carriers, over 300 artillery pieces, over 1,200 trucks, 500 pieces of engineer equipment, 19 missiles, and 25 aircraft, and rounded up over 5,000 enemy soldiers (Schubert and Kraus 1995, 196).

5.52.5.8. Outcome – U.S.-led Coalition won. In most places along the front, the Iraqis put up only minimal resistance and surrendered in droves to the advancing coalition forces. The 100-hour ground offensive had been halted by a cease-fire on February 28 (Clodfelter 2008, 636).

5.52.6. Battle of Rumaylah (Clodfelter 2008, 635-636)

5.52.6.1. In most places along the front, the Iraqis put up only minimal resistance and surrendered in droves to the advancing coalition forces. The 100-hour ground offensive had been halted by a cease-fire on February 28. Two days after the cease-fire, U.S. 24th Mechanized Division clashed with a Republican Guard Division at Rumaylah (Clodfelter 2008, 635-636); At 0700 hours an armored convoy of T-72s and BMPs from the Hammurabi Division ran into the scouts of 2nd Battalion, 7th Infantry and opened fire…. The rules of the U.S. declared cease-fire allowed the Americans to

return fire when fired upon. The Iraqis were about to get more than they had bargained for. Major General Barry McCaffrey, the 24th Infantry Division Commander, approved a counter-attack by First Brigade (Pierson 2011).

5.52.6.2. Onset: 02/03/1991; Termination: 02/03/1991

5.52.6.3. United States versus Iraq

5.52.6.4. United States – 1 Mechanized Division; approximately 18,000 troops (AUSA 2001, 18).

5.52.6.5. United States – only 1 tank lost; The cost to the Americans had been only one wounded soldier and one destroyed tank (Pierson 2011).

5.52.6.6. Iraq – 1 Republican Guard Division; approximately 20,000 troops (AUSA 2001, 13)

5.52.6.7. Iraq – 600 tanks, guns, and APCs destroyed; The 24th Infantry had destroyed 30 tanks, 33 artillery pieces, 56 other armored vehicles, 486 trucks, as well as an estimated 200 Iraqi dead and 89 captured (Pierson 2011)

5.52.6.8. Outcome – United States won. (Clodfelter 2008, 636).

5.53. War of Bosnian Independence

5.53.1. Battle of Kupres I

5.53.1.1. In March 1992, the Yugoslav army had moved to carve out Serbian-populated areas of Bosnia. In seven weeks of fighting, before an April 23 cease-fire, over 250 people were killed (Clodfelter 2008, 582).

5.53.1.2. Onset: 03/04/1992; Termination: 11/04/1992

5.53.1.3. Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) and Bosnian Serbs (Bosnian Serb Territorial Defence Force, Bosnian Serb TO) versus Croatia (Croatian Army, HV) and Bosnian Croats (Croatian Defense Council, HVO) (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 355)

5.53.1.4. Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) and Bosnian Serbs (Bosnian Serb Territorial Defence Force, Bosnian Serb TO) – Yugoslavia (JNA) – 4,000 troops (2 brigades) (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 355), Bosnian Serb TO – 1,000 troops (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 356);

5.53.1.5. Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) and Bosnian Serbs (Bosnian Serb Territorial Defence Force, Bosnian Serb TO) – Yugoslavia (JNA) and Bosnian Serb TO – 31 killed (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 356)

5.53.1.6. Croatia (HV) and Bosnian Croats (HVO) – no more than 2,000 troops (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 355)

5.53.1.7. Croatia (HV) and Bosnian Croats (HVO) – Unknown

5.53.1.8. Outcome – Yugoslavia (JNA) and Bosnian Serb TO won. As would be expected with such a rapid victory, the JNA and Serb TO forces suffered relatively light casualties (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 356).

5.53.2. Siege of Srebrenica (Clodfelter 2008, 582)

5.53.2.1. In March 1992, the Yugoslav army had moved to carve out Serbian-populated areas of Bosnia. In seven weeks of fighting, before an April 23 cease-fire, over 250 people were killed. Fighting quickly resumed, Bosnian Serb troops had placed Sarajevo under siege and begun to ethnically cleanse large areas of Bosnia against Bosnian Muslim population

5.53.2.2. Onset: ?/04/1992; Termination: 11/07/1995

5.53.2.3. Yugoslavia (Yugoslav People's Army, JNA), Bosnian Serb Territorial Defence Force (Bosnian Serb TO), Army of Republika Srpska, VRS (a Bosnian Serb group) versus Bosnian Muslims (Army of Bosnia and Hezegovina, ARBiH) (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 151 and 185)

5.53.2.4. Yugoslavia (JNA), Bosnian Serb TO, and the Army of Republika Srpska, (VRS), Serbian forces allocated totaled about 3,000 troops to the Srebrenica operation beginning of July 1995. (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 322)

5.53.2.5. Yugoslavia (JNA), Bosnian Serb TO, and the Army of Republika Srpska, (VRS) – Unknown

5.53.2.6. Bosnian Muslims (ARBiH) – Approximately 4,200 fighters

5.53.2.7. Bosnian Muslims (ARBiH) – Unknown

5.53.2.8. Outcome – Yugoslavia (JNA), Bosnian Serb TO, and the Army of Republika Srpska, (VRS) victory.

5.53.3. Siege of Mostar I

5.53.3.1. Bosnian Serbs' offensive in the Mostar-Stolac-Neum area was justified by Bosnian Serbs' beliefs that Bosnian Croat dominance of the area would threaten the Bosnian Serb population. (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 356)

5.53.3.2. Onset: ?/04/1992; Termination: ?/06/1992

5.53.3.3. Yugoslavia (Yugoslav People's Army, JNA) and Bosnian Serbs (Bosnian Serb Territorial Defence Force, Bosnian Serb TO) versus Croatia (Croatian Army, HV), Bosnian Croats (Croatian Defense Council, HVO) and Bosnian Muslims (Army of Bosnia and Hezegovina, ARBiH)

5.53.3.4. Yugoslavia (JNA) and Bosnian Serbs (Bosnian Serb TO) – 10,000 JNA troops with 1,500 to 2,000 supporting Bosnian Serb TO troops (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 357)

5.53.3.5. Yugoslavia (JNA) and Bosnian Serbs (Bosnian Serb TO) – Unknown

5.53.3.6. Croatia (HV), Bosnian Croats (HVO), and Bosnian Muslims (ARBiH) – 5,000 to 6,000 HV troops with at least 2,000 supporting HVO troops (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 357), ARBiH troops appear to have played at most a secondary role in the

attacks eastward out of Mostar itself. (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 157)

5.53.3.7. Croatia (HV), Bosnian Croats (HVO, and Bosnian Muslims (ARBiH) – Unknown

5.53.3.8. Outcome – Draw. There was a cease-fire agreement, but it was short-lived. Bosnian Croats took a narrow band on the eastern bank in Mostar and Bosnian Serbs took the three sides of the city. (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 358)].

5.53.4. Siege of Bihac

5.53.4.1. The flashpoint is Bihac, a beleaguered Muslim enclave in northwest Bosnia that all parties to the conflict regard as a vital strategic interest. Bihac, home to some 180,000 Muslims, has been under Serb siege since last autumn. But when rebel Serbs from Croatia and Bosnia stepped up the attack last week, the government of Croatia sniffed danger-and opportunity (Hundley July 30, 1995).

5.53.4.2. Onset: 12/06/1992; Termination: 05/08/1995

5.53.4.3. Bosnian Serbs (Army of Republika Srpska, VRS) versus Bosnian Muslims (Army of Bosnia and Hezegovina, ARBiH) and Bosnian Croats (Croatian Defense Council, HVO) (Hundley July 30, 1995).

5.53.4.4. Bosnian Serbs (VRS) – 13,000 to 15,000 troops (Gordon November 30, 1994); 8,000 to 10,500 Bosnian Serb troops at the end of 1992 (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 150)

5.53.4.5. Bosnian Serbs (VRS) – Unknown

5.53.4.6. Bosnian Muslims (ARBiH) and Bosnian Croats (HVO) – 10,000 troops (Hundley July 30, 1995); Croatia – 8,000 to 10,000 troops (Hundley July 30, 1995); 7,000 to 10,000 troops (six Bosnian Muslim ARBiH brigades and one Bosnian Croat HVO battalion at the end of 1992 (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 150)

5.53.4.7. Bosnian Muslims (ARBiH) and Bosnian Croats (HVO) – Unknown

5.53.4.8. Outcome – Bosnian Muslims (ARBiH) and Bosian Croats (HVO) won. This week the siege of this town was loosened when the Croatian Army added its might to a struggling Bosnian Army in sweeping back the rebel Serbs.

5.53.5. Siege of Sarajevo (Clodfelter 2008, 582)

5.53.5.1. In March 1992, the Yugoslav army had moved to carve out Serbian-populated areas of Bosnia. In seven weeks of fighting, before an April 23 cease-fire, over 250 people were killed. Fighting quickly resumed, Bosnian Serb troops had placed Sarajevo under siege and begun to ethnically cleanse large areas of Bosnia against Bosnian Muslim population. The death toll in and around Sarajevo

in 1992 was 3,060. Another 3,091 people were killed in 1993 and 1,797 more in 1994 (Clodfelter 2008, 582).

5.53.5.2. Onset: 05/04/1992; Termination: 29/02/1996

5.53.5.3. Yugoslavia (Yugoslav People's Army, JNA), Bosnian Serb Territorial Defence Force (Bosnian Serb TO), and the Army of Republika Srpska, VRS (a Bosnian Serb group) versus Bosnian Muslims

5.53.5.4. Yugoslavia (JNA) and Bosnian Serbs (Bosnian Serb TO and VRS)– The total forces comprised about 15,000 troops as many as 80 tanks, about 72 field artillery pieces, and 12 multiple rocket launchers (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 153; United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 346).

5.53.5.5. Yugoslavia (JNA) and Bosnian Serbs (Bosnian Serb TO and VRS) – Unknown

5.53.5.6. Bosnian Muslims – 10,000 non-Serb men (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 347); Initially perhaps 10,000 to 15,000 troops which included former members of Sarajevo Territorial Defense Force, units from the Muslim-majority municipals, some Muslim deserters from the JNA, and probably several thousand Patriotic League members, if not fully armed. (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 153)

5.53.5.7. Bosnian Muslims – Unknown

5.53.5.8. Outcome – Draw; siege ended with conflict-ending treaty

5.53.6. **Siege of Mostar II**, June 1993 – April 1994 [Note: There is no information in Clodfelter's book.]

5.53.6.1. Bosnian Croats and Bosnian Muslims were allies against Serbs but they also had conflicting interests reflected by their own nationalisms. Conflicts between their forces broke out as early as October 1992, and fighting was particularly fierce in Mostar. In March 1994, the two sides signed the Washington Agreement and restored the military partnership between them against Serbs (Ramet 2006, 433-439).

5.53.6.2. Onset: ?/06/1993; Termination: ?/04/1994

5.53.6.3. Bosnian Croats (Croatian Defense Council, HVO) versus Bosnian Muslims (Army of Bosnia and Hezegovina, ARBiH)

5.53.6.4. Bosnian Croats (HVO) – 45,000 troops (Ramet 2006, 434).

5.53.6.5. Bosnian Croats (HVO) – Unknown

5.53.6.6. Bosnian Muslims (ARBiH) – 44,000 troops but seriously under-equipped (Ramet 2006, 434) [these figures seem the total strength, and it is not clear how many troops among them participated at the Siege of Mostar II]

5.53.6.7. Bosnian Muslims (ARBiH) – Unknown

5.53.6.8. Outcome – Draw. The stalemate and the U.S. mediation led to the Washington Agreement.

5.53.7. Kupres II, 20 October – 3 November 1994

5.53.7.1. Kupres had been under the control of Bosnian Serbs since the last Battle of Kupres I. Bosnian Croats hungered to avenge that humiliating defeat and take back the Croat-majority town. The Bosnian Muslims also longed to free Kupres. The campaign began on 20 October 1994 (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 507)

5.53.7.2. Onset: 20/10/1994; Termination: 03/11/1994

5.53.7.3. Bosnian Serbs (Army of Republika Srpska, VRS) versus Croatia (Croatian Army, HV), Bosnian Croats (Croatian Defense Council, HVO) and Bosnian Muslims (Army of Bosnia and Hezegovina, ARBiH) (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 507)

5.53.7.4. Bosnian Serbs (Army of Republika Srpska, VRS) – Bosnian Serb army (30th Infantry Division) (Redman 2003, 6). Unit Size Unknown.

5.53.7.5. Bosnian Serbs (Army of Republika Srpska, VRS) – Unknown

5.53.7.6. Croatia (HV), Bosnian Croats (HVO), and Bosnian Muslims (ARBiH) – the Bosnian Government (ARBiH, 7th Corps), the Bosnian Croats (HVO, three brigades and two battalion-sized units), the regular Croatian armed forces units (HV, two brigades) (Redman 2003, 5-6); the Bosnian Government (ARBiH, 7th Corps), the Bosnian Croats (HVO, three brigades and two battalion-sized units), the regular Croatian armed forces units (HV, two brigades) (Redman 2003, 5-6); ARBiH 7th Corps and three HVO Guards Brigades, one HVO Guards Airborne Battalion, some HV forces (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 243). Unit Size Unknown.

5.53.7.7. Croatia (HV), Bosnian Croats (HVO), and Bosnian Muslims (ARBiH) – Unknown

5.53.7.8. Outcome – Croatia (HV), Bosnian Croats (HVO), and Bosnian Muslims (ARBiH) won. Kupres-by this time an abandoned ghost town-fell the following day to a lightning Croat advance (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 508); the first militarily successful act of cooperation between the Army of Bosnia and Hezegovina (ARBiH) and the Croatian Defence Council (HVO) (Redman 2003, 1)

5.53.8. Operation Winter 94

5.53.8.1. Bosnia and Croatia (and Bosnian Croats and Bosnian Muslims) sought to the following goals: to weaken and halt the enemy offensive against Bihac, and to create a favorable operational-strategic zone for liberation of the parts under the control of Serbs in Bosnia (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 543).

5.53.8.2. Onset: 29/11/1994; Termination: 24/12/1994 [

5.53.8.3. Bosnian Serbs (Army of Republika Srpska, VRS) versus Croatia (Croatian Army, HV) and Bosnian Croats (Croatian Defence Council, HVO) (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 543)

5.53.8.4. Bosnian Serbs (VRS) – 3,500 troops (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 544); 3,500 Bosnian Serbs army (VRS) (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 250)

5.53.8.5. Yugoslavia – Unknown

5.53.8.6. Croatia (HV) and Bosnian Croats (HVO)– 4,500 troops with 1,000 reserve troops (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 544); 3,000 to 4,000 Croatian army (HV) and 2,000 to 3,000 Bosnian Croats army (HVO) (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 250)

5.53.8.7. Croatia (HV) and Bosnian Croats (HVO) – Unknown

5.53.8.8. Outcome – Croatia (HV) and Bosnian Croats (HVO) won. Although a resounding battlefield success, Operation Winter 94 failed to achieve its immediate strategic objective of relieving Serb pressure on Bihac (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2003, 547).

5.53.9. Operation Summer 95

5.53.9.1. The Croatian offensive began on July 25, 1995, against the strategic town of Bosanko Grahovo, in western Bosnia, in order to cut off the line between Knin, Bosnian Serb capital, and Banja Luka, a major Bosnian Serb city (Ripley 1999, 185). Operation Ljeto 95 (Summer 95), whose objectives was the capture of Bosansko Grahovo-the primary road junction linking Republika Srpska and the RSK (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 364)

5.53.9.2. Onset: 25/07/1995; Termination: 29/07/1995

5.53.9.3. Bosnian Serbs (Army of Republika Srpska, VRS) and Republic of Serbian Krajina (RSK, a Serbian group from Croatia; their army called the Krajina Serb Army, SVK) versus Croatia (Croatian Army, HV) and Bosnian Croats (Croatian Defence Council, HVO) (Ripley 1999, 185).

5.53.9.4. Bosnian Serbs (VRS) – 2nd Krajina Corps (not clear in terms of the number of troops), and 9th Brigade with 1,500 men (Ripley 1999, 185); VRS 2nd Krajina Corps fielded some 5,500 troops. (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 365); RSK Vijuga Battle Group is a part of VRS 2nd Krajina Corps. (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 365)

5.53.9.5. Bosnian Serbs (VRS) and Republic of Serbian Krajina (RSK, a Serbian group from Croatia)– at least 1,400 casualties (Ripley 1999, 185)

5.53.9.6. Croatia (HV)/Bosnian Croats (HVO) – 4th and 7th HV Guard Brigades (Ripley 1999, 185) and 1st HGZ (1st Croatian Guards Brigade of the HV); 2nd and 3rd HVO Guards Brigades; The total HV

[Croatian army]/HVO [Bosnian Croats army] force numbered about 8,500 troops (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 365)

5.53.9.7. Croatia (HV)/Bosnian Croats (HVO) – [not clear]

5.53.9.8. Outcome – Croatia (HV) and Bosnian Croats (HVO) won. Knin was effectively cut off from outside help and being watched by Croat artillery observers (Ripley 1999, 185).

5.53.10. Operation Deliberate Force (Clodfelter 2008, 582)

5.53.10.1. Only a twenty-day NATO bombing campaign against Serbian armor and artillery targets brought about a sustained cease-fire in December 1995 (Clodfelter 2008, 582); Before discussing the UN and NATO military structures in the former Yugoslavia, one should note the strategic political objectives of Operation Deliberate Force as agreed upon by the UN and NATO communities in the summer of 1995: (1) reduce the threat to the Sarajevo safe area and deter further attacks there or on any other safe area, (2) force the withdrawal of Bosnian Serb heavy weapons from the 20-kilometer total-exclusion zone around Sarajevo , (3) ensure complete freedom of movement for UN forces and personnel as well as nongovernmental organizations, and (4) ensure unrestricted use of the Sarajevo airport (Owen 2000, 44).

5.53.10.2. Onset: 30/08/1995; Termination: 20/09/1995

5.53.10.3. Bosnian Serbs (Army of Republika Srpska (VRS) versus NATO (United States; France; United Kingdom; Italy; Netherlands; Turkey; Germany; Spain (Owen 2000, 204))

5.53.10.4. Bosnian Serbs (Army of Republika Srpska (VRS) – Unknown

5.53.10.5. Bosnian Serbs (Army of Republika Srpska (VRS) – 357 individual targets were attacked by the NATO (232 were destroyed, 58 were moderate to severe damage, 54 were light damage, 13 were no damage (Owen 2000, 342)

5.53.10.6. NATO – 305 aircraft (Owen 2000, 204), over 5,000 personnel (Owen 2000, 349); NATO total aircraft – 305: United States – 141 aircraft; France – 47 aircraft; United Kingdom – 28 aircraft; Italy – 20 aircraft; Netherlands – 18 aircraft; Turkey – 18 aircraft; Germany – 14 aircraft; Spain – 11 aircraft (Note: NATO itself – 8 aircraft); NATO total sorties – 3,535: United States – 65%; France – 8%; United Kingdom – 10%; Italy – 1%; Netherlands – 5%; Turkey – 2%; Germany – 2%; Spain – 4% (Note: NATO itself – 3%); NATO total penetrating sorties (offensive operations) – 2,470: United States – 68%; France – 7%; United Kingdom – 10%; Italy – 1%; Netherlands – 6%; Turkey – 3%; Germany – 1%; Spain – 4% (Owen 2000, 204, 331-332)

5.53.10.7.NATO casualties – Unknown

5.53.10.8. Outcome – NATO won. Only a twenty-day NATO bombing campaign against Serbian armor and artillery targets brought about a sustained cease-fire in December 1995 (Clodfelter 2008,

582).; “On 20 September, after reviewing the actions the Bosnian Serbs had taken to comply with UN requirements, the UN and NATO formally declared that “resumption of airstrikes is currently not necessary.” (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 379)

5.53.11. Operation Mistral 2

5.53.11.1. With no breakthrough in the American sponsored peace talks with the Serbs, and the NATO air offensive in full swing, the Croats and Muslims decided to commit their armies to a major offensive with the aim of inflicting a decisive defeat on the Serbs (Ripley 1999, 276).

