

Non-State Actor Data: Version 3.4

Kristian Skrede Gleditsch¹
David Cunningham²
Idean Salehyan³

April 10, 2013

¹Department of Government, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, CO 4 3SQ, email: ksg@essex.edu

²University of Maryland

³University of North Texas

Contents

1 ID 1	1
2 ID 2	7
3 ID 3	9
4 ID 4	13
5 ID 5	17
6 ID 6	19
7 ID 7	23
8 ID 8	25
9 ID 9	27
10 ID 10	29
11 ID 11	33
12 ID 12	35
13 ID 13	37
14 ID 14	39
15 ID 17	41

16 ID 18	43
17 ID 19	45
18 ID 21	47
19 ID 22	51
20 ID 23	55
21 ID 24	59
22 ID 25	67
23 ID 26	73
24 ID 36	75
25 ID 37	83
26 ID 39	95
27 ID 40	97
28 ID 40	99
29 ID 43	101
30 ID 44	105
31 ID 46	107
32 ID 47	111
33 ID 48	113
34 ID 49	115
35 ID 50	119

36 ID 51	125
37 ID 52	127
38 ID 54	129
39 ID 56	133
40 ID 57	137
41 ID 59	139
42 ID 60	141
43 ID 61	143
44 ID 62	145
45 ID 63	157
46 ID 64	167
47 ID 65	171
48 ID 66	177
49 ID 67	181
50 ID 68	193
51 ID 69	197
52 ID 70	199
53 ID 72	209
54 ID 73	213
55 ID 74	215

56 ID 76	221
57 ID 78	223
58 ID 80	227
59 ID 82	229
60 ID 83	231
61 ID 85	233
62 ID 86	241
63 ID 87	253
64 ID 88	255
65 ID 89	259
66 ID 90	263
67 ID 91	271
68 ID 92	299
69 ID 93	307
70 ID 94	309
71 ID 95	313
72 ID 98	319
73 ID 99	323
74 ID 100	325
75 ID 101	327

76 ID 102	329
77 ID 103	333
78 ID 107	339
79 ID 111	343
80 ID 112	345
81 ID 113	355
82 ID 114	369
83 ID 115	371
84 ID 116	373
85 ID 117	375
86 ID 118	379
87 ID 119	407
88 ID 120	411
89 ID 121	417
90 ID 122	421
91 ID 123	427
92 ID 125	429
93 ID 126	431
94 ID 129	433
95 ID 130	439

96 ID 131	441
97 ID 133	447
98 ID 134	451
99 ID 135	455
100ID 136	457
101ID 137	461
102ID 139	479
103ID 140	483
104ID 141	487
105ID 143	503
106ID 144	507
107ID 145	509
108ID 146	511
109ID 147	519
110ID 148	523
111ID 149	525
112ID 150	527
113ID 152	531
114ID 153	537
115ID 156	539

116ID 157	541
117ID 158	547
118ID 159	549
119ID 162	553
120ID 163	555
121ID 164	557
122ID 165	559
123ID 167	561
124ID 168	563
125ID 169	567
126ID 170	571
127ID 171	575
128ID 172	579
129ID 174	581
130ID 175	585
131ID 177	587
132ID 178	591
133ID 179	595
134ID 180	599
135ID 181	603

136ID 182	605
137ID 183	607
138ID 184	609
139ID 185	611
140ID 186	615
141ID 187	621
142ID 188	627
143ID 189	629
144ID 190	631
145ID 191	635
146ID 192	641
147ID 193	647
148ID 194	651
149ID 195	655
150ID 196	659
151ID 197	661
152ID 198	663
153ID 199	665
154ID 200	667
155ID 201	671

156ID 202	675
157ID 203	677
158ID 204	681
159ID 205	683
160ID 206	685
161ID 207	687
162ID 209	689
163ID 212	691
164ID 213	695
165ID 214	697
166ID 216	701
167ID 217	703
168ID 218	705
169ID 219	709
170ID 220	711
171ID 221	713
172ID 222	715
173ID 223	719
174ID 224	721
175ID 225	723

176ID 227	727
177ID 254	729
178ID 255	731
179ID 258	733
180ID 259	735
181ID 263	737
182ID 264	739
183ID 265	741
184ID 266	743
185ID 267	745
186ID 268	747
187ID 269	749
188ID 270	751
189ID 271	755

Chapter 1

ID 1

ID 1

Incompatibility: Government, Bolivia

DyadID 462: Bolivia-Popular Revolutionary Movement

In May 1946, the Democratic Anti-Fascist Front (FDA) was created as an organization of opponents of the current regime, both on the Left and Right. In June 1946, the FDA began organizing a strikes and revolts against the government that escalated into major street fighting on 20 July 20. On 21 July, a street mob burst into the capital and killed the president and six of his closest advisers. The next day a new government was formed.

Bolivia suffered severe economic hardship, which helped bring on a popular revolt against the government at La Paz on July 17-21, 1946. The army did nothing to check rebellious soldiers, workers, and students; Villaroel was seized and hanged from a lamppost in front of the presidential palace. A provisional liberal government was installed and recognized by the United States and Argentina.

Rebels: Popular Revolutionary Movement

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: acknowledged link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The FDA was a legal political organization and had general control over the striking workers. However, there was also a mob mentality to the violence that was not totally controlled.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: unclear

None of the sources available give an indication of the number of people participating in the strikes or in the street violence.

Centcontrol: yes Strengthcent: moderate

The striking and revolting workers were generally controlled by a political party, the FDA.

Mobcap: moderate Armscap: unclear Fightcap: moderate

The FDA was able to mobilize workers to strike and riot across a range of professions including teachers, students, and railworkers. It is not clear that they had an inability to procure arms. Their fighting capacity in terms of the ability to wage street warfare was moderate.

Sources:

- Whitehead, Laurence (1991). "Bolivia since 1930". In Leslie Bethell, Ed. *The Cambridge History of Latin America Volume VIII: Latin America since 1930, Spanish South America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keesing's Contemporary Archives.
- Library of Congress Country Study
- New York Times Archives

DyadID 463: Bolivia-National Revolutionary Movement

In elections in May, 1951, the National Revolutionary Movement (MNR) party won the majority of seats. However, the elections were annulled and a military junta took power. On 9 April 1952, the MNR organized a violent insurrection in La Paz against the junta government. If the military had thrown the full weight of its support behind the government, the insurrection would have been crushed. However, the police force in La Paz decided to support the MNR, and the government was quickly overthrown. By 11 April, the MNR had established control throughout much of Bolivia and on April 13 a new government was formed.

Note: the Uppsala data is incorrect. This rebellion took place on April 9, 1952, not in 1951 as noted in the dataset

In the presidential election of May 1951, the MNR's Paz Estenssoro ran for president on a platform of nationalization and land reform. With the support of the POR and the newly formed Bolivian Communist Party (Partido Comunista de Bolivia – PCB), the MNR won with a clear plurality. The

outgoing president, however, persuaded the military to step in and prevent the MNR from taking power. By the beginning of 1952, the MNR tried to gain power by force, plotting with General Antonio Seleme, the junta member in control of internal administration and the National Police (Policia Nacional). On April 9, the MNR launched the rebellion in La Paz by seizing arsenals and distributing arms to civilians. Armed miners marched on La Paz and blocked troops on their way to reinforce the city. After three days of fighting, the desertion of Seleme, and the loss of 600 lives, the army completely surrendered; Paz Estenssoro assumed the presidency on April 16, 1952.

Rebels: MNR

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The MNR was a political party and had participated in elections in the previous year.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: unclear

None of the sources available had any figures on the number of troops supporting the MNR.

Rebstrength: weaker

The MNR would not have been able to take over La Paz if the military police force had not joined them.

Sources:

- Whitehead, Laurence (1991). "Bolivia since 1930". In Leslie Bethell, Ed. *The Cambridge History of Latin America Volume VIII: Latin America since 1930, Spanish South America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keesing's Contemporary Archives.
- Library of Congress Country Study
- New York Times Archives

DyadID 464: Bolivia-ELN

In November of 1966, Ernesto ‘Che’ Guevara, the famous guerrilla leader, came to Bolivia with other Cuban revolutionaries to organize a leftist insurgency there. In early 1967 the government learned of his organization and with the help of United States military advisers began organizing a military response to it (prior to this time the Bolivian army was very weak and did not have the capacity to wage war in the periphery where Guevara’s forces were). Guevara did not have the success he was expecting at organizing new forces and once the Bolivian army was sufficiently trained to launch an attack, the movement was quickly defeated. On 8 October 1967, Guevara was killed and by the end of the month the guerrilla movement had been defeated.

In March 1967, Bolivia became a prime target of Cuban-supported subversion when Ernesto ‘Che’ Guevara and his tiny National Liberation Army (Ejército de Liberación Nacional–ELN) launched a guerrilla campaign. Despite its increased United States training, Bolivia’s army still consisted mostly of untrained Indian conscripts and had fewer than 2,000 troops ready for combat. Therefore, while the army kept the 40-man guerrilla group contained in a southwestern area of the country, an 800-man Ranger force began training in counterinsurgency methods. With counterinsurgency instructors from the United States Southern Command (Southcom) headquarters in Panama, the army established a Ranger School in Santa Cruz Department. By late July 1967, three well-trained and well-equipped Bolivian Ranger battalions were ready for action. Supported by these special troops, units of the Eighth Division closed in on Guevara’s demoralized, ill-equipped, and poorly supplied band. Guevara’s capture and summary execution on October 7 ended the ill-fated, Cuban-sponsored insurgency.

Rebels: ERP

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: explicit. Cuba directly inspired/launched the rebellion.

Rtypesup: military. Cuban government sent troops, but support was mostly material.

Govsupport: explicit. The US provided military training and assistance

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: alleged link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

There were Bolivian communist parties that were banned after the guerrilla uprising broke out. However, there had been tensions between Guevara and the leadership of those parties so it is not clear that there was an actual link.

Rebestimate: 100

Rebestlow: 50

Rebesthigh: 200

Rebstrength: much weaker

It is not clear exactly how many guerillas Guevara had on his side. The Cambridge History of Latin America says that he never had more than 50 guerillas, while Keesing's Contemporary Archives reports that the government identified at least 200 guerillas in April, 1967. Regardless of the actual number, however, it is clear that the guerilla army had many fewer troops than the army.

Mobcap: low

Armsproc: moderate

Fightcap: low

At the beginning of the war, the guerillas had arms that were as good as or better than that possess by the Bolivian army. However, Guevara ran into major problems mobilizing peasants to support him and the lack of sufficient numbers of troops hindered the fighting capacity of the guerillas, who went fighting actually came to the countryside were no match for the government.

Sources:

- Whitehead, Laurence (1991). "Bolivia since 1930". In Leslie Bethell, Ed. *The Cambridge History of Latin America Volume VIII: Latin America since 1930, Spanish South America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keesing's Contemporary Archives.
- Library of Congress Country Study
- New York Times Archives

Chapter 2

ID 2

ID 2

Incompatibility: Territory, Cambodia

DyadID 654: France-Khmer Issarak

In the aftermath of World War II, France faced violent uprisings for independence in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. The Cambodian campaign, which began in 1945, was one of the less violent in the region, as the Khmer Issarak, the violent left-wing anti-colonial movement was quite weak at its inception. However, supported by the Viet Minh, the group grew in power and by 1952 it controlled one-sixth of the country. In 1953, France finally granted full independence to Indochina, and the Khmer Issarak continued to grow.

In the late 1940s and the early 1950s, the struggle for independence in Cambodia took place on several levels. The Liberal Party advocated an evolutionary approach to independence. The Democratic Party the rapid attainment of independence and the formation of whatever political alliances might be necessary. Underground, Cambodian guerrillas took to the jungles to fight the returning French. The Khmer Issarak, as these guerrillas were called, encompassed disaffected Cambodians from across the entire political spectrum. Upon the Japanese withdrawal following WWII, the Khmer Issarak, with Thai backing, declared their opposition to a French return to power in Cambodia and proclaimed a government-in-exile. More radical factions of the Khmer Issarak were supported by the Viet Minh in Vietnam. In 1953, Cambodia became an independent nation.

Rebels: Khmer Issarak

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: major. The Viet Minh in Vietnam fought with the Khmer Issarak

Rebpresosts: extensive. The group was based in Thailand. Also had networks in Vietnam

Rebsupport: explicit. Thailand backed the Khmer Issarak

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: explicit. The United States provided military support

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: alleged link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

In the late 1940s, Indonesia was granted partial independence with a king and a national assembly. Two main parties competed in the national assembly, the Democrats, a left-wing party who won the majority of the seats and the Liberals, a party primarily gaining support for the upper class. The Democrats had loose ties to the Khmer Issarak, one of the factors making them more popular with the population. In the early 1950s, a Khmer People's Revolutionary party (KPRP) was formed modeled on the Vietnamese communist party.

Rebestimate: 6,000

Rebestlow: 5,000

Rebesthigh: 7,000

Rebstrength: low

In 1952, French intelligence estimated that 5,000 Khmer Issarak forces were controlled by the KPRP. However, Chandler (1992, p. 181) reports that this was probably an underestimate. It is included as the low estimate with one thousand added for the main estimate and 2000 for the high estimate. Regardless of the actual number of troops, it is clear that the Khmer Issarak could never defeat the French in full-blown military combat, however, the fact that the French were fighting so many battles in Indochina, many against much stronger opponents, made continued occupation too costly.

Sources:

- Chandler, David P. (1992). *A History of Cambodia*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- *Cambodia: A Country Study, Third Edition* (1990). Washington, DC: Library of Congress.
- www.wikipedia.org

Chapter 3

ID 3

ID 3

Incompatibility: Government, China

Dyad ID 466: China-PLA

The three-year civil war between the nationalist Guomindang government, led by Chiang Kai-Shek, and the Chinese Communist Party's (CCP) Peoples Liberation Army (PLA), led by, among others, Mao Zedong, was really the continuation of a decades long struggle for control over China. Fighting between the CCP and the Goumindang began in April 1927 and continued for ten years until a United Front was formed between the two groups to challenge Japanese occupation during World War II. In the aftermath of the Japanese surrender, however, the alliance broke down, and the nationalist government, recognizing the growing power of the Chinese communists in the countryside decided to attack in 1946 to try to defeat the communist party before it got too strong. However, despite a strong advantage in troop strength and level of armaments, and despite a string of initial military victories, the government armies were never able to stop the growing mobilization of the CCP. By 1947 the tide had turned and it became increasingly clear that the PLA could out mobilize the government armies and it gained increasing numbers of troops. In 1948, Mao Zedong claimed that an additional 1.6 million Chinese had joined the PLA over the last two years, a number approximately twice what the PLA had in 1946. Finally, on 1 October 1949, the PLA took power and declared the establishment of the People's Republic of China.

The hostility between the Chinese Nationalists and the Communists flared into full-scale war as both raced to occupy the territories evacuated by the Japanese. The United States, alarmed at the prospect of a Communist success in China, arranged through ambassadors Patrick J. Hurley and George C. Marshall for conferences between Chiang and the Communist leader Mao Zedong, but these proved unsuccessful. When the Russians withdrew from Manchuria, which they had occupied in accordance with agreements reached at the Yalta Conference, they turned the Japanese

military equipment in that area over to the Chinese Communists, giving them a strong foothold in what was then the industrial core of China. Complete Communist control of Manchuria was realized with the capture of Shenyang (Mukden) in Nov., 1948. Elsewhere in the country, Chiang's Nationalists, supplied by U.S. arms, were generally successful until 1947, when the Communists gained the upper hand. Beijing fell to the Communists without a fight in Jan., 1949.

Rebels: People's liberation army

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Reb suport: explicit. The Soviet Union provided support for Chinese communists

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: explicit. The US provided extensive assistance to the Nationalist government. However, sources conflict as to whether arms or simply financial resources were provided. In any case, funds given to the Nationalists were used primarily for military procurement

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: unclear

Rebpolwinglegal: no

This variable is difficult to code for this case. Clearly, the Communist Party had a political platform and acted politically to try to advance its goals of radical egalitarianism in the areas of China that it controlled. However, the PLA did not make any attempt to compete in elections, instead relying on popular mobilization and military victory to advance its cause.

Rebestimate: 1 million

Rebestlow: 800,000

Rebesthigh: 1.2 million

Rebstrength: weaker

There is not a clear indication of the number of troops the PLA possessed throughout the conflict. However, at the time of the outbreak in 1946, the government had 2.5 million troops, and varying reports indicate that this is somewhere between 2 and 3 times the number of troops the communists had. So, the estimate for PLA troop strength is 1 million at the time the fighting broke out. It is clear that over the course of the fighting the government lost forces and the PLA gained them, however, at the time of outbreak the government was clearly stronger.

Mobcap: high

The PLA clearly had a much stronger ability to rally Chinese to its side and was able to mobilize new forces at a much faster rate than the government.

Armsproc: moderate

When the war broke out, the government had a much greater arms capacity. However, the communists were able to seize weapons from many of the 700,000 surrendering Japanese troops in the aftermath of World War II which strengthened their fighting capacity.

Terrname: Northwest China

Efftercontrol: high

In the areas of northwest China that it controlled, the Chinese Communist Party was able to enact policies such as land-reform to try to advance its goal of radical egalitarianism.

Sources:

- Patrick Brogan (1998). *World Conflicts: Fighting Never Stopped*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Moise, Edwin E. (1986). *Modern China: A History*. New York: Longman.
- Pepper, Suzanne (1991). "The KMT-CCP conflict, 1945-1949". In Eastman, Lloyd E., Jerome Ch'en, Suzanne Pepper and Lyman P. Van Slyke, Eds., *The Nationalist Era in China 1927-1949*.
- Onwar.com
- Library of Congree Country Study
- www.infoplease.com
- www.wikipedia.com

Chapter 4

ID 4

ID 4

Incompatibility: Government, Greece

DyadID 467: Greek civil war

The Greek civil war of 1946-1949 actually represented the “third round” of fighting between Communist and right-wing/monarchist forces in Greece. During World War II, there had been two major guerilla movements fighting the Axis occupation of Greece and these groups became the precursors to the combatants in the Greek Civil War. In 1946, the Democratic Army of Greece (DSE) began an insurgent campaign against the monarchist/republican government of Greece, backed by promises of aid by Yugoslavia. While initially the DSE was highly outnumbered by the Greek government, the latter’s control over the whole country was weak enough that it could not protect all of the villages from hit and run tactics. In 1947, the DSE made advances as it increased the size of its forces almost three-fold and began to exercise political control throughout more of the territory it controlled. At the end of 1947, the United States, seeking to prevent a communist takeover in Greece, began providing large amounts of aid to the Greek government. 1948 was primarily a year of stalemate between the two groups, but by 1949 the Greek government had gained the upper hand and on 16 October 1949, the DSE declared a cease-fire and stopped fighting.

The Greek Civil War was a conflict during which Greek communists unsuccessfully tried to gain control of Greece. During 1946 a full-scale guerrilla war was launched by the communists, who had gone underground. Both the Yugoslav and Albanian Communist regimes supported the fighters, but the Soviet Union remained ambivalent. After WWII the commitment of defending Greece became too much for Great Britain, and it was taken on by the U.S. government, with the announcement of the Truman Doctrine. Massive military and economic aid from the United States was much needed, for by the end of 1947 the communists had proclaimed a provisional government in the northern mountains. On Oct. 16, 1949, the Greek communist broadcasting station

announced the end of open hostilities, and many of the remaining communist fighters fled the country into neighbouring Albania.

Rebels: DSE

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: explicit. Albania and Yugoslavia assisted the communists

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: explicit. The UK and the US backed the government with military aid

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: unclear

Rebpolwinglegal: no

These variables are difficult to code. The DSE clearly had a political agenda and played a somewhat political role in the area it controlled, even holding elections, but it did not try to gain power in the country politically, rather through armed insurrection.

Rebestimate: 23,000

Rebestlow: 4,000

Rebesthigh: 28,000

Rebstrength: weaker

O'Ballance provides a number of estimates for the troop strength of the DSE at different points across the conflict. For the bulk of the conflict, the DSE had over 20,000 troops in the field, and so I have estimated the rebel forces at 23,000. O'Ballance's estimates are as follows:

March 1946: 4,000

October 1946: 6,000

December 1946: 7,000

March 1947: 13,000

Summer 1947: 23,000

March 1948: 28,000

End of 1948: 21,000

rebstrength: weaker

The DSE was definitely weaker than the Greek government supported by first Britain and then the United States, in that it never had the potential to capture the entire country. However, it did have the ability to evade total defeat by waging an insurgency war.

Sources:

- O'Ballance, Edgar (1966). *The Greek Civil War 1944-1949*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Iatrides, John O., ED. (1981). *Greece in the 1940s: A Nation in Crisis*. Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Close, David H. (1995). *The Greek Civil War*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Onwar.com
- <http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/Greek+Civil+War>

Chapter 5

ID 5

ID 5

Incompatibility: Territory, Indonesia

Dyad ID 657: Netherlands-Indonesian Peoples Army

An anti-colonial movement that had been growing in Indonesia in the early twentieth century saw an opportunity for achieving its goals in the aftermath of World War II. The Indonesian archipelago had been seized by Japan in the 1940s and as the Japanese defeat seemed imminent, Indonesian politicians began assembling a government and setting the stage for independence. The Netherlands, however, was eager to reassert colonial rule and in the aftermath of World War II Indonesia was placed under the control of the Allied powers. In late 1945, clashes between Indonesian nationalists and British forces created high casualties and in 1946 a cease-fire was brokered between the nationalists and the Dutch with a sort of commonwealth political arrangement for the archipelago. In 1947 the Netherlands, claiming violations of the ceasefire agreement, attacked and took much of the archipelago by the end of the year. However, the severity of the Dutch response provoked international outrage, and by 1949 the United Nations had brokered an agreement in which the Netherlands agreed to transfer sovereignty to the Republic, which occurred on December 27, 1949.

In 1940 during World War II, Japan begins its invasion of Malaya, capturing Indonesia in 1942. In March 1945 Japan organized a committee for Indonesian independence; after the Pacific war ended in 1945, this group led by Sukarno declared Indonesian independence. The Dutch, not able to send forces of their own, relied on the British to maintain order. The Dutch finally accepted Indonesian Independence on December 27th 1949.

Rebels: Indonesian People's Army

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: explicit. British troops formally control counter-insurgency operations. Japan also assists in sending troops

Gtypesup: troops

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

In this case, both parties were fighting to see who would be the government of Indonesia, would it be a colonial power or an independent nationalist government. The rebels, in this case, were the nationalist government trying to assert control and so they were a political movement.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 200,000

This estimate is from onwar.com.

Rebstrength: weaker

Indonesia would have had a much harder time defeating the Dutch and gaining full independence without the role of the international community.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: moderate

There was a nationalist government which controlled much of internal Indonesia. However, that government faced a moderate amount of internal division about how the independence movement should be waged and about what independent Indonesia would look like.

Sources:

- Cribb, Robert and Colin Brown (1995). *Modern Indonesia: A History Since 1945*. London: Longman.
- Ray, J.K. (1967). *Transfer of Power in Indonesia 1942-1949*. Bombay: Manaktalas.
- Onwar.com
- Library of Congress Country Study
- www.wikipedia.org
- <http://www.gimonca.com/sejarah/sejarah08.shtml>

Chapter 6

ID 6

ID 6

Incompatibility: Territory, Kurdistan

DyadID 260: Iran-KDPI

The Kurds are an ethnic group spread across three countries, i.e. Iran, Iraq and Turkey. In all three, Kurdish groups have waged war against the government in an attempt to achieve greater autonomy leading up to secession and incorporation with the neighboring Kurdish areas.

Remove Entry for Soviet Union. KDPI/Republic of Kurdistan are the same actor. There should be two civil wars for KDPI, one in 1946 , and a second in 1966-1993

At the outbreak of World War II, Iran declared its neutrality, but the country was soon invaded by both Britain and the Soviet Union. Eventually, collusion between the Tudeh (Communist Party) and the Soviet Union brought further disintegration to Iran. In September 1944, while American companies were negotiating for oil concessions in Iran, the Soviets requested an oil concession in the five northern provinces. In December 1945, the Azarbaijan Democratic Party, which had close links with the Tudeh and was led by Jafar Pishevari, announced the establishment of an autonomous republic. In a similar move, activists in neighboring Kordestan established the Kurdish Republic of Mahabad. Both autonomous republics enjoyed the support of the Soviets, and Soviet troops remaining in Khorasan, Gorgan, Mazandaran, and Gilan. Other Soviet troops prevented government forces from entering Azarbaijan and Kordestan. In May, partly as a result of United States, British, and UN pressure, Soviet troops withdrew from Iranian territory. Without Soviet backing, the Pishevari government collapsed, and Pishevari himself fled to the Soviet Union. Similar fate befell the Kurdish Republic of Mahabad.

This conflict has multiple distinct phases.

Period 1

In the aftermath of World War II, the Kurdish region of Iran, with Soviet support, declared independence. The Iranian government was opposed to Kurdish independence but had no hope of defeating the Soviet Union militarily. Instead, the government pressured the Soviet Union to uphold its agreement to fully pull out of Iran after the end of the World War, and in May 1945 under international pressure and in the interest of achieving a favorable oil deal with Iran, the Soviets did so. By the end of the year Kurdistan realized it could not stand up to the Iranian military and peacefully surrendered.

The Kurdish conflict in Iran lay dormant for thirty years, although it later reignited (see below).

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: unclear

The region of Kurdistan was represented by the Kurdish Democratic Party of Iran. None of the sources identified whether this party was legal in the Iranian Republic.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 10,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

Onwar.com reports that the rebels fighting for Kurdish independence had 10,000 troops. The Kurdish army was much weaker than the Iranian national army and was only able to initially establish independence due to Soviet support.

Period 2

A conflict between the Kurdish population and the Iranian government took place after World War II and then lay dormant for until resuming in 1966-68.

Periods 3-5

In 1979, however, when the Iranian Shah was overthrown in the Islamic revolution, the Kurdish Democratic Party of Iran (KDPI) chose to take the opportunity to try to seize control of Kurdish. They were able to do so for a short amount of time, however, the next government rallied forces and took back control of the territory. The conflict between the KDPI and the Iranian government ran throughout the 1980s. In the 1990s the conflict continued, however, only in 1990, 1993 and 1996 did the fighting generate more than 25 battledeaths.

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The KDPI is a political and military organization. However, it has not been a legal political party throughout the conflict.

Rebestimate: 10,000

Rebestlow: 8,000

Rebesthigh: 10,500

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 1989, 1990 and 1993 the KDPI had 10,500 troops while in 1996 it had 8,000 troops. These estimates are in comparison to over 600,000 troops possessed by the Iranian army.

Terrcont: no

With the exception of a brief period beginning in 1979 when the group had control of the Kurdish region of Iran, the KDPI has not controlled territory throughout this conflict.

Although the conflict is not officially resolved, it has not generated more than 25 battledeaths in a year since 1996.

Sources:

- Daniel, Elton L.(2001). *The History of Iran*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Hambly, Gavin R.G. (1991). "The Pahlavi Autocracy: Muhammad Riza Shah, 1941-1979". In Peter Avery, Gavin Hambly and Charles Melville, Eds. *The Cambridge History of Iran, Volume 7: From Nadir Shah to the Islamic Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keesing's Contemporary Archives
- Onwar.com
- Uppsala Conflict Database

Chapter 7

ID 7

ID 7

Incompatibility: Territory, Azerbaijan

DyadID 468: Iran-Republic of Azerbaijan

Iran was divided between the allied powers during the second World War but a commitment was made by Britain and the Soviet Union to grant Iran independence again after the war. However, in the months following the end of the World War, two regions of Iran-Kurdistan and Azerbaijan began clamoring for independence. The Soviets were interested in helping Azerbaijan achieve independence for two reasons-the Tudeh (or New Democratic) Party was a left-wing party with communist leanings that had a lot of power in Azerbaijan and the Soviets hopes that if Azerbaijan were to secede it might integrate with the Soviet Republic of Azerbaijan, thus adding to the size of the Soviet Union. On 16 November 1945, the Republic of Azerbaijan declared open rebellion and members of the Tudeh party attacked Iranian police in Tabriz (the provincial capital of Azerbaijan). The Iranian government clamored for the removal of Soviet troops from Iranian soil as they had agreed, but the Soviets stalled throughout the early months of 1946 until international pressure and oil interests convinced them to withdraw in May. In December of 1946 the Iranian government decided to attack the secessionists regions and they quickly collapsed.

Rebels: Republic of Azerbaijan

Transconstsupp: tacit. Ethnic kin in Azerbaijan were sympathetic.

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: explicit. Had extensive support from the Soviet Union

Rtypesup: troops

Govsupport: explicit. Diplomatic support from US and UK

Gtypesup: endorsement

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The secessionists in Azerbaijan were primarily members of the Tudeh party who were allowed to compete in provincial elections.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the sources identify the number of troops the Tudeh party in Azerbaijan controlled. However, it is clear that without Soviet support the province was no match for the national army.

Keesing's Contemporary Archives reports that the Soviet Union had 60,000 troops in their occupied portions of Iran following World War II and before their pullout in 1946. The Iranian national army was obviously no match for the Soviet army and could not defeat the Republic of Azerbaijan militarily as long as the Soviets were backing it.

Sources:

- Keesing's Contemporary Archives
- Daniel, Elton L. (2001). *The History of Iran*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Hambly, Gavin R.G. (1991). "The Pahlavi Autocracy: Muhammad Riza Shah, 1941-1979". In Peter Avery, Gavin Hambly and Charles Melville, Eds. *The Cambridge History of Iran, Volume 7: From Nadir Shah to the Islamic Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Library of Congress Country Study
- http://web.mit.edu/cascon/cases/case_soi.html

Chapter 8

ID 8

ID 8

Incompatibility: Territory, Palestine/Israel.

Dyad ID 665: United Kingdom-IZL

During World War II, a growing Zionist movement based in Palestine began pushing for the creation of a Jewish state. The large number of Jewish refugees in Europe after the holocaust led to increased pressure on the United Kingdom to allow the creation of a state of Israel. Despite this pressure, the UK government continued to place strict limits on Jewish immigration to Palestine. In response, a number of underground militant organizations began waging terrorist campaigns aimed at pushing the British out of Palestine. The largest of these organizations was Irgun Zvai Leumi, an organization led by Menahem Beggin. In 1946, this terrorism reached its peak with incredibly high-profile attacks including the bombing of the King David Hotel, where the colonial offices were based, which resulted in the death or injury of over 150 people. The combination of terrorism in Palestine, domestic political movements in the UK and international pressure led the United Kingdom to turn the question of Palestine over to the United Nations in 1947, leading to the creation of an Israeli state in May 1948.

In 1937, a group of Haganah members left the organization in protest against its "defensive" orientation and joined forces with Betar to set up a new and more militant armed underground organization, known as the Irgun. The formal name of the Irgun was the Irgun Zvai Leumi (National Military Organization), sometimes also called by the acronym, Etzel, from the initial letters of the Hebrew name. This group sought immediate statehood for Israel. Further more, as news regarding Nazi persecution of Jews in Europe increased, the Irgun and Stern Gang stepped up harassment of British forces in an attempt to obtain unrestricted Jewish immigration.

Rebels: IZL

Transconstsupp: explicit. Jewish groups in Europe and the US supported the group.

Rebextpart: minor. Support of groups in UK, Europe, US

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: explicit. Poland supplied arms to the Irgun in an attempt to create a Jewish state and encourage Jewish emigration

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

Irvun Zvai Leumi was an organization dedicated to violent challenge of the British colonial authority in order to promote the creation of an Israeli state, but was not affiliated with a political organization.

Rebestimate: 1,500

Rebestlow: 1,500

Rebesthigh: 5,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The New York Times reported on 28 July 1946 that “Irgum Zvai Leumi . . . numbers 4,000 to 5,000 men and women, of whom 1,500 are engaged in 'frontline duty'.”

Sources:

- New York Times
- Sachar, Howard M. (1996). *A History of Israel from the Rise of Zionism to Our Time. Second Edition*. New York: Knopf.
- Metz, Helen Chapin. Ed. (1988). *Israel: A Country Study*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress.
- W. Cleveland, "History of the Modern Middle East"
- www.wikipedia.com

Chapter 9

ID 9

ID 9

Incompatibility: Territory, Laos

Dyad ID 666: France-Lao Issara

In 1945, Japan captured Laos and the other Indochinese colonies from France and declared it independent. A government was established in Laos generally referred to as the Lao Issara government. Following Japan's defeat in the summer of 1945, the French decided to re-colonize Laos. The Lao Issara government opposed the recolonization and held onto power for almost a year. However, French troops quickly reoccupied Laos and in 1946, overthrew the Lao Issara government which fled into exile in Thailand. For the next seven years, the Lao Issara launched small-scale guerilla attacks into Laos which were almost completely ineffectual. In 1953, the insurrection ended when France, giving into international pressure, granted Laos independence and the Lao Issara became the government.

Souphanouvong and his escort proceeded upriver, first to Thakhek and then to Vientiane, where a provisional revolutionary government had been proclaimed two weeks earlier, taking the name Lao Issara (Free Laos—see Glossary). The royal dismissal of Phetsarath turned Lao Issara leaders against the monarchy, which they saw as hopelessly compromised by the French. At the outset of its rule, the authority of the Lao Issara provisional government was extremely limited outside Vientiane. The Viet Minh in Vietnam cooperated with the Lao Issara government. After several military defeats, the Lao Issara government-in-exile set up its headquarters in Bangkok.

The Lao Issara (Free Laos) movement is generally seen as a nationalist movement to recover Laos's independence from France. The movement, headed by Prince Phetsarath, began its existence in Vientiane in 1945 after the Second World War; its government-in-exile dissolved in Bangkok in 1949. Its pro-independence stance was in direct confrontation with the pro-French Lao monarchy and Lao civil servants and military officers who supported the French. Many of the Lao Issara

movement's original members went on to form the Pathet Lao movement, the party that gained power in Laos in 1975. This paper will cover the old days of the French protectorate Laos, the Lao Issara years, and the Lao Issara legacy. Rebels: Lao Issara

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: major. The Vietnamese Viet Minh had extensive contacts with the Lao Issara

Rebpresosts: extensive. The movement was based in Thailand

Rebsuport: explicit. The Thai government granted sanctuary to the rebels

Rtypesup: military

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Lao Issara was the former government of Laos in the brief period that it was independent in 1945-1946. The government was overthrown by the French who reinstated their colonial rule.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the Lao Issara. However, it is clear that the group was considerably weaker than the French forces present in Laos.

Laos achieved independence in October 1953.

Sources:

- Evans, Grant (2002). *A Short History of Laos: The Land in Between*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Library of Congress Country Study

Chapter 10

ID 10

ID 10

Incompatibility: Government, Philippines

Dyad ID 217: Philippines vs. Communist Party of the Philippines

The Philippines has faced a communist-inspired peasant insurgency for much of its independent history. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, this insurgency was led by the Huks. In the 1960s, a new guerilla organization formed, the New People's Army (NPA), the armed wing of the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP). The NPA began an armed struggle in the late 1960s that would continue for more than thirty years. At first the group was very small, but in the early 1970s it gained in force. Soon, more than 20,000 guerillas waged war against the government and presented a major threat to the internal security of the country. In 1972, Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos responded to the insurgency by declaring martial law, however, the NPA proved resilient. In 1986, Marcos was removed from power, and the instability in the country and abuses brought about by martial law were the major factors behind his ousting.

Following the removal of Marcos, new Philippine president Aquino initiated peace talks with the rebels. Aquino's handling of the conflict led to some clashes with the military, including at least six attempts from 1987-1990 to remove her in a coup d'etat led by a faction of the military often referred to as Reform Movement of the Armed Forces-Soldiers of the Filipino People (RAM-SFP). In the early 1990s, the conflict de-escalated as international support for the NPA declined and as the government increasingly pursued negotiations. However, the attempts at reaching a peace agreement have not succeeded and the conflict escalated again during the late 1990s/early 2000s.

Consolidate entries for NPA into a single record. RAM-SFP and Military Faction should be merged. The Military Faction were essentially members of RAM

On 26 December 1968, Sison formally established the CPP (Communist Party of the Philippines) CPP's military wing, the NPA (New People's Army) was established on 29 March 1969.

Even though some peace talks were held, the situation caused widespread popular unrest in the Philippines, eventually leading to mass demonstrations and the ousting of Marcos in 1986. Instrumental in the actual power take-over were several groups of disgruntled younger officers that a few years earlier - unhappy with the Marcos regime and the handling of the conflicts - had formed the RAM (Reform the Armed Forces Movement). After the newly elected president Aquino instigated peace talks with the CPP, some of the former RAM members, especially Gregorio "Gringo" Honasan, participated in several coup attempts. Between 1987-1990, six attempts were made to replace the elected president but neither lasted for longer than a week.

The degree of foreign involvement in the conflict has over the years been very low. Foreign presence has, however, been influential. When the military faction made its biggest coup attempt in 1989, US fighter jets patrolled over rebel air bases to prevent the military faction to use its air superiority that turned out to be substantial in settling the dispute. When US left their bases on Filipino soil in 1992, and also during the years 1995-1999 when no joint military exercises were held between the US and the Filipino forces, it was followed by lengthy cease-fires and progress in negotiations. The armed conflict is ongoing as of December 2003.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 220: Philippines vs. Military Faction/RAM-SFP

These refer to the same group Critical of Marcos's domination of the military and of senior officers' alleged corruption and incompetence, a group of midlevel AFP officers founded a reform movement—the Reform the Armed Forces Movement (RAM) in 1982. These officers, led by then Minister of National Defence Juan Ponce Enrile and Vice Chief of Staff Fidel V. Ramos spearheaded the February 1986 military leadership of the popular revolt that ultimately toppled Marcos. Despite the Aquino government's attempts to depoliticize the Philippine military, the February 1986 rebellion against Marcos was not the last uprising. Units loyal to the deposed president mutinied in Manila only months after Aquino took office, and by 1991 there had been six open rebellions against her rule. The two most serious, in August 1987 and December 1989, were led by the RAM officers that had helped bring her to power. In 1991 discontented elements of the AFP, led by fugitive RAM founders, still threatened to unseat the president.

