

MILITARY INTERVENTION PROJECT (MIP)

Codebook

Monica Duffy Toft
The Center for Strategic Studies (CSS)
The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy
160 Packard Avenue
Medford, MA 02155
Monica.Toft@tufts.edu

Sidita Kushi
Department of Political Science
Bridgewater State University
101 Clifford House
131 Summer St.
Bridgewater, MA 02325
skushi@bridgew.edu

Nils Hägerdal
The Center for Strategic Studies (CSS)
The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy
114 Curtis St.
Somerville, MA 02144
Nils.Hagerdal@gmail.com

Version 1.0
2022

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. DEFINITIONS AND OPERATIONALIZATION OF CONCEPTS.....	5
Table 1. Concepts and Sources	7
Table 2. Variable Codebook	15
III. THE UNIVERSE OF U.S. MILITARY INTERVENTIONS	31
(Drone data and Frontier Wars data available separately, please request)	31
Table 3. U.S. Military Interventions from 1776 – 2019, Comparative.....	31
IV. SAMPLE CASE STUDY NARRATIVES.....	44
NAME: Operation Restore Hope (UNITAF)	44
NAME: Greek Civil War	47
V. DATA AND CASE DISCREPANCIES.....	51
Table 4. Removed Cases of US Military Missions from 1776 – 2019	76
REFERENCES	81
APPENDIX.....	85
Selected Datasets on U.S. Military Intervention.....	85
The Military Intervention Project (MIP) Case Study Template	88
MIP Case Study Backlogging.....	92
Comparative Perspective on MIP	95

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the past decades, the United States (U.S.) has increasingly relied on its superior military capabilities to project power and promote its interests internationally. Consequently, U.S. military interventions are no longer foreign policy outliers, but part of a consistent pattern in regular state behavior. The empirical record of such military interventions, however, remains fragmented, as different sources rely on divergent definitions, timelines, and scopes of military intervention. Even the most common understanding of these military interventions as promoting US geopolitical interests does not sit well with the dynamics of the post-Cold War era, which was less prone to great power conflicts. In other words, if the US only militaristically intervenes when its security interests are threatened, why has it led more interventions in an era where fewer vital interests are arguably at stake?

Examining this increasing reliance on force is the focus of The Military Intervention Project (MIP) at the Center for Strategic Studies (CSS) at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University. MIP is a comprehensive dataset of all US military operations since the country's founding, including non-traditional operations, such as the frontier wars, which are coded separately as part of the project. MIP also measures domestic and international costs of US military involvements, alongside many other related factors.

This document proceeds in five parts. The next section outlines operational definitions of our unit of analysis and other major concepts relevant to the usage of force abroad. Included in this section are two detailed tables on concept operationalization and sources, as well as a comprehensive variable codebook.

In the third section, we provide the universe of U.S. military operations abroad since 1776 until 2019, while in the fourth section, we provide samples of our case narrative of intervention. MIP currently has over 400 of such case studies written.

Finally, in the fifth section, we list and describe a range of data discrepancies that we encountered when collecting cases of military intervention from other data sources. We include a table on removed cases, which could not be confirmed via case study/by at least three scholarly sources.

The Reference List includes all of our data sources, while the Appendix offers further information on the other datasets, the versions, and where to access them. The Appendix also includes MIP's case study template and backlogging code guide.

MIP improves upon existing intervention datasets by:

- 1) expanding the timeline of data from 1776 to 2019;
- 2) using different definitions of military intervention, including display and threat of force;
- 3) comparing definitions and cases across different databases;
- 4) measuring both short-term and long-term costs of intervention to the US and target states via a range of political and economic indicators;
- 5) measuring drone strikes and covert special forces operations, and how they are impacting patterns of intervention;

- 6) supplementing the quantitative data with individual case studies of U.S. military intervention since its founding.

Unlike existing databases, this project measures *every* confirmed instance of the US usage of force, including displays and threats of force and underexplored covert operations and drone strikes (included as separate sub-samples within the available data). Moreover, it matches these cases to the explicit costs of the mission, ranging from economic, political, to human costs. For a deeper scope of analysis, case study narratives of every intervention complement the aggregated dataset. By relying on a broad historical lens of US military interventions, this dataset can speak to long-term trends, dramatic changes, and lasting costs and benefits to domestic and international politics.

II. DEFINITIONS AND OPERATIONALIZATION OF CONCEPTS

One of the most challenging aspects of empirically tracing patterns of military interventions is how to define an intervention. Every leading dataset on military interventions offers its own definition, varying from types of interventions to degrees of intervention. To mitigate such definitional issues, MIP has reviewed cases of US military interventions from all available datasets and many other sources, coding each case's corresponding definition of intervention, as per the list below (definitions are not mutually exclusive). The Appendix offers more information on these sources.

MIP's unit of analysis is a US military intervention within a target country, with start and end dates. Taking inspiration from MID's definition, MIP's broadest definition of US intervention encompasses united instances of international conflict or potential conflict outside of normal peacetime activities in which the purposeful threat, display, or use of military force by official US government channels is explicitly directed toward the government, official representatives, official forces, property, or territory of another state actor (Palmer et al. 2015; Gibler 2018). This scaled measurement of hostility levels allows scholars to aggregate and disaggregate different types of interventions and even follow the progression from a US threat to any rise in hostility levels thereafter.

The definition of "US military intervention" may fall under any of the following categories, which each correspond to at least one existing dataset or list of US military intervention:

1. "The movement of regular troops or forces (airborne, seaborne, shelling, etc.) of one country inside another, in the context of some political issue or dispute." To separate higher intensity interventions from minor skirmishes, this definition excludes paramilitaries, government-backed militias, and other security forces that are not part of the regular uniformed military of a state. Similarly, "events must be purposeful, not accidental." Inadvertent border crossings are not included in this definition and neither are unintentional confrontations between planes or naval ships. The definition excludes soldiers engaging in exercises in a foreign land, transporting men or material across borders, or concentrated on foreign bases. Furthermore, the definition categorizes international military interventions by temporal guidelines so that interventions are continuous if repeated acts occur within six months of one another (Pearson and Baumann 1993). – International Military Intervention (IMI) dataset
2. "Instances in which the United States has used its Armed Forces abroad in situations of military conflict or potential conflict or for other than normal peacetime purposes...Covert operations, disaster relief, and routine alliance stationing and training exercises are not included here, nor are the Civil and Revolutionary Wars and the continual use of U.S. military units in the exploration, settlement, and pacification of the western part of the United States" (Salazar Torreon 2017). - Congressional Research Service (CRS)
3. "A political use of military force involving ground troops of either the US Army or Marine Corps in an active attempt to influence the behavior of other nations" (Blechnan and Kaplan 1978).

4. “Any deployment of US ground troops on the territory of another country that included at least 100 person-years” (Kavanagh et al. 2017). - RAND RUGID dataset.
5. “A use of armed force that involves the official deployment of at least 500 regular military personnel (ground, air, or naval) to attain immediate term political objectives through action against a foreign adversary. Routine military movements and operations without a defined target like military training exercises, the routine forward deployment of military troops, non-combatant evacuation operations, and disaster relief should be excluded” (Sullivan and Koch 2009). – Military Interventions by Powerful States (MIPS)
6. “Militarized interstate disputes are united historical cases of conflict in which the threat, display or use of military force short of war by one member state is explicitly directed towards the government, official representatives, official forces, property, or territory of another state” (Palmer et al. 2015; Gibler 2018). - Correlates of War (COW) Militarized Intrastate Disputes (MID) dataset

Table 1. Concepts and Sources

VARIABLE	INDICATORS	SOURCE
Usage/Threat of Force (Hostility Levels for State A, B, and Dyadic pair)	1. None 2. Threat to use force 3. Display of force 4. Use of force 5. Interstate war War dummy variable	Militarized Interstate Disputes (MID); Congressional Research Service (CRS); Military Intervention by Powerful States (MIPS) - Backlogged through Case study narratives
Fatality Level (total, State A, State B)	Fatality level of dyadic dispute: 0. None 1. 1-25 deaths 2. 26-100 3. 101-250 4. 251-500 5. 501-999 6. 1,000+	Militarized Interstate Disputes (MID) - Backlogged and edited through Case study narratives
Objective	1. Remove Foreign Regime 2. Maintain/Build Foreign Regime Authority 3. Maintain Empire 4. Acquire/Defend Territory 5. Policy Change 6. Social Protection & Order; 6.1. Social Protection 6.2. Humanitarian Intervention 7. Economic Protection; 8. Protect own Military and/or Diplomatic Interests 9. Unclear/missing	MID, International Military Intervention (IMI) - Case study narratives
Initiator (SideAA)	US on initiator of dispute's side? 1. Yes 0. No	MID - Case study narratives

Costs & Consequences of US Intervention

VARIABLE	INDICATORS	SOURCE
DIRECT COSTS		
Military Costs	Number of troop deployed and aircrafts, ships, and other equipment used for duration of mission.	Case study analysis
Outcome	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Victory for U.S. & Allies 2. Victory for Target & Allies 3. Yield by U.S. 4. Yield by Target Actor 5. Stalemate 6. Compromise 7. Released (for seizures) 8. Unclear/missing 9. Ongoing 	Adapted from MID, , backlogged via case study

Independent & Control Variables

VARIABLE	INDICATORS	SOURCE
GEOPOLITICAL NATIONAL INTERESTS		
Oil & Gas	Oil Exports, Production & Value Gas Exports, Production & Value	Ross and Mahdavi (2015)
Direct Contiguity	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Separated by a land or river border 2. Separated by 12 miles of water or less 3. Separated by 24 miles of water or less (but more than 12 miles) 4. Separated by 150 miles of water or less (but more than 24 miles) 5. Separated by 400 miles of water or less (but more than 150 miles) 	Correlates of War (COW)
Alliances	defense neutrality nonaggression entente	Correlates of War (COW)

Colonial Contiguity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land: Number of colonial land borders this year - Sea: Number of colonial sea borders this year - Total: Total number of colonial borders this year 	Correlates of War (COW)
Affinity Scores	Political affinity and alignment between target state and US – measured via UN General Assembly voting records	Voeten et al. (2009)

HUMAN COSTS		
Human Rights	CIRI Physical Integrity Rights CIRI Empowerment Rights CIRI Women’s Rights Child Mortality Rates (under 5) Life Expectancy	CIRI: Cingranelli et al. (2014) Roser (2018a) Roser (2018b)
Human Dislocation	Number of refugees & internally displaced per year: <i>Source:</i> Number of Refugees (x1000) Originating in country at end of year <i>IDP:</i> Number of Internally Displaced Persons (x1000) in county at end of year <i>Host:</i> Number of Refugees (x1000) hosted by country at end of year	World Refugee Survey Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) (Marshall 2008)
Political Terror Scale for target state	5-level “terror scale” from yearly country reports of Amnesty International, U.S. State Department Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, and Human Rights Watch’s World Reports.	(Gibney et al. 2017)

DOMESTIC FORCES		
US Party Affiliation (post-1945)	Dummies: 1 Democrat majority, 0 Republican majority Senate Democrat House Democrat Executive Democrat	The History, Art, and Archives: United States House of Representatives; U.S. Senate archives
Election Year	Presidential Election year dummy	
US Crime Rates	Total Violent Crime Rate (per 100,000 population): - Murder - Legacy & revised rape - Robbery - Aggravated Assault Total Property Crime Rate: - Burglary - Larceny-theft - Motor vehicle theft	Uniform Crime Reporting Statistics (UCR): Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)
US Human Capital Index	Human capital index, based on years of schooling and returns to education.	Feenstra et al (2015): Penn World Table
US Unemployment Rate	Unemployment, 16 years or older Average across months since 1948; December measures before 1948 due to data sources.	Bureau of Labor Statistics post-1948; Lebergott (1948) pre-1948.
State B Human Capital Index	Human capital index, based on years of schooling and returns to education.	Feenstra et al (2015): Penn World Table
US Federal Debt	Gross Federal Debt as % of GDP	Office of Management and Budget: Historical Tables
US Surplus & Deficit	In millions of dollars As % of GDP (since 1930) In billions of constant FY 2009 dollars (since 1940)	Office of Management and Budget: Historical Tables
US Government Expenditures	Total Government Expenditures as % of GDP Total Defense & International Expenditures as % of GDP	Office of Management and Budget: Historical Tables

National Defense Outlays	Total National Defense Outlays for major public direct physical capital investment in millions of dollars Defense outlays % of total outlays	Office of Management and Budget: Historical Tables
Department of Defense vs. Department of State Outlays	DOD Outlays (in millions of \$) DOS Outlays (in millions of \$) DOD Outlays (% of total outlays) DOS Outlays (% of total outlays) DOS/DOD Outlay rate (from \$ outlays) DOS/DOD Outlay rate (from % outlays)	Office of Management and Budget: Historical Tables
Department of Defense vs. Department of State Budget Authority	DOD Budget Authority (in millions of \$) DOS Budget Authority in millions of \$) DOD Budget Authority (% of total) DOS Budget Authority (% of total) DOS/DOD Budget rate (from \$ measure) DOS/DOD Budget rate (from % measure)	Office of Management and Budget: Historical Tables
ECONOMICS & TRADE		
Trade Flow	Imports of Country A from Country B in current US millions of dollars. Imports of Country B from Country A in current US millions of dollars.	Correlates of War (COW)

National Trade	Total Imports of Country in current US millions of dollars. Total Exports of Country in current US millions of dollars.	Correlates of War (COW)
US GDP per capita	US GDP per capita, real and inflation-fixed numbers.	BEA (2018) & Johnston and Williamson (2018)
State B GDP per capita	Real GDP at constant 2011 national prices (in mil. 2011US\$)	Feenstra et al (2015): Penn World Table
US Recession	Dummy variable for recession, defined as a significant decline in economic activity spread across the economy, lasting more than a few months, normally visible in real GDP, real income, employment, industrial production, and wholesale-retail sales.	National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER)
STATE MILITARY POWER (for US & State B)		
Total Population	National Material Capabilities Index	Correlates of War (COW)
Military Expenditures	National Material Capabilities Index	Correlates of War (COW)
Military Personnel	National Material Capabilities Index	Correlates of War (COW)
Primary Resource Consumption	National Material Capabilities Index	Correlates of War (COW)
DEMOCRACY & COUPS		
Level of Democracy	Polity Democracy Score for US and Target State	Polity (Marshall 2008)
	Democracy and Dictatorship (DD) scores for US and Target State	Cheibub, Gandhi, Vreeland (2010)
Regime Stability	Regime durability: number of yrs since most recent regime change, for Target state	Polity Durable Index (Marshall and Gurr 2018)

Coup Attempts	<p>Coup is “overt attempts by the military or other elites within the state apparatus to unseat the sitting head of state using unconstitutional means.”</p> <p>“A coup attempt is defined as successful if the coup perpetrators seize and hold power for at least seven days.”</p>	Powell and Thyne (2011)
----------------------	--	-------------------------

Table 2. Variable Codebook (All Variables Marked -9 if missing)

Variable	Variable Label	Value Labels	Comments
Name	Name of Dispute	Operation name and/or other common names for incident	
Dispnum	Dispute Number	Match to MID 4.2 numbers	Marked -9 if missing
State B	State B	COW Abbreviated name of target of US threat, display, or usage of force.	If case includes more than one state, all names are listed
State B Code	State B Code	COW Number of State B	If case includes more than one state, all codes are listed
Location	Location	Location of dispute by COW country code. Listed as Disputed if in international waters or disputed territory	Confirmed by case study
Styear	Start Year of Dispute		Case study
Stmonth	Start Month of Dispute		Case study
Stdaily	Start Day of Dispute		Case study
Endyear	End Year of Dispute		Case study
Endmon	End Month of Dispute		Case study
Endday	End Day of Dispute		Case study
Era2	Era when Dispute Started	Time period when dispute began, using Start Year: 1. 1776-1812 2. 1813-1864 3. 1865-1917 4. 1918-1945 5. 1946-1989 6. 1990-2000 7. 2001-2019	Periods are categorized based on key historical events and consensus. For instance, #7 depicts the post-9/11 era, while #6 depicts the post-Cold War era (unipolar moment).
Decade	Decade in which Dispute Started (for post-1940 cases only)	Decade when dispute began, using Start Year: 1. 1940-1949 2. 1950-1959 3. 1960-1969 4. 1970-1979 5. 1980-1989 6. 1990-1999 7. 2000-2009 8. 2010-2019	

Variable	Variable Label	Value Labels	Comments
Ongoing	Ongoing dispute	Is dispute ongoing as of Dec. 31, 2019 ? 1. Yes; 0. No	Case study
InterType	Intervention Type	1. Unilateral 2. Multilateral non-UN 3. Multilateral UN 4. Other	Case study
US HiHost	US Highest Hostility Level	Hostility level reached by US 1. No militarized action 2. Threat to use force 3. Display of force 4. Use of force 5. War	Scale adopted from MID 4.0 and Dyadic MID 3.0. We code all non-MID cases to correspond to scale.
Dyadic HiHost	Highest level of hostility in dyadic dispute	Same as US HiHost for Dyadic	Scale adopted from Dyadic MID 3.0.
HiHostB	Highest level of hostility by State B (target) in dispute	Same as US HiHost for State B	Scale adopted from Dyadic MID 3.0.
US HighAct	Highest action by US in Dispute	Numbers in parenthesis refer to corresponding hostility levels. 1. None (1) 2. Threat to use force (2) 3. Threat to blockade (2) 4. Threat to occupy terr. (2) 5. Threat to declare war (2) 6. Threat to join war (2) 7. Show of troops (3) 8. Show of ships (3) 9. Show of planes (3) 10. Alert (3) 11. Nuclear Alert (3) 12. Mobilization (3) 13. Fortify border (3) 14. Border violation (4) 15. Blockade (4) 16. Occupation of territory (4) 17. Seizure (4) 18. Clash (4) 19. Raid (4) 20. Declaration of war (4) 22. Begin interstate war (5) 23. Join interstate war (5) 24. Use CBR Weapons (5)	Scale was adopted from MID 4.0 and Dyadic MID 3.0. We code all non-MID cases to correspond to this scale. - Confirmed by case study

Variable	Variable Label	Value Labels	Comments
Dyadic HighAct	Highest military confrontation action in dyadic dispute	Same as US HighAct for Dyadic	The Scale was adopted from Dyadic MID 3.0.
HighActB	Highest action by State B (target) in dispute	Same as US HiAct for State B	The Scale was adopted from Dyadic MID 3.0.
US Orig	US Originator of Dispute	1= Yes; 0 = No	Case study
Outcome	Outcome of Dyadic Dispute	1. Victory for U.S. & Allies 2. Victory for Target & Allies 3. Yield by U.S. 4. Yield by Target Actor 5. Stalemate 6. Compromise 7. Released (for seizures) 8. Unclear/missing 9. Ongoing	Adopted partially from MID 4.0 and completed using case studies. Listed only for the last year of the dispute.
Objective	Objective(s) of US military mission. (Also exists as individual dummy variable per category)	1. Remove Foreign Regime 2. Maintain/Build Foreign Regime Authority 3. Maintain Empire 4. Acquire/Defend Territory 5. Policy Change 6. Social Protection & Order; 6.1. Social Protection 6.2. Humanitarian Intervention 7. Economic Protection; 8. Protect own Military and/or Diplomatic Interests 9. Unclear/missing	Adopted from MID, International Military Intervention (IMI), & Case study narratives. More than one objective may be selected, as dummy variable. See Appendix for description of categories. - Confirmed via case study
Fatalities	Fatalities	Average number of all casualties across sources	Case studies
FatLev	Total Fatality Level of Dyadic Dispute, scaled version.	0. None 1. 1-25 deaths 2. 26-100 3. 101-250 4. 251-500 5. 501-999 6. 1,000+	Adopted from MID 4.0. Listed only for the last year of the dispute. - Confirmed by case study

Variable	Variable Label	Value Labels	Comments
FatUS	All Fatalities incurred by the US	Average number of all US casualties across sources	Case studies
FatB	All Fatalities incurred by State B	Average number of all State B casualties across sources	Case studies
FatLevUS	All Fatalities incurred by US in dyadic dispute, scaled version.	Same as FatLev for the US.	Listed only for the last year of the dispute.
FatLevB	Fatality incurred by State B (target) in dyadic dispute, scaled.	Same as FatLev for State B.	Listed only for the last year of the dispute.
BattleFat	Battle Fatalities	Average number of all battle casualties across sources	Case studies
BattleFatUS	US Battle Fatalities	Average number of US battle casualties across sources	Case studies
BattleFatB	State B Battle Fatalities	Average number of State B battle casualties across sources	Case studies
BattleLev	Battle fatalities incurred by all, scaled.	Same as FatLev scale.	Case studies, using MID fatalities coding.
BattleLevUS	Battle fatalities incurred by US, scaled	Same as FatLev scale.	Case studies, using MID fatalities coding.
BattleLevB	Battle fatalities incurred by State B, scaled	Same as FatLev scale.	Case studies, using MID fatalities coding.
MaxCost	Maximum \$ Costs incurred by US	Maximum dollar value	Case studies
MaxTroops	Maximum US troops deployed in dispute	Maximum number of US air, ground, and sea troops deployed to conflict throughout dispute	Case studies
MaxNavy	Maximum US naval vessels	Maximum number of naval vessels used by US during dispute.	Case studies
MaxAir	Maximum US aerial usage	Maximum number of airplanes, drones, and other aerial equipment used by US	Case studies
OriginatA	US participated in the first incident of dispute	1. Yes; 0. No	1=US either primary initiator or primary target; 0=US joiner (on initiator or target side) Corresponds with MID 4.0 SideAA.