5.53.11.2. Onset: 08/09/1995; Termination: 15/09/1995

5.53.11.3. Bosnian Serbs (Army of Republika Srpska (VRS)) versus Croatia (Croatian Army (HV)) and Bosnian Croats (Croatian Defence Council (HVO)) (Ripley 1999, 276-278)

5.53.11.4. Bosnian Serbs (VRS) – 1st Krajina Corps (Ripley 1999, 278) (no clear in terms of the number of troops), 3rd Serbian Brigade, 7th Motorized Brigade, 1st Armored Brigade, 1st Drvar Light Infantry Brigade, and three Drina Light Infantry Brigades (1st, 2nd, and 3rd) (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 381). Unit Size Unknown.

5.53.11.5. Bosnian Serbs (VRS) – Unknown

5.53.11.6. Croatia (HV)/Bosnian Croats (HVO)– Guard Brigades (Ripley 1999, 277) (not clear in terms of the number of troops); three HV Guard Brigades (7th, 4th, and 1st HGZ – 1st Croatian Guard Brigade) and three HVO Guard Brigades (1st , 2nd , and 3rd) (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 381). Unit Size Unknown.

5.53.11.7. Croatia (HV)/Bosnian Croats (HVO) – Unknown

5.53.11.8. Outcome – Croatia (HV) and Bosnian Croats (HVO) won. The Croatian and Bosnian Croats’ attack was the decisive move which completely unhinged the Serb defenses in western Bosnia (Ripley 1999, 278).

5.53.12. Operation Sana

5.53.12.1. Bosnian Muslims attempted to capture Sanski Most (Ripley 1999, 311).

5.53.12.2. Onset: 13/09/1995; Termination: 20/10/1995

5.53.12.3. Bosnian Serbs (Army of Republika Srpska (VRS)) versus Bosnian Muslims (the Army of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina (ARBiH)) (Ripley 1999, 311).

5.53.12.4. Bosnian Serbs (VRS) – Six infantry or light infantry brigades with about 8,000 troops; reserve brigades with some 5,000 to 6,000 troops (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 380); 13,000 total

5.53.12.5. Yugoslavia/Bosnian Serbs – Unknown

5.53.12.6. Bosnian Muslims (ARBiH)– 5th Corps and 7th Corps (Ripley 1999, 310) ; 5th Corps with 15,000 troops, 7th Corps with 11,000 troops (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 380)

5.53.12.7. Bosnian Muslims (ARBiH) – Unknown

5.53.12.8. Outcome – Bosnian Muslims (ARBiH) won. The Serb warlord Arkan fled with his para-military militia just before the 5th Corps occupied the town (Ripley 1999, 311).

5.53.13. Operation Southern Move

5.53.13.1. The U.S. was keen for the Croats and Muslims to gain as much land as possible before the ceasefire came into effect (but Banja Luka, a major Bosnian Serb city was off limits). The Croats and Bosnian Croats began their final push north to seize the Bocac Dam complex and Mrkonjic Grad (Ripley 1999, 310-311)

5.53.13.2. Onset: 08/10/1995; Termination: 11/10/1995

5.53.13.3. Bosnian Serbs (Army of Republika Srpska (VRS) versus Croatia (Croatian Army (HV)) and Bosnian Croats (Croatian Defence Council (HVO) (Ripley 1999, 310-312).

5.53.13.4. Bosnian Serbs (VRS)– About 5,500 troops (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 390)

5.53.13.5. Bosnian Serbs (VRS) – at least 20 tanks lost (Ripley 1999, 311)

5.53.13.6. Croatia (HV)/Bosnian Croats (HVO)– 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 7th Guard Brigades and Special Police unit (Ripley 1999, 310) (not clear in terms of the number of troops); total 11,000 to 12,000 troops (United States Central Intelligence Agency 2002, 390)

5.53.13.7. Croatia (HV)/Bosnian Croats (HVO) – Unknown

5.53.13.8. Outcome – Croatia (HV) and Bosnian Croats (HVO) won. The Croatian and Bosnian Croats brigades took the Bocac Dam and Mrkonjic Grad and threatened Banja Luka (Ripley 1999, 310-312).

5.54. Azeri-Armenian (Clodfelter 2008, 583)

5.54.1. Operation Goranboy (Clodfelter 2008, 583)

5.54.1.1. Operation Goranboy was an Azerbaijani offensive that took place in the summer of 1992. Front spokesman Ayaz Akhmedov stated that the goal of the offensive was to restore a constitutional order on all of our republic's territory, which was under occupation by Armenian and Karabakh troops. The tactical objective of the operation was to isolate the separatist Karabakh forces from their ally Armenia by taking the Lachin corridor which connected the two (Parks 17 June 1992). Fighting concentrated in the Martakert and Shaumian Districts near the Karabakh capital Stepanakert (Denber and Goldman 1992, 14). Elchibey's reform efforts were undertaken in tandem with the launching of a large-scale Azerbaijani offensive in Nagorno-Karabakh on 12 June, scarcely five days after his election. The assault, involving some 100 tanks and armored personnel carriers backed by artillery and close air

support, was directed at the Mardakert and Askeram districts in northern and central Nagorno-Karabakh, respectively. Initial operations appeared to be aimed at cleaving the region in two, and Azerbaijani units made significant headway toward such a goal during the opening days of the offensive. Taken by surprise by the tenacity of the attack, Karabakh Armenian troops were forced to abandon several of the villages they had gained in earlier fighting (Coissant 1998, 83-84).

5.54.1.2. Onset: 12/06/1992; Termination: 18/06/1992

5.54.1.3. Azerbaijan versus Armenia, Karabakh separatists, and Russian air support

5.54.1.4. Azerbaijan – Unknown; 100 to 150 tanks (Associated Press 1992)

5.54.1.5. Azerbaijan – 50 dead, 130 wounded (Parks 15 June 1992)

5.54.1.6. Armenia, Karabakh separatists, and Russia – Unknown

5.54.1.7. Armenia, Karabakh separatists, and Russia – 200 to 500 dead or wounded (Parks 15 June 1992); The figures for the Armenians are 500 to 600, though 1,000 is probably more accurate. That figure breaks down to approximately 700 Karabagh Armenians and 300 from the Republic of Armenia (Chorbajian, Donabédian, and Mutafian, 1994, 41)

5.54.1.8. Outcome – Azerbaijan victory. By the end of the offensive, Azerbaijan had occupied forty-eight percent of Karabakh territory. The Azeri troops were halted when "the Armenians persuaded the Russian military to intervene and help them turn the tide. Russian attack helicopters were sent in and carried out air strikes, which halted the offensive in its tracks (de Waal 2013, 196).

5.54.2. Battle of Kalbajar (Clodfelter 2008, 583)

5.54.2.1. Armenian forces invaded the Azerbaijani province Kelbajar which bordered Armenia. The main thrust of the Armenian attack came from the west, from the Vardenis region of Armenia…. a supporting offensive came from Karabakh [from the south] (de Waal 2013, 196). Kelbajar was of strategic importance to the Armenians because it provided another land-bridge between Armenia and Karabakh and provided a buffer to the Lachin corridor; Following their victories in the north, Karabakh Armenian forces turned to the west and attacked the Kelbajar district of Azerbaijan. Spokesmen of the self-styled NKR administration claimed the offensive was necessary to relieve Azerbaijani military pressure on the Lachin corridor, but the unmistakable strategic objective behind the assault was the opening of a new land link between Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. After heavy fighting from 31 March to 3 April, local Armenian troops succeeded in capturing the regional center of Kelbajar and numerous surrounding villages (Coissant 1998, 87-88).

5.54.2.2. Onset: 27/03/1993; Termination: 03/04/1993

5.54.2.3. Azerbaijan versus Armenia, Karabakh separatists, and Russia

5.54.2.4. Azerbaijan – Unknown

5.54.2.5. Azerbaijan – 200 civilians and soldiers killed, 150 soldiers and 80 civilians captured (Human Rights Watch 1994, 24); approximately 300 casualties.

5.54.2.6. Armenia, Karabakh separatists, and Russia – Mountain troops from the 128th Regiment of the 7th Russian Army partook in the fighting, Armenian forces unclear (Human Rights Watch 1994, 12; DeRouen 2007, 151). Unit Size Unknown.

5.54.2.7. Armenia, Karabakh separatists, and Russia – Unknown; "military losses were minimal" (de Waal 2013, 212)

5.54.2.8. Outcome – Armenia, Karabakh separatists, and Russia. Armenia secured the town of Kelbajar on April 3rd, which threw another land bridge from Karabakh to Armenia however it came with a heavy diplomatic cost. For the first time, strong evidence was produced that troops from the Republic of Armenia had fought inside Azerbaijan and outside Karabakh. As a result, the United Nations passed a resolution calling for both sides cease hostilities and demanded an immediate withdraw of all occupying forces from Kelbajar (de Waal 2013, 212-213). Moreover, the loss of Kelbajar shook the [Azeri] regime, resulting in the declaration of a sixty-day State of Emergency and conscription (de Waal 2013, 212). As Azerbaijan descended into political chaos after Abulfaz Elchibey presidency collapsed with astonishing speed" in June 1993, Armenian forces invaded Azeri territory virtually unopposed (de Waal 2013, 213).

5.55. Cenepa Valley

5.55.1. **Battle of Tiwinza** (Clodfelter 2008, 695)

5.55.1.1. On the Peruvian side, Tiwintza was two-phased battle in order to occupy grids 1209 and 1061 and expel the Ecuadorian military infiltration in these grids. On the Ecuadorian side Tiwintza was a defensive battle to repel a Peruvian envelopment maneuver (Chiabra Leon 2010, 76; Macias Nuñez 2007, 114)

5.55.1.2. Onset: 12/02/1995; Termination: 23/02/1995 (Chiabra Leon 2010, 75-99)

5.55.1.3. Peru versus Ecuador

5.55.1.4. Peru – Peruvians acknowledge 3 infantry battalions and 1 special forces battalion for phase one between 12/02/1995-13/02/1995, and 2 infantry battalions plus a special forces battalion and a special forces company for phase two between 20/02/1995-23/02/1995. Given that the Peruvian narrative emphasizes that fire support seems to have been separate from the engaged units, estimate 1,700 troops (Chiabra Leon 2010, 75-99; Macias Nuñez 2007, 114)

5.55.1.5. Peru – Peruvians acknowledge 12 KIA, 12 wounded (Chiabra Leon 2010, 75-99)

5.55.1.6. Ecuador – In Tiwintza Ecuadorians acknowledge only 770 troops arranged around a task force-type unit called sub-tactical group which is itself a detachment of a larger task force. They were supported by 5 Igla launchers and two 6 81mm batteries (Macias Nuñez 2007, 118-119)

5.55.1.7. Ecuador – Ecuador acknowledges 13 KIA and 20 wounded on 22/02 and 25 KIA and 62 wounded in the whole Tiwintza defense (Macias Nuñez 2007, 118-126)

5.55.1.8. Outcome – Equador won (Spencer 1998)

5.56. Badme Border War

5.56.1. Battle of Mereb River (Clodfelter 2008, 596-597)

5.56.1.1. Eritrea had barely attained independence from Ethiopia before it became embroiled in a border dispute with Ethiopia. On May 6, 1998, their respective forces clashed in heavy combat along the Mereb River, southwest of the Eritrean capital of Asmara (Clodfelter 2008, 596). On May 6, 1998, the tense standoff gave way to war when Eritrean troops advanced into a disputed region along the border with the northern Ethiopians, the Eritreans invaded the area near Badme (previously controlled by Ethiopia) and engaged local militia and security forces (Ciment 2007, 164).

5.56.1.2. Onset: 06/05/1998; Termination: 20/05/1998

5.56.1.3. Eritrea versus Ethiopia

5.56.1.4. Eritrea – The surprise attack, which was never expected by the Ethiopians, was carried out along the whole border by mobilizing and deploying a more than 200,000-strong army including veterans and SAWA recruits (Walta Information Center 1999, 226).

5.56.1.5. Eritrea – Unknown

5.56.1.6. Ethiopia – Unknown

5.56.1.7. Ethiopia – Unknown; Note: 1,000 troops had died on both sides (Clodfelter 2008, 596)

5.56.1.8. Outcome – Unknown

5.56.2. Battle of Badme Plain (Clodfelter 2008, 596-597)

5.56.2.1. On May 6, 1998, their respective forces clashed in heavy combat along the Mereb River, southwest of the Eritrean capital of Asmara. Thereafter, fighting faded, but the conflict resumed in February 1999, with major fighting raging on the Badme Plain and around Tsorona until September (Clodfelter 2008, 596-597). "The battle for Badme was short and decisive….The Battle for Badme was very short. It took only a few hours to actually breach the Eritrean defence early in the counter offensive, not as Issayas' propagandists said on Friday February 26 1999. Once they breached the Eritrean fortifications at one point, the Ethiopian

defence forces penetrated through that line and attacked the enemy from the side and rear directions. For two consecutive days, the Eritreans charged in wave after wave in their vain attempt to regain their lost fortifications (Walta Information Center 1999, 220).

5.56.2.2.

5.56.2.3. Onset: 23/02/1999; Termination: 26/09/1999 (Negash and Tronvoll 2000, 77; Walta Information Center 1999, 221).

5.56.2.4. Eritrea versus Ethiopia

5.56.2.5. Eritrea – Approximately 40,000 (Negash and Tronvoll 2000, 73)

5.56.2.6. Eritrea – Unknown

5.56.2.7. Ethiopia – Unknown

5.56.2.8. Ethiopia – Unknown. [Note: By September, as many as 10,000 Eritreans and 30,000 Ethiopians had been slain. (Clodfelter 2008, 597)]

5.56.2.9. Outcome – Unknown

5.56.3. Battle of Tsorona (Clodfelter 2008, 596-597)

5.56.3.1. On May 6, 1998, their respective forces clashed in heavy combat along the Mereb River, southwest of the Eritrean capital of Asmara. Thereafter, fighting faded, but the conflict resumed in February 1999, with major fighting raging on the Badme Plain and around Tsorona until September (Clodfelter 2008, 596-597).

5.56.3.2. Onset: ?/02/1999; Termination: ?/09/1999

5.56.3.3. Eritrea versus Ethiopia

5.56.3.4. Eritrea – Unknown

5.56.3.5. Eritrea – Unknown

5.56.3.6. Ethiopia – Unknown

5.56.3.7. Ethiopia – A new Ethiopian offensive on the Tsorona front resulted in about 10,000 Ethiopians dead" (Oxford Analytica Daily Brief Service 28 June 1999).

5.56.3.8. Outcome – Eritrea. Ethiopian forces were pushed back and unable to advance towards Amara. "Victory in Tsorona would have cleared the way for Ethiopian advance towards Eritrean capital, Asmara….After repulsing the Ethiopian offensive in Tsorona" (Oxford Analytica Daily Brief Service 28 June 1999).

5.56.4. Battle of Assab (Clodfelter 2008, 596-597)

5.56.4.1. Ethiopians undertook a thrust toward the Eritrean port of Assab (Clodfelter 2008, 596-597).

5.56.4.2. Onset: ?/?/1999; Termination: ?/09/1999

5.56.4.3. Eritrea versus Ethiopia

5.56.4.4. Eritrea – Unknown

5.56.4.5. Eritrea – Unknown

5.56.4.6. Ethiopia – Unknown

5.56.4.7. Ethiopia – Unknown
5.56.4.8. Outcome – Unknown

5.56.5. Ethiopian Offensive (Clodfelter 2008, 596-597)

5.56.5.1. After a long lull, Ethiopia commenced a major offensive, May 12, 2000, on the western front. The offensive was extended to the central front, near Zalambessa, on May 23. (Clodfelter 2008, 596-597)
5.56.5.2. Onset: 12/05/2000; Termination: 18/06/2000
5.56.5.3. Eritrea versus Ethiopia
5.56.5.4. Eritrea – Unknown
5.56.5.5. Eritrea – 2,600 captured
5.56.5.6. Ethiopia – Unknown
5.56.5.7. Ethiopia – 1,000 captured
5.56.5.8. Outcome – Ethiopia won. After driving to within a dozen miles of Asmara, Ethiopia agreed to halt their advance and a cease-fire went into effect on June 18 (Clodfelter 2008, 597).

5.57. War for Kosovo

5.57.1. Battle of Kosare (Clodfelter 2008, 582)

5.57.1.1. Milosevic had to deal with a secessionist movement in the ethnic Albanian province of Kosovo, an integral part of Serbia. The conflict there began with the killing of 24 ethnic Albanians by Serbian policemen at Likosane on February 28, 1998 (Clodfelter 2008, 582). The Kosare base is on a hillside about 2.5 miles inside Kosovo on the road from Tropoje towards Junik. It is on one of the main corridors which the KLA was hoping to open, with the help of Nato strikes on Serb positions in western Kosovo, to allow them to bring men and arms from Albania into a liberated pocket which could be expanded.
5.57.1.2. Onset: 09/04/1999; Termination: 10/06/1999
5.57.1.3. Yugoslavia fought Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) with US/NATO air support
5.57.1.4. Yugoslavia – 800 to 1,200 men
5.57.1.5. Yugoslavia – 400 to 600 killed by US/NATO air airstrikes (B-52s)
5.57.1.6. KLA –Operation Arrow, involving up to 4,000 Kosovo Liberation Army guerrillas, was launched last week to drive into Kosovo from two points across its southwestern border with Albania in hopes of capturing control of the highway linking Prizren and Pec, according to KLA fighters in Albania and military officials in Washington (Priest and Finn June 2, 1999);"NATO is seeking to maintain its distance from the KLA, declining to supply the rebels with weapons or an open endorsement of their goal of an independent Kosovo. But NATO's arm's-length approach is difficult because the alliance and the rebels are waging a common battle

against the Belgrade government, and because the KLA has emerged in recent weeks as the sole legitimate political force representing the province's 1.6 million ethnic Albanians. …Widespread revulsion in Albania at the forced expulsions of ethnic Albanians has prompted the government to assist the guerrillas much more directly, turning over trucks and ammunition to the rebels, according to Western and Albanian officials. Also, NATO airstrikes have helped the KLA achieve scattered tactical victories, including the capture of stocks of weapons and ammunition (Finn and Smith April 23, 1999).