Rebels: RAM, Military Faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: explicit. The US provided extensive military assistance

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

The 2009 version of the UCDP has the conflict as active only in 1989 and 1990

The RAM-SFP was a faction of the military and did not represent a political organization.

Rebpolwing: no

Rebestimate: 3,000 Rebestlow: 350 Rebesthigh: 6,000 Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that the Military Faction had 3,000-6,000 troops in 1989 and 350-1,000 in 1990.

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Kerkvliet, Benedict J. (1977). *The Huk Rebellion: A Study of Peasant Revolt in the Philippines*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lexis-Nexis

Dyad ID 469: Philippines vs. Huk

Hukbalahap Rebellion, also called HUK REBELLION (1946-54), Communist-led peasant uprising in central Luzon, Philippines. The name of the movement is a Tagalog acronym for Hukbo ng Bayan Laban sa Hapon, which means "People's Anti-Japanese Army." The Huks came close to victory in 1950 but were subsequently defeated by a combination of advanced U.S. weaponry supplied to the Philippine government and administrative reforms under the charismatic Philippine president Ramon Magsaysay.

Rebels: Huk

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: Explicit. The United States gave extensive military support

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

The Huk were a group formed in the central Luzon region of Philippines in the 1940s to challenge the Japanese occupation. When the United States took the Philippines back from Japan and set 1946 as the time of independence for the island nation, the Huk transformed into a political movement and participated in elections. The party was defeated, however, by the liberal party, and the left-wing group returned to central Luzon and began a guerilla insurgency. While the rebellion

started out small, within a couple of years the Huk had grown and were threatening the government. The United States, however, was alarmed by the Communist connections of the group and began providing advanced weapons and training to the Philippine government, and by 1954 the Huk had been largely defeated.

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Huk participated as a political party in elections in 1946. However, following their defeat in the elections they returned to armed struggle and were subsequently banned.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 50,000

Rebstrength: parity

Onwar.com estimates that the Huk had 50,000 troops during the war, as compared to 75,000 for the Philippine government.

Sources:

- Library of Congress Country Study
- Onwar.com

Chapter 11

ID 11

ID 11

Incompatibility: Territory, Estonia

Dyad ID 478: Soviet Union vs. Forest Brothers

On 23 August 1939, the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany signed the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, which carved up Europe into German and Soviet zones. The Soviet Union was given control over the Baltics and in 1940 they invaded and took control of the independent states of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Armed resistance to the Soviet occupation soon formed in all of these countries, but was halted when in 1941 Germany broke its pact with the Soviets and invaded and took control of the Baltic states. In 1944, the Soviet Union regained control of these states and the resistance began again. In Estonia, the groups opposed to the Soviet occupation were referred to as the "Forest Brothers" and they comprised people who literally went into the forests to conduct guerilla warfare aimed at ending the Soviet occupation. A brutal strategy of deportation to Siberia depleted the Forest Brothers and, although the war continued on a low level until 1954, the conflict was effectively over in 1948.

With the invasion of the Red Army in 1944 the Soviet occupation was re-established in Estonia. Estonia again became a Soviet socialist republic completely subordinated to Moscow and the communist party. By the end of 1944 the batch of people hiding from the Soviet power was varied and numerous, probably amounting to twenty-thirty thousand. After the German army had left, a great number of Estonians who had served there hid themselves in the forest, and soon they were joined by those scrimshanking from the Red Army mobilization as well as the members of the former Self Defence and Defence Union, who had nothing good to expect from the Soviet power. It was them who made up the core of the post-war Estonian armed resistance movement - forest brothers. After World War II had ended, the western countries started to make bigger and bigger concessions to the Soviet Union, which strengthened the latter's positions on the occupied territories. The expected

help failed to come and the Soviet power started extensive operations against the forest brothers' families and their collaborators. By 1953 the Soviet authorities were able to suppress the active armed resistance.

Rebels: Forest Brothers

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup:n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The Forest Brothers were a group of guerilla fighters opposed to the Soviet occupation and did not represent a political organization.

Rebestimate: 35,000

Rebestlow: 30,000

Rebesthigh: 40,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Laar (2001) writes there were an estimated 30,000-40,000 Forest Brothers in Estonia. This category included everyone who went into the forest to flee Soviet occupation; it is not clear what percentage of this number actively battled the occupation.

Sources:

- Laar, Matt (2001). "The Armed Resistance Movement in Estonia from 1944 to 1956". In Arvydas Anusauskas, Ed., *The Anti-Soviet Resistance in the Baltic States*. Akreta: Genocide and Resistance Research Centre of Lithuania.
- <http://linnamuseum.tartu.ee/en/branches/kgb/forestbrothers.html>

Chapter 12

ID 12

ID 12

Incompatibility: Territory, Latvia

Dyad ID 479: Soviet Union vs. LTS[p]A

On 23 August 1939, the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany signed the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, which carved up Europe into German and Soviet zones. The Soviet Union was given control over the Baltics and in 1940 they invaded and took control of the independent states of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Armed resistance to the Soviet occupation soon formed in all of these countries, but was halted when in 1941 Germany broke its pact with the Soviets and invaded and took control of the Baltic states. In 1944, the Soviet Union regained control of these states and the resistance began again. In Latvia, the resistance was led by several different “partisan unions,” the main ones of which were the Association of the Latvian Fatherland Guards (LTSPA) and the Latvian National Partisan Association (LNPA). These groups conducted guerilla warfare against the Soviet occupation. However, a harsh Soviet policy of mass deportations (over 40,000 Latvians were deported to Siberia) dried up information and supply lines for the partisans and the rebellion was defeated.

The reestablishment of Soviet control in the mid-1940s was not welcomed. Many Latvians joined the guerrilla movement, which fought the occupying power for close to a decade.

Insufficient information on this conflict

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The LTSPA was a military organization dedicated to removing the Soviet occupation and not a political organization.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 10,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Strods (2001) estimates that in Latvia there were 20,000 people who conducted armed resistance against the Soviets. It is not clear how many of these resisters were in LTSPA but it was one of the two largest groups.

Dyad ID 481: Soviet Union vs. LNPA

Rebpolwing: no

The LNPA was a military organization dedicated to removing the Soviet occupation and not a political organization.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 10,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Strods (2001) estimates that in Latvia there were 20,000 people who conducted armed resistance against the Soviets. It is not clear how many of these resisters were in LNPA but it was one of the two largest groups.

Sources:

- Strods, Heinrihs (2001). “The Latvian Partisan War between 1944 and 1956”. In Arvydas Anusauskas, Ed., *The Anti-Soviet Resistance in the Baltic States*. Akreta: Genocide and Resistance Research Centre of Lithuania.

Chapter 13

ID 13

ID 13

Incompatibility: Territory, Lithuania

Dyad ID 482: Soviet Union vs. BDPS

On 23 August 1939, the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany signed the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, which carved up Europe into German and Soviet zones. The Soviet Union was given control over the Baltics and in 1940 they invaded and took control of the independent states of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Armed resistance to the Soviet occupation soon formed in all of these countries, but was halted when in 1941 Germany broke its pact with the Soviets and invaded and took control of the Baltic states. In 1944, the Soviet Union regained control of these states and the resistance began again. In Lithuania, like in its Baltic neighbors, this resistance was led by partisan groups that took to the forest and engaged in guerilla warfare. One of the major groups involved in the resistance was the United Democratic Resistance Movement (BDPS). Repressive Soviet tactics of executions, torture and massive deportations led to the demise of the partisan movement.

The Red Army forced the Germans out of Lithuania in 1944 and reestablished control. Sovietization continued with the arrival of communist party leaders to create a local party administration. The mass deportation campaigns of 1941-52 exiled 29,923 families to Siberia and other remote parts of the Soviet Union. In response to these events, an estimated several tens of thousands of resistance fighters participated in unsuccessful guerilla warfare against the Soviet regime from 1944-53.

Rebels: BDPS (United Democratic Resistance Movement; Bendras Demokratinio Pasipriesinimo Sajudis)

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The BDPS was a militant organization dedicated to removing the Soviet occupation and did not represent a political organization.

Rebestimate: 25,000

Rebestlow: 20,000

Rebesthigh: 30,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Onwar.com estimates that between 20,000 and 30,000 partisans died during the war. It is not clear what percentage of the overall number this was.

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- Gaskaite-Zemaitiene, Nijole (2001). "The Partisan War in Lithuania from 1944 to 1953". In Arvydas Anusauskas, Ed., *The Anti-Soviet Resistance in the Baltic States*. Akreta: Genocide and Resistance Research Centre of Lithuania.
- http://www.state.gov/www/background_notes/lithuania_9801_bgn.html
- Library of Congress Country Study

Chapter 14

ID 14

ID 14

Incompatibility: Territory, Ukraine

Dyad ID 483: Soviet Union vs. UPA

The Ukrainian people were divided among a number of states in the period between the two World Wars. The eastern part of Ukraine was in the Soviet zone of control while the Western part of the country was divided between Poland, Romania and Czechoslovakia. During World War II, the Ukraine was first split between Germany and the Soviet Union, then in 1941 it was entirely taken over by Nazi Germany and in 1944, the whole territory was reconquered by the Soviet Union. Nationalist groups formed across the Ukraine but were most prominent in Western Ukraine where there was not a history of Soviet control. The main “partisan” or nationalist group to form in Western Ukraine was the Ukraine Partisan Army (UPA), which battled both the Nazi and the Soviet occupation. The UPA achieved the most military success in its battles with the Soviets in the early years of the occupation, 1944-1946, while the Soviet army was still heavily involved in Germany. However, with the end of World War II, Stalin was able to focus more attention on the rebellious province and the UPA was quickly defeated.

When the Germans attacked the Soviet Union in 1941, Ukrainians anticipated establishing an independent Ukraine. As the Red Army retreated eastward, Ukrainian nationalists proclaimed an independent state, but the invading Germans arrested and interned its leaders. Ukrainian nationalist forces consequently began a resistance movement against both the occupying Germans and the Soviet partisans operating in the Ukrainian Republic. When the Red Army drove the Germans out of the Ukrainian Republic, Ukrainian partisans turned their struggle (which continued until 1950) against the Soviet army (the name changed from Red Army just after the war) and Polish communist forces in western Ukraine.

USSR versus Ukraine. Cannot find sufficient information on this conflict

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The UPA was affiliated with the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), a political party dedicated to promoting independence for the Ukraine.

Rebestimate: 35,000

Rebestlow: 30,000

Rebesthigh: 40,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Subtelny (2000) writes that the best estimates are that the UPA had between 30,000 and 40,000 partisans at its peak.

Sources:

- Subtelny, Orest (2000). *Ukraine: A History, Third Edition*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Chapter 15

ID 17

ID 17

Incompatibility: Territory, Vietnam

Dyad ID 668: France vs. Viet Minh

Vietnam was a French colony leading up to World War II when it was occupied by the Japanese. Prior to World War II, Vietnam already had a significant communist apparatus, the Indochina Communist Party (ICP) that campaigned on behalf of the colony's large peasant population. During World War II, the ICP, led by Ho Chi Minh, switched their strategy and decided that national independence had to come before social revolution. To accomplish this goal, the group softened its economic and social demands and allied with other nationalist organizations. In the aftermath of World War II, the ICP and its affiliated Viet Nam Doc Lap Dong Minh Hoi (hereafter referred to as Viet Minh) took advantage of the power vacuum in the region to establish a provincial government in Hanoi and declare an independent Democratic Republic of Vietnam. The French government did not recognize the independence of Vietnam and in 1946 a war broke out between the Viet Minh and French forces. At first, the Viet Minh were completely outmatched by the superior firepower and fighting capacity of the French and they lost most of the territory they had controlled. However, the Viet Minh was able to use its large number of soldiers (as many as 250,000) and guerilla warfare tactics to turn the war to its advantage and by the late 1940s the Viet Minh was in a strong position. The war continued until 1954 when the French acceded control of North Vietnam to the Viet Minh and a government was established in Hanoi. The North Vietnamese government quickly turned its attention to supporting communist groups in South Vietnam which had also achieved independence and was supported by the United States (see conflict id 1520).

On August 16, the Viet Minh National Congress convened at Tan Trao and ratified the Central Committee decision to launch a general uprising. On August 28, the Viet Minh announced the formation of the provisional government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV) with Ho

as president and minister of foreign affairs. Moscow and Beijing quickly recognized the DRV. Among these parties, the nationalist VNQDD and Viet Nam Phuc Quoc Dong Minh Hoi parties had the benefit of friendship with the Chinese expeditionary forces of Chiang Kai-shek, which began arriving in northern Vietnam in early September. The growing frequency of clashes between French and Vietnamese forces in Haiphong led to a French naval bombardment of that port city in November 1946.

Rebels: Viet Minh

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: explicit. China and the USSR supported the Viet Minh

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Viet Minh was directly affiliated with the Indochinese Communist Party, which was made illegal prior to World War II.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 250,000

Rebstrength: parity

Vietnam: A Country Study reports that by late 1948 the Viet Minh had 250,000 guerillas.

On May 7, 1954, the French garrison at Dien Bien Phu surrendered, which marked the end of the last major battle of the war. The next day, peace negotiations began which led to French recognition of the independence of North Vietnam.

Sources:

- Cima, Ronald J. Ed. (1987). *Vietnam: A Country Study*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress.
- Library of Congress Country Study
- www.infoplease.com

Chapter 16

ID 18

ID 18

Incompatibility: Territory, Taiwan

Dyad ID 580: China vs. Taiwanese Insurgents

Taiwan was reunified with China in 1948 following World War II. However, there was a high degree of dissatisfaction among Taiwanese with the policies pursued by the Chinese administration. In 1947, an armed uprising broke out after two Taiwanese cigarette vendors were killed by Chinese police officers. Subsequent rioting and a very harsh government crackdown led to over a thousand deaths. While the government accused the Taiwanese insurgents of having ties to the communists fighting for control of China (see conflict id 1030), it appears that the conflict was more over Chinese economic and political policies relating to Taiwan. The Taiwanese insurgents proved much too weak to challenge the Chinese government and by the end of March 1947 the conflict had ended.

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The leadership of the insurgents was not affiliated with a political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of people participating in the insurgency. However, it is clear that the insurgents were no match for the Chinese army.

In July 1947, Keesing's Record of World Events reported that "On March 21 it was reported that the disorders had been quelled, all major centres being in the Government's hands; air, sea, and telegraph communications with the Chinese mainland were reopened on March 22."

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 17

ID 19

ID 19

Incompatibility: Government

Dyad ID 756: Hyderabad vs. CPI

When India became independent from Great Britain in 1947, most of the independent “princely states” within it agreed to join the state. However, two did not, one of which was Hyderabad, a state with a population that was 80% Hindu and ruled by a Muslim sultanate. In 1947, the sultan of Hyderabad and the government of India signed a “standstill” agreement that left the status of the state undetermined for one year. During that period, however, the Communist Party of India (CIP) waged a war against the government of Hyderabad aimed at forcing the state to join with the Indian Union. The CPI troops were not able to accomplish much, however. In September 1948, the Indian army invaded Hyderabad and quickly defeated the government and the region became party of India.

Cannot find sufficient information on this conflict

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The Communist Party of India was a political movement within India. However, in Hyderabad it was merely an insurgent force aimed at forcing the government to join with the Indian union.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the Communist Party of India. However, the group was clearly weaker than the forces possessed by the Hyderabad army.

On September 13, 1948 the Indian army invaded Hyderabad and within four days resistance had

been crushed. This ended Hyderabad's existence as an independent state and therefore there was no longer a civil war within Hyderabad.

Sources:

- Wolpert, Stanley (2000). *A New History of India, Sixth Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chapter 18

ID 21

ID 21

Incompatibility: Territory, Malagasy

Dyad ID 669: France vs. Madagascar Nationalists

Madagascar was a colony in the French empire. After World War II, when many Madagascar soldiers who had fought on the side of the French in World War II, returned home, nationalist sentiments in the colony were high. In 1946, Madagascar was upgraded to the status of a French overseas territory, which gave greater (although still small) political power to the Malagasy. Malagasy were given three seats in the government, and in elections in 1946 the Democratic Movement for the Malagasy Renovation (MDRM), a political party calling for independence from France, won all three seats. The group began organizing guerillas and on 29 March 1947 launched an insurrection against the French army stationed there. The MDRM knew that it could not possibly match forces with the entire French army, however, France had a relatively small force deployed to the island. Additionally, the MDRM hoped to receive support from the United States, which had taken an anti-colonial position in the United Nations. U.S. support did not come, and although the MDRM guerillas were able to take control of about 1/3 of the Madagascar countryside, they were never able to take control of any important strategic locations and by the end of 1948, they were soundly defeated. In the midst of the conflict, the political party was outlawed, and Madagascar remained a French colony for 10 years until it became an autonomous state in the French Union in 1958.

The 1946 constitution of the French Fourth Republic made Madagascar a territoire d'outre-mer (overseas territory) within the French Union. It accorded full citizenship to all Malagasy parallel with that enjoyed by citizens in France. But the assimilationist policy inherent in its framework was incongruent with the MDRM (Democratic Movement for Malagasy Renewal) goal of full independence for Madagascar. On March 29, 1947, Malagasy nationalists revolted against the French. The

French were able to restore order after reinforcements arrived from France. Casualties among the Malagasy were estimated in the 60,000 to 80,000 range. Although the MDRM leadership consistently maintained its innocence, the French outlawed the party. French military courts tried the military leaders of the revolt and executed twenty of them.

Rebels: MDRM

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Library of Congress Country Study
- New York Times Archives

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

When the conflict began, the MDRM was the only Madagascan political party represented in the government.

Rebestimate: 5,500

Rebestlow: 5,000

Rebesthigh: 6,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Onwar.com reports that in the aftermath of the conflict, 5,000-6,000 people in Madagascar were convicted of participating in the rebellion in some fashion. It is not clear how many of these people actually participated or what fraction of the participants were tried.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of Rural Madagascar

Effterrcont: moderate

Brown (1995) writes that by the end of 1947, the MDRM had managed to take control of about 1/3 of the countryside in Madagascar but had not been able to control any small towns.

Sources:

- Brown, Mervyn (1995). *A History of Madagascar*. Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener.
- Onwar.com
- Library of Congress Country Study
- New York Times Archives

Chapter 19

ID 22

ID 22

Incompatibility: Government, Paraguay

Dyad ID 474: Paraguay vs. Military Faction of 1989

General Alfredo Stroessner, who took power in a military coup in 1954, stayed in power in Paraguay by winning 8 consecutive Presidential elections. These elections, however, including one in February 1988, were widely believed to be characterized by fraud. In the late 1980s, a split emerged in the ruling Colorado Party, with a group of “militants” led by Stroesser who wanted to continue one-man rule, and a group of “traditionalists” who sought to gradually make the country more democratic. One of the leading traditionalists was the second in command of the armed forces General Andres Rodriguez. Rodriguez led a coup d’etat on 3 February 1989 and took power. The coup was very bloody, with conflict producing as many as 300 battledeaths.

After taking power in a coup in 1954, General Stroessner was declared the winner of Presidential elections on eight consecutive occasions, most recently in February 1988. This election was denounced by foreign observers due to widespread irregularities such as prevention of secret voting, stuffing of ballot boxes, intimidation by members of the ruling Partido Colorado at the ballot station and a true voter turn out of less than 50 percent. After 34 years of uninterrupted dictatorial rule President Alfredo Stroessner was overthrown in a violent coup on 3 February 1989. The coup was lead by General Andres Rodriguez, second in command of the armed forces, and a former ally of the President.

Rebels: military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

General Andres Rodriguez was an elite member of the same political party, the Colorado Party, that President Stroesser led. They belonged to separate factions, however.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 4,000

Rebstrength: parity

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the elite army division led by General Rodriguez had 4,000 troops and that there were 12,000 other troops in Paraguay. However, the database reports that over the course of the conflict troops from other divisions joined Rodriguez.

- Lewis, Paul H. (1991). "Paraguay since 1930". In Leslie Bethell, Ed., *The Cambridge History of Latin America, Volume VIII: Latin America since 1930, Spanish South America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keesing's Contemporary Archives
- Uppsala Conflict Database

Dyad ID 671: Paraguay-Military Faction of 1954

An internal coup d'etat removed the current president, Chves, who was eventually replaced by General Alfredo Stroessner who would rule Paraguay for 34 years. The coup d'etat emerged out of disputes between factions within the ruling Colorado party and broke out on 3 May 1954, when General Stroessner tried to take control of a military base and were arrested by forces loyal to the president. Fighting occurred the next two days in Asuncin and on May 5, Stroessner prevailed and Chves was deposed.

Early in 1954, recently fired Central Bank Director Epifanio Mndez Fleitas joined forces with Stroessner—at that time a general and commander in chief of the armed forces—to oust Chaves. Mndez Fleitas was unpopular with Colorado Party stalwarts and the army. In May 1954, Stroessner ordered his troops into action against the government after Chaves had tried to dismiss one of his subordinates. Fierce resistance by police left almost fifty dead. About two months later, a divided Colorado Party nominated Stroessner for president.

Rebels: military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: no

Although the coup d'état emerged out of disputes within the ruling party, it was the military that inserted itself into politics and replaced the existing government.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: unclear

Rebstrength: stronger

None of the sources provided any information on the number of troops that supported the opposition or the government. However, it is clear that with the bulk of the military behind the General, his was the stronger fighting force.

Sources:

- Library of Congress Country Study
- Onwar.com

Dyad ID 673: Opposition coalition [Febreristas, Liberals and Communists]

This civil war in Paraguay occurred between the government and members of an opposition coalition represented three different parties-the Communist, Liberal, and feberista party. The feberistas had been represented in a coalition government but in response to violence against their supporters by one faction of the Colorado party, they resigned in protest on 11 January 1947. The government responded by arresting leaders of the three major opposition parties and sending them out of the country. There was little violence until March when members of the feberista party seized the police station in Asuncion. They were kicked out within a matter of hours, but the next day an infantry division in Concepcion revolted and supported the rebels. Over the next few days several army units in eastern Paraguay joined the rebellion. The government quickly rallied support from a range of sources-peasants loyal to the Colorado party, foreign aid from Argentina and a militant wing of the Colorado party. On 31 July the army attacked Concepcion and were successful, however, they learned upon entry that the rebels had fled the night before and were making their way to Asuncin on river boats. They reached the city and fierce fighting continued, and by 19 August the rebels had been defeated and the government retained power.

General Higinio Morinigo (1897-1983), named president of Paraguay in 1940, suspended the constitution and ruled as a military dictator. Under his regime, Paraguay suffered frequent disturbances, including labor and general strikes and student riots. The military, which received 45 percent of the national income, remained loyal to Morinigo and crushed his opposition. In July 1946, he permitted the resumption of political activity, banned since 1940, and formed a two-party cabinet. The next year the Febreristas resigned from the cabinet and, under their party's leader, Rafael Franco (1896-1973), a former Paraguayan president, tried to seize control of the government with the help of other liberals. They were defeated in a civil war from March to August 1947.

Rebels: Opposition coalition (Febreristas, Liberals, Communists)

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The feberista party was a legal political organization that had participated in a coalition government prior to the civil war. The Communist party, however, was not legal.

Rebestimate: 3,300

Rebestlow: 2,000

Rebesthigh: 4,500

Rebstrength: weaker

No source identified an estimate of the size of the rebel forces. However, Keesing's Contemporary Archives reports that 1,650 rebels were killed in the unsuccessful attempt to take Asuncin. We have doubled that number for the estimate, assuming that no more than half of the rebels were killed and have included numbers for the low and high estimate on either end of that. It is clear, however, that the rebel strength throughout the civil war was less than that of the Paraguayan army that remained loyal to the government.

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- New York Times

Chapter 20

ID 23

ID 23

Incompatibility: Territory, Karen

Dyad ID 306: Burma/Myanmar vs. KNU

The Karen are a minority population in Myanmar (formerly Burma) that is concentrated in the southeastern part of the country along the border with Thailand. The Karen region was administered as part of Burma during the British colonial period and prior to independence Karen leaders asked that the region become a separate state upon independence. That request was denied by the British and conflict over the status of the region began almost immediately after independence. In 1949, the Karen National Union (KNU) and their armed wing the Karen National Defense Organization (KNDO) started an armed campaign and wrested control of large areas of the Karen region away from the Burmese government. However, the group overextended itself and by 1950, the Burmese army had regained control of some of the territory. Since then, the KNU has waged a more than fifty year guerilla campaign against the Burmese government for independence.

Notes on Coding

This conflict is best described in three periods. The first period covers the first year of the conflict (1949) when the conflict was the most intense and when the KNU achieved the greatest military success. The second period covers the next fifty-five years of the conflict as the KNU has waged a guerilla warfare campaign against the Burmese/Myanmar government. From 1988 the rebels have had military support from India.

Period 1

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The KNU was a political organization and had a military wing, the Karen National Defense Organization (KNDO). However, the group was not a legal political party.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 10,000

Rebstrength: weaker

According to Fredholm (1993, p. 103), the KNU was able to mobilize about 10,000 fighters in the early period of the conflict.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: high

Throughout the conflict, the KNU has been the only Burmese insurgent group that has not been beset by fractionalization.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: much of Karen region

Effterrcont: moderate

In its initial advance, the KNU was able to gain control of large parts of the Karen region.

Periods 2-3

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The KNU is a political organization and had a military wing, the KNDO. However, the group is not a legal political party.

Rebestimate: 6,000

Rebestlow: 2,000

Rebesthigh: 20,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database provides the following estimates for the troop strength of the KNU: In 1989: 3,000-8,000; in 1990: 4,000-8,000; in 1991: 5,000-20,000; in 1992: 4,000-6,000; in 1995: 3,500-4,000; in 1997: 2,000-4,000; in 1998: 4,000; in 1999: 4,000-15,000; in 2000: 4,000-20,000; in 2001: 4,000; in 2002: 2,000-7,000; in 2003: 4,000. These estimates are in comparison to between 200,000 and 400,000 troops for the Burmese army.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: high

Throughout the conflict, the KNU has been the only Burmese insurgent group that has not been beset by fractionalization.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of the Karen Region and Shan State

Effterrcont: moderate

After their initial advance, the KNU was pushed back by the Burmese army. However, throughout the conflict they have controlled parts of the Karen region and also have at times established control over parts of Shan state.

Dyad ID 314: Burma vs. God's Army

God's Army is a small breakaway faction from the Karen National Union, believed to number between 100 and 200. It operates independently from KNU. It is coded as generating more than 25 battledeaths in 2000 by the UDCP.

- Fredholm, Michael (1993). *Burma: Ethnicity and Insurgency*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Uppsala Conflict Database

Dyad ID 314: Burma/Myanmar vs. God's army

In 2000, the God's Army broke away from the Karen National Union because it argued that KNU could not protect villagers. The group was small and was defeated by the Myanmar government.

Territorial Conflict?: Yes

This conflict was a territorial one, fought over the Karen region of Myanmar.

Rebel Political Wing: No

The God's Army was a breakaway faction from the KNU and did not have a political wing of its own.

Rebel estimate: 200

Rebel estimate (low): 200

Rebel estimate (high): 200

The UCDP estimates that God's Army had about 200 troops.

Rebel strength: Much weaker

The God's Army was a very small force, much weaker than the Myanmar army.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

God's Army was led by twins and appeared to generally be a cohesive organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

God's Army was generally lacking in popular support and unable to mobilize significant arms or fighting capacity.

Territorial Control: No

God's Army did not control territory.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

God's Army tried to operate in Thailand but the border was closed to them.

Rebel Support: No

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: China

China provided weapons to the government of Myanmar. India and Pakistan also provided some logistical support.

Non-State Military Support to Government: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Victory

Victorious Side: A

Dyad previously active?: No

God's Army was defeated militarily by the end of 2000.

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 21

ID 24

ID 24

Incompatibility: Government, Burma/Myanmar

Upon independence, Burma faced a communist insurgency. The Communist Party of Burma (CPB) was the main organization, but it quickly fractured into two main wings—the Red Band and the White Band, with the White Band being the dominant faction and here treated as the CPB. In addition, the "White Bands" faction of the People's Volunteer Organization (PVO) also rebelled against the government. In the late 1940s and early 1950s the government faced rebellion by all of these groups, but they gradually declined in strength and an amnesty in 1958 led to many of their members abandoning them. In 1970, the leader of the Red Bands was captured and most of the organization was defeated.

Dyad ID 305: Burma vs. Communist Party of Burma (BCP)

Burma, like many other southeast Asian countries, faced a communist insurgency that predated its independence in 1948. The insurgency was led primarily by the Communist Party of Burma (CPB), which was split into two factions, the Red Flag movement, a Marxist-Leninist organization that was more closely allied with the Soviet Union, and the White Flag movement, a Maoist faction that received support from the Chinese Communist Party. The White Flag movement became the dominant faction in the CPB and was the most influential leftist group in Burma. However, the Red Flag and several other leftist groups also waged armed conflict against the Burmese government, albeit with much less success.

In 1947 and 1948, the CPB seized major areas of territory across Burma. The government was on the defensive facing a robust leftist rebellion as well as several ethnic insurgencies. In 1948 the conflict shifted in the government's favor, however, and by the late 1940s the CPB was losing territory. In the 1950s the government continued to score major successes against both the CPB (which consisted of the White Flag movement) and the Red Flag movement, and on July 31, 1958,

a government amnesty robbed the organizations of many of their members. The CPB persisted, however, and beginning in 1959 it began to cooperate more heavily with the ethnic insurgents in the country. Meanwhile, the Red Flag movement was never able to completely recover, and it split into two new organizations both of which confined themselves to a small region of Burma and fought on behalf of the Arakan ethnic group (see conflict id 22).

Throughout the 1960s the CPB grew in strength again and was able to gain a good amount of territory. A new counter-insurgency strategy in 1968, however, put the CPB on the defensive and in the 1970s the CPB suffered several crushing defeats. The group was able to reorganize again in the 1980s and achieve some tactical success, however, by the end of the 1980s the combination of neative relations with the ethnic insurgents and the emergence of a new, pro-democracy political movement (see conflict id 21, dyad 280) led the CPB to fractionalize and to disappear as a noticeable insurgent group.

Notes on Coding

This conflict is best described in three periods. The first covers the phase of the conflict from 1948 to 1953 when the CPB was at its strongest militarily and was a legal political party. The second covers 1953 to 1958. The third the covers the remaining 30 years of the conflict.

Period 1: 1948-1953

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The Communist Party of Burma was a political and military organization. While all the ethnic insurgent groups were declared illegal after their formation, the government left the BCP legal for five years to try to encourage negotiations and to de-escalate the armed struggle.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 4,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Fredholm (1993) writes that in the early years of the conflict, the CPB was estimated to have 4,000 troops spread across the country.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Much of Burma

Effterrcont: moderate

Fredholm (1993) writes that in early 1948 "vast areas (of Burma) had already fallen to the communist insurgents" (p. 210).

Period 2: 1953-1958

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Communist Party of Burma was a political and military organization. It was declared illegal in October 1953.

Rebestimate: 4,500

Rebestlow: 4,000

Rebesthigh: 5,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Fredholm (1993) writes that the People's of Burma (PA) the armed wing of the CPB, had 4,000 to 5,000 troops.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of Burma

Effterrcont: moderate

The CPB, as mentioned above, seized large areas of Burma in the first year of the conflict. However, over the period leading up to 1958 much of that territory was taken back by the government.

Period 3: 1958-1988

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Communist Part of Burma was a political and military organization. It was declared illegal in October 1953.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 20,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Fredholm (1993) writes that in 1968, the north-east command of the Communist Party of Burma had 20,000 armed troops.

Dyad ID 322: Burma vs. ABSDF

The government of Myanmar (formerly Burma) has experienced conflict throughout its independent history, most of it driven by minority ethnic groups seeking greater autonomy from the state. However, the Burmese authoritarian government has also faced challenge from groups seeking to overthrow it and replace it with a different form of government. Throughout the Cold War, the Burmese Communist Party and a set of other leftist organizations challenged the government militarily (see conflict id 24, dyad 305). In the late 1980s, as the economy of Burma was in recession a growing number of student groups and other organizations organized protests, many of which turned violent. These groups organized an insurgent movement, the All Burma Students Democratic Front (ABSDF) in the early 1990s and began challenging the government. The organization was highly dependent on support from the ethnic insurgent groups, however, and was unable to accomplish much militarily. By the end of 1992, although there was still an organization it had

lost most of its fighting capacity because many of its members had joined ethnic insurgent groups instead.

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The ABSDF was formed as a political organization to oppose the military government.

Rebestimate: 2,250

Rebestlow: 500

Rebesthigh: 4,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database provides the following estimates for the troop strength of the ABSDF: In 1990, 500-2,570; in 1991: 4,000; in 1992: 1,400-2,000. These estimates are in comparison to over 200,000 troops for the Burmese army.

Newstartdate: 3/20/1990

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict first reached 25 battledeaths on March 20, 1990.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Fredholm, Michael (1993). *Burma: Ethnicity and Insurgency*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Dyad ID 677: Burma vs. Red Flag Movement

This conflict is best described in two periods, one covering 1948-1950 when the CPB (including the Red Flag movement) was a legal political party and the next covering the reemergence of the conflict in 1970.

Period 1: 1948-1950

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The Red Flag movement was a faction of the Communist Party of Burma and so was a legal political entity.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 3,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Fredholm (1993) writes that the Red Flag movement probably never had more than 3,000 troops and that the best estimates are that it had around 750 troops in 1958.

On July 31, 1958, the Burmese government offered an amnesty to insurgents and a number of the members of the Red Flag movement accepted.

Period 2: 1970

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing legal: No

The Red Flag Movement was directly affiliated with communist political parties in Burma. Those parties were illegal in this period.

Rebel Estimate: unclear

Rebel Estimate (low): unclear

Rebel Estimate (high): unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

No estimate was found for the number of troops possessed by the Red Flag Movement in 1970. Lintner (1999) estimates that the organization had 1,500-2,000 troops in the early 1950s and it was clearly much smaller than that by 1970.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The Red Flag Movement was made up of different bands, but controlled by the leader. When he was captured the organization essentially fell apart.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The Red Flag Movement was very small in this period and had little ability to mobilize popular support or procure arms.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Parts of Irrawady Delta

Effective level of control: Moderate

The Red Flag Movement controlled parts of the Irrawady Delta from the 1940s until its defeat in 1970.

Conflict Type: communist rebellion

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

I could find no reference to external support to the Burmese communist movements in this period.

Government Support: No

Non-state military support to Government: No

The Burmese government did not appear to receive external support in this period.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Victory

Victory Side: A

The Red Flag Movement was defeated by the Burmese army in 1970.

Sources:

- Martin Smith (1988). *Burmas: Insurgency and the Politics of Ethnicity*. London: Zed Books.
- Bertil Lintner (1999). *Burma in Revolt: Opium and Insurgency Since 1948*. Bangkok: Silkworm Books.
- UCDP

Dyad ID 678: Myanmar vs. PVO-White Band Faction

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing legal: Yes

The PVO-White Band Faction was affiliated with communist political parties in Burma.

Rebel Estimate: 4000

Rebel Estimate (low): 4000

Rebel Estimate (high): 4000

Rebstrength: weaker

Lintner (1999) and Fredholm (1998) both report that the PVO-White Band Faction had around 4,000 troops at the beginning.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: High

The PVO-White Band Faction was a well disciplined military organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

Communist movements were popular in Burma in this period. The organization was made up of militias with access to weapons and fighting capacity, and the Burmese army was quite weak in this period.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Parts of central Burma

Effective level of control: Low

The PVO-White Band faction was active throughout central Burma and able to establish some territorial control there.

Conflict Type: Communist Rebellion

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

I could find no reference to external support to the Burmese communist movements in this period.

Government Support: No

Non-state military support to Government: No

The Burmese government did not appear to receive external support in this period.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

The PVO-White Band was essentially wiped out by the government amnesty of 1958, but after 1953 the dyad did not reach 25 battledeaths in a year.

Chapter 22

ID 25

ID 25

Incompatibility: Territory, Arakan

Myanmar (then Burma) gained independence in 1948 and immediately faced insurgency in many areas. One of these was in Arakan, a region of Myanmar that borders Bangladesh and that is dominated by two groups-the Rakhine, who are Buddhist, and the Rohingya, who are Muslim. The insurgency initially contained two main groups. The first was the Arakan People's Liberation Party (APLP), a Buddhist organization that fought from 1948 until they accepted a general amnesty in 1958. The second was the Mujahid Party, which was made up of many Muslim World War II veterans. The Mujahid Party fought and controlled parts of northern Arakan, but lost control of most of it by 1954. The organization continued to launch some offensives, but its remaining members surrendered in 1961. In the 1960s, a number of small Arakan insurgent groups battled the government, but with little effectiveness. These organizations included the Communist Party of Arakan, the Arakan National Liberation Party (ANLP), the Rohingya Patriotic Front (RPF), and the Arakan Liberation Party (ALP).