Variable	Variable Label	Value Labels	Comments
StateBPrimary	Is State B the primary target of US action in this case?	1. Yes; 0. No.	Case studies
SideAA	US on initiator's side?	1. Yes; 0. No.	Case studies
OriginatB	State B initiator of first incident?	1. Yes; 0. No	Case studies
Cumdurat	Number of cumulative dispute days	Days	Cumulative number of days from start date of dispute to end
MID Addition	Added dispute outside of MID sources	1. Yes; 0. No	
IMI Dummy	Dispute listed in International Military Intervention (IMI)	1. Yes; 0. No	
MIPS Dummy	Dispute listed in Military Interventions by Powerful States (MIPS) dataset.	1. Yes; 0. No	
CRS Dummy	Dispute listed in Congressional Research Service (CRS) "Instances of Use of United States Armed Forces Abroad, 1798-2017"	1. Yes; 0. No	
ACD Dummy	Dispute listed in Armed Conflict Dataset (ACD)	1. Yes; 0. No	
National Interest Index	Additive Index of Contiguity, Colonial, Alliance, and Oil Dummies	Additive scale of 1-4 Ordinal Additive Index = (OilDummy + Colonial History + AllianceDummy + ContiguityDummy)	Constructed from data
Contiguity	Direct contiguity of target state to the US	1. Separated by a land or river border 2. Separated by 12 miles of water or less 3. Separated by 24 miles of water or less (but more than 12 miles) 4. Separated by 150 miles of water or less (but more than 24 miles) 5. Separated by 400 miles of	Adapted from COW

		water or less (but more than 150 miles)	
Variable	Variable Label	Value Labels	Comments
Contiguity Dummy	Does US and State B have direct contiguity?	1. Yes; 0. No	
US CINC	Composite Index of National Capability (CINC) score for US	<p>Includes disaggregated indicators as well:</p> <p><i>US Milex</i>: Military Expenditures (For 1816-1913: thousands of current year British Pounds. For 1914+: thousands of current year US Dollars.)</p> <p><i>US Milper</i>: Military Personnel (thousands)</p> <p><i>US Irst</i>: Iron and steel production (thousands of tons)</p> <p><i>US Pec</i>: Primary energy consumption (thousands of coal-ton equivalents)</p> <p><i>US Tpop</i>: Total population (thousands)</p> <p><i>US Upop</i>: Urban population (living in cities with population greater than 100,000; in thousands)</p>	The CINC reflects an average of a state's share of the system total of each of the six element of capabilities in each year, weighting each component equally. In doing so, the CINC will always range between 0 and 1. "0.0" would indicate that a state had 0% of the total capabilities present in the system in that year, while "1.0" would indicate that the state had 100% of the capabilities in a given year (from COW).
State B CINC	Composite Index of National Capability (CINC) for State B	Same as US CINC indicators above, but for State B	
Defense	Is US in a defense pact with State B during dispute?	1. Yes; 0. No	From COW
Neutrality	Is US in neutrality pact with State B during dispute?	1. Yes; 0. No	From COW
Nonaggression	Is US in non-aggression pact with State B?	1. Yes; 0. No	From COW

Variable	Variable Label	Value Labels	Comments
Entente	Is US in entente with State B?	1. Yes; 0. No	From COW
Alliance(1-4)	Number of alliances between US and State B during year of dispute, from Neutrality to Entente.	Range of 1-4	
Alliance Dummy	Does US and State B have alliance during year of dispute?	1. Yes; 0. No	
Colonial Land	Number of colonial land borders in start year between US and State B		From COW
Colonial Sea	Number of colonial sea borders in start year between US and State B		From COW
Colonial Contiguity	Total number of colonial borders in start year between US and State B		From COW
Colonial Dummy	Does US and State B share a colonial border?	1. Yes; 0. No	
US Imports	Total Imports of US in current US millions of dollars.		From COW
US Exports	Total Exports of US in current US millions of dollars.		From COW
State B Imports	Total Imports of State B in current US millions of dollars.		From COW
State B Exports	Total Exports of State B in current US millions of dollars.		From COW
Trade Flow1	Imports of US from Country B in current US millions of dollars.		From COW
Trade Flow2	Imports of Country B from US in current US millions of dollars.		From COW

Variable	Variable Label	Value Labels	Comments
US Democ	Institutionalized Democracy Indicator	Additive scale (0-10)	Polity
US Autoc	Institutionalized Autocracy Indicator	Additive scale (0-10)	Polity
US Polity2	US regime score, standardized for transition periods	Score ranges from +10 (full democracy) to -10 (full autocracy)	
US Durable	Durability Index for US	Number of years since most recent regime change (defined by a threepoint change in the Polity score over a period of three years or less)	
State B Democ	State B Institutionalized Democracy Indicator	Same as US Democ, State B	
State B Autoc	State B Institutionalized Autocracy Indicator	Same as US Autoc, State B	
State B Polity2	State B regime score	Same as US Polity2, State B	
State B Durable	Durability Index for State B	State as US Durable, State B	
Democracy	State B Democracy	1 if State B qualifies as a democracy in start year	Based on Democracy and Dictatorship (DD) Index
Assconfid	State B Democracy with Assembly Confidence	1 if State B is democracy and government is subject to assembly confidence, 0 otherwise. In start year.	DD Index
Poppreselect	State B Democracy with Popular Elections	1 if State B regime is democracy and head of state chosen via popular election.	DD Index
Regime	State B Regime Type	Six-fold regime classification for State B during start year: 0. Parliamentary democracy 1. Mixed (semi-presidential) democracy 2. Presidential democracy 3. Civilian dictatorship 4. Military dictatorship 5. Royal dictatorship	DD Index

Variable	Variable Label	Value Labels	Comments
Stra	State B Past Authoritarianism	Sum of past transitions to authoritarianism in State B.	DD Index
Ttd	State B Transition to Democracy	Coded 1 when there is transition to democracy in State B in start year.	DD Index
Tta	State B Transition to Dictatorship	Coded 1 when there is a transition to dictatorship in State B in start year.	DD Index
US Source	Number of Refugees Originating in US at end of year	In thousands	
US IDP	Number of Internally Displaced Persons in US at end of year	In thousands	
US Host	Refugees hosted by US at end of year	In thousands & % change	Also in % change (US HostChange)
State B Source	Refugees Originating in State B end of year	In thousands	
State B IDP	Internally Displaced Persons in State B at end of year	In thousands	
State B Host	Refugees hosted by State B at end of year	In thousands	
US nGDP	US Nominal GDP	In millions of current dollars	
US rGDP	US Real GDP	In millions of 2012 dollars	
US nGDP Capita	US Nominal GDP/Capita	In millions of current dollars	
US Real GDP Capita	US Real GDP/Capita	In millions of 2012 dollars	Also in % Change (USrGDPCChange)
US Recession	Is the US in a Recession during the current year?	1. Yes; 0. No	A significant decline in economic activity. lasting more than a few months, visible in real GDP, income, employment, industrial production, and retail sales.
S2un	Dyadic Affinity Score with 2 Categories	Voter data categories: 1 = yes or approval for an issue; 2 = no or disapproval for an issue. range from -1 (least similar interests) to 1 (most similar)	

Variable	Variable Label	Value Labels	Comments
S3un	Dyadic Affinity Score with 3 Categories	Voter data categories: 1 = yes or approval for an issue; 2 = abstain, 3 = no or disapproval for an issue.	
Agree2un	Voting Similarity Index with 2 Categories	0-1 Index, equal to (total # of votes where both states agree)/(total # of joint votes) – computed using 2 category voter data (1 = yes or approval for an issue; 2 = no or disapproval for an issue.)	
Agree3un	Voting Similarity Index with 2 Categories	0-1 Index, computed using 3 category vote data (1 = yes or approval for an issue; 2 = abstain, 3 = no or disapproval for an issue)	Abstention is counted as half-agreement with a yes or no vote
PhysInt	Physical Integrity Rights Index for State B	Additive index constructed from the Torture, Extrajudicial Killing, Political Imprisonment, and Disappearance indicators. From 0 (no government respect for rights) to 8 (full government respect)	CIRI Index
Disap	Disappearances for State B	0: disappearances have occurred frequently in year; 1: disappearances occasionally occurred; 2: disappearances did not occur in year.	
Kill	Extrajudicial Killings for State B	Same as Disap but for killings	
PolPris	Political Imprisonment for State B	Same as Disap but for political imprisonment	
Tort	Torture for State B	Same as Disap but for torture	
Relfree	Freedom of Religion Index for State B	0: government restrictions on religious practices are severe and widespread. 1: Restrictions are moderate 2: Restrictions are practically absent.	

Variable	Variable Label	Value Labels	Comments
Empinx	Empowerment Rights Index for State B	Additive Index constructed from the Foreign Movement, Domestic Movement, Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Assembly & Association, Workers' Rights, Electoral Self-Determination, and Freedom of Religion indicators. Ranges from 0 (no government respect for rights) to 14 (full government respect).	
Worker	Worker's Rights for State B	0: Workers' rights were severely restricted; 1: Workers' rights were somewhat restricted; 2: workers' rights were fully protected during year.	
Wecon	Women's Economic Rights for State B	0: no economic rights for women in law and systematic discrimination built into law; 1: Some economic rights under law, but not effectively enforced; 2: Some economic rights under law, effectively Enforced, but still allowing low level of discrimination; 3: All or nearly all of women's economic rights guaranteed by law and fully enforced.	
Wopol	Women's Political Rights for State B	0: Women's political rights were not guaranteed by law; 1: Rights guaranteed in law, but severely prohibited in practice; 2: Rights guaranteed in law, but moderately prohibited in practice; 3: Rights guaranteed in both law and practice.	

Variable	Variable Label	Value Labels	Comments
Injud	Independence of the Judiciary for State B	0: not independent; 1: partially independent; 2: generally independent	
UNReg	UN Region Category for State B	Africa – 2 Latin American & Caribbean – 419 Northern America – 21 Asia – 142 Europe – 150 Oceania – 9	Variable exists in numerical and text form (UNRegN and UNRegT)
SubReg	UN Sub-Region Category for State B	North Africa – 15 Sub-Saharan Africa – 202 Caribbean – 29 North America – 21 Central & South America – 14 Middle East – 5 Asia – 35 Eastern Europe – 151 Southern Europe – 39 Western & North Europe – 154 Oceania – 9	Variable exists in numerical and text form (SubRegN and SubRegT)
OECDReg	OECD Region Category for State B	eap – East Asia and Pacific eca – Europe and Central Asia lac – Latin America and Caribbean mena – Middle East and North Africa na – North America sa – South Asia ssa – Sub-Saharan Africa	
PTS_A	Political Terror Scale, Amnesty International for State B	5-level increasing terror scale from yearly country reports	
PTS_S	Political Terror Scale, Department of State for State B	5-level increasing terror scale from yearly reports on Human Rights Practices	
ChildMort	Under Five Mortality Rate for State B		
LifeExp	Life Expectancy for State B		

Variable	Variable Label	Value Labels	Comments
StateBHC	Human Capital Index for State B	Based on years of schooling and returns to education	
StateBrGDP	Real GDP for State B	In 2011 constant dollars	
USHC	Human Capital Index for US	based on years of schooling and returns to education	
USunemp	US Unemployment Rate	Unemployment, 16 years or older. Average across months since 1948; December measures before 1948	
USDeficit	US Deficit	In millions of US dollars	
USDeficitGDP	US Deficit as % GDP		
USDeficitCon	US Deficit Constant	In billions of 2009 dollars	
USDebtGDP	US Debt as % of GDP		
USExpGDP	Total US Government Expenditures % GDP		
USDExpGDP	Total Defense & International Expenditures % GDP		
USCapInv	Total National Defense Outlays for public direct physical capital investment	In millions of dollars	
DefOutlay%	Defense outlays as % of total outlays		
DODOutlays\$	DOD Outlays	In millions of dollars	
DOSOutlays\$	DOS Outlays	In millions of dollars	
SDratioOutlays\$	DOS/DOD Outlay Ratio	In millions of dollars	
DODOutlays%	DOD Outlays % of total outlays		
DOSOutlays%	DOS Outlays % of total outlays		
SDratioOutlays%	DOS/DOD Outlay Ratio	In % of total outlays	
DOD BA\$	DOD Budget Authority	In millions of dollars	
DOS BA\$	DOS Budget Authority	In millions of dollars	

Variable	Variable Label	Value Labels	Comments
SDratioBA\$	DOS/DOD Budget Ratio	In millions of dollars	
DOD BA%	DOD Budget Authority % of total		
DOS BA%	DOS Budget Authority % of total		
SDratioBA%	DOS/DOD BA Ratio	In % of total outlays	
SenateDem	Senate Democrat	1: Democrat majority; 0: Republican majority	
HouseDem	House Democrat	1: Democrat majority; 0: Republican majority	
PresidentDem	President Democrat	1: Democrat president; 0: Republican president	
DemControl	Degrees of Democratic Control of Government	1: Majority in 1 branch 2: Majority in 2 branches 3: Majority in all branches	
RepControl	Degrees of Republican Control of Government	1: Majority in 1 branch 2: Majority in 2 branches 3: Majority in all branches	
CongressDem	Majority Democrat in both chambers of Congress	1: Majority Democrat in Congress 0: No Majority of Democrats	
CongressRep	Majority Republican in both chambers of Congress	1. Majority Republican in Congress 0. No Majority of Republicans	
PresElectionYear	Presidential Election Year	1: Yes; 0: No	
ViolentCrime	Total Violent Crime Rate	Per 100,000 population Includes separate indicators: - Murder - Legacy & revised rape - Robbery - Aggravated Assault	
PropertyCrime	Total Property Crime Rate	Includes separate indicators: - Burglary - Larceny-theft - Motor vehicle theft	
Oil Dummy	Oil Dummy	Coded 1 when target state's oil exports exceed one-third of export revenues	Fortna (2008)

Variable	Variable Label	Value Labels	Comments
Oil_prop	Oil Production	Volume measured in metric tonnes	
Gas_prop	Gas Production	Volume measured in metric tonnes	
Oil_value_nom	Value of Oil, nominal US dollars	Multiply volume by world price for oil in nominal US dollars	Nominal dollars per million British Thermal Units
Oil_value_2000	Value of Oil, constant 2000 US dollars	Multiply volume by world price for oil in 2000 US dollars	Also available in 2014 US dollars
Gas_value_nom	Value of Gas, nominal	Same as Oil_value_nom	
Gas_value_2000	Value of Gas, 2000 US dollars	Same as Oil_value_2000	Also available in 2014 US dollars
Oilgas_value_nom	Value of Gas and Oil, nominal US dollars	Added Gas and Oil values from above in nominal dollars	
Oilgas_value_2000	Value of Gas and Oil, 2000 US dollars	Added Gas and Oil values in 2000 US dollars	Also available in 2014 US dollars
Oil_exports	Oil Exports	Thousands of barrels per day, metric tonnes per year	
Gas_exports	Gas Exports	Billions of cubic feet per year	
PresName	President in power during start year		
Coup1 (Also available Coup2, 3, 4)	First coup attempt in Target State	First coup attempt in country/year. 0=no coup attempt; 1=failed coup attempt 2=successful coup attempt in	“Overt attempts by the military or other elites within the state apparatus to unseat the sitting head of state using unconstitutional means...defined as successful if perpetrators hold power for at least 7 days” (Powell & Thyne 2011)
MilExp_Con	US Military Expenditures	In Constant Millions of 2018 US Dollars	Source: SIPRI
ExpShareGDP	US Military Expenditures, % of GDP		SIPRI
Description	Description of Military Missions	Short overview of US military involvement in State B during year.	

Era	Pivotal Era of US Foreign policy in which intervention occurred (as per MIP book categories)	1. 1776-1864 2. 1865-1917 3. 1918-1945 4. 1946-1989 5. 1990-2000 6. 2001-2019	
-----	--	--	--

III. THE UNIVERSE OF U.S. MILITARY INTERVENTIONS

(Drone data and Frontier Wars data available separately, please request)

Table 3. U.S. Military Interventions from 1776 – 2019, Comparative

Target State	Target COW ID	Start Year	End Year	Remove	MID	IMI	MIPS	CRS	ACD
FRN	220	1798	1801	0	0	0	0	1	0
LIB	620	1801	1805	0	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1806	1806	0	0	0	0	1	0
SPN, FRN	220, 230	1806	1810	0	0	0	0	1	0
SPN	230	1810	1810	0	0	0	0	1	0
SPN	230	1812	1814	0	0	0	0	1	0
UKG	200	1812	1815	0	0	0	0	1	0
SPN	230	1813	1813	0	0	0	0	1	0
CUB	40	1814	1825	1	0	0	0	1	0
UKG	200	1814	1814	1	0	0	0	1	0
LIB/ALG	620/615	1815	1815	0	0	0	0	1	0
SPN	230	1817	1819	0	1	0	0	1	0
SPN	230	1817	1817	0	0	0	0	1	0
RUS/SPN		1818	1818	0	0	0	0	1	0
SPN	230	1818	1818	1	1	0	0	1	0
Africa/LBR	450	1820	1823	0	0	0	0	1	0
CUB	40	1822	1824	0	0	0	0	1	0
CUB	40	1823	1823	1	0	0	0	1	0
CUB	40	1824	1824	1	0	0	0	1	0
SPN	230	1824	1824	0	0	0	0	1	0
CUB	40	1825	1825	0	0	0	0	1	0
GRC	350	1827	1827	0	0	0	0	1	0
IDN	750	1832	1832	0	0	0	0	1	0
ARG	160	1833	1833	0	0	0	0	1	0
COL	100	1834	1834	1	1	0	0	0	0
FRN	220	1835	1835	1	1	0	0	0	0
PER	135	1835	1836	0	1	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1836	1837	0	1	0	0	0	0
MEX	70	1836	1836	0	1	0	0	0	0
UKG	200	1837	1838	1	1	0	0	0	0
IDN	750	1838	1839	0	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1838	1838	1	1	0	0	0	0
MEX	70	1835	1835	0	1	0	0	0	0
UKG	200	1839	1839	0	1	0	0	0	0
FIJ	950	1840	1840	0	0	0	0	1	0
KIR	946	1841	1841	0	0	0	0	1	0
WSM	990	1841	1841	0	0	0	0	1	0

MEX	70	1842	1842	0	1	0	0	0	0
CHN	710	1843	1843	0	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1843	1848	1	1	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1846	1848	0	0	0	0	1	0
UKG	200	1846	1846	1	1	0	0	0	0
TUR	640	1849		1					
MEX	70	1850	1851	1	1	0	0	0	0
SPN	230	1850	1850	0	1	0	0	0	0
Johanns Isl.	N/A	1851	1851	0	0	0	0	1	0
TUR	640	1851	1851	0	0	0	0	1	0
ARG	160	1852	1853	0	0	0	0	1	0
PER	135	1852	1852	0	1	0	0	0	0
AUH	300	1853	1853	0	1	0	0	1	0
JPN	740	1853	1854	0	0	0	0	1	0
NIC	93	1853	1854	0	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1854	1854	0	0	0	0	1	0
NIC	93	1854	1854	1	0	0	0	1	0
SPN	230	1854	1854	0	1	0	0	1	0
UKG	200	1854	1854	0	1	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1855	1855	0	0	0	0	1	0
FIJ	950	1855	1855	0	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1855	1855	0	1	0	0	1	0
SPN	230	1855	1855	1	1	0	0	1	0
URU	165	1855	1855	0	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1856	1856	0	0	0	0	1	0
COL	100	1856	1856	0	1	0	0	1	0
PAN	95	1856	1856	0	0	0	0	1	0
UKG	200	1856	1856	0	1	0	0	1	0
NIC	93	1857	1857	0	0	0	0	1	0
FIJ	950	1858	1858	0	0	0	0	1	0
PER	135	1858	1858	1	1	0	0	1	0
TUR	640	1858	1858	0	0	0	0	1	0
UKG	200	1858	1858	0	1	0	0	1	0
URU	165	1858	1858	0	0	0	0	1	0
PAR	150	1858	1859	0	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1859	1859	0	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1860	1860	0	1	0	0	0	0
ANG	540	1860	1860	0	0	0	0	1	0
COL	100	1860	1860	0	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1860	1860	0	1	0	0	0	0
UKG/FRN/SPN	200	1860	1860	0	1	0	0	0	0
UKG/CUB/RUS	200	1861	1861	0	1	0	0	0	0
JPN	740	1863	1864	0	1	0	0	1	0
JPN	740	1864	1864	1	0	0	0	1	0
SPN	230	1864	1864	1	1	0	0	1	0
FRN	220	1865	1866	0	1	0	0	0	0

PAN	95	1865	1865	0	0	0	0	1	0
BRA	140	1866	1866	0	1	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1866	1866	0	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1866	1866	0	0	0	0	1	0
SPN	230	1866	1866	0	1	0	0	0	0
NIC	93	1867	1867	0	0	0	0	1	0
TAW	713	1867	1867	0	0	0	0	1	0
COL	100	1868	1868	0	0	0	0	1	0
JPN	740	1868	1868	0	0	0	0	1	0
URU	165	1868	1868	0	0	0	0	1	0
HAI	41	1869	1869	0	1	0	0	0	0
CHN	710	1870	1870	0	1	0	0	0	0
Hawaii		1870	1870	1	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1870	1870	0	1	0	0	1	0
KOR	730	1871	1871	0	0	0	0	1	0
COL	100	1873	1873	0	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1873	1882	0	1	0	0	1	0
SPN	230	1873	1873	1	1	0	0	0	0
Hawaii		1874	1874	0	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1874	1875	0	1	0	0	0	0
MEX	70	1876	1876	0	1	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1880	1880	1	1	0	0	0	0
UKG	200	1881	1881	1	1	0	0	0	0
EGY	651	1882	1882	0	0	0	0	1	0
HAI	41	1882	1882	1	1	0	0	0	0
CHL	155	1883	1883	1	1	0	0	0	0
GUA	90	1885	1885	1	1	0	0	1	0
JPN	740	1885	1885	1	1	0	0	0	0
PAN	95	1885	1885	0	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1886	1886	1	1	0	0	1	0
GMY	255	1888	1889	0	1	0	0	1	0
HAI	41	1888	1889	0	1	0	0	1	0
KOR	730	1888	1888	0	0	0	0	1	0
WSM	990	1888	1889	0	0	0	0	1	0
HAI	41	1889	1889	1	1	0	0	1	0
Hawaii		1889	1889	0	0	0	0	1	0
ARG	160	1890	1890	0	0	0	0	1	0
CHL	155	1891	1892	0	1	0	0	1	0
HAI	41	1891	1891	0	1	0	0	1	0
Hawaii		1893	1893	0	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1893	1893	0	1	0	0	0	0
BRA	140	1894	1894	0	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1894	1895	0	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1894	1895	1	0	0	0	1	0
KOR	730	1894	1896	0	0	0	0	1	0
NIC	93	1894	1894	0	0	0	0	1	0