5.57.1.7. KLA – at least 7 killed, 27 wounded by US/NATO friendly fire

5.57.1.8. Outcome – KLA won. The capture of Kosare from the Serbs was one of the KLA's most important victories since the mass deportations of ethnic Albanians began

5.57.2. Operation Allied Force (Clodfelter 2008, 582-583; United States Air Force Historical Support Division 2012)

5.57.2.1. To put a halt to this further ethnic cleansing, NATO initiated a bombing campaign, dubbed Operation Allied Force, on March 24, 1999 (Clodfelter 2008, 582). U.S. and NATO Strategic Objectives . . . Demonstrate the seriousness of NATO's opposition to Belgrade's aggression in the Balkans; Deter Milosevic from continuing and escalating his attacks on helpless civilians and create conditions to reverse his ethnic cleansing; Damage Serbia's capacity to wage war against Kosovo in the future or spread the war to neighbors by diminishing or degrading its ability to conduct military operations. When diplomacy failed to end a crisis in the Serbian province of Kosovo in the former Yugoslavia, NATO undertook Operation Allied Force, commanded by Gen. Wesley Clark, to stabilize the region. Calling the American joint force component Operation Noble Anvil, the Clinton administration supported NATO's intervention to protect Kosovo's ethnic Albanian majority from depredations of Serbian troops controlled by President Slobodan Milosevic. American air and sea units cooperated with British forces to target Yugoslav military capabilities within Kosovo and around Belgrade in Serbia, beginning on March 24. The campaign involved more than 31,000 U.S. military personnel and saw the combat debut of the B-2 Stealth bomber. After Serbian forces withdrew from Kosovo, the air campaign was suspended on June 10 and formally ended ten days later (Bryne and Sweeney 2006, 323).

5.57.2.2. Onset: 24/03/1999; Termination: 09/06/1999

5.57.2.3. Yugoslavia versus NATO; NATO countries gave operational or tactical control over their forces to Admiral Ellis as the operational NATO commander. The following NATO allies contributed forces: Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway,

Poland, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, and the United States. Admiral Ellis directed air missions for conventional aircraft through a NATO-releasable air tasking order prepared in the Combined Air Operations Center (CAOC) in Vicenza, Italy. In addition, 16th Air Force prepared a U.S.-only air tasking order for U.S. stealth aircraft (Nardulli et al 2002, 26-27).

5.57.2.4. Yugoslavia – 700 surface-to-air defenses (mostly SA-3s and SA-6s); Approximately 40,000 troops in Kosovo (Lambeth 2001, 9, 57).

5.57.2.5. Yugoslavia – 5,000 killed and 10,000 wounded (NATO estimate; Serbia claimed only 1,800 casualties including 642 soldiers and 114 policemen), 93 tanks lost, 153 APCs lost, 380 artillery pieces and mortars lost (another estimate was 14 tanks, 18 APCs, 20 artillery pieces verifiably destroyed)

5.57.2.6. NATO – 1,000 aircraft, 10,434 bombing missions and 23,000 other missions, 23,000 bombs and missiles against 900 targets in Kosovo and the rest of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), 46 sorties of B-2 bombers (first employment in combat, 6 B-2s dropped 11% of all the air ordinance expended against Yugoslavia), 400 satellite-guided Joint Direct Attack Munitions (JDAMs), 540 Tomahawk cruised missiles. The campaign involved more than 31,000 U.S. military personnel and saw the combat debut of the B-2 Stealth bomber (Bryne and Sweeney 2006, 323). NATO countries gave operational or tactical control over their forces to Admiral Ellis as the operational NATO commander. The following NATO allies contributed forces: Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, and the United States. Admiral Ellis directed air missions for conventional aircraft through a NATO-releasable air tasking order (p. 26) prepared in the Combined Air Operations Center (CAOC) in Vicenza, Italy. In addition, 16th Air Force prepared a U.S.-only air tasking order for U.S. stealth aircraft. (Nardulli et al 2002, 26-27). Approximately 55,600 troops total (Daadler 2000, 157)

5.57.2.7. NATO – No NATO troops killed in combat (2 U.S. pilots were killed in a helicopter crash), 2 U.S, planes lost (1 F-117 and 1 F-16) (Clodfelter 2008, 583).

5.57.2.8. Outcome – NATO won.

5.58. Kargil War

5.58.1. **Battle of Tololing** (Clodfelter 2008, 651)

5.58.1.1. While insurgency tormented the interior of Kashmir, the always uneasy ceasefire line between Pakistan and India often erupted. Much serious was the conflict that commenced on May 14, 1999, when Pakistan crossed the border to occupy five peaks on the Dras-Kargil ridgeline (Clodfelter 2008, 651). When Pakistani

regulars and Mujahaden fighters occupied strategic heights in Indian Kashmir, India counter-attacked in force, with heaviest fighting for 16,000-foot Tololing, overlooking Das and the Srinigar-Leh highway. After initial costly failure, large-scale artillery was introduced and the position was taken by brutal assault. Nearby heights fell and the Pakistanis withdrew (22 May-13 June 1999) (Jaques 2007, 3:1023). Absorbing the initial setbacks and indisputable evidence concerning the extent of the Pakistani incursion, India settled down to prepare for a counteroffensive campaign. India outlined tactical priorities and decided to evict the infiltrators from the Tololing and Tiger Hill complexes as these posed the most direct threat to National Highway-1A, where the Dras-Kargil sector is dominating (Gill 2009, 105).

5.58.1.2. Onset: 10/06/1999; Termination: 13/06/1999

5.58.1.3. India versus Pakistan and Kashmiri Guerillas. Note: After the Kargil War, India reviewed the war and estimated 1,500-2,400 Pakistani troops, both regular (by and large the Northern Light Infantry, NLI) and irregular, were deployed. The regular/irregular ratio may well have been in the range of 70:30. (Kargil Review Committee 2000, 96-97)

5.58.1.4. India – 8 Mountain Divisions (Gill 2009, 114). Unit Size Unknown.

5.58.1.5. India – "India says 297 fighters have been killed on the Pakistani side since last month while India has suffered 104 dead." (CNN June 17, 1999) [Note: These numbers probably include other battles.]

5.58.1.6. Pakistan and Kashmiri Guerillas – Two companies of the 12th Northern Light Infantry and two companies of the Special Service Group (SSG), a Pakistani special force, intruded the Dras sector which includes the Tololing and Tiger Hill complexes in May 1999. (Gill 2009, 99 and 127). Unit Size Unknown.

5.58.1.7. Pakistan and Kashmiri Guerillas – "India says 297 fighters have been killed on the Pakistani side since last month while India has suffered 104 dead." (CNN June 17, 1999) [Note: These numbers probably include other battles.]

5.58.1.8. Outcome – India won. After initial costly failure, large-scale artillery was introduced and the position was taken [by the Indians] by brutal assault. Nearby heights fell and the Pakistanis withdrew (Jaques 2007, 3:1023).

5.58.2. Battle of Tiger Hill (Clodfelter 2008, 651)

5.58.2.1. The success at Tololing allowed 8 Mountain Division to shift resources for the assault on Tiger Hills by the recently induced 192 Mountain Brigade. (Gill 2009, 114)

5.58.2.2. Onset: 02/07/1999; Termination: 04/07/1999

5.58.2.3. India versus Pakistan and Kashmiri Guerillas

5.58.2.4. India – 192 Mountain Brigade (Gill 2009, 115). Unit Size Unknown.

5.58.2.5. India – at least 39 killed or wounded (Gill 2009, 115)

5.58.2.6. Pakistan and Kashmiri Guerillas – Indian officials say 600 to 700 infiltrators are still holed up in high ridges on its side of the Line of Control. (CNN June 17, 1999); Two companies of the 12th Northern Light Infantry and two companies of the Special Service Group (SSG), a Pakistani special force, intruded the Dras sector which includes the Tololing and Tiger Hill complexes in May 1999. (Gill 2009, 99 and 127)

5.58.2.7. Pakistan and Kashmiri Guerillas – Unknown

5.58.2.8. Outcome – India won. By July 3, India regained five peaks and Tiger Hill, was the last to be recovered (Clodfelter 2008, 651).

5.59. Invasion of Afghanistan

5.59.1. **Battle of Mazar-e-Sharif** (Clodfelter 2008, 767)

5.59.1.1. American retribution for September 11 began on October 7, 2001, striking the al-Qaida and Taliban bases in Afghanistan (Clodfelter 2008, 767). U.S. Special Forces began their operations on October 19, 2001, when they joined the 6,000-strong Northern Alliance force under General Abd al-Rashid Dostum in its attack on the strategic city of Mazar-e Sharif along with some 10,000 troops under Fahim Khan and Bissmullah Khan advancing through Panjsher Valley to Kabul. The Special Forces teams called and coordinated close air support provided by Rockwell/Boeing B-1 Lancer and Boeing B-52 Stratofortress bombers, Grumman F-14 Tomcat, McDonnell Douglas/Boeing F-15 Eagle and McDonnell Douglas/Boeing/Northrop F-18 Hornet fighter-bombers, and Fairchild Republic A-10 Thunderbolt II combat support aircraft. These attacked key Taliban command posts, tanks and armored vehicles, artillery pieces, troop concentrations, bunkers, and ammunition storage areas. The heavy application of airpower had a huge and demoralizing psychological effect on the Taliban fighters and allowed Northern Alliance forces to soon seize key strategic targets. On November 9, 2001, the anti-Taliban forces secured Mazar-e Sharif (Tucker 2010, 416-417).

5.59.1.2. Onset: 09/11/2001; Termination: 10/11/2001

5.59.1.3. Afghanistan (Taliban, al Qaeda, Pakistani Taliban) versus the Northern Alliance/the United States

5.59.1.4. Afghanistan (Taliban, al Qaeda, Pakistani Taliban) – There were still large pockets of Taliban and Al Qaeda resistance in Mazar…. But now that Mazar had basically fallen, we had a split. We had 500-600 Taliban, Al Qaeda who decided to stake themselves off and die for the jihad, while the rest continued to flee to the east towards Kunduz. It was the first time when we saw a sort of split in the ranks of the Taliban, where their frustrations and their defeat

really began to affect their operational decisions (Campaign Against Terror, 2002); On 9 November, the forces of Dostum and Atta broke out of the Balkh Valley and, via the Tangi Pass, swept down into the city of Mazar-e-Sharif. On the outskirts of the city, several hundred defiant Pakistani Taliban fighters barricaded themselves in a former girls' school and swore to fight to the death. When the Pakistanis gunned down a party of mullahs seeking to negotiate a surrender, anti-Taliban troops prepared to assault the school compound. ODA 595 guided smart bombs directly into (p. 101) the barricaded building, eliminating all of the fanatical defenders. Shortly afterward, another 3,000 Taliban soldiers surrendered (Briscoe et al 2003, 101-102); Their (Northern Alliance's) opponents, the Taliban armed forces, were thought to number as many as 40,000. Dostum was based in the Dari-a-Souf Valley in the mountains south of Mazar-e-Sharif." (Briscoe et al 2003, 95)

5.59.1.5. Afghanistan (Taliban, al Qaeda, Pakistani Taliban) – several vehicles, a number of antiaircraft guns, and numerous troop concentrations lost (Stewart 2004, 13); The International Committee of the Red Cross and the Afghan Red Crescent say that more than 300 Taliban fighters died in the fighting in the town – 150 of them in and around the school – and that 250 were taken prisoner. Their staff members collected and buried the bodies (Gall 2001).

5.59.1.6. United States and Northern Alliance – The 5th Special Forces Group (Airborne), stationed in Fort Campbell, Kentucky, formed the core of Joint Special Operations Task Force NORTH, called Task Force (TF) DAGGER (12 special forces members) (Stewart 2004, 8 and 10); the Northern Alliance – Approximately 16,000 non-US troops (Tucker 2010, 416)

5.59.1.7. United States and Northern Alliance – United States – Unknown; Northern Alliance – Unknown

5.59.1.8. Outcome – United States and Northern Alliance. More important, the capture of Mazar-e Sharif was the first major victory for the U.S.-led coalition in the war in Afghanistan, giving it a strategic foothold and an airport in northern Afghanistan (Stewart 2004, 14).

5.59.2. Battle of Kunduz (Clodfelter 2008, 767)

5.59.2.1. After the fall of Mazar-e-Sharif and Taloqan, the Special Forces continued its primary mission of assisting the Northern Alliance's combat operations with CAS (close air support) as the Northern Alliance began moving west, toward the city of Kondoz (or Kunduz) (Stewart 2004, 16); Having taken Mazar-i-Sharif, the Northern Alliance turned east to besiege perhaps 10,000 Taliban at Kunduz, including 3,000 Arabs and Chechens determined to fight to the

death. Massive American bombing and fierce ground attack saw the last Taliban stronghold in the north surrender to General Rashid Dostam. Many prisoners died in transports or at Qala-i-Jangi (14-26 November 2001) (Jaques 2006, 2:552).

5.59.2.2. Onset: 11/11/2001; Termination: 23/11/2001

5.59.2.3. Afghanistan (Taliban and al Qaeda, Pakistani Taliban) versus the Northern Alliance/the United States [not clear in Clodfelter's book]

5.59.2.4. Afghanistan (Taliban and al Qaeda Pakistani Taliban) – "Kabul fell without a fight on November 13, and after a 12-day siege, a force of some 5,000 Taliban and al Qaeda survivors encircled in the city of Kunduz surrendered on November 26" (Biddle 2003, 33). Approximately 5,500 fighters.

5.59.2.5. Afghanistan (Taliban and al Qaeda, Pakistani Taliban) – SF [Special Forces]-directed air strikes destroyed 12 tanks, 51 cargo trucks, 44 bunker complexes, and numerous other vehicles and supply dumps while inflicting losses on the Taliban/al Qaeda of around 2,000 killed or wounded . . . Over 3,500 Taliban troops surrendered in the Kondoz area . . . (Stewart 2004, 16)

5.59.2.6. United States and Northern Alliance – United States – 12 special forces members of Task Force (TF) DAGGER. (Stewart 2004, 16); the Northern Alliance – Unknown

5.59.2.7. United States and Northern Alliance – United States – Unknown; Northern Alliance – Unknown

5.59.2.8. The United States and the Northern Alliance won. Kondoz, the last Taliban stronghold in northern Afghanistan, was under Northern Alliance control (Stewart 2004, 16).

5.59.3. Battle of Kabul (Clodfelter 2008, 767)

5.59.3.1. With the 10 November fall of Mazar-e-Sharif, the second largest city in Afghanistan, others fell in rapid succession to the growing anti-Taliban forces. The towns of Bamian in the central region, Taloquan in the north, and Herat in the west surrendered within days, and Konduz was besieged. Then, on 12 and 13 November, Northern Alliance forces, most of which rode standing, jam-packed in large Ginga cargo trucks, literally drove from the trench lines at Bagram into the hastily abandoned capital of Kabul in less than 24 hours (Briscoe et al 2003, 103)

5.59.3.2. Onset: 13/11/2001; Termination: 14/11/2001

5.59.3.3. Afghanistan (Taliban and al Qaeda) versus the Northern Alliance/the United States

5.59.3.4. Afghanistan (Taliban and al Qaeda) – Some 5,000 Taliban defected altogether, which allowed Kabul to be taken without a fight. Another 3,000 Taliban and Al Qaeda personnel were estimated to have escaped into Pakistan…" (Lambeth 2005, 133). Approximately 8,500.

5.59.3.5. Afghanistan (Taliban and al Qaeda) – "From 21 October through 14 November 2001, the Special Forces directed almost continuous CAS missions against the dug-in enemy. The constant air attacks degraded the Taliban/al Qaeda command and control, killed hundreds of entrenched front-line troops, and disrupted their support elements." (Stewart 2004, 15) Approximately 5,500 casualties.

5.59.3.6. United States – 12 special forces members of Task Force (TF) DAGGER. (Stewart 2004, 16); the Northern Alliance – Unknown

5.59.3.7. United States – [not clear but maybe zero because no casualties are mentioned in Stewart 2004]; Northern Alliance – None, since Kabul was "taken without a fight" (Lambeth 2005, 133).

5.59.3.8. The United States and the Northern Alliance won. "[Northern Alliance's] ground forces liberated Kabul without incident" (Stewart 2004, 15).

5.59.4. Battle of Tora Bora (Clodfelter 2008, 767)

5.59.4.1. After the fall of Kabul, al Qaeda and Taliban forces had retreated into major strongholds in the Tora Bora Mountains south of Jalalabad near the Pakistani border, some of the most rugged terrain in the world (Stewart 2004, 26). "About 40 U.S. Special Forces troops from Task Force Dagger directed the efforts of three separate tribes of indigenous anti-Taliban militia against this complex of caves and trenches at an al-Qaeda training base in the rugged Tora Bora mountains, south of Jalalabad. British Special Air Service commandos also participated. Following an aerial bombardment starting on November 30, ground forces began their assault on December 5, meeting determined opposition. Repeated air strikes (including use of the 7.5-ton "daisy cutter" bomb) and ground skirmishes resulted in an estimated 300 enemy dead and between 60 or more (some estimated 150) captured. Yet, because the encirclement was incomplete on the porous Pakistani border and Afghan forces proved hesitant in battle, at least 1,000 al-Qaeda fighters slipped away, likely including their leader Osama bin Laden, a key target for the Americans. Afghan guerrilla leaders declared victory on December 17. Disappointed U.S. strategists, however, altered their methods, choosing to rely more heavily on American troops and less on indigenous forces as they continued to search the caves during the next few months" (Bryne and Sweeney 2006, 325).

5.59.4.2. Onset: 16/11/2001; Termination: 16/12/2001

5.59.4.3. Afghanistan (Taliban and al Qaeda) versus the Northern Alliance/the United States

5.59.4.4. Afghanistan (Taliban and al Qaeda) – Approximately 1,500 (Kerry 2009, 5, 14)

5.59.4.5. Afghanistan (Taliban and al Qaeda) – "The SF soldiers had called in hundreds of air strikes, dropping thousands of tons of munitions and killing hundreds of enemy troops. A few al Qaeda were captured, but most of them fought to the death or slipped away into the relative safety of nearby Pakistan. The whereabouts of Osama bin Laden, or even whether he had been in the Tora Bora region in the first place, remained a mystery" (Stewart 2004, 27). Approximately 450 casualties (Bryne and Sweeney 2006, 325).

5.59.4.6. United States – 90, Northern Alliance – approximately 2,000. Total approximately 2,100 (Kerry 2009, 5, 11)

5.59.4.7. United States – Unknown; Northern Alliance – Unknown

5.59.4.8. The United States and the Northern Alliance won. "With the capture of Kabul and Kandahar and the destruction of organized resistance in Tora Bora, Afghanistan was now in effect liberated" (Stewart 2004, 27).

5.59.5. Battle of Kandahar (Clodfelter 2008, 767)

5.59.5.1. Following the tactical successes in northern Afghanistan, Kandahar, far to the south, was to be the next U.S. objective. Military planners suspected that it would be the hardest city to take. The populous city was a long way from the Northern Alliance strongholds in the north, was of a different ethnic makeup-Pashtuns, not Tajiks-and was the spiritual and political center of the Taliban movement. With few opposition leaders or forces in the area to work with, its capture might take months, or even be delayed until spring. Still, two separate SF elements infiltrated into the region and approached the city from the north and the south, with their supported host nation commanders picking up support all along the way (Stewart 2004, 21). "Under the command of Lt. Col Dave Fox, U.S. Special Forces working with two groups of anti-Taliban forces, led by Hamid Karzai and Gul Agha Sharzai, began to move on the city of Kandahar from the north and south, respectively, while bombing attacks weakened the enemy. The northern force began its advance on November 30, meeting light resistance except for firefights at Sayed Alam-a-Kalay (Dec 3) and Shalawi Kowt (Dec 5), when a friendly fire incident at the latter site killed three Americans and 23 or more Karzai's irregulars. The advance, however, continued. Meanwhile, Sharzai's forces captured the airfield and cut a main road from south of the city. Negotiations for a surrender ensued, but the Taliban forces fled their last remaining stronghold in the country and Kandahar was occupied on December 7" (Bryne and Sweeney 2006, 325).