Dyad 312: Burma/Myanmar vs. Rohingya Solidarity Organisation

Dyad 323: Burma/Myanmar vs. Arakan Rohingya Islamic Front

Dyad 794: Burma/Myanmar vs. RPF

Rebel Political Wing: No

The RPF was primarily a military organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

UCDP provides no estimate for the number of troops possessed by the RPF. However, it is clear that the organization was much smaller than the Burmese army, although the Burmese army was torn because it faced insurgency across the country.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The RPF generally operated as a coherent organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The Rohingya were a majority in the area that the RPF operated and it had the potential to draw a lot of support from them. However, this was a small military organization that was outmatched by the Burmese army in its ability to fight or procure arms.

Territorial Control: No

The RPF did not appear to control territory in Arakan.

Conflict Type: Secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

I could find no reference to support to the rebels in this period.

Government Support: No

Non-state military support to Government: No

The Burmese government did not appear to receive external support in this period.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

This dyad did not reach 25 battledeaths after 1978.

Dyad 795: Myanmar vs. ALP

Rebel Political Wing: No

The ALP was primarily a military organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

UCDP provides no estimate for the number of troops possessed by the ALP. However, it is clear that the organization was much smaller than the Burmese army, although the Burmese army was

torn because it faced insurgency across the country.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The ALP generally operated as a coherent organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The ALP was a very small organization with little popular support, weapons, or ability to fight.

Territorial Control: No

The ALP did not appear to control territory in Arakan.

Conflict Type: Secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

I could find no reference to support to the rebels in this period.

Government Support: No

Non-state military support to Government: No

The Burmese government did not appear to receive external support in this period.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Victory

Victory Side: A

The ALP was wiped out in clashes with the Burmese army in 1977.

Dyad 800: Burma/Myanmar vs. Mujahid Party

Period 1: 1948-1954

Rebel Political Wing: No

The Mujahid Party was primarily a military organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

I could find no estimate of the number of troops possessed by the Mujahid. The Burmese national army was quite small in this period, and was actually outnumbered by the total number of insurgents in the country, who were spread among many groups.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: High

The group had a clear leadership in this period.

Mobilization Capacity: High

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

The Mujahid had a lot of support in this area, particularly compared to the Burmese government. Many of the members of the Mujahid were veterans from World War II and so had combat experience.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Much of northern Arakan

Level of effective territorial control: moderate

The Mujahid controlled much of northern Arakan into 1954.

Conflict Type: Secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

I could find no reference to support to the rebels in this period.

Government Support: No

Non-state military support to Government: No

The Burmese government did not appear to receive external support in this period.

Period 2: 1955-1961

Rebel Estimate: 500

Rebel Estimate (low): 500

Rebel Estimate (high): 500

Rebstrength: much weaker

Martin Smith (1999, p. 194) reports that "some 500 heavily-armed 'Rohingya' Mujahid guerrillas commanded by Rauschild Bullah and Mustafiz" surrendered in 1961. The numbers of fighters prior to 1961 were almost certainly higher, but no specific reference to this was found.

Territorial Control: No

The Mujahid Party's military leader was arrested in East Pakistan in 1954, and after his arrest the Burmese army recaptured most of northern Arakan.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Victory

Victory Side: A

The conflict ended in 1961 when the remaining Rohingya fighters surrendered to the Burmese army.

Dyad 801: Burma/Myanmar vs. ANLP

Rebel Political Wing: No

The ANLP was primarily a military organization.

Rebel Estimate: 120

Rebel Estimate (low): 120

Rebel Estimate (high): 120

Rebstrength: much weaker

Smith (1988, p. 239) reports that the ANLP reached a maximum of 120 guerilla fighters in the mid-1970s. This number was clearly much lower than that possessed by the Burmese army.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The ANLP generally operated as a coherent organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The ANLP was a very small organization with little popular support, weapons, or ability to fight.

Territorial Control: No

The ANLP did not appear to control territory in Arakan.

Conflict Type: Secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

I could find no reference to support to the rebels in this period.

Government Support: No

Non-state military support to Government: No

The Burmese government did not appear to receive external support in this period.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

This dyad did not reach 25 battledeaths again after 1972.

Sources:

- UCDP
- Smith, Martin (1988). *Burmas: Insurgency and the Politics of Ethnicity*. London: Zed Books.

Dyad 802: Burma/Myanmar vs. Communist Party of Arakan

tba

Chapter 23

ID 26

ID 26

Incompatibility: Territory, Mon

Dyad 683: Burma/Myanmar vs. MFL-MUF

Upon independence in 1948, the government of Burma (now Myanmar) faced insurgencies led by a number of minorities in the state. One of these was in Mon, where a number of political organizations, including the Mon Freedom League (MFL) and Mon United Front (MUF) battled against the government with a militant organization, the Mon National Defense Organization. In 1951, many of these organizations came together to form the Mon People's Front (MPF).

Rebel Political Wing: explicit link

Rebel Political Wing legal: No

The MFL-MUF was both a political and military organization fighting for Mon interests, like other Burmese insurgents it was illegal.

Rebel Estimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

The MFL-MUF was a small insurgent organization, but the Burmese army was also quite weak in this period.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Low

The MFL and MUF were different political organizations that cooperated along with a militant organization, the Mon National Defense Organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The Mon cause was quite popular and so could mobilize popular support, but this organization had difficulty obtaining arms and fighting.

Territorial Control: unclear

I could find no information on whether this organization controlled territory in Mon state.

Conflict Type: civil war/ethnic conflict

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

I could find no reference to support to the rebels in this period.

Government Support: No

Non-state military support to Government: No

The Burmese government did not appear to receive external support in this period.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Continuation as another dyad.

In 1952, the MFL-MUF, along with other Mon organizations, came together to form the MPF.

Sources:

- Martin Smith (1988). *Burmas: Insurgency and the Politics of Ethnicity*. London: Zed Books.
- Bertil Lintner (1999). *Burma in Revolt: Opium and Insurgency Since 1948*. Bangkok: Silkworm Books.

Chapter 24

ID 36

ID 36

Incompatibility: Government, Guatemala

Guatemala vs. Leftist Insurgents

The Central American state of Guatemala experienced one of the longest running left-wing insurgencies in the world. Guatemala has throughout its independent history had an incredibly high level of income inequality as its economic and political system has been almost entirely controlled by plantation owners and international corporations. The Guatemalan conflict began on November 13, 1960 when a group of liberal military officers attempted a coup d'état against the Guatemalan President. The coup was unsuccessful but the officers fled to the hills and formed the 13th of November Movement, the first left-wing guerilla organization. In 1965, the M-13 split and a new group, the Rebel Armed Forces (FAR) was added to the conflict. At the same time, the Guatemalan insurgency escalated and 1965 was the first year that at least 25 battledeaths occurred.

Over the next thirty years the state of Guatemala battled a left-wing insurgency. As the conflict progressed, additional groups joined the fighting including the Guerilla Army of the Poor (EGP), the Organization of Armed People (ORPA) and the Guatemalan Worker's Party (PGT). The government responded to the conflict both by pushing economic and agrarian reforms that increased the livelihood of peasants and by pursuing the guerilla organizations with vigor. These policies were effective, the guerilla organizations never grew very large, however, the Guatemalan government was never able to completely defeat the insurgents.

In 1982, the four major guerilla organizations-EGP, ORPA, PGT and FAR united to form the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Unity (URNG). The government initially responded with high levels of repression, however, when that did not work dual approaches of increasing aid to peasant and indigenous communities (the main supporters of URNG) and negotiations were attempted. Negotiations carried on for a long time before an agreement was reached, however, in March 1996 the

government and URNG signed a cease-fire. Later that year, the parties signed a peace agreement which made the Guatemalan military and intelligence services subservient to the democratically elected government and the conflict ended.

Dyad ID 228: Guatemala vs. URNG

All of these groups operated under the umbrella of the URNG

In response to the increasingly autocratic rule of Gen. Ydigoras Fuentes, who took power in 1958 following the murder of Colonel Castillo Armas, a group of junior military officers revolted in 1960. When they failed, several went into hiding. This group (MR-13) became the nucleus of the forces that were in armed insurrection against the government for the next 36 years. Four principal left-wing guerrilla groups—the Guerrilla Army of the Poor (EGP), the Revolutionary Organization of Armed People (ORPA), the Rebel Armed Forces (FAR), and the Guatemalan Labor Party (PGT)—conducted economic sabotage and targeted government installations and members of government security forces in armed attacks. These organizations combined to form the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Unity (URNG) in 1982. The government and the URNG conducted peace negotiations which ended the war in 1995. (<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/2045.htm>)

[IS note: information about individual rebel groups is scarce. More information is available after the merger of the four main rebel groups into the URNG. It also appears that none of the main variables change between the groups, nor are there major changes after the merger. Therefore, it is possible to consolidate all of these groups into a single record]

Rebels: MR-13, FAR, EGP, PGT, ORPA, Later known as URNG

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. Minor presence of troops among refugees in Mexico

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: Explicit. Except for a few years of suspended aid during the Carter administration, the US has backed the Guatemalan government with military aid and training

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

URNG was an alliance of guerilla organizations and was not affiliated with a political organization.

Rebestimate: 1,500

Rebestlow: 800

Rebesthigh: 5,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) provides the following estimates for the troop strength of the URNG: in 1986 and 1987: 2,000-2,500; in 1988: 1,000-2,000; in 1989: 1,500-2,000; in 1990: 1,000-2,000; in 1991 and 1992: 1,000; in 1993, 1994, 1995 and 1996: 800-1,100. Additionally, SIPRI reports that government offensives in the period 1983-1986 cut URNG's troop strength more than in half, which would mean the group had at least 5,000 troops in that period. These estimates are in comparison to 32,000-44,200 troops for the Guatemalan army.

Newstartdate: 12/31/1982

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the Guatemalan government and the URNG reached 25 battledeaths sometime in 1982.

Newenddate: 12/31/1995

Although a final peace deal between the government and URNG was not reached until 1996, 1995 was the last year in which fighting produced 25 battledeaths.

Sources:

- Patrick Brogan
- Onwar.com
- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Keesings

Dyad ID 621: Guatemala vs. Military Faction

Colonel Fernandez Ilivares launched a failed coup against the government.

Rebels: military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

On July 18, 1949 a group of military officers attempted a coup d'etat against the Guatemalan government. The coup was in response to the assassination of the chief of the armed forces, Colonel Francisco Arana. However, the bulk of the military remained loyal to the government and the insurgents were defeated on July 19 when forces loyal to the government seized the rebel headquarters at Forst Guardia de Honor.

Rebpolwing: no

The coup d'etat was carried out by military officers in reaction to the assassination of the chief of the armed forces and does not appear to have been affiliated with any political movement.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops that participated in the coup d'etat. However, it is clear that the majority of the troops stayed loyal to the government.

Sources:

- Keesing's Contemporary Archives
- New York Times Archives

Dyad ID 622: Guatemala vs. Forces of Carlos Castillo Armas

On June 18, 1954, Colonel Castillo Armas and a group of 5,000-6,000 men invaded Guatemala from Honduras. Colonel Castillo Armas had been based in Honduras after being exiled for political reasons from Guatemala and was upset over the current government's alleged softness on communism. Castillo Armas' forces marched into Guatemala on July 3 and a new government was established with the Colonel in charge. The "liberation army" that Colonel Castillo Armas had used to gain power was not dissolved, however, and the presence of an additional military force outside the regular army led to tensions. On August 2, 1954, a group of military soldiers attacked some members of the liberation army in protest of the presence of this additional armed forces. After this conflict, President Castillo Armas agreed to disband the liberation army.

President Arbez decided to implement agrarian reform and nationalized lands owned by the United Fruit Company, a US firm. The CIA organized a coup under a Guatemalan Colonel, Castillo Armas. The forces were organized in Honduras and equipped by the CIA. Arbenz fled the country and Armas took control of the government.

Rebels: Forces of Castillo Arms

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases located in Honduras

Rebsupport: Explicit. The US CIA directly organized the coup.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

This conflict was between members of the military and the liberation army that Colonel Castillo Armas had used to take power and was not a political dispute.

Rebestimate: 5,500

Rebestlow: 5,000

Rebesthigh: 6,000

Rebstrength: parity

Keesing's Contemporary Archives reported in July 17-24, 1954 that both the government forces and those loyal to Colonel Castillo Armas numbered between 5,000 and 6,000.

Sources:

- Keesing's Contemporary Archives
- Skidmore and Smith
- Modern Latin America
- Patrick Brogan
- Onwar.com

Dyad ID 624: Guatemala vs. FAR

Rebpolwing: no

The FAR was a group that broke off from MR-13 and was not affiliated with a political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by FAR. However, it is clear that the group was considerably weaker than the Guatemalan army.

Newendate: 3/6/1982

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the first use of armed force by URNG (the alliance of FAR with the three other main guerilla organizations) was on March 6, 1982.

Dyad ID 625: Guatemala vs. EGP

Rebpolwing: no

The Guerilla Army of the Poor as a military organization and does not appear to have been affiliated with a political group.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the EGP. However, it is clear that the group was considerably weaker than the Guatemalan army.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1976

In June 1978, Keesing's Record of World Events reported that the EGP became active in the conflict in 1976.

Newenddate: 3/6/1982

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the first use of armed force by URNG (the alliance of EGP with the three other main guerilla organizations) was on March 6, 1982.

Dyad ID 627: Guatemala vs. ORPA

Rebpolwing: no

ORPA was a military organization and does not appear to have been affiliated with a political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by ORPA. However, it is clear that the group was considerably weaker than the Guatemalan army.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1979

In October 1981 Keesing's Record of World Events reported that ORPA formed "officially" in 1979.

Newenddate: 3/6/1982

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the first use of armed force by URNG (the alliance of ORPA with the three other main guerilla organizations) was on March 6, 1982.

Dyad ID 694: Guatemala vs. MR-13

Rebpolwing: no

MR-13 was a group of liberal army officers who attempted a revolt and then fled to the Guatemalan hills and was not affiliated with a political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the MR-13. However, it is clear that the group was considerably weaker than the Guatemalan army.

Newendate: 12/31/1982

No reference could be found for when MR-13 dropped out of the conflict. However, it appears that after 1982 the URNG was the only significant anti-government group in Guatemala so the conflict between the government and MR-13 is coded as ending in that year.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
- Onwar.com

Chapter 25

ID 37

ID 37

Incompatibility: Territory (Israel), Palestine (although arguably government, since territorial claim encompassing all of Israel)

Dyad ID 377: Israel vs. Fatah

This conflict is best described in two periods. The first describes the first thirty years of the conflict leading up to signing of an agreement in 1993. The second covers the return to conflict after the breakdown of final-status negotiations in 2000.

Period 1: 1965-1993

Rebpolwing: no

Prior to the negotiations in 1993, Fatah was a militant insurgent group and not a political organization.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 4,500

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that Fatah had 4,500 troops between 1989 and 1992. These estimates are in comparison to 175,000 troops possessed by the Israeli army.

Newendate: 9/13/1993

On September 13, 1993, Fatah and the Israeli government signed a peace agreement which led to the creation of a Palestinian Authority and Fatah transformed into a political party.

Period 2: 2000-ongoing

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

Fatah is a political organization which is the ruling party in the Palestinian Authority.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 2,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 2000 Fatah had 2,000 troops. This estimate is in comparison to over 100,000 troops possessed by the Israeli army.

Newstartdate: 11/1/2000

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that by November 1, 2000, the conflict between the Israeli government and Fatah had again reached 25 battledeaths.

Dyad ID 380: Israel vs. PIJ

Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ) is an organization that seeks to destroy the state of Israel through a holy war. It has been involved in conflict with the Israeli state in 1996 and since 2002.

Period 1: 1996

Rebel Political Wing: No

PIJ is a military organization without a direct political organization.

Rebel estimate: 350

Rebel estimate low: 350

Rebel estimate high: 350

Rebel strength: much weaker

UCDP estimates that PIJ had 350 troops in 1995. The Israeli army had more than 100,000 troops.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Low

There are actually a variety of different organizations that operate as PIJ.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The PIJ is a small organization with some popular support, but less than the Israeli state and little ability to procure arms.

Territorial Control: no

The PIJ operates out of the Palestinian authority but does not control territory there.

Conflict Type: terrorist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: Some

The PIJ operates to some extent out of Syria.

Rebel Support: No

Other than Syrian access to territory, there was no record of external support in this period.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Name of Government Supporters: United States

Israel receives high levels of military aid from the United States.

Non-state military support to Government: Minor

Israel received support from the Jewish diaspora.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

The Israel-PIJ dyad did not reach 25 battledeaths after 1996.

Period 2: 2002-2009

Rebel Political Wing: No

PIJ is a military organization without a direct political organization.

Rebel estimate: 500

Rebel estimate low: 500

Rebel estimate high: 500

Rebel strength: much weaker

UCDP estimates that PIJ had 500 troops in 2002-2009. The Israeli army had more than 100,000 troops.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Low

There are actually a variety of different organizations that operate as PIJ.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The PIJ is a small organization with some popular support, but less than the Israeli state and little ability to procure arms.

Territorial Control: no

The PIJ operates out of the Palestinian authority but does not control territory there.

Conflict Type: civil war/ethnic conflict

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: Some

The PIJ operates to some extent out of Syria and Iran.

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Financial

Name of Rebel Supporters: Iran

UCDP reports that Iran provides economic support to PIJ.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Name of Government Supporters: United States

Israel receives high levels of military aid from the United States.

Non-state military support to Government: Minor

Israel received financial support from the Jewish diaspora.

Ended?: No

Source:

- UCDP

Dyad ID 381: Israel vs. Hamas

The HAMAS (in Arabic, an acronym for "Harakat Al-Muqawama Al-Islamia" – Islamic Resistance Movement – and a word meaning courage and bravery) is a radical Islamic fundamentalist organization which became active in the early stages of the intifada, operating primarily in the Gaza District but also in Judea and Samaria. Formed in late 1987 as an outgrowth of the Palestinian branch of the Muslim Brotherhood.

Rebels: Hamas

Transconstsupp: explicit. Islamic organizations across the region support the group

Rebextpart: major. Ties to militant Islamist groups.

Rebpresosts: some. Some presence of leadership in Syria, Lebanon, Gulf states. Recruitment activity in the region

Rebsupport: explicit. At least endorsement from more radical governments. Also reports that Iran supplies funding to the organization

Rtypesup: non-military

Govsupport: explicit. Israel receives billions in US military aid

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: minor. Members of the Jewish diaspora give support to the government

Rebpolwing: no

Hamas is a militant organization dedicated to reclaiming all territory of current Israel and the occupied territories and does not operate as a political organization within Palestine.

Rebestimate: 400

Rebestlow: 300

Rebesthigh: 500

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database provides the following estimates for the number of troops possessed by Hamas: In 1993, 1994 and 1996: 300; in 2000: 500; in 2001: no estimate; in 2002 and 2003: 500. These estimates are in comparison to over 100,000 troops possessed by the Israeli army.

Newstartdate: 9/12/1993

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict first reached 25 battledeaths on September 12, 1993.

Sources:

- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>
- Library of Congress

Dyad ID 419: Israel vs. Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP)

Marxist-Leninist group founded in 1967 by George Habash-as a member of the PLO-when it broke away from the Arab Nationalist Movement. The PFLP does not view the Palestinian struggle as a religious one, seeing it instead as a broader revolution against Western imperialism. The group earned a reputation for spectacular international attacks, including airline hijackings that have killed at least 20 US citizens. The PFLP is opposed to the Oslo process.

Rebels: PFLP

Transconstsupp: tacit. Sympathy by arab nationalist groups

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. Presence in Syria, Lebanon

Rebsupport: Explicit. Receives some support and safehaven from Syria

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: explicit. The US provides billions in aid

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: minor. Assistance from the Jewish diaspora

Sources:

- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>
- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Rebpolwing: no

The PFLP is a militant organization dedicated to destroying Israel and creating a democratic socialist Palestine. It does not act as a political organization.

Rebestimate: 900

Rebestlow: 800

Rebesthigh: 1,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 1989, the PFLP had 900 troops, in 2001 it had 800 and in 2003 it had 1,000.

Newstartdate: 5/31/1972

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between Israel and the PFLP first reached 25 battledeaths on May 31, 1972.

Sources:

- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>
- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Dyad ID 426: Israel vs. al-Aqsa Martyr's Brigade (AMB)

Rebpolwing: alleged link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

AMB is connected with Fatah.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources provide any information as to the troop strength of AMB. However, it is clear that the group is considerably weaker than the Israeli army.

Newstartdate: 3/26/2002

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between Israel and AMB first reached 25 battledeaths on March 26, 2002.

Dyad ID 427: Israel vs. Palestinian National Authority (PNA)

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The Palestinian National Authority is the recognized government of the Palestinian Authority.

Rebestimate: 35,000

Rebestlow: 29,000

Rebesthigh: 35,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database provides the following estimates for the troop strength of the PNA: In 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001: 35,000; in 2002: 29,000. These estimates are in comparison to over 100,000 troops for the Israeli army.

Newstartdate: 9/25/1996

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between Israel and the PNA first reached 25 battledeaths on September 25, 1996.

Dyad ID 428: Israel vs. Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command (PFLP-GC)

Rebpolwing: no

PFLP-GC is a militant organization dedicated to eliminating Israel and does not represent a political organization.

Rebestimate: 1,000

Rebestlow: 500

Rebesthigh: 2,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 1989 PFLP-GC had 500-2,000 troops and in 2003 it had 500. These estimates are in comparison to over 100,000 troops possessed by the Israeli army.

Newstartdate: 12/31/1974

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between Israel and the PFLP-GC had reached 25 battledeaths by December 31, 1974.

Source:

- Uppsala Conflict Database

Dyad ID 629: Israel vs. Popular Resistance Committees

TBA

Dyad ID 695: Israel vs. Palestinian insurgents

Israel became independent in 1948 and immediately fought a war with multiple Arab states. After the 1948 war, Israel faced attack from Palestinians both within Israel and living in other Arab states. In the period from 1948-1965 these comprised a variety of different organizations which are here referred to collectively as "Palestinian Insurgents." In 1965, the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) became the dominant Palestinian organization, but there were others which are here referred to as "Non-PLO Groups." In 1974, several of these organizations joined together as the Rejectionist Front, which was opposed to what it saw as the PLO's willingness to negotiate and to consider a two-state solution.

Rebel Political Wing: No

This dyad represents a number of different organizations and were not collectively affiliated with a political organization

Rebel Estimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

I could find no estimate of the number of Palestinian insurgents in this period, but clearly they were much weaker than the Israeli state.

Central Control: No

This dyad represents a number of different organizations that did not have some collective organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

While Palestinians were a large group, they were spread among multiple countries and these organizations' ability to fight or procure arms did not approach that of the Israeli state.

Territorial Control: No

These organizations did not control any territory.

Conflict Type: civil war/ethnic conflict

Transnational Constituency Support: Unclear

Rebel External Support: Unclear

Rebel Presence in External States: Extensive

Rebel Support: Unclear

It is difficult to find whether these various organizations were supported by external states or non-state actors, but all were based in other countries.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Name of Government Supporters: United States

The United States provided some military support to Israel in this period.

Non-state military support to Government: Minor

Israel received financial support from the Jewish diaspora.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Continuation as another dyad

Many of these organizations continued as either the PLO or non-PLO groups, which are the dyads UCDDP identifies after this.

Dyad ID 696: Israel vs. Non PLO groups

Rebel Political Wing: No

This dyad represents a number of different organizations and were not collectively affiliated with a political organization

Rebel Estimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

I could find no estimate of the number of Palestinian insurgents in this period, but clearly they were much weaker than the Israeli state.

Central Control: No

This dyad represents a number of different organizations that did not have some collective organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

While Palestinians were a large group, they were spread among multiple countries and these organizations' ability to fight or procure arms did not approach that of the Israeli state.

Territorial Control: No

These organizations did not control any territory.

Conflict Type: civil war/ethnic conflict

Transnational Constituency Support: Unclear

Rebel External Support: Unclear

Rebel Presence in External States: Extensive

Rebel Support: Unclear

It is difficult to find whether these various organizations were supported by external states or non-state actors, but all were based in other countries.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Name of Government Supporters: United States

The United States provided some military support to Israel in this period.

Non-state military support to Government: Minor

Israel received financial support from the Jewish diaspora.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Continuation as another dyad

Many of these organizations continued as members of the "Rejectionist Front," which is another dyad in the data.

Dyad ID 780: Israel vs. Rejectionist Front

Rebel Political Wing: No

The Rejectionist Front was a network of organizations that were opposed to the PLO and to Israel, but did not have a direct political wing.

Rebel Estimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

UCDP gives no estimate as to the number of troops possessed by the Rejectionist Front. However, the organization was clearly small and much weaker than the Israeli military.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Low

The Rejectionist Front was really a coalition of organizations and although it did have a leadership these organizations still retained their own independence.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

While Palestinians were a large group, the Rejectionist Front had little ability to mobilize many of them and was outmatched by the Israeli army in the ability to procure arms and in its fighting capacity.

Territorial Control: No

The Rejectionist Front did not control any territory in Israel.

Conflict Type: civil war/ethnic conflict

Transnational Constituency Support: Minor

The Rejectionist Front drew some support from the Palestinian diaspora.

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: Extensive

The Rejectionist Front operated to some extent out of Syria.

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Name of Supporters: Syria, Iran

UCDP reports that Syria and Iran provided military and economic support across this period.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Name of Government Supporters: United States

The United States provided military support to the Israeli government throughout this period.

Non-state military support to Government: Minor

Israel received financial support from the Jewish diaspora.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Other

After 1988, the UCDP finds better information on constituent groups and so codes them as individual dyads rather than as part of the Rejectionist Front.

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 26

ID 39

ID 39

Incompatibility: Territory, Tibet

Dyad ID 606: China vs. Tibet

Tibet, which had been incorporated into China in the late 18th century, gained independence in the Chinese revolution of 1911. Tibet stayed independent until 1950 and was protected from China by the British, who had a strong colonial presence in Asia. However, in the aftermath of World War II Britain's presence in the region was dwindling and the colonial power was no longer willing to protect Tibet's independence. In 1950, two years after the communist revolution, the Chinese army invaded Tibet and took control of the province. In 1951, the governments of Tibet and China signed an agreement (under heavy Chinese pressure) making Tibet an autonomous region within China. Despite this agreement, Tibetan nationalists continued to push for independence and several violent clashes occurred between Tibetan and Chinese forces. In 1959, the most violent episode occurred with an uprising in Lhasa, the capital of Tibet. The uprising was quickly suppressed and the leadership of Tibet, including the Dalai Lama, fled into exile.

On October 7, 1950, Chinese communist forces occupied Lhasa, Tibet. By 1955, a full-scale rebellion broke out against Chinese control. In 1955-56 the CIA became involved there in the most serious revolt against Chinese rule. The CIA trained groups of Khampa warriors at bases in Asia and parachuted them in behind Chinese lines to sow chaos. In 1959 the Dalai Lama was forced to flee Tibet.

Rebels: Tibet

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: explicit. The US CIA gave covert assistance and training to resistance movement

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The Tibetan uprisings were led by the government of Tibet, which was recognized by China as autonomous.

Rebestimate: 22,500

Rebestlow: 15,000

Rebesthigh: 30,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Norbu (2001) estimates that 15,000 "partisans" participated in the uprising in 1956 and 30,000 participated in the uprising in 1959.

Sources:

- Norbu, Dawa (2001). *China's Tibet Policy*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press.
- Encyclopedia Britannica
- Onwar.com
- <http://www.naatanet.org/shadowcircus/time.html>
- Patrick Brogan

Chapter 27

ID 40

ID 40

Incompatibility: Territory, South Moluccas

Dyad ID 605: Indonesia vs. Republic of South Moluccas

Indonesia was granted independence by the Netherlands in the aftermath of World War II and emerged as a federal republic. The republic had a huge diversity of languages and religion and quickly faced challenges from groups trying to gain more autonomy from the state. One of the early rebellions that the Indonesian republic faced was from the islands around Amboina, collectively referred to as the Moluccas. On April 26, 1950, the regional government in Amboina announced the secession of those islands and the creation of an independent Republic of South Moluccas. Negotiation attempts by the Indonesian government were rebuffed and in the fall of 1950, Indonesian troops landed on Amboina and launched a military campaign to reintegrate the renegade republic. Although the Amboinese unit of troops were one of the better fighting forces in Indonesian they were not a match for the federal army and by the end of the year the rebellion had been quelled.

In 1950, in the first years of Indonesian independence, a group of Christians in the southern Moluccan islands, backed by Moluccan Christian soldiers from the Dutch colonial army, proclaimed the independent Republik Maluku Selatan (or RMS, Republic of the South Moluccas). The Indonesian Army quelled the uprising, though guerilla forces continued to fight for years after. (www.globalsecurity.org)

Rebels: Republic fo South Moluccas

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: explicit. The Netherlands offered moral and diplomatic support

Rtypesup: endorsement

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The secession of Amboina and the neighboring islands was led by the regional government in Amboina. However, the newly independent Republic of South Moluccas was not recognized by the Indonesian government.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 5,000

Rebstrength: weaker

On May 7, 1950, the New York Times reported that there were an estimated 5,000 troops on the island of Amboina alone.

Sources:

- New York Times
- www.globalsecurity.org
- New York Times Archives

Chapter 28

ID 40

ID 41

Incompatibility: Territory, Puerto Rico

Dyad ID 698: United States vs. Puerto Rican Nationalist Party

In October-November 1950, there was a brief conflict between authorities on the island of Puerto Rico and a small group of Puerto Rican nationalists who were opposed to a new constitution on the status of the island. Puerto Rican residents were United States citizens but the island was not a state in the U.S. While many Puerto Ricans supported statehood, the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party, which had formed in 1928, supported independence for the island. On October 30, 1950, members of the Puerto Rican nationalist party attacked governmental officials and killed several police officers and fire fighters. Several of the nationalists were killed as well. On November 1, two Puerto Rican nationalists attempted to assassinate United States president Dwight Eisenhower. The rebellion on Puerto Rico was quickly quelled by the authorities but the violence cost the lives of approximately 27 people.

Puerto Rican nationalists attacked the governor's mansion in San Juan. Violence and arson erupted across the Island. An attempt to assassinate President Truman was also uncovered and foiled. Leftist members of Cuba's legislature declared support for the revolt.

Rebels: Puerto Rican Nationalist party

Transconstsupp: tacit/sympathy. Sympathy by some members of Cuba's House of Representatives

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The Puerto Rican Nationalist Party was a political organization founded in the 1920s.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 500

Rebstrength: weaker

The New York Times reported that the Governor of Puerto Rico, Luis Munoz Marin, claimed that the nationalist party had no more than 500 members.

Sources:

- New York Times
- Onwar.com
- New York Times Archives

Chapter 29

ID 43

ID 43

Incompatibility: Government,

Dyad ID 598: Thailand vs. Military Faction (Navy)

In November 1951, military and police officers announced in a radiobroadcast that the 1949 constitution was suspended by the government and that the 1932 constitution was in force. The reason given for restoring a unicameral parliament with half its membership appointed by the government was the danger of communist aggression. Shortly after the government-engineered coup, King Bhumibol Adulyadej was called back to Thailand, and for the first time since 1935 an adult monarch resided in the palace in Bangkok. A revised constitution was promulgated in February 1952, and an election was held for seats in the new, single-house legislature, half of the members of which were to be appointed. Nearly all the appointed parliamentary members were army officers.

Rebels: military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

On June 29, 1951, the Thailand Navy attempted a coup d'état by abducting the Prime Minister, Pibul Songgram, and placing him under arrest. The army, air force, and police forces all remained

loyal to the government, however, and quickly launched an attack against the naval forces. They were quickly defeated and Pibul escaped, and order was restored (although the government was overthrown in a subsequent coup d'état led by all of the armed forces later that year).

Rebpolwing: no

Keesing's Contemporary Archives in July 14-21, 1951 reported that the "revolt had no ideological significance."

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave an indication as to the number of troops that participated in the coup attempt. However, while the Navy organized the coup, the remainder of the armed forces stayed loyal to the government.

Sources:

- Keesing's Contemporary Archives
- Library of Congress Country Study

Dyad ID 599: Thailand vs. Communist Party of Thailand

Thailand, like many of its southeast Asian neighbors, faced a communist insurgency during the Cold War. The insurgency in Thailand, however, was not as strong as in states such as Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam and the state itself was never really threatened. The Communist Party of Thailand (CPT) formed in the 1920s and was relatively popular among the country's minority populations, particularly the ethnic Chinese. The CPT began an armed insurgency against the Thai state in the aftermath of World War II, however, it did not benefit from an anti-colonial struggle the way that communist parties in other southeast Asian states did (Thailand was never colonized and was only briefly occupied by Japan during World War II). Still, the CPT benefited from support from China and North Vietnam and by the 1970s the group did represent a significant fighting force. The conflict escalated until 1980, however, at that point the combination of a decrease in Chinese support to the CPT and new policies adopted by the government led to a weakening of the CPT. By the end of 1982 the group had been severely depleted and although the conflict continued after that, it did so at a very low intensity.

The Thai communist movement had begun in the late 1920s. Dominated by ethnic Chinese, the movement also appealed to other neglected minorities, including the various hill tribes, the Malay, and the Vietnamese. The CPT continued its clandestine activities in schools and associations that had large Chinese-Thai memberships and among villagers in border regions. In 1959 the party began to recruit and train limited numbers of Hmong hill people in the North geographical region for use as cadres in antigovernment activities. The principal energy for the CPT came from external Asian sources. As early as 1959, and particularly after the early 1960s, China and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (North Vietnam) began providing Thai cadres with training, money, and materiel for insurgency, subversion, and terrorism. Training camps were set up in Vietnam, in the

Pathet Lao-controlled areas of neighboring Laos, and in Yunnan Province in China. The United States channeled millions of dollars in military assistance to stop the CPT.

Rebels: CPT

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: major. The Pathet Lao cooperated with the CPT. Allowed use of bases in Laos

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases located in Laos and Vietnam

Rebsupport: explicit. China, Vietnam provided assistance.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: explicit. The US had over 20,000 troops stationed in Thailand. However, these troops did not appear to be involved directly in counter-insurgency operations; they were in place until 1975 during the Vietnam war. Therefore, US assistance is regarded as military only (not troops). Joint operations were also conducted with Malaysia along the common border.

Gtypesup: military.

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Communist Party of Thailand was a political organization. However, it and other communist organizations were made illegal in 1952.

Rebestimate: 10,000

Rebestlow: 4,000

Rebesthigh: 12,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Thailand: A Country Study reports that the CPT had 12,000 troops in 1979 but had declined in 4,000 by the end of 1982.

Sources:

- LePoer, Barbara Leitch (1987). *Thailand: A Country Study*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress.
- Keesings
- New York Times Archives

Chapter 30

ID 44

ID 44

Incompatibility: Territory, Kenya

Dyad ID 699: United Kingdom vs. Mau Mau

Conflict Summary: In the 1950s, the British colonial authority faced an anti-colonial uprising in Kenya led by a group called the Mau Mau. The Mau Mau were a group drawn primarily from Kenya's dominant Kikuyu tribe and, despite its appeal to traditional Kikuyu ritual, gained support from prominent figures such as the political Jomo Kenyatta, who would later become Kenya's first President. Although the Mau Mau had more soldiers than the British colonial authority they were not a match militarily, however, the Mau Mau rebellion did prove quite costly for the British. The conflict de-escalated in 1956 after Britain had cracked down on the Mau Mau, but it had continued at a low level of intensity until Kenya achieved independence in the early 1960s.

Mau Mau , secret insurgent organization in Kenya, comprising mainly Kikuyu tribespeople. They were bound by oath to force the expulsion of white settlers from Kenya. In 1952 the Mau Mau began reprisals against the Europeans, especially in the "white highlands," claimed as Kikuyu lands. The settlers retaliated and non-participant Kikuyu were killed by the Mau Mau. Jomo Kenyatta and other nationalist leaders were imprisoned. By 1956, however, British troops hunted down the Mau Mau in the mountain forests. Most leaders were captured and executed. Later the entire Kikuyu tribe was resettled within a guarded area. The state of emergency decreed (1952) in Kenya was ended in 1960 and Kenyatta was released; he subsequently became prime minister (1963) upon independence, and president (1964) when the country became a republic. (From www.infoplease.com)

Rebels: Mau Mau

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The Mau Mau was a Kikuyu-dominated anti-colonial rebellion and was not affiliated with a political party.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 120,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Onwar.com estimates that the Mau Mau had 120,000 forces while the British colonial authority 51,000 troops. However, the British troops were much better equipped and trained.