COL	100	1895	1895	0	0	0	0	1	0
FRN	220	1895	1895	1	1	0	0	0	0
SPN	230	1895	1895	1	1	0	0	0	0
COL	100	1896	1896	1	1	0	0	1	0
NIC	93	1896	1896	0	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1898	1898	0	0	0	0	1	0
NIC	93	1898	1898	0	0	0	0	1	0
PRI		1898	1898	1	0	0	0	1	0
SPN	230	1898	1898	0	1	0	0	1	0
SPN, Guam		1898	1899	1	0	0	0	0	0
NIC	93	1899	1899	0	0	0	0	1	0
PHI	840	1899	1906	0	0	0	0	1	0
WSM	990	1899	1899	0	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1900	1900	0	1	0	0	1	0
DOM	42	1900	1900	0	1	0	0	1	0
COL	100	1901	1901	0	0	0	0	1	0
COL	42	1902	1902	0	0	0	0	1	0
COL	100	1902	1902	0	0	0	0	1	0
UKG	200	1902	1903	0	1	0	0	1	0
UKG, GMY, ITA	200	1902	1903	0	1	0	0	1	0
BRA	140	1903	1903	1	1	0	0	1	0
COL	100	1903	1914	0	1	0	0	1	0
DOM	42	1903	1903	0	0	0	0	1	0
ETH	530	1903	1904	0	0	0	0	1	0
HON	91	1903	1903	0	0	0	0	1	0
PAN	5	1903	1914	1	0	0	0	1	0
SYR	652	1903	1903	0	0	0	0	1	0
UKG	200	1903	1903	1	1	0	0	1	0
KOR	730	1904	1905	0	0	0	0	1	0
MOR	600	1904	1904	0	1	0	0	1	0
PAN	95	1904	1904	0	0	0	0	1	0
DOM	42	1904	1904	0	1	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1905	1906	1	1	0	0	0	0
CUB	40	1906	1909	0	0	0	0	1	0
HON	91	1907	1907	0	0	0	0	1	0
PAN	95	1908	1908	0	0	0	0	0	0
NIC	93	1909	1933	1	1	0	0	1	0
NIC	93	1910	1910	0	1	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1911	1913	0	0	0	0	1	0
GUA	90	1911	1911	1	1	0	0	1	0
HAI	41	1911	1911	0	1	0	0	1	0
HON	91	1911	1911	0	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1911	1919	0	1	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1912	1941	1	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1912	1912	1	0	0	0	1	0
CUB	40	1912	1912	0	0	0	0	1	0

HON	91	1912	1912	0	0	0	0	1	0
NIC	93	1912	1912	0	0	0	0	1	0
PAN	95	1912	1914	0	0	0	0	1	0
TUR	640	1912	1912	0	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1913	1914	1	1	0	0	1	0
DOM	42	1914	1914	0	1	0	0	0	0
DOM	42	1914	1914	1	0	0	0	1	0
HAI	41	1914	1914	0	1	0	0	0	0
MEX	70	1914	1917	1	0	0	0	1	0
GMY	255	1915	1915	1	1	0	0	0	0
HAI	41	1915	1920	0	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1915	1915	1	1	0	0	0	0
CHN	710	1916	1916	0	0	0	0	1	0
DOM	42	1916	1924	0	1	0	0	1	0
GMY	255	1917	1917	0	0	0	1	1	0
MEX	70	1916	1917	1	1	0	0	0	0
AUH, BUL, GMY, TUR	255,300,355	1917	1918	0	1	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1917	1917	0	0	0	0	1	0
CUB	40	1917	1922	0	0	0	0	1	0
SWD	380	1917	1917	1	1	0	0	0	0
MEX	70	1918	1918	1	1	0	0	1	0
PAN	95	1918	1920	0	0	0	0	1	0
RUS	365	1918	1920	1	1	0	0	1	0
RUS	365	1918	1922	0	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1918	1920	1	1	0	0	1	0
CRO	344	1918	1912	0	0	0	0	1	0
HON	91	1919	1919	0	0	0	0	1	0
TUR	640	1919	1919	0	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1920	1920	0	0	0	0	1	0
GUA	90	1920	1920	0	0	0	0	1	0
CUB	40	1921	1921	0	1	0	0	1	0
PAN/COS	94/95	1921	1921	0	1	0	0	1	0
SAL	92	1921	1921	0	1	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1922	1922	0	0	0	0	1	0
TUR	640	1922	1922	0	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1924	1924	0	0	0	0	0	0
CHN	710	1924	1924	0	0	0	0	1	0
HON	91	1924	1924	0	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1925	1925	0	0	0	0	1	0
HON	91	1925	1925	0	0	0	0	1	0
PAN	95	1925	1925	0	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1926	1926	0	1	0	0	0	0
NIC	93	1926	1933	0	1	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1927	1927	0	1	0	0	0	0
HON	91	1929	1929	0	1	0	0	0	0
CHN	710	1932	1932	0	0	0	0	1	0

JPN	740	1932	1932	1	1	0	0	0	0
SAL	92	1932	1932	0	0	0	0	1	0
CUB	40	1933	1934	0	1	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1934	1934	0	0	0	0	1	0
JPN	740	1937	1937	0	1	0	0	0	0
GMY	255	1939	1939	1	1	0	0	0	0
UKG	200	1939	1940	1	1	0	0	0	0
JPN	740	1940	1941	0	1	0	0	0	0
Newfoundland, Bermuda		1940	1940	1	0	0	0	1	0
Greenland		1941	1941	1	0	0	0	1	0
ICE	395	1941	1941	1	0	0	0	1	0
JPN, GMY, ITA, ROM, HUN, BUL	740	1941	1945	0	1	0	0	1	0
NTH	210	1941	1941	1	0	0	0	1	0
BUL	355	1941	1941	1	1	0	0	0	0
GMY	255	1941	1941	1	1	0	0	1	0
FRN	220	1942	1942	1	1	0	0	0	0
THI	800	1942	1942	1	1	0	0	0	0
ITA	325	1943	1943	1	1	0	0	0	0
CHN	710	1945	1949	0	0	0	0	1	0
RUS	365	1946	1946	0	1	0	0	0	0
YUG	345	1946	1946	0	1	0	0	0	0
LBR	450	1947	1947	1					
URU	165	1947	1947	0	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1948	1949	1	0	0	0	1	0
GRC	350	1948	1949	0	0	0	1	0	0
ISR	666	1948	1949	0	0	0	0	1	0
RUS	365	1948	1949	0	1	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1949	1950	1	1	0	0	0	0
TAW	713	1949	1950	1	1	0	0	0	0
YUG, BUL, RUS	345	1949	1951	0	1	0	0	1	0
CHN, PRK	710	1950	1953	0	1	1	1	0	0
PRI	N/A	1950	1950	1	0	0	0	1	1
TAW	713	1951	1954	0	1	0	0	1	0
PHL	840	1951	1954	1	0	1	0	1	0
ECU	130	1952	1952	1	1	0	0	1	0
CHN, RUS	710	1953	1953	0	1	0	0	0	0
CZE, RUS	315	1953	1953	0	1	0	0	0	0
IRN	630	1953	1953	1	0	0	0	0	0
RUS, CHN	365	1953	1956	1	1	0	0	1	0
TAW, CHN	713	1953	1955	0	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1954	1954	0	1	0	1	1	0
GUA	90	1954	1954	0	0	0	0	1	0
NIC	93	1954	1954	1	1	0	0	0	0
PRK	731	1954	1956	0	1	0	0	0	0
SWZ	225	1954	1954	1	1	0	0	0	0

DRV	816	1955	1964	0	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1955	1955	0	1	0	0	0	0
ECU	130	1955	1955	1	1	0	0	0	0
PER	135	1955	1955	1	1	0	0	0	0
CHN	710	1956	1956	0	1	0	0	0	0
EGY	651	1956	1956	1	0	0	0	1	0
RUS	365	1956	1956	0	1	0	0	0	0
CHN	710	1957	1957	0	1	0	0	0	0
CZE	315	1957	1957	1	1	0	0	0	0
SYR	652	1957	1957	1	1	1	0	0	0
ALB	339	1958	1958	1	1	0	0	0	0
CUB	40	1958	1958	1	0	1	0	0	0
GDR	265	1958	1958	1	1	0	0	0	0
GUA	90	1958	1958	1	1	0	0	0	0
IRQ	645	1958	1959	0	0	0	0	1	0
LEB, RUS, IRQ, EGY	660	1958	1958	0	1	1	0	0	0
PAN	95	1958	1959	1	0	0	0	1	0
PRK	731	1958	1961	0	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1958	1959	0	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1958	1958	0	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1958	1958	1	1	0	0	0	0
CHN	365	1958	1958	0	1	1	1	1	0
CUB	40	1959	1960	0	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1960	1960	1	1	0	0	0	0
CUB	40	1960	1961	0	1	1	0	0	0
DRC	490	1960	1964	0	0	1	0	1	0
RUS	365	1960	1960	0	1	0	0	0	0
DOM	42	1961	1961	0	1	1	1	1	0
DRV	816	1961	1962	1	1	0	1	1	0
DRV, RUS, CHIN	816	1961	1961	1	1	0	0	0	0
GDR, POL, CZE, RUS	265	1961	1961	0	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1961	1961	0	1	0	0	0	0
CHN	710	1962	1962	0	1	0	0	0	0
CUB, RUS	40	1962	1962	0	1	0	1	1	0
EGY, YAR	651	1962	1962	1	1	0	0	0	0
LAO, CHIN	812	1962	1973	0	1	0	0	1	0
PER	135	1962	1962	1	1	0	0	0	0
PRK	731	1962	1964	1	1	0	0	0	0
THI	800	1962	1962	0	0	1	0	1	0
ECU	130	1963	1963	1	1	0	0	0	0
HAI, DOM	41, 42	1963	1963	0	1	1	0	0	0
IRQ	645	1963	1963	1	0	0	0	1	0
RUS	365	1963	1963	1	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1963	1963	1	1	0	0	0	0
CAM	811	1964	1969	0	1	1	0	0	0
DRC	490	1964	1965	0	0	1	0	1	0

PRK, RUS, ROK	731, 732, 365	1964	1969	1	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1964	1964	1	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1964	1964	1	1	0	0	0	0
RVN, RUS, CHIN, DRV, LAO	817, 816, 365	1964	1973	0	0	1	1	1	0
CHN	710	1965	1968	0	1	0	0	0	0
CHN, CAM	710	1965	1966	1	1	0	0	0	0
DOM	42	1965	1966	0	0	1	1	1	0
INS	850	1965	1965	1	0	0	0	0	0
PRK	731	1965	1965	0	1	0	0	0	0
GUA	90	1966	1968	0	0	0	0	1	0
RUS	365	1966	1966	1	1	0	0	1	0
CAM	811	1967	1967	1	1	0	0	0	0
DRC	490	1967	1967	0	1	0	0	1	0
ECU	130	1967	1967	1	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1967	1967	0	1	0	0	1	0
RUS	365	1967	1967	1	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1967	1967	1	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1967	1967	0	1	0	0	0	0
CAM	811	1968	1969	1	1	1	0	0	0
EGY	651	1968	1968	0	1	0	0	0	0
PRK	731	1968	1968	0	1	0	0	0	0
CHN	710	1969	1969	0	1	0	0	0	0
PRK	731	1969	1969	0					
PER	135	1969	1969	1	1	0	0	0	0
CAM	811	1970	1970	0	0	0	1	1	0
RUS	365	1970	1970	0	1	0	0	0	0
RUS, IRQ, SYR	365	1970	1970	0	1	0	1	0	0
CHN	710	1971	1971	1	1	0	0	0	0
CUB	40	1971	1971	0	1	0	0	0	0
ECU	130	1971	1971	1	1	0	0	0	0
CHN	710	1972	1972	0	1	0	0	0	0
ECU	130	1972	1972	1	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1972	1972	1	1	0	0	0	0
CHL	155	1973	1973	1	0	0	0	1	0
LIB	620	1973	1973	1	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1973	1973	0	1	0	0	0	0
CUB	40	1974	1974	1	1	0	0	0	0
CAM	811	1975	1975	0	1	1	0	0	0
PRK	731	1975	1975	0	1	0	0	0	0
ANG	540	1976	1992	1	1	0	0	1	0
CUB	40	1976	1976	0	1	0	0	0	0
ISR	666	1976	1976	1	1	0	0	0	0
LEB	660	1976	1976	0	0	0	0	1	0
PRK	731	1976	1976	0	1	0	0	0	0
PRK	731	1976	1976	1	1	0	0	0	0

CUB	40	1977	1977	1	1	0	0	0	0
PRK	731	1977	1978	0	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1977	1977	1	1	0	0	0	0
DRC	490	1978	1978	0	0	0	0	1	0
RUS	365	1978	1979	0	1	0	0	0	0
CAN	20	1979	1979	1	1	0	0	0	0
CUB, RUS	40	1979	1979	0	1	0	0	0	0
NIC	93	1979	1979	1	0	1	0	1	0
PER	135	1979	1979	1	1	0	0	0	0
PRK	731	1979	1980	0	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1979	1979	0	1	0	0	0	0
ECU	130	1980	1981	1	1	0	0	1	0
IRN	630	1980	1980	1	0	0	0	1	0
IRN	630	1980	1980	0	1	1	0	0	0
RUS	365	1980	1980	0	1	0	0	1	0
CUB	40	1981	1981	0	1	0	0	0	0
LIB	620	1981	1981	1	1	0	0	0	0
LIB	620	1981	1981	0	1	0	0	0	0
PRK	731	1981	1982	1	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1981	1981	1	1	0	0	0	0
SAL	92	1981	1992	0	0	0	0	1	0
EGY	651	1982	1982	0	0	0	0	1	0
GRC	350	1982	1984	0	1	0	0	0	0
LIB	620	1982	1982	1	1	0	0	0	0
NIC	93	1982	1982	0	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1982	1986	0	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1982	1982	1	1	0	0	0	0
SYR, LEB	652, 660	1982	1984	0	1	1	1	1	0
YPR	680	1982	1982	1	1	0	0	0	0
CHA	483	1983	1983	1	0	0	0	1	0
CUB	40	1983	1983	0	1	0	0	0	0
GRN	40, 55	1983	1983	0	1	1	1	1	0
HON	91	1983	1989	1	0	1	0	1	0
IRN	630	1983	1983	0	1	0	0	1	0
LIB, CHA	620, 483	1983	1983	0	1	0	0	1	0
LIB	620, 651	1983	1983	0	1	0	0	1	0
NIC	93	1983	1988	0	1	0	0	0	0
PRK	731	1983	1983	0	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1983	1984	0	1	0	0	0	0
EGY	651	1984	1984	0	0	1	0	1	0
IRN	630	1984	1984	0	0	0	0	1	0
IRN	630	1984	1984	1	1	0	0	0	0
LIB	620	1984	1984	0	1	0	0	0	0
PRK	731	1984	1985	1	1	0	0	1	0
RUS	365	1984	1984	1	1	0	0	0	0
CZE	315	1985	1985	1	1	0	0	1	0

GDR, RUS	265	1985	1985	1	1	0	0	1	0
IRN	630	1985	1986	0	1	0	0	1	0
ITA	325	1985	1985	0	0	0	0	1	0
LIB	620	1985	1985	0	1	0	0	1	0
BOL	145	1986	1986	0	0	0	0	1	0
IRN	630	1986	1988	0	1	0	0	0	0
LIB	620	1986	1986	0	0	0	0	0	0
LIB	620	1986	1986	0	1	1	1	1	0
NIC	93	1986	1988	1	1	0	1	1	0
RUS	365	1986	1986	1	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1986	1986	1	1	0	0	0	0
CUB	40	1986	1986	0	1	0	0	0	0
IRN	630	1987	1988	1	1	0	0	0	0
IRQ	645	1987	1987	0	1	0	0	0	0
PAN	95	1987	1988	0	1	1	0	0	0
IRQ	645	1988	1988	1	1	0	0	0	0
LIB	620	1988	1989	0	1	0	0	0	0
CAN	20	1989	1989	1	1	0	0	1	0
COL, BOL, PER	100, 145, 153	1989	1994	0	0	0	0	1	0
PAN	95	1989	1990	0	1	1	1	1	0
PHI	840	1989	1989	0	0	1	0	1	0
CUB	40	1990	1990	1	1	0	0	0	0
IRQ	645	1990	1991	1	1	1	1	1	0
KUW	690	1990	1991	1	1	1	1	1	0
LBR	450	1990	1991	0	0	0	0	1	0
SAU	670	1990	1991	0	1	1	1	1	0
CAN	20	1991	1991	0	1	0	0	1	0
DRC	490	1991	1991	0	0	0	0	1	0
IRN	630	1991	1991	0	1	0	0	1	0
IRQ	645	1991	2003	1	0	1	1	1	0
IRQ	645	1991	1991	0	1	1	1	1	0
SOM	520	1991	1991	0	0	0	0	0	0
IRQ	645	1991	2003	0	1	0	1	1	0
PER	135	1992	1992	0	1	0	0	1	0
SIE	451	1992	1992	0	0	0	0	1	0
SOM	520	1992	1992	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOM	520	1992	1993	0	0	1	1	1	0
YUG	345	1992	1996	0	1	0	1	1	0
BOS	346	1993	2004	0	0	0	0	1	0
IRQ	645	1993	1993	1	1	0	0	1	0
IRQ	645	1993	1993	1	1	0	0	1	0
MAC	343	1993	1999	0	0	0	0	1	0
PRK	731	1993	1993	0	1	0	0	1	0
PRK	731	1993	1999	0	1	0	0	1	0
SOM	520	1993	1995	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOM	520	1993	1994	1	0	1	1	1	0

CHN	710	1994	1994	1	1	0	0	0	0
HAI	41	1994	1995	0	1	1	1	1	0
DRC	490	1994	1994	0	0	1	0	1	0
IRQ	645	1994	1995	1	1	1	1	0	0
MAC	345	1994	1994	1	1	0	0	0	0
RWA	517	1994	1994	0	0	1	0	0	0
CHN	710	1995	1996	0	1	0	1	1	0
CEN	482	1996	1996	0	0	0	0	1	0
CUB	40	1996	1996	1	1	0	0	0	0
IRQ	645	1996	1996	1	1	1	1	1	0
LBR	450	1996	1996	0	0	0	0	1	0
SYR	652	1996	1996	1	1	0	0	0	0
ALB	339	1997	1997	0	0	0	0	1	0
CAM	811	1997	1997	0	0	0	0	1	0
CAN	20	1997	1997	1	1	0	0	1	0
DRC	490	1997	1997	0	0	0	0	1	0
IRN	630	1997	1997	0	1	0	0	1	0
IRQ	645	1997	2003	1	1	0	1	1	0
RUS	365	1997	1997	1	1	0	0	1	0
SIE	451	1997	1997	0	0	0	0	1	0
AFG	700	1998	1998	0	1	1	0		0
GNB	404	1998	1998	0	0	0	0	1	0
KEN, TAZ	501, 510	1998	1998	0	0	0	0	1	0
LBR	450	1998	1998	0	1	1	0		0
SUD	625	1998	1998	0	1	1	0	1	0
CHN	710	1999	2000	0	1	0	0		0
ETM	860	1999	2002	0	0	0	0	1	0
PRK	731	1999	1999	0	1	0	0		0
RUS	365	1999	1999	1	1	0	0		0
VEN	101	1999	2000	0	1	0	0	0	0
YUG	345	1999	1999	0	1	0	1	1	0
ERI	531	2000	2008	0	0	0	0	1	0
PRK	731	2000	2000	1	1	0	0		0
RUS	365	2000	2001	0	1	0	0		0
RUS	365	2000	2000	0	1	0	0		0
RUS	365	2000	2000	1	1	0	0		0
SIE	451	2000	2001	0	0	0	0	1	0
YEM	679	2000	2000	0	0	0	0	1	0
YUG	345	2000	2000	0	1	0	0	1	0
YUG	345	2000	2000	0	1	0	0		0
YUG	345	2000	2000	1	1	0	0		0
AFG	700	2001	2003	1	1	1	1	1	0
AFG	700	2001		0	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	2001	2001	0	1	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	2001	2001	0	1	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	2001	2001	1	1	0	0		0

MAC	343	2001	2002	1	0	0	0	1	0
CDI	437	2002	2002	0	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	2002	2002	1	1	0	0		0
DJI	522	2002	2006	0	0	0	0	1	0
PAK	770	2002	2005	0	1	1	0		0
PHI	840	2002	2002	0	0	0	0	0	0
PRK	731	2002	2002	1	1	0	0		0
COL	100	2002	2005	0	0	0	0	0	0
INS	850	2003	2003	0	1	0	0	0	0
IRN	630	2003	2003	0	1	0	0		0
IRQ	645	2003	2011	0	0	1	0	1	0
LBR	450	2003	2003	0	0	0	0	1	0
PRK	731	2003	2003	0	1	0	0	0	0
TUR	640	2003	2003	0	1	0	0	0	0
ETH	530	2003	2015	0	0	0	0	1	0
CDI	437	2004	2004	1	1	0	0	1	0
HAI	41	2004	2004	0	0	0	0	1	0
IRN	630	2004	2011	0	1	0	0	0	0
IRN	630	2004	2005	0	1	0	0	1	0
KEN	501	2004		0	0	0	0	1	0
PRK	731	2004	2004	0	1	0	0	1	0
SYR	652	2004	2004	0	1	0	0	1	0
PAK	770	2005	2006	0	0	1	0	0	0
PAK	770	2005	2005	0	1	0	0	0	0
PAK	770	2005	2006	0	1	0	0	1	0
SYR	652	2005	2005	0	1	0	0	1	0
YEM	679	2005		0	0	0	0	1	0
LEB	660	2006	2006	0	0	0	0	1	0
PAK	770	2006	2010	0	1	0	0	1	0
SOM	520	2006	2008	0	0	0	0	0	0
IRN	630	2007	2007	0	1	0	0		0
IRN	630	2007	2007	0	1	0	0	0	0
IRN	630	2008	2008	1	1	0	0		0
PAK	770	2008	2008	0	1	0	0		0
PAK	770	2008	2009	0	1	0	0	0	0
SOM	520	2008	2008	1	1	0	0		0
SYR	652	2008	2008	0	1	0	0		0
CHN	710	2009	2009	0	1	0	0		0
IRN	630	2009	2009	0	1	0	0	0	0
YEM	679	2009	2009	0	0	0	0	0	0
PRK	731	2009	2010	0	1	0	0	0	0
PAK	770	2010	2010	0	1	0	0	0	0
VEN	101	2010	2010	0	1	0	0	0	0
UGA	500	2011	2017	0	0	0	0	1	0
LIB	620	2011	2011	0	0	0	0	1	0
SYR	652	2011		1					

SSD	626	2011		1	0	0	0	1	0
DRC	490	2011		1	0	0	0	1	0
CEN	482	2012		1	0	0	0	1	0
PHI	840	2012	2012	0	0	0	0	1	0
SOM	520	2012	2012	0	0	0	0	1	0
CEN	482	2013	2013	0	0	0	0	1	0
JOR	663	2013		0	0	0	0	1	0
NIR	436	2013		0	0	0	0	1	0
IRQ, SYR	645, 625	2014		0	0	0	0	1	0
LBR	450	2014	2015	0	0	0	0	1	0
SYR	652	2014	2019	0	0	0	0	1	0
UKR	369	2014		0	0	0	0	1	0
AFG	700	2015		0	0	0	0	1	0
CAO	471	2015		0	0	0	0	1	0
HAI	41	2016	2016	0	0	0	0	1	0
YEM	679	2016	2016	0	0	0	0	1	0
DMA	54	2017	2017	0	0	0	0	1	0
GUA, HON, COL	90, 91, 100	2017	2017	0	0	0	0	1	0
LKA	780	2017	2017	0	0	0	0	1	0
PER	135	2017	2017	0	0	0	0	1	0
Dominica, St. Martin,	220, 210	2017	2017	0	0	0	0	1	0
URU	165	2017	2017	0	0	0	0	1	0
THI	800	2018	2018	0	0	0	0	1	0
ICE	395	2018	2018	1	0	0	0	1	0
HON	91	2018	2018	0	0	0	0	1	0
ECU	130	2018	2018	0	0	0	0	1	0
IRQ	645	2019	2020	0	0	0	0	1	0
SAU	670	2019		0	0	0	0	1	0

IV. SAMPLE CASE STUDY NARRATIVES (all cases available upon request)

NAME: Operation Restore Hope (UNITAF)

DISPUTE NUMBER: N/A

DATES: December 3, 1992 - May 9, 1993

TARGET STATE(S): Somalia (SOM), 520

SUMMARY:

The collapse of the Somali state in 1991 further increased conflict between various armed groups and provisional governments. In July 1992, 50 unarmed U.N. military observers were deployed to Mogadishu to oversee the ceasefire that had been reached. On August 15, 1992, UNOSOM I, the U.N.'s humanitarian relief mission, Operation Provide Relief began.