5.59.5.2. Onset: 22/11/2001; Termination: 07/12/2001

5.59.5.3. Afghanistan (Taliban and al Qaeda) versus two anti-Taliban forces led by Hamid Karzai (a charismatic Pashtun tribal leader born near Kandahar, was both pro-western and anti-Taliban) and

Gul Sharzai (the former governor of Kandahar)/the United States [not clear in Clodfelter's book] (Stewart 2004, 21 and 24).

5.59.5.4. Afghanistan (Taliban and al Qaeda) – Unknown

5.59.5.5. Afghanistan (Taliban and al Qaeda) – Unknown

5.59.5.6. United States – two Special Forces teams (Stewart 2004, 21); Hamid Karzai's forces – 800 troops (Stewart 2004, 22); Gul Sharzai's forces – 800 troops (Stewart 2004, 24)

5.59.5.7. United States – 3 SF members killed by friendly fire; 1 SF member wounded (Stewart 2004, 23); Hamid Karzai's forces – at least 23; Gul Sharzai's forces – Unknown

5.59.5.8. The United States and two anti-Taliban forces won. "The city had fallen without a shot, and Karzai subsequently confirmed Sharzai as the governor of the city" (Stewart 2004, 25).

5.59.6. Operation Anaconda (Clodfelter 2008, 767)

5.59.6.1. Though the Northern Alliance held firm control of the north and the Taliban had been chased from the cities by the beginning of 2002, the Muslim militants and their al-Qaida allies still roamed much of the countryside in southern Afghanistan. To ferret out these enemy hold-out units, the United States conducted Operation Anaconda, March 1-16, 2002, in the Shahi-Kot Valley, near Gardez. (Clodfelter 2008, 767) "The purpose of this operation was to root out bands of Taliban and al-Qaeda fighters over 60 to 70 square miles in the Shah-i-Kot Valley and its rugged, snowy mountains (8,000-12,000 ft.) in eastern Afghanistan near Gardez. …Designed quickly to encircle and squeeze the enemy, the operation instead ran into heavy resistance in close fighting in cave complexes on March 2, and fierce fighting at the Takur Ghar ridge on March 4 cost the lives of seven U.S. Rangers. Heavy combat continued to March 12, and the operation ended on March 17. (Bryne and Sweeney 2006, 325-326).

5.59.6.2. Onset: 01/03/2002; Termination: 16/03/2002

5.59.6.3. Afghanistan (Taliban and al Qaeda) versus U.S.-led Coalition (United States, Afghanistan (anti-Taliban forces), Canada, Norway, Denmark, Germany, Australia, New Zealand, and Turkey).

5.59.6.4. Afghanistan (Taliban and al Qaeda) – Approximately 1,000 (Kugler 2007, 6)

5.59.6.5. Afghanistan (Taliban and al Qaeda) – U.S. command estimated over 500 enemy dead, but few bodies were found; hundreds likely escaped. (Bryne and Sweeney 2006, 325-326)

5.59.6.6. Coalition – Under the command of Gen. Franklin L. Hagenbeck, about 900 troops from the 10th Mountain Division, the 101st Airborne and Special Forces teams joined with 200 soldiers from six Coalition partners and eventually 2,000 Afghan troops. Approximately 3,100 troops. (Bryne and Sweeney 2006, 325-326)

5.59.6.7. Coalition – 11 dead, eight of them American. (Bryne and Sweeney 2006, 325-326). Approximately 60 total US casualties – 8 KIA and 50+ WIA (Kugler 2007, 1). 17 Afghan casualties (Kugler 2009, 3). 77 total casualties.

5.59.6.8. U.S.-led Coalition won. "Declaring the entire operation highly successful, General Franks, the commander of Central Command, declared Operation ANACONDA officially over on 19 March" (Stewart 2004, 44).

5.60. Invasion of Iraq

5.60.1. Battle of Al Faw (Clodfelter 2008, 769-770)

5.60.1.1. "On the evening of March 20, 2003, the British 1st Armoured Division crossed into Iraq, led by the U.S. 15th Marine Expeditionary Unit (MEU). The immediate target was the Rumaila oil fields and the oil terminals on the Al-Faw Peninsula. The 7th Armoured Brigade and the 16th Air Assault Brigade [under the British 1st Armoured Division] would provide back-up to special forces in taking the oil fields." (Murray and Scales, Jr. 2003, 131)

5.60.1.2. Onset: 20/03/2003; Termination: 24/03/2003

5.60.1.3. Iraq versus Coalition of the Willing (United States, United Kingdom, Poland) (Carney 2011, 98)

5.60.1.4. Iraq – Unknown

5.60.1.5. Iraq – about 40 killed

5.60.1.6. Coalition of the Willing - United States – 100 SEALs; United Kingdom – 4,000 troops (mostly 3 Commando Brigade, Royal Marines under the British 1st Armoured Division), and Royal naval forces (Carney 2011, 9); Poland – special forces and naval support. The first contingent consisted of 125 soldiers from the elite GROM commando unit and 24 "Marine Division," along with 74 chemical and biological warfare troops from 4 Brodnicki Pułk Chemiczny (Carney 2011, 9). Approximately 4,225 troops.

5.60.1.7. Coaliton of the Willing – United States – No fatal casualties in SEALs; United Kingdom – Unknown (Clodfelter 2008, 769); Poland – Unknown

5.60.1.8. Coalition of the Willing won. SEALs seized the al-Faw oil facilities on March 20, and the British troops seized the al-Faw Peninsula on March 21 (Clodfelter 2008, 769-770).

5.60.2. Battle of Um Qasr (Clodfelter 2008, 769-770)

5.60.2.1. On March 21, the U.S. Marines attempted to seize the post of Um Qasr. (Clodfelter 2008, 769-770) "At the start of the war, British marines established a bridgehead on the Al Faw Peninsula, then joined American forces advancing on Umm Qasr, Iraq's only deep water port, which fell after tanks and helicopters overcame stiff resistance. The first humanitarian aid ship arrived three days later, while British forces contained Basra and the Americans

moved north towards Nasiriya" (Jaques 2006, 3:1053); "Another British force, the 16th Air Assault Brigade, secured the oil fields in southern Iraq around Rumaylah, while Polish commandos captured offshore oil platforms near Umm Qasr. These forces completed all tasks successfully." (Carney 2011, 10)

5.60.2.2. Onset: 21/03/2003; Termination: 24/03/2003

5.60.2.3. Iraq and Fedayeen versus Coalition of the Willing (United States, the United Kingdom, and Poland) (Carney 2011, 9; Cordesman 2003, 60)

5.60.2.4. Iraq and Fedayeen - Unknown

5.60.2.5. Iraq and Fedayeen – Unknown

5.60.2.6. Coalition of the Willing – United States – Marines (15th Marine Expeditionary Unit (MEU); United Kingdom – 4,000 troops (mostly 3 Commando Brigade, Royal Marines) (United Kingdom Ministry of Defence 2003, 11); Poland – special forces

5.60.2.7. United States – Unknown; United Kingdom – Unknown; Poland – Unknown

5.60.2.8. Coalition of the Willing won. "3 Commando Brigade held critical oil infrastructure at Al Faw and the port of Umm Qasr" (United Kingdom Ministry of Defence 2003, 25).

5.60.3. Battle of Basra (Clodfelter 2008, 769-770)

5.60.3.1. The United States ordered a lightning offensive against Iraq on March 20, 2003. While the U.S. raced for Baghdad, the U.K. was securing Basra, in the south. Operation James was launched on March 30 (Clodfelter 2008, 769-770). "In order to accomplish its mission and tasks, 1 (UK) Armoured Division needed to achieve success in five key areas: the Iraqi Armed Forces would have to be defeated (in this context meaning unable to interfere with coalition operations); Iraqi irregulars would have to be overcome; the southern oilfield infrastructure – Iraq's future wealth – seized intact and defended; the port of Umm Qasr captured and opened for use; and Saddam Hussein's regime removed from control of urban areas, critically Basrah, Iraq's second largest city" (United Kingdom Ministry of Defence 2003, 25).

5.60.3.2. Onset: 21/03/2003; Termination: 06/04/2003

5.60.3.3. Iraq and Fedayeen versus the Coalition of the Willing (United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, and Poland)

5.60.3.4. Iraq and Fedayeen – 3,000 troops (Clodfelter 2008, 770)

5.60.3.5. Iraq – 70 killed, 300 captured, 29 tanks lost, 200 more killed or wounded

5.60.3.6. Coalition of the Willing – United Kingdom – 7 Armoured Brigade, 3 Cdo Brigade; 7,000 troops, 80 tanks, 100 APCs (Murray and Scales, Jr. 2003, Map of Battle for Basra, March and April 2003, between 152 and 153); United States – ANGLICO (Air-Naval-Gunfire Liaison Company) teams of U.S. Marines interspersed

among the British attacking columns (Murray and Scales, Jr. 2003, 151), air support (Sydney Morning Herald, March 31, 2003); Australia – air support (Sydney Morning Herald, March 31, 2003); Poland – special forces ("Polish and U.K. special units in the Naval Task Force conducted operations around Umm Qasr and Al Basrah." (Carney 2011, 9) Approximately 7,250 troops.

5.60.3.7. Coalition of the Willing – United Kingdom – 2 Royal Marines killed (Clodfelter 2008, 770); United States – Unknown; Australia – Unknown; Poland – Unknown

5.60.3.8. Coalition of the Willing won. "6 Apr UK troops enter and remain in Basrah encountering little opposition" (United Kingdom Ministry of Defence 2003, 74); Basra was secured by April 7 (Clodfelter 2008, 770).

5.60.4. Battle of Nasiriya (Clodfelter 2008, 769-770)

5.60.4.1. The first ground action took place on March 20, in an attempt to seize the al-Faw oil facilities to prevent Iraqi sabotage. March 23 was the bloodiest day of the conventional campaign for the invaders. The battle for the Nasiriya bridges continued until March 27. (Clodfelter 2008, 769-770)

5.60.4.2. Onset: 23/03/2003; Termination: 29/03/2003

5.60.4.3. Iraq and Fedayeen versus the Coalition of the Willing (United States and United Kingdom)

5.60.4.4. Iraq – 400 troops of the 11th Medina Infantry Division, hundreds of Fedayeen militiamen; approximately 700 total

5.60.4.5. Iraq – "Numerous prisoners were taken, including an Iraqi brigadier general" (Snakenberg 2010, 39); "Iraqi casualties are impossible to estimate" (Snakenberg 2010, 40).

5.60.4.6. United States – 5,000 Marines (2nd Marine Expeditionary Brigade, "Task Force Tarawa" (Murray and Scales, Jr. 2003, 119), 1st Marine Division (Murray and Scales, Jr. 2003, 124)); United Kingdom – one parachute regiment (Murray and Scales, Jr. 2003, 142). Unit Size Unknown.

5.60.4.7. Coalition of the Willing – United States – 29 killed just on March 23. (Clodfelter 2008, 770; Snakenberg 2010, 39); "In all, the U.S. suffered 33 killed, 66 wounded, and 7 captured" (Snakenberg 2010, 40); United Kingdom – Unknown

5.60.4.8. United States won. "By 26 March, Iraqi resistance was contained, although the city was not fully secured until 2 April" (Snakenberg 2010, 40).

5.60.5. Battle of Karbala (Clodfelter 2008, 769-770)

5.60.5.1. "U.S. forces attempted to evict Iraqi forces from Karbala. Units involved in the fight included those from the U.S. 3rd Infantry Division, having pushed their way through Republican Guard forces southeast of Karbala, arrived in the area on March 31. While some

troops kept a watchful eye on the Iraqis in Karbala, the main body bypassed the city and attacked Baghdad through the Karbala Gap. (Tucker 2010, 672).

5.60.5.2. Onset: 23/03/2003; Termination: 06/04/2003

5.60.5.3. Iraq versus the United States

5.60.5.4. Iraq – Medina Division, paramilitary forces (2,000 to 3,000 fighters (Fontenot et al 2004, 101).

5.60.5.5. Iraq – 400 killed

5.60.5.6. United States – 101st Airborne, 3rd Infantry Division (Cordesman 2003, 70)

5.60.5.7. United States –1 killed and 6 wounded (Clodfelter 2008, 770)

5.60.5.8. United States won. "The 101st captured Karbala, April 5-6 . . ." (Clodfelter 2008, 770).

5.60.6. Battle of Najaf (Clodfelter 2008, 769-770)

5.60.6.1. On the main front, the 3rd Marine Division encountered significant opposition around Najaf between March 24-27 (Clodfelter 2008, 769-770); "Like As Samawah, An Najaf is located along the Euphrates River with several key bridges across the river. Highway 9 parallels the river and runs directly through the town. Highway 28 also parallels the river but runs several kilometers to the west of the town. Any Iraqi forces in the town, conventional or paramilitary, could interdict travel along both highways and disrupt the corps' planned attack through Karbala" (Fontenot et al 2004, 195).

5.60.6.2. Onset: 24/03/2003; Termination: 04/04/2003

5.60.6.3. Iraq and Fedayeen versus the Coalition of the Willing (United States and United Kingdom)

5.60.6.4. Iraq – Unknown, paramilitary forces (1,400-2,100 fighters committed (Fontenot et al 2004, 197)

5.60.6.5. Iraq – 1,000 killed; wounded unknown

5.60.6.6. United States – 101st Airborne, 3rd Infantry Division. 8,000 troops from 101st Airborne, combined infantry and helicopter units (Bryne and Sweeney 2006, 327); United Kingdom – air support (RAF Tornados).

5.60.6.7. United States – 4 killed, 2 tanks lost (Clodfelter 2008, 770); United Kingdom – Unknown

5.60.6.8. Coalition of the Willing won. The 101st mopped up resistance in Najaf. (Clodfelter 2008, 770).

5.60.7. Battle of Samawah

5.60.7.1. Battle Description

5.60.7.2. Onset: 30/03/2003; Termination: 04/04/2003

5.60.7.3. Iraq and Fedayeen versus the United States

5.60.7.4. Iraq and Fedayeen – "Iraqis had a company of Republican Guards, some local Fedayeen (estimated at approximately 300 to

350), about 200 to 250 Ba'ath Party militia, and approximately 100 to 150 Al Quds. There were other enemy forces, however . . . Hundreds of Arab volunteers had entered Iraq from Syria and Jordan in recent weeks. US troops would soon be fighting non-Iraqi Arab fighters in several districts. According to eyewitness reports, 40 to 50 volunteer fighters from Syria had joined the forces battling US troops in As Samawah" (Fontenot et al 2004, 213)

5.60.7.5. Iraq and Fedayeen – "the brigade estimated that it killed from 300 to 400 Iraqis and destroyed approximately 30 civilian trucks mounting heavy machine guns" (Fontenot et al 2004, 281).

5.60.7.6. United States – 2nd Brigade of the 82nd Airborne Division, TF 1-41 IN, a mechanized infantry unit originally from the 1st Armored Division (Fontenot et al 2004, 213). Unit Size Unknown.

5.60.7.7. United States – Unknown

5.60.7.8. United States won. "The 101st would secure An Najaf and control the LOCs around that city, while the 82nd achieved similar results at As Samawah" (Fontenot et al 2004, 260).

5.60.8. Battle of Hillah

5.60.8.1. 101st Airborne commander Gen. Petraeus was ordered to attack Iraqi forces in Al Hillah, pinning them down so that coalition forces could approach Baghdad from the southwest after having secured the Karbala Gap. His 2nd Brigade Combat Team was opposed by irregular forces – fedayeen – but also by soldiers from the elite Republican Guard's Hammurabi Division, resulting in one of the few instances of a determined defense by Iraq's regular army. The battle began on April 2 and consumed an enormous amount or ordnance as helicopters, fighter-bombers and artillery supported a ground assault on the stronghold. As the fighting intensified, Petraeus committed his 3rd Brigade Combat Team to clear the city, which was accomplished by April 10 in heavy urban fighting" (Bryne and Sweeney 2006, 328).

5.60.8.2. Onset: 31/03/2003; Termination: 02/04/2003

5.60.8.3. Iraq versus the United States

5.60.8.4. Iraq – "a brigade of the Nebuchadnezzar Division" (Fontenot et al 2004, 248); Republican Guard brigade estimated size at 2850 per Appendix IV; Republican Guard's Hammurabi Division (Murray and Scales Jr. 2003, 201), Fedayeen (Murray and Scales Jr. 2003, 202). Unit Size Unknown.

5.60.8.5. Iraq – Some 250 killed (Fontenot et al 2004, 276).

5.60.8.6. United States – 101st Airborne Division (Fontenot et al 2004, 273); 101st Airborne Division estimated at 20000 per Appendix IV

5.60.8.7. United States – Unknown

5.60.8.8. United States won. "Although the Iraqis . . . in Al Hillah fought hard, resistance collapsed the next day" (Fontenot et al 2004, 249).

5.60.9. Battle of Karbala Gap

5.60.9.1. The 3rd Infantry Division's advance on Baghdad from the southwest depended on its control of the Karbala Gap, a strip of land 25 miles wide with bridges over the Euphrates River. Following a series of air attacks on the Iraqi Republican Guard units defending the area, the 1st and 2nd Brigade Combat Teams launched an offensive on April 1, meeting stiff resistance. Rangers captured the important Hadithah Dam, the destruction of which would have flooded the invasion route, and defended the dam while enduring heavy fighting for two weeks. Late in the afternoon of April 2, a platoon managed to cross a bridge that the Iraqis then tried to blow up. When the bridge failed to collapse, U.S. engineers secured it and built a second crossing. The path to Baghdad was open" (Bryne and Sweeney 2006, 327-328).

5.60.9.2. Onset: 02/04/2003; Termination: 04/04/2003

5.60.9.3. Iraq versus the United States

5.60.9.4. Iraq – Medina Division (Fontenot et al 2004, 245); "[The Karbala gap] was defended by the Baghdad Division and elements of the Nebuchadenezzar Division. Most of those were arrayed further up to the northwest" (Cordesman 2003, 78.) Approximately 14400 troops based on Appendix IV note on unit sizing (both are Republican Guard units)

5.60.9.5. Iraq – Approximately 300 casualties (Bryne and Sweeney 2006, 327-328)

5.60.9.6. United States – 3rd Infantry Division (Fontenot et al 2004, 245); approximately 20,000 troops.

5.60.9.7. United States – Unknown

5.60.9.8. United States won. "After V Corps completed its operations to attack through the Karbala Gap, it left one unfinished piece of business—cleaning up Al Hillah" (Fontenot et al 2004, 248).

5.60.10. Battle of Al Kut

5.60.10.1. "On 3 April, the division attacked to destroy the Baghdad Republican Guard Division at Al Kut. RCT-7 attacked from the west along Highway 6 north of the Tigris (supported by 3/11 and reinforced by 5/11), and RCT-1 fixed the enemy division from the south along Highway 7 (supported by 1/11)." (Kennedy et al 2006, 104).