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- www.infoplease.com
- en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mau_Mau

Chapter 31

ID 46

ID 46

Incompatibility: Government,

Darul Islam movement listed twice. Consolidate into a single record. PRRI and Permesta became active in 1958, not 1953 as listed in the spreadsheet

Darul Islam was a movement demanded an Islamic state. This revolt began in 1953. The Darul Islam movement, originally based in West Java, had spread to Aceh and southern Sulawesi. In March 1957, Lieutenant Colonel H.N.V. Sumual, commander of the East Indonesia Military Region based in Ujungpandang, issued a Universal Struggle Charter (Permesta) calling for "completion of the Indonesian revolution." On February 10, 1958, when Sukarno was out of the country, a group of Sumatran military officers, Masyumi politicians, and others sent an ultimatum to Jakarta demanding Sukarno's return to a figurehead role as president and the formation of a new government under Hatta and Yogyakarta sultan Hamengkubuwona IX. Five days later, the group proclaimed the Revolutionary Government of the Indonesian Republic (PRRI). On February 17, Permesta rebels in Sulawesi made common cause with them. The PRRI revolt also soured Sukarno's relations with the United States. He accused Washington of supplying the rebels with arms and angrily rejected a United States proposal that marines be landed in the Sumatra oil-producing region to protect American lives and property. The United States was providing clandestine aid to the rebels and Allen Pope, an American B-25 pilot, was shot down over Ambon on May 18, 1958, creating an international incident. Independent Malaya had given assistance to the PRRI rebels in 1958. PRRI-Permesta claimed that they were fighting against a communist-dominated government.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 595: Indonesia vs. Darul Islam

Darul Islam was a radical Islamist movement. The group's main activity was in 1953. However, it participated as a minor actor during the PRRI-Permesta revolt in 1958-1961

Rebels: Darul Islam Movement

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: explicit. The Soviet Union was providing non-military assistance, according to the NYT

Gtypesup: non-military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Darul Islam established a parallel government in West Java that ruled that province and part of neighboring Aceh and Sulawesi. However, the government was not recognized by the Indonesian government.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the Darul Islam movement. However, it is clear that the group was weaker than the Indonesian army.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: West Java, Parts of Aceh and Sulawesi

Effterrcont: high

Darul Islam established a parallel government in West Java (which also controlled parts of Aceh and Sulawesi) and was effectively the only government in that region throughout the conflict.

Sources:

- Library of Congress Country Study
- New York Times Archives

Dyad ID 596: Indonesia vs. PRRI

On February 10, 1958, when Sukarno was out of the country, a group of Sumatran military officers, Masyumi politicians, and others sent an ultimatum to Jakarta demanding Sukarno's return to a figurehead role as president and the formation of a new government under Hatta and Yogyakarta sultan Hamengkubuwona IX. Five days later, the group proclaimed the Revolutionary Government of the Indonesian Republic (PRRI).

Rebels: PRRI

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: explicit. Malaysia and the U.S. supported the rebels. The CIA bombed government position

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: explicit. The Soviet Union was providing non-military assistance, according to the NYT. Military arms purchases were made from the USSR and E. European nations.

Gtypesup: non-military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The PRRI had close ties to Indonesian political parties such as the Indonesian Socialist Party, which were legal for the majority of the conflict (the Indonesian Social Party was declared illegal in August 1960).

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the PRRI government. However, it is clear that the government was weaker than the Indonesian army.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of Sumatra

Effterrcont: moderate

The PRRI was able to establish a government in Sumatra that had a good degree of control over the region.

Sources:

- Library of Congress
- Patrick Brogan
- New York Times Archives

Dyad ID 752: Indonesia vs. Permesta Rebels

Rebels: Permesta

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: explicit. Malaysia and the US assisted the rebels

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: explicit. The USSR supplied financing to the government for the purchase of arms.

Gtypesup: non-military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The Permesta Rebels were military officers who did not want to be transferred out of their region. Later, they fought with the PRRI government but they were not directly affiliated with a political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the Permesta rebels. However, it is clear that the group was weaker than the Indonesian army.

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- Ricklefs, M.C. (1993). *A History of Modern Indonesia since c. 1300*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Frederick, William H. and Robert L. Worden (1992). *Indonesia: a country study*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress.
- New York Times Archives
- Patrick Brogan

Chapter 32

ID 47

ID 47

Incompatibility: Territory, Morocco

Dyad ID 702: France vs. Istiqlal

Much of North Africa, including Morocco was colonized by France. In the 1950s, France faced anti-colonial insurgencies in many of their North African colonies. In Morocco, this struggle was led by the Istiqlal, or nationalist, party, a left-wing pro-independence party with ties to the Moroccan Communist Party. From 1953 to 1956 Istiqlal conducted terrorist attacks against colonial targets and Moroccans suspected of being in favor of the colonial regime. These attacks resulted in the deaths of over 700 people and over 2,000 injuries.

During WWII an independence party, the Istiqlal, was formed. After the war the nationalist movement gained strength and received the active support of the sultan, Sidi Muhammad, who demanded a unitary state and the departure of the French and Spanish. Faced with growing nationalist agitation, the French outlawed (1952) the Istiqlal and in Aug., 1953, deposed and exiled Sidi Muhammad. These measures proved ineffective, and under the pressure of rebellion in Algeria and disorders in Morocco, the French were compelled (1955) to restore Sidi Muhammad. In Mar., 1956, France relinquished its rights in Morocco; in April the Spanish surrendered their protectorate; in October Tangier was given to Morocco by international agreement. Spain ceded the Southern Protectorate in 1958. (from www.infoplease.com)

insufficient information for coding purposes

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

Istiqlal was a political party that also used violence. The party was illegal for most of the conflict as

it was outlawed after launched terrorist attacks in 1952. In 1955, the party was legal and indeed was the dominant party in the pre-independence Moroccan cabinet (Morocco achieved independence in 1956), however, it was illegal for the majority of the armed conflict.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by Istiqlal. However, it is clear that the group was considerably weaker than the French colonial authority.

Newendate: 3/2/1956

Morocco became independent from France on March 2, 1956.

Source:

- Keesing's Contemporary Archives

Chapter 33

ID 48

ID 48

Incompatibility: Territory, Tunisia

Dyad ID 705: France vs. National Liberation Army

France colonized much of North Africa, including Tunisia. In the 1950s, France faced anti-colonial struggles in a number of its North African colonies. In Tunisia, the anti-colonial insurrection was led by fellaghas (or nationalist guerillas) who jointly were sometimes referred to as a National Liberation Army. The fellaghas conducted a series of terrorist attacks against French targets. In 1956, Tunisia gained independence from France and the conflict ended.

Insufficient information for coding purposes

Rebpolwing: no

The fellaghas were militant groups dedicated to promoting Tunisian independence and do not appear to have been affiliated with a political organization.

Rebestimate: 1,600

Rebestlow: 1,200

Rebesthigh: 2,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Keesing's Contemporary Archives of December 11-18, 1954, reported that the French colonial authority estimated the fellaghas had about 1,200 guerillas while the French newspaper Le Monde estimated that they had about 2,000 guerillas.

Newendate: 3/20/1956

On March 20, 1956, France signed an agreement recognizing Tunisia's independence.

Source:

- Keesing's Contemporary Archives

Chapter 34

ID 49

ID 49

Incompatibility: Territory, Algeria

Algeria was the site of one of the bloodiest anti-colonial wars in the world. Algeria was a settler colony and had a large population of Europeans. However, differences between this settler population/colonial authority and the majority Algerian population, which was almost exclusively Islamic, led to grievances. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, a number of political organizations formed and began pushing for independence. In 1954, one of these groups, the National Liberation Front, opened a guerilla campaign aimed at colonial government and military targets. This approach did not achieve much, however, and in 1955 the group switched to a strategy of attacking civilian targets as well. The French colonial authority responded with massive amounts of force and the conflict quickly escalated. By the mid-1950s, Algeria was immersed in a full-scale civil war which would lead to hundreds of thousands of civilian deaths. The main axis of conflict was between the French colonial authority and the FLN, there were other Algerian insurgent groups such as the National Algerian Movement (MNA), however, they were quickly defeated by the main belligerents. The conflict between the FLN and the French army raged for eight years, with the only brief interlude being a cease-fire agreement signed between the FLN and the government in 1961. However, a group of generals based in Algeria rejected the agreement and attacked the FLN there, which led the French government to finally consent to grant independence. In 1962, Algeria became an independent state after enduring an incredibly bloody war.

In October the Revolutionary Committee of Unity and Action (CRUA) renamed itself the National Liberation Front (Front de Libération Nationale–FLN), which assumed responsibility for the political direction of the revolution. The National Liberation Army (Arme de Libération Nationale–ALN), the FLN’s military arm, was to conduct the War of Independence within Algeria. Encouraged by Egypt’s President Gamal Abdul Nasser (r. 1954-71), their role was to gain foreign support for the rebellion and to acquire arms, supplies, and funds. Messali Hadj formed the leftist National Algerian Movement (Mouvement National Algrien– MNA), which advocated a policy of violent revolution and total independence similar to that of the FLN. The ALN subsequently wiped out

the MNA guerrilla operation, and Messali Hadj's movement lost what little influence it had had in Algeria. More than 30,000 rebels were organized in external units that were stationed in Moroccan and Tunisian sanctuaries near the Algerian border.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 707: France vs. FLN

Rebels: FLN

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Leadership was based in Tunis. Troops located in Morocco and Tunisia

Rebsupport: explicit. Arab governments in the region gave moral support to the movement

Rtypesup: endorsement

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The FLN was a political and military organization; however, it was not legal in French Algeria.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 40,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Algeria: A Country Study reports that by 1957 the FLN had almost 40,000 troops.

Terrcont: no

Algeria: A Country Study reports that during the conflict the FLN did gain control of Algerian territory. However, the group was not able to hold any specific piece of territory for very long.

Newendate: 7/3/1962

On July 3, 1962, French President Charles de Gaulle declared Algeria independent.

Sources:

- Library of Congress Country Study
- www.infoplease.com

Dyad ID 709: France vs. MNA

Insufficient information available for this group

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The MNA was a political and military organization; however, it was not legal in French Algeria.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the MNA. However, the group was wiped out by the FLN early in the conflict.

Source:

- Metz, Helen Chapin, ED. (1993). *Algeria: A Country Study*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress

Chapter 35

ID 50

ID 50

Incompatibility: Government,

Dyad ID ?: Argentina vs. Left-wing Groups

In the 1970s, like many of its Latin American counterparts, Argentina faced guerilla warfare from extreme left-wing groups. In Argentina, there were two primary groups-the Revolutionary Workers Party (ERP), a Trotskyite organization, and the Montoneros, a "Peronista" organization. The height of the conflict actually occurred during a brief interlude of democratic rule from 1973 to 1976. Hector Campora, a Peronist, won elections in 1973 but then stepped down and Juan Peron, the former dictator who ruled Argentina from 1945 to 1955, won new elections. Peron died in 1974 and was succeeded by his wife, Isabel, however, she exercised very little control over the army who were the major power in government. Despite the Peronist ties of the Montoneros, the group was opposed to the alignment between Juan Peron and the more conservative elements of his party, and they and the ERP carried out terrorist attacks against the government. In 1976, Isabel Peron was removed by the army and replaced with a military junta that began a series of kidnappings, murders and "disappearings" targeted at suspected leftists. This policy would be referred to as the "dirty war," and was effective at ending the left-wing insurgency. By the end of 1977, both the Montoneros and the ERP had been soundly defeated.

There are two coups in Argentina. The first occurred in 1955, the second in 1963. Create separate entries

Dissatisfaction spread as Peron's grip on Argentina weakened. Peron offered to resign, but the working classes indicated continued support for him by calling a general strike until he promised to remain in office. On September 16, 1955, army revolts against Peron broke out in Cordoba, Rosario, Santa Fe, and Parana; the navy and air force soon joined and threatened to bomb Buenos Aires unless Peron resigned. With the army, navy, and air force converging on the capital, Peron

took refuge on a Paraguayan gunboat anchored in the harbor and later flew to Paraguay and on to exile in Spain. On September 23, 1955, five days after Peron had been ousted, General Eduardo Lonardi (1896-1956) became provisional president.

1955 Coup Rebels: Military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- New York Times Archives

1963 Coup

Much internal fighting took place within the armed forces over whether to allow elections or establish a dictatorship. In late 1962, General Juan Carlos Onganía (1914-), commander in chief of the army, took the position that the armed forces should remove themselves from politics, but other military leaders attempted to assert the political power of the military on the civilian government. The Peronistas were forbidden to run candidates in the 1963 elections, so, in protest, they cast blank ballots as they had in 1957. In the midst of this explosive political situation full of intrigues, secret alliances, street fighting, intimidating methods of the military, and popular unrest, Arturo Umberto Illia (1900-83), a semi-leftist, was elected president.

Rebels: Military faction (Azules)

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- New York Times Archives

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 590: Argentina vs. Military Faction of 1955

Juan Peron became President of Argentina in 1945. In the mid-1950s opposition to his regime increased and by 1955, he faced domestic opposition from members of the military and opposition political groups as well as international pressure from the Vatican. In June, 1955, an internal uprising against Peron's government was quickly suppressed; however, the subsequent stability would prove temporary. On September 16, another insurrection broke out led by officers of the military in the Argentina countryside. Despite the government's insistence that it was effectively containing the militants, within days the military units opposed to the government had captured all of the country outside of Buenos Aires. On September 19, President Peron resigned, and he was subsequently replaced by a military government.

Rebpolwing: no

Although Peron faced domestic political opposition, the military officers who led the coup were not affiliated with a political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: stronger

None of the available sources gave information which would allow for estimating the number of troops on the side of the insurgents. However, it is clear that the majority of the military supported the insurgency.

Source:

- Keesing's Contemporary Archives

Dyad ID 592: Argentina vs. Military Faction of 1963

Argentina experienced a succession of military coups, both attempted and successful, in the 20th century. In April 1963, the military government of Argentina faced a revolt by the navy. The navy revolted in reaction to a government plan to hold elections in June 1963 and to fears that a party loyal to former dictator Juan Peron would gain power. The navy forces launched the revolt against the government on April 2, 1963, but were no match for the army and air force which stayed loyal. By April 3 the revolt had ended, however, an estimated 25 people were killed and several tanks were destroyed in the fighting.

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The revolt was led by the navy which was opposed to elections including a Peronista party, but was not affiliated with a political organization of its own.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops which supported the revolt. However, it is clear that the majority of Argentina's armed forces stayed loyal to the government.

Source:

- New York Times

The Movimiento Peronista Montonero was an Argentinian leftist guerrilla group, active during the 1970s. The group formed around 1970 from the socialist supporters of Juan Domingo Peron. The Montoneros hoped that Peron's would return from exile in Spain and transform Argentina into a "Socialist Fatherland". In May 1974, the Montoneros were expelled from the Justicialist movement by Peron. The ERP was another leftist, anti-Peronist guerilla group. (<http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com>)

Dyad ID 593: Argentina vs. Montoneros

Rebels: Montoneros

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Montoneros were a legal political party until 1974, however, they were banned in that year and so were illegal for most of the conflict.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the Montoneros. However, the group was primarily a terrorist organization and did not have a significant military capacity.

Sources:

- <http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com>
- Keesings

Dyad ID 594: Argentina vs. ERP

Rebels: ERP

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Revolutionary Worker's Party was a political party. However, throughout most of the guerilla warfare it was not a legal political party.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the ERP. However, the group existed primarily through carrying out terrorist attacks and was not a very strong military force.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Torre, Juan Carlos and Liliana de Riz (1991). "Argentina since 1946." In Leslie Bethell, Ed., *The Cambridge History of Latin America Volume VIII: Latin America since 1930 Spanish South America*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- <http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com>

Chapter 36

ID 51

ID 51

Incompatibility: Territory, Cyprus

Dyad ID 710: United Kingdom vs. EOKA

Cyprus is an island with a population that is majority Greek and minority Turkish. In the early 20th century, Cyprus was a colony in the British Empire. In the 1950s, a group of Greek Cypriots led by Archbishop Makarios and generally referred to as the National Union of Cypriot Fighters (EOKA) began pushing for the island to be united with Greece. From 1955 to 1959, EOKA conducted terrorist attacks against British colonial targets and against Turkish Cypriots. By 1959, the conflict had largely petered out and many EOKA operatives had been arrested.

On April 1, 1955, EOKA opened a campaign of violence against British rule in a well-coordinated series of attacks on police, military, and other government installations in Nicosia, Famagusta, Larnaca, and Limassol. Finally in 1959, a settlement was reached, providing for Cypriot independence in 1960.

Rebels: National Union of Cypriot Fighters, EOKA

Transconstsupp: tacit. Sympathy by Greeks in Greece

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

EOKA was a terrorist organization and was not affiliated with a political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by EOKA. However, it is clear that the group was considerably weaker than the British authority.

Sources:

- Keesing's Contemporary Archives
- Onwar.com
- Library of Congress Country Study

Chapter 37

ID 52

ID 52

Incompatibility: Territory, South Vietnam

Dyad ID 614: South Vietnam vs. FLN

North and South Vietnam became independent states in 1954. In the north, a communist government led by the Viet Minh took power (see conflict id 1170). In the south, the government was led by Ngo Dinh Diem who received heavy support from the United States. Almost immediately upon independence, the North Vietnamese government began providing support to various southern Vietnamese communist groups who fought under the banner the National Liberation Front (FLN). Despite the assistance of United States military advisers, the U.S.-trained South Vietnamese army had difficulty defeating the FLN. Additionally, the repressive tactics the Diem government used to respond to the conflict, such as village resettlement programs, led to increased opposition to his government and increased the support of the FLN. Throughout the late 1950s and early 1960s the United States and North Vietnam escalated their involvement in the South Vietnamese conflict to the point where, around 1965, it no longer makes sense to treat the conflict as a civil war in South Vietnam but rather as an interstate war between the United States/South Vietnam and North Vietnam.

This is the same dyad. Consolidate into a single record

After Vietnam gained independence from France, Diem had consolidated his control and conducted a "denounce the communists" campaign, in which, according to communist accounts, 25,000 communist sympathizers were arrested and more than 1,000 killed. The communist leadership in Hanoi decided for the time being to continue to concentrate its efforts on the political struggle. By 1957, however, a shift to a more militant approach to the reunification of the country was apparent. By 1959 some of the 90,000 Viet Minh troops that had returned to the North following the Geneva Agreements had begun filtering back into the South to take up leadership positions in the insur-

gency. On December 20, 1960, the National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam, informally called the National Liberation Front, was founded. President John F. Kennedy's administration decided to increase United States support for the Diem regime. China expressed its full support for the Vietnamese war of national liberation. In 1965, a full scale war between North and South Vietnam erupted.

Rebels: FNL

Transconstsupp: explicit. Communist parties in N. Vietnam directly assisted the rebels

Rebextpart: major. Communist supporters from the north actively took part in the rebellion

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases were located in North Vietnam and Laos

Rebsupport: explicit. Military assistance from N. Vietnam, China, and the USSR.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: Explicit. The US supplied arms, funds, and troops

Gtypesup: troops

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The National Liberation Front was a network of communist organizations in South Vietnam. The group was not a legal political party.

Rebestimate: 40,000

Rebestlow: 6,000

Rebesthigh: 80,000

Rebstrength: parity

The strength of the FLN grew almost linearly across the course of the conflict. In February 1962, Keesing's Record of World Events reported that while the Viet Cong (another name for the FLN) had only had 6,000-7,000 guerillas in 1960 it had 20,000 by the end of 1961. In April 1964, Keesing's Record of World Events reported that the U.S. government estimated that the Viet Cong had about 20,000 "hard-core" guerillas, with an additional 60,000-80,000 irregular forces.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Cima, Ronald J. Ed. (1987). *Vietnam: A Country Study*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress.

Chapter 38

ID 54

ID 54

Incompatibility: Territory (India), Nagaland

NNC was only active from 1956 to 1975. The NSCN was active from 1982 to the present. Update the spreadsheet

Among all the ethnic groups and tribes living in the northeast, the Nagas were the first to raise the banner of revolt against the Indian government. The Naga Nationalist Council voiced its demand for a separate Naga state. The Shillong agreement was signed in November 1975, whereby NNC accepted the Indian constitution and agreed to surrender. A group of about 140 refused to surrender and in 1978 formed a new underground movement, called the National Socialist Council of Nagaland (NSCN). The territory that falls within NSCN's vision of a "greater Nagaland" not only includes the present state of Nagaland, but also parts of Assam, Manipur, Arunachal Pradesh and Myanmar. It has allegedly also received secondary support from sections within Bangladesh, Thailand, Burma and Myanmar. According to the Indian government, NSCN cadres have also been trained by Pakistan's Inter Service Intelligence in Pakistan. These allegations were denied by the Pakistani government.

Dyad ID 286: India vs. NSCN-IM

Rebpolwing: no

The NSCM-IM is a Maoist organization dedicated to violently creating an independent Naga state and is not affiliated with a political organization.

Rebestimate: 2,500

Rebestlow: 600

Rebesthigh: 4,500

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database provides the following estimates for the troop strength of the NSCM-IM: In 1992: 600-1,500; in 1993: 1,500; in 1994, 1995, 1996 and 1997: 1,500-4,500. These estimates are in comparison to over a million troops possessed by the Indian army and over 200,000 troops deployed in Nagaland specifically.

Newstartdate: 7/31/1992

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and the NSCM-IM first reached 25 battledeaths on July 31, 1992.

Newenddate: 8/1/1997

On August 1, 1997, the NSCM-IM signed a ceasefire agreement with the government. Although the conflict has continued at a low level of intensity since the agreement, it has not reached 25 battledeaths in a given year.

Dyad ID 453: India vs. NSCN-K

India faces challenges led by a number of different ethnic groups, particularly in northeastern India. One of these groups is the Naga, and the main groups have been the National Socialist Council of Nagaland (NSCN). This group has been in several factions, including NSCN-IM and NSCN-Kaplang Faction (NSCN-K) which rejects any compromise with India and calls for independence for Nagaland.

Rebel political wing: no

The NSCN-K is only a military organization, not a political party.

Rebel estimate: 2000

Rebel estimate low: 2000

Rebel estimate high: 2000

UCDP estimates that NSCN-K had approximately 2000 troops in 2005.

Rebel strength: Much Weaker

India has a very large military and is clearly much stronger militarily than NSCN-K.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: High

NSCN-K has a clear command structure led by S.S. Khaplang.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The Naga are a fairly large group in this region of India, but NSCN-K is clearly outmatched in its ability to fight or procure arms.

Territorial Control: No

I found no reference to NSCN-K controlling territory in Nagaland.

Conflict Type: secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: Some

UCDP reports that NSCN-K has received some support from Karen groups in Myanmar.

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

There was no evidence of NSCN-K receiving any support from external states in this period.

Government Support: No

Government External Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Troops

Name of Government Supporters: Myanmar

The UCDP reports that Myanmar uses its military against the NSCN-K's forces.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

The government-NSCN-K dyad did not reach 25 battle deaths for several years after 2007.

Source:

- UCDP

Dyad ID 711: India vs. NNC

India has faced a number of insurgencies from groups seeking to gain more autonomy, up to secession, from the state. One of the earliest of these insurgencies broke out in the Naga region of northeast India. The Naga are a minority group that straddle the border of India with Myanmar. Many Naga throughout India's independent history have pushed for greater freedom for the region. In 1947, the Naga Underground Rebels (NNC) launched an armed struggle against the Indian government to push for autonomy for the region. The conflict escalated in the 1950s and in 1963, India agreed to set up a Naga state within India. The conflict continued, however, into the 1970s when the NNC finally signed a peace agreement with the Indian government.

Despite this agreement, some members of the NNC remained dedicated to the armed struggle. In 1978, a new organization, the Naga Socialist Council of Nagaland (NSCN) was formed dedicated to an independent state that controlled all territories claimed by the Naga (which included parts of neighboring Myanmar and parts of India outside of Naga state) that would have a government based on the philosophy of Mao Tse Tung. The NSCN split into two groups shortly after its inception, with the faction led by Isaac Swu and T. Muivah being the most dominant (NSCN-IM). The conflict between the Indian government and the NSCN-IM remained at a low level of intensity until the early 1990s when it heated up again. In 1992, the NSCN-IM launched a larger offensive

that pushed the conflict over 25 battledeaths in one year for the first time. In addition to its battles with the Indian government, the NSCN-IM has also targeted violence against members of other ethnic groups living in Naga state in an attempt to ethnically cleanse the region.

In the 1990s, the Indian government opened a series of negotiations with the NSCN-IM. In 1997, the group signed a ceasefire. Sporadic violence has continued since then, but at a lower level of intensity and has not generated 25 battledeaths in a given year.

For many years, the Naga National Council (NNC) under Angami Zapu Phizo, and with Chinese and the then undivided Pakistan support, fought a bitter war for Naga independence. <http://www.globalsecurity.org>

Insufficient information for coding purposes

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The NNC was a military organization dedicated to forcing the Indian government to grant greater autonomy and was not affiliated with a political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the NNC. However, it is clear that the group was considerably weaker than the Indian government.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Onwar.com
- Minorities at Risk Group Profiles

Chapter 39

ID 56

ID 56

Incompatibility: Territory (Burma/Myanmar), Karenni

Dyad ID 311: Burma vs. Karenni National Progressive Party

The Karenni are a small minority group in Myanmar (formerly Burma) that is related to the Karen ethnic group. Since Burma achieved independence in 1948, Karenni groups have campaigned for Karenni self-determination. In 1957, the Karenni National Progressive Party was formed and it began waging an armed campaign for self-determination. The group was marginal militarily; however, it has for more than forty years been politically active on behalf of the Karenni and also has supported other Burmese insurgent groups representing the Karen and Shan ethnic groups. In 1992 and 1996, the KNPP staged larger scale attacks but with the exception of these rare occurrences the conflict between the KNPP and the government has not reached 25 battledeaths in any other year.

In 1957, the KNPP was founded by Saw Maw Reh, who started a short-term insurgency. The Karenni demand broad autonomy from the central government.

***(sources consulted: U [only has information for post1989 period], NYT, L, K, <http://www.myanmar.com>

Insufficient information for coding purposes

Notes on Coding

Period 1: 1957

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The KNPP has acted as a political organization throughout its participation in the conflict.

Rebestimate: 500

Rebestlow: 300

Rebesthigh: 700

Rebstrength: much weaker

Frentholm (1993) writes that the Karenni resistance movement in the 1950s consisted of "several hundred armed men."

Period 2: 1987

Rebel political wing: explicit link

Rebel political wing legal: no

The Karenni National Progressive Party (KNPP) operated as both a political and a military organization.

Rebel estimate: 1000

Rebel estimate low: 1000

Rebel estimate high: 1000

UCDP does not give an estimate for the number of troops possessed by KNPP in 1987. However, in 1992 it estimates that the group had 1000 so I use that estimate here.

Rebel strength: Much Weaker

KNPP was a small group and clearly much weaker than the Myanmar army in this period.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

KNPP had a command structure that generally coordinated the activities of the organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

KNPP represented the Karenni who were a large group in the area they operated. It was outmatched by the Myanmar government in its ability to fight or procure arms.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Parts of Karenni region

Level of effective territorial control: moderate

The KNPP controlled territory in the Karenni region of Myanmar which the government had difficulty accessing.

Conflict Type: secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

There was no evidence of KNPP receiving any external support in this period.

Government Support: No

Government External Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Name of Government Supporters: China

The UCDP reports that China supported the government in this period.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

The government-KNPP dyad did not reach 25 battle deaths for several years after 1987.

Period 3: 1992, 1996

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The KNPP has acted as a political organization throughout its participation in the conflict.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 1,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 1995 and 1996 the KNPP had about 1,000 fighters.

This estimate is in comparison to approximately 300,000 troops possessed by the Myanmar army.

Period 4: 2005

Rebel political wing: explicit link

Rebel political wing legal: no

The Karenni National Progressive Party (KNPP) operated as both a political and a military organization.

Rebel estimate: 1400

Rebel estimate low: 800

Rebel estimate high: 2000

UCDP estimates that the KNPP had between 800 and 2000 troops in 2005.

Rebel strength: Much Weaker

KNPP was a small group and clearly much weaker than the Myanmar army in this period.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

KNPP had a command structure that generally coordinated the activities of the organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

KNPP represented the Karenni who were a large group in the area they operated. It was outmatched by the Myanmar government in its ability to fight or procure arms.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Parts of Karenni region

Level of effective territorial control: moderate

The KNPP controlled territory in the Karenni region of Myanmar which the government had difficulty accessing.

Conflict Type: secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

There was no evidence of KNPP receiving any external support in this period.

Government Support: No

Government External Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Name of Government Supporters: China

The UCDP reports that China supported the government in this period.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

The government-KNPP dyad did not reach 25 battle deaths for several years after 1987.

Sources:

- UCDP

Chapter 40

ID 57

ID 57

Incompatibility: Territory, Cameroon

Dyad ID 713: France vs. UPC

Cameroon was divided between colonial powers during the colonial period. About 80% of Cameroon was controlled by the French with additional territories in the southern and northern region controlled by the British. In the aftermath of World War II, as nationalism was increasing across African colonies, a Cameroon political party, the Union of the Populations of Cameroon (UPC), began pushing for full independence and reunification of the Cameroon territories. In the 1950s, France started the process of independence for Cameroon but the colonial powers were reluctant on unification, and the UPC began waging guerilla warfare. In 1960, Cameroon became independent and the following year the southern British Cameroon territory was unified (the northern region voted to join with Nigeria). However, the rebellion did not end upon independence as the UPC continued to present an armed challenge to the Cameroon government.

Following World War II, nationalist movements began to press for independence. The Union des Populations Camerounaises (UPC) was the most radical party. It was allegedly a Communist group. In 1960 Cameroon gained independence.

Rebels: UPC

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. Some reports that rebels had crossed the border into Nigeria (still under British control)

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The UPC was a political movement. However, its political organization operated primarily in exile during the guerilla war.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the UPC. However, it is clear that the group was considerably weaker than the French army deployed in the colony.

Newendate: 1/1/1960

On January 1, 1960, Cameroon became an independent state and so this conflict should no longer be treated as a civil war with France as the Side A actor.

Sources:

- Eyongetah, Tambi and Robert Brain (1974). *A History of the Cameroon*. London: Longman.
- New York Times Archives
- www.infoplease.com
- <http://www.ambafrance-cm.org/lmth/camero/histor/camfr1p.htm>
- <http://www.gamji.com/nowa49.htm>

Chapter 41

ID 59

ID 59

Incompatibility: Territory, Morocco/Mauritania

Dyad ID 715: France and Spain vs. National Liberation Army

Much of northwestern Africa was colonized by France, including Morocco and Mauritania. However, Spain colonized the western Saharan region, an area that has been the sight of conflict for the last fifty years (see conflict id 2350). In the 1950s, as the colonial era was winding down, the French North African colonies were granted more independence, Spain, however, held onto Western Sahara into the 1970s. As Morocco moved toward independence, the National Liberation Army which had struggled against France for independence was transformed into the army of the state. However, some members of the National Liberation Army remained outside of the control of the government and continued to struggle against the colonial presence in north Africa. The National Liberation Army fought for the independence of the Spanish Saharan colonies and their integration with Morocco. The Spanish and French army conducted joint military operations against the insurgents and by 1958 the National Liberation Army had been defeated. This conflict took place on Moroccan, Mauritanian and Spanish Saharan territory.

Ifni was ceded by Morocco to Spain in 1860, but Spanish administration was nominal until 1934; from then until 1958 its capital, Sidi Ifni, was the residence of the governor-general of Spanish Sahara. Border clashes between Spanish and Moroccan troops occurred in 1957. Spain returned Ifni to Morocco in 1969.

Insufficient information about this conflict for coding purposes. Consulted NYT, Onwar.com

In 1956 and 1957, Mauritanian and Moroccan members of the Army of Liberation (Arme de Liberation-AL), the military wing of the Mauritanian National Liberation Front headquartered in Morocco, raided Mauritania's northern region. With no military forces of its own to defend the frontiers, the preindependence transition government called on France for aid. In February 1958,

a joint Franco-Spanish land-air operation destroyed the AL in the Spanish Sahara and stopped the southward infiltration of Moroccan supported guerrillas. (www.encyclopedia.com)

Rebels: National Liberation Army/Front

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: major. Local Mauritians were assisted by a large contingent of Moroccan fighters

Rebpresosts: extensive. Fighters were mainly located in Morocco

Rebsupport: explicit. Morocco had territorial claims to parts of Mauritania. Gave explicit backing to the insurgents

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: explicit. Spain assisted France in police operations

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The National liberation Army was not a political organization.

Rebestimate: 5,000

Rebestlow: 4,500

Rebesthigh; 5,500

Rebstrength: weaker

In December 1957, Keesing's Record of World Events reported that the National Liberation army was "estimated to number between 4,500 and 5,500 men."

Newendate: 3/1/1958

Keesing's Record of World Events reported in June 1958 that on March 1 the Spanish army announced that the conflict had ended.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Library of Congress Country Study
- New York Times Archives

Chapter 42

ID 60

ID 60

Incompatibility: Territory, Morocco/Spanish territories

Dyad ID 716: Spain vs. NLA

TBA

Chapter 43

ID 61

ID 61

Incompatibility: Territory, Oman

Dyad ID 607: Muscat and Oman, United Kingdom vs. State of Oman/Free Oman

The Persian Gulf state of Muscat and Oman was independent in the 1950s but the sultan of Muscat and Oman had close treaty relations with the United Kingdom. Prior to 1955, the province of Oman within Muscat and Oman had been outside of the sultan's control and ruled as a de-facto state by the Imam of Oman, Sheikh Ghalib bin Ali. In 1955, the Sultan's forces, supported by the United Kingdom, were able to expel bin Ali and his supporters and to establish control over the province. In the summer of 1957, however, the ex-Imam returned to Oman and led a rebellion against the sultan aimed at the creation of an independent state of Oman. The insurrection was unsuccessful, however, as the United Kingdom provided ground troops and air support to supplement the sultan's forces and the Imam and his supporters were quickly defeated, and control of the province was restored to the sultan.

A historical split between coast and interior had continued through the second half of the nineteenth century and the first part of the twentieth. The dispute between the two groups was exacerbated by the exploration for oil, which began in Oman in 1924. When the oil men went inland to explore, they were attacked by the tribes, whom the sultan considered to be rebels. In 1957 forces loyal to Said ibn Taimur captured the town of Nazwah, which the Al Said had not controlled since the nineteenth century.

Rebels: State of Oman

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. Leadership was originally based in Saudi Arabia. The exiled spiritual leader of the group was residing in S. Arabia

Rebsupport: explicit endorsement, and alleged military support by Saudi Arabia and Egypt. Saudi Arabia had interests in Oil discovered in Oman

Rtypesup: endorsement (known), military, alleged. There were some British allegations that Saudi Arabia was supplying arms

Govsupport: explicit. British troops led the counter-insurgency campaign

Gtypesup: troops

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The rebellion in Oman was led by the former leader of the province, who had run it as a de-facto state. His government was not recognized by the sultan or the United Kingdom, however.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the insurgents. However, it is clear that they were no match for the British forces which supported the sultan's army.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Villages of Oman Province

Effterrcont: low

The insurgents were able to gain control of some villages in Oman province in the brief war. However, they did not hold them for long.

Newendate: 8/12/1957

Keesing's Record of World Events in August 1957 reported that, "By August 11-12, the Sultan's authority had been fully restored in the affected areas, the rebel leaders were in flight, and a number of small towns and villages formerly in rebel hands had been reoccupied by the British and Sultanate forces."

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- New York Times Archives
- Library of Congress Country Study

Chapter 44

ID 62

ID 62

Incompatibility: Government, Iraq

Dyad ID 298: Iraq vs. SAIRI

In the 1980s and 1990s, the secularist Iraqi government of Saddam Hussein was challenged by a variety of Shi'i groups who were dedicated to overthrowing his regime and replacing it with an Islamist government. Many of these groups fought under the banner of an umbrella organization, the Supreme Assembly for the Islamic Revolution in Iraq (SAIRI). The leadership of SAIRI was based in Iran and received much support from the Iranian government. The conflict between SAIRI and the Iraqi government continued at a low-level during the 1980s but following the government's defeat in the Persian Gulf War of 1991, SAIRI stepped up attacks against the regime. The Hussein regime proved resilient, however, and SAIRI was unsuccessful in its attempts to take power. The conflict continued at a moderate intensity through 1996, and sporadic fighting between the government and SAIRI occurred leading up to Saddam Hussein's removal by the United States in 2003.

The Supreme Assembly/Council for the Islamic Revolution in Iraq (SAIRI/SCIRI) was the main Shi'i opposition coalition in Iraq during the reign of Saddam Hussein. Following different forms of persecution of members of Islamic movements Ayatollah Sayed Al-Hakim left Iraq in 1980. From his refuge in Iran he had a leading role in the creation of SCIRI on 17 November 1982. Ever since the 1982 creation of SCIRI, Iran has allowed it to be based in Tehran and has supported it with arms and financial aid.⁰

Rebels: SAIRI

Transconstsupp: tacit. Sympathy by Shiite groups in the region, esp. Iran

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. The organization was primarily based in Iran

Rebsupport: explicit. Iran harbors and aids SAIRI

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

SAIRI was a coalition of Shi'i Islamist group opposed to the Hussein regime based in Iran and did not represent a single political organization.

Rebestimate: 4,000

Rebestlow: 2,000

Rebesthigh: 8,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database provides the following estimates for the troop strength of SAIRI: In 1991: 4,000-8,000; in 1992, 1993, 1994 and 1995: 2,000-4,000; in 1996: 4,000. These estimates are in comparison to over 300,000 troops possessed by the Iraqi army.

Centcont: no

SAIRI was an umbrella organization and was made up of several factions.

Source:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>

Iraq Civil War following U.S. Invasion

The United States invaded Iraq in 2003 to overthrow the government of Saddam Hussein and established a new government in its wake. Not long after the overthrow, the U.S. and the new government faced a large-scale insurgency involving a proliferation of groups. Of these, there were four main insurgent groups. Ansar-al-Islam was a Sunni-led organization that had battled with Kurds in northern Iraq and was opposed to both the U.S. presence and its Iraqi allies. It fought against the U.S. and Iraqi government from 2004 to 2007 when it lost many of its fighters to other groups or to local paramilitary forces organized by the Iraqi government. Jama'at al-Tawhid wa'al-Jihad /ISI was an organization allegedly led by Abu Mus'ab al-Zarqawi that allied itself with Al Qaeda and continued to battle the Iraqi government into 2010. The Islamic Army of Iraq (IAI) and the Reformation and Jihad Front (RJF) were also groups dedicated to pushing a Sunni agenda in Iraq, but opposed to the tactics of ISI, particularly the targeting of civilians. In addition to these Sunni organizations, the Al-Madhi Army was a Shia organization led by Muqtada al-Sadr that was

opposed to the U.S. occupation. It participated in a violent insurgency through 2008 but has been generally peaceful since then.