UNOSOM I failed to stop violence and famine. 500,000 Somalis had already died from hunger by the fall of 2012. On December 3rd, U.N. Security Council Resolution 794 authorized the U.S.-led intervention "to use all necessary means to establish a secure environment for humanitarian relief operations in Somalia as soon as possible." The United States sent troops to protect relief workers and establish security to promote an environment for eventual political reconciliation. Operation Restore Hope included air assault operations, patrols, cordons and searches, and other combat operations to facilitate the distribution of humanitarian aid.

President George W. Bush ordered 25,000 troops to Somalia to provide additional security. The first forces arrived in Mogadishu on December 9, 1992. CENTCOM directed a joint and combined task force under UN auspices. The United States initially resisted the expansion of the original mission, but eventually attempted to disarm some of the local militias.

By March 1993, mass starvation had been overcome, and the security situation improved. The U.S. turned over operations to the U.N. on May 9, 1993. By June 1993 1,200 American troops remained in Somalia.

SOURCES:

Davis, Lois M., Susan D. Hosek, Michael G. Tate, Mark Perry, Gerard Hepler, and Paul S. Steinberg. 1996. *Army Medical Support for Peace Operations and Humanitarian Assistance*, Chapter 4. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

https://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR773/MR773.chap4.html

DeBruyne, Nese F. 2018. *American War and Military Operations Casualties: Lists and Statistics*, September 14. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL32492.pdf>

Harned, Glenn M. 2016. *Stability Operations in Somalia 1992-1993: A Case Study*. United States Army War College Press.
<http://pksoi.armywarcollege.edu/default/assets/File/Stability%20Ops%20in%20Somalia.pdf>.

“Operation Restore Hope,” *Global Security*,
https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/restore_hope.htm

Peace Operations: Cost of DOD Operations in Somalia. 1994. (Chapter Report, 03/04/94, GAO/NSIAD-94-88),<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GAOREPORTS-NSIAD-94-88/html/GAOREPORTS-NSIAD-94-88.htm>

Schmitt, Eric. 1993. “Somali War Casualties May Be 10,000,” *New York Times*, December 8.
<https://www.nytimes.com/1993/12/08/world/somali-war-casualties-may-be-10000.html>.

Snyder, R. 2001. “Operation Restore Hope, Battle of Mogadishu,” August.
<https://novaonline.nvcc.edu/eli/evans/his135/Events/Somalia93/somalia93.html>

“United States Forces, Somalia After Action Report and Historical Overview: The United States Army in Somalia, 1992–1994.” 2003. *Center of Military History*, United States Army.
<https://history.army.mil/html/documents/somalia/SomaliaAAR.pdf>.

Uppsala Conflict Data Program (Date of retrieval: 1/17/19) *UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia*. Uppsala University. www.ucdp.uu.se.

OBJECTIVE:

Social Protection & Order; Humanitarian Intervention

OUTCOME:

Victory for U.S. & Allies

BATTLE DEATHS:

43 U.S. troops, FAS
○ Army: 31, Marine Corps: 4, Air Force: 8

US/Total Death Rate: .43%

TOTAL DEATHS:

From June-Oct 1992
○ 6,000-10,000 Somali casualties, Somali sources
○ Several thousands, U.N. and Red Cross
● June 5th, 24 Pakistanis

COSTS:

- Marines, Air Force, Army, Special Operations Forces
- At its height, 30,000 American troops
- When President Bill Clinton took office on January 20, 1993, UNITAF consisted of 37,000 troops (24,000 U.S. and 13,000 coalition)
- Deployed engineer force
- \$1.7 billion dollars (1992-1994), New York Times
- Dec 1992-April 1993: 692.2 million, GAO
- Of the almost \$885 million in incremental costs incurred through fiscal year 1993, DOD was reimbursed by the United Nations for at least \$123.6 million for UNITAF and UNOSOM II.

DEFINITIONAL ISSUES: This case appears in the MIPS, IMI, and CRS datasets of US military involvements, but not in the MID dataset (perhaps due to the multilateral nature of the mission). But the timeframes of the incident vary across sources. MIPS has a start date of December 3, 1992 and an end date of May 4, 1993. IMI has a start date of December 9, 1992 and end date of March 25, 1994. We use the start date of December 3rd, 1992 as this is when UN authorization for the US mission began, and we use the end date of May 9, 1993 - when the US handed the mission to UN authorities. We code a new incident for the post-1993 mission that is portrayed in the IMI coding (Operation Continue Hope).

Lastly, due to a high degree of overlap between UNITAF and UNOSOM II, especially during the transition period, it was difficult to confirm figures for each individual intervention.

NAME: Greek Civil War

DISPUTE NUMBER: N/A

DATES: February 28, 1948 - October 16, 1949

TARGET STATE(S): Greece (GRC), 350

SUMMARY:

British forces liberated Greece from Nazi forces in 1944 and subsequently took responsibility for maintaining a fragile peace between the National Unity government and the Greek Community Party's military wing, the Greek National Liberation Army (ELAS). Fighting broke out between the British, Communists and Nationalists between 1944 and 1945 as the Communist forces refused to disarm after the Nazis were removed. The Communists and Nationalists returned to fighting in March 1946, with the ELAS receiving support from Communists in neighboring Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania. The British forces (nearly 40,000 strong) alerted the United States in early 1947 that, due to an internal economic crisis, Great Britain would no longer be able to supply economic and military aid to the Greek state, and that British military forces (except advisers) would be leaving by March 31, 1947.

On March 12, 1947, President Truman asked a joint session of Congress for \$400 million in military and economic assistance to Greece and Turkey, with the majority of funds directed to Greece. Truman's address to Congress laid out the Truman Doctrine, in which American foreign policy would support anti-Communist movements and governments wherever they were threatened. The next month, Secretary of State George Marshall announced further economic aid to Greece under the auspices of the European Recovery Program, known colloquially as the "Marshall Plan".

By 1949, roughly 500 American military advisers were assisting the Greek government in beating back Communist guerillas in the north. One American Lieutenant Colonel was killed when his air support aircraft was shot down during a battle with ELAS forces. The significantly larger Greek government forces struggled against the ELAS guerillas until 1948, when the Soviet Union broke off relations with Tito's Yugoslavia over their continued support of the Greek rebels. The Soviets and British had agreed after World War II to a "percentages agreement," which delineated which Balkan states would remain under their respective sphere of influence; the U.S.S.R. had agreed to leave Greece to the British. Tito, Yugoslavia's Communist dictator, continued to supply the ELAS and was rebuked by Stalin. This led to serious divisions inside the Greek Communist party and ELAS, and by 1949 Tito had ceased supporting the rebels. A final offensive by the Greek military in August 1949 pushed the remaining rebel forces into Albania, effectively ending the war.

Greece would remain a divided country for the following decades, with multiple political murders culminating in a coup in 1967 and counter-coup in 1973. American military advisers, especially Lt General James Van Fleet, would exercise considerable influence in Greek politics throughout the 50s and 60s, successfully pushing the government to take a harder line against left wing movements in favor of reactionary right-wing politics.

SOURCES:

Calbos, Paul T. 1993. *Cold War Conflict: American Intervention in Greece*. PhD diss., Indiana University, 1993.

Harris, William D. 2012. *Instilling Aggressiveness: U.S. Advisors and Greek Combat Leadership in the Greek Civil War, 1947-1949*. U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth: United States Army.

Nachmani, Amikam. 1990. "Civil War and Foreign Intervention in Greece: 1946-49." *Journal of Contemporary History* 25, no. 4: 489-522. doi:10.1177/002200949002500406.

Van Schaick, F. 1949. "American Aid to Greece." *Editorial Research Reports* 19491. <https://library.cqpress.com/cqresearcher/document.php?id=cqresrre1949020900>.

OBJECTIVE:

Maintain/Build Foreign Regime Authority; defend Greek state from Communist rebels

Protect own Military and/or Diplomatic Interests; ensure Greece remains within Western sphere of influence and can act as bulwark against Soviets and Tito in Yugoslavia

OUTCOME:

Victory for U.S. & Allies; Communist rebels defeated in 1949 and Western-backed government remains in power

BATTLE DEATHS:

Guerillas: 29,000 killed, 13,000 captured, 28,000 surrendered¹

Government: 11,000 killed, 23,000 wounded, 8,000 missing²

Guerillas and government: ~50,000 killed³

United States: 1 killed⁴

US/Total Death Rate: .002%

¹ Nachmani, Amikam. "Civil War and Foreign Intervention in Greece: 1946-49." *Journal of Contemporary History* 25, no. 4 (October 1990): 489-522. Accessed January 15, 2019. doi:10.1177/002200949002500406.

² *ibid*

³ "Greek Civil War." Encyclopædia Britannica. November 26, 2018. Accessed January 15, 2019. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Greek-Civil-War>.

⁴ Calbos, Paul T. *COLD WAR CONFLICT: AMERICAN INTERVENTION IN GREECE*. PhD diss., Indiana University, 1993.

Per capita battle deaths: 533.3-666.7 per 100,000 Greeks

TOTAL DEATHS:

100,000 killed (civilians, soldiers and guerillas)⁵

~140,000 killed (civilians, soldiers and guerrillas)⁶

4,000 civilians killed by guerillas alone ⁷

Per capita total deaths:

1,333.3-1,866.6 per 100,000 Greeks

COSTS:

700,000 Greeks displaced by the violence⁸

\$350 million in combined military and economic aid for 1947-48⁹

\$200 million in combined military and economic aid for 1948-49¹⁰

~\$550 million in total American aid to Greece during the Civil War (does not include funds disbursed under Marshall Plan)

American aid financed 67% of Greek imports and accounted for 25% of Greek GDP during the Civil War (1947-49)¹¹

\$700 million in economic aid disbursed to Greece under the Marshall Plan¹²

DEFINITIONAL ISSUES: This incident appears in the MIPS and CRS datasets on US military involvements abroad, with the same start and end dates. It does not appear in MID, IMI, or other leading datasets. This is potentially due to the advisorship role of the US in this case. Nonetheless, while no US combat troops were involved in this incident, US advisors did go into combat,

⁵ Smith, Helena. "Bittersweet Return for Greek Civil War's Lost Victims." *The Guardian*. October 17, 2003. Accessed January 15, 2019. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/oct/17/greece>.

⁶ Nachmani, Amikam. "Civil War and Foreign Intervention in Greece: 1946-49." *Journal of Contemporary History* 25, no. 4 (October 1990): 489-522. Accessed January 15, 2019. doi:10.1177/002200949002500406.

⁷ *ibid*

⁸ Pike, John. "Greek Civil War." *Greek Civil War*. July 27, 2018. Accessed January 15, 2019. <https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/war/greek.htm>.

⁹ Van Schaick, F. "American Aid to Greece." *Editorial Research Reports 19491* (1949). <https://library.cqpress.com/cqresearcher/document.php?id=cqresrre1949020900>.

¹⁰ Harris, William D. *Instilling Aggressiveness: U.S. Advisors and Greek Combat Leadership in the Greek Civil War, 1947-1949*. Master's thesis, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 2012. Fort Leavenworth: United States Army, 2012.

¹¹ Havers, Rob. "Greece and the Marshall Plan." *Greece and the Marshall Plan*. June 08, 2018. Accessed January 15, 2019. <https://www.marshallfoundation.org/blog/greece-and-the-marshall-plan/>.

¹² *ibid*

something that MIPS labels as "aggressive assistance." Thus, we include this case as a confirmed usage of force by the US abroad.

V. DATA AND CASE DISCREPANCIES

Cuba 1814. This case, from CRS, denotes a pattern of clashes between U.S. ships and pirates that took place all over the Caribbean from 1814 to 1825. However, the U.S. did not deploy naval ships on a concerted mission to stop this activity until 1822; we thus delete this case, while keeping Cuba 1822 and Cuba 1825 in the dataset.

United Kingdom 1814. This case, which comes from CRS, is about the capture of Pensacola Bay by General Jackson. However, we consider this campaign to form part of the War of 1812 and thus merge the two in the dataset.

Spain 1818, MID 1567. We merge this case with 1816 Spain as both cases refer to events of the First Seminole War.

Cuba 1823. Aggregated to Cuba 1822.

Cuba 1824. Aggregated to Cuba 1822.

Colombia 1834, MID 1524. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It is in reference to U.S. merchant ship being seized by the Colombian government. The case was resolved judicially and the U.S. did not use or threaten to use its military. Therefore the case is removed from MIP.

France 1835, MID 301. This case refers to a situation where the U.S. was demanding payments from France as reparations for past wrongs. In response to French intransigence, President Jackson contemplated a range of options, including imposing trade sanctions and seizing French vessels. At one point Jackson asked Congress to authorize the use of naval ships in these endeavors, but the Senate refused to do so and eventually France relented before the U.S. took any concrete steps toward retaliation. At most, we find indication that the U.S. undertook “preparations” for potential naval deployment but this step falls short of the threat, display, or use of force we would need to see to include the case in our dataset.

United Kingdom 1837, MID 38. This incident, The *Caroline* Affair, resulted when the U.S. government deployed additional troops to police the disputed U.S.-Canadian border so as to prevent private U.S. citizen groups (assisting anti-British rebels inside Canada) from precipitating war between the U.S. and Canada. These concerns were evidently well-founded, as the disputed border yielded a full-blown international war between the two countries in 1839, which we include in MIP. However, the 1837 incident is best understood as strengthened border protection and enforcement. We exclude border protection events (such as recent episodes along the U.S.-Mexican border) from the data set, and therefore exclude this particular case as well.

Mexico 1838, MID 1553. This case features in MID, but we cannot find three independent sources that verify that U.S. naval forces were actually involved and therefore exclude the case from MIP. We consulted a number of primary sources, including the formal report by Secretary of the Navy J.K. Paulding to the President on 1838 naval activity, which does not reference any involvement in the Matamoros region for this time period. The U.S. may have incorrectly been included in an episode primarily involving European powers; the case narrative also matches certain incidents that did occur ten years later during the Mexican-American War, which could have been listed incorrectly in MID.

Mexico 1843, MID 1552. This entry refers to the Mexican-American War, which also appears in CRS although with different dates. We merge both cases into 1846 Mexico, using the dates during which the two countries were formally at war.

United Kingdom 1846, MID 373. This incident is listed only in MID. President Polk was aggressively pursuing manifest destiny. He wanted the Oregon territory and told the British he was leaving the joint occupation agreement of 1818 with full intentions of securing the Oregon Territory. Britain and many in the US government did not want a war so they split the territory roughly in half in the 1846 Oregon Treaty. This prevented any conflict and settled land disputes. No military force was utilized and conflict was resolved diplomatically. Therefore, we're excluding it from the dataset.

Turkey 1849. The description of this incident, listed in CRS, exactly matches that of another case (Kosztka/Smyrna affair) that we code as Austria 1853. The sources we consult indicate that the aspects of this affair that involved US naval force occurred in 1853, and we therefore stick with this date and exclude the 1849 listing.

Mexico 1850, MID 1551. This case refers to a diplomatic dispute between the U.S. and Mexico as the U.S. was seeking access to a land route traversing the Mexican isthmus through a treaty. Treaty negotiations became somewhat heated, and U.S. negotiators used firm language to make it understood that they would not accept European powers dominating the territories under discussion. However, through our research we cannot find three sources that corroborate that the U.S. displayed or threatened force. The MID bibliography lists "American Foreign Policy in Mexican Relations" by James Morton Callahan as its main source, but we do not find that its description of events merit inclusion of this case as a military intervention.

Nicaragua 1854: We merge this case with 1853 Nicaragua. They feature as separate cases in the CRS report, but both refer to protective missions that the US undertook during the same one bout of political instability and violence in Nicaragua; the 1854 mission occurs explicitly in response to an 1853 assault on the American Minister to Nicaragua

Spain 1855, MID 1564. This case refers to a maritime dispute between the U.S. and Spain over customs collection and other commercial arrangements for American ships doing business in Cuba and elsewhere in the Caribbean. The specific incident took place after Spanish forces detained a commercial U.S. ship, searched its hull, and demanded customs payment. In response, the U.S. secretary of state met with his Spanish counterpart and issued a forceful protest, including passages that could be construed as a threat. However, we consider the language and nature of the exchange as essentially diplomatic in nature and not constitutive of a U.S. military intervention.

Peru 1858, MID 2322. This case appears in both MID and CRS datasets. It is in reference to U.S. flagged commercial vessels being detained by the Peruvian government. The matter was resolved diplomatically and the U.S. did not utilize its military. Therefore, the cases have been removed from MIP.

Spain 1864, MID 2014. This incident features in Gibler (MID) and refers to a letter sent from Secretary of State William Seward to his Spanish counterpart. The letter states that the U.S. would not indifferently accept if Spain, at the time in conflict with Peru, were to conquer parts of the latter country. However, the letter does not directly threaten any use of force by the U.S. and we consider this exchange to be diplomatic in nature and far short not just of a military intervention but even of an explicit threat of force. We therefore exclude it from the dataset.

Japan 1864. Throughout 1863-64 a series of threats, displays, and usages of force ensued as the US and other Western powers clashed with Japan over maritime access to the Shimonoseki Straits. Some of these incidents feature in Gibler (2018), others in the CRS report, and some in both. However, all of these incidents relate to the same one strategic campaign of using naval power to open up Japan to Western interests. Consequently we code these incidents as a single US intervention against Japan in 1863-64.

Hawaii 1870. This case refers to two incidents. The first incident occurred on September 21, 1870. Following the death of Queen Consort Kalema of Hawaii, foreign consulates lowered their flags to half-mast as a sign of respect. The U.S. Consul did not, claiming he did not have the authority to do so. The commander of the U. S. S. Jamestown (then harbored in Honolulu) disagreed, landed a detachment of marines, and forced the consulate to fly the U.S. flag at half-mast. The U.S., therefore, was itself the target state of this coercive act by a U.S. military commander. The second incident occurred over the course of a month. On October 29, 1870, the U. S. S. Saginaw shipwrecked on Kure Atoll (then called Ocean Island) en route to San Francisco. A small number of men sailed 1500 miles to Kauai for help. Only one survived the trip, and made it back to Kure Atoll with the help of a Hawaiian ship to save the stranded sailors. This was a humanitarian intervention on behalf of a foreign country to save U.S. sailors, not a U.S. military intervention in a foreign country.

Spain 1873, MID 256. We exclude this case (MID #256) as it does not demonstrate either a threat of or use of force by the United States. In October 1873, a ship named the *Virginius* was captured by a Spanish vessel, the *Tornado*, in international waters offshore of Cuba. The ship, originally the *Virginia* used by the Confederates in the U.S. Civil War had been purchased by Cuban revolutionaries seeking independence from Spain, and was used to ferry munitions, supplies, and dissidents to Cuba. After capturing the *Virginius*, Spanish General Burriel executed American captain, Joseph Fry, 53 of the American crew and a handful of British shipmates. Calls for war rang out across the Southern United States, but President Grant was determined to use diplomacy. After he and his Secretary of State, Hamilton Fish, discovered the true ownership of the *Virginius*, making its operations illegal by U.S. law, they tempered their demands on Madrid. Spain agreed to pay \$80,000 to families of the executed Americans and confrontation between the two powers was avoided.

Mexico 1880, MID 1543. This case refers to a border violation incident. However, there were a large number of minor violations that formed part of a larger military theatre of operations on the southern border from 1873 until a reciprocal border agreement was negotiated in 1882. We merge all of these incidents in the 1873 Mexico case.

United Kingdom 1881, MID 1637. This case is only featured in the MID dataset and is in reference to British troop deployment in Venezuela. Local authorities appealed to the United States to deploy troops but the U.S. declined. The issue created tension between the U.K and U.S. only to be resolved in 1895 following the Venezuelan Crisis. Because the U.S. did not threaten, show, or utilize force the case has been removed from the dataset.

Haiti 1882, MID 1531. This case does not demonstrate either a clear threat, or use, of force by the United States. The late 19th century represented a period of tension between the United States, recovering from its Civil War, and Haiti, which was privy to frivolous lawsuits by private Americans and Europeans, virtually bankrupting the state government. In 1861, notorious slave-trader Antonio Pelletier, a Frenchman who was naturalized as an American citizen, was arrested in Fort Liberty, Haiti, after flying a false flag and attempting to capture 50 Haitians to sell as slaves in Louisiana. Originally sentenced to death, Pelletier's sentence was commuted to 10 years in a Haitian prison. He escaped to the U.S. after two years and passionately lobbied the government to assist him in his efforts for compensation. The U.S. government, in the midst of Reconstruction, initially denied his appeals due to his shaky citizenship, false ownership claims of the *Williams*, the vessel he used in Haiti. In 1878, Pelletier's claim was given consideration by the new Secretary of State, who appointed former Supreme Court Justice Strong to oversee the case. In July 1884, Strong awarded Pelletier 57 thousand dollars, a fraction of the two million dollars he had calculated himself. President Cleveland believed the judgement was inappropriate and would not press Haiti for Pelletier's compensation. While Pelletier's case was the most famous of this time, there were many other instances where American or European private citizens were detained by Haitian

authorities. Great Britain, on occasion, would launch a man-of-war to Port-au-Prince to intimidate the country into releasing its captive citizens. Over 20 years of arbitration, the United States pressed Pelletier's case when politically convenient, but his dubious slave-trading record, and the governments' focus on Reconstruction, deterred the government from threatening or using force to win compensation.