5.60.10.2. Onset: 03/04/2003; Termination: 04/04/2003

5.60.10.3. Iraq versus the United States

5.60.10.4. Iraq – Baghdad Republican Guard Division (Groen 2006, 251). Unit Size Unknown.

5.60.10.5. Iraq – Unknown

5.60.10.6. United States – 1st Marine Division (Groen 2006, 251); 1st Marine Regiment of the 1st Marine Division (Murray and Scales, Jr. 2003, 224-225). Unit Size Unknown.

5.60.10.7. United States – 1 killed and 13 wounded (Kennedy et al 2006, 2)

5.60.10.8. United States won.

5.60.11. Battle of Baghdad (Clodfelter 2008, 769-770)

5.60.11.1. "While the 1st Marine Division approached Baghdad from the south and east, the 3rd Army Infantry Division was poised west of the city. On April 5 Col. Dave Perkins's 2nd Brigade Combat Team (BCT) made the initial ground assault on Baghdad, executing a rapid "thunder run" by Task Force 1-64 Armor into and out of the city center. After the 3rd BCT blocked the city's northern exit on April 6, Perkins conducted a second run on April 7 and into the morning of April 8, the troops and armored vehicles remaining in the heart of the city despite determined and skilled opposition from fedayeen fighters. Marine infantry, meanwhile, entered the city from the south and east at four separate points, having fought their way across a makeshift bridge spanning the Diyalah River while the U.S. Naval Construction Force (Seabees) constructed another in 20 hours. The allied military fully occupied the city on April 9" (Bryne and Sweeney 2006, 328)

5.60.11.2. Onset: 03/04/2003; Termination: 12/04/2003

5.60.11.3. Iraq versus the Coalition of the Willing (United States and United Kingdom)

5.60.11.4. Iraq – Republican Guard; Special Republican Guard (SRG), a force of approximately 15,000 soldiers (Fontenot et al 2004, 99 and 378); Fedayeen – several hundreds from Syria, Jordan, Egypt and other Middle Eastern and African countries (Murray and Scales, Jr. 2003, 228)

5.60.11.5. Iraq – 1,650 killed or wounded, 100 military vehicles destroyed

5.60.11.6. Coalition of the Willing – United States – 3rd Infantry Division, the 1st Marine Division (Fontenot et al 2004, 377); and United Kingdom – air support (Harrier GR7 attack jets) and special forces (SAS) on the ground as "forward air controllers" (Rory McCarthy et al, The Guardian, March 25, 2003). Unit Size Unknown.

5.60.11.7. Coalition of the Willing - United States – 3 killed, 6 wounded, 1 tank lost (Clodfelter 2008, 770); United Kingdom – Unknown

5.60.11.8. Coalition of the Willing won.

Appendix I: Unit Sizes

Unit Size World War I

Austria-Hungry:

Clodfelter Reported Unit Size: Infantry division – 15,000 men; Two infantry divisions composed a corps – plus a cavalry squadron and two 4-gun heavy howitzer batteries; Cavalry division – 4,500 men.

For other sources that report Austro-Hungarian unit size see: Deak 1990, 18; Ellis and Cox 2001.

Belgium:

No Clodfelter unit size figures available.

Accordingly, we rely on Ellis and Cox 2001 who report that in 1914 a division comprised of 31,196 officers and men.

For other sources that report Austro-Hungarian unit size see: Gray 1991, 25

France:

Clodfelter Reported Unit Size: Infantry division – 15,000 men; Two divisions make up an Infantry Corps, which also contained a reserve infantry brigade of 2 regiments plus 4 battalions of three 4-gun artillery batteries. An additional cavalry regiment of 4 squadrons was also attached; Cavalry division – 4,500 men.

For other sources that report French unit size see: Center for Military History 1988, 80-81: Ellis and Cox 2001; Greenhalgh 2014, 26-34; Grey 1991, 25, Stevenson 2004, xvii.

Germany:

Clodfelter Reported Unit Size: Infantry division – 17,000 men; Two Infantry divisions make up an Infantry Corps; Cavalry division – 5,200 men

For other sources that report German unit size see: Center for Military History 1988, 80; Ellis and Cox 2001; Stevenson 2004, xvii;.

Italy:

No Clodfelter unit size figures available.

Accordingly, we rely on Ellis and Cox 2001: Infantry division – 14,200 officers & men; Cavalry division – 4,200 officers & men.

Romania:

No Clodfelter unit size figures available.

Accordingly, we rely on Ellis and Cox 2001: Infantry division – 20,000 officers & men; Cavalry division – 5,280 officers & men

Russia:

Clodfelter Reported Unit Size: Infantry division – 20,000 men**;** Infantry Corps – 2 infantry divisions plus 2 additional 6-gun batteries**;** Cavalry division – 4,500 men.

For other sources that report Russian unit size see: Ellis and Cox 2001.

Turkey:

No Clodfelter unit size figures available.

Accordingly, we rely on Ellis and Cox 2001: Infantry Battalion: 1,081 x 3= 3,240; Infantry Regiment: 3,240 x 3 = 9,720; Infantry Division: 11,146; Artillery Regiment: 948-1,422; Calvary Regiment: 647

For other sources that report Russian unit size see: Erickson 2007, 8.

United Kingdom

Clodfelter Reported Unit Size: Infantry division – 18,000 men**;** Cavalry division – 9,269 men. Ellis and Cox 2001: Infantry Battalion: 1,000 officers and men.

For other sources that report United Kingdom unit size see: Beckett 2006, 41 and 44; Center for Military History 1988, 80-81**;** Ellis and Cox 2001; Grey 1991, 25; Stevenson 2004, xvii.

United States

No Clodfelter unit size figures available.

Accordingly, we rely on Ellis and Cox 2001: Infantry – 28,105 officers and men (we round to 28,000).

For other sources that report United Kingdom unit size see: Ayres 1919, 35; Center for Military History 1988, 115-117, 161-294, and 339**;** Ellis and Cox 2001; Grey 1991, 25; Stevenson 2004, xvii.

Unit Size World War II

Canada:

No Clodfelter unit size figures available.

Accordingly, we rely on Ellis 1993, 201: Canadian forces were organized and equipped in the same was as UK forces. See that entry for details.

France:

No Clodfelter unit size figures available.

Accordingly, we rely on Ellis 1993, 202: Infantry – 17,500.

For other sources that report French unit size see Clark and Smith 1993, 26-69.

Germany:

No Clodfelter unit size figures available.

Accordingly, we rely on Ellis 1993, 203-205: 1939 Infantry Division: 17,200 officers and men; 1942 Infantry Division: 12,352 officers and men; 1944 Infantry Division: 12,352. A 1941 Panzer Division comprised of 15,600 men; 1944 Panzer division 13,276 men.

For other sources that report German unit size see Ellis 1962, 553 and Ellis 2009a.

Hungary:

No Clodfelter unit size figures available.

Accordingly, we rely on Ellis 1993, 208: 1941 Infantry Division: 11,000 men; 1941 Mobile Corps 24,000 men.

Italy:

No Clodfelter unit size figures available.

Accordingly, we rely on Ellis 1993, 209: 1940 Infantry – 14,300. A North Africa and Libyan Division Infantry Division were smaller totaling 7,400 men.

Japan:

Clodfelter Reported Unit Size: Infantry division – 26,691 personnel**;** A Japanese infantry division consisted of 3 infantry regiments [6,167 men]; a division HQ; an artillery regiment of 3,490 men; an artillery mortar battalion of 824 men; an infantry mortar battalion of 591 men; a recon regiment of 730 men; a tank battalion of 720 men; a divisional signal unit of 285 men; and medical units totaling 1085 personnel (Clodfelter 2008, 520).

Romania:

No Clodfelter unit size figures available.

Accordingly, we rely on Ellis 1993, 216: In 1941 infantry divisions numbered 17,500 officers and men. In 1942 infantry divisions numbered 13,500 officers and men. By 1944 divisions were back to an official establishment of over 17000 officers and men. The divisions that fought with the Russians in 1945 had only some 9000 officers and men. In 1942 a cavalry division included 6500 officers and men. By 1944 these divisions comprised of four cavalry regiments and had a strength of about 10,000 officers and men.

Soviet Union

Clodfelter Reported Unit Size**:** Infantry Division: Typical strength 14,500 men; Tank Corps: 7,000 men; Mechanized Corps: 17,000 men (Clodfelter 2008, 480).

United States:

Clodfelter Reported Unit Size for the Pacific Theater**:** Infantry Division – 13,926 personnel strength; Regiment – 3,256 personnel strength; Battalion – 3 rifle

companies (of 193 men), battalion HQ, a headquarters company, and a heavy weapons company of 166 men – 745 personnel strength

Ellis 1993, 220: In 1943 an Infantry Division comprised of 14,253 men; an Armored Division comprised of 10,937; in 1942 an airborne division comprised of 8,505 men.

For other sources that report United States unit size see Ellis 1962, 541 and Ellis 2009a.

United Kingdom:

No Clodfelter unit size figures available.

We rely on Biddle 2004, 535: Infantry division – 18,347; Armored division – 14,964.

For other sources that report UK unit size see Ellis 1962, 553; Ellis 1993, 217; Ellis 2009a, Appendix I; Sebag-Montefiore 2008.

Unit Size for Non-World Wars

Third Central American War

Castillo gives a good order of battle of the Guatemalan brigade from its departure from Asuncion to its deployment in Mongoy (Castillo 1960, 64-68). Ortega provides data on the average manpower and organization of Guatemalan battalions during the campaign (Ortega 2014, 85). Garcia provides precise data on the Guatemalan artillery units and corps (Garcia 1902, 16-17).

First Balkan War

See Hall 2000, 22-28.

Third Sino Japanese War

Japanese infantry division in 1937 had a paper strength of 21,945 men and 5,849 horses (Clodfelter 2008, 391).

Chinese division supposed to have 10,923 soldiers but only 10 divisions were fully up to strength, most had only 4,000-6,000 men, and some had just 3,000.

Russo-Finish War

Finland Division Size – 14,200 men to a division (Clodfelter 2008, 465).

Second Spanish-Moroccan War

See Gallego 2005, 67-67 and 99-101.

1948 Israeli War

Israel. By the end of the British Mandate (in May 1948), the Haganah forces consisted of the following numbers (Gal 1986, 27; Luttwak and Horwitz 1975, 34, report the same numbers; Dupuy1978, 43-44 has slightly lower figures)

Palmach (three brigades)	6,000
Ground forces by brigades	
Golani	4,095
Carmeli	2,238
Alexandroni	3,588
Kiryati	2,504
Givati	3,229
Etzioni	3,166
Training	398
Air Force	675
Artillery	650
Engineers	150
Military Police	168
Transport units	1,097
New conscripts in training	1,719

Note: As the numerical strength of the Haganah increased with the inflow of new recruits, the process of militarization begun in November 1947 was taken a stage further: the battalions of the Hish, now larger and manned on a full-time basis, were formed into six brigades of 3-4,000 men each (Luttwak and Horowitz 1975, 27)

Korean War

North Korea. The North Korean infantry division at full strength numbered 11,000 men (Appleman 1992, 12). At the first battle of Naktong Bulge estimated North Korean division had a total strength of about 7,000 men with about 1,500 men in each of the infantry regiments (Applemen 1992, 293).

China. In general, the strength of one army is 21,000 to 30,000; one division is 8,000 to 10,000; one regiment is 3,000 (Mossman 1990, 54).

United States. Full strength Battalion was 880 men, 5 warrent officers and 34 officers (Ney 1968, 183).

Assam War

Standard Infantry Division for China in 1964 had a total strength of 13,914. Standard Infantry Division (Light) had a total strength of 13,195 (Defense Intelligence Agency 1964, Chinese Communist Military Logistics and Capabilities: Tab A-Capabilities on the Sino-Indian/Nepalese Frontier, Annex IA and Annex IB).

Vietnam War

United States. In 1963 a battalion consisted of 792 men, 2 warrant officers and 37 officers (Ney 1968, 183; See also Rottman 2013, 25). In September, the present-for-duty strength of the 66 US combat maneuver battalions in South Vietnam (48 US Army, 18 USMC) averaged 92 percent. The authorized strength of a US infantry battalion in South Vietnam is 837 and that of a US Marine infantry battalion is 1,200. (CIA Report 1966 – The South Vietnamese Army Today, Pg 9). Each battalion, trained in airmobile tactics and techniques, had an authorized strength of 767 officers and men, significantly fewer than the 849 in a standard infantry battalion (Carland 2000, 62).

South Vietnam. For June 1965 average government infantry battalion is reported to number about 350 effectives, although some general reserve units are fielding about 650 men (CIA Report 1965 – Developments in South Vietnam During the Past Year – pg 13). Collins 1975 reports 450 per battalion (Collins 1975, 62). As of September 1966, the average present-for-duty strength for the 158 ARVN maneuver battalions was 458, or 63% of the authorized strength of 714. Beyond this, the limited mobility capability of the ARVN, and its continuing requirement to provide security for populated areas, tends to reduce even further the actual number of troops available for offensive operations. For example, many infantry and ranger battalions are frequently unable to put more than 250 to 300 men into a field operation, compared with the 400 to 600 men in a Communist main force or provincial battalion. (CIA Report 1966 – The South Vietnamese Army Today, Pg 9).

Viet Cong. VC battalions, while varying form 250 to over 700, average about 240 CIA Report 1965 – Developments in South Vietnam During the Past Year – pg 13). Standard NVA infantry battalions ranged between 450 and 600 soldiers (Lanning and Cragg 2008, 83).

Viet Cong and North Vietnamese Army Forces (See CIA 1968 Report – The Probable Strength of the Viet Cong Main and Local and North Vietnamese Army Forces in South Vietnam 31 Janurary 1968 – Appendix B)

Appendix B

Service and Support Troops Integral to Divisions Listed in the MACV OB a/

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Divisions	Overall Divisional Strength	Troops Assigned to Regiments	Divisional Headquarters and Support Troops	Integral Service and Support Battalions	Troops Assigned to Service and Support Battalions	Total Service & Support Troops (Columns 4 & 6)
NVA 2nd	5,550	4,150	100	5	1,300	1,400
NVA 324B	9,500	7,800	120	7	1,580	1,700
NVA 325C	5,500	5,400	100	0	0	100
NVA 1st	6,670	5,240	100	5	1,330	1,430
NVA 3rd	6,684	3,759	655	7	2,270	2,925
NVA 5th	2,890	2,790	100	0	0	100
VC 5th	3,700	2,750	650	1	300	950
NVA 7th	5,820	4,920	900	0	0	900
VC 9th	3,995	3,245	750	0	0	750
Total	50,309	40,054	3,475	25	6,780	10,255

a. Based on the 30 January 1968 OB. The NVA 5th Division and the VC 5th Division have two infantry regiments. The rest have three.

Six Day War

According to Dupuy 1978, 243, the average strength of the three Israeli divisions (Tal, Sharon, and Yoffee) was 15,000 men.

Yom Kippur

Egypt (See Dupuy 1978, 402-403). Each infantry division was composed of two infantry brigades, a mechanized infantry brigade, and an artillery brigade of 72 guns. For this operation an armored brigade was also attached to each infantry division. The normal tank complement of the crossing infantry division had been increased from about 95 to about 200, and personal strength from less than 12,000 to more than 14,000. The armoured divisions consisted of two armoured brigades of about 100 tanks each, a machanised brigade with an additional 50 takes, and an artillery brigade. Normal personnel strength was nearly 12,000. Mechanized divisions consisted of two mechanized infantry brigades, an armoured brigade and an artillery brigade. Standrd strength 200 tanks and 12,000 men. Second Army 110,000 men. Third Army – 90,000 men

Israel. Etzioni Brigade was 8,000 troops (Dupuy 1978, 399-400)

Syria. Infantry division – 10,000 men. Armored brigades – 2,000 men. Each infantry and mechanized infantry brigades had 3 infantry battalsions, a battalion of 40 tanks, an AA artillery battalion, and a field artillery battalion (Dupuy 1978, 441).

Gulf War

Saudi Arabia. Brigades have over 5,000 soldiers and is organized as a combined arms command with four maneuver battalions (Stanton 1996, 6).

Invasion of Iraq

United States. See Cordesman 2003, 40.

Iraq. See Cordesman 2003, 45.

Bosnian War

Yugoslavia and Bosnian Serbs (BSA – with some 30,000 Serb irregulars attached)) [and Krajina Serb Forces – paramilitary force] vs. Croatian Armed Forces, Croatian Defense Forces (HVO – Croats of Bosnia and Hersogovnia), and Bosnian Army (Army of Bosnia and Hersogovnia – has small number of foreign Islamic fighters attached).

For Unit Sizes of BSA, KSF, HVO see CIA Report 1993 – NIE 23/11 Combat Forces in the Former Yugosalvia).

- Yugoslav Unit Sizes - Pristina Corps up to 12,00 men; 30,000 men in three other corps—Podgorica, Nis, and Leskovac.
- Croatian Ground Forces – Units (brigade) range in size form 1,000-3,000 men.
- Bosnian Army – Some brigades reportedly have as many as 4,000 to 5,000 men while others have fewer than 1,000
- Croation Defense Forces: (HVO) – The average brigade has 2,000 to 3,000 men.

In 1988 the Yugoslav Army had placed the Bosnian provincial Territorial Defense Force under 1 Military District (Belgrade). This Bosnian Territorijalna odbrana (TO), commanded by Bosnian-Serb generals, comprised of nine regions. Brigades 1,800 strong (Thomas, Mikulan and Pavlovic 2006, 4).

In April 1992 – a TORBiH brigade was 1,500 but often only a true strength was about 500 (Thomas, Mikulan and Pavlovic 2006, 5).

On 20 May 1992 the TORBiH, PL, other militias and the Bosnian-Croat HVO and HOS were officially united as the Armed Forces of the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina (Thomas, Mikulan and Pavlovic 2006).

In August 1992 the Army of the Serb Republic (VRS) comprised redesignated JNA, TO and newly raised VRS units – 500 strong battalions (Thomas, Mikulan and Pavlovic 2006, 12-13).

Foreign volunteers from June 1992, about 3,000 Moslem Mujahedin ('holy warriors') from Afghanistan, Albania, Chechnya, Egypt, Iran, Jordan, Lebanon, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Turkey and Yemen served in the ABiH. 7 Moslem Mountain Bde (3 Corps) was formed in Oct 1992, and by Dec 1995 six more Moslem light brigades – 4, 9, 17, 447, 448 and 807 – all seven being redesignated Moslem Liberation Brigades. Each 2,000-strong Muslimanska oslobodilacka brigada, including about 750–1,000 Mujahedin, was allocated to a different corps. The el-Mudzahedin Detachment was formed in Travnik on 13 Aug 1993 with 600 Bosnian-Moslems and 200 Mujahedin, serving from 6 Sept under Bosanska Krajina OPG (Thomas, Mikulan and Pavlovic 2006)

Works Cited

1st Cavalary Division. 1966. Combat After Action Report. Ft. Leavenworth: Command and General Staff College.

Acheson-Brown, D. G. 2001. "The Tanzanian invasion of Uganda: A just war?" *International Third World Studies Journal and Review*. Vol. 12. 1-11.

Akçora, Ergünöz. 1995. "Kilis'in Antep Müdafaasindaki Yeri." Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi. Vol. XI, no. 31. 55-87.