Dyad ID 442: Iraq vs. Al-Mahdi Army

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: Yes

The Al-Mahdi Army is the military organization led by Muqtada al-Sadr. Jamaat al-Sadr al-Thani is the political organization, which has seats in the Iraqi parliament.

Rebel estimate: 60,000

Rebel estimate (low): 6,000

Rebel estimate (high): 60,000

In 2004, UCDP estimates that the Al-Mahdi army had 6,000 troops; in 2008 it estimated that it had 60,000.

Rebel strength: Weaker

The Al-Mahdi Army was clearly weaker than the Iraqi government and U.S. forces, but was a formidable force, significantly larger than the other insurgent groups.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Low

Clearly, the Al-Mahdi army was led by Al-Sadr. However, it was unclear as the conflict wore on how much influence he had over its members.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The Al-Mahdi army had some substantial popular support. Its ability to mobilize weapons and engage in conventional warfare, however, was greatly outmatched by the Iraqi government.

Territorial Control: Yes

Territory Name: Sadr City

Level of effective territorial control: Low

The Al-Mahdi Army has provided public services in the Sadr City area of Baghdad.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Alleged

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External Supporters: Iran

There are allegations that Iran provides military support to the Al-Mahdi Army.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: United States, United Kingdom, many others

The Iraqi government was backed by a large international coalition led by the United States.

Non-state military support to Government: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Other

Al-Sadr suspended all operations of the Al-Mahdi Army on August 28, 2008.

Source:

- UCDP

Dyad ID 443: Iraq vs. Ansar al-Islam

Rebpolwing: No

Ansar al-Islam is primarily a military organization dedicated to overthrowing the government and does not have a political wing.

Rebel estimate: 1,600

Rebel estimate (low): 1,600

Rebel estimate (high): 1,600

The UCDP estimates that Ansar al-Islam had about 1,600 troops in 2005.

Rebel strength: Much Weaker

The Iraqi military, backed up by more than 100,000 U.S. troops, is clearly much stronger than Ansar al-Islam, which primarily carries out attacks against civilians and terrorist activities.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

It was unclear exactly what the leadership structure of Ansar al-Islam was, but the leaders did generally appear to control the organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

Ansar al-Islam had relatively little popular support within Iraq and its ability to obtain weapons and to fight conventional warfare is much weaker than the government and its allies.

Territorial Control: No

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

There are no known state or non-state sponsors of Ansar al-Islam.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: United States, United Kingdom, many others

The Iraqi government was backed by a large international coalition led by the United States.

Non-state military support to Government: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

The Iraqi government-Ansar al-Islam dyad has not reached 25 battledeaths in a calendar year since 2007.

Dyad ID 448: Iraq vs. ISI/Jamaat Al-Tawhid wa Al-Jihad

Period 1: 2004-2005

Rebpolwing: No

The ISI is primarily a military organization dedicated to Jihad and overthrowing the government and does not have a political wing.

Rebel estimate: 1,500

Rebel estimate (low): 1,500

Rebel estimate (high): 1,500

The UCDP estimates that ISI had about 1,500 troops in this period.

Rebel strength: Much Weaker

The Iraqi military, backed up by more than 100,000 U.S. troops, is clearly much stronger than the ISI, which primarily carries out attacks against civilians and terrorist activities.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The ISI leadership is secretive, but does appear to control the organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The ISI had relatively little popular support within Iraq and its ability to obtain weapons and to fight conventional warfare is much weaker than the government and its allies.

Territorial Control: No

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: Yes

Rebel External Support: Major

ISI is alleged to have received support from Al Qaeda.

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

There are no known state sponsors of ISI.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: United States, United Kingdom, many others

The Iraqi government was backed by a large international coalition led by the United States.

Non-state military support to Government: No

Period 2: 2006-2007

Rebel estimate: 2,000

The UCDP estimates that ISI had 2,000 troops in this period.

Territorial Control: Yes

Territory Name: Al-Anbar Province

Level of effective territorial control: Moderate

By 2006, ISI had essentially gained full control over Al-Anbar Province, where Iraqi governmental institutions were entirely absent.

Period 3: 2008-2009

Territorial Control: No

In 2007, the U.S. shifted strategy toward Sunni elders in Al-Anbar Province and by 2008 the province was no longer controlled by ISI.

Ended?: No

The Iraqi government-ISI dyad continued in 2010.

Dyad ID 578: Iraq vs. RJF/Al-Jaysh al-Islami fi Iraq

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing legal: Yes

The Iraqi Resistance Political Council (IRPC) is the political wing of RJF/IAI and it has negotiated with both the U.S. authorities and the Iraqi government.

Rebel estimate: 2,000

Rebel estimate (low): 2,000

Rebel estimate (high): 2,000

The UCDP estimates that RJF/IAI had about 2,000 troops in 2005.

Rebel strength: Much Weaker

The Iraqi military, backed up by more than 100,000 U.S. troops, is clearly much stronger than Ansar al-Islam, which primarily carries out attacks against civilians and terrorist activities.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Low

The RJF/IAI was an umbrella organization, but exercised some control over its constituent parts.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

RJF/IAI had little ability to conduct conventional warfare and relatively low ability to mobilize supporters.

Territorial Control: No

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

There are no known state or non-state sponsors of Ansar al-Islam.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: United States, United Kingdom, many others

The Iraqi government was backed by a large international coalition led by the United States.

Non-state military support to Government: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

The Iraqi government-RJF/IAI dyad has not reached 25 battledeaths in a calendar year since 2007.

Dyad ID 717: Iraq vs. Military Faction of 1958

***Iraq versus military faction. There were two coups, 1958 and 1963. However, the spreadsheet lists this as one long coup. Instead, break into two events.

1958 Coup

The Hashimite monarchy was overthrown on July 14, 1958, in a swift, predawn coup executed by officers of the Nineteenth Brigade under the leadership of Brigadier Abd al Karim Qasim and Colonel Abd as Salaam Arif. Colonel Arif led a battalion into Baghdad and immediately proclaimed a new republic and the end of the old regime. The July 14 Revolution met virtually no opposition.

Rebels: military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: explicit. Egypt quickly recognized the new government. Support was mainly endorsement

Rtypesup: endorsement

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

On July 14, 1958, the King of Iraq and his government were overthrown in a military coup d'etat. A "Republican Government" was immediately formed by the coup plotters which included a broad spectrum of political parties. The coup d'etat was swift and encountered no resistance from members of the military.

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

While the coup d'etat was led by the military, it was directly affiliated with nationalist political figures in the country, as evidenced by their participation in the government formed immediately after.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much stronger

It is not clear how many soldiers and officers participated in the coup d'etat. However, the coup plotters encountered virtually no resistance from the military and were able to quickly overthrow the government.

Sources:

- Keesing's Contemporary Archives
- Library of Congress
- New York Times Archives

Dyad ID 718: Iraq vs. Military Faction (forces of Abdul Wahab al-Shawaf)

On March 7, 1959, the army garrison at Mosul mutinied and declared itself the legitimate government of Iraq. The attempted coup d'état was based on dissatisfaction with the perceived left-wing policies of the current government. The coup attempt was unsuccessful, the leader of the coup, Colonel Abdul Wahab al-Sharawaf was killed on March 9 and loyal army troops entered and captured the garrison the next day.

In March 1959, a group of disgruntled Free Officers, who came from conservative, well-known, Arab Sunni families and who opposed Qasim's increasing links with the communists, attempted a coup. Aware of the planned coup, Qasim had his communist allies mobilize 250,000 of their supporters in Mosul. The ill-planned coup attempt never really materialized and, in its aftermath, the communists massacred nationalists and some well-to-do Mosul families.

Rebels: Nationalists

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The military officers at Mosul received some support from local tribesmen (as well as external support from Syria) but do not seem to have been affiliated with a specific Iraqi political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the garrison at Mosul. However, it is clear that the group that mutinied was no match for the Iraqi government.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events

- Library of Congress Country Study

Dyad ID 719: Iraq vs. Military Faction of 1963

Conflict Summary: In 1963, the government of Iraq was ruled by the Baathist Party, an international party which also controlled the Syrian government and was dedicated to promoting Arab unity. The Baathist party was divided into factions, primarily between moderate Baathists, who preferred Arab unity, and extreme Baathists who believed that radical economic transformation should take precedence before unity. By November, 1963, the Iraqi government was polarized by the division between these elements. On November 18, 1963, a coup d'etat led by the President's brother and allegedly supported by the President overthrow the existing government and replaced it with a government made up of moderate Baathists and military officers.

1963 Coup

With its party ranks weakened, the Baath was overthrown by Arif and a coterie of military officers in a bloodless coup in November 1963. Upon assuming power, Arif immediately announced that the armed forces would manage the country. The governing core consisted of Arif; his brother, Abd ar Rahman Arif; and his trusted colleague, Colonel Said Slaibi.

Rebels: military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

Although the new government formed by the coup plotters included moderate Baathists, it appears that the coup was primarily a reaction against governmental deadlock rather than being directly affiliated with the moderate Baathist elements.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: stronger

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the coup plotters. However, it is clear that the majority of the military supported, or at least did not oppose, the coup.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Library of Congress Country Study

Dyad ID 720: Iraq vs. NCRC

Iraq-Coup of February 1963

On February 8 1963 a group of air force officers, working with the Iraqi Baath Party, committed a coup d'état killing President Qasim. A new government was formed (the National Council of the Revolutionary Command, or NCRC), although a coup occurred months later due to deadlock within the government.

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: No

The NCRC was directly affiliated with the Iraqi Baath Party, which Keesing's Record of World Events reports operated underground.

Rebestimate: Missing

Rebstrength: Stronger

No estimate was given of the number of troops loyal to the coup, but it was clear that the majority of the military supported the coup.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The coup was led by a central command, however, there were divisions within the NCRC as well.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: High

Fighting Capacity: High

It is unclear that the NCRC drew from large levels of popular support, however, with the backing of the air force they had superior arms and fighting capacity.

Territorial Control: No

The coup plotters did not control any territory before they successfully executed the coup.

Conflict Type: Coup d'état

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

Government Support: No

Non-state military support to Government: No

Although the Baath movement was a pan-Arab movement that existed in other countries, there was no reference to external support to either side.

Ended? Yes

Type of Termination: Victory

Victory Side: B

The coup was successful.

Sources:

- UCDP database
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 45

ID 63

ID 63

Incompatibility: Government, Lebanon

Remove entries for Syria and Israel

Dyad ID 376: Lebanon vs. Lebanese Army

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Lebanese Army was fighting on behalf of Prime Minister Aoun, who led one of the two competing governments at this time. This government was not recognized by the other government.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 20,000

Rebstrength: stronger

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that the Lebanese Army had 20,000 troops in 1989. The government, in comparison, had 9,000 troops on its side.

Newstartdate: 3/15/1989

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that the conflict between the government and the Lebanese Army first reached 25 battledeaths on March 15, 1989.

Newenddate: 10/13/1990

In 1990, Syria attacked the Lebanese Army and defeated it by October.

Dyad ID 383: Lebanon vs. Lebanese Forces

Territorial Conflict: No

The Lebanese conflict was over government, not territory.

Rebel Political Wing: No

This group was a faction of the military opposed to the President but not directly affiliated with a political organization.

Rebel estimate: 6,000

Rebel estimate low: 6,000

Rebel estimate high: 6,000

Rebel strength: Parity

The Lebanese army is estimated to have 9,000 troops in this period, which is similar to the size of the Lebanese Forces

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: High

This military faction was well organized and led by Samir Gaega.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

This faction had comparable popular support and military capacity to the government.

Territorial Control: No

This faction did not appear to control territory.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: explicit

Type of Rebel Support: military

Name of Rebel Supporters: Iraq

UCDP reports that Iraq provided weapons to the Lebanese Forces.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Troops

Name of Government Supporters: Syria

Syria had 30,000 troops in Lebanon at this point.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Ceasefire

On September 23, 1989, various groups in Lebanon signed a ceasefire.

Source:

- UCDP

Dyad ID 570: Lebanon vs. Independent Nasserite Movement/Mouribiton Militia

In May 1958, a major insurrection broke out in Lebanon against the government. While there were several different factions involved in the fighting, in general the conflict arose out of dissatisfaction with the pro-Western policies of the current government. The conflict quickly spread throughout much of the countryside and much of Lebanon was in a state of civil war through the end of July. In July, the United States landed 10,000 marines in the country, and new elections were held. A new President was elected and a coalition cabinet was formed which included many of the opposition leaders, and the civil war ended.

Pro-Nasser demonstrations grew in number and in violence until a full-scale rebellion was underway. Shamun, realizing the gravity of his situation, summoned the ambassadors of the United States, Britain, and France on the morning of July 14. He requested immediate assistance, insisting that the independence of Lebanon was in jeopardy. United States forces began arriving in Lebanon by mid-afternoon of July 15 and played a symbolic rather than an active role.

Rebels: Nasserite Movement

Transconstsupp: tacit. Sympathy by Arab nationalist parties in the ME.

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: alleged. Shamun claimed that the Nasserites were receiving Soviet support, but this has not been substantiated.

Rtypesup: military, alleged.

Govsupport: Explicit. The US sent troops and assistance to support the government

Gtypesup: troops

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The leaders of the insurrection were opposed to the pro-Western policies of the Lebanese government; however, it does not appear that they were affiliated with any specific political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: parity

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the

rebels. However, they were able to quickly seize large areas of territory and the imposition of a United States military force was needed to end the conflict.

Centcont: no

Keesing's Contemporary Archives that the insurrection had three different leaders who commanded the forces in various areas of Lebanon.

Source:

- Keesing's Contemporary Archives
- Library of Congress Country Studies
- www.infoplease.com

Dyad ID 722: Lebanon vs. Lebanese National Movement

This conflict is best split into two periods. The first period covers the initial Lebanese civil war between 1975 and 1976. The second period covers the conflict after it reignited in 1982 until its resolution in 1989.

Period 1: 1975-1976

Rebpolwing: no

The Lebanese National Movement was a loose coalition of Muslim organizations and was not affiliated with a political organization.

Rebestimate: 35,000

Rebestlow: 25,000

Rebesthigh: 45,000

Rebstrength: parity

Lebanon: a country study reports that the National Movement forces in 1975-1976 were fewer than 30,000 and that they were sometimes allied with 20,000 Palestinian forces. For that reason, the low estimate is 25,000 and the high estimate is the 25,000 plus the 20,000 Palestinian forces, with the best estimate being halfway in between.

Centcont: no

The Lebanese National Movement was only a loose alliance of a broad range of groups and did not have a central command structure.

Newendate: 10/16/1976

An Arab peace conference was held on October 16, 1976 in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia which produced a peace agreement.

Period 2: 1982-1989

Rebpolwing: no

The Lebanese National Movement was a loose coalition of Muslim organizations and was not affiliated with a political organization.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 40,000

Rebstrength: stronger

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimates that in 1986, 1987 and 1988, the Lebanese National Movement had approximately 40,000 troops. This estimate is in comparison to 15,000 troops possessed by the government.

Newendate: 9/30/1989

In September 1989, the major parties to the conflict signed a peace agreement.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Onwar.com
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks
- Collelo, Thomas, Ed. (1987). *Lebanon: a country study*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress.

Dyad ID 723: Lebanon vs. LAA/Lebanese Arab Army

Rebel Political Wing: No

The LAA was primarily a military organization without a political wing.

Rebel estimate: 4,000

Rebel estimate (low): 4,000

Rebel estimate (high): 4,000

UCDP estimates that the LAA had 4,000 troops in 1976.

Rebel strength: Parity

The Lebanese army forces loyal to the government totaled only about 1,000, but the President also had 7,000 militia forces on his side. This force was not substantially larger than that of the LAA.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: High

The LAA was led by Lieutenant Ahmed Katib and was generally a disciplined force.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

Lebanon in this period was divided among a variety of groups (including the government) that had some popular support. This insurgent group, arising out of the army, had access to the same level of arms and fighting capacity as the forces still loyal to the government.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: half of Lebanon

Effective territorial control: Moderate

UCDP reports that the LAA controlled half of Lebanon at its height.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

UCDP reports no external support for the LAA.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Troops

Names of Government Supporters: Syria

Syria had 12,000 troops present in Lebanon in 1976.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Ceasefire

On October 22, 1976, a ceasefire came into effect which included LAA.

Dyad ID 724: Lebanon vs. Amal

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: Yes

Amal was the military wing associated with the Shiite political organization Movement of the Disinherited.

Rebel estimate: 14,000

Rebel estimate (low): 14,000

Rebel estimate (high): 14,000

UCDP estimates that Amal had 14,000 troops in 1984.

Rebel strength: Weaker

The Lebanese army had about 33,000 troops in this period, so considerably more than Amal.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: High

Amal was a disciplined military organization with a clear command structure.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

Amal represented Lebanese Shiites, who were a significant group in Lebanon. The group had less access to arms and fighting capacity than the Lebanese government.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: parts of Beirut

Effective territorial control: Moderate

Amal operated out of Shia slums in Beirut.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

UCDP reports no external support for Amal.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Troops

Names of Government Supporters: France, United States

The United States and France had troops present in Lebanon in 1983-1984.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Continuation as another dyad

On July 2, 1985, Amal and the LNM joined together to form the NUF.

Dyad ID 725: Lebanon vs. NUF

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: Yes

The NUF was led by Kamal Jumblatt of the Progressive Socialist Party, and also included other political organizations.

Rebel estimate: unclear

UCDP reports that it is unclear how many troops the NUF had, but that Amal alone had 14,000.

Rebel strength: Parity

The various military elements of the NUF together approached the Lebanese army in military might.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The NUF had a clear command structure, but was a coalition of organizations.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

The NUF had quite a bit of popular support in Lebanon and, due to foreign support, the ability to procure arms.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: parts of Lebanon and Beirut

Effective territorial control: Moderate

Amal operated out of Shia slums in Beirut and the other elements of the NUF controlled some territory.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of rebel support: Military

Name of supporters: Syria

UCDP reports that Syria provided support to the NUF in 1985.

Government Support: No

The UCDP reports no support to the Lebanese government in this period.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

The government-NUF dyad did not reach 25 battledeaths after 1986.

Dyad ID 726: Lebanon vs. Lebanese Forces - Hobeika faction

Rebel Political Wing: No

This group was a faction of the military opposed to the President and not affiliated with a political organization.

Rebel estimate: unclear

Rebel strength: weaker

It is unclear how many troops supported Hobeika, but it was clearly weaker than those loyal to the army as a whole.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: High

This military faction was well organized and led by Hobeika.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

This faction had little popular support, but as part of the regular military had comparable fighting capacity and ability to procure arms.

Territorial Control: No

This faction did not appear to control territory.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

UCDP reports that no external support to Hobeika's forces.

Government Support: No

The UCDP reports no support to the Lebanese government in this period.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Victory

Victory Side: A

Hobeika's forces were defeated by the rest of the Lebanese army.

Chapter 46

ID 64

ID 64

Incompatibility: Government, Malaysia

Dyad ID 585: Malaysia vs. Communist Party of Malaya

When Malaya achieved independence on August 31, 1957, the country had already experienced a nine year guerilla insurgency led by the Communist Party of Malaya (see conflict id 1310). The conflict continued for three years after independence. However, by 1957, the government/UK forces had gained the upper hand and the communist insurgents were on the run. The new government offered an amnesty to "terrorists" and a number of the communist forces surrendered, hurting the insurgents even further. By 1960, the communists had been completely defeated and driven into Thailand.

The communist threat subsided for the next fourteen years, however, it did not completely go away. The Communist Party of Malaya continued to try to build a following and received ideological support from China, who broadcast anti-Malaysian government messages into the country. In 1974 and 1975, encouraged by other communist victories in Asia, a strengthened Communist Party of Malaya launched a new set of attacks. They were unsuccessful in overthrowing the government, however, it became clear that the communist influence in Malaysia had increased as numerous communist sympathizers were found throughout the society, including in the Malay population which had previously been anti-communist. The Communist Party of Malaya continued to launch attacks against the government but the conflict did not generate 25 battledeaths per year any year except for 1981, when the Malaysian government claimed to have killed 63 communist guerillas in the countryside.

These records refer to the sam group. Consolidate into a single record. Note: there are three periods of fighting listed in Uppsala/PRIO data, 1958-1960; 1974-75, and 1981. This data refers only to the 1958-1960 conflict. Insufficient information was found for later events.

The rural poor Chinese supported the MPAJA and its successor organization, the Malayan Communist Party (MCP), which was created in 1948 and soon after launched its insurgency (1948-1960). The conflict began during the British colonial administration (see entry for Malaysia below). The newly independent state of Malaysia "inherited" this conflict from the UK. Renewed fighting occurred in the mid-1970's and early 1980's.

Rebels: Communist Party of Malaya

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: explicit. British troops were using during the fighting. Australia and New Zealand also played a supporting role

Gtypesup: troops

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- <http://www.britains-smallwars.com/malaya/malayan1.html>

Notes on Coding

This conflict is best described in two periods. The first refers to the conflict which was already ongoing at the time of independence in 1957 and continued until 1960. The second period covers the subsequent conflict in the mid 1970s and early 1980s.

Period 1: 1957-1960

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Communist Party of Malaya was a political party. However, it was banned in 1948 when the insurrection broke out.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 600

Rebstrength: much weaker

Turnbull (1989, p. 275), writes that "At the end of the Communist Emergency in Malaya in 1960, the number of guerrillas had probably dwindled to about 600."

Period 2: 1974-1975, 1981

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Communist Party of Malaya was a political party. However, it was banned in 1948.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 3,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Turnbull (1989, p. 276) writes that in 1975 "the communists probably totaled around 3000 armed men in the (Malaysian) peninsula and southern Thailand."

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Jungles of Pahang, Perak and Kelantan

Effterrcont: low

In August 1982, Keesing's Record of World Events reported that the Malaysian government claimed in 1981 that the rebels were only operating in the jungles of Pahang, Perak and Kelantan.

Sources:

- Turnbull, C. Mary (1989). *A History of Malaysia, Singapore and Brunei*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Onwar.com
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 47

ID 65

ID 65

Incompatibility: Government, Laos

Remove North Vietnam as an actor. Consolidate multiple entries for Pathet Lao and for the Neutrals

The Pathet Lao had fought against French colonialism, but was not included in the first independent government. Fighting broke out all along the border with North Vietnam. North Vietnamese regular army units participated in attacks on July 28-31, 1959. These operations established a pattern of North Vietnamese forces leading the attack on a strong point, then falling back and letting the Pathet Lao remain in place once resistance to the advance had been broken. Thailand and the United States granted military assistance to the government; Thailand deployed troops. The Pathet Lao defeated the government in 1975.

Dyad ID 382?: Laos vs. ULNLF

Laos has a long history of conflict over governance between different ethnic groups, particularly between the Hmong, who live in the highland area of the countries, and those Laotians that live in the lowland valleys. During the civil war with the Pathet Lao (*see conflict id 1850, dyads 820 and 850*), the United States organized many Hmong into irregular forces that attacked the Pathet Lao. In the aftermath of the Pathet Lao takeover in 1975, some of these Hmong groups continued to operate and challenge the government. In the 1970s, the government launched an offensive against these groups, the most prominent of which is the United Lao National Liberation Front (ULNLF). The conflict has continued at a low intensity to the present, although it has not generated more than 25 battledeaths in a year since 1990.

The Hmong have a long history of conflict and poor relations with the lowland Lao, and throughout history several attempts have been made by the Hmong to avoid integration into the Lao administration. Anti-government resistance groups were started in refugee camps in Thailand and by

exiled Hmong in the US, France, and Australia. Reports suggested that they formed a loose alliance under the name Lao Resistance Movement (LRM), or National Liberation Front (NLF) in the late 1980s, leading to the supposed proclamation of an independent government in December 1989. The military wing of this group is the United Lao National Liberation Front. The repatriation of Lao refugees in Thailand by the UNHCR in the early 1990s, as well as improving relations between Laos and bordering countries has limited the possibility for violent actions by the insurgent groups.

Rebels: ULNLF

Transconstsupp: explicit. Hmong groups in the United States regularly send funds to opposition groups

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Rebels recruited mainly in Thailand and maintained bases there. Refugee camps used for recruitment, R&R. Thailand was complicit in this until the early 1990's. As Thai-Lao relations improved, Thailand worked to pacify refugee camps.

Rebsupport: explicit. Thailand provided sanctuary and possibly military assistance.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: Explicit. Vietnam and the USSR provided military assistance.

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The ULNLF is a political organization opposed to the Pathet Lao government. It is not a legal participant in Laotian politics.

Rebestimate: 4,000

Rebestlow: 1,000

Rebesthigh: 10,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimated that in 1989 the ULNLF had between 1,000 and 10,000 troops and in 1990 that they had 3,000 troops. These estimates are in comparison to approximately 55,000 troops for the Laotian government.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of the hill country of Laos

Effterrcont: low

The ULNLF and the other Hmong groups have operated in the hill country of Laos, an area that is largely isolated from governmental control.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1977

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict first reached 25 battledeaths sometime in 1977.

Newenddate: 12/31/1990

The conflict did not reach 25 battledeaths again after 1990.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage
- Library of Congress Country Study

Dyad ID ?: Laos vs. Neutralists and Pathet Lao

After Laos achieved independence in 1953, the new government attempted to pursue a strategy of "neutrality" in order to stay out of regional conflicts such as that between North and South Vietnam. Laos had a small communist movement during the 1950s, but the Laotian Communists, later referred to as "Pathet Lao," was not a very large force. However, the United States and some internal Laotian politicians were worried by the electoral showings of the leftist parties and began to crack down. In 1960, a military coup brought a new government led by Colonel Kong Le to power dedicated to neutrality, however, the United States opposed the new government and helped to bring a right-wing anti-communist government to power. This government faced an armed insurgency from three groups. The Pathet Lao escalated an insurgency which had begun in the 1950s and established control over parts of the Laotian countryside. The neutralists of Kong Le also battled the government, although they were marginal in the conflict. Additionally, North Vietnam, which was dependent on Laotian supply routes in its war with South Vietnam, sent thousands of troops into the country to support the Pathet Lao and oppose the Laotian government.

Attempted cease-fires and coalition governments in the early 1960s failed and by 1962 Laos was immersed in full-scale civil war. The Pathet Lao continued to receive support from 10,000 North Vietnamese troops as it waged war against both the government and the neutralists. The government forces, backed up by the United States and later Thailand and South Vietnam, was unable to stem the growth of the Pathet Lao and by 1970, the group had 48,000 troops. By the 1970s, the war had shifted in the Pathet Lao's favor and a cease-fire in 1973 only brought a temporary peace as the group rearmed and prepared to take the capital. In 1975, the Pathet Lao marched into the capital and became government of Laos.

Rebels: Pathet Lao

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Pathet Lao also operated inside North Vietnamese territory

Rebsupport: Explicit. North Vietnam provided troops. The USSR also provided military assistance
Rtypesup: troops

Govsupport: explicit. The United States and Thailand provided extensive military assistance. Thailand also contributed troops.

Gtypesup: troops, military

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- Library of Congress Country Study

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 734: Laos, United States, Thailand and South Vietnam vs. Pathet Lao

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Pathet Lao was the military wing of a communist party. However, with the exception of brief periods when the group participated in coalition government, it was not a legal political party.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 48,000

Rebstrength: parity

Onwar.com reports that by 1970 the Pathet Lao had 48,000 troops in Laos.

Newendate: 8/23/1975

Onwar.com reports that by August 23, 1975, the Pathet Lao had completely secured control of the capital.

Dyad ID 736: Laos, Thailand vs. Neutrals

Kong Le's troops readily adopted the unofficial name Neutralist Armed Forces. After Phoumi captured Vientiane, the Neutralists were compelled—for their survival—to enter into an alliance with the Pathet Lao and their North Vietnamese backers, on whom they thereafter depended for supplies. China took a greater interest in the Laotian resistance movement by providing sanctuary, military training, and equipment to various resistance elements including Kong Le's Neutralists.

Rebels: Neutralists

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. Presence in China and North Vietnam

Rebsupport: explicit. For a while, North Vietnam provided assistance. China also provided military support

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: explicit. Military assistance from Thailand (including troops) and the US

Gtypesup: troops.

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Neutralist fighting forces were those of Colonel Kong Le who had been the government of Laos for a brief period in 1960. The neutrals were not a legal political party.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the neutrals. However, it is clear that they were weaker than the government forces.

Source:

- Library of Congress Country Study

Dyad ID ?: Laos, USA, South Vietnam, Thailand vs. North Vietnam

Rebpolwing: Does Not Apply

North Vietnam was an external state participant in the Laotian conflict and so did not represent a domestic political organization.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 10,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Onwar.com reports that North Vietnam had about 10,000 troops in Laos throughout the conflict.

Sources:

- Evans, Grants (2002). *A Short History of Laos: The Land in Between*. New South Wales, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Chapter 48

ID 66

ID 66

Incompatibility: Territory, Angola

Conflict Summary: While most European colonial powers granted independence to their African colonies in the early 1960s, the Portuguese held on much longer to their colonies of Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and Angola. By holding on longer, they faced a rising tide of African nationalism both within their colonies and in other parts of the continent. Consequently, Portugal faced anti-colonial wars in all three colonies which cost the lives of thousands of Angolan troops. The war in Angola was one of the most bloody as the colonial authority faced a conflict from three separate Angolan groups who received support from many African and other foreign states.

The conflict broke out in 1961 when the Popular Liberation Movement of Angola (MPLA) and the Union of Angolan Peoples (UPA) launched attacks targeted at European civilians and at Portuguese colonial offices. The Portuguese army was able to quickly restore control to most of the country; however, they were not able to completely defeat the rebels. In the next year the UPA formed the National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FNLA) and for the next twelve years the FNLA and MPLA would represent major threats to the Portuguese colonial authority. In the late 1960s, the FNLA and MPLA were joined by a third rebel group, the Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), a Maoist organization led by Jonas Savimbi.

The Angolan rebel groups benefited from a large degree of external support. The FNLA was based in Kinshasa (the capital of neighboring Congo/Zaire) and received a large degree of military support from the Zairean army. The MPLA, with its Marxist-Leninist stance, received support from Cuban troops. Additionally, recently independent African states such as Tanzania and Zambia provided bases and financial support to the Angolan rebels.

In the end, however, it was not the internal insurgency that led directly to the end of Portuguese colonialism in Angola. Rather, the high cost of the various African insurgencies was one factor that led to a military coup d'état in Portugal that removed the existing government in 1974. The new government immediately committed to pulling out of the African colonies and 1975 was set as

the time for Angolan independence. The Angolan parties formed a brief coalition government that was supposed to lead the country into independence. The government did not last, however, and the anti-colonial groups began fighting each other, a war that would last for almost three decades (see conflict id 2310).

Remove entries for Cuba, South Africa, and Zaire

The earliest anticolonialist political group in Angola, founded about 1953, was the Party of the United Struggle of Africans of Angola (Partido da Luta Unida dos Africanos de Angola – PLUA). In December 1956, the PLUA combined with other organizations in Luanda to form the MPLA, whose aim was to achieve independence for Angola. The organization's leftist orientation attracted the support of the Soviet Union and China. The FNLA was founded in 1954 as the Union of Peoples of Northern Angola (União das Populações do Norte de Angola – UPNA). It was founded to advance the interests of the Bakongo rather than to promote independence. By 1963, with training and arms from Algeria, bases in Zaire, and funds from the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the FNLA military and political organization was becoming formidable. The MPLA had its headquarters in Brazzaville, Congo. The growing military success of the MPLA in the mid-1960s was largely the product of support from the governments of Tanzania and Zambia, which permitted the organization to open offices in their capitals. More important, Tanzania and Zambia allowed the transport of Chinese and Soviet weapons across their territories to the Angolan border. Beginning in 1965, the MPLA began to receive training from Cuban forces. UNITA first came to international attention when, in December 1966. UNITA was a Maoist organization. The organization began its guerrilla war with a small amount of Chinese military aid transported via Tanzania and Zambia. On April 25, 1974, a group of disillusioned military officers, led by the former governor and commander in Guinea-Bissau, General António de Spínola, overthrew the Lisbon government.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 738: Portugal vs. MPLA

Rebels: MPLA

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases located in Congo-B, Zambia, Tanzania, with government backing

Rebsupport: explicit. The USSR, China, Cuba, Congo, Zambia, Tanzania provided arms, supplies, and bases

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: explicit. The White governments of South African and Rhodesia provided military assistances

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The MPLA was a Marxist-Leninist anti-colonial organization that attempted to achieve independence through armed struggle and not politically.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the MPLA. However, it is clear that the group was weaker than the Portuguese colonial authority in Angola.

Sources:

- Library of Congress Country Study
- Patrick Brogan

Dyad ID 739: Portugal vs. FNLA

Rebels: FNLA

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. The group was based in the Congo (Zaire)

Rebsupport: explicit. Algeria, Zaire, and OAU governments provided military support

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: explicit. South African and Rhodesia provided military support

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The FNLA was an anti-colonial organization based primarily in Zaire and was not affiliated with a political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the FNLA. However, it is clear that the group was no match for the Portuguese colonial authority in Angola.

Newendate: 7/31/1974

In July 1974, the new Portuguese government signed cease-fire agreements with the Angolan rebel groups and agreed to pave the way for independence.

Sources:

- Library of Congress Country Study

- Patrick Brogan

Dyad ID 740: Portugal vs. UNITA

Rebels: UNITA

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. UNITA was based mostly inside Angola, but some access to Zambia and Tanzania

Rebsupport: explicit. Tanzania, Zambia, and China cooperated in arming the rebels

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: explicit. South Africa and Rhodesia provided armaments

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

UNITA was a Maoist anti-colonial organization that attempted to achieve independence through armed struggle, not politically.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by UNITA. However, it is clear that the group was weaker than the Portugese colonial authority.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Much of central and southern Angola

Effterrcont: moderate

According to Angola: A Country Study, "On the eve of independence, UNITA controlled many of the rich, food-producing central and southern provinces and was therefore able to regulate the flow of food to the rest of the country. At the time, it claimed the allegiance of about 40 percent of the population" (p. 33).

Newstartdate: 12/1/1966

The first major military operation undertaken by UNITA was in December 1966.

Sources:

- Library of Congress Country Study
- Patrick Brogan

Chapter 49

ID 67

ID 67

Incompatibility: Burma vs. Shan Groups

Myanmar (formerly Burma) has been one of the most conflict-torn countries in the world in the last 50 years. It has a very ethnically diverse population and the last fifty years have seen conflicts between various minority groups seeking to achieve greater autonomy within or independence from the state and the government (*see conflict ids 1230, 1240, 1250, 1260 and 1560*). One of the regions of Burma that has seen constant conflict with the government for more than forty years is Shan state, whose majority Shan population is ethnically distinct from the dominant Burmese population.

The Shan region was ruled separately during the British colonial period but was joined with Burma as Shan State upon independence in 1948. However, a provision was included in the constitution that the state could hold a referendum for independence in ten years. In the early years after independence, Shan state experienced spillover from two neighboring conflicts: an internal Burmese conflict between Karen separatists and the Burmese government and the Chinese civil war. Both Karen insurgents and Chinese nationalist groups based in Shan state and committed atrocities against the local population. These spillovers, combined with the Burmese government's moves to centralize power in the state's hands, led some Shan youths and intellectuals to begin clamouring for independence.

When the time came for the referendum, the Burmese government did not give the state the option to declare independence. In 1958, a Shan group launched an attack against government positions and by 1961 several Shan insurgent groups had emerged, including the Shan State Independence Army (SSIA). In 1964, the SSIA and three other groups merged to form the Shan State Army (SSA), which would be the most well-known group battling the government on behalf of the Shan for the next forty years.

As the conflict progressed, a large number of Shan groups formed, many of whom disbanded within years. This included the Shan State Revolutionary Army (SSRA), a marginal group that formed in

1978 and was completely defeated in 1980. Additionally, other insurgent groups formed in Shan State to fight for various causes, including the Palaung State Liberation Organization (PSLO) and the Shan State Nationalities People's Liberation Organization (SSNPLO).

Each of these groups expressed a political agenda, generally calling for secession of Shan State. However, the high level of opium-trafficking in this region of Burma meant that many of the groups could be more accurately viewed as narco-traffickers than groups with an actual political agenda.

One group that emerged in the 1980s that managed to last for more than a decade and represent a coherent insurgent was the Mong Tai Army (MTA). The MTA was led by Mon Heng and managed to gain control of a large amount of Shan territory along the border with Thailand by attacking other Shan insurgent groups and taking their territory.

In the late 1980s and 1990s, the Myanmar government pursued a dual strategy of escalating the military conflict and pursuing negotiations. The strategy appears to have worked to some extent, several of the groups, including MTA signed ceasefire and peace agreements with the government and the level of conflict in the region has declined. New insurgent groups continued to emerge in the 1990s, including the Shan United Revolutionary Army (SURA) and the Shan State National Army (SSNA) which merged in 1996 with the existing SSA to become the new SSA.

Note: the record for SSA is incorrect. There was a Shan State Army that was active until the 1970's (no information on this group). The second SSA record 1670-900-0, is a different organization, the SSA/South. This group emerged in 1996.