Chile 1883, MID 1517. This case refers to the "War of the Pacific" between Chile and Peru. At one point Italy, France, and Great Britain threatened to intervene and sent a written declaration to the Chilean government. An American representative also signed this declaration, but was later reprimanded for acting without authorization from his superiors. We find no evidence that the U.S. threatened or deployed force at any point and therefore exclude the case from MIP.

Guatemala 1885, MID 1535. This case appears in both the CRS and MID datasets. It is in reference to Justo Rufino Barrio's attempt of unifying central american into one nation. The second Central American War was a failure and embroiled many nations in the region. While the United States maintained a close eye on the conflict it did not engage militarily. Therefore, the case has been removed from MIP.

Japan 1885, MID 1488. This case comes from MID, which claims that "Chinese, American and British naval gunboats" gathered off the coast of Japan in response to rumours about domestic instability. However, despite extensive research we cannot find any other sources to corroborate that U.S. naval forces took part in this operation. Without three independent sources, we exclude the case from MIP.

Mexico 1886, MID 1542. This case appears in both the CRS and MID dataset. It is in reference to a U.S. citizen being detained. The U.S. diplomatically protested but did not utilize its military. The case has therefore been excluded from MIP.

Haiti 1889, MID 1599. We merge this intervention with 1888 Haiti as these operations form parts of a single coherent intervention into the Haitian Revolution. However, we technically exclude the case listed in MID (#1599) for lack of documentation and sources to support its narrative; we do not find that any U.S. naval activity in Haiti during 1889 took such shapes as to constitute a military intervention.

China 1894. We combine multiple U.S. naval landings in China during 1894-95 into a single case.

France 1895, MID 1644. France intervened against the Dominican Republic in response to an attack on a French citizen. The U.S. countered by putting significant diplomatic pressure on France to respect the sovereignty of the Dominican Republic, in a regional context where U.S. decision-makers increasingly sought to assert hegemony over the Western Hemisphere in accordance with the Monroe Doctrine. MID reports that U.S. naval vessels deployed to the harbor of Santo Domingo as part of this effort. However, we cannot find further evidence in support of this claim

across scholarly works, contemporary newspapers, and FRUS. Other sources indicate that the U.S. did not deploy vessels until March 13, two days after the French-Dominican crisis resolved; confirm only that U.S. vessels entered Dominican waters, but not its main port; and suggest that the deployment may have been part of preordained maneuvers unrelated the French-Dominican crisis. Since we cannot find three independent sources confirming that the U.S. undertook an intentional military intervention we drop the case, in accordance with our coding rules.

Spain 1895, MID 3232. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It is in reference to a Spanish naval ship firing on a commercial U.S. boat. The U.S. protested the act diplomatically but did not pursue military means. The case is therefore removed from MIP.

Colombia 1895, MID 2342. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It is in reference to U.S. merchant ship being seized by the Colombian government. The case was resolved peacefully and the U.S. did not use or threaten to use its military. Therefore the case is removed from MIP.

Guam 1898. Aggregated with the Spanish-American War.

Puerto Rico 1898. Aggregate with the Spanish-American War.

Panama 1903. This case features in the CRS report and refers to the 1903-14 U.S. operations in Panama that culminated in the U.S. gaining sovereign jurisdiction over a narrow sliver of territory inside Panama used to construct the Panama Canal. However, this same intervention also appears in MID but listed as a U.S. intervention against Colombia (MID #159). We merge these two cases, since they explicitly refer to the same episodes and incidents. We choose to retain the MID coding choice of designating Colombia as the target of this operation, since it was Colombia (not Panama) that opposed U.S. moves and Colombian forces that challenged their U.S. counterparts. Panama (freshly independent from Colombian rule) served as an ally rather than an opponent throughout this time period.

Brazil 1903, MID 2005. This case (from MID) refers to a border dispute between Brazil, Bolivia, and Peru in the Acre territory. A long-contested region, the area heightened in importance in the 1890s as the perceived center of global rubber production. All three countries claimed it. Bolivia went as far as granting an American company (nicknamed “The Syndicate”) essentially autonomous power to operate there. In response to these tensions, Brazil closed Amazon to foreign shipping, deployed troops, and annexed the territory. In November 1903, Bolivia agreed to recognize the region as Brazil’s as part of the Treaty of Petrópolis. Peru eventually acquiesced too. Gibler claims that U.S. Secretary of State John Hay threatened Brazil on February 4, 1903 that the U.S. would remain neutral but would intervene if U.S. interests were not protected (i.e. a threat of force). Not only were we unable to verify this threat in academic articles, books, newspapers, PhD dissertations, even John Hay’s letters, but some research contradicts this. Historian Joseph Smith

writes that the State Department said The Syndicate had no official backing, that President Theodore Roosevelt was sympathetic to the Brazilian position, and that Brazilian Ambassador to the U.S. Assis Brasil reported home that the U.S. government would not intervene in the dispute (Joseph Smith, *Unequal Giants: Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and Brazil, 1889-1930*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1991 pp. 40-41). Thus, even if John Hay had made a threat, as Secretary of State, he did not have the authority to execute it, his own department contradicted his position, and he furthermore did not have the backing of the commander in chief. The threat appears more circumspect when we observe Brazil's actions later that week. On February 7, three days after the supposed threat, Brazil deployed troops to the region and captured Bolivian prisoners. An odd move to show deference to the U.S. position, if Bolivia was the one favoring U.S. commercial interests.

United Kingdom 1903, MID 3301. This case is only included in the MID dataset. However, the case appears to be missing in the databook. Further research on any intervention between U.S. and UK forces in and around 1903 came up empty. Therefore we have removed the case from the MIP dataset.

China 1905, MID 1650. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It has been removed from the MIP dataset as the case in reference to a President Roosevelt's order in a change of the legation guard. Essentially, the marine corps relieved the army that was already guarding the U.S. legation in Peking. Marines stayed there until 1941. This should not be included because it was not a separate military intervention. President Roosevelt merely replaced the ongoing duties of one military branch with another military branch.

Nicaragua 1909-1933, MID 1203. In 1909 Nicaragua experienced a coup that sparked a civil war that yielded a string of U.S. interventions and periodic military occupation. MID codes this series of events as a single episode from 1909-1933, whereas the CRS report contains a number of distinct U.S. interventions during this time period. We follow the CRS report and break up U.S. actions into discrete interventions as there was not a continuous war going on for 24 years but a series of related events.

Guatemala 1911, MID 1734. We merge this case with 1911 Honduras. After reviewing a multitude of sources we find evidence only that U.S. warships passed along the coast of Guatemala en route to Honduras, but no evidence of any actual intervention in Guatemala. We also cannot find this MID incident in the Gibler (2018) book.

China 1912-1941. CRS includes an entry for a U.S. intervention in China from 1912-1941, but then also includes separate entries for about 10 separate interventions that together constitute this 30-year long pattern of intervention. All entries concern various U.S. operations to protect Western interests during an extended period of political upheaval in China. To ensure that our entries for

China in this time period are comparable to other eras where the U.S. made extended deployment of forces to regional theaters of operations, we code these incidents as separate interventions rather than one 30-year long intervention.

China 1912. Aside from the 1912-1941 intervention (see above), CRS also includes about 10 separate entries for distinct interventions that occurred during this 30-year time period. One of those concerns an intervention during August 24-30, 1912. However, we find that this intervention was merely one among several troop deployments during 1911-1913 aimed at protecting U.S. interests during political turmoil and violence inside China. Since these interventions were numerous, occurred during a relatively short timespan, and had the same set of objectives, we merge all 1911-1913 activity as one intervention in the MIP dataset.

Mexico 1913, MID 136; Mexico 1914; Mexico 1915, MID 1775; Mexico 1916, MID 321; Mexico 1918, MID 2184; Mexico 1918, MID 2185: We code a single intervention from 1911 - 1919 (technically merging the aforementioned cases with Mexico 1911, MID 1653) to capture an enduring pattern of U.S. force mobilization along the border, border incursions, and clashes on both sides of the border with Mexican regular forces, militias, rebels, and criminal elements. While this period contains distinct operations, they all form part of a larger picture of U.S. responses to

Dominican Republic 1914. We merge multiple incidents concerning U.S. intervention in the Dominican civil war into a single case.

Germany 1915, MID 398: This case concerns US diplomatic protests against Germany because of the German campaign of submarine warfare and its effects on US maritime and commercial interests. We exclude this case as US actions did not include the display, threat, or usage of force.

Sweden 1917, MID 1660. The UK had a naval blockade against Sweden at this time, and they issued various ultimatums against Sweden, which was formally neutral but traded with Germany in ways that strengthened the Germans. MID's says that the US "coordinated" with the UK but they were not involved with any kind of military force. Thus, we remove this case from our dataset.

Russia 1918-1920. We merge several cases that feature across CRS and MID. All of these entries refer to U.S. Marine deployments to the Vladivostok region in the aftermath of World War I and the Russian Revolution.

Japan 1932, MID 248. We merge this case (from MID) with the CRS case for China 1932 as the two entries describe the same intervention. We choose to code it as an intervention in China since the U.S. engaged in a mission to protect its own interests inside this country during a period of strife, rather than a mission targeting either combatant during the Japanese incursion into Chinese territory.

Germany 1939, MID 3708. This incident involved a civilian, commercial U.S. maritime vessel, not any regular military forces. Consequently we exclude it from MIP.

United Kingdom 1939, MID 3709. This case refers to diplomatic protests by the U.S. against German interference with shipments of postal mail. As the incident was diplomatic, not military, we exclude it from MIP.

Newfoundland, Bermuda, St. Lucia, BHM, JAM, AAB, TRI, British Guiana 1940. This case, which features in CRS, refers to U.S. forces deploying to those new bases obtained as part of the lend-lease agreement with the United Kingdom and others. However, as this deployment consists of moving U.S. forces onto U.S. bases it falls outside of the scope conditions of MIP.

Iceland 1941. This case, from CRS, denotes how the U.S. extended its military umbrella to include more areas under its formal military domains. This was done for protective reasons in accordance with the wishes of the local government. After this date U.S. forces would be stationed on Iceland and would also enter its territory as part of regular rotations and patrols. However, the case is better understood as the establishment of an alliance and a permanent military base rather than a discrete intervention. We therefore exclude the case from MIP.

Greenland 1941. This case features in the CRS report. After the fall of Denmark in 1940, Greenland was no longer ruled by its colonial metropole partly as the British Royal Navy prevented German or occupied-Danish communications with the territory. In response to uncertainty over the territory's future, the U.S. acted in a diplomatic capacity to guarantee its independence from German control. Following U.S. entry into World War II its military also established bases on Greenland and used the territory for strategic and operational purposes. However, we consider those activities as an integral part of World War II and thus aggregate this activity as part of that case.

Netherlands 1941. We aggregate this case - found in the CRS report - as part of World War II.

Bulgaria 1941, MID 518. We aggregate this case as part of World War II.

Germany 1941, MID 414. We aggregate this case as part of World War II.

France 1942, MID 3587. We aggregate this case as part of World War II.

Thailand 1942, MID 1694. We aggregate this case as part of World War II.

Italy 1943, MID 3716. We aggregate this case as part of World War II.

Liberia, 1947. This case appears in the IMI dataset, but we can not confirm a display, threat, or usage of force beyond this citation. IMI itself only lists “Protect Garrison-FoF/NYT” as their source and description for the case. During WWII, the U.S. for the first time established a major logistics military base in Liberia and many American soldiers transited through the country en route elsewhere. When the Cold War broke out, the U.S. government moved swiftly to ensure that Liberia stayed in the Western camp, and from 1946, the U.S. made major loans and donations of foreign aid to its government. It also retained its military base, that remained important for logistics purposes throughout the Cold War. So perhaps in 1947 the U.S. may well have moved more troops to its bases in Liberia, but it seems that the move is more about reinforcing an existing military base than it is a novel military intervention of any kind. Thus, due to the inability to confirm this dispute via at least 3 separate sources, we remove it from our dataset.

China 1948-49. This case only appears in the CRS dataset. It has been aggregated with a similar case, China 1945 as it describes the instance of U.S. troops in China protecting U.S. diplomatic assets during Operation Beleaguer.

China 1949-50, MID 634. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It is in reference to the Chinese government seizing U.S. commercial and diplomatic assets. The United States responded diplomatically and did not use its military. Therefore the case has been dropped from MIP.

Taiwan 1949, MID 2006. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It is in reference to U.S. diplomatic support for Taiwan following China’s civil war. The United States did not employ its military to generate support for the Republic of China. Therefore, this case has been excluded from MIP.

Korea 1950, MID Disputes 633 and 51: These two cases both measure US intervention during the Korean War, but from the separated perspectives of CHN and PRK and with different durations (MID 633 ends in 1950, while MID 51 ends in 1953). We merge these two cases and keep the longer duration found within the MID 51 dispute to more accurately capture the intensity and characteristics of US involvement in the Korean War.

Puerto Rico 1950. This case only appears in the CRS dataset. While the case does involve the use of U.S. military, it was used domestically as Puerto Rico is a U.S. territory. Therefore, this case cannot be considered as occurring abroad. For this reason it has been removed from the MIP dataset.

Philippines 1951. The U.S. supplied weapons to the Philippine government during the Huk rebellion with the intention of thwarting a rebellion and supporting the incumbent government. However, the U.S. government never directly used, deployed, or threatened force. We therefore remove the case.

Ecuador 1952, MID 1702. This case appears in both the MID and CRS dataset. It is in reference to the seizure of U.S. fishing vessels off the Ecuadorian coast. The vessels were released after paying fines. The case includes no U.S. military involvement and thus has been removed from the MIP dataset.

China 1953, MID 50. This case has been aggregated to the First Taiwan Strait Crisis of 1954. The case refers to President Eisenhower's change in U.S. policy toward Formosa (Taiwan) to one of non-neutralization. The change in policy is noted in both the MID and CRS datasets. This case has been aggregated to the First Taiwan Strait Crisis as signals the evolution of U.S. policy toward Formosa in the early 1950s that eventually led up to the First Taiwan Strait Crisis. The dates of U.S. intervention during the Crisis have been refined to begin during the first threat of force made by the Chairman of JCOS Adm. Radford in 1954 up until the release of the 11 imprisoned U.S. airmen in August 1955.

Iran 1953. This case does not appear in any of the datasets. We originally included this covert operation. However, we have removed it as the coup d'état was pushed forward only by covert agencies and not the U.S. military.

Nicaragua 1954, MID 1193. This case only appears in the MID dataset and corresponding Gibler (2018) narratives as it represents an indirect usage of US military resources abroad to stop a rebel group on behalf of another foreign power. The OAS asked its member states to aid Costa Rica, leading to the sale of four American fighters and a transport plane. The Costa Rican rebels were quickly defeated and the two countries signed an agreement reaffirming their 1949 Treaty of Amity. Given that this case only presents with US arms sales, and not any display, threat, or usage of force, we remove this case from our dataset.

Switzerland 1954, MID 3209. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It is in reference to a U.S. plane accidentally entering Swiss airspace. The plane was chased out by Swiss fighters. The incident did not see any threat or usage of force and therefore has been deleted from the MIP dataset.

Ecuador 1955, MID 3242. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It is in reference to the seizure of U.S. fishing vessels off the Ecuadorian coast. The vessels were released after paying fines. The case includes no U.S. military involvement and thus has been removed from the MIP dataset.

Peru 1955, MID 3243. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It is in reference to the seizure of U.S. fishing vessels off the Peruvian coast. The vessels were released after paying fines. The case includes no U.S. military involvement and thus has been removed from the MIP dataset.

North Korea 1956-1961, MID 2187: This case only appears in the MID dataset and Gibler (2018) narratives. It depicts several acts of aggression by North Korean military actors against US and South Korean aircrafts and shipping vessels. It also includes the shooting of a US Sabre jet flying over North Korean territory. But since most of these acts relate to North Korean aggression without US provocation or the display, threat, or usage of force, we have removed this case from our dataset.

Egypt 1956. This case only appears in the CRS dataset. It is in reference to the Suez Canal Crisis. This case clearly involved U.S. intervention and is noted in MID as case number 200 (U.S.-Russia dispute). The cases have been aggregated together.

Czechoslovakia 1957, MID 2849. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It is in reference to Czechoslovakian officials accusing the United States of violating its airspace multiple times. Further research could not confirm these allegations. Therefore, the case has been dropped.

Syria 1957, MID 607. This case study is mentioned in the MID and IMI datasets. Historical analysis shows that while this was a remarkably tense period, the United States did not deploy its military forces to counter any perceived threats. While sources show that it did consider the idea of using covert military operations, the US ultimately handled the Syrian Crisis diplomatically. Therefore, due to a lack of the threat, display, or usage of force by the US, we remove this case from the dataset.

Albania 1958, MID 2857. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It is in reference to a U.S. fighter plane being forced to land in Albanian territory after the plane got lost. The pilot and plane were released two weeks later. The incident does not include any clear threat or use of force against Albania and therefore has been dropped by MIP.

Germany 1958, MID 2854. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It is in reference to nine American soldiers being seized by East German forces after emergency landing their helicopter in its territory during a storm. Negotiations proceeded for six weeks before the men were released under a "Red Cross arrangement." There is no clear military intent behind the U.S. incursion and it was an accident. Moreover, the incident was resolved diplomatically. Therefore, the case is not an instance of U.S. military intervention and has been dropped by MIP.

Cuba, 1958: This case appears in the IMI dataset as the Cuban Revolution, but not in the other key datasets on US military intervention. It appears that there were a handful of American who participated, perhaps on more than one side, within the revolution and some individuals may have had CIA connections and may have used those for gun running. However, we cannot find any indication that American military forces were involved in this event. The US basically stopped

supporting the Cuban dictator at this point, and even had an arms embargo against him. Thus, due to lack of confirmation on US military involvement, we remove this case from our dataset.

Guatemala 1958, MID 1124. This case only appears in the MID dataset. This incident references threats made by Guatemala to the U.S. and Mexico regarding fishing rights. The Guatemalan military engaged with three Mexican shipping vessels. The U.S. was not targeted outside the threat and did not respond. Therefore, the case has been removed from the MIP dataset.

Panama 1958. This case only appears in the CRS dataset. It references the fortification of American territory in Panama during civil unrest that engulfed the country in 1958. Because the U.S. was defending its territory this is not seen as an act of military intervention abroad. Therefore, the case has been removed from MIP.

East Germany, 1958, MID 2854: During what should have been a routine flight, a United States helicopter encountered navigational issues and entered East German airspace in early June 1958. The helicopter was forced to land and the eight officers and one sergeant on board were detained. Once the flight was overdue, it was immediately brought to the attention of the United States mission in Potsdam and the State department. Over a 6 week period, negotiations were held that led to the release of all the US soldiers under a “Red Cross arrangement.” Due to the unintentional nature of this US landing of military equipment, we remove this case from our dataset on US military involvements abroad. Moreover, we were unable to obtain at least distinct sources to corroborate this incident.

Lebanon 1958, MID 125, & RUS, IRQ, EGY, LEB 1958: These two cases overlap: the one describes that the US moved the 6th fleet into Eastern Mediterranean, the other one is about how the soldiers disembarked. We merge these two data points into one case of intervention.

Russia 1958, MID 2216. This case is only noted in the MID dataset. However, the actual case is not described in the narrative. Further research found no intervention. We have removed from MIP.

Austria, 1960, MID 2876: This MID incident depicts an American military helicopter landing in Austria as the crew mistakenly believed they were still in West Germany. Due to the unintentional nature of this incident, we can not code it as a threat, display, or usage of force by the U.S. abroad. Thus, we remove it from our dataset.

China 1960, MID 2002. This case is only noted in the MID dataset and is in reference to an American military exercise in the Pacific. The MID narrative books notes that this exercise was intended to be against the Chinese government. However, MIP does not include such training exercises unless they are joint and large in scale. Therefore, we have removed this case from MIP.

Vietnam 1961, MID 3361 & 1363. These cases are noted in the both the MID and CRS dataset and are in regards to a change in name, scope, and size of U.S. military advisors sent to the Vietnam prior to the Vietnam War. The objective of either case is the same as Vietnam 1955, MID 816. Therefore, we have aggregated these three cases under the initial deployment of U.S. military advisors.

Egypt/Yemen 1962, MID 1108. This case only appears in the MID dataset and is in reference to foreign intervention during the Yemeni civil unrest and political infighting that essentially began a civil war. The U.S. offered diplomatic support to various actors during the struggle but never engaged at the military level. Therefore, the case has been removed from MIP.

Peru 1962, MID 3244. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It is in reference to the seizure of U.S. fishing vessels off the Peruvian coast. The vessels were released after paying fines. The case includes no U.S. military involvement and thus has been removed from the MIP dataset.

North Korea, 1962, MID 2188. This MID case describes several incidents where U.S. soldiers were killed and injured by North Korean attacks. The first attack occurred on June 2nd, when an American soldier was wounded in a gunfight near the truce line. A North Korean agent was also killed. Another attack occurred on November 23rd at the U.N. observation post, leaving 1 U.S. soldier killed and another wounded. There is no record the U.S. responded to these attacks with threats or displays of force. Since the U.S. did not respond to either of these attacks with a threat or display of force, we have removed this case from the dataset.

Ecuador 1963, MID 1803. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It is in reference to the seizure of U.S. fishing vessels off the Ecuadorian coast. The vessels were released after paying fines. The case includes no U.S. military involvement and thus has been removed from the MIP dataset.

Iraq 1963. This case only appears in the CRS dataset and is in reference to the CIA support for a coup d'état in Iraq. While the intervention of American agents in the domestic conflict are indisputable, the covert nature of the operation and the fact that it was carried out by the CIA means that we cannot add it to the MIP dataset.

Russia 1963, MID 2218 & 2899. These two incidents refer to U.S. protests at alleged Russian airspace violations over Germany and Alaska, but did not involve any active use or threat of U.S. force.

Egypt 1964, MID 2906. The MID's description says the event involved a civilian US propeller plane that crashed in Egypt. If this plane were a secret CIA plane or other government equipment,

there should have been evidence on this case, but we have not been able to corroborate this event via any other sources. Thus, we drop the incident altogether given the non-military nature of the encounter.

North Korea 1964, MID 1379: This case is referenced only in the MID dataset and provides a range of military actions both North Korean and South Korean forces took against each other while the United States had focused its military power in Vietnam. The case spans multiple years and includes U.S. interventions against North Korea that separately listed in both MID and MIP. We drop the incident as incidents involved are already accounted or do not involve the United States.

Cambodia, 1964, MIDs 1213, 1216, 1217, 1806. We have aggregated these incidents within one unit as Cambodia, 1964 to 1969, as they all represent spillovers and incursions into Cambodia during the Vietnam War.