Advertiser. 1934. "Confused position in Arabia." Thursday 10 May. p. 17. available at https://trove.nla.gov.au/newspaper/article/47557243.

Aldea, David. 2010. "The Argentine Commandos on Mount Kent." Retrieved from britains-smallwars website; url: https://web.archive.org/web/20100328175325/http://www.britains-smallwars.com/Falklands/David/kent2.html

Allison, William Thomas. 2012. *The Gulf War, 1990-91*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Al-Marashi, Ibrahim and Sammy Salama. 2008. Iraq's Armed Forces. New York: Routledge

Anderson, Thomas. 1984. *La Guerra de los Desposeidos.* Lincoln: University Press of Nebraska.

Andrew Jr., Rod. 2009. "The Battle of An-Nasiriyah" in *U.S. Marines in Battle: An-Nasiriyah 23 March – 2 April 2003*. Washington, DC. United States Marine Corps History Division.

Appleman, Roy. 1992. *South to the Naktong, North to the Yalu*. Washington DC: Center of Military History.

Army History Directorate (Greece), ed. 1998. *A Concise History of the Balkan Wars, 1912-1913*. Athens: Hellenic Army General Staff, Army History Directorate.

Arostegui, Joshua M. 2013. *The People's Liberation Army and the Sino-Indian Border Conflict of 1962.* University of Nebraska at Kearney.

Asher, Daniel. 2014. *Inside Israel's Northern Command: The Yom Kippur War on the Syrian Border*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.

Asher, Jerry and Eric Hammel. 1987. *Duel for the Golan: the 100-hour battle that saved Israel*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Associated Press. 16 June 1992. "Azerbaijan Retakes Region from Armenians." *New York Times*. Available: https://www.nytimes.com/1992/06/16/world/azerbaijan-retakes-region-from-armenians.

AUSA (Association of the United States Army). 1991. *Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm: A Logistics Perspective*. Arlington, VA: Institute of Land Warfare, Association of the United States Army.

Avirgan, Tony, and Martha Honey. 1982. *War in Uganda: The Legacy of Idi Amin*. Westport, CT: Lawrence Hill & Company.

Ayres, Drummond B., Jr. 1969. "Israelis in tanks raid Suez Coast in Gulf Crossing." *New York Times*.

Ayres, Leonard P. 1919. *The War with Germany: A Statistical Summary*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Baer, George W. 1976. *Test Case: Italy, Ethiopia, and the League of Nations*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Baiwei, Jiang et al. 2015. Research Result Reports on Compile and translation of International Relations History Sources about Quemoy during Cold War (Volume II): Based on Documentaries of National Archives Bureau of the United States, Academy of National Park of Republic of China.

Bajwa, F. 2013. *From Kutch to Tashkent: The Indo-Pakistan War of 1965*. Hurst Publishers.

Balkelis, Tomas. 2018. *War, Revolution, and Nation-Building in Lithuania, 1914-1923* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Balogh, Eva S. 1975. "Romanian and Allied Involvement in the Hungarian *Coup d'Etat* of 1919." *East European Quarterly* IX, no. 3.

Barker, A.J. 1968. *The Civilising Mission*. New York: The Dial Press.

Barker, A. J. 1971. *Rape of Ethiopia*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Barker, A. J. 1974. *The Yom Kippur War*. New York, NY. Random House, Inc.

Beckett, Ian. 2006. *Ypres The First Battle 1914*. London, UK: Pearson.

Beehler, William Henry. 1913. *The History of the Italian-Turkish War, September 29, 1911, to October 8, 1912*. Annapolis, MD: Advertiser-Republican.

Beg, A. (Ed.). 1966. *Seventeen September Days*. Babur and Amer Publications.

Bell, J. B. 2006. Besieged: Seven Cities Under Siege. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction

Bell, P. M. H. 2014. "Gaulle, Brig-General Charles de and the Free French." In *The Oxford Companion to World War II*. Online Version. Eds. Dear, I. C. B. and M. R. D. Foot. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Biddle, Stephen. 2003. "Afghanistan and the Future of Warfare." *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 82, No. 2. Pp. 31-46.

Biddle, Stephen. 2004. *Military Power: Explaining Victory and Defeat in Modern Battle.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bisher, Jamie. 2005. *White Terror: Cossack Warlords of the Trans-Siberian*. New York: Routledge.

Blair, Clay. 1987. *The Forgotten War: America in Korea, 1950-1953*. New York: Anchor Press.

Boog, Horst, Werner Rahn, Reinhard Stumpf, and Bernd Wegner. 2001. *Germany and the Second World War*. Vol. 6. Trans. Ewald Osers, John Brownjohn, Patricia Crampton, and Louise Willmot. Clarendon Press: Oxford.

Borzęcki, Jerzy. 2008. *The Soviet-Polish Peace of 1921 and the Creation of Interwar Europe*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bowman, John (Ed). 1985. The Vietnam War: An Almanac. New York: World Almanac Publications

Brines, Russell. 1968. *The Indo-Pakistani Conflict*. London. Pall Mall Press.

Briscoe, Charles H., Richard L. Kiper, James A. Schroder, and Kalev I. Sepp. 2003. *Weapon of Choice: U.S. Army Special Operations Forces in Afghanistan*. Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Combat Studies Institute Press

Brody, J. Kenneth. 1999. *The Avoidable War: Pierre Laval and the Politics of Reality, 1935-1936.* Transaction Publishers.

Buell Thomas B., Clifton R. Franks, John A. Hixson, David R. Mets, Bruce R. Pirnie, James F. Ransone, Jr., Thomas R. Stone. 2002. *The Second World War: Europe and the*

Mediterranean. West Point Military History Series. Garden City Park, NY: Square One Publishers.

Burkman, Thomas W. 2007. *Japan and the League of Nations*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'I Press.

Byrne, Kevin B., and Jerry K. Sweeney. 2006. *A Handbook of American Military History: From the Revolutionary War to the Present*. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press.

Cakmak, Haydar. 2008. *Turk dis politikasi, 1919-2008*. Essen: Platin.

"Campaign Against Terror." 2002. FRONTLINE. Public Broadcasting Service (PBS). https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/campaign/.

Carland, J. M. 2000. *Combat Operations: Stemming the Tide, May 1965 to October 1966*. Carlisle Barracks, PA: Center of Military History, United States Army.

Carney, Stephen A. 2011. *Allied Participation in Operation Iraqi Freedom*. Washington DC: Center of Military History United States Army

Casabianca, A. 1999. *Una Guerra Desconocida: La Campaña del Chaco Boreal, 1932-1935*. Asunción: El Lector.

Cassavetti, D.J. 1914. *Hellas and the Balkan Wars*. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

Castillo, A. 1960. "La tragedia de Mongoy" *Revista Militar.* 64-68.
Center for Military History, 1988. *United States Army in the World War, 1917-1919: Organization of the America Expeditionary Forces, Volume 1.* Washington, DC: Center for Military History United States Army.

Chakravorty, B. C. 1992. *History of the Indo-Pak War, 1965* New Delhi: History Division Ministry of Defence Government of India.

Chiabra Leon, Roberto. 2010. *Cenepa "Mision de Honor"*. El Callao: Freddy W. Huiza Rios

Choate, Mark. 2008. *Emigrant Nation: The Making of Italy Abroad*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Chorbajian, L., Patrick Donabedian, and Claude Mutafian. 1994. *The Caucasian Knot: The History & Geopolitics of Nagorno-Karabakh*. London: Zed Books.

Ciment, James. 2007. *Encyclopedia of Conflicts Since World War II*. Sharpe Reference.

Clark, Jeffrey J. and Robert Ross Smith. 1993. *Riviera to the Rhine.* Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History

Clodfelter, Michael. 2007. *Warfare and Armed Conflicts*. 3rd ed. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company.

CNN. 1999. "India Presses Kashmir Attacks," June 17, 1999. http://www.cnn.com/WORLD/asiapcf/9906/17/kashmir.01/.

Commission of Local Chronicles of Fujian Province. 1995. *Chronicles of Fujian Province [Fujian Shengzhi]*. Beijing: Xinhua Publication House.

Compile Group of History of Sino-Indian Border Self-defense Counterattack War. 2000. *History of Sino-Indian Border Self-Defense Counterattack War*. Beijing: Military Science Press.

Coogan, Anthony. 1994. "Northeast China and the Origins of the Anti-Japanese United Front." *Modern China* 20(3): 282-314.

Coox, A. 1985. *Nomonhan: Japan against Russia, 1939*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Cordesman, A. and Abraham Wagner. 1990. *The Lessons of Modern War*. Boulder: Westview.

Croissant, M. 1998. *The Armenia-Azerbaijan Conflict: Causes and Implications*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Cunningham, David E., Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, and Idean Salehyan. 2013. "Non-State Actors in Civil Wars: A New Dataset." *Conflict Management and Peace Science."* 30(5): 516-531.

Daalder, I. et al. 2000. *Winning Ugly: NATO's War to Save Kosovo*. Washington DC: The Brookings Institution.

Damis, John. 1983. *Conflict in Northwest Africa: The Western Sahara Dispute*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

Davids, Jules. 1981. *American Diplomatic and Public Papers: The United States and China: Volume 5 Boxer Rebellion*. Wilmington: Scholarly Resources.

Davies, Norman. 1972. *White Eagle, Red Star: the Polish-Soviet War 1919-20.* London: Macdonald.

Dear, I. C. B. and M. R. D. Foot. 2014. *The Oxford Companion to World War II*. Online Version. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Deak, Istvan. 1990. *Beyond Nationalism: A Social and Political History of the Habsburg Officer Corps, 1848-1918*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Defense Intelligence Agency. 1964. "Chinese Communist Military Logistics and Capabilities: Tab A-Capabilities on the Sino-Indian/Nepalese Frontier." Report Number: DIA-30299/64 TKC. (Department of Defense). https://www.cia.gov/library/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP78T05439A000400210031-4.pdf

Denber, Rachel and Robert K. Goldman. 1992. *Bloodshed in the Caucasus: Escalation of the Armed Conflict in Nagorno Karabakh*. New York: Human Rights Watch.

Department of Military History, Chinese Academy Military Science. 2000. *History of War to Resist America and Aid Korea [Kangmei Yuanchao Zhanzheng Shi]*. Beijing: Military Science Press

DeRouen, Karl R. 2007. *Civil Wars of the World: Major Conflicts Since World War II*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

De Waal, Alexander. 1991. *Evil Days: Thirty Years of War and Famine in Ethiopia*. An Africa Watch Report. New York, NY: Human Rights Watch.

Dixon, John. 2009. Magnificent but not War: The Battle for Ypres, 1915. South Yorkshire, UK: Pen & Sword Military.

Doughty, Robert A. 2005. *Pyrrhic Victory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Dowling, Timothy C. 2015. *Russia at War: From the Mongol Conquest to Afghanistan, Chechnya, and Beyond. Volume I: A-M*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

Drea, Edward J. 1981. *Nomonhan: Japanese-Soviet Tactical Combat, 1939.*

Dupuy, Trevor N. 1978. *Elusive Victory: The Arab-Israeli Wars, 1947-1974.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Dunstan, Simon. 2007. *The Yom Kippur War: The Arab-Israeli War of 1973*. Oxford, U.K.: Osprey Publishing.

Dziewanowski, MK. 1969. *Joseph Pilsudski: A European Federalist, 1918-1922*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

Editors. 1970. "Chronology August 16, 1969-November 15, 1969" *Middle East Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 1. Winter. Middle East Institute.

Edmunds, J.E. 1925. *Military Operations: France and Belgium, 1914.* London, UK: Macmillan and Co., Limited.

Edwards, R. 2008. *The Winter War*. New York: Pegasus Books.

Efron, Sonni. 25 August 1993. "Up to 100,000 Azerbaijanis Reportedly Fleeing Armenians." *Los Angeles Times*. Available: http://articles.latimes.com/1993-08-25/news/mn-27857_1_karabakh-armenians.

El-Edroos, S. 1980. *The Hashemite Araba Army*. Amman: The Publishing Coommittee.

Elleman, Bruce. 1996. "Chinese Invasion of Vietnam February." Retrieved from GlobalSecurity; url: https://web.archive.org/web/20051025074147/http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/war/prc-vietnam.htm

Ellis, John. 1993. *The World War II Databook: The Essential Facts and Figures for All the Combatants.* London, UK: Aurum Press Ltd.

Ellis, John and Michael Cox. 2001. *The World War Databook: The Essential Facts and Figures for All the Combatants.* London, UK: Aurum Press Ltd.

Ellis, L. F. 2009a. *Victory in the West Volume I: Battle of Normandy*. East Sussex, UK: The Naval & Military Press Ltd.

Ellis, L. F. 2009b. *War in France and Flanders 1939-1940*. East Sussex, UK: The Naval & Military Press Ltd.

Elvir Sierra, Cesar. 2002. *El Salvador, Estados Unidos y Honduras*. San Juancito: Litografia Lopez

English, A. 2018. *La Guerra del Chaco*. Asunción: El Lector.

Erickson, Edward J. 2007. *Ottoman Army Effectiveness in World War I: A Comparative Study*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Estonian National Historical Committee. 1968. *Estonian War of Independence 1918-1920*. New York: Eesti Vabadusvoitlejate Liit.

Farrokh, Kaveh. 2011. *Iran at War: 1500-1988*. Oxford: Osprey.

Finn, Peter, and R. Jeffrey Smith. 1999. "KLA: Rebels With an Uncommon Cause." *The Washington Post*, April 23, 1999.

Ferrell, Robert H. 2007. *America's Deadliest Battle: Meuse-Argonne, 1918.* Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Fontenot, Gregory, E.J. Degen and David Tohn. 2005. *On Point: The United States Army in Operation Iraqi Freedom*. Naval Institute Press.

Freedman, Lawrence. 2004. *The Official History of the Falklands Campaign, Volume 2: War and Diplomacy*. London: Routledge.

Gabriel, Ronald. 1984. *Operation Peace for Galilee*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Gal, Reuven. 1986. *A portrait of the Israeli Soldier.* New York: Greenwood Press.

Gall, Carlotta. 2001. "A Deadly Siege At Last Won Mazar-e Sharif." *New York Times* 19 November. Sec. B. pg. 1

Gallego, E. 2005. *La Campaña del Rif, 1909*. Malaga: Editorial Algazara.

Ganguly, Sumit. 2002. Conflict Unending: India-Pakistan Tensions Since 1947. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ganguly, Sumit. 2019. *The origins of war in South Asia: Indo-Pakistani conflicts since 1947*. Routledge.

Garcia, A. 1902. *Organizacion Militar de America-Guatemala*. San Lorenzo: Imprenta del Cuerpo de Artilleria.

García, E. 1959. *Dos Relatos Históricos: Conferencias Políticas de Presidentes de Centro América-Parte de Operaciones de la Brigada del General J. Claro Chajón de la Campaña de 1906*. Guatemala: Editorial del Ejército.

Gawrych, G. W. 1990. *Key to the Sinai: The Battles for Abu Ageila in the 1956 and 1967 Arab-Israeli Wars* (Vol. 7). Ft. Leavenworth, KS: US Army Command and General Staff College.

Gawrych, G. W. 1996. *The 1973 Arab-Israeli War: The Albatross of Decisive Victory (Leavenworth Papers, Number 21)*. Fort Leavenworth: Army Command and General Staff College Combat Studies Institute.

Gedeon, Dimitrios. 1998. *A Concise History of the Balkan Wars, 1912–1913* (1.udg. ed.). Athens: Hellenic Army General Staff.

Geibel, Adam. 2002. "Operation Anaconda, Shah-i-Khot Valley, Afghanistan, 2-10 March 2002" in *Military Review*. Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. United States Army University Press.

George, E. 2004. *The Cuban Intervention in Angola, 1965-1991: From Che Guevara to Cuito Cuanavale*. New York: Routledge.

Gill, John H. 2009. "Military Operations in the Kargil Conflict." In *Asymmetric Warfare in South Asia: The Causes and Consequences of the Kargil Conflict*, edited by Peter R. Lavoy, 92–129. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Gleditsch, Nils Petter, Peter Wallensteen, Mikael Eriksson, Margareta Sollenberg, and Havard Stand. 2002. "Armed Conflict 1946-2001: A New Dataset." *Journal of Peace Research* 39(5): 615-637.

Gleijeses, Piero. 2002. *Conflicting Missions: Havana, Washington, and Africa, 1959-1976*. Envisioning Cuba. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Gonzalez, R. 1998. *Historia Militar de Guatemala*. Mexico D.F.: McGraw-Hill/Interamericana Editores.

Gordon, Michael R. 1994. "Conflict in the Balkans: Strategy; Croat Warns Of Wider War If Bihac Falls." *New York Times*, November 30. http://www.nytimes.com /1994/11/30/world/conflict-in-the-balkans-strategy-croat-warns-of-wider-war-if-bihac-falls.html.

Goren, Michael S. 2006. "With the 1st Marine Division in Iraq, 2003: No Greater Friend, No Worse Enemy." *Occasional Paper.* Quantico, Virginia: History Division Marine Corps University.

Gosa, P. 2008. *Le Conflit Franco-Thailandais de 1940-1941*. Paris: Nouvelles Editions Latines.

Graham, Benjamin A.T., Erik Gartzke, and Christopher J. Fariss. 2015. "The Bar Fight Theory of International Conflict: Regime Type, Coalition Size, and Victory." *Political Science Research and Methods* FirstView (October): 1–27.

Gramajo, Jose R. 1937. *Las Revoluciones Exteriores contra el expresidente Estrada Cabrera*. Coatapeque: Tipografia Torres Hnos.

Grauer, Ryan. 2016. *Commanding Military Power: Organizing for Victory and Defeat on the Battlefield*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grauer, Ryan and Michael C. Horowitz. 2012. "What Determines Military Victory? Testing the Modern System." *Security Studies* 21: 83-112.

Gray, Randal. 1991. *Kaiserschlacht 1918*. Oxford, UK: Osprey Publishing Limited.

Gray, Randal, and Christopher Argyle. 1990. *Chronicle of the First World War*. Vol. I 1914-1916. New York: FactsOnFile.

Gray, Randal, and Christopher Argyle. 1991. *Chronicle of the First World War*. Vol. II 1917-1921. New York: FactsOnFile.

Greenhalgh, Elizabeth. 2005. *Victory through Coalition: Britain and France during the First World War.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Greenhalgh, Elizabeth. 2014. *The French Army and the First World War.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Grimm. C. 1963. *Vor den Toren Europas 1918-1920*. Hamburg: August Friedrich Velmede Verlag.

Haggerty, Richard and Richard Millet. 1995. *Honduras: A Country Study*. Ed. Tim Merrill. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army.

Hale, William. 2013. *Turkish Foreign Policy since 1774.* New York: Routledge.

Hall, Richard C. 2000. *The Balkan Wars, 1912-1913*. New York: Routledge.

Halperin, M.H. 1966. *The 1958 Taiwan Straits Crisis: A Documented History*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

Hammel, Eric. 1992. *Six Days in June: How Israel Won the 1967 Arab-Israeli War*. New York, NY. Charles Scribner's Sons.

Hammel, Eric. 2010. *Six Days in June: How Israel Won the 1967 Arab-Israeli War*. Pacifica Military History.

Hay, John H. 1989. *Tactical and Materiel Innovations*. Washington, DC: Department of the Army.