The Shan nationalist movement started gaining strength in the mid-1950s when students at universities in Rangoon and Mandalay started forming cultural associations. Following the refusal of the Burmese government to allow the Shan State to secede, a small underground resistance group was formed in 1958. Following the Burmese military coup in 1962, the elected Shan administration collapsed and the state was under virtual military occupation by the government. The various resistance groups continue to receive Shan youths volunteers. On 22 April 1964, the three largest rebel Shan organisations; SSIA (Shan State Independence Army), SNUF (Shan National United Front), and KRF (Kokang Resistance Force) merged as the SSA (Shan State Army). After several large-scale government offensives in the early 1980s, virtually the only remaining ethnic forces were the "warlord-led" SUA (Shan United Army, led by Khun Sa) and the faction of SURA (Shan United Revolutionary Army) led by Moh Heng (a.k.a. Gon Jerng). Both of these warlords were heavily involved in large-scale drug trafficking. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, most of the Shan insurgent organisations either signed ceasefire agreements with the government or became affiliated (or incorporated) with the Mong Tai Army (MTA). Throughout 1995, and following the surrender by Khun Sa, the members of the MTA split into several different factions. Several of these were involved in fighting against the government but finally three main groups united as the Shan State Army (south) (SSA/s.)

Cannot find sufficient information on these groups. SURA is another name for the SSA/South

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 307: Burma vs. Shan State Army - South (SSA-S)

This record refers to the Shan State Army/South, which emerged in 1996 as a splinter group from the MTA

Rebels: SSA/South

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases located in Thailand

Rebsupport: explicit. Myanmar accuses Thailand of supporting the rebels by allowing bases in refugee camps, but this is denied by Thailand. However, it is known that the Thai government has used the SSA in its efforts at drug eradication.

Rtypesup: non-military

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para>
- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Dyad ID 308: Government vs. MTA

Rebels: MTA

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. The group operated along the Thai-Burma border

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: Explicit. Uppsala reports that China provided arms to the government

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The MTA was a military, not a political, organization.

Rebestimate: 10,000

Rebestlow: 2,100

Rebesthigh: 20,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database provides the following estimates for the troop strength of the MTA: In 1993: 2,100-20,000; in 1994: 10,000-20,000; in 1995: 5,000-10,000. These estimates are in comparison to over 200,000 troops for the Burmese army.

Newendate: 1/3/1996

The MTA and the government signed a ceasefire agreement on January 3, 1996.

Myanmar became independent in 1948 and the Shan states were incorporated into it. The Shan people were ethnically distinct from the rest of Myanmar and had a history of self-rule and autonomy even during colonialism. Upon independence, the Shan states were given the right to secede in ten years, a right that was not granted in 1958. At that point, insurgency started in Myanmar led primarily by the Noom Suik Harn (NSH), a small underground Shan organization. The NSH soon splintered into smaller groups which included the Shan State Independence Army (SSIA) and the Shan National United Front (SNUF). In 1964, these organizations (along with others) came together to the Shan State Army (SSA), which battled the Myanmar government for approximately a decade. The Shan United Revolutionary Army (SURA) broke off from SSA and battled the government independently. As conflict progressed, a number of Shan groups formed to fight for a variety of issues. These included the Shan State Revolutionary Army (SSRA), which formed in 1976 and was active in the opium trade. In 1984, part of the Shan State Army merged with the SURA to form the Tai-land Revolutionary Council (TRC). The TRC eventually became the Mong Tai Army (MTA).

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para>
- Minorities at Risk Webpage
- International Boundaries News Database

Dyad ID 742: Burma vs. NSH

Rebel Political Wing: No

The NSH was primarily a military organization without a political wing.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

I could find no estimate of the number of troops possessed by the NSH, but it was a very small military organization.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Low

The NSH fractionalized quickly and had trouble maintaining organizational coherence.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The Shan independence cause was very popular within Shan state, but the various insurgents had difficulty getting access to weapons.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Parts of Shan State

Effective Territorial Control: Low

The NSH was able to control some territory in Shan state, but had difficulty resisting army advances.

Conflict Type: Secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

I could find no reference to support to the rebels in this period.

Government Support: No

Non-state military support to Government: No

The Burmese government did not appear to receive external support in this period.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Continuation as another dyad.

The NSH split into other organizations after 1959.

Dyad ID 743: Government vs. SSIA

Rebpolwing: no

The Shan State Independence Army (SSIA) was a military organization dedicated to achieving independence for the province and did not represent a political organization.

Rebestimate: 2,500

Rebestlow: 2,000

Rebesthigh: 3,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events in March 1962 reported that there were about 3,000 Shan insurgents prior to 1961, but that a government offensive in that year reduced the number to 2,000. It is not clear how many of these insurgents were in SSIA, since there were other groups active as well.

Newendate: 4/22/1964

Fredholm (1993, p. 159) reports that the SSIA and two other organizations met on April 22, 1964, and merged to form the Shan State Army.

Dyad ID 744: Burma vs. SNUF

Rebel Political Wing: No

The SNUF was primarily a military organization without a political wing.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

I could find no estimate of the number of troops possessed by the SNUF, but it was a very small military organization.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Low

The SNUF was more of an umbrella organization made up of constituent parts.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The Shan independence cause was very popular within Shan state, but the various insurgents had difficulty getting access to weapons.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Parts of Shan State

Effective Territorial Control: Low

The various insurgents were able to control some territory in Shan state, but had difficulty stopping army advances.

Conflict Type: Secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

I could find no reference to support to the rebels in this period.

Government Support: No

Non-state military support to Government: No

The Burmese government did not appear to receive external support in this period.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Continuation as another dyad

The SNUF, along with the SSIA and other insurgent groups, merged to form the SSA in 1964.

Dyad ID 746: Government vs. SSA

This conflict is best described in two periods. The first describes the period from 1964 to 1970 when the SSA was first active. The second describes the period from 1997 to the present when the old SSA combined with two other organizations, the SSNA and the SURA and re-emerged as an important actor.

Period 1: 1964-1970

Rebpolwing: no

The SSA was a military organization dedicated to secession and did not represent a political opposition.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 8,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Fredholm (1993, p. 158) writes, "In the 1960s, the total armed strength of the various Shan factions was estimated to be at most 8,000."

Period 2: 1997-ongoing

Rebpolwing: no

The SSA was a military organization dedicated to secession and did not represent a political opposition.

Rebestimate: 8,000

Rebestlow: 800

Rebesthigh: 15,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database gives the following estimates for the troop strength of the SSA: In 1996: 10,000; in 1997: 10,000-15,000; in 1998 and 1999: 8,000; in 2000: 3,000; in 2001: 3,000-10,000; in 2002: 800-7,000. These estimates are in comparison to over 300,000 troops for the Burmese army.

Dyad ID 747: Burma vs. SURA

Rebel Political Wing: No

The SURA was primarily a military organization without a political wing.

Rebel Estimate: 1,500

Rebel Estimate (low): 1,000

Rebel Estimate (high): 2,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

Lintner (1999, p. 492) writes that the SURA had between 1,000 and 2,000 troops.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The SURA was an organization with a command structure that generally coordinated its actions.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The Shan independence cause was very popular within Shan state, but the various insurgents had difficulty getting access to weapons.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Parts of Shan State

Effective Territorial Control: Low

The various insurgents were able to control some territory in Shan state, but had difficulty stopping army advances.

Conflict Type: Secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

I could find no reference to support to the rebels in this period.

Government Support: No

Non-state military support to Government: No

The Burmese government did not appear to receive external support in this period.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Continuation as another dyad

In 1985, the SURA merged with part of the SSA to form the TRC.

Dyad ID 748: Government vs. SSNPLO

Rebpolwing: no

The SSNPLO was an organization affiliated with the Burmese Communist Party that promoted the interests of the Pa-O ethnic group, but did not represent a political organization (the Burmese Communist Party was an insurgent group).

Rebestimate: 1,250

Rebestlow: 500

Rebesthigh: 2,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

Fredholm (1993, p. 122-124) reports that in the late 1960s, the SSNPLO (which he calls the SSNLO) had 2,000 troops, but that by the late 1970s it had 500.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: low

The SSNPLO did have a central command structure; however, it experienced fractionalization across the course of the conflict.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1967

The SSNPLO was formed in 1967 and began waging an armed campaign sometime around that time, in fact, the group was most effective during the late 1960s.

Dyad ID 750: Government vs. SSRA

Rebpolwing: no

The SSRA was an organization based on a breakaway faction from the SSA and was almost completely marginal in the conflict. It did not represent a political organization.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 145

Rebstrength: much weaker

Fredholm (1993, p. 204) reports that the SSRA had only 145 troops at the time of their surrender in 1980.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1976

The SSRA was formed in 1976. It is not clear when the dyad reached 25 battledeaths, if it did.

Newenddate: 12/31/1980

All of the SSRA forces surrendered to the government under an amnesty in 1980.

Dyad ID 751: Burma vs. TRC

Rebel Political Wing: No

The TRC was primarily a military organization without a political wing.

Rebel Estimate: 1,750

Rebel Estimate (low): 1,500

Rebel Estimate (high): 2,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

Lintner (1999, p. 492) writes that the TRC had between 1,500 and 2,000 troops.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The SURA was an organization with a command structure that generally coordinated its actions.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The Shan independence cause was very popular within Shan state, but the various insurgents had difficulty getting access to weapons.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Parts of Shan State

Effective Territorial Control: Low

The various insurgents were able to control some territory in Shan state, but had difficulty stopping army advances.

Conflict Type: Secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

I could find no reference to support to the rebels in this period.

Government Support: No Non-state military support to Government: No

The Burmese government did not appear to receive external support in this period.

Type of Termination: Low Activity

The government-TRC dyad did not reach 25 battledeaths again for years after 1985, the TRC eventually reemerged as the Mong Tai Army (MTA).

Dyad ID 826: Myanmar vs. Shan State Progress Party (SSPP)

The Shan State Progress Party (SSPP) is one of many groups which has been active in the conflict between the Myanmar government and the Shan people. In 2011, conflict flared up between the Myanmar army and the SSPP, who was unhappy with the construction of an oil pipeline between Myanmar and China which ran through territory it controlled.

Rebel Political Wing: explicit link

Rebel Political Wing legal: yes

The SSPP originally formed as the political wing of the Shan State Army. Political parties are currently legal in Myanmar, and I found no evidence that the SSPP in particular has been banned.

Rebel Estimate: 3000

Rebel Estimate (low): 3000

Rebel Estimate (high): 3000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The UCDP estimates that SSPP had 3000 troops in 2011. The Myanmar army, meanwhile, has approximately 375000 troops, according to UCDP.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The SSPP has a leadership structure that generally coordinates the activities of its troops.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The SSPP are one of many groups attempting to represent the Shan and do not appear to have the ability to rally large numbers of personnel. They also do not have access to high-grade military technology and have not demonstrated a particularly strong ability to fight.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Areas of Shan State

Effective level of control: Moderate

The SSPP controls some territory in Shan State, particularly along the border with Thailand, in areas there are difficult for the Myanmar army to penetrate.

Conflict Type: ethnic conflict

For years, the government of Myanmar has engaged in conflicts with a large number of insurgent groups representing different ethnic groups living in Myanmar. The SSPP is one of these groups, although it claims that it does not seek an independent Shan State.

Transconstsupp: no Rebextpart: no Rebpresosts: no Rebsupport: none Rtypesup: NA Govsupport: no Gtypesup: NA Govextpart: no

Sources:

- Bertil Lintner (1999). *Burma in Revolt: Opium and Insurgency Since 1948*. Bangkok: Silkworm Books.
- Martin Smith (1988). *Burmas: Insurgency and the Politics of Ethnicity*. London: Zed Books.
- UCDP database

Chapter 50

ID 68

ID 68

Incompatibility: Territory, Katanga

Dyad ID 587: Congo/Zaire vs. Katanga

The huge central African country of Congo achieved independence from Belgium in 1960 and almost immediately was immersed in conflict. A confrontation over government in Kinshasa (*see conflict id 1860, dyad 1100*) was overshadowed by a conflict over the Katanga region, which seceded from Congo on July 11, 1960. Katanga was the richest region in the country and seceded in an attempt to keep control over all its mineral wealth. The subsequent conflict between the Katangese forces (supported by Belgium) and the Congolese army threatened the security of the entire region and led the international community to intervene. The United Nations sent an international mission which initially had a mandate to try to separate the combatants. By the fall of 1961, however, the United Nations had shifted strategy and was dedicated to forcefully ending the secession and ensuring the unity of the Congo. The Katangese forces could not stand up to the United Nations armies and by 1963, the secession crisis had ended and Katanga was reintegrated into the Congo.

On July 11, 1960, as the Belgian Congo was gaining independence, the mineral rich province of Katanga declared its independence. Under Belgian supervision, immediate steps were taken to convert the Katangan Gendarmerie into an effective security force. That the secession lasted as long as it did (from July 11, 1960, to January 14, 1963) is largely a reflection of the efforts of Belgian civilian and military authorities to prop up their client state. The UN dispatched a peacekeeping force which fought against Katangan and Belgian forces, maintaining the country's unity.

Rebels: Katanga

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: major. Belgian mercenaries, recruited in Belgium, enlisted to fight in support of

Katanga. South African mercenaries were also present.

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: explicit. Katanga was a client state of Belgium. Much of the military activity was directly conducted by Belgium

Rtypesup: troops

Govsupport: explicit. The UN intervention force backed the government and prevented Katangan secession.

Gtypesup: troops

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

Moise Tshombe, who led the secession of Katanga, was the leader of the largest political party in the province. His government was not recognized by the Congolese government, however.

Rebestimate: 13,500

Rebestlow: 12,000

Rebesthigh: 15,000

Rebstrength: parity

Keesing's Record of World Events in April 1963 reported that the Katangan forces were estimated to include between 12,000 and 15,000 troops.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Katanga, except for Balubakat

Effterrcont: moderate

The provincial government of Katanga was the group that led the secession. However, the northern area of Katanga, Balubakat, seceded from Katanga and reintegrated with Congo shortly after the conflict began.

Newendate: 1/14/1963

On January 14, 1963 the leader of the Katanga secessionists, Moise Tshombe, announced that the secession had ended.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Meditz, Sandra W. and Tim Merrill Ed. (1993). *Zaire: a country study*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress.
- Onwar.com

- Library of Congress Country Study

Chapter 51

ID 69

ID 69

Incompatibility: Territory, South Kasai

Dyad ID 588: Congo/Zaire vs. Independent Mining State of South Kasai

Congo became immersed in overlapping internal conflicts almost immediately following its independence from Belgium in the summer of 1960. The largest of these conflicts were a governmental dispute (*see conflict id 1860, dyad 1100*) and a dispute over the province of Katanga, which seceded on July 11, 1960 (*see conflict id 1680*). An additional conflict to occur in this period was between the government and the southeastern Congolese region of Kasai, which declared itself the Independent Mining State of South Kasai on August 8, 1960. South Kasai produced a huge percentage of the world's diamonds and the leader of South Kasai, Albert Kalonji, ran the independent state like a king and used the diamond revenues to enrich himself and fund limited state services. With the imposition into Congo of a United Nations peacekeeping force in 1961, however, the conflict turned in favor of the government and by 1963 the province of South Kasai had been reintegrated into a united Congo.

The secession of the country's richest region, Katanga, on July 11, soon followed by a similar move in southeastern Kasai Province (now Kasai-Oriental Region), which declared itself the Independent Mining State of South Kasai on August 8.

Rebels: Independent Mining State of South Kasai

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: alleged/unknown. While it was clear that Belgium supported the Katangan independence movement, support for Kasai is less well established

Rtypesup: unknown

Govsupport: explicit. The UN sent in peacekeeping troops which eventually re-established the central government's control

Gtypesup: troops

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

Throughout the conflict, Albert Kalonji was the leader of South Kasai. His government was not recognized by the Congolese government.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the South Kasai separatists. However, it is clear that the group was weaker than the Congolese army.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Meditz, Sandra W. and Tim Merrill Ed. (1993). *Zaire: a country study*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress.

Chapter 52

ID 70

ID 70

Incompatibility: Ethiopia vs. TPLF, OLF, EPDM and EPRP

In 1974, the Ethiopian emperor Haile Selassie was overthrown in a military coup and his government was replaced with a Marxist-Leninist dictatorship. Almost immediately, the new regime faced armed insurgency from groups that called for democracy and self-determination for all Ethiopian ethnic groups, many of whom, such as the Oromo and Tigray felt that they had been discriminated against under Haile Selassie and continued to be so under the new dictatorship. The first group to challenge the government was the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party (EPRP), a radical leftist party that was nevertheless opposed to the new Marxist dictatorship. As the conflict continued, another political movement, the Ethiopian People's Democratic Movement (EPDM) joined the conflict. Additionally, three ethnic-based groups, the Tigrayan People's Liberation Front (TPLF), the Oromo Liberation Front (OLF) and the Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF) all joined the insurgency (note: the conflict between the government and the EPLF is treated as a separate conflict because the EPLF was battling for an independent Eritrea, rather than to change the political system of Ethiopia, *see conflict id 1780*). In the late 1970s and early 1980s the government had the upper hand against the insurgents, however by the late 1980s the momentum had shifted. In 1989 the government offered to conduct bilateral negotiations with the various insurgents, but that offer was rejected and in 1991, the various groups (now fighting under the banner Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front-EPRDF) surrounded Addis Ababa. In May 1991, President Mengistu fled the country and the rebels entered and took the capital.

Note that the OLF emerged again in 1999. Record listed above The Mengistu government was first challenged by the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party (EPRP).. In 1976 the Tigray People's Liberation Front (TPLF) joined the armed struggle. The TPLF coordinated some of its attacks with the Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF) that was simultaneously fighting for an independent Eritrea, and the Oromo Liberation Front (OLF) struggling for an independent Oromiya. In 1989 the TPLF linked up with Ethiopian People's Democratic Movement (EPDM), forming the umbrella movement Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF).

The government would however not negotiate with the EPRDF at first, but would only talk to one party at the time. Thus, the TPLF met with the government in March 1990 for preliminary peace talks, but they collapsed without any results. On 21 May President Mengistu resigned and fled the country. When peace talks between the government and EPRDF, OLF and EPLF, were opened on 27 May 1991 in London, the EPRDF had encircled the capital. The opposition groups agreed to let EPRDF set up an interim government until democratic elections could be held within one year. The EPRDF is still in power in Ethiopia.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 46: Ethiopia vs. TPLF

Formed in 1975, the Tigray People's Liberation Front (TPLF) was dedicated to the overthrow of the Mengistu regime. It survived during its early years only because of the money and weapons it received from the EPLF. Later, there was a rift between the two groups. In the later phase of the fighting, the TPLF became the dominant actor.

Rebels: TPLF

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. After early defeats, the TPLF retreated to Sudan.

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: Explicit. The USSR and Cuba supported the government. Israel also provided military aid.

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The TPLF was a political and military organization dedicated to promoting the interests of the minority Tigrayan population. When the conflict ended, the TPLF was the dominant party in the coalition government and has remained so since.

Rebestimate: 20,000

Rebestlow: 10,000

Rebesthigh: 50,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute provides the following estimates for the troop strength of the TPLF: In 1986 and 1987: 10,000; in 1988 and 1989: 20,000; in 1990: 40,000-50,000. These estimates are in comparison to the following estimates for the Ethiopian

government: in 1986 and 1987: 227,000; in 1988: 300,000; in 1989: 313,000; in 1990: 438,000.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1976

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and the TPLF reached 25 battledeaths sometime in 1976, but does not date it more precisely than that.

Newenddate: 5/28/1991

The EPRDF, of which the TPLF was a member, entered and took the capital on May 28, 1991.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Library of Congress Country Study

Dyad ID 47: Ethiopia vs. EPDM

The EPDM, like the TPLF, supported the right of all nationalities to self-determination and the formation of a democratic state once the Mengestu regime had been overthrown. The EPDM and the TPLF formed an allied movement, the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF).

Rebels: EPDM

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: Explicit. The USSR and Cuba supported the government. Israel also provided military aid.

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

(Source: Library of Congress Country Study, U)

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The EPDM was a political movement dedicated to promoting democracy and self-determination for minority groups that also had a military wing.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the EPDM. However, it is clear that the group was considerably weaker than the Ethiopian army.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1980

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the first reported use of armed force between the EPRP and the Ethiopian government occurred sometime during the early 1980s but that it cannot be dated more precisely than that. It is not clear when, or whether, 25 battledeaths first occurred in a given year.

Newenddate: 5/28/1991

The EPRDF, of which the EPRP was a member, entered and took the capital on May 28, 1991.

Dyad ID 48: Ethiopia vs. EPRDP

TBA

Dyad ID 49: Ethiopia vs. Military Faction of 1989

On May 16, 1989, the armed forces chief of staff Merid Neguisse attempted a coup d'état aimed at removing President Mengistu. The coup was unsuccessful and was followed by a purge of those in the military suspected of participating in the coup d'état. Some reports suggested as many as 480 people were killed in the months following the coup.

Impatient with the rate or form of social and political change, several groups conspired to launch a coup d'état on December 13, 1960, while the emperor was abroad on one of his frequent trips. The leadership of the 1960 revolt came from three groups: the commander of the Imperial Bodyguard Mengistu Neway, and his followers; a few security officials, including the police chief; and a handful of radical intellectuals related to the officials, including Girmame Neway, Mengistu's brother. The coup's leaders failed to achieve popular support for their actions. Although university students demonstrated in favor of the coup, army and air force units remained loyal to the emperor, who returned to the capital on December 17.

Rebels: military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Library of Congress Country Study

Ethiopia versus military faction, 1989. Not listed in the spreadsheet

On 16 May 1989 a faction within the military, led by the chief of staff of the armed forces, Major General Merid Negusie, and the head of the air force, Major General Amha Desta, initiated a coup attempt to overthrow President Mengistu.

Rebels: military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The coup d'état was led by members of the military and was not affiliated with a political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the coup plotters. However, it is clear that the majority of the military stayed loyal.

Newendate: 12/31/1989

Although the coup attempt was defeated within hours, the purges of the military lasted for a long time after the coup and so the conflict is dated as ending at the end of 1989.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Library of Congress Country Study

Dyad ID 50: Ethiopia vs. EPRP

The EPRP challenged the Derg's control of the revolution itself by agitating for a broad-based democratic government run by civilians, not by the military. In February 1977, the EPRP initiated terrorist attacks—known as the White Terror—against Derg members and their supporters. Government security forces systematically hunted down and killed suspected EPRP members and their supporters, especially students. Mengistu and the Derg eventually won this latest struggle for con-

trol of the Ethiopian revolution, at a cost to the EPRP of thousands of its members and supporters imprisoned, dead, or missing.

Rebels: EPRP

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases located along the Sudanese border.

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: military

Govsuport: Explicit. The Soviet Union and Cuba granted extensive military assistance. Israel also granted military aid.

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The EPRP was a radical leftist party that also had a military wing.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the EPRP. However, the group was marginal militarily throughout the conflict.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1977

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and the EPRP had its first battledeath in 1977. No information was available on whether or when the conflict reached 25 battledeaths.

Newenddate: 12/31/1991

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and the EPRP did not again reach 25 battledeaths after 1991.

Source:

- Library of Congress Country Study

Dyad ID 55: Ethiopia vs. OLF

Created in July 1973, the Oromo Liberation Front (OLF) set forth as its goals Oromo liberation from "Ethiopian colonialism" and the establishment of an independent Democratic Republic of Oromia in southern Ethiopia.

Rebels: OLF

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. The OLF had a political office in Mogadishu, Somalia

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: Explicit. The USSR and Cuba supported the government. Israel also provided military aid.

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The OLF was a political and military organization dedicated to promoting the interests of the minority Tigrayan population. When the conflict ended, the OLF was a participant in the coalition government, although it withdrew a couple of years later and has since launched an armed struggle against the TPLF-led government.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 7,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimates in 1990 and 1991 that the OLF had 7,000 troops. This estimate was in comparison to over 400,000 troops possessed by the Ethiopian army.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1974

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and the OLF probably had its first battledeath in 1974. No information was available on when the conflict reached 25 battledeaths.

Newenddate: 5/28/1991

The EPRDF, of which the OLF was a member, entered and took the capital on May 28, 1991.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks
- Marcus, Harold (2002). *A History of Ethiopia: Updated Edition*. Berkeley: CA: University of California Press.
- Library of Congress Country Study
- Keesings
- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Dyad ID 754: Ethiopia vs. EDU

The Marxist/Leninist Dergue regime which ruled Ethiopia from 1974 to 1991 faced an insurgency led by a bunch of different rebel groups. One of these, the Ethiopian Democratic Union (EDU) was made up of former military and political leaders from the imperial regime. The group was based in Tigray and was able to launch assaults against the Dergue led government, but was defeated by 1978 as it experienced fractionalization and also was driven out of Tigray by the Tigrayan People's Liberation Front.

Rebel Political Wing: No

Although the EDU was made up of former military and political figures, in this period it appeared to be primarily a military organization and not a political one.

Rebel Estimate: 10,000

Rebel Estimate (low): 10,000

Rebel Estimate (high): 10,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The UCDP estimates that the EDU had about 10,000 troops in 1977.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: moderate

The EDU had a clear command structure, but the organization also experienced fractionalization throughout the conflict.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

The EDU was unable to garner much popular support, but as it was made up of former officers was generally well equipped and experienced in fighting.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Parts of Tigray

Effective Territorial Control: Moderate

The EDU was based in and able to control some of the Tigrayan region of Ethiopia before it was driven out by the TPLF.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: Some

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Economic

Name of Supporters: United States, Saudi Arabia

UCDP reports that the United States and Saudi Arabia provided economic support to the EDU and that Sudan gave it access to territory.

Government Support: Explicit Link

Type of Government Support: Military

Name of Government Supporters: Soviet Union, East Germany, Israel, Cuba

Non-state military support to Government: No

UCDP reports that Ethiopia received military support from the Soviet Union, East Germany, Israel, and Cuba

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

The EDU was unable to continue fighting after 1978.

Source:

- UCDP

Dyad ID 755?: Ethiopia vs. Military Faction of 1961

On December 14, 1961, while Ethiopian Emperor Haile Selassie was in Brazil, members of the Imperial Guard and Ethiopian police forces staged a coup d'état. They arrested members of the Imperial family, seized government buildings and declared a new government. The Ethiopian army and air force, however, did not immediately support the coup and over the next two days the coup leaders negotiated with the military to gain its support. While the negotiations were taking place, however, the military pulled troops out of the provinces and moved them to the capital and, on December 15, 1961, they attacked the rebel positions. The coup leaders were quickly driven out of the capital and the Emperor returned to Addis Ababa on December 17. Fighting continued between loyalist and opposition forces for the next week, but by December 24, all of their leaders had been defeated.

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The coup was led by members of the Imperial Guard, the force ordered to protect the Emperor and his family. They did not have any link to any political party.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events reports that the Imperial Guard had about 8,000 troops, but that at the time of the coup about 2,500 of them were participating in a peacekeeping mission in the Congo. It is not clear how many of the remaining 5,500 Guard members participated in the coup or how many police officers joined them.

Mobcap: low

Keesing's Record of World Events reports that, with the exception of some student rallies at the University in Addis Ababa, there was very little popular support for the coup.

Source:

- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 53

ID 72

ID 72

Incompatibility: Nepal vs. CPN-M/UPF

Dyad ID 349: Nepal vs. CPN-M/UPF

Through the late 1980s, Nepal was run as a monarchy. However, popular opposition to the monarch led the royal family to agree to an opening of the political system. In 1990, Nepal transitioned to a constitutional monarchy and there were high expectations of greater political and economic freedom in the country. However, the promised political and economic opening was delayed and by the mid 1990s, opposition to the government had grown. In 1996, an insurgency broke out led by the Communist Party of Nepal-Maoist/United People's Front (CPN-M/UPF) against the constitutional monarchy. The CPN-M/UPF called for the overthrow of the government and the establishment of a communist government. The ensuing conflict has been quite violent and resulted in over 8,000 casualties since 1996. Despite a few attempts at negotiations, the conflict was ongoing as of the end of 2003.

The Communist Party of Nepal-Maoist (CPN-M) publicly launched its armed struggle for a revolutionary transformation of the society. The stated goal of incompatibility of the "People's War," launched on 13 February 1996, was to overthrow the constitutional monarchy and install a communist government in its place. The outfit has received secondary support in the form of training and military hardware from a number of Indian Maoist insurgency movements, amongst them the Maoist Communist Centre and the People's War Group. In early 2002 the government took major steps to strengthen the army crackdown, announcing a large jump in military expenditure and adding approximately 10 000 soldiers to the armed forces. The Nepalese government also secured considerable amounts of foreign aid, both in the form of military hardware, training, and financial funds from England, USA and India. There have been numerous, failed attempts at peace talks. The conflict is still active

Rebels: CPN-M

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: minor. Communist groups in India (N.E. India and among Naxalites) have conducted joint training missions. There are strong political links among the groups

Rebpresosts: some. It was reported that there has training taking place in India

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: explicit. India, US, UK, and China have assisted Nepal with counter-insurgency training and limited military hardware

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The CPN-M/UPF was a political, as well as military, organization. It established parallel administrations in the parts of the country that it controlled. However, it was not a legal political party.

Rebestimate: 5,000

Rebstlow: 1,000

Rebesthigh: 15,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database provides the following estimates for the troop strength of the CPN-M/UPF: In 1996 and 1997: no estimate; in 1998: 2,300-10,000; in 1999: 1,000-10,000; in 2000: 1,000-1,500; in 2001: 4,000-5,000; in 2002: 3,000-4,000; in 2003: less than 15,000. These estimates are in comparison to about 40,000 for the Nepalese army.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of Nepal

Effterrcont: high

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the CPN-M/UPF has been able to take control of parts of Nepalese territory and has established parallel governments in the areas that it controls.

Newstartdate: 7/13/1996

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict reached 25 battledeaths on July 13, 1996.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events

- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>

Dyad ID 652: Nepal vs. Nepali Congress

A constitutional government was established in Nepal in 1959 led by the Nepali Congress Party, but it was dissolved by the King in 1960. In response, members of the Nepali Congress waged a two-year armed struggle against the new government established by the King. The Nepali Congress received support from India and was joined by Nepalese peasants who were opposed to the feudal policies of the King. In 1962, the Nepali Congress decided to end the insurgency and in 1963 a new government was formed with the Nepali Congress as one of the participants.

On December 26, 1961, King Mahendra appointed a council of five ministers to help run the administration. Several weeks later, political parties were declared illegal. At first the Nepali Congress leadership propounded a nonviolent struggle against the new order and formed alliances with several political parties, including the Gorkha Parishad and the United Democratic Party. By late 1961, violent actions organized by the Nepali Congress in exile began along the Indian border, increasing in size and number during early 1962. The political situation changed completely when war broke out between India and China on October 20, 1962. Because India needed strong friends rather than insurrections in the region, it withdrew support from insurgents along the border with Nepal and established closer relations with the king's government.

Rebels: Nepali Congress

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. The movement was based in India. There were allegations by Nepal that India was allowing rebels to set up bases on Indian territory, which India denied. When the India-China war broke out, however, India made it clear that the rebels were not welcome on its territory.

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Nepali Congress had been in the government prior to its dissolution in 1960. When the King dissolved the cabinet in 1960, he made all political parties illegal.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the Nepali Congress. However, it is clear that the group was weaker than the army controlled by the government.

Newstartdate: 12/1/1960

The King dissolved parliament in December 1960.

Newenddate: 11/8/1962

Keesing's Record of World Events reported in February 1963 that the Nepali Congress had announced the suspension of its rebel activities on November 8, 1962.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Onwar.com

Chapter 54

ID 73

ID 73

Incompatibility: France vs. OAS

Dyad ID 584: France vs. OAS

In 1961 and 1962, an extreme right wing organization known as the Secret Army Organization (OAS) launched a series of terrorist attacks against French government targets. These attacks included two unsuccessful attempts to assassinate French President De Gaulle. The French government cracked down on the group and arrested and tried several of its key leaders and by the end of 1962, the insurgents had been defeated.

The OAS was created in response to the referendums on self-determination for Algeria. Elements in the military were opposed to granting Algeria independence. There were uprisings in January and April which were quickly suppressed. The main hope of the OAS was to provoke the FLN (Algerian Independence group) into restarting military action after a cease-fire was agreed in the Evian Accords of March and the referendum of June 1962.

Rebels: OAS

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

It does not appear that the OAS was affiliated with any political movement as its activities were condemned by the parties in the French government.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the OAS. However, it is clear that the group was considerably weaker than the French government.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- www.wordiq.com/definition/Algerian_War_of_Independence
- encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com

Chapter 55

ID 74

ID 74

Incompatibility: Territory, Kurdistan

The Kurds make up a majority of the population in northern Iraq. Since the 1960s, the government of Iraq has faced an insurgency led by Kurdish groups seeking greater autonomy within Iraq. The two dominant groups throughout the insurgency have been the Kurdish Democratic Party (KDP) and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK). These groups have battled each other, as well as the Iraqi government. From the 1960s to the late 1980s the conflict continued at a moderate level of intensity. The Kurdish insurgents did not represent a real challenge to the Iraqi government, however, and were unable to project power outside of Kurdistan. During the Persian Gulf War of 1991, however, when an international coalition led by the United States launched an attack aimed at forcing Iraq to pull out of Kuwait, Kurdish leaders saw an opportunity to escalate the conflict against a weakened government. The attempt was unsuccessful, however, and the Kurdish uprising was brutally suppressed. The conflict between the Iraqi government and the Kurdish groups continued into the mid 1990s but has been dormant since 1996.

Two entries listed for PUK. Consolidate into a single record. Start date for KDP should be 1975, not 1961. Cannot find any reference to the DPK; this group is not in the Uppsala/PRIO data

The Kurdish struggle stretches far back in time; the Kurds have been a nation for a long time but they have never governed Kurdistan, the territory on which they are in majority. The modern Kurdish struggle in Iraq began in 1961, spearheaded by the KDP (Kurdistan Democratic Party), and later by the PUK (Patriotic Union of Kurdistan). On 1 June 1975 the former KDP member Jalal Talabani and leaders of other Kurdish groups announced the formation of the PUK, which would act as the left-wing alternative to KDP. The most important factor affecting the dynamic of the conflict was the Gulf War. Although weakened, the Iraqi regime resolutely crushed the Kurdish revolt initiated in the wake of the Gulf War. In 1996 the US forces acted as a secondary warring party on behalf of the PUK, when they attacked Iraqi positions following joint Iraqi and

KDP attacks on the PUK. In 2003, the US invaded Iraq and deposed Sadaam Hussein. The status of Kurdistan has still yet to be determined.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 279: Iraq vs. KDP/DPK

Rebels: KDP

Transconstsupp: explicit. Organized Kurdish groups in Iran and Turkey as well as among the diaspora supported the group.

Rebextpart: major. The KDP was allied with the KDPI, and Iranian Kurdish group.

Rebpresosts: extensive. Fighters located in Iran and Turkey.

Rebsupport: Explicit. During the Iran-Iraq war, Iran gave military assistance to Iraqi Kurds. Syria and Israel are also listed as having given support.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

The conflict in this dyad is best described in two periods, one covering the period prior to the 1991 Gulf War, and the second covering the period after the Gulf War.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para>
- Patrick Brogan

Period 1: 1961-1990

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: unclear

The Kurdish Democratic Party was formed as a political party with a military wing dedicated to promoting greater autonomy of Kurds within Iraq. I could not find a reference to whether the KDP was legal in this period.

Rebestimate: 30,000

Rebestlow: 15,000

Rebesthigh: 45,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 1989 and 1990 the KDP had between 15,000 and 45,000 troops. These estimates are in comparison to 1 million troops possessed by the Iraqi army.

Newstartdate: 12/1/1961

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and the KDP reached 25 battledeaths in December 1961.

Period 2: 1991-1993

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

It is not clear whether the KDP was legal prior to 1992. However, in 1992, an autonomy arrangement was enacted which allowed Kurdish political groups, including the KDP, to have control over affairs in northern Iraq.

Rebestimate: 40,000

Rebestlow: 15,000

Rebesthigh: 55,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 1991, the KDP had between 15,000 and 45,000 troops and that in 1992 and 1993 it had between 25,000 and 55,000 troops. In the same period, the government was estimated to have over 300,000 troops.

Newenddate: 12/31/1993

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the KDP and the government of Iraq did not reach 25 battledeaths again after 1993.

Dyad ID 285: Government vs. PUK

Rebels: PUK

Transconstsupp: explicit. Organized Kurdish groups in Iran and Turkey as well as among the diaspora supported the group.

Rebextpart: major. The group was reported as being close to Turkey's PKK rebel group.

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases located in Turkey and Iran

Rebsupport: explicit. At various points in time, Syria, Iran, and the US were supporting the PUK. In 1996, the US conducted air strikes against Iraq in support of the PUK

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

This conflict is best described in two periods, one covering the phase of the conflict prior to the 1991 Persian Gulf War and the second covering the period during and after the war.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para>
- Patrick Brogan

Period 1: 1974-1990

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: unclear

The PUK was established as a political and military organization. I could not find a reference to whether the PUK was legal prior to 1991.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 4,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 1989 and 1990 the PUK had 4,000 troops. This estimate was in comparison to 1 million troops possessed by the Iraqi army.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1976

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and the KDP reached 25 battledeaths sometime in 1976, but does not date it more precisely than that.

Period 2: 1991-1996

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

It is not clear whether the PUK was legal prior to 1992. However, in 1992 an autonomy agreement was enacted which allowed Kurdish groups, including the PUK, to have control over affairs in northern Iraq.