Russia, 1964, MID 2220. This case only appears in the MID dataset. Soviet planes shot down an American training aircraft after it accidentally flew across the East German border. Three American officers were killed when the plane crashed. Another American plane was shot down over East Germany two months later. The crew was detained and released 17 days later. In this incident, we do not find any evidence that the U.S. threatened or used force against the Soviets, thus, we remove it from the dataset.

Russia 1964, MID 2901. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It refers to a maritime incident between the Soviet navy and a U.S. commercial vessel. The commercial vessel was temporarily engaged by Soviet ships after a disagreement that occurred in a Soviet port of payment of fines. The U.S. military did not get involved. Therefore, the case is removed from MIP.

Indonesia 1965. This case was added to MIP and does not appear in any other dataset. The case is in reference to CIA involvement in Indonesia. The CIA helped sponsored a coup d'état which eventually led to the death of millions of Indonesians throughout the Cold War. While the case certainly is an instance of U.S. intervention that lack of defined military component means it is not applicable to the MIP dataset.

Russia 1966, MID 2921. This case appears in both the MID and CRS dataset. The incident occurred over West Germany when a Soviet helicopter violated West German airspace forcing an American helicopter, on a routine flight, was forced to land to avoid a collision. Because the United States military did not threaten or use force against the Soviets, the case has been removed.

Ecuador 1967, MID 1805. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It is in reference to the seizure of U.S. fishing vessels off the Ecuadorian coast. The vessels were released following

diplomatic efforts. The case includes no U.S. military involvement and thus has been removed from the MIP dataset.

Russia 1967, MID 2931. This case appears only in the MID dataset and is in reference to Soviet accusations that U.S. fighter planes buzzed Russian naval ships off the coast of Greece. We could not confirm the incident from three separate sources. Therefore, it has been removed from the MIP dataset.

Russia 1967, MID 2934. This case appears only in the MID and Gibler sources as it is an example of the usage of low level force against shipping vessels. We have deleted the case from the data set as the incident occurs in U.S. territorial waters which implies defensive measures and not foreign intervention abroad.

Peru 1969, MID 350. This case only appears in the MID dataset. The case is in reference to a series of U.S. fishing vessel seizures made by Peru. The Nixon administration responded by cutting military aid to the country. The diplomatic spat was resolved without the use of the military. Therefore, the case has been removed from the MIP dataset.

China, 1971, MID 2947. This case only appears in the MID dataset and Gibler's (2018) narratives, not in any of the other key datasets of US military intervention. In fact, our research does not show a direct threat, show, or usage of force by the US against the original Chinese threat. Thus, we have removed this case from the dataset as we cannot confirm any U.S. military intervention.

Ecuador 1971, MID 1158. This case only appears in MID dataset. It is in reference to the Ecuadorian seizure of eight American tuna boats between waters it claimed as an exclusive zone. In protest, the United States cut aid and ended military sales to Ecuador. The boats were eventually released without U.S. military involvement.

Ecuador 1972, MID 602. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It is in reference to the seizure of U.S. fishing vessels off the Ecuadorian coast. The vessels were released following diplomatic efforts. The case includes no U.S. military involvement and thus has been removed from the MIP dataset.

Russia 1972, MID 2949. This case appears in the MID dataset and Gibler (2018) narrative as a fishing boat dispute. No force was used by the U.S. military in this situation. The case occurs over contested waters so can be seen as a dispute occurring domestically. For this reason the case has been excluded from the MIP dataset.

Chile 1973, This case only appears in the CRS listing of US military usages of force abroad, most likely due to its secretive nature. This is an example of a CIA-backed coup as part of U.S. foreign

policy. Our sources confirm the U.S. involvement in this coup, including funding, CIA operatives, and military resources, but we do not have direct confirmation of the U.S. usage of force against the Chilean regime. Because of this, we choose not to include this infamous case to our dataset. While, we are including covert operations in our dataset, the inability to ensure that the U.S. military was involved in the case means that we cannot include the case into the dataset.

Libya 1973, MID 2950. Only the MID dataset includes this case of US military involvement abroad, since the event depicts an initial attack on a non-military target by another country, followed by US non-intervention. We chose not to include it in the MIP dataset.

Cuba 1974, MID 2951. This case appears in the MID dataset only. It is in reference to a American missionary plane being forced down by the Cuban air force. The plane was released the following day after the pilot paid a fine. The pilot had permission to fly through Cuban airspace but flew too low. The U.S. military did not intervene and therefore the case has been removed from MIP.

Angola 1976. This case appears in the CRS dataset. While American intervention in Angola civil war is irrefutable, the intervention was 1) financial support to Angola funneled through Zaire and 2) a CIA function rather than a Department of Defense function. The lack of American involvement in the conflict itself, and the absence of a formal military operation, to include planning, suggest that this case does not qualify for MIP.

Israel 1976, MID 2335. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It refers to an instance in which The Israeli gunboats fired on American prospect markers in the Suez. No one was hurt and the American oil ship complied with all Israeli requests to leave the area. The State Department summoned the Israeli Ambassador to discuss American concerns in the area. The U.S. Military was not involved and therefore the case has been removed from the MIP dataset.

North Korea 1976, MID 2960. This case appears in the MID and Gibler (2018), but there is no evidence that the US threatened, displayed, or used force during this dispute. North Korea accused the United States of conducting spy operations over its territory with an SR-71 reconnaissance plane. The accusation was broadcast by official North Korean state media. Tensions between the two countries were already high at this time, as the killing of two U.S. troops by the North Koreans in August 1976 deeply angered the United States. But we are not able to find any record of U.S. response or action, so we remove this case from the dataset.

Cuba 1977, MID 2962. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It references a U.S. tagged marine research vessel being seized by Cuban forces after the ship mistakenly entered the country's waters. The ship was released three days later without U.S. military intervention. Therefore, the case has been removed from the MIP dataset.

Russia 1977, MID 2222. This case appears in the MID listing, but we do not believe that it represents a case of U.S. intervention. It does not appear in other key datasets on US military intervention as it is an example of a fishing vessel seizure, not a traditional military advance or mission. On April 9, 1977 the US Coast Guard detained the Soviet fishing trawler *Taras Shevchenko* for violating the US's newly implemented 200-mile fishing boundary. The following day on April 10, its mother ship was boarded and seized as well. Both vessels were found to be in violation of legal quotas of various fish species, including river herring, ocean perch, and cod. Despite the many previous violations, these were the first two vessels that had been detained under the new 200 mile fishing boundary. We remove this case from our universe of US military interventions as it occurred within US waters. EEZ (exclusive economic zones) extend for 200 miles off the coast – to include this incident. However, EEZ were not codified in international law until 1982.

Canada 1979, MID 2968. This case only appears in the MID dataset and is in reference to Canada seizing eight American ships 60 miles off the coast of Vancouver. The ships were eventually released. There was no U.S. military intervention.

Libya 1979, MID 3021. It is an incident where the US changes its operational doctrine of how close it will operate to Libyan coasts. This issue then yields a set of new MIDs in the 1980s. But in the description for the 1979 instance, there is no indication that the US actually used force in any way. Therefore, we remove this case from our dataset.

Nicaragua, 1979. This case appears only in IMI, not in MID, CRS, or Grossman. IMI has two interventions, both in 1979, both lasting for two days each in June and July. They reference "NYT". We searched the NYT archives for any mention of this incident. The Sandinista emerged in the 1970s to challenge US-backed dictator Somoza. By mid-1979, the Sandinistas had mostly taken control of the country and it appears that President Carter at this point had lost faith in Somoza. So Carter intervened diplomatically to (i) get Somoza to resign, (ii) encourage the formation of a Sandinista government dominated by moderates rather than hard-left elements. But this was an entirely diplomatic intervention. The US had given a lot of military aid to the Somoza regime, and briefly continued to aid the Sandinista government, but there is no indication in any of the articles from June/July that any US troops set foot on Nicaraguan soil. It does not appear that the U.S. embassy was evacuated. Thus, we drop this case from our universe of US military interventions.

Peru 1979, MID 2967. This case only appears in the MID dataset. It is in reference to the seizure of six American tuna boats for fishing within Peru's offshore limit without licenses. The owner's paid over \$365,000 in fines, and the boats were released. The United States protest and place an embargo on Peruvian tuna. No U.S. military action took place and therefore, the case has been removed.

Ecuador 1980, MID 3105. This case only appears in the MID dataset and is in reference to Ecuador seizing five U.S. fishing vessels off their coast. The U.S. reacted by placing economic sanctions on Ecuador. Consequently, Ecuador seized another U.S. fishing vessel. After diplomatic engagement, Ecuador released the American vessels. No use of the U.S. military was noted. Therefore the case has been removed.

Libya 1981. We merge two separate MID entries (#3098 & 3099) into one intervention in the Gulf of Sirte.

Russia, 1981, MID 2228. This case appears in the MID dataset and corresponding Gibler (2018) narratives. It does not appear in other key datasets on US military intervention as it is an example of a Soviet commercial cargo airplane search and seizure by US customs, not a traditional military advance or mission. The seizure also occurred within Dulles International Airport, within the continental USA. The cargo plane was not carrying anything illegal or military-related, thus the incident was portrayed as a mistake by the US. We have dropped this case from the MIP dataset.

North Korea 1981-82, MID 2971. This case only appears in the MID dataset and Gibler (2018) narratives as it depicts a US reconnaissance/spy mission, not a traditional case of the display, threat, or usage of force by the US. Therefore, we have dropped the case from the MIP dataset.

Libya 1982, MID 2978. Gaddafi made threats towards the US, but there is no evidence that the US responded in any measure, let alone the display, threat, or use of force. We drop this case from the dataset due to US non-response.

Russia 1982, MID 2982. This case only appears in the MID dataset and references the mobilization of Russian military aircraft to an island in the North Pacific that is disputed between Russia and Japan. The move was likely following the installment of American jets in Japan. The case did not see any intervention on the side of the U.S. Therefore, the case has been removed.

Yemen 1982, MID 3613. This case cannot be found in the MID narrative dataset. Further research was unable to produce an instance of U.S. military intervention. It has therefore been excluded from MIP.

Libya 1983, MID Disputes 3634 and 13065. Both involve how the US deploys carrier group and AWACS to Libya from Chad. 3634 also mentions that US fighters shot down two Libyan fighters. Otherwise the two MIDs describe the very same incident(s). We merge these two cases.

Honduras 1983. This case was an addition to MID but included in both the IMI and CRS datasets. The case is in reference to U.S. Military support for Honduras during the Nicaraguan Civil War. However, we have chosen to aggregate this case to U.S. intervention against Nicaragua, MID 2347.

While these cases were initially separate, the amount of overlap between the cases made it more accurate to include both in one singular case of U.S. aggression against Nicaragua.

Iran 1984, MID 3541. We cannot find this MID instance in the Gibler (2018) narrative of cases, not under either US-Iran or Iraq-Iran. It does not appear in the index of the book.

North Korea 1984, MID 2196. This case appears in MID and the CRS listing of US usage of force abroad, but it is a unique case of unexpected usage of force due to one individual. We are unsure whether this case represents an intended US military threat, display, or usage of force. Therefore, we have excluded case from the MIP dataset.

Russia 1984, MID 2230. This case is only appears in the MID dataset and is in reference to the Soviet seizure of a U.S. fishing vessel off the coast of Alaska. The vessel and five man crew were released a few days later. The U.S. military was not involved in the incident. Therefore, the case is removed from MIP.

Czech Republic 1985, MID 2559. This case appears in both the MID and CRS dataset and is reference to the Czechoslovakian air force entering W. German airspace and firing upon a U.S. helicopter that was conducting routine surveillance. The American helicopter sustained no damage and the crew was not injured. Following the incident, the United States filed a diplomatic protest. Because of the lack of U.S. military intervention outside of routine operations the case is excluded.

Germany, GDR 1985, MID 2232: While MID includes this case, none of the key datasets on military intervention include it. It is somewhere between traditional military movements and covert/spy operations. The US recon mission may not even fit definitions on the display of force as it was not intentionally trying to reveal its position. Because there is no clear threat of usage of American force, we have removed it from the MIP dataset.

Nicaragua 1986, MID 2353: This case appears in both the MID and CRS dataset and references an American announcement committing U.S. troops to continue supporting the Honduran government. Because the case is just in regards to a diplomatic announcement and does not involve any military immediately, we have chosen to remove it from the dataset. Note, other incidents in Nicaragua during the 1980s have been aggregated into one case study.

Russia 1986, MID 2233. This case is only mentioned in the MID dataset. It refers to an exchange of diplomatic protests between the Soviet Union and the United States over the U.S. Navy's mobilization into the Black Sea. The case follows the ratification of the 1982 Law of the Sea convention that allowed passage of ships into such waters. Therefore, the act is not seen as a military intervention and is excluded from the MIP dataset.

Russia 1986, MID 3637. This case is only referenced in the MID dataset and refers to the positioning of Soviet navy off the coast of Israel. The U.S. did not respond to this mobilization. However, its Navy was already positioned off the coast of Libya given ongoing confrontations.

Iran, 1986 - 1987, MIDs 2578, 2740. We have aggregated these incidents within one unit as Iran 1986 to 1988, as they both represent the same event continuation of the US intervening on the side of Iraq in the war, defending reflagged tankers and shooting down civilian jets. As a precaution, we have left the disaggregated incidents in the dataset, but coded them as “RemoveCase” and listed the aggregation in the comments.

Iran 1988, MID 2834. Gibler (2018) in his *International Conflicts* book of MID narratives states that this was an incident where Iran attacked a few Danish-flagged ships in the Persian Gulf. There is no mention of the United States being involved in any way, although the MID dyadic dataset includes the US as a key actor. The CRS report states that the US and Iran had militarized disputes on certain dates but none that match the dates in this MIDs incident. Therefore, we remove this incident from our dataset.

Iraq 1988, MID 2774. During the “Tanker Wars” the U.S. was protecting Kuwaiti oil tankers from Iranian attacks at a time when Kuwait was a key Iraqi ally. In February, 1988 U.S. naval ships and Iraqi jet fighters exchanged fire, likely from accidental causes (mistaken identity) as the two nations were technically allied at the time. We therefore exclude this incident from MIP.

Canada 1989, MID 3900: This case is mentioned in both the MID and CRS datasets. It is in reference to an incident between Canadian forces and an American fishing vessel. Although, Canadian forces did use force to attempt to disperse the American ship, the case does not classify as a form of American intervention. First, the U.S. military was not involved, Second, the incident occurred in disputed waters, not necessarily abroad.

Cuba 1990, MID 3950: This case is only noted in the MID dataset. However, there appears to be an error in the book as no case involving Cuba is mentioned in the book apart from the in the index pages.

Iraq 1990, MID 3957: This case appears in all the datasets and refers to U.S. mobilization during operation Desert Shield. We have chosen to aggregate this case with Kuwait and Saudi Arabia for consistency given that the U.S. intervention in each state was to accomplish the same objective, protect diplomatic assets from Iraqi aggression.

Kuwait 1990. This case added to the MIP dataset initially as a separate instance of military intervention. The case was referenced as a separate case to Operation Desert Storm against Iraq in both IMI and CRS datasets. However, upon closer inspection MIP decided to aggregate this case

with Iraq, 1991 - Operation Desert Storm. While the U.S. intervention was not against Kuwait it had the same objective as Operation Desert Storm, that of removing Iraqi forces from Kuwait

Iraq, 1991 – 1997, MID 3552, 3568, 4299, 4269, 4271, 4273: These cases are separate incidents that involved the United States engaging with the Iraqi military and other state apparatuses following the Gulf War. These attacks were under the direction of U.S. Operation Southern Watch, Operation Vigilant Warrior, Operation Provide Comfort/ Provide Comfort II/ Operation Northern Watch. All of these operations had the objective of limiting Iraq's military capabilities. Because the scope and nature of the each incident throughout this time period is the same, we have chosen to aggregate the cases into one single case spanning the time period up until the War in Iraq.

Somalia 1993: This case refers to U.S. Troops deploying aid during Operation United Shield which is coded separately. Therefore, we have aggregated this case into that one.

Macedonia, 1993 – 2002: We have aggregated the US participation in state security and stabilization operations in Macedonia, including the disarming of ethnic Albanian rebels, under Macedonia 1993. This includes MID case number 4046.

China, 1994, MID 4065: This case only appears in the MID dataset and refers to a Chinese shot of force near the North Korean border. China's military threatened to attack South Korean and U.S. military assets if they attempted to invade North Korea. The U.S. did not react and therefore is not an instance of American military intervention.

Cuba, 1996, MID 4196: This case only appears in the MID dataset. The case is in reference to the Cuban Air Force shooting down a U.S. civilian aircraft. The United States diplomatically protested the aggression but did not intervene militarily. Therefore, the case has been removed as there was no use of the U.S. military

Syria, 1996, MID 4190. This case appears in the MID dataset, but we cannot confirm a display, threat, or usage of force by the U.S. beyond this source. This case was more about a potential Turkish intervention in Syria because Syria at the time harbored Abdullah Ocalan the leader of Kurdistan Workers' Party. Turkey had accused Syria of aiding Ocalan in conducting terrorist activities in Turkey. Syria, on the other hand, accused Turkey of stealing Syrian water from the Euphrates and Tigris rivers and signing a military agreement with Israel against Syria. There were some media reports of border clashes between the two countries in June of 1996, but we do not find in the scholarly literature any mentioning of American military intervention in Syria or even a public threat to intervene. For that reason, we omit this intervention from our dataset.

Canada, 1997, MID 4183. This MID case depicts Canadians seizing four American fishing vessels off the coast of British Columbia. The crisis seemed to be averted when the U.S. asked

Canada to resume talks around salmon quotas, and all four American crews and boats were released after the captains paid a fine for fishing in Canadian territorial waters. We have removed this case from our intervention dataset since the US did not threaten, display, or use force against the Canadians. It was, instead, Canada who used force against US vessels. We do, however, write up a case narrative for this incident as an example of MID cases where the US did not retaliate against acts of hostility against them. We have removed all such cases of no US hostility from our dataset.

Russia, 1997, MID 4174: Two possible incidents match this MID case. The first occurred on April 4, 1997. A U.S. Navy ship noticed a Russian fishing trawler with a suspicious amount of antennas. A Canadian military helicopter flew to take pictures of the ship and noticed a laser being directed at them. Some injuries were incurred. However, the instrument turned out to be a rangefinder and no source of the burns could be identified. When the ship was boarded, it ended up being a fishing vessel. American Coast Guard authorities were allowed in most of the ship (with the exception of private quarters), and were allowed to take pictures of the ship's log.

The second incident occurred in August 1997. A different Russian fishing vessel was seized by the Coast Guard for being within 6 or 7 kilometers of the American Exclusive Economic Zone (mentioned in the Radio Free Europe article below). It was the 9th incursion of Russian fishing vessels in a two month period. We decide not to include these instances in our dataset since they appear to be Russian commercial intrusion, and there was no movement of U.S. forces (domestic or abroad).

Russia, 1999, MID 4342: This case is only noted in the MID dataset and is in reference to Russian forces being placed on alert during NATO's bombing intervention in Yugoslavia. U.S. and NATO forces did not respond to Russian forces being placed on alert so this dyad did not include any further intervention from the United States. Because of the lack of U.S. intervention toward Russia during the bombing campaign, the case has been excluded from the MIP dataset. The NATO bombing of Yugoslavia is noted in another case.

People's Republic of Korea, 1999-2000, MIDs 4342 & 4218: These cases are only noted in the MID dataset. North Korea threatened force against both South Korea and the United States should vessels from either country cross their claimed waters. North Korea was attempting to revise the post-Korean War settlement line. The U.S. did not respond to the threat and no further action was taken. Since there was no U.S. intervention, the cases have been removed from the MIP dataset.

Russia, 2000, MID 4220: This case is only mentioned in the MID dataset. It is in reference to a Russian reconnaissance plan and an interceptor fighter reportedly entering, unnoticed, into American groupings radar zone and flying over the aircraft carrier *USS Kitty Hawk*. The U.S. did not respond and therefore presents no instance of U.S. military intervention.

Yugoslavia, 2000, MID 4343: This case is only present in the MID dataset and is in reference to Serbia displaying military force along its border with Kosovo while NATO troops were stationed there. NATO forces, which contained U.S. forces, did not react, therefore there new U.S. intervention. The deployment of U.S. troops to intervene in Kosovo is included elsewhere in the data.

Afghanistan, 2001, MID 4283: This case is in reference to initial operations conducted by the United States in the War in Afghanistan. Initially, MIP wanted to disaggregate the War and focus on distinct operations that occurred throughout the war's period. However, upon further research, we have chosen to aggregate the various operations the United States conducted in the country into one distinct case. This case has therefore been aggregated into a larger case that include all U.S. operations in Afghanistan since 2001.

China, 2001, MID 4336: This case only appears in the MID codebook but not does not exist as a narrative. Further research could not find any evidence of U.S. military intervention. Therefore, the case has been deleted.

China, 2002, MID 4450: This case is only cited in the MID dataset and refers to Chinese military aircraft buzzing an American oceanographic ship within Chinese exclusive economic zone. The incident did not target the U.S. military received no reaction from the United States. It therefore has been excluded the dataset.

North Korea, 2002, MID 4451: This case only appears in the MID dataset. Two Spanish warships seized a North Korean ship suspected of carrying illegal weapons to Yemen. After U.S. naval forces searched the ship and determined there were no illegal weapons on board, it was released. We find no confirmed display, threat, or usage of force by the U.S. in this incident, thus we remove it from the dataset.

Côte d'Ivoire, 2004, MID 4371: This case involves a dyad between Cote d'Ivoire force and French forces. The U.S. was not involved in the dispute. Therefore, the case has been removed from the MIP dataset.

Iran, 2008, MID 4541: This case was removed from the dataset as it indicates a threat of force from Iran to the United States. The United States did not respond to the threat. Because the United States did not react, there is no intervention on behalf of the United States. For that reason it has been removed from the dataset.

Somalia, 2008, MID 4397: This case was aggregated to a novel case included into MIP, Somalia 2006. The MID case is in reference to a U.S. air strike against al-Qaeda training camps in Somalia.

The attack was conducted under an AMISOM mission established years prior. United States armed forces began operating against terrorist organizations based in Somalia in 2006. The 2008 aerial attack was a continuation of the objective of the force deployment in 2006.

Pakistan, 2008, MID 4577: We were not able to find any mention of airstrikes that occurred in 2007 in Pakistan, as recorded in the MID dispute. However, the 2008 Gora Prai Airstrike fits the MID dispute definition very well, given the single Pakistani casualty. We updated the case to reflect that it was a year later than MID and the Gibler (2018) narrative lists, updating the start date from 2007 to 2008.