Heder, Stephen P. "The Kampuchean-Vietnamese Conflict." *Southeast Asian Affairs*, 1979, pp. 157–186.

Hellenic Army General Staff. 1998. *An Index of Events in the Military History of the Greek Nation*. Athens: Hellenic Army General Staff, Army History Directorate.

Henkin, Y. 2015. *The 1956 Suez War and the New World Order in the Middle East: Exodus in Reverse*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Hermann, David G. 1989. "The Paralysis of Italian Strategy in the Italian-Turkish War, 1911-1912." *The English Historical Review* 104(411): 332-356.

Herwig, Holger H. 2014. *The First World War: German and Austria-Hungary 1914-1918*. 2nd ed. London, UK: Bloomsbury.

Herzog, Chaim. 1975. *The War of Atonement: October, 1973*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Herzog, C. 1982. *The Arab-Israeli Wars*. New York: Random House.

Herzog, C. 1984. *The Arab-Israeli Wars: War and Peace in the Middle East from the War of Independence to Lebanon*. London: Arms and Armour Press.

Hesse D'Alzon, C. 1985. *La Presence Militaire Française en Indochine (1940-1945)*. Vincennes: Publications du Service Historique de l'Armee de Terre.

Hinh, Nguyen D. 1979. *Lam Son 719.* Army Center of Military History. Washington DC: Ft. Belvoir Defense Technical Information Center.

Hiro, Dilip. 1991. *The Longest War: The Iran-Iraq Military Conflict*. New York: Routledge.

Hoffapuir, M. 1991. "Tactical Evolution in the Iraqi Army: The Abadan Island and Fish Lake Campaigns of the Iran-Iraq War." Master's Thesis. Ft. Leavenworth: Command and General Staff College.

Hofi, Y., Simchoni, U., David, A. B., & Mann, H. 2016. *Inside Israel's Northern Command: The Yom Kippur War on the Syrian Border*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.

Holmes, Richard. 2001. *The Oxford Companion to Military History*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hooton, Edward R. 2014. *Prelude to the First World War: The Balkan Wars, 1912-1913*. Stroud: Fonthill Media.

Honey, Martha. 1979. "Uganda Prepares for Attack on Capital." March 26. *The Washington Post.* https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1979/03/26/uganda-prepares-for-attack-on-capital/1a1c5aec-5bb8-4a24-9502-c7a02c54120a/?utm_term=.0f484f183d35

Honey, Martha. 1979. "Entebbe: Tranquility Amid Destruction." April 11. *The Washington Post.* https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1979/04/11/entebbe-tranquility-amid-destruction/222b27f1-efc2-40d5-ada0-cc2fa2d00ccb/?utm_term=.25772ea780e4

Howe, George F. 1993. *United States Army in World War II: The Mediterranean Theater of Operations: Northwest Africa: Seizing the Initiative in the West*. Washington, DC: Center of Military History, United States Army.

Hoyt, E. 1986. *Japan's War*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hsi-sheng, Ch'i. 1991. "The Military Dimension, 1942-1945." In *China's Bitter Victory: The War with Japan, 1937-1945*. Edited by J. Hsiung and S. Levine. Armonk: East Gate.

Hsu, L. and M. Zhang, eds. 1972. *History of the Sino-Japanese War*. Taibei : Zhong Wu Pub. Co.

Human Rights Watch. 1994. *Azerbaijan: Seven Years of Conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh*. New York: Human Rights Watch.

Hundley, Tom. 1995. "Croatia, Serbia Face Off At Bihac: New Flashpoint Leaves West On Fringe." *Chicago Tribune*, July 30. http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1995-07-30/news/9507300180_1_bihac-bosnian-serb-bosnian-government.

Hussain, H. 2002. "The Fourth Round-A Critical Review of 1973 Arab-Israeli War." *Defense Journal*.

The India-Pakistan War of 1965: A History. 2011. India: Natraj Publishers.

International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS). 1967. The Military Balance. London: Institute for Strategic Studies

Interational Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS). 1972. The Military Balance. London: Institute for Strategic Studies

International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS). 1974. The Military Balance. London: Institute for Strategic Studies

Irinchev, B. 2011. *War of the White Death: Finland against the Soviet Union 1939-40*. Barnsley: Pen & Sword Military.

Jackson, Gen. Sir William, and Grp. Capt. T.P. Gleave. 1987. *The Mediterranean and Middle East*, *Victory in the Mediterranean*, Vol. 6, pt. 2. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

Japanese Society of the Study of the History of Land Warfare. 2000. *The Korean War: A Japanese Perspective* [*Riben Luzhanshi Yanjiu Puji Hui Bian, Gao Pei, Pei Shan Bianyi, Riben Ren Yanli de Chaoxian Zhanzheng*]. Trans. by Pei Gao and Shan Pei. Beijing: China National Defence University Publisher.

Jaques, Tony. 2007. *Dictionary of Battles and Sieges*. Vols. 1-3. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Jamieson, Perry D. 2001. *Lucrative Targets: The U.S. Air Force in the Kuwaiti Theater of Operations*. The USAF in the Persian Gulf War. Washington, D.C.: Air Force History and Museums Program

Jentleson, Bruce W. and Thomas G. Paterson. 1997. *Encyclopedia of US Foreign Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jiang Siyi and Li Hui 1994. *Zhong-Yin Bianjing Ziwei Fanji Zuozhan Shi* (*The history of China's counterattack in self-defense on the Sino-Indian border*), Beijing: Junshi Kexue Chubanshe, 391-424.

Jowett, Philip S. 2011. *Armies of the Balkan Wars, 1912-13*. Oxford: Osprey.

Jukes, Geoffrey. 2002. *The First World War: The Eastern Front 1914-1918.* Oxford, UK: Osprey Publishing Limited.

Kalotsa, Gergely. 2012. "The 1974 Turkish Invasion in Cyprus" *Études Sur La Région Méditerranéenne*, *22*, 55-64.

Kamm, H. 1979. "News about Vietnamese-Cambodian War." Special to the New York Times. The New York Times Archives.

Kargil Review Committee. 2000. *From Surprise to Reckoning: The Kargil Review Committee Report, New Delhi, December 15, 1999*. New Delhi; London: Sage Publications.

Karim, Afsir. 1999. "Kargil: A Strategic and Military Assessment" in *Kargil: The Crisis and its Implications.* New Delhi, India. Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.

Karnes, Thomas L. 1976. *The Failure of Union: Central America, 1824-1975*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.

Karsh, Efraim. 2002. *The Iran-Iraq War.* Oxford: Osprey Publishing.

Kassimeris, Christos. 2008. "The Inconsistency of United States Foreign Policy in the Aftermath of the Cyrpus Invasion: The Turkish Arms Embargo and its Termination." Journal of Modern Greek Studies 26(1): 91-114.

Kaufman, Michael T. 1977. "Ethiopians Fall Bach From Somali Onslaught at Jijiga." *New York Times*, September 18, 1977. https://www.nytimes.com/1977/09/18/archives/ethiopians-fall-back-from-somali-onslaught-at-jijiga-town-dominates.html

Kaufman, M. 1977-1978. “News about Second Ogaden War.” Special to the New York Times. The New York Times Archives.

Kedward, Roderick 2014. “France.” In *The Oxford Companion to World War II*. Online Version. Eds. Dear, I. C. B. and M. R. D. Foot. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Kennedy, Christopher M., Wanda J. Renfrow, Evelyn A. Englander, and Nathan S. Lowrey. 2006. *U.S. Marines in Iraq, 2003: Anthology and Annotated Bibliography*. U.S. Marines in the Global War on Terrorism. Washington, D.C.: History Division, United States Marine Corps.

Kerr, Stanley E. 1973. *The Lions of Marash: Personal Experiences with American Near East Relief, 1919-1922.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Keesing's Record of World Events. 1979. “Cambodia, Vietnam, Cambodian, Vietnamese, Cambodia.” 25(May): 1-6.

Kendall, Paul. 2012. *Aisne 1914: The Dawn of Trench Warfare.* Gloucestershire, UK: The History Press.

Kerry, John F. 2009. *Tora Bora Revisited: How We Failed to Get Bin Laden and Why it Matters Today*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Khoo, Nicholas. 2011. *Collateral Damage: Sino-Soviet Rivalry and the Termination of the Sino-Vietnamese Alliance*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kiss, P. A. 2013. The First Indo-Pakistani War, 1947-48. *ResearchGate.com*.

Kiyaga-Nsubuga, John. 1995. “Political Instability and the Struggle for Control on Uganda, 1970-1990.” Thesis: University of Toronto.

Kostiner, Joseph. 1993. *The Making of Saudi Arabia, 1916-1936*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krepp, Endel. 1980. *The Estonian War of Independence, 1918-1920*. Stockholm: Estonian Information Centre.

Kugler, Richard. 2007. *Operation Anaconda in Afghanistan: A Case Study of Adaptation in Battle*. Washington, DC: National Defense University.

Kugler, Richard L. et al. 2009. *Operation Anaconda: Lessons for Joint Operations*. Washington, DC: National Defense University.

Kurtcephe, Israfil. 1990. “Trablusgarp’in Italyanlarca Isgali, Mustafa Kemal ve Arkadeaslarinin Direnise Katilmalari.” *AU Turk Inkilap Tarihi Enstitusu Dergisi Ataturk Yolu*. 3:6. 361-375.

Laffin, John. 1982a. *The Israeli Army in the Middle East Wars 1948-73.* Osprey Publishing.

Laffin, John. 1982b. *Arab Armies of the Middle East Wars 1948-73.* Osprey Publishing.

Lambeth, Benjamin S. 2001. *NATO's Air War for Kosovo: A Strategic and Operational Assessment*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Lambeth, Benjamin S. 2005. *Air Power Against Terror: America's Conduct of Operation Enduring Freedom.* Santa Monica, CA. RAND Corporation.

Landaburu, Carlos. 1989. *La Guerra de las Malvinas*. Buenos Aires: Círculo Militar,

Langley, Lester D. and Thomas D. Schoonover. 1995. *The Banana Men: American Mercenaries and Entrepreneurs in Central America, 1880-1930*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Lanning, Michael Lee and Dan Cragg. 2008. Inside the VC and the NVA. College Station: Texas A&M University Press

Leeds, Brett Ashley, Jeffrey Ritter, Sara Mitchell and Andrew Lang. 2002. "Alliance Treaty Obligations and Provisions, 1815-1944." *International Interactions*. 28(3) 237-260.

Lescius, Vytautas. 2004. "Lithuanian Armed Forces in the Struggle for Independence." Vilnius University.

Lensen, George A. 1974. *The Damned Inheritance*. Tallahassee: The Diplomatic Press.

Leonhard, Robert. R. Undated. *The China Relief Expedition: Joint Coalition Warfare in China, Summer 1900*. Laurel, MD: Applied Physics Laboratory, Johns Hopkins University. Available: https://www.jhuapl.edu/Content/documents/China ReliefSm.pdf.

Lescius, V. 2004. *Lietuvos Kariuomene Nepriklausomybes Kovose*. Vilnius: Vilniaus Universitetas.

Liddell Hart, Sir Basil H. 1963. *Real War 1914-1918*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Liebenberg, I., Risquet, J., and Shubin, V., eds. 2016. *A Far-away War: Angola, 1975-1989*. Stellenbosch: Sun Media.

Lintner, B. 2018. *China's India war: Collision course on the roof of the world*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lloyd, T. O. 1997. *The British Empire 1558-1995, Second Edition.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Luttwk, Edward and Dan Horowitz. 1975. *The Isareli Army*. New York: Harper & Row.

Macartney, CA. 1962. *Hungary: A Short History*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

MacDonald, Charles B. 1993. *United States Army in World War II: The European Theater of Operations: The Siegfried Line Campaign*. Washington, DC: Center of Military History, United States Army.

Macias Nuñez, Edison. 2007. Historia General del Ejercito Ecuatoriano, tomo 7. Quito: Centro de Estudios Historicos del Ejercito.

Mahe, Y. et al. 2008. "Les Operations terrestres de la Guerra Franco-Thailandaise 1940-1941." In *Champs de Bataille: Histoire Militaire Strategie & Analyse*. Vol 19.

Maide, Jann. 1933. *Ülevaade Eesti Vabadussõjast, 1918-1920* (*Overview of the Estonian War of Independence*). Kaitseliit

Maier, Klaus A. 1991. *Germany and the Second World War, Volume 2*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Malik, V. P. 2006. *Kargil: From Surprise to Victory*. New Delhi, India. HarperCollins Publishers.

Marcus, H. 1994. *A History of Ethiopia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Marston, D. 2014. *The Indian Army and the end of the Raj* (Vol. 23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maxwell, Neville. 1970. *India's China War*. London: Cape.

McCarthy, Rory, Julian Borger, and Stuart Millar. 2003. "Battle for Baghdad Begins." *The Guardian*, March 25, 2003. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/mar/25/iraq.rorymccarthy.

McManus, John C. 2004. *The Americans at Normandy: The Summer of 1944-The American War from the Normandy Beaches to Falaise*. New York, NY: Tom Doherty Associates, LLC.

Mercer, John. 1976. "The Cycle of Invasion and Unification in the Western Sahara." *African Affairs* 75(301): 498-510.

Mercer-Bernadet, Fabienne. 2001. “Le conflit Franco-Thailandais (juin 1940-mai 1941), une manipulation japonaise?” *Revue Historique des Armees* 223. pp. 31-40.

Middlebrook, Martin. 2012. *The Falklands War*. South Yorkshire: Pen & Sword Books.

Millett, Allan R. 2010. *The War for Korea, 1950-1951: They Came From the North*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Mockler, A. 2003. *Haile Selassie’s War*. Oxford: Signal Books.

Moore, M. 28 February 1991. “Arab Forces, Marines Take Kuwait City.” *Washington Post*. Available at https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/inatl/longterm/iraq/timeline/022891.htm

Moores, L.W. 1991. “The Mounted Raid: An Overlooked Deep Operations Capability.” Fort Leavenworth, KS: Army Command and General Staff College.

Morey, Daniel S. 2016. “Military Coalitions and the Outcome of Interstate Wars.” *Foreign Policy Analysis* Advance Access (February).

Morris, Benny. 2008. *1948: A History of the First Arab-Israeli War*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Morris, Stephen J. 1999. Why Vietnam Invaded Cambodia: Political Culture and the Causes of the War. Stanford: Stanford University Press

Morton, Louis. 1953. *The Fall of the Philippines.* Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History.

Moses, L. 1967. “Soviet-Japanese Confrontation in Outer Mongolia.” *Journal of Asian History* 1, no. 1. pp. 64-85.

Murphy, Caryle. 1990. “Iraqi Invasion Force Seizes Control of Kuwait.” *Washington Post*. Washington, DC. Friday, August 3rd, 1990.

Murray, Williamson and Robert H. Scales, Jr. 2003. *The Iraq War: A Military History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mutawi, Samir A. 1987. *Jordan in the 1967 War*. Cambridge Middle East Library. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mutawi, Samir A. 2002. *Jordan in the 1967 War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nagy, Z. 1973. “Revolution in Hungary (1918-1919),” in *A History of Hungary,* ed. Ervin Pamlényi. Budapest: Collet’s.

Nardulli, Bruce R., Walter L. Perry, Bruce Pirnie, John Gordon IV, and John G. McGinn. 2002. *Disjointed War: Military Operations in Kosovo, 1999*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand

Navy Department. 1900. *Annual Report of the Navy Department for the Year 1900*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Available at: https://www.history.navy.mil/ content/history/nhhc/research/library/online-reading-room/title-list-alphabetically/b/boxer-rebellion-usnavy-1900-1901/selected-documents-boxer-rebellion/relief-tientsin-june-july-1900/tientsin-allied-proclamation-to-the-inhabitants.html

Nawaz, Shuja. 2009. *Crossed Swords: Pakistan, Its Army, and the Wars Within*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Negash, Tekeste and Tronvoll, Kjetil. 2000. *Brothers at War: Making Sense of the Eriteran-Ethiopian War*. Athens, OH. Ohio University Press.

New York Times. 1977. “New Somali Attack on Harar Reported,” November 24, 1977. https://www.nytimes.com/1977/11/24/archives/new-somali-attack-on-harar-reported-rebels-in-ethiopia-are-said-to.html

Ney, Virgil. 1969. Evolution of the U.S. Army Division 1939-1968. Ft. Belvoir: Technical Operations Incorporated.

Niles, D. 2015. *A Noble Cause: American Battlefield Victories in Vietnam*. New York: Penguin.

Norton-Taylor, Richard, and Jonathan Steele. 2001. “Fighters Prepare for Mass Assault on Tora Bora: Sources Claim Bin Laden Seen in Past Four Days.” *The Guardian*, December 4, 2001. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2001/dec/05 /afghanistan.richardnortontaylor

Nowik, Grzegortz. 2004. *Before Enigma Was Broken: Polish Radio Intelligence During the War with Bolshevick Russia, 1918-1920*. Warsaw: Rytm.

O’Ballance, Edgar. 1979. *No Victor, No Vanquished: The Yom Kippur War*. London, United Kingdom: Barrie & Jenkins.

O’Dowd, Edward. 2007. *Chinese Military Strategy in the Third Indochina War*. New York: Routledge.

Ogden, Chris. 2013. “Tracing the Pakistan-Terrorism Nexus in Indian Security Perspectives: From 1947 to 2011.” *India Quarterly* 69(1): 35-50.

Omara-Otunnu, Amii. 1987. *Politics and the Military in Uganda, 1890-1985*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Oren, Michael B. 2003. *Six Days of War: June 1967 and the Making of the Modern Middle East*. New York, NY. Presidio Press.

Ortega Gaytan, Jorge Antonio. 2014. *Nuestras Guerras*. Guatemala: Centro Editorial y de Documentacion para la Historia Militar.
Owen, Robert C. 2000. *Deliberate Force: A Case Study in Effective Air Campaigning.* Maxwell Air Force Base Alabama: Air University Press.

Oxford Analyitca Daily Brief Service. 1999. "Eritrea/Ethiopia: Fierce Clashes." 28 June. Oxford: Oxford Analytica LtD.

Pakistan Army Museum. Undated. https://www.pakarmymuseum.com/exhibits /history-of-azad-kashmir-regiment/

Palij, M. 1995. *Ukrainian-Polish Defensive Alliance*. Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.

Pandey, D. H. H. K., & Singh, M. R. 2017. India's Major Military & Rescue Operations.

Parks, Michael. 15 June 1992. "Azerbaijanis Retake 15 Karabakh Villages." *Los Angeles Times*. Available: http://articles.latimes.com/1992-06-15/news/mn-322_1_azerbaijani-forces.

Parks, Michael. 17 June 1992. "Armenia Seeks Alliance's Help Against Azerbaijan." *Los Angeles Times*. Available: http://articles.latimes.com/1992-06-17/news/mn-492_1_commonwealth-of-independent-states.

Patrikeeff, Felix. 2002. *Russian Politics in Exile: The Northeast Asian Balance of Power 1924-1931*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Patrikeeff, Felix. 2010. "Railway as a Political Catalyst: The Chinese Eastern Railway and the 1929 Sino-Soviet Conflict." In *Manchurian Railways and the Opening of China: An International History*, eds. Bruce A. Ellemen and Stephen Kotkin. M.E. Sharpe.