Rebestimate: 10,000

Rebestlow: 4,000

Rebesthigh: 12,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database provides the following estimates for the troop strength of the PUK: in 1991: 4,000; in 1992, 1993 and 1996: 12,000. These estimates are in comparison to over 300,000 troops possessed by the Iraqi army.

Newendate: 11/30/1996

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that the conflict between the government and the PUK did not reach a noticeable level of intensity after November 30, 1996.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Onwar.com

Dyad ID 653: Iraq vs. KDP - QM

In 1976, the Kurdish Democratic Party (KDP) signed an agreement with the Iraqi government and stopped fighting. A faction of the KDP was opposed to the agreement and continued fighting as KDP-Provisional Command. KDP-QM operated in the conflict in 1977 and 1978.

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: Yes

KDP-QM was both a political and a military organization.

Rebel Estimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

UCDP gives no estimate as to the troop strength of KDP-QM but the group was clearly quite a bit weaker than the Iraqi army.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: moderate

KDP-QM had a central command that coordinated its activities.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The Kurds were a large group in Iraq, but this faction never garnered much popular support and did not come close to matching the Iraqi army in its ability to fight or procure arms.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Parts of Northern Iraq

Effective Territorial Control: Moderate

This faction of the KDP was able to control some territory in northern Iraq.

Conflict Type: Autonomy

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

UCDP gives no indication of external support to KDP-QM.

Government Support: No

Non-state military support to Government: No

UCDP gives no indication of external support to the Iraqi government in relation to the Kurdish conflict in this period.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

The government-KDP-QM dyad did not generate 25 battledeaths again after 1978.

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 56

ID 76

ID 76

Incompatibility: Territory, North Borneo

Dyad ID 655: United Kingdom vs. North Kalimantan Liberation Army

The Sultanate of Brunei was under British protection prior to the 1960s. In the early 1960s, an agreement was reached between the United Kingdom and the sultan of Brunei for Brunei to enter into a federation with Malysia, the country that it shared an island with. A group calling itself the North Kalimantan Liberation Army launched a revolt against the British authority on December 8, 1962, to oppose Brunei's joining the Malysian Federation. The rebels achieved some initial military success but were unable to seize the Sultan's palace and within days had been driven into the countryside. Over the next week the British army conducted mopping up operations in rural Brunei but by December 20, the rebels had been defeated.

A large-scale revolt broke out on Dec. 8, 1962, in the British-protected Sultanate of Brunei and also in adjoining areas of the other two territories comprising British Borneo—Sarawak and North Borneo. On Dec. 19, however, President Sukarno of Indonesia publicly declared in a Jakarta broadcast that "we, the people of Indonesia, feel great sympathy for the struggle of the people of North Borneo who are fighting for their independence." The rebellion failed, and Brunei did not become independent until 1984.

Rebels: North Kalimantan Liberation Army

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: Explicit. Indonesia declared its endorsement of Brunei independence. (Although there are some reports (O), that Indonesia supported the uprising, a NY Times article says that the UK

does not believe there was Indonesian involvement)

Rtypesup: endorsement

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The North Kalimantan Liberation Army was affiliated with the Brunei People's Party, an organization which was made illegal shortly after the rebellion broke out.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the Brunei's People's Party. However, it is clear that the group was no match for the British army.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Onwar.com
- New York Times Archives

Chapter 57

ID 78

ID 78

Incompatibility: Territory, Eritrea

In 1950, the UN decided that Eritrea should indeed be federated with Ethiopia, against the will of the Eritrean people. Emperor Haile Sellassie unilaterally annexed Eritrea and incorporated it as Ethiopia's 14th province. From the late 1970s and onwards, one rebel organisation dominated the Eritrean scene: Eritrea People's Liberation Front (EPLF). All rebel movements, including EPLF, originated from the Eritrean Liberation Movement (ELF), which launched its struggle in 1961. During the 1970s and the early years of the 1980s, the EPLF and various ELF factions fought each other for dominance, with EPLF having the upper hand in the fighting. In 1982 EPLF finally managed to push ELF out of Eritrea and into Sudan. In December 1974, Ethiopia was declared a socialist state, and subsequently developed close relations with both the Soviet Union and Cuba. A military assistance agreement was worked out with the USSR. In 1989 a secret agreement was closed between Israel and Ethiopia, providing for Israeli military assistance in exchange for Mengistu's promise to let Ethiopian Jews return to Israel. The Eritrean rebels, for their part, received external support from numerous Arab states, channelled through Sudan. Syria, Iraq and Libya provided the rebels with weapons and artillery. On 21 May 1991 Mengistu, facing a military defeat, fled the country. Following a referendum on the future of the province, Eritrea proclaimed its de jure independence on 24 May 1993, marking the formal resolution of the incompatibility.

Split this record into two periods. Before and after 1974. In 1974, Haile Selassie was deposed and the Mengistu regime was put in place.

Dyad ID 53: Government vs. EPLF

Rebpolwing: no

The EPLF was a secessionist organization. Although it did establish some parallel governmental

structures in the areas of Eritrea it controlled, it was only a military, not a political, opposition.

Rebestimate: 30,000

Rebestlow: 25,000

Rebesthigh: 60,000

Rebstrength: weaker

In December, 1978, Keesing's Record of World Events estimated that the EPLF had between 25,000 and 30,000 troops at its command. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute provides the following estimates for the troop strength of the EPLF: In 1986, 1987, 1988 and 1989: 30,000; in 1990: 40,000-50,000; in 1991: 60,000. These estimates are in comparison to over 200,000 troops possessed by the Ethiopian government.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: high

The EPLF had a strong central command structure which was easily transferred into a national government in Eritrea once it achieved independence.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1972

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government of Ethiopia and the EPLF reached 25 battledeaths sometime in 1972 but does not give more specific information than that.

Newenddate: 5/28/1991

On May 28, 1991, several other Ethiopian rebel groups led by the Tigrayan People's Liberation Front (TPLF) entered Addis Ababa and overthrew the government. The TPLF and EPLF had already reached an agreement that would allow for a referendum on the independence of Eritrea once the TPLF took power, and the referendum was held. Therefore, the conflict between the TPLF and the government of Ethiopia ended on May 28, 1991.

Dyad ID 655: Ethiopia vs. Eritrean Rebel Groups

Eritrea was an Italian colony prior to World War II and after the war was administered by the victorious allied powers. In 1950, the United Nations decided that Eritrea would enter into a federation with neighboring Ethiopia, a move not popular among the Eritrean population. The federation lasted ten years until in 1960, Ethiopian emperor Haile Selassie ended the federation and made Eritrea another province within Ethiopia. The next year, an armed struggle broke out between the Eritrean Liberation Front (ELF) and the Ethiopian government, an insurgency that would last for over 40 years.

The ELF battled the Ethiopian government alone until 1970, when a faction of the ELF broke off and formed the Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF). While the ELF was a conservative political organization, the EPLF was a Marxist-organization and was dominated by Christian Eritreans from the country's highland regions. In the 1970s, fighting occurred between the ELF and

the EPLF, as well as between each rebel group and the government, but by the late 1970s, the EPLF had emerged as the predominant rebel group. The ELF continued to be beset by fractionalization and by the 1980s a number of different factions had emerged.

In 1982, the EPLF forced the ELF out of Eritrea and into neighboring Sudan, and by that point the EPLF controlled almost all of Eritrea. In the 1980s, the EPLF also gained from alliances with other Ethiopian rebel groups which had organized to oppose the nationalist/Marxist Ethiopian government of Mengistu, such as the Tigrayan People's Liberation Front (TPLF) and the Oromo Liberation Front (OLF) (see conflict id 1700). In 1991, the EPLF/TPLF/OLF alliance overthrew the Ethiopian government, and the EPLF was granted the right to hold a referendum on the independence of Eritrea. The referendum was successful and on May 24, 1993, Eritrea declared itself independent.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 670?: Government vs. ELF factions

Rebpolwing: no

The ELF factions were various secessionist movements and did not represent political oppositions.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the ELF factions. However, it is clear that the groups were considerably weaker than the Ethiopian government.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1970

It is not clear exactly when the ELF factions broke off. However, the EPLF broke off in 1970 and it was the major faction, so the start date for these groups is marked as the beginning of 1970.

Newenddate: 12/31/1982

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the EPLF drove the ELF out of Eritrean in 1982 and became the only group fighting the Ethiopian government in Eritrea.

Dyad ID 667: Government vs. ELF

Rebpolwing: no

The ELF was a secessionist movement and did not represent a political opposition.

Rebestimate: 12,500

Rebesthigh: 15,000

Rebstrength: weaker

In December 1978, Keesing's Record of World Events estimated that the largest faction of the ELF

had between 10,000 and 15,000 troops.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Much of Eritrea

Effterrcont: moderate

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that throughout much of the conflict, the ELF and EPLF controlled a large percentage of Eritrea.

Newendate: 12/31/1982

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the EPLF drove the ELF out of Eritrea in 1982 and became the only group fighting the Ethiopian government in Eritrea.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Databse
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks
- Pool, David (2001). *From Guerillas to Government: The Eritrean People's Liberation Front*. Oxford, UK: James Currey.

Chapter 58

ID 80

ID 80

Incompatibility: Venezuela vs. Military Factions

Dyad ID 475: Venezuela vs. Military Faction of 1992

In 1992, Venezuela was in a highly unstable position. The economy was in bad shape and the economic austerity policies implemented by President Carlos Andrés Pérez were very unpopular. The country experienced high levels of strikes and violent protests and in 1992, a faction of the military led by Hugo Chávez Frías twice attempted to take power through a coup d'état. First, on February 4, 1992, a group of officers tried to seize the main government offices but were thwarted when the bulk of the military stayed loyal to Pérez. Chávez Frías was thrown in jail for plotting the coup, but while he was in jail other supporters tried again on November 27, 1992. Although they were again unsuccessful in overthrowing Pérez, they were able to take control of several radio stations and so broadcast their anti-Pérez message. This message proved quite popular and in elections in 1998, Hugo Chávez Frías was elected president of Venezuela.

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The army officers were opposed to the government of Pérez but did not appear to be affiliated with another political organization.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 1,100

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that 1,100 military personnel were arrested following the two coup attempts, which suggests that at least that number were involved.

Source:

- Uppsala Conflict Database

Dyad ID 672: Venezuela vs. Military Faction of 1962

In 1962, Venezuela experienced two revolts by Marines with a leftist political orientation. The second insurrection, which broke out in the town of Puerto Cabello on June 3, resulted in over 100 deaths. The Puerto Cabello revolt was led by Lieutenant Commander Pedro Silva and involved about 400 marines. The government forces were able to quickly repress the revolt, however, the fighting was very bloody and 120 government soldiers lost their lives.

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The rebels were a faction of the military with a leftist political orientation, however, it does not appear that they were affiliated with a political organization.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 400

Rebstrength: much weaker

The New York Times on June 3, 1962, reported that, "The rebel marines were believed to number about 400."

Source:

- New York Times

Dyad ID 778: Venezuela vs. Bandera Roja

TBA

Chapter 59

ID 82

ID 82

Incompatibility: Territory, Guinea-Bissau

Dyad ID 675: Portugal vs. PAIGC

Most African colonies achieved independence in the early 1960s. However, Portugal held onto its colonies of Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau much longer. In each, the colonial power faced large-scale guerilla insurgencies aimed at forcing it out. In the small West African colonial of Guinea-Bissau the conflict was initiated by the African Party for the Independence of Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde), a political organization which formed in the 1950s. The conflict heated up in the 1960s, and by 1970 the group had 10,000 troops challenging a Portuguese army that was also involved in conflicts in Mozambique and Angola. In 1973, the PAIGC declared Portuguese Guinea (as the area was known in the colonial period) the independent state of Guinea-Bissau and created a government, although it was not recognized by the colonial power. In 1974, a military coup in Portugal led to a new government that was eager to pull out of the increasingly costly overseas possessions. Portugal granted the colony independence in September 1974.

In 1956, Amilcar Cabral (1921-73) founded the African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde (PAIGC), which tried unsuccessfully through negotiations to gain independence for Portuguese Guinea (Guinea-Bissau) and the Cape Verde Islands. In late 1962, small guerrilla bands began attacking Portuguese army posts. By 1973, the PAIGC had obtained control of two-thirds of Portuguese Guinea; it proclaimed independence and renamed the province the Republic of Guinea-Bissau.

Rebels: PAIGC

Transconstsupp: explicit. The World Council of Churches and the Vatican expressed support for the rebels. WCC also provided some financial assistance

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. The group had bases in Guinea and Senegal.

Rebsupport: explicit. The governments of Guinea and Senegal allowed rebels to use their territory. Cuba also provided training.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The PAIGC was a political and military organization dedicated to achieving independence for the colony. It was not legal within the Portuguese colonial authority.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 10,000

Rebstrength: weaker

In August 1970, Keesing's Record of World Events estimated that the PAIGC had 10,000 men engaged in the fighting. It went on to report that Portugal had about 25,000 soldiers and these were backed up by about 25,000 irregulars that were recruited against segments of the local population opposed to independence.

Mobcap: high

In August 1970, Keesing's Record of World Events reported that the PAIGC "enjoyed the support of all the tribes except the Fula, whose Moslem chiefs considered independence to be a threat to their traditional suzerainty."

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Encyclopedia.com

Chapter 60

ID 83

ID 83

Incompatibility: Territory, North Borneo

Dyad ID 586: Malaysia vs. CCO

Malaysia, which became an independent federation in 1963, faced armed insurgency almost immediately following its creation. Upon independence, the government already faced an armed challenge by a Communist group, the Clandestine Communist Organization (CCO) based in the Malaysian province of North Borneo. The CCO was affiliated with the Malaysian Communist Party and received support from China and from Indonesia, who wanted to destabilize Malaysia. The CCO was small, however, and was unable to accomplish much militarily, and the conflict ended in 1966 when Indonesia agreed to stop providing support to Malaysian rebels. Without its external support, the CCO was not viable.

This may not count as an internal war. Indonesia and Malaysia fought an international war during this period. The CCO appears to be local forces that Indonesia backed. There is little information about the group itself

Between 1962 and 1966 Indonesia and Malaysia fought a small, undeclared war which came to involve troops from Australia and Britain. The conflict resulted from a belief by Indonesia's President Sukarno that the creation of the Federation of Malaysia, which became official in September 1963, represented an attempt by Britain to maintain colonial rule behind the cloak of independence granted to its former colonial possessions in south-east Asia. The antagonism that gave rise to Confrontation was already apparent in December 1962, when a small party of armed insurgents, with Indonesian backing, attempted to seize power in the independent enclave of Brunei, only to be defeated by British troops from Singapore. By early 1963 military activity had increased along the Indonesian side of the border in Borneo, as small parties of armed men began infiltrating Malaysian territory on propaganda and sabotage missions. These cross-border raids, carried out

by Indonesian "volunteers", continued throughout 1963; by 1964 Indonesian regular army units had also become involved. Australian units which fought during Confrontation did so as part of a larger British and Commonwealth force under overall British command.

Rebels: CCO

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases located in Indonesia

Rebsupport: explicit. Indonesian troops led the uprising.

Rtypesup: troops

Govsupport: explicit. England and Australia provided troops.

Gtypesup: troops

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: acknowledged link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The CCO was affiliated with the Malaysian Communist Party.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the CCO. However, it is clear that the group was considerably weaker than the Malaysian army and was unable to function in the absence of foreign support.

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- <http://www.awm.gov.au/atwar/confrontation.htm>
- <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Konfrontasi>

Chapter 61

ID 85

ID 85

Incompatibility: Territory, Southern Sudan

Dyad ID 676: Sudan vs. Anya Nya

Sudan is the largest country in Africa, and is divided between the northern part of the country, which has a population that is primarily Islamic and Arabic, and the southern part whose population is primarily Animist or Christian and African. In 1956, Sudan achieved independence from British and Egyptian colonial occupation and tensions between northern and southern Sudanese politicians were already high. The southern part of Sudan was disadvantaged economically, politically, and socially relative to the north and prior to independence, northern Sudanese politicians had agreed to consider federalism for the country. However, upon independence Sudan was a unitary state with a parliamentary government that was dominated by northerners. The first instance of violence occurred prior to independence in 1955 in southern Sudan, however, the first seven years after independence were largely peaceful.

By 1963, however, a substantial number of southern Sudanese had committed to armed struggle and an insurgency broke out. There were several different groups waging war against the government but the largest and most important was the Anya Nya. It was not clear exactly what the demands of the Anya Nya were, they ranged from greater autonomy to secession and creation of a new state, and the conflict raged for nine years. In 1971, a military coup (the third in two years) brought a government to power that was committed to ending the armed struggle and a substantial peace agreement was reached between the government and the rebels. The agreement called for federalism, power-sharing in the military, and would produce a peace that would last for eleven years until a new, more bloody civil war, broke out (see conflict id 1850, dyad 1080).

In August 1955 troops of the Equatoria Corps, together with police, mutinied. The mutinies were suppressed although some of the rebels were able to escape to rural areas. This led to the formation

of the Anya Nya guerrilla army, composed of remnants of the 1955 mutineers and recruits among southern students. By 1969 the rebels had developed foreign contacts to obtain weapons and supplies. Israel, for example, trained Anya Nya recruits and shipped weapons via Ethiopia and Uganda to the rebels. After considerable consultation, a conference between SSLM (Anya Nya's political organization) and Sudanese government delegations convened at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in February 1972 where they reached a peace agreement.

Rebels: Anya Nya

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases were located in Uganda and Ethiopia. Recruitment occurred mainly in Ugandan refugee camps

Rebsupport: explicit. Israel supported the group militarily. Uganda allowed territorial access.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: none. The Soviet Union and China sold vast quantities of arms to Sudan. However, this was purchased (rather than granted) and it does not appear that the USSR and China supported the government's political agenda.

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The southern Sudanese rebels created a parallel government in southern Sudan and the Anya Nya was affiliated with a political movement there. However, the government was not recognized by the Sudanese national government.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 12,000

Rebstrength: parity

Keesing's Record of World Events reported in March 1972 that at the time of the signing of the peace agreement, Anya Nya was estimated to have 12,000 troops and the Sudanese army southern command was estimated at 15,000.

Centcont: no

In December 1970, Keesing's Record of World Events wrote, "Among the rebels there was neither a unified command nor co-ordinated political leadership."

Newendate: 2/28/1972

On February 28, 1972, the Sudanese government and Anya Nya signed a peace agreement which ended the conflict.

Sources:

- Woodward, Peter (1995). "Sudan: War Without End" in Furley, Oliver, Ed., *Conflict in Africa*. New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers.
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Library of Congress Country Study
- Patrick Brogan

Dyad ID ? Sudan vs. SPLM, faction of SPLM and NDA

Sudan has experienced two very violent civil wars in its independent history. The first, lasting from 1963-1972, involved fighting between a southern secessionist movement (Anyanya) and a northern government that was dedicated to keeping the country intact (*see conflict id 1850, dyad 1060*). A peace agreement in 1972 terminated that conflict and Sudan was at peace for eleven years. In 1983, however, a new conflict erupted, again between a rebel group representing southern Sudan and the government. However, unlike Anyanya, the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement (SPLM), led by John Garang, set as its goals the formation of a unified, democratic Sudan, with religious freedom, rather than the secession of the south.

From 1983 into the 1990s a very bloody civil war was waged in southern Sudan between the SPLM and the government. Although many battles occurred, neither side was able to make much progress and neither was close to achieving military victory. In the 1990s, the conflict became more complex, as a faction of the SPLM dedicated to southern secession split off and became the Southern Sudan Independence Movement (SSIM). Additionally, another group, the National Democratic Alliance (NDA), emerged which was made up primarily of northern opposition parties. The SPLM joined with the NDA in its attempt to overthrow the Islamist government.

Throughout much of the conflict, the SPLM received support from the government in neighboring Uganda. In retaliation, the Sudanese government supported Ugandan opposition groups such as the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA). However, an agreement between the Sudanese and Ugandan governments in 2002 led to the loss of Ugandan support for the SPLM, which severely hurt the rebel group's position relative to the government. The early years of the 21st century saw several rounds of negotiations between the government and the SPLM, however, the conflict was ongoing as of the end of 2003.

Consolidate multiple entries for SPLM (aka SPLA). The NDA is the name given to the umbrella organization that includes the SPLM-the NDA is dominated by the SPLM. NDA should be removed as an actor-its military operations were directed by SPLM leadership

A peace agreement in 1972 granted the southern region some measure of self-rule, but in 1983 this was repealed. The main rebel group fighting the government is Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA), under the leadership of John Garang. The SPLA fought for autonomy, however factions that wanted complete independence split from the group. This faction first used the name SPLA United and later Southern Sudan Independence Movement (SSIM). In 1995 SPLA joined an umbrella organisation called National Democratic Alliance (NDA), which also included several

northern opposition parties. NDA was a solely political platform, but in August 1996 the NDA decided to set up a joint military force under the command of the SPLA leader John Garang. During the 1980s, SPLA received crucial aid from the Mengistu regime in Ethiopia, which provided both rear bases and arms. During the 1990s, SPLA managed to enlist the support of the new regimes in Ethiopia and Eritrea, as well as of the government of Uganda. The government for its part has received aid from a number of different states over the past 14 years. In 2003, warring parties agreed to a cease-fire and to peace negotiations.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID ?: Government vs. SPLM

Rebels: SPLM/SPLA

Transconstsupp: explicit. Religious organizations in the US and South Africa have provided the SPLA with supplies and financial assistance.

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases located in Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Uganda.

Rebsupport: explicit. Uganda is the most active supporter, providing bases and supplies. Also reports that various governments have helped the rebels militarily, including, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Zimbabwe, Egypt, Ethiopia, Eritrea. The United States also provided military assistance through Ethiopia.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: explicit. During various periods of the conflict, Iraq, Libya, Iran, China supplied arms to the government

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

This conflict is best treated in two periods. The first covers the period from 1983 to 1994, before the SPLM joined with the NDA. The second covers the period of the conflict beginning in 1995 which is still ongoing, when the SPLM fought alongside the NDA.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts
- Patrick Brogan
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>
- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Period 1: 1983-1994

Rebpolwing: no

The SPLM was formed by southern military officers who did not want to submit to northern command of the army. It was dedicated to the formation of a unified, democratic Sudan. However, it does not appear that the group was affiliated with a political movement in the early years of the conflict.

Rebestimate: 30,000

Rebestlow: 20,000

Rebesthigh: 55,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the troop strength of the SPLM: In 1986 and 1987: 20,000; in 1988 and 1989: 30,000; in 1990: 55,000; in 1991, 1992 and 1993: no estimate; in 1994: 30,000-50,000. These estimates are in comparison to the following estimates for the Sudanese government in this period: In 1986: 56,750; in 1987 and 1988: 57,000; in 1989: 65,000; in 1990: 75,700; in 1991: 65,000; in 1992: 82,500; in 1993 and 1994: 81,000.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: moderate

The SPLM has, throughout the conflict, had a strong command structure led by John Garang. However, the group has also experienced a fair degree of fractionalization, since many of the members of SPLM did not agree with the group's call for a unified Sudan and instead wanted secession for the south.

Newstartdate: 5/17/1983

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the SPLM and the government reached 25 battledeaths on May 17, 1983.

Period 2: 1995 to ongoing

Rebpolwing: acknowledged link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

Since 1995, the SPLM has been fighting alongside the NDA, a group made up of northern opposition parties. These opposition parties are illegal.

Rebestimate: 40,000

Rebestlow: 30,000

Rebesthigh: 50,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) estimates that in 1995 and 1996, the SPLM had 30,000 to 50,000 troops. After 1996, SIPRI only gives estimates for the National Democratic Alliance, which included the SPLM. Throughout this period, SIPRI estimated the Sudanese government had around 100,000 troops.

Dyad ID ?: Sudan vs. Faction of SPLM/SSIM

Rebpolwing: no

The Southern Sudanese Independence Movement (SSIM) was a faction of the SPLM that was opposed to the SPLM's call for a unified Sudan. However, the group was not affiliated with a political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops that broke off from the SPLM and joined the SSIM. However, it is clear that the group was considerably weaker than the government.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1991

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the faction of the SPLM and the Sudanese government reached 25 battledeaths sometime in 1991 but did not date it more precisely than that.

Newenddate: 4/21/1997

On April 21, 1997, the government of Sudan and the SSIM signed a peace agreement which ended the armed conflict. The conflict had been largely inactive for five years prior to that and may have ended due to low activity in 1992.

Dyad ID ?: Sudan vs. NDA

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The National Democratic Alliance was an alliance of opposition groups, including northern opposition parties. Political parties were illegal in Sudan during this period.

Rebestimate, rebestlow rebesthigh: 2,500

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the vast majority of the troops under the command of the National Democratic Alliance were possessed by the SPLM, which is treated here as a separate group. However, the Database reports that two other groups in the NDA, the Sudan Alliance Forces and Beja Congress had about 2,500 troops between them, so that number is treated as the troop strength of the NDA. This force is considerably weaker than the around 100,000 troops possessed

by the Sudanese government.

Mobcap: low

Armsproc: low

Fightcap: low

The vast majority of the military force represented by the NDA was controlled by the SPLM, which is treated as a separate group.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1996

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the Sudanese government and the NDA first reached 25 battledeaths sometime in 1996.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks

Chapter 62

ID 86

ID 86

Incompatibility: Congo/Zaire vs. AFDL, Rwanda and Angola

The conflict which began in Zaire (later the Democratic Republic of the Congo) in 1996 was a complex mix of internal conflict and interstate war. The conflict was incredibly complex but primarily grew out of lingering consequences of the Rwandan genocide of 1994. In the aftermath of that genocide, as the Tutsi Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) army was winning and taking control of the country, over a million Hutu refugees fled Rwanda, many into neighboring Zaire. These refugees included the main planners and perpetrators of the genocide—the Interahamwe and the ex-Rwandan Armed Forces (ex-FAR). Ex-FAR/Interahamwe used the refugee camps in Eastern Zaire to launch attacks back into Rwanda and also coordinated attacks against Congolese Tutsi (the Banyamulenge).

The RPF-led Rwandan government and the Banyamulenge began increasingly frustrated with the unwillingness of the international community to do anything to stop the attacks and decided to take matters into their own hands. They organized a Zairean military, the Alliance of Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Congo-Zaire (AFDL), and in October 1996 the AFDL, along with the Rwandan army, attacked the refugee camps. Hundreds of thousands of Rwandan refugees went back into Rwanda, while hundreds of thousands others went deeper into Zaire. The AFDL/Rwandan alliance (along with Uganda) began pursuing the refugees across Zaire and met little to no resistance from the Zairean army as they did so. This military success prompted them to widen their objectives beyond merely defeating ex-FAR/Interahamwe and to try to remove Zairean president Mobutu Seso Seke, who had ruled the country since the mid-1960s from power. Mobutu had been a long-time supporter of the Rwandan Hutu and had allowed the perpetrators of the genocide to organize on Zairean territory.

As the Rwandan/AFDL alliance marched toward Kinshasa, they were joined by Angola, a long-time enemy of Mobutu's. Angola was upset over Zairean support to the Angolan rebel group Union for the Total Independence of Angola (*see conflict id 2310*).

Angola, Rwanda, and the AFDL were able to march to Kinshasa with very little resistance from a Zairean army that was underarmed, unprofessional, and had been unpaid for years. In May 1997, the alliance took Kinshasa, a new government was established with Laurent Kabila as President, backed by a large contingent of Rwandan, Ugandan, and Angolan troops. Kabila changed the name of the country to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Peace would prove elusive, however, as the alliance between Kabila and Rwanda and Uganda would last barely a year, and a subsequent civil war which caused the death of over 3 million Congolese would break out (*see conflict id 1860, dyad 1130*).

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 39: Congo/Zaire vs. AFDL

Rebels: ADFL (Kabila versus Mobutu)

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. The group was originally formed in Rwanda

Rebsupport: Explicit. Extensive military support from Rwanda, Uganda, Angola and Zambia. Rwanda also sent 20,000 troops to back the ADFL. Angola also sent in a force of 2,000 troops to help the ADFL.

Rtypesup: troops, military

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The AFDL was an organization formed by the Rwandan government and Banyamulenge militias in the Kivus region of Eastern Zaire and did not represent a political organization.

Rebestimate: 20,000

Rebestlow: 20,000

Rebesthigh: 40,000

Rebstrength: parity

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimates that in 1997, the AFDL had between 20,000 and 40,000 troops. The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the whole alliance had at most 40,000 troops and since the Rwandan army reportedly had 20,000 troops in Zaire, the estimate for the AFDL is placed at 20,000. The Zairean army had 28,000 troops.

Terrcont: yes

Tername: Much of Eastern Zaire

Effterrcont: moderate

As the AFDL/Rwandan alliance marched on Kinshasa, they were able to take control of many key towns in Eastern Zaire. Kabila even signed international mining contracts for the resource-rich towns before he became President.

Newstartdate: 10/18/1996

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict first reached 25 battledeaths on October 18, 1996

Newenddate: 5/17/1997

On May 17, 1997, the AFDL/Rwanda/Angola alliance took power in Kinshasa.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 40: Congo vs. RCD

On 2 August 1998, an organised group of Congolese Tutsis, the Banyamulenge, launched a rebellion against the Kabila regime in Goma and Bukavu in the Kivu region.

Rebels: RCD

Transconstsupp: tacit. Possibly sympathy, support, but Tutsi groups in Rwanda and Burundi

Rebextpart: major. The Angolan rebel group UNITA fought with the RCD and allowed the RCD to use its bases in Angola.

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases located throughout the region including in Rwanda, Uganda, Angola.

Rebsupport: explicit. Rwanda, Uganda, Burundi supported the RCD with military supplies, bases, and troops.

Rtypesup: troops, military. Rwanda consistently supported with troops, while Uganda chose to support the RCD faction after the parties split.

Govsupport: Explicit. Sudan, Libya, Angola, Chad, Zimbabwe and Namibia have assisted the Kabila government with military supplies and troops.

Gtypesup: troops, military.

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The RCD was nominally a domestic Congolese opposition group based in the Kivus region of Eastern Zaire. However, the group was almost completely artificial, and was used primarily by Rwanda to put a Congolese face on its invasion. It did not represent a coherent political organization.

Rebestimate: 40,000

Rebestlow: 15,000

Rebesthigh: 60,000

Rebstrength: parity

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the troop strength of the RCD: In 1998: 60,000; in 1999: 50,000; in 2001 and 2001: 15,000-20,000. In comparison, the Government of Congo is estimated to have approximately 50,000 troops, with another 10,000 from Angola, Namibia, Zimbabwe and Chad.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: low

The RCD did have a central command structure. However, the organization was beset by rampant fractionalization throughout its participation in the conflict.

Mobcap: low

The RCD was able to rally almost no domestic Congolese support and was entirely dependent on funding from Rwanda for its existence.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of the Kivu region of Eastern Zaire

Effterrcont: low

The RCD did control some territory in the Kivus, the region of Zaire on the border with Rwanda and Burundi. However, this control was contested as they battled with local Congolese militias (the Mai-Mai) opposed to their ties to Rwanda.

Newstartdate: 8/11/1998

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the DRC government and the RCD reached 25 battledeaths on August 11, 1998.

Newenddate: 12/31/2001

Despite the presence of a peace agreement signed by all parties in 1999, the conflict continued through 2001. By the end of 2001 it had largely wound down, however, and the conflict has not reached 25 battledeaths since.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Dyad ID 41: Congo vs. MLC

MLC was created by Bemba in September 1998 as a rebel formation in order to bring down the dictatorship of Kabila.

Rebels: MLC

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases located in Uganda.

Rebsupport: Explicit. Uganda, in addition to backing the RCD-ML, also directly assists the MLC.

Rtypesup: troops, military.

Govsupport: Explicit. Several African governments, listed above, have helped the Kabila government during this conflict

Gtypesup: troops, military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The MLC established a quasi-government in the Equateur Province where it was based, and extracted taxation revenue and provided public goods. This government was not officially recognized by the Congolese government.

Rebestimate: 12,000

Rebestlow: 10,000

Rebesthigh: 15,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the troop strength of the MLC: In 1999 and 2000: 10,000; in 2001: 10,000-15,000. These estimates are in comparison to approximately 50,000 troops for the Congolese army, plus another 10,000-15,000 troops from foreign armies.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: high

The MLC was a well-organized group with a clear command structure led by Jean-Pierre Bemba.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Equateur Province

Effterrcont: high

The MLC was able to establish a quasi-government in Equateur Province, and received much of its revenue from local taxation.

Newstartdate: 11/7/1998

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the MLC and the Congolese government first reached 25 battledeaths on November 7, 1998.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Dyad ID 42: Congo vs. RCD faction (also RCD-Liberation Movement or RCD-ML)

(RCD-ML, is the Uganda backed faction of the RCD)

Rebels: RCD-ML

Transconstsupp: tacit. Possibly support from ethnic Tutsis in other countries

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Located in Uganda, with some bases located in other states in the region

Rebsupport: explicit. Uganda backed the group with military assistance and troops

Rtypesup: troops.

Govsupport: Explicit. Various governments assisted the Kabila government during the conflict. See entry for government versus RCD, above.

Gtypesup: troops

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The RCD-ML was formed as a breakaway faction in 1999 that received support from Uganda, as opposed to the primary RCD organization that was supported by Rwanda. It did not represent a political organization.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 2,500

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimates that in 2000 and 2001 the RCD-ML had 2,500 troops, as compared to 45,000-55,000 for the Congolese government.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of Kisangani

Effterrcont: low

The RCD-ML faction, led by Ernest Wamba dia Wamba, moved to the resource-rich city of Kisangani in 1999 after its split with the overall organization. Kisangani was the site of three major conflicts between the Rwandan army and their Congolese proxies and the Ugandan army/RCD-ML.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1999

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and the RCD-ML reached 25 battledeaths sometime in 1999 but does not date it more precisely than that.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks

- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Dyad ID 646: Congo/Zaire vs. CNDP

In 2006, Laurent Nkunda formed a group which would later be called the National Congress for the Defense of the People (CNDP) which fought on behalf of the Banyamulenge in North Kivu. The CNDP was able to gain control of some territory in North Kivu and engaged in clashes with the Congolese army, the United Nations peacekeepers in the country and the civilian population. In 2009, Nkunda was removed as leader of the group, placed under house arrest in Rwanda, and CNDP negotiated a ceasefire agreement with the government.

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: Yes

CNDP was primarily a military organization but also operated as a political organization.

Rebel Estimate: 5,500

Rebel Estimate Low: 2,300

Rebel Estimate High: 8,000

Rebstrength: weaker

UCDP gives estimates of the number of troops for the CNDP ranging from 2,300 to 8,000.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: high

The CNDP had a clear leadership that coordinated its activities.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The CNDP had little popular support and was not particularly strong militarily compared to the Congolese army. However, it operated in North Kivu, large parts of which existed outside the control of the Congolese state.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Villages in North Kivu

Effective Territorial Control: High

UCDP reports that CNDP was able to establish administrative control of some villages in North Kivu including taxing the population and running public services.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: Some

Rebel Support: Alleged

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Name of Rebel Supporters: Rwanda

According to UCDP, Rwanda provided CNDP with military resources and an ability to base on its territory. Rwanda has not confirmed these allegations.

Government Support: No

Non-state military support to Government: No

The Congolese government was supported by the United Nations peacekeeping mission MONUC, but did not receive direct support from external states related to this dyad.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Ceasefire Agreement

The CNDP signed a ceasefire agreement with the Congolese government in 2008.

Source:

- UCDP

Dyad ID 679: Congo/Zaire vs. CNL

The Congo achieved independence from Belgian in 1960. However, the first five years of the country's independent history were incredibly tumultuous. Congo is the second-largest country in Africa and has over 200 ethnic groups. Within two weeks after independence, the country was immersed in civil war when the resource-rich region of Katanga seceded (see conflict id 1680). Additionally, the country experienced political turmoil as the country's first prime minister, Patrice Lumumba, was dismissed after less than nine months over divisions with the President and in 1961 was assassinated.

Lumumba was popular in much of the country, particularly in the Eastern Congo, and his dismissal and assassination increased the grievance of Eastern Congolese with the national government. In 1964, another civil war broke out, this one over government rather than territory, when former supporters of Lumumba formed the National Liberation Committee (CNL) and seized control of much of Eastern Congo. The armed conflict and political turmoil continued until in November, 1965, Lieutenant General Mobutu Seso Seke seized power in a coup d'état and declared himself President for 5 years. Mobutu hired white mercenaries and used them to help defeat the CNL and started an administration that would rule over Congo (which he would subsequently re-name Zaire) for over 30 years.

From January to August 1964, rural insurgency engulfed five provincettes out of twenty-one and made substantial inroads into another five, raising the distinct possibility of a total collapse of the central government. Among the several factors that combined to precipitate rebellion, none was more consequential than the dissolution of parliament in September 1963. Several deputies affiliated with the MNC-Lumumba decided to move to Brazzaville, in the former French Congo, and

organize a National Liberation Council (Conseil National de Libération–CNL). CNL became the central coordinating apparatus for the eastern rebellion. Gaston Soumialot was sent to Burundi by the CNL, with the mission of organizing the rebellion. With the full support of the Burundi authorities, and thanks to his own skill in exploiting local conflicts and working out tactical alliances with Tutsi exiles from Rwanda, Soumialot was able to recruit thousands of supporters in eastern Kivu. In dealing with the rebellion, the government used the Katangan gendarmes, recalled from exile in Angola, and a few hundred battlehardened white mercenaries. An internal coup by Mobutu removed the Tshombe government.

Rebels: CNL

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Recruitment took place in Burundi. Leadership based in Brazzaville

Rebsupport: explicit. The Burundian government allowed territorial access.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: explicit. Belgium and the United States provided military support to Tshombe's government.

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: major. European mercenaries fought with the Congolese defence forces.

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Regpolwinglegal: no

The CNL was made up of supporters of former Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the CNL. However, it is clear that the group was weaker than the Congolese army, even though the Congolese army was one of the least professional in all of Africa.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Lefever, Ernest W. (1965). *Crisis in the Congo: A United Nations Force in Action*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- www.encyclopedia.com

Dyad ID 680: Congo/Zaire vs. Opposition Militias

Mobutu Seso Seke seized power in Congo in 1965 after a bloody five-year civil war. He would remain as leader for over 30 years. The first 12 years of his reign were generally stable; however, in 1967 he faced a small insurgency in Katanga province. Katanga was a region of Congo that had attempted to secede after independence (*see conflict id 1680*) and was a region with a high level of anti-Mobutu sentiment. The insurrection was led by militias that were organized by Katangese refugees living abroad and they attempted to take control of key cities such as Bukavu and Kisangani. The rebels were defeated by the Congolese army, which was supported by private mercenaries hired by Mobutu, and the rebellion was quickly defeated.

After the Mobutu coup, Tshombe was plotting a comeback from his Spanish retreat. By July 1967 a major mutiny broke out in Kisangani, triggered by the news that Tshombe's airplane had been hijacked over the Mediterranean and forced to land in Algiers, where Tshombe was held prisoner. As the rebels were forced out of Kisangani by the government, they made their way to Bukavu, near the Rwandan border, which they held for three months. They unsuccessfully tried to fight back the attacks of the ANC, but by November, faced with imminent defeat, the entire group crossed the border into Rwanda where it surrendered to local authorities.

Cannot find sufficient information on this group

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: alleged link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The militias were presumed to have some connection to, or at least be supporters of former Prime Minister Tshombe, who was overthrown by Mobutu in 1965. All political parties were illegal in Congo at this point.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the opposition militias. However, it is clear that the Congolese army was stronger than the militias, particularly when it was supplemented by hired mercenaries.

Centcont: unclear

Strengthcent: unclear

Very little information was available about the leadership of these militias so it is difficult to say much about them.

Newendate: 7/31/1967

It is not clear when exactly the fighting stopped in this conflict. However, it does appear that it had largely died down by the end of the month.

Source:

- Keesing's Record of World Events

Dyad ID 681: Congo/Zaire vs. FLNC

Mobutu Seso Seke seized power in Congo in a coup d'état in 1965 and remained the leader of the country (later named Zaire) until 1997. The first twelve years of his reign were largely peaceful, however, in 1977-1978 he faced a major insurrection led by militants in the Shaba province of Zaire (formerly Katanga). Katanga was a region of Zaire that had attempted to secede after independence (see conflict id 1680) and the highest level of anti-Mobutu feeling in Zaire was based in Shaba/Katanga. In 1977, the Congolese National Liberation Front (FLNC), an anti-Mobutu organization formed in Angola, invaded Shaba from Angola and tried to seize control of the copper-mining areas. The rebels were beaten back. However, in May 1978, the FLNC attacked again and seized control of large parts of Shaba, before they were defeated by the Zairean army, supported by Belgian paratroopers and other African armies. By the end of 1978, the FLNC-led rebellion had been defeated.

The 1977 and 1978 invasions were spearheaded by the Front for the National Liberation of the Congo (Front pour la Libération Nationale du Congo–FLNC). The distant origins of the FLNC are traceable to Tshombe's Katangan gendarmes, many of whom had found refuge in Angola after the secession. Mobutu issued an urgent call for military assistance to France and Morocco, and shortly thereafter French transport airplanes proceeded to airlift Moroccan troops into Shaba. A year later, in May 1978, the FLNC launched another invasion into Shaba, this time from Zambia. Not until May 19, after paratroops from the French Foreign Legion and Belgium were airlifted into Shaba, was Kolwezi recaptured. By then more than 100 European residents had lost their lives as well as large numbers of Kolwezi residents and FAZ and FLNC soldiers. Zairian allegations of joint Soviet-Cuban involvement in the Shaba invasions were instrumental in prompting a favorable response from Mobutu's friends (France, Belgium, and the United States) to his request for immediate military assistance. But the evidence in support of these allegations is scanty at best. (from Library of Congress Country Study)

Rebels: FLNC

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. The group was mainly based in Zambia and Angola

Rebsuport: explicit. Zambia and Angola allowed the rebels to use its territory. Angola may have also provided limited military support.

Rtypesup: military

Govsuport: explicit. Morocco, Belgium, France, sent supplies, troops. The US provided military assistance

Gtypesup: troops

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The FLNC was an anti-Mobutu organization formed in Angola and did not represent a domestic political opposition.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 4,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events reported in August 1978 that the FLNC led force invading Shaba in May 1978 had about 4,000 troops. This number was considerably smaller than the Zairean army; however, the Zairean army was notoriously unprofessional and ill-suited to armed conflict.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of Shaba Province

Effterrcont: moderate

The FLNC rebels were able to seize control of parts of Shaba province in their two invasions. However, they were not able to hold onto the territory for long.

Newendate: 12/31/1978

It is not clear exactly when the conflict between the government and the FLNC ended and so it is dated at the end of 1978

Source:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Library of Congress Country Study

Chapter 63

ID 87

ID 87

Incompatibility: Gabon, France vs. Military Faction

Dyad ID 583: Gabon, France vs. Military Faction

Gabon gained independence from France in 1960 and emerged as a multiparty democracy. The first Prime Minister was Lon Mba, who led the largest party in a multi-party coalition government in the legislature. Shortly after independence it became clear, however, that Mba was unhappy having to bargain with other parties and he began pushing for the creation of a post of President that would be directly elected and be more powerful than the legislature. His attempts to increase his personal power, along with his close relationship to France, led to some opposition within Gabon and on February 17, 1964, a group of younger officers led a coup d'état and arrested Mba. An interim government was established, led by members of opposition parties, but within twenty-four hours the French military intervened and restored Mba to power. Fighting continued between French forces and supporters of the coup for a few days but soon the forces were completely suppressed.

A faction of military officers forced President Mba to resign on Feb 18, 1964. On Feb 19, France sent several hundred troops to regain control of the country. Mba was reinstated as President.

Rebels: military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: none

Govsuport: Explicit. France sent in troops to reinstate President Mba

Gtypesup: troops

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: alleged link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

After the coup d'état, members of parties opposed to Mba's moves to increase his personal power created an interim government. It is not clear whether the people in the government had encouraged the coup d'état.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the sources gave any indication as to the number of troops participating in the coup d'état. However, it is clear that the coup supporters were substantially weaker than the French army.

Newendate: 2/24/1964

Barnes (1992) writes that within a few days after the coup the fighting had subsided but does not give a clear end date, so it is listed as having ended one week after the coup attempt.

Source:

- Barnes, James (1992). *Gabon: Beyond the Colonial Legacy*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- New York Times Archives

Chapter 64

ID 88

ID 88

Incompatibility: Territory, Mozambique

Dyad ID 685: Portugal vs. FRELIMO

While most of the continent of Africa achieved independence in the early 1960s, Portugal hung onto its three colonies of Angola, Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique into the 1970s. In each, the colonial power faced an armed insurgency led by African groups struggling for independence (*see also conflict ids 1660 and 1820*). The insurgency in Mozambique, led by the Mozambique Liberation Front (FRELIMO) was the last of the three and began in 1964.

The post-World War II period in Africa was one of rising nationalism as the growing educated African class became to clamour for self-determination. Mozambique was no different, and by the 1950s there were several movements in Mozambique calling for independence. As other African states gained independence and insurgencies developed in the other Portuguese colonies, these Mozambiquan nationalists began to increasingly see violence as the way to achieve independence. In the early 1960s, several of these organizations merged to form FRELIMO, which would be the main challenger to Portuguese rule in the colony. In 1964, an armed insurgency broke out, however, in the early years FRELIMO was not able to accomplish much as it was hampered by fractionalization and was well overpowered by the Portuguese army. In the late 1960s and the early 1970s, the group gained as it became more coherent and was able to establish more of a base in parts of northern Mozambique. However, the group was no overmatched and would not have been able to defeat the Portuguese army directly. Rather, Mozambique won independence after a coup d'état in Portugal in 1974 brought a new government to power and the new government decided that the costs of holding onto the colonies was too high, and in 1975 Mozambique, along with Angola and Guinea-Bissau, achieved independence.

Frelimo was formed in neighbouring Tanzania in 1962 by exiled Africans from Mozambique who

were seeking to overthrow Portuguese colonial rule in their country. The movement's original leader was Eduardo Mondlane; he held the nascent organization together, obtained support from both communist and western European countries, and built a force of several thousand guerrillas who became active in northern Mozambique. Following the left-wing military coup in Portugal in 1974, Mozambique attained independence in 1975 under a Frelimo government headed by Machel.

Rebels: Frelimo

Transconstsupp: explicit. World Council of Churches, Lutheran World Federation, and other religious groups provided financial assistance to Frelimo.

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. The group was based in Tanzania. Also presence in Zambia and Malawi

Rebsupport: Explicit. Tanzania allowed territorial access. Yugoslavia, USSR, China provided arms.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: explicit. Support given by Rhodesia and South Africa

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

FRELIMO was an organization established to organize opposition to colonial rule and not to compete within the existing political system.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 15,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Onwar.com estimates that during the conflict, FRELIMO had 15,000 troops. At the same time, the Portuguese army had 73,000 troops in Mozambique.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: low

FRELIMO experienced high degrees of fractionalization during the conflict, particularly in the early years.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of Northern Mozambique

Effterrcont: low

FRELIMO operated in northern Mozambique for much of the conflict and was able to control some territory. However, relations between the group and the population of northern Mozambique were strained because FRELIMO was primarily led by southern Mozambiquans.

Newendate: 10/31/1974

In October, 1974, FRELIMO and the Portuguese government signed the Lusaka Agreement which ended the armed conflict and paved the way for independence in July 1975.

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- Patrick Brogan
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Ciment, James (1997). *Angola and Mozambique: Postcolonial Wars in Southern Africa*. New York: Facts on File, Inc.

Chapter 65

ID 89

ID 89

Incompatibility: Territory, Aden/South Yemen

Dyad ID 686: United Kingdom vs. FLOSY and NLF

For much of the last century, Yemen was divided into two: North and South Yemen. South Yemen, whose seaport of Aden was very important to Arabian trade, was a British colony until the late 1960s. In the early part of that decade, violent opposition to British colonialism increased in what was one of the least-developed countries in the world. Two major groups emerged as the major ones to challenge British rule, the National Liberation Front (NLF), a Maoist organization that received primarily indigenous support, and the Front for the Liberation of South Yemen (FLOSY), an organization that was backed by Egypt. The fighting reached the status of a full-scale armed conflict in 1964, and the British decided to grant independence to South Yemen in 1968. As independence approached, the fighting became increasingly between Yemenese groups such as the NLF and FLOSY over who would control post-colonial South Yemen and less between the United Kingdom and these groups. The NLF emerged as the dominant group and on November 30, 1967, South Yemen became independent as the only Marxist state in the Middle East, with the NLF in charge.

The establishment of a republic in North Yemen provided a tremendous incentive to the elements in the south that sought to eliminate the British presence there. Furthermore, the Egyptians agreed to provide support for some of the organizations campaigning for southern independence—e.g., the Front for the Liberation of South Yemen (FLOSY). However, not all elements in either of the two Yemens were sympathetic to Egyptian policies, much less to the dominant role that Egypt had begun to play in southwestern Arabia. An emergent alternative movement, the National Liberation Front (NLF), drew its support primarily from indigenous sources. As the time for independence drew near, the conflict between the various groups, and especially the NLF and FLOSY, escalated

into open warfare for the right to govern the state after British withdrawal. By late 1967, the NLF clearly had the upper hand; the British finally accepted the inevitable and arranged the transfer of sovereignty to the NLF on Nov. 30, 1967.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 686: United Kingdom vs. NLF

Rebels: NLF

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The NLF was a Maoist anti-colonial insurgent group and did not represent a political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the NLF. However, the group was able to achieve victory because it imposed costs on the United Kingdom that they were unable to pay, not through military victory.

Mobcap: high

The NLF was primarily able to achieve success by mobilizing indigenous Yemenese.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of Rural South Yemen

Effterrcont: moderate

The NLF was able to control parts of the South Yemen countryside, while the British were based almost exclusively in Aden.

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- Keesings

Dyad ID 686: United Kingdom vs. FLOSY

Rebels: FLOSY

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: explicit. Was supported and equipped by Egypt

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

FLOSY was an organization that opposed the British colonial rule militarily, not as a political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by FLOSY. However, the group was overshadowed in the conflict by the NLF.

Mobcap: moderate

Unlike the NLF, FLOSY did not have a high level of internal support, but survived primarily due to assistance from Egypt.

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- Keesings
- Dresch, Paul (2000). *A History of Modern Yemen*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Chapter 66

ID 90

ID 90

Incompatibility: Government, Burundi

Burundi is a country with a majority ethnic group, the Hutu, who make up approximately 85% of the population, and a minority group, the Tutsi, who comprise about 14% of the population. In Burundi, the Tutsi have been dominant politically, socially, and economically since independence in 1962. Inter-ethnic violence has occurred several times, and since 1990 the country has been embroiled in a large civil war between various groups promoting Hutu interests and the Tutsi-dominated government. The conflict has been quite complex because of high levels of fractionalization on both the state and the government side, which has led to a large number of actors and has made finding a peaceful solution quite difficult.

The conflict broke out in 1990 when armed Hutu groups that had organized in refugee camps in neighboring Tanzania and Rwanda began launching attacks into Burundi. The Tutsi-led government of Pierre Buyoya was highly unstable in the early years of the conflict and faced numerous coup attempts and in 1993 introduced multiparty democracy to try to de-escalate the rising conflict. However, in 1993 and 1994, subsequent Hutu presidents were killed (the first intentionally, the second in the same plane crash which killed Rwandan President Juvenal Habyarimana). The Tutsi-dominated military took control of the government and the conflict restarted and reached a higher level.

Beginning in 1998, the Burundian government took a less hard-line stance and began making steps toward implementing a power-sharing government. Additionally, the government pursued negotiations with some of the armed combatants. However, the Burundian conflict also became more complex in the late 1990s because it became intertwined with the massive civil war in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) (*see conflict id 1860*). In 2001, 2002 and 2003, as the conflict in the DRC began to wind down and as progress was made at the negotiating table the conflict in Burundi appeared to be inching toward resolution. However, as of the end of 2003, the power-sharing government was still in armed conflict with two groups: the National Council for

the Defense of Democracy-Forces for the Defense of Democracy (CNDD-FDD) and the Party for the Liberation of the Hutu People-National Liberation Forces (PALIPEHUTU-FLN).

Ever since independence in 1962, the Tutsi minority has controlled the government. Hutu uprisings and subsequent brutal repression by the Tutsi army have taken place on a number of occasions in the country. In 1972, the armed repression was on the verge of genocide, and many Hutu survivors sought refuge in Rwanda and in Tanzania. In the early 1990s, Hutu rebels launched an armed struggle, which in the early stages mainly consisted of cross-border attacks from Tanzania. Ubumw, PALIPEHUTU, PALIPEHUTU-FNL, CNDD, FROLINA and CNDD-FDD have all been more or less active at some point in the conflict. The Hutu organisations have a history of factionalism, and consensus within, as well as among them, tend to be short-lived. Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 11: Burundi vs. Palipehutu

In 1980, Parti pour la libration du peuple Hutu (PALIPEHUTU) was established clandestinely in Tanzanian refugee camps. The group advocated armed struggle to fight Tutsi domination and to seek to advance the interests of the Hutu ethnic group.

Rebels: Palipehutu

Transconstsupp: tacit. Sympathy, support by Hutus in Rwanda, others

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Group was formed in Tanzania and recruited among exiles. Also located in Rwanda.

Rebsupport: none.

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: Explicit. The government of Rwanda cooperated with Burundi against Hutu rebel groups. France and the US also provided limited military aid.

Gtypesup: military.

Govextpart: minor. The DRC based group, Rally for Congolese Democracy assisted the government in providing security along the Congo-Burundi border

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

Palipehutu formed as a political organization with a military wing and began launching attacks in 1991. However, Palipehutu was not recognized as a political organization by the Burundian government in the period in which it was engaged in armed conflict.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources give any indication as to the number of troops possessed by Palipehutu. However, the group was clearly weaker than the more professional Tutsi-dominated military.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: moderate

In 1992, Palipehutu split into two factions. However, the leadership of the faction which has remained Paliphutu was generally pretty strong.

Newstartdate: 11/26/1991

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict reached 25 battledeaths on November 26, 1991.

Newenddate: 12/31/1992

In 1992, Palipehutu split into two main factions. One, which continued to be referred to as Palipehutu, committed itself to struggling for a greater role for Hutu in the government primarily as a political organization. The other, Palipehutu-FNL committed itself to armed struggle and should properly be treated as a separate organization.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>

Dyad ID 12: Burundi vs. CNDD

Conceil National pour la Dfense de la Dmocratie (CNDD) was set up in the aftermath of the 1993 assassination of Hutu president Melchior Ndadaye. Many of its founding members had previously belonged to the Hutu political party Frodebu, but could not tolerate the concessions made to Tutsi parties after the crisis.

Rebels: CNDD

Transconstsupp: tacit. Sympathy by Hutus in Rwanda, other states

Rebextpart: minor. Reports that the Angolan UNITA rebels provided weapons to the group.

Rebpresosts: Extensive. Extensive bases in Congo and Tanzania, with government complicity.

Rebsupport: Explicit. Zaire (before fall of Mobutu) and Tanzania allowed rebels to operate on their soil.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: Explicit. The government of Rwanda cooperated with Burundi against Hutu rebel groups. France and the US also provided limited military aid.

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: minor. The DRC based group, Rally for Congolese Democracy assisted the government in providing security along the Congo-Burundi border

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

CNDD was formed as a political organization and also had a military wing. However, during the period that CNDD was active in the conflict (before the military wing broke off from the political organization), political parties were illegal in Burundi.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by CNDD in this period. However, it is clear that the organization was militarily weaker than the Burundian army.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: low

The CNDD has been beset by fractionalization, particularly in its armed wing, since its formation.

Newstartdate: 11/26/1994

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and CNDD first reached 25 battledeaths on November 26, 1994.

Newenddate: 5/8/1998

On May 8, 1998, the military wing of the CNDD split off from the political wing and formed a new organization, the CNDD-FDD. The remaining CNDD largely ceased the armed struggle and primarily competed as a political organization.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>

Dyad ID 13: Burundi vs. Frolina

Front pour la libération nationale (FROLINA) was the first movement to break away from PALIPEHUTU in 1990.

Rebels: tacit. Sympathy by Hutus in Rwanda, other states

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: explicit. Rwanda cooperated with Burundi against Hutu rebel groups

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: minor. The RCD (Congo) assisted the government in security operations

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

Frolina was a political organization with an armed wing that formed based on a break with Palipehutu in 1992. However, the organization was not a legal political organization until after it signed an agreement ending its participation in the conflict.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by Frolina. However, it does appear that the group was largely marginal in the conflict.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1997

None of the sources gave any information that would allow for dating the exact start of the dyad in the conflict. However, it is clear that the group operated during 1997.

Newenddate: 12/31/1997

The conflict between Frolina and Burundi did not reach 25 battledeaths after 1997 and in fact in 1998, the group entered into peace negotiations with the government.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>

Dyad ID 14: Burundi vs. CNDD-FDD

In 1998, FDD, under commander-in-chief Jean-Bosco Ndayiekengurukiye, broke away from the political wing CNDD and established CNDD-FDD. The new movement immediately launched its armed struggle and has since been the main group fighting the government.

Rebels: CNDD-FDD

Transconstsupp: tacit. Sympathy by Hutus in Rwanda, other states

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Based in the DRC and Tanzania

Rebsupport: explicit. The CNDD-FDD was well-armed as a result of cooperation with the DRC. In addition, the DRC government allowed the CNDD-FDD to operate and to maintain bases in the DRC.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: Explicit. Security cooperation with Rwanda

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: minor. The RCD assisted with security operations.

Rebpolwing: no

The CNDD-FDD was the military wing of the CNDD which split off on May 8, 1998, and did not participate politically.

Rebestimate: 11,000

Rebestlow: 3,000

Rebesthigh: 16,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the troop strength of the CNDD-FDD: In 1998: 3,000-10,000; in 1999: 10,000; in 2000 and 2001: 10,000-16,000; in 2002: 11,000-12,000. These estimates are in comparison to 40,000 troops for the Burundian army.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1999

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that this conflict first reached 25 battledeaths sometime in 1999. It does not give any more specific information than that.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>

Dyad ID 15: Burundi vs. Palipehutu-FNL

Note: The original PRIO/Uppsala Armed Conflict Database does not have this dyad in it. However, this group split off from Palipehutu in 1992 and while Palipehutu remained a political organization, Palipehutu-FNL was a military organization with a separate agenda, and so should be counted as a separate actor.

Rebpolwing: no

Palipehutu-FNL has existed exclusively as a military organization and is separate from the political Palipehutu organization.

Rebestimate: 2,500

Rebestlow: 2,000

Rebesthigh: 3,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the strength of Palipehutu-FNL (which they call Palipehutu): In 1998, 1999 and 2000: 2,000; in 2001: 2,000-3,000; in 2002: 3,000. These estimates are in comparison to 40,000 troops for the Burundian army.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1997

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between Burundi and the Palipehutu-FNL reached 25 battledeaths sometime in 1997, but does not give a more specific estimate.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks

Dyad ID 485: Burundi vs. Military Faction

On October 18-19, 1965, a group of military and police officers attempted to overthrow the Burundian government. They were unsuccessful in doing so, although they did assassinate the Prime Minister, Leopold Biha, in the process. The officers attempted the coup following a long period of unrest in Burundi over the composition of the government. In recent elections, the ruling Uprona party, which was primarily Tutsi but did include some Tutsis, had won again, although a predominately Hutu party had won a sizable majority (in Burundi, the Hutu make up about 84% of the population with the Tutsi making up about 15%). This election result produced a situation in which the parliament was majority Hutu but the government was majority Tutsi, which led to some dissatisfaction on the part of the Hutu party. This coup attempt was unsuccessful but the political instability in Burundi continued.

An abortive coup against Mwami (King) Mwambutsa IV of Burundi and his Government was carried out by a group of Army and gendarmerie officers, in collusion with some political leaders, on the night of Oct. 18-19 in Bujumbura, the capital. The revolt was crushed within a few hours by loyal Government forces.

Rebels: military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

The military officers were allied with members of the Hutu-based People's Party.

Rebestimate: 80

Rebestlow: 40

Rebesthigh: 120

Rebstrength: weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events reports that between 40 and 120 officers participated in the coup attempt.

Source:

- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 67

ID 91

ID 91

Incompatibility: Chad vs. Insurgent Groups of 1989-

Note: Libya has a long history of intervention in the Chadian conflict. Some of this intervention has been on the side of the government, as in their largest involvement in 1980-1981, but for the most part they have intervened to oppose the government.

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks estimated that in 1986 and 1987 Libya had 5,000 troops in Chad opposing the government.

It is not clear exactly how to date Libya's intervention into the conflict as an opponent of the government. However, directly prior to the FAN's seizure of power in N'djamena in June 1982, Libya had backed the government and so would more properly be viewed as a Side A actor.

It is not clear exactly when Libya pulled out of the conflict, and in fact the country remained involved to some degree throughout the 1990s. However, by the end of 1987, the scale of its intervention had decreased.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks
- Onwar.com

Chad has been immersed in civil war for nearly its entire independent history. This conflict has been incredibly complex, with a large number of rebel groups opposing subsequent Chadian governments, and the conflict experienced a high level of external intervention with France and Libya in particular supporting various factions of the conflict. The conflict broke out primarily over historical animosities between the north and the south. The population of Chad, like that of many

countries in this region of Africa, is divided between north and south, with the northern population primarily Muslim and Arabic and the southern population primarily Christian or Animist and African. In the mid 1960s, two main rebel groups formed to oppose the southern-dominated government, the Front for the National Liberation of Chad (FRONILAT) formed in the north while the Chad National Front (FNT) formed in the east.

As the conflict has progressed, it has become primarily dominated by conflict among northern factions representing different ethnic groups or ideological positions. In 1982, a northern rebel group, the Armed Forces of the North (FAN), which had broken off from FROLINAT, seized power in N'djamena and since then one northern group or another has controlled the government. The 1980s and 1990s saw several rebel groups challenging the government of FAN and its successor government, that led by the Patriotic Salvation Movement (MPS), which seized power in 1990. Additionally, the MPS government has been under siege from within, facing several attempted coups.

Fighting has continued in Chad throughout the 1990s and into the 21st century despite multiple series of negotiations and peace agreements. By 2003, it appeared that the conflict had de-escalated because many of the rebel groups had been defeated or dropped out. However, no lasting comprehensive peace agreement has been achieved and the issues at stake in the conflict have not been resolved.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 18?: Chad vs. Military Faction

Rebpolwing: no

The military faction was a group of military officers opposed to the authoritarian tendencies of the government and was not affiliated with a political movement.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the military faction. However, the group was not able to accomplish much militarily against the Chadian government.

Newstartdate: 10/20/1989

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and the military faction reached 25 battledeaths on October 20, 1989.

Newenddate: 12/31/1989

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that there was no fighting between Chad and the military faction after 1989. However, the military faction merged with another group to become the Patriotic Salvation Movement (MPS) in 1990, and the conflict between the government and MPS is treated as a separate dyad.

Dyad ID 19: Chad vs. Movement for the National Salvation of Chad (MOSANAT)

In late 1986, after a series of incidents between Toubou troops and Hajerai soldiers, a group of Hajerai who felt that they were being pushed out of positions of influence formed the underground Movement for the National Salvation of Chad (Mouvement pour le Salut National du Tchad–MOSANAT).

Rebels: MOSANAT

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. MOSANAT reportedly was operating from bases in western Sudan

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

MOSANAT was created as a military organization and did not have a link to a political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by MOSANAT. However, it is clear that the group was weaker than the Chadian army.

Newstartdate: 3/3/1989

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and MOSANAT first reached 25 battledeaths on March 3, 1989.

Newenddate: 12/31/1989

After 1989, MOSANAT merged with some other groups to become the Patriotic Salvation Movement (MPS) and the conflict between the government and MPS is treated as a separate dyad.

Sources:

- Library of Congress Country Study
- Keesings
- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Dyad ID 20: Chad vs. Islamic Legion

Start date should be 1987, not 1965

The Islamic Legion was a mercenary force directed by Libya to attack the Habre government. The group was defeated. Later Libya gave its support to Deby.

Rebels: none

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none. Although the force was primarily made up of non-Chadian mercenaries, these forces were organized by Libya and not by a non-state actor.

Rebpresosts: extensive. The organization was based in Libya and Sudan

Rebsupport: Explicit. The Islamic Legion was directly formed by Libya and Sudan.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: explicit. 1.) Zaire supplied the Chadian government with military equipment and allowed government elite troops to be trained by Israel at Zairean military bases. 2.) Iraqi transport aircraft flew military equipment for the Chadian government in 1990. 3.) In 1990 it was reported that the United States had given significant military support, including covert aid.

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The Islamic Legion was a military organization based primarily in Libya and did not represent a Chadian political opposition.

Rebestimate: 3,000

Rebestlow: 2,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute provides the following estimates for the troop strength of the Islamic Legion: In 1988: 3,000; in 1989: 2,000-5,000; in 1990: less than 2,000. These estimates are in comparison to 17,000 troops possessed by the Chadian army.

Newstartdate: 12/31/1988

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between Chad and the Islamic Legion first reached 25 battledeaths on December 31, 1988.

Newenddate: 12/31/1990

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that after 1990 the conflict between the government and the Islamic Legion did not again reach 25 battledeaths in a year.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Patrick Brogan

Dyad ID 21: Chad vs. Committee of National Revival for Peace and Democracy (CSNPD)

CSNPD proclaimed that they wanted the introduction of a federal political system in the country.

Rebels: CSNPD

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. Some troops located in the Central African republic

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: explicit. France provided military support

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The CSNPD was formed by dissatisfied military officers and did not have links to a political party.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 5,000 Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that in 1992 the CSNPD had 5,000 troops as compared to 25,200 for the Chadian army.

Newstartdate: 8/31/1992

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and the CSNPD first reached 25 battledeaths on August 31, 1992.

Newenddate: 8/11/1994

On August 11, 1994, the government and the CSNPD signed a peace agreement which ended the conflict between the two.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts

Dyad ID 22: Chad vs. National Council for Recovery (CNR)

Minister of Public Works and Transport, Col. Abbas Koty, made a failed coup attempt. There were several armed clashes between supporters of Col. Koty, fighting under the banner of the National Council for Recovery (CNR), and government troops.

Rebels: CNR

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. CNR troops, leadership, was based in Algeria, though probably not with government consent

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: explicit. Military assistance from France.

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The CNR was an armed organization that was formed by the former Interior Minister in the government who attempted a coup. It was based primarily outside of Chad and did not represent a domestic political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the CNR. However, it does appear that the group was much weaker than the Chadian government.

Newstartdate: 12/31/1992

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and the CNR reached 25 battledeaths sometime in 1992, but that an exact date cannot be determined.

Newenddate: 12/31/1994

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the last reported armed conflict between the government and the CNR occurred in 1994.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts

Dyad ID 23: Chad vs. Patriotic Salvation Movement (MPS)

Note: This dyad is not in the PRIO/Uppsala Armed Conflict Dataset. It is not clear why not. It was formed by multiple other organizations in 1990 to overthrow the government and in fact succeeded in doing so.

Rebpolwing: no

Although the MPS was clearly formed with the goal of overthrowing the Chadian government, it does not appear that they participated as a political organization at the same time.

Rebestimate: 3,750

Rebestlow: 2,500

Rebesthigh: 5,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the MPS had between 2,500 and 5,000 troops in 1990, as compared to 17,000 for the government.

Terrcont: no

Although the MPS did take some towns on its way to the capital, the offensive that brought it to power began in the Sudan and only lasted 3 weeks, so the group did not effectively control territory for much of the conflict.

Newstartdate: 3/31/1990

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and the MPS first reached 25 battledeaths on March 31, 1990.

Newenddate: 12/2/1990

On December 2, 1990, the MPS defeated the army and took over control of Chad.

Dyad ID 24: Chad vs. Chad National Front (FNT)

It is said that the Chad National Front (FNT) started their rebellion in 1992 and that their goal was to create an Islamic State in the region of Ouadai.

Rebels: FNT

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. Some troops were located in Sudan, though apparently without government consent.

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: explicit. France provided military assistance

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

This conflict is best described in two periods, as there were two different groups under the name FNT that battled the Chadian government. The first fought during the 1960s and into the early 1970s. The second battled the government beginning in 1992.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts

Period 1: 1965-1971

Rebpolwing: no

The FNT was a military organization and did not have a political affiliation in this period.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the FNT. However, it is clear that the group was quite small.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Biltine region of east-central Chad

Effterrcont: moderate

Keesing's Record of World Events in June 1970 reported that the FNT operated primarily in the Biltine region of east-central Chad.

Newenddate: 12/31/1970

It is not clear when the conflict between the FNT and the government ended in this period. However, Keesing's Record of World Events reports that the group was largely defeated in 1970.

Period 2: 1992-1994

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

Keesing's Record of World Events reported in May 1993 that at negotiations with the FNT, the government refused to recognize the rebel group as a political party.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the FNT. However, it does not appear that the group was very significant in the conflict.

Newstartdate: 12/31/1992

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and the FNT reached 25 battledeaths sometime during 1992, but does not give a more precise estimate.

Newenddate: 10/16/1994

The government and FNT signed a cease-fire agreement on October 16, 1994, which effectively ended the conflict.

Dyad ID 25: Chad vs. Movement for Development and Democracy (MDD)

After the fall of Habre, in late 1991, a rebel group called Mouvement pour la démocratie et le développement (MDD), largely consisting of fighters loyal to former president Habr, invaded Chad from Nigeria.

Rebels: MDD

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases were located in Nigeria, Niger, and Libya. Niger and Nigeria were cooperating to shut down these bases.

Rebsupport: alleged. Possible that Libya was allowing use of its territory, however, not possible to confirm this.

Rtypesup: military, alleged

Govsupport: explicit. France provided military assistance to the Deby government

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpoling: no

The MDD was primarily a military opposition with its leadership based in Libya, it does not appear that it was affiliated with any political organization.

Rebestimate: 750

Rebestlow: 500

Rebesthigh: 1,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that in 1992, the MDD had between 500 and 1,000 troops. This estimate is in comparison to approximately 25,000 troops held by the Chadian army at this point.

Newstartdate: 12/31/1991

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that this dyadic conflict had reached 25 battledeaths by December 31, 1991

Newenddate: 5/20/1998

On May 20, 1998, the MDD decided to end its war against the government.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts

Dyad ID 26: Chad vs. Armed Forces of the Federal Republic (FARF)

In an interview the leader of the Armed Forces of the Federal Republic (FARF), Laokein Barde Frisson, stated five conditions for holding negotiations with the government: all petroleum companies wishing to exploit Chad's oilresources had to put pressure on the government to introduce a true rule of law, all Sudanese citizens who had helped President Idriss Deby take power in 1990 had to return home, talks had to be held under international supervision, Chad had to withdraw from the Organisation of the Islamic Conference and the form of the state and the question of

bilingualism had to be submitted to a referendum.

Rebels: FARF

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. Troops located in Cameroon and the Central African Republic, though without government support

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: explicit. France provided military assistance

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the May 7, 1998 peace agreement that ended the conflict between the government and the FARF made FARF a legal political party.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the FARF. However, the group was not very significant militarily.

Newstartdate: 11/30/1997

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and the FARF first reached 25 battledeaths on November 30, 1997

Newenddate: 5/7/1998

On May 7, 1998, the government and FARF signed a peace agreement which led to FARF ending the armed struggle and becoming a legal political party.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts

Dyad ID 27: Chad vs. Movement for Democracy and Justice in Chad (MDJT)

Rebels: MDJT

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. Medical treatment was given to hundreds of fighters from the Movement for Democracy and Justice (MDJT) in Libyan hospitals.

Reb suport: explicit. Libya provided medical care and allowed for party meetings on its territory.

Rtypesup: non-military

Gov suport: explicit. Military assistance from France

Gtypesup: military

Gov extpart: none

Reb polwing: no

The MDJT was a small group that operated mainly in the mountains and does not appear to have been affiliated with any political organization.

Reb estimate: unclear

Reb strength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the MDJT. However, they did indicate that the group was really small and was able to persist primarily because it was far away in the capital and in the mountains.

New startdate: 12/31/1999

The Uppsala Conflict Database indicates that the conflict first reached 25 battledeaths on December 31, 1999.

New enddate: 12/31/2002

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that after 2002 the conflict between the government and the MDJT did not reach 25 battledeaths.

Chad has faced near continuous civil war since shortly after independence. Beginning around 2005, the character of this civil war changed somewhat as Sudan began supporting rebel groups in Chad dedicated to overthrowing the government of President Deby in retaliation for Chad's support of rebels in the Darfur region of Sudan. Chad has seen a proliferation of rebel groups. One of these groups, the Unique Front for Democratic Change (FUCD) fought from 2005 until it signed an agreement with the government in late 2006 and exited the conflict. The Assembly of Democratic Forces (RAFD) formed in 2006 after Deby changed the constitution to allow him to serve a third term and signed a peace agreement in October 2007. The Union of Forces for Democracy and Development (UFDD) was an alliance of three smaller rebel groups which fought as an independent organization until 2008. In January 2008, the UFDD, along with several other rebel groups, formed an alliance called the National Alliance. It launched an attack on N'djamena that was nearly successful, but at the end of 2008 the organization fell apart. In 2009, eight rebel groups came together to form an organization called the Union of Resistance Forces (URF) which fought the government.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts

Dyad ID 455: Chad vs. FUCD

Territorial Conflict: No

Although the various Chadian rebel groups operated out of eastern Chad, the conflict was primarily over who would control the central government.

Rebel Political Wing: No

No reference to a political wing associated with FUCD, which appears to be primarily a military organization although clearly with political goals.

Rebel estimate: 3,500

Rebel estimate (low): 3,000

Rebel estimate (high): 4,000

The UCDP estimates the FUCD had 4,000 troops in 2005 and 3,000 in 2006.

Rebel strength: Weaker

The Chadian army stands at about 25,000 troops and was clearly somewhat stronger than the FUCD.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The FUCD had a leadership that generally was able to exercise some control over the organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

The FUCD had relatively little support within Chad and seemed to be primarily dependent on Sudanese support. That Sudanese support, however, allowed it to have access to training and weapons that strengthened its fighting capacity.

Territorial Control: No

The FUCD operated out of eastern Chad and Western Sudan, both of which were very chaotic and the group did not appear to control territory.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: Some

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External Supporters: Sudan

The FUCD operated out of and received military support from the government of Sudan.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: France

France provided direct military aid to the government of Chad.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Type of Termination: Peace Agreement

The FUCD signed a peace agreement with the government of Chad in December 2006 and exited the conflict.

Dyad ID 633: Chad vs. RAFD

Territorial Conflict: No

Although the various Chadian rebel groups operated out of eastern Chad, the conflict was primarily over who would control the central government.

Rebel Political Wing: No

No reference to a political wing associated with RAFD, which appears to be primarily a military organization although