Syria, 2011: This case was added to MIP and did not exist in previous datasets. Operation Timber Sycamore was a CIA ran operation to fund and distribute weapons for rebels during the early phases of the Syrian Civil War. Because the intervention was not military in nature and covert through U.S. agencies outside of the Department of Defense we have removed it from MIP.

South Sudan, Democratic Republic of Congo, Central African Republic, 2011 and 2012: These three cases were not included in the MID dataset and were added to account for U.S. intervention in Central Africa during Operation Observant Compass. The cases has been aggregated into one unique case study under Uganda, 2011 as the United States' objective in each country was the same.

Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Turkey, Somalia, Yemen, Djibouti, Libya, Cuba, Central Africa, Egypt, Jordan, Kosovo 2016. President Obama confirmed deployment to these countries as part of the conflict with Islamic State. However, we include all relevant activities as part of different case studies.

Iceland 2018. This case forms part of the regular rotation of U.S. forces and we thus exclude it from the dataset.

The following cases were removed from other leading datasets due to the inability to confirm the display, threat, or usage of force by the US abroad. Most of these cases are explicitly coded in the MID dataset as characterized by zero degrees of force used by the US. The ones that are not explicitly coded as zero level of US hostilities are described in detail above.

Table 4. Removed Cases of US Military Missions from 1776 – 2019

Target State(s)	Target COW ID	Start Year	End Year	MID Case	IMI Case	MIPS Case	CRS Listed	ACD Case
CUB	40	1814	1825	0	0	0	1	0
UKG	200	1814	1814	0	0	0	1	0
SPN	230	1818	1818	1	0	0	1	0
CUB	40	1823	1823	0	0	0	1	0
CUB	40	1824	1824	0	0	0	1	0
COL	100	1834	1834	1	0	0	0	0
FRN	220	1835	1835	1	0	0	0	0
UKG	200	1837	1838	1	0	0	0	0
MEX	70	1838	1838	1	0	0	0	0
MEX	70	1843	1848	1	0	0	1	0
UKG	200	1846	1846	1	0	0	0	0
TUR	640	1849						
MEX	70	1850	1851	1	0	0	0	0
NIC	93	1854	1854	0	0	0	1	0
SPN	230	1855	1855	1	0	0	1	0
PER	135	1858	1858	1	0	0	1	0
JPN	740	1864	1864	0	0	0	1	0
SPN	230	1864	1864	1	0	0	1	0
Hawaii		1870	1870	0	0	0	1	0
SPN	230	1873	1873	1	0	0	0	0
MEX	70	1880	1880	1	0	0	0	0
UKG	200	1881	1881	1	0	0	0	0
HAI	41	1882	1882	1	0	0	0	0
CHL	155	1883	1883	1	0	0	0	0
GUA	90	1885	1885	1	0	0	1	0
JPN	740	1885	1885	1	0	0	0	0
MEX	70	1886	1886	1	0	0	1	0
HAI	41	1889	1889	1	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1894	1895	0	0	0	1	0
FRN	220	1895	1895	1	0	0	0	0
SPN	230	1895	1895	1	0	0	0	0
COL	100	1896	1896	1	0	0	1	0
PRI		1898	1898	0	0	0	1	0
SPN, Guam		1898	1899	0	0	0	0	0
BRA	140	1903	1903	1	0	0	1	0
PAN	5	1903	1914	0	0	0	1	0

UKG	200	1903	1903	1	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1905	1906	1	0	0	0	0
NIC	93	1909	1933	1	0	0	1	0
GUA	90	1911	1911	1	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1912	1941	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1912	1912	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1913	1914	1	0	0	1	0
DOM	42	1914	1914	0	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1914	1917	0	0	0	1	0
GMY	255	1915	1915	1	0	0	0	0
MEX	70	1915	1915	1	0	0	0	0
MEX	70	1916	1917	1	0	0	0	0
SWD	380	1917	1917	1	0	0	0	0
MEX	70	1918	1918	1	0	0	1	0
RUS	365	1918	1920	1	0	0	1	0
MEX	70	1918	1920	1	0	0	1	0
JPN	740	1932	1932	1	0	0	0	0
GMY	255	1939	1939	1	0	0	0	0
UKG	200	1939	1940	1	0	0	0	0
Bermuda		1940	1940	0	0	0	1	
Greenland		1941	1941	0	0	0	1	0
ICE	395	1941	1941	0	0	0	1	0
NTH	210	1941	1941	0	0	0	1	0
BUL	355	1941	1941	1	0	0	0	0
GMY	255	1941	1941	1	0	0	1	0
FRN	220	1942	1942	1	0	0	0	0
THI	800	1942	1942	1	0	0	0	0
ITA	325	1943	1943	1	0	0	0	0
LBR	450	1947	1947					
CHN	710	1948	1949	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	1949	1950	1	0	0	0	0
TAW	713	1949	1950	1	0	0	0	0
PRI	N/A	1950	1950	0	0	0	1	1
PHL	840	1951	1954	0	1	0	1	0
ECU	130	1952	1952	1	0	0	1	0
IRN	630	1953	1953	0	0	0	0	0
RUS, CHN	365	1953	1956	1	0	0	1	0
NIC	93	1954	1954	1	0	0	0	0
SWZ	225	1954	1954	1	0	0	0	0
ECU	130	1955	1955	1	0	0	0	0
PER	135	1955	1955	1	0	0	0	0
EGY	651	1956	1956	0	0	0	1	0
CZE	315	1957	1957	1	0	0	0	0
SYR	652	1957	1957	1	1	0	0	0
ALB	339	1958	1958	1	0	0	0	0
CUB	40	1958	1958	0	1	0	0	0

GDR	265	1958	1958	1	0	0	0	0
GUA	90	1958	1958	1	0	0	0	0
PAN	95	1958	1959	0	0	0	1	0
RUS	365	1958	1958	1	0	0	0	0
CHN	710	1960	1960	1	0	0	0	0
DRV	816	1961	1962	1	0	1	1	0
DRV, RUS, CHIN	816	1961	1961	1	0	0	0	0
EGY, YAR	651	1962	1962	1	0	0	0	0
PER	135	1962	1962	1	0	0	0	0
PRK	731	1962	1964	1	0	0	0	0
ECU	130	1963	1963	1	0	0	0	0
IRQ	645	1963	1963	0	0	0	1	0
RUS	365	1963	1963	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1963	1963	1	0	0	0	0
PRK, RUS	731, 365	1964	1969	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1964	1964	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1964	1964	1	0	0	0	0
CHN, CAM	710	1965	1966	1	0	0	0	0
INS	850	1965	1965	0	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1966	1966	1	0	0	1	0
CAM	811	1967	1967	1	0	0	0	0
ECU	130	1967	1967	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1967	1967	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1967	1967	1	0	0	0	0
CAM	811	1968	1969	1	1	0	0	0
PER	135	1969	1969	1	0	0	0	0
CHN	710	1971	1971	1	0	0	0	0
ECU	130	1971	1971	1	0	0	0	0
ECU	130	1972	1972	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1972	1972	1	0	0	0	0
CHL	155	1973	1973	0	0	0	1	0
LIB	620	1973	1973	1	0	0	0	0
CUB	40	1974	1974	1	0	0	0	0
ANG	540	1976	1992	1	0	0	1	0
ISR	666	1976	1976	1	0	0	0	0
PRK	731	1976	1976	1	0	0	0	0
CUB	40	1977	1977	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1977	1977	1	0	0	0	0
CAN	20	1979	1979	1	0	0	0	0
NIC	93	1979	1979	0	1	0	1	0
PER	135	1979	1979	1	0	0	0	0
ECU	130	1980	1981	1	0	0	1	0
IRN	630	1980	1980	0	0	0	1	0
LIB	620	1981	1981	1	0	0	0	0
PRK	731	1981	1982	1	0	0	0	0

RUS	365	1981	1981	1	0	0	0	0
LIB	620	1982	1982	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1982	1982	1	0	0	0	0
YPR	680	1982	1982	1	0	0	0	0
CHA	483	1983	1983	0	0	0	1	0
HON	91	1983	1989	0	1	0	1	0
IRN	630	1984	1984	1	0	0	0	0
PRK	731	1984	1985	1	0	0	1	0
RUS	365	1984	1984	1	0	0	0	0
CZE	315	1985	1985	1	0	0	1	0
GDR, RUS	265	1985	1985	1	0	0	1	0
NIC	93	1986	1988	1	0	1	1	0
RUS	365	1986	1986	1	0	0	0	0
RUS	365	1986	1986	1	0	0	0	0
IRN	630	1987	1988	1	0	0	0	0
IRQ	645	1988	1988	1	0	0	0	0
CAN	20	1989	1989	1	0	0	1	0
CUB	40	1990	1990	1	0	0	0	0
IRQ	645	1990	1991	1	1	1	1	0
KUW	690	1990	1991	1	1	1	1	0
IRQ	645	1991	2003	0	1	1	1	0
IRQ	645	1993	1993	1	0	0	1	0
IRQ	645	1993	1993	1	0	0	1	0
SOM	520	1993	1994	0	1	1	1	0
CHN	710	1994	1994	1	0	0	0	0
IRQ	645	1994	1995	1	1	1	0	0
MAC	345	1994	1994	1	0	0	0	0
CUB	40	1996	1996	1	0	0	0	0
IRQ	645	1996	1996	1	1	1	1	0
SYR	652	1996	1996	1	0	0	0	0
CAN	20	1997	1997	1	0	0	1	0
IRQ	645	1997	2003	1	0	1	1	0
RUS	365	1997	1997	1	0	0	1	0
RUS	365	1999	1999	1	0	0		0
PRK	731	2000	2000	1	0	0		0
RUS	365	2000	2000	1	0	0		0
YUG	345	2000	2000	1	0	0		0
AFG	700	2001	2003	1	1	1	1	0
CHN	710	2001	2001	1	0	0		0
MAC	343	2001	2002	0	0	0	1	0
CHN	710	2002	2002	1	0	0		0
PRK	731	2002	2002	1	0	0		0
CDI	437	2004	2004	1	0	0	1	0
IRN	630	2008	2008	1	0	0		0
SOM	520	2008	2008	1	0	0		0
SYR	652	2011						

SSD	626	2011		0	0	0	1	0
DRC	490	2011		0	0	0	1	0
CEN	482	2012		0	0	0	1	0
ICE	395	2018	2018	0	0	0	1	0

REFERENCES

- Banks, Arthur S., and Kenneth A. Wilson. 2015. Cross-National Time-Series Data Archive. *Databanks International*. www.databanksinternational.com.
- Barbieri, Katherine and Omar Keshk. 2012. Correlates of War Project Trade Data Set Codebook Version 3.0. <http://correlatesofwar.org>.
- Barbieri, Katherine, Omar M. G. Keshk, and Brian Pollins. 2009. "TRADING DATA: Evaluating our Assumptions and Coding Rules." *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 26, no. 5: 471–491.
- Belasco, Amy. 2014. "The Cost of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Other Global War on Terror Operations since 9/11." *Congressional Research Service*, 8 December. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL33110.pdf>.
- Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA). 2018. Gross Domestic Product. *U.S. Department of Commerce*. <https://www.bea.gov/data/gdp/gross-domestic-product>.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). 2018. Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey. *U.S. Department of Labor*. <https://data.bls.gov/pdq/SurveyOutputServlet>.
- Cheibub, José Antonio, Jennifer Gandhi, and James Raymond Vreeland. 2010. "Democracy and Dictatorship Revisited." *Public Choice*, 143, no. 2-1: 67-101.
- Cingranelli, David L., David L. Richards, and K. Chad Clay. 2014. "The CIRI Human Rights Dataset." <http://www.humanrightsdata.com>. Version 2014.04.14.
- Correlates of War Project. (a). *Colonial/Dependency Contiguity, 1816-2016*. Version 3.1. <http://correlatesofwar.org>.
- Correlates of War Project. (b). *Direct Contiguity Data, 1816-2016*. Version 3.2. <http://correlatesofwar.org>.
- Correlates of War Project. (c). *Formal Alliances Data, 1648-2012*. Version 4.1. <http://correlatesofwar.org>.
- Correlates of War Project. (d). *National Material Capabilities, 1816-2012*. Version 5. <http://www.correlatesofwar.org>.
- Daggett, Stephen. 2010. "Costs of Major U.S. Wars." *Congressional Research Service*. 29 June.
- Feenstra, Robert C., Robert Inklaar and Marcel P. Timmer. 2015. "The Next Generation of the Penn World Table." *American Economic Review*, 105(10): 3150-3182. Available for download at www.ggdc.net/pwt.

- Fortna, Virginia P. 2008. *Does Peacekeeping Work? Shaping Belligerents' Choices After Civil Wars*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Freedom House. 2018. "Freedom in the World." <https://freedomhouse.org/report-types/freedom-world>.
- Gartner, Scott Sigmund. 2006a. *Historical Statistics of the United States Millennial Edition Online*, edited by Susan B Carter, Scott Sigmund Gartner, Michael R Haines, Alan L Olmstead, Ritchard Sutch, and Gavin Wright. New York: Cambridge University Press. <http://hsus.cambri dge.org/seriescsg265-345>.
- Gartner, Scott Sigmund. 2006b. Table Ed1-5 – Military Personnel and Casualties, by War and Branch of Service: 1775–1991. DOI:10.1017/isbn-9780511132971.ed1-145. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/ISBN-9780511132971.Ed1-145>.
- Gibler, Douglas M. 2018. *International Conflicts, 1816-2010: Militarized Interstate Dispute Narratives*. Landham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gibler, Douglas M. 2009. *International Military Alliances, 1648-2008*. CQ Press.
- Gibney, Mark, Linda Cornett, Reed Wood, Peter Haschke, Daniel Arnon, and Attilio Pisanò. 2017. *The Political Terror Scale 1976-2016*. <http://www.politicalterrorscale.org>.
- Grossman, Zoltan. 2018. "From Wounded Knee To Syria: A Century Of U.S. Military Interventions." <https://sites.evergreen.edu/zoltan/interventions/>.
- History, Art, and Archives: United States House of Representatives n.d. *Party Divisions of the House of Representatives*. <https://history.house.gov/Institution/Party-Divisions/Party-Divisions/>.
- Johnston, Louis and Samuel H. Williamson. 2018. "What Was the U.S. GDP Then?" *MeasuringWorth*. <https://www.measuringworth.com/datasets/usgdp/>.
- Kavanagh, Jennifer, Bryan Frederick, Matthew Povlock, Stacie L. Pettyjohn, Angela O'Mahony, Stephen Watts, Nathan Chandler, John Speed Meyers, and Eugeniu Han. 2017. *The Past, Present, and Future of U.S. Ground Interventions: Identifying Trends, Characteristics, and Signposts*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1831.html.
- Kavanagh, Jennifer, Bryan Frederick, Alexandra Stark, Nathan Chandler, Meagan L. Smith, Matthew Povlock, Lynn E. Davis, and Edward Geis. 2019. *Characteristics of Successful U.S. Military Interventions*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/238a/aaace546a2ab1cfebf7721ae9af354fd8cb4.pdf>

- Kisangani, Emizet F., and Jeffrey Pickering. 2008. "International Military Intervention, 1989-2005." Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, Data Collection No 21282. Ann Arbor, MI. <http://www.k-state.edu/polsci/intervention/index.html>.
- Lebergott, Stanley. 1948. "Labor force, employment, and unemployment, 1929-39: estimating methods." *Monthly Labor Review: Bureau of Labor Statistics*. <https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/1948/article/labor-force-employment-and-unemployment-1929-39-estimating-methods.htm>.
- Leland, Anne. 2012. "American War and Military Operations Casualties: Lists and Statistics." *Congressional Research Service*, 15 Nov.
- Marshall, Monty, and Ted Robert Gurr. 2018. POLITY IV Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-2017. *Center for Systemic Peace*. <http://www.systemicpeace.org/polityproject.html>.
- Marshall, Monty G. 2008. Forcibly Displaced Populations, 1964-2008. <http://www.systemicpeace.org/inscrdata.html>.
- Office of Management and Budget. 2018. *Historical Tables*. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/historical-tables>.
- Palmer, Glenn, Vito D'Orazio, Michael Kenwick, and Matthew Lane. 2015. "The Mid4 Dataset, 2002-2010: Procedures, Coding Rules and Description." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 32: 222-42.
- Pearson, Frederic S., and Robert A. Baumann. 1993. "International Military Intervention, 1946-1988." *Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research*, Data Collection No 6035. Ann Arbor, MI. <http://www.k-state.edu/polsci/intervention.html>.
- Powell, Jonathan M., and Clayton L. Thyne. 2011. "Global Instances of Coups from 1950 to 2010: A New Dataset." *Journal of Peace Research* 48, no. 2: 249-259. Replication dataset here: http://www.uky.edu/~clthyn2/coup_data/home.htm.
- Ross, Michael, and Paasha, Mahdavi. 2015. "Oil and Gas Data, 1932-2014", Harvard Dataverse, V1. <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/ZTPW0Y>.
- Roser, Max. 2018a. "Child Mortality." *Our World in Data*. <https://ourworldindata.org/child-mortality>.
- Roser, Max. 2018b. "Life Expectancy." *Our World in Data*. <https://ourworldindata.org/life-expectancy>.
- Salazar Torreon, Barbara. 2017. "Instances of Use of United States Armed Forces Abroad, 1798-2017." *Congressional Research Service*, 12 Oct. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R42738.pdf>.

- Singer, J. David. 1987. "Reconstructing the Correlates of War Dataset on Material Capabilities of States, 1816-1985." *International Interactions*, 14: 115-32.
- Stinnett, Douglas M., Jaroslav Tir, Philip Schafer, Paul F. Diehl, and Charles Gochman. 2002. "The Correlates of War Project Direct Contiguity Data, Version 3." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 19, no. 2:58-66.
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institution. 2016. Extended Military Expenditure Database. Beta. <https://www.sipri.org/databases/milex>.
- Sullivan, Patricia, and Michael Koch. 2009. "Military Intervention by Powerful States, 1945–2003." *Journal of Peace Research* 46(5): 707-718. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25654465>.
- Uniform Crime Reporting Statistics (UCR). *Federal Bureau of Investigation*. U.S. Department of Justice. <https://www.ucrdatatool.gov/>.
- "US Business Cycle Expansions and Contractions." 2018. *The National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER)*. <https://www.nber.org/cycles.html>.
- United States Senate. n.d. *Party Division in the Senate, 1789-Present*. <https://www.senate.gov/history/partydiv.htm>.
- Voeten, Erik, Anton Strezhnev, and Michael Bailey. 2009. "United Nations General Assembly Voting Data," Harvard Dataverse, V18. <https://hdl.handle.net/1902.1/12379>.
- Westerfield, Donald L. 1996. *War Powers: The President, the Congress, and the Question of War*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Worley, D. Robert. 2005. Improving Initial Performance of the Joint Task Force Headquarters. *Institute for Defense Analyses*. May.
- Zeev, Maoz, Paul L. Johnson, Jasper Kaplan, Fiona Ogunkoya, and Aaron Shreve. 2018. "The Dyadic Militarized Interstate Disputes (MIDs) Dataset Version 3.0: Logic, Characteristics, and Comparisons to Alternative Datasets." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, DOI: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0022002718784158>.

APPENDIX

Selected Datasets on U.S. Military Intervention

1.) Instances of Use of United States Armed Forces Abroad, 1798-2017, Congressional Research Service (CRS)

An annotated list of US military involvements abroad, originating from historical sources, US government archives, and presidential reports to Congress related to the War Powers Resolution. It includes instances in which the US has used its Armed Forces abroad in situations of military conflict or potential conflict or for other than normal peacetime purposes. Covert operations, disaster relief, and routine alliance stationing and training exercises are not included here, nor are the Civil and Revolutionary Wars and the continual use of U.S. military units in the exploration, settlement, and pacification of the western part of the United States (Salazar Torreon 2017).

2.) MIDA/MIDB (COW): 5 datasets that cover all conflicts/interventions, 1816-2010.

Includes information on highest escalation level by conflict, nations involved, period fought, originator, revisions post-conflict and casualties size by participant, and exact number of casualties (Palmer et al. 2015; Zeev et al. 2018).

- Defines an intervention as “a use of armed force that involves the official deployment of at least 500 regular military personnel (ground, air, or naval) to attain immediate term political objectives through action against a foreign adversary.”
- “Militarized interstate disputes are united historical cases of conflict in which the threat, display or use of military force short of war by one member state is explicitly directed towards the government, official representatives, official forces, property, or territory of another state. Disputes are composed of incidents that range in intensity from threats to use force to actual combat short of war.”
- MIDB includes nations involved, while MIDA limits to incidents.
- MIDIP includes participants, while MIDI limits to incidents, 1993-2010.
- MIDDyadic: Breaks down all multilateral disputes into bilateral incidents between two nations in the same manner as MIDI. Only includes cases where two nations directly engaged in militarized incidents with one another.

For narratives of each MID, we refer to Douglas M. Gibler, *Militarized Interstate Dispute Narratives, 1816-2010*, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2018.

3.) U.S. Historical Involvement, Airforce, 1916-1991.

Denotes officially recognized battles/campaigns that the air force participated in by date and conflict/theater. Source: Historical Statistics of the United States, Millennium Edition (Gibler 2006a)

4.) U.S. Historical Involvement, Army, 1775-1991.

Denotes officially recognized battles/campaigns that the army participated in by date and conflict/theater. Source: Historical Statistics of the United States, Millennium Edition. Useful to triangulate list of cases (Gibler 2006a).