Pazzanita, Anthony G. 2006. *Historical Dictionary of Western Sahara*. Third Edition. Historical Dictionaries of Africa, No. 96. Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Peck, Michael. 2015. "The Almost War of 1938-1939: Russia and Japan's Nearly Forgotten Battle." *The National Interest*. https://nationalinterest.org/feature/the-almost-war-1938-1939-russia-japans-nearly-forgotten-13956

Pelletiere, Stephen. 1992. *The Iran-Iraq War*. New York: Praeger Publishers

Perez, A. G 1902. *Organizacion Militar de America-Guatemala*. Madrid: Imprenta del Cuerpo de Artilleria.

Perris, George Herbert. 1920. *The Battle of the Marne*. London, UK: Methuen & Co. Ltd.

Pierson, David S. 2011. "Battle at Rumaila." *Military Magazine*, 2011. http://milmag.com/2011/02/battle-at-rumaila/

Plakans, Andrejs. 2011. *A Concise History of the Baltic States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Playfair, I. S. O. 2004. *The Mediterranean and Middle East Volume III (September 1941 to September 1942): British Fortunes Reach their Lowest Ebb.* East Sussex, UK: The Naval & Military Press Ltd.

Playfair, Maj. Gen. I.S.O., Brig. C.J.C. Molony, Cap. F.C. Flynn, and Grp. Cap. T.P. Gleave. 1966. *The Mediterranean and Middle East, Volume IV, The Destruction of the Axis Forces in Africa*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

Pollack, Kenneth. 1996. "The Influence of Arab Culture on Arab Military Effectiveness." PhD thesis. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Pollack, Kenneth. 2004. *Arabs at War*. Lincoln: University Press of Nebraska.

Prasad, S. 2005. *The Gallant Dogras: An Illustrated History of the Dogra Regiment*. Lancer Publishers.

Prasad, S. and D. Pal. 1987. *History of Operations in Jammu & Kashmir*. New Delhi: Ministry of Defense.

Preston, Diana. 2002. *The Boxer Rebellion: The Dramatic Story of China's War on Foreigners that Shook the World in the Summer of 1900.* New York: Walker & Company.

Pribbenow, Merle L. "A Tale of Five Generals: Vietnam's Invasion of Cambodia." *The Journal of Military History*, vol. 70 no. 2, 2006, pp. 459-486.

Price, Crawford. 1914. *The Balkan Cockpit*. London: T.W. Laurie.

Priest, Dana, and Peter Finn. 1999. "NATO Gives Air Support to KLA Forces." *The Washington Post*, June 2, 1999

Quilter, Charles J. 1993. *U.S. Marines in the Persian Gulf, 1990-1991: WITH THE I MARINE EXPEDITIONARY FORCE IN DESERT SHIELD AND DESERT STORM*.

Washington, D.C. History and Museums Division, Headquarters, United States Marine Corps.

Rabinovich, A. 2007. *The Yom Kippur War: The Epic Encounter that Transformed the Middle East*. New York: Schocken.

Ramet, Sabrina P. 2006. *The Three Yugoslavias: State-Building and Legitimation, 1918–2005*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press

Raun, Toivo U. 2001. *Estonia and the Estonians*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

Ready, J. Lee. 1985. *Forgotten Allies: The Military Contribution of the Colonies, Exiled Governments, and lesser Powers to the Allied Victory in World War II*. Vol. 1. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co.

Redman, Mike. 2003. "Joint ABiH-HVO Operations 1994: A Preliminary Analysis of the Battle of Kupres." *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 16 (4): 1–11.

Ripley, Tim. 1999. *Operation Deliberate Force: The UN and NATO Campaign in Bosnia 1995*. Centre for Defence and International Security Studies

Roberts, George. 2017. "The Uganda-Tanzania War, the Fall of Idi Amin, and the Failure of African Diplomacy, 1978-1979." In David M. Anderson and Rolandsen Oystein, eds., *Politics and Violence in Eastern Africa: The Struggles of Emerging States*. London: Routledge.

Romsics, I. 2002. *The Dismantling of Historic Hungary*. Wayne: Center for Hungarian Studies and Publications.

Rottman, Gordon L. 2002. *Korean War Order of Battle: United States, United Nations, and Communist Ground, Naval, and Air Forces, 1950-1953*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Ruf, Werner. 1987. "The Role of World Powers." In *War and Refugees: The Western Sahara Conflict*, edited by Richard Lawless and Laila Monahan, 65–97. London; New York: Pinter Publishers.

"Salvador, Beaten, Asks Intervention; Appeals to Mexico to Step In and Stop the War with Nicaragua." *New York Times*. 27 March 1907.

Sander, G. 2013. *The Hundred Day Winter War*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Sandhu, P. J. S., Vinay Shankar, and G. G. Dwivedi. 2015. *1962: A View from the Other Side of the Hill*. New Delhi: United Service Institution of India.

Sarkar, B. 2000. *Outstanding Victories of the Indian Army, 1947-1971*. Godstone: Spantech & Lancer.

Sarkees, Meredith Reid and Frank Wayman. 2010. *Resort to War: 1816-2007*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Sarkees, Meredith Reid, Frank Whelon Wayman and J. David Singer. 2003. "Inter-State, Intra-State, and Extra-State Wars: A Comprehensive Look at Their Distribution over Time, 1816-1997." *International Studies Quarterly* 47(1): 49-70.

Schubert, Frank N. and Theresa L. Kraus. 1995. *The Whirlwind War: The United States Army in Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm.* US Army Center of Military History

Scott, Leonard B. 1988. "The Battle of Hill 875, Dak To, Vietnam 1967." Carlisle Barracks, PA: United States Army War College.

Sebag-Montefiore, Hugh. 2008. *Dunkirk: Fight to the Last Man*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sela, Avraham. 2000. "The 1973 Arab War Coalition: Aims, Coherence, and Gain-Distribution." In *Revisiting the Yom Kippur War*, edited by P. R. Kumaraswamy, 36–69. London, United Kingdom: Frank Cass.

Schiff, Z. et Al. 1984. *Israel's Lebanon War*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Schubert, Frank N., and Theresa L. Kraus, eds. 1995. *The Whirlwind War: The United States Army in Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm*. Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History, United States Army

Shaw, John M. 2005. *The Cambodian Campaign: The 1970 Offensive and America's Vietnam War*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Shaw, S. and Ezel Kural Shaw. 1977. *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shazly, S. 1980. *The Crossings of the Suez*. San Fransisco, CA: American Mideast Research.

Sheffield Gary. 2004. *The Somme.* London, UK: Cassell.

Shepard, Lorin. 1921. "Fighting the Turks at Aintab." *Current History* XIV(April-September). New York. New York Times Company, 590-593.

Shi, Shuang. 2004. *The First War since the Foundation of PRC [Kaiguo Diyi Zhan]*. Beijing: History of Chinese Communist Party Publisher.

Showatler, Dennis. 2014. *The Encyclopedia of Warfare*, London: Amber Books.

Shulimson, Jack. 1982. *U.S. Marines in Vietnam: An Expanding War, 1966.* Washington, DC: United States Marine Corps History and Museum Division.

Sierra, Cesar Elvir. 2012. *Las Campañas Militares del General Manuel Bonilla*. Tegucigalpa: Ediciones 18 Conejo.

Silbey, David J. 2012. *The Boxer Rebellion and the Great Game in China*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Singh, Rohit. 2012. "Operations in Jammu and Kashmir 1947-48." *Scholar Warrior* Autumn: 130-158.

Singh, V. K. 2005. *Leadership in the Indian army: biographies of twelve soldiers*. SAGE Publishing India.

Siniver, A., ed. 2013. *The October 1973 War: Politics, Diplomacy, Legacy*. Hurst Publishers.

Skoko, Savo. 1982. "An analysis of the Strategy of VojVod Putnik during the Balkan Wars". *War and Society in East Central Europe*. vol 18.

Snakeberg, Mark K. 2010. "An Nasiriyah America's First Battle in Operation Iraqi Freedom." *Army History* 76 (Summer): 32-43.

Spence, Jonathan D. 1991. *The Search for Modern China*. New York: Norton.

Spencer, David. 1998. Peru-Ecuador 1995: The Evolution of Military Tactics from the Conflict of 1981. *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 9(3): 129-151.

Stacey, Colonel C.P. 1960. *Official History of the Canadian Army in World War II: The Victory Campaign: The Operations in North-West Europe, 1944-1945*. Ottawa: The Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationary.

Stanton, Martin N. 1996. "The Saudi Arabian National Guard Motorized Brigades: Wheeled Armor Plays a Big Role In the Kingdom's Internal Security Mission." *ARMOR*, no. March-April: 6–11

Stapleton, T. 2018. *Africa: War and Conflict in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Routledge.

Stephenson, Charles. 2014. *A Box of Sand: The Italo-Ottoman War 1911-1912: The First Land, Sea and Air War*. East Sussex: Tattered Flag Press.

Stevenson, David. 2004. *The 1914-1918: The History of the First World War*. New York, NY: Allen Lane.

Stewart, Richard W. 2004. *The United States Army in Afghanistan, October 2001 – March 2002: Operation Enduring Freedom*. Washington, DC. United States Army Center of Military History.

Stewart, Richard W. 2010. *War in the Persian Gulf: Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm: August 1990-March 1991.* Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History, United States Army

Subramaniam, A. 2017. *India's Wars: A Military History, 1947-1971*. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press.

Sydney Morning Herald. 2003. "British Seek Revolution in Basra," March 31, 2003. https://www.smh.com.au/world/middle-east/british-seek-revolution-in-basra-20030331-gdgis3.html.

Szilassy, Sándor. 1971. *Revolutionary Hungary: 1918-1921*. Astor Park, FL: Danubian Press.

Szlanta, Piotr. 2014. "Cēsis, Battle of." 1914-1918 Online. October 8. https://encyclopedia.1914-1918-online.net/article/cesis_battle_of

Tal, David. 2004. *War in Palestine 1948: Israeli and Arab Strategy and Diplomacy.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Tanca, Antonio. 1993. *Foreign Armed Intervention in Internal Conflict*. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Tareke, Gebru. 2000. The Ethiopia-Somalia War of 1977 Revisited. The International Journal of African Historical Studies. Vol. 33 (3), pp. 635-667

Tareke, G. 2009. *The Ethiopian revolution: war in the Horn of Africa*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Telfer, Gary L, Lane Rogers and V. Keith Fleming. 1984. *U.S. Marines in Vietnam: Fighting the North Vietnamese 1967*. Washington, DC: United States Marine Corps History and Museum Division.

Tho, Tran Dnh. 1979. *The Cambodian Incursion*. Washington DC: US Army Center of Military History.

Thomas, Nigel and K. Mikulan. 2006. *The Yugoslav Wars (2): Bosnia, Kosovo, and Macedonia 1992-2001*. Osprey.

Thompson, HC. 1902. *China and the Powers: A Narrative of the Outbreak of 1900*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.

Tillotson, H. M. 1993. *Finland At Peace And War, 1918-1993*. Wilby, Norwich: Michael Russell.

Traas, Adrian. 2017. *Turning Point, 1967-1968*. Washington, DC: United States Army Center of Military History.

Trotter, W. 1991. *A Frozen Hell*. Chapel Hill: Algonquin Books.

Tucker, Spencer C. 1998. *The Great War: 1914-18*. London, UK: UCL Press.

Tucker, Spencer C., ed. 2005. *Encyclopedia of World War II*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

Tucker, Spencer C. 2010 *The Encyclopedia of Middle East Wars [5 volumes]: The United States in the Persian Gulf, Afghanistan, and Iraq Conflicts*. ABC-CLIO.

Tucker, Spencer C. 2011. *The Encyclopedia of the Vietnam War*. 2nd ed. ABC-CLIO.

Tucker, Spencer C. 2013. *Almanac of American Military History*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

Tully, J. 2003. France on the Mekong. New York: University Press of America.

United Kingdom Ministry of Defence. 2003. *Operations in Iraq: Lessons for the Future*. London, United Kingdom: Directorate General Corporate Communication.

United States Air Force Historical Support Division. 2012. "1999—Operation Allied Force." Washington, DC: United States Air Force. Available: https://www.afhistory.af.mil/FAQs/Fact-Sheets/Article/458957/operation-allied-force/.

United States Army Center of Military History. Undated. "China Relief Expedition Campaigns." Available: https://history.army.mil/html/reference/army_flag /cre.html.

United States Army Center of Military History. 2017. *Turning Point, 1967-1968*. Washington, DC: United States Army Center of Military History.

United States Army Center of Military History. 2010. *War in the Persian Gulf: Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, August 1990-March 1991*. Washington, DC: United States Army.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. Undated. “Chronology of Principal Events During the Hungarian Revolution, 23 October to 4 November 1956.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 1 February 1957. “Information Report: Hungary. 1. Sagvari Endre Quartermaster OCS. 2. Unidentified units, Casualities, Atrocities and Weapons Observed during the Hungarian Uprising.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 8 Feburary 1957. “Information Report: Hungary. 1. Military Units in Hungry. 2. The Hungarian Uprising.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 1 March 1957. “Hungary: Participation in the Hungarian Fight for Freedom.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. September 1975. “Intelligence Report: The 1973 Arab-Isareli War: Overview and Analysis of Conflict.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 10 June 1965. “The President’s Daily Brief.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 14 June 1965. “Central Intelligence Bulletin.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 29 June 1965. “Developments in South Vietnam During the Past Year.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 29 January 1966. “Central Intelligence Bulletin.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 31 January 1966. “The President’s Daily Brief.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 1 February 1966. “Central Intelligence Bulletin.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 3 February 1966. “Central Intelligence Bulletin.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 10 March 1966. “Central Intelligence Bulletin.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 14 November 1966. “The Situation in Vietnam.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 18 November 1966. “Operational Attleboro-Its Significance.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 27 November 1966. “The Situation in Vietnam.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 14 December 1966. “The Impact of Operation Attleboro.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 22 November 1967. “Central Intelligence Bulletin.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 24 November 1967a. “Central Intelligence Bulletin.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 24 November 1967b. “Current Intelligence Digest.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 30 January 1968. “The Situation in Vietnam.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 31 January 1968. “The Probable Strength of the Viet Cong Main and Local and North Vietnamese Army Forces in South Vietnam.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 28 May 1970. “The President’s Daily Brief.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 1973. *National Intelligence Survey: Hungary*. Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. July 1993. “National Intelligence Estimate: Combatant Forces in the Former Yugoslavia.” Langley, VA: United States Central Intelligence Agency.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 2002. *Balkan Battlegrounds: A Military History of the Yugoslav Conflict, 1990-1995*. Vol. I. 2 vols. Washington, D.C.: Office of Russian and European Analysis, Central Intelligence Agency

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 2003. *Balkan Battlegrounds: A Military History of the Yugoslav Conflict, 1990-1995*. Vol. II. 2 vols. Washington, D.C.: Office of Russian and European Analysis, Central Intelligence Agency

Urban, Mark. 1983. Soviet Intervention and the Ogaden Counteroffensive of 1978. *The RUSI Journal*. Volume 128 (2), pp. 42-46

Vachkov, A. 2005. The Balkan Wars 1912-1913. Sofia: Angela Publishing.

Van der Bijl, Nick. 2014. Nine Battles to Stanley. South Yorkshire: Pen & Sword

Van Dyke, C. 1997. *The Soviet Invasion of Finland 1939-1940*. London: Frank Cass.

Varble, D. 2008. *The Suez Crisis*. New York: Rosen.

Vikelis, Gintaras. 2006. *Relations between Lithuania and Poland in the League of Nations*. Vilnius: Versus Aureus.

Verge-Hodge, Edward Reginald. 1950. *Turkish Foreign Policy, 1918-1948.* PhD Thesis, Imprimerie Franco-Suisse, Ambilly-Annemasse.

Vien, Cao Van. 1985. *The Final Collapse*. Washington DC: US Army Center of Military History.

Von der Gotz, Rudiger. 1920. *Meine Sendung in Finnland und im Baltikum*. Leipzig: K.F. Koehler.

de Waal, Thomas. 2013. *Black Garden: Armenia and Azerbaijan through Peace and War.* 10th-year anniversary edition. New York: New York University Press.

Walker, Michael. 2017. *The 1929 Sino-Soviet War*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Walta Information Center. 1999. *One Year of Ethio-Eritrean Conflict*. Addis Ababa: Walta Information Center

Warbrick, Colin. 1991. "The Invasion of Kuwait by Iraq." *The International and Comparative Law Quarterly*. Vol. 40, No. 2. Cambridge University Press.

Ward, S. 2009. *Immortal: A Military History of Iran and its Armed Forces*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Weitsman, Patricia. 2013. *Waging War: Alliances, Coalitions, and Institutions of Interstate Violence*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Westermeyer, Paul W. 2008. *The Battle of al-Khafji*. Washington, D.C., United States Marine Corps History Division.

Weygand, Maxime. 1957. *Memoirs Volume II* Paris: Flammarion.

Williams, Scott. 2002. “The Battle of Al-Khafji.” Master’s Thesis, Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School

Wolpert, S. 2010. *India and Pakistan: continued conflict or cooperation?* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Woodward, A.S. 1992. *One Hundred Days: The Memoirs of the Falklands Battle Group Commander.* Annapolis, MD: US Naval Institute Press.

Woodward, Sandy. 1992. *Los Cien Dias with Patrick Robinson*. Translated by Julio Sierra. Buenos Aires: Editorial Suramericana,

Worrell, Harold H. 1994. “The Battle of Warsaw 1920: Impact on Operational Thought.” Ft. Leavenworth, KS: United States Army Command and General Staff College.

Wortzel, Larry M. 2003. “Concentrating Forces and Audacious Action: PLA Lessons from the Sino-Indian War” in *The Lessons of History: The Chinese People’s Liberation Army at 75.* Laurie Burkitt, Andrew Scobell, and Larry M. Wortzel, eds. Carlisle, PA. United States Army War College.

Xu Yan. 1990. *First Confrontation: Reviews and Reflections on the History of War to Resist America and Aid Korea [Di Yici Jiaoliang: Kangmei Yuanchao Zhanzheng de Lishi Huigu yu Fansi]*. Beijing: Chinese Radio and Television Publishing House.

Yan, Xu. 1990. *Battle of Quemoy* [Jinmen Zhizhan]. Shenyang: Liaoning People’s Press.

Yitzhak, R. 2012. *Abdullah Al-Tall, Arab Legion Officer: Arab Nationalism and Opposition to the Hashemite Regime*. New York: Apollo Books.

Zamora, P. 1925. *Vida military de Centro America*. Guatemala: Tipografia Nacional

Zamoyski, Adam. 1981. *The Battle for the Marchlands*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Zamoyski, Adam. 2014. *Warsaw 1920: Lenin’s Failed Conquest of Europe*. New York: William Collins.

Zhao, Shenying. 2001. General Zhang Guohua in Tibet [Zhang guohua Jiangjun zai Xizang] (Beijing: China Tibet Study Press.

Zhang, Xiaoming. 2015. *Deng Xiaoping’s Long War: The Military Conflict Between China and Vietnam, 1979-1991*. Chapel Hill, NC. University of North Carolina Press.

Zhanzheng Shi, Kangmei Yuanchao. 2000. *History of War to Resist America and Aid Korea*. Volume II. Edited by Department of Military History, Chinese Academy Military Science. Beijing: Military Science Press.z

Zhou, T., et al. 2011. *History of Republic of China*, Volume 8. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company