- 5.) U.S. Historical Involvement, Navy, 1776-1991.
Denotes officially recognized battles/campaigns that the navy participated in by date and conflict/theater. Source: Historical Statistics of the United States, Millennium Edition. Useful to triangulate list of cases (Gibler 2006a)
- 6.) Armed Conflict PRIO/UCDP, 1946-2017.
Lists armed conflicts with at least one nation-state involved. Includes location, primary disputants, primary supporters of each disputant, issue over which the conflict began, year, territory, conflict type (extrasystemic, interstate, internal and internationalized internal), intensity level, dates of conflict initiation and ending, date of episode beginning and ending (categorized by at least 25 deaths occurring), and region of conflict (Pettersson and Wallensteen 2015; Gleditsch et al. 2002).
- 7.) Intrastate Conflict/Political Violence Dataset, 1946-2016.
Major Episodes of Political Violence, by year, score, independent vs. non-independent state, magnitude of violence associated with independence, international violence, international warfare, civil violence, civil warfare, ethnic violence, ethnic warfare and total levels of violence in that state for a year. In the extended data set, it also includes number of countries sharing a border with that state, and number and names of countries with interstate warfare, civil warfare, or all warfare, as well as number of states with these variables in the region of the country examined (Marshall 2016).
- 8.) International Military Intervention, IMI, 1946-2015.
Unit of analysis: “the movement of regular troops or forces (airborne, seaborne, shelling, etc.) of one country inside another, in the context of some political issue or dispute” (Pearson and Baumann 1993; Pickering 2009).
Twenty-seven separate pieces of information are coded for each case to capture multiple dimensions of the intervention.
- 9.) Military Intervention by Powerful States, 1945-2003.
Paper focuses on the effectiveness of military force as a policy instrument and applies the measure to code the outcomes of all military interventions conducted by five major powers since the termination of World War II. The MIPS dataset provides detailed data on US, British, Chinese, French, and Russian uses of military force against both state and non-state targets between 1946 and 2003 (Sullivan and Koch 2009).
Outcome variables: political objectives strong states pursue using force, the human and material cost of their military operations, and measures of intervention outcomes relative to the intervening states’ objectives. The dataset also includes extensive data on factors commonly hypothesized to be associated with war outcomes, such as the nature of the target, the type of force used by the intervening state, and military aid and assistance provided to each side.
- 10.) Zoltan Grossman, List of US Interventions, 1790-2018 (Grossman 2018).
- 11.) RAND U.S. Ground Intervention Dataset (RUGID), 1898-2015. (Cannot publicly access)

The start date was chosen to correspond with the start of the Spanish American War, cited by many as marking the emergence of the United States on the international stage. For this dataset, an intervention includes any deployment of U.S. ground troops on the territory of another country that included at least 100 “person years” (Kavanagh et al. 2017).

12.) American War and Military Operations Casualties, CRS, 1775-2017.

Includes data tables containing the number of casualties among American military personnel who served in principal wars and combat operations from 1775 to the present. It also includes data on those wounded in action and information such as race and ethnicity, gender, branch of service, and cause of death (Leland 2012)

13.) Cost of Major US Wars, CRS, 1776-Present.

Costs of *major* U.S. wars from the American Revolution through current conflicts in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere. It presents figures both in “current year dollars” and in inflation adjusted “constant dollars” in FY2011 prices. All estimates are of the costs of military operations only and do not include costs of veterans’ benefits, interest paid for borrowing money to finance wars, or assistance to allies. The report also provides estimates of the cost of each war as a share of GDP during the peak year of each conflict and of overall defense spending as a share of GDP at the peak (Daggett 2010).

14.) Cost of Iraq, Afghanistan, & Other War on Terror Operations since 9/11, CRS, 2001-2013.

A 100+ report on budgetary numbers, figures, and trends regarding major War on Terror Operations since 9/11 (Belasco 2014).

15.) SIPRI Datasets: Military Expenditures & Peace Operations, 1949-2017

The SIPRI database on multilateral peace operations provides comprehensive data on all multilateral peace operations (both UN and non-UN) conducted around the world. It includes more than 120 peace operations and over 600 mission-year entries from 2000–2010. SIPRI gives the annual military spending of countries since 1949, allowing comparison of countries’ military spending in local currency at current prices; in US dollars at constant prices and exchange rates; and as a share of GDP (Stockholm International Peace Research Institution 2016).

16.) Cross National Time Series Data Archive, from 1815.

Over 200 variables, including crisis/political instability unique variables found across other listed datasets (Banks and Wilson 2015).

17.) U.S. Casualties by Service Branch, 1775-1995.

Includes number of deaths for Army, Navy, Marines and Airforce per war, as well as personnel serving worldwide, number of total casualties, number of battle casualties, number of other casualties, and number of wounded. Source: Historical Statistics of the United States, Millennium Edition (Gartner 2006).

The Military Intervention Project (MIP) Case Study Template

NAME: Conventional name of intervention, E.g. Iraq war

DISPUTE NUMBER: Match the case study to the coded unit in the MIP dataset. This number refers to Gibler's (2018) *International Conflicts* books.

DATES: Start and End Dates. Month, Day, Year – Month, Day, Year (whenever possible).

TARGET STATE(S): List by full state name and Correlates of War (COW) country codes.

SUMMARY: A 2-3 paragraph description of the military intervention, focusing on U.S. responses and outcomes.

- 1.) What preceded the intervention? Briefly describe the political atmosphere of domestic target. (e.g. was there a civil war underway, constitutional crisis, transition in power, economic disruption, international aggression?)
- 2.) Describe the key political, economic, and diplomatic steps that the U.S. and the international community implemented before the intervention.
- 3.) State the nature of the intervention: number of troops, type of force used, duration of force, any retaliation attempts, etc.
- 4.) Discuss the immediate outcomes of the intervention for the U.S. and target country as well as any longer-term consequences. No more than 2-3 sentences needed.

SOURCES: Use at least 3 sources for the summary. Cite in Chicago style.

OBJECTIVE: Code one or more of these categories (see appendix for definitions):

Remove Foreign Regime; Maintain/Build Foreign Regime Authority; Maintain Empire; Acquire/Defend Territory; Policy Change; Social Protection & Order; Social Protection; Humanitarian Intervention; Economic Protection; Protect own Military and/or Diplomatic Interests

OUTCOME: Code one of these categories:

Victory for U.S.	Victory for Target State	Yield by U.S.
Yield by Target State	Stalemate	Compromise
		Unclear/missing

BATTLE DEATHS: Number of deaths incurred by all parties, not including civilians. Whenever possible, separate these numbers by state. Provide a range of available estimates via different sources in bullet format.

TOTAL DEATHS: Number of deaths included by all parties, including civilians. Whenever possible, separate numbers by state and provide a range of estimates in bullet format.

COSTS: Record any information on the costs of the US intervention, such as specific technologies used, the financial burdens of the mission, environmental costs, etc. This section will be further refined in the near future. For now, take note of any sources that discuss costs of the military mission.

DEFINITIONAL ISSUES: Refer to MIP Database for discrepancies in case study listing across different sources. These alternative data sources are coded as dummy variables in the master dataset. Referring to each dataset's definition of intervention, note any reasons for the discrepancies in bullet format.

OBJECTIVE DEFINITIONS (adapted from MIPS definitions):

For the original MIPS coding that we heavily rely on, see Sullivan, Patricia and Michael Koch. 2008. MIPS Codebook. https://plsullivan.web.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1570/2011/09/MIPS_codebook_Sullivan.pdf

Remove Foreign Regime. Military force is employed with the intention of removing (i.e., deposing, overthrowing) a foreign regime from power. The intervening state may overthrow and replace a foreign government itself, fight alongside insurgent groups that seek to replace the regime in power, or support foreign invasions by other states attempting to seize power.

Maintain/Build Foreign Regime Authority. Military force is employed in an attempt to preserve the governing authority of an incumbent regime or the existing political institutions in another state. This includes both operations to assist a foreign government with the elimination of a domestic insurgent threat and operations to defend a foreign government against an external threat. This category should also be chosen if the intervening state is attempting to establish and then maintain the political authority of a particular regime or create particular political institutions in a state (i.e., statebuilding). Military operations do not have to seek the preservation of any particular incumbent *leader* to be considered interventions for the maintenance of regime authority. Often individual leaders are appointed and replaced as the intervening state sees fit during the course of an intervention. The key criteria is the goal of defeating some perceived threat (external or internal) to a state's sovereignty or system of government. Foreign regime building and maintenance may follow, but should be distinguished from, the use of force to remove a foreign regime from power. Cases should be coded as defense of territory rather than maintenance of political authority if a piece of land, rather than political authority over an entire nation, is in dispute. Cases should be coded as maintenance of empire when the intervening state is attempting to maintain its own political authority, rather than that of an ally.

Maintain Empire. Military force is employed in an attempt to re-assert or maintain the intervening state's own political authority over territory claimed as national homeland by another ethnic group. Cases should be coded as foreign regime maintenance if the conflict location is an independent state.

Acquire or Defend Territory. Military force, or the threat of force, is employed to defend, acquire, or reclaim territory. The state may intervene to defend the territory of an ally from an external threat, help an ally acquire territory or reassert authority over previously held territory, or seize territory for itself. Cases are coded as territorial only if a piece of land, rather than political authority over an entire nation, is in dispute.

Policy Change. Military force, or the threat of force, is employed in an attempt to coerce an incumbent regime, group, or leader into change specific policies (foreign or domestic) or behaviors. While many conflicts stem from policy disputes, the primary political objective of an intervention is only policy change when the intervening state wants the targeted adversary to change an objectionable policy of its own accord.

Economic Protection. Intervener attempts to protect economic or resource interests of itself or others in the target region.

Social Protection and Order. Military force, or the threat of force, is used to protect civilians from violence and/or other human rights abuses; restore social order in a situation of unrest (e.g. violent protests, rioting, looting); or to suppress violence between armed groups within another state. ‘Peacekeeping’ operations that are actually intended to prop up an incumbent regime or maintain empire should not be coded as social protection and order operations. Similarly, ‘humanitarian’ operations in which military force is used in an attempt to coerce the incumbent government into changing the way it is treating a minority group within its borders should be coded as policy change operations.

Subsections of this objective (can select more general umbrella or below subsections, if distinguishable):

Social Protective Intervention: to protect a socio-ethnic faction(s) or minority of the target country.

Humanitarian Intervention: to save lives, relieve suffering, distribute foodstuffs to prevent starvation and so forth) apart from protection of a minority group.

Intervention to Protect own Military and/or Diplomatic Interests: This also includes property inside or outside the target: (e.g., military property; diplomats; diplomatic property)

MIP Case Study Backlogging

NAME: Type out Name as shown in case study and any other common terms for the event
Variables: **Name**

START AND END DATES: Confirm start and end dates match in dataset and case narrative.

Variables: **Styear; Stmonth; Stdaily; Endyear; Endmon; Endday.**

Cumdurat – Number of cumulative days from start to end of dispute

Ongoing – Is this dispute ongoing as of Dec. 2019? 1 = Yes; 0. No

TARGET STATE: Confirm that target states and their codes match in case and dataset.

Variables: **State B; State B Code, Location** (list location of dispute by COW country code)

SUMMARY: Check the summary for levels of US and State B hostility levels, and either fill in missing variables on this or check to see that the case study and dataset match.

Variables: **USHiHost** – Highest Level of US Hostility

1. No militarized action
2. Threat to use force
3. Display of force
4. Use of force
5. War

US HighAct – Highest action by US in dispute (refer to MID codebook for categories)

Dyadic Hostility – Highest level of hostility across both parties, same scale as above.

Dyadic HighAct – Highest action by all parties (refer to MID codebook for categories)

HiHostB – Highest level of hostility by State B in dispute, same scale as above.

Numbers in parenthesis refer to corresponding hostility levels.

1. None (1)
2. Threat to use force (2)
3. Threat to blockade (2)
4. Threat to occupy terr. (2)
5. Threat to declare war (2)
6. Threat to join war (2)
7. Show of troops (3)
8. Show of ships (3)
9. Show of planes (3)
10. Alert (3)
11. (3) NEOs, humanitarian, and SFA because of shorter temporal scopes and limited troop involvements
12. Mobilization (3) (represent UN peacekeeping, because these ops are longer and require a larger footprint.)
13. Fortify border (3)
14. Border violation (4)
15. Blockade (4)
16. Occupation of territory (4)
17. Seizure (4)
18. Clash (4)
19. Raid (4)
20. Declaration of war (4)
22. Begin interstate war (5)
23. Join interstate war (5)
24. Use CBR Weapons (5)

HighActB – Highest action undertaken by State B (refer to MID codebook)

US Orig – US Originator of Dispute? 1 = Yes; 0 = No.

OriginatA – US participated in first incident of dispute? 1 = Yes; 0 = No.

OriginatB – State B initiator of first incident? 1 = Yes; 0 = No.

SideAA – US on initiator's side? 1 = Yes; 0 = No.

InterType – Intervention type coding: 1. Unilateral; 2. Multilateral non-UN;
3. Multilateral UN; 4. Other.

OBJECTIVE: Objective of the US mission, as per case study template coding.

Variables: **Objective** – Write out one or more of the objective categories.

ObjectiveCode – Write out the number corresponding to the objective(s) in MID codebook. If there are two objectives, separate numbers by a semicolon.

1. Remove Foreign Regime
2. Maintain/Build Foreign Regime Authority
3. Maintain Empire
4. Acquire/Defend Territory
5. Policy Change
6. Social Protection & Order; 6.1. Social Protection
- 6.2. Humanitarian Intervention
7. Economic Protection;
8. Protect own Military and/or Diplomatic Interests
9. Unclear/missing

ForeignReg – Was US objective to remove a foreign regime? 1. Yes; 0. No.

BuildReg – Was US objective to maintain/build a foreign regime? 1. Yes; 0. No.

Empire – Was US objective to main their empire? 1. Yes; 0. No.

Territory – Was US objective to acquire or defend territory? 1. Yes; 0. No.

Policy – Was US objective to affect policy change? 1. Yes; 0. No.

SocialProt – Was US objective to protect society and order? 2. Yes,
humanitarian intervention; 1. Yes, Social protection; 0. No.

Economic – Was US objective economic protection? 1. Yes; 0. No.

ProtOwn – Was US objective to protect its military/diplomatic interest? 1. Yes; 0. No.

OUTCOME: Outcome of the dispute, as per case study categories.

Variables: **Outcome** – Write out the number corresponding to the category:

1. Victory for US & Allies
2. Victory for Target & Allies
3. Yield by US
4. Yield by Target Actor
5. Stalemate
6. Compromise
7. Released (for seizures) (NEW CATEGORY)
8. Unclear/missing
9. Ongoing

BATTLE DEATHS: Total number of battle deaths as per case study.

Variables: **BattleFatUS** – Give the average number of US battle casualties across your sources

BattleFatB – Give the average number of State B battle casualties across sources

BattleFat – Give average number of all battle casualties across sources

BattleLevUS – Categorize US battle deaths by numerical scale:

0. None
1. 1-25 deaths
2. 26-100 deaths
3. 101-250 deaths
4. 251-500 deaths
5. 501-999 deaths
6. 1,000+ deaths

BattleLevB – Categorize battle deaths incurred by state B by numerical scale above.

BattleLev – Categorize all battle deaths by numerical scale above.

TOTAL DEATHS: Total deaths, including civilians as per case study.

Variables: **FatUS** – Give the average number of all US casualties across your sources

FatB – Give the average number of all State B casualties across sources

Fatalities – Given average number of all casualties across sources

FatLevUS – Categorize all US deaths by numerical scale:

0. None
1. 1-25 deaths
2. 26-100 deaths
3. 101-250 deaths
4. 251-500 deaths
5. 501-999 deaths
6. 1,000+ deaths

FatLevB – Categorize all deaths incurred by state B by numerical scale above.

FatLev – Categorize all deaths by numerical scale above.

COSTS: US costs of intervention, in dollars and troop numbers.

Variables: **MaxCost** – Write out the maximum dollar value of costs incurred by the US during the dispute, as per case study. In Millions of US Dollars.

MaxTroops – Write out the maximum number of US air, ground, and sea troops deployed to the conflict throughout the dispute.

MaxNavy – Write out the maximum number of naval vessels used by US during the dispute.

MaxAir – Write out the maximum number of airplanes, drones, and other aerial equipment used by US during the dispute.

Comparative Perspective on MIP

While several datasets offer information on U.S. foreign military involvements, the main actors, and types of forces employed (air, naval, or ground), each of the datasets presents with significant limitations. The biggest challenges lie in dataset time frames, varying definitions of military intervention, and lack of detail in the units of analysis. Moreover, none of the datasets contain key variables on intervention outcomes, consequences, and other explanatory measures for the U.S. and target countries.

a. Compiling the Case Universe of Interventions

The most complete document that lists US military interventions since before the 1800s is the Congressional Research Service's (CRS) "Instances of Use of United States Armed Forces Abroad", from 1798 to 2017 (Salazar Torreon 2017). We have meticulously reviewed every intervention listed in this document, written a 3-4-page case study on each confirmed operation that requires at least three academic sources for case confirmation, and coded all related variables for the MIP. At least three individuals on the team have reviewed each coding choice to maximize the reliability of measures. The CRS document was thus used to create the preliminary set of cases for the MIP dataset, but it does have some key limitations. First, covert operations are not included. Second, the list itself is in PDF narrative format, requiring the manual input of each data into statistical software. Third, the list does not disaggregate post-2000 military missions, sometimes listing over ten target countries and missions as one unit of analysis per year in many cases (e.g. as part of the Global War on Terror). We, therefore, had to make judgments on disaggregating, aggregating, or removing military operations, beyond standard information gathering steps. Any discrepancies we have encountered are listed in our codebook with a one-paragraph description.

Beyond reviewing the CRS listing as well as existing datasets on US military interventions, MIP also relied on a set of documents and data from the Institute for Defense Analysis measuring Joint Task Force Headquarters and operations since the 1970s (Worley 2005). We also reviewed Donald Westerfield's book on War Powers for additional intervention archives as well as Harry Ellsworth's *One Hundred Eighty Landings of the United States Marines* until 1934 for additional cases (Ellsworth 1974). Lastly, we explored all cases in existing datasets on US military interventions, often altering measures, disaggregating operations, or even marking the cases as unconfirmed interventions or clear non-interventions via our detailed case studies. Lastly, we have backlogged all new data collected from our case studies back into the MIP dataset as per our codebook guidelines and case study backlogging templates included as supplementary documents in this article. Therefore, each case study of US military intervention included in MIP will also have a listing of its source documentation, which spans a wide range of government documents, scholarly books, media reports, and more.

Below, we highlight the most relevant sources of data on U.S. military interventions, starting with the unit of analysis and ending with measures of financial cost, human casualties, economic changes, and levels of democratization in target states. WE discuss both the benefits and limitations of each data source listed. Lastly, we explain how we utilized the existing datasets towards the advancement of the Military Intervention Project (MIP).

b. Datasets of US Military Intervention

The only existing document that lists U.S. military interventions since before the 1800s is the Congressional Research Service's (CRS) "Instances of Use of United States Armed Forces Abroad", from 1798 to 2017 (Salazar Torreon 2017). This document was used as the preliminary set of cases for the MIP dataset, but it, too, possesses several limitations. First, covert operations and recent drone missions are not included. Second, the list itself is in PDF narrative format, requiring the manual input of each data into statistical software. Third, the list does not disaggregate post-2000 military missions, instead listing several target countries and missions as one unit of analysis per year in many cases.

The second most comprehensive list of U.S. military involvements originates from the Correlates of War (COW) Militarized Intrastate Disputes (MID) dataset. This was the secondary source for compiling MIP's master set of cases. The dataset covers the period 1816 to 2010 (Palmer et al. 2015). But while certain versions of the dataset include state actor labels, none of the versions include details on each listed dispute (at least not until 1993). The coding of the dispute is limited to a numerical entry with no paralleling information in the codebook. Fortunately, COW recently launched an updated dyadic version of the MID datasets, allowing us to obtain some information on listed disputes via the dyadic pairs (Zeev et al. 2018). Beyond this, Gibler's (2018) book, *International Conflicts*, offers individualized narratives of each dispute in the dataset.

Moreover, the Militarized Interstate Disputes (MID) dataset has a relatively high threshold for inclusion in terms of numbers of troops but no threshold for duration, which affects the set of interventions included. It also lacks information on the size of the intervention. While the MID relied heavily on the CRS listing and Dyadic MID dataset to populate its units of analysis, it also used many other sources to reach a comprehensive universe of US military involvements since the 1700s.

The International Military Interventions (IMI) data limits itself to a narrow timeframe of 1946-2015, but it includes all movement of troops, regardless of size and duration. In this way, the data captures many operations that may be categorized as border skirmishes rather than interventions (Kisangani and Pickering 2008; Pearson and Baumann 1993). IMI also includes some important information on size, but this information is categorical and so does not give a clear view of how many troops are involved at different points in the intervention. Despite its time and definitional limitations, however, IMI offers 27 different variables that relate to intervention outcomes and target state characteristics. The MIP dataset collected additional variables via the IMI sources.

The Armed Conflict Database (ACD/PRIO) lists armed conflicts with at least one nation-state involved, but it only includes post-1945 instances, which limits the usefulness to MIP. (Pettersson and Wallensteen 2015; Gleditsch et al. 2002). Supplementing these main datasets, MIP relied on lists of U.S. Historical Involvements by sector (Navy, Army, and Airforce), from 1775 until 1991 to triangulate results (Gartner 2006a). These documents originate from CRS and the Historical Statistics of the U.S. As a last confirmation of cases, MIP review Zoltan Grossman (2018)'s well-regarded list of U.S. military interventions since 1790.

Two other datasets, RAND's U.S. Ground Intervention Dataset (RUGID), from 1898 to 2015, and the Cross-National Time Series Data, from 1815, would benefit MIP research into the future (Kavanagh et al. 2017; Banks and Wilson 2015). Unfortunately, RUGID is undergoing the Army's Public Affairs review before it becomes public. The timeline for this process is unknown.

Furthermore, RUGID only includes US ground interventions, which biases the sample towards more difficult/urgent cases of foreign intervention.

c. Independent Variables and Concepts

Once the list of intervention cases was solidified, MIP required the addition of information on intervention outcomes and consequences, not limited to: battle casualties, human rights, financial costs, democratic transitions, GDP gains/losses, and alternations in power capabilities. Several datasets were consulted for such purposes. First, the dataset on Military Intervention by Powerful States (MIPS), while not ideal for the population of cases due to its narrow timeline of 1945 to 2003, offers a range of conceptualizations on the effectiveness of military force as a policy instrument (Sullivan and Koch 2009). Some of the outcome variables include: political objectives pursued, the human and material cost of military operations, and measures of intervention outcomes relative to the intervening states' objectives. The dataset also includes extensive information on factors commonly hypothesized to be associated with war outcomes, such as the nature of the target, the type of force used by the intervening state, and military aid and assistance provided to each side. The biggest challenge in incorporating these variables into MIP was the limited time frame.

Several sources exist to measure U.S. military casualties across history. CRS offers data tables on "American War and Military Operations Casualties," from 1775 to 2017; while Historical Statistics of the U.S. provides U.S. Casualties by Service Branch, from 1775 to 1995 (Gartner 2006b; Leland 2012). This document includes the number of deaths for Army, Navy, Marines and Airforce per war, as well as personnel serving worldwide, number of total casualties, number of battle casualties, number of other casualties, and number of wounded. These two documents were cross-referenced for a comprehensive analysis within the case narratives.

Lastly, the CRS offers a list of Costs of Major U.S. Wars, from 1776 to the present. This, however, is not a comprehensive list of all costs (Daggett 2010). Moreover, all estimates are of the costs of military operations only and do not include costs of veterans' benefits, interest paid for borrowing money to finance wars, or assistance to allies. Thus, MIP supplemented this information with SIPRI's dataset on Military Expenditures & Peace Operations, from 1949 to 2017, as well as its own case study narratives (Stockholm International Peace Research Institution 2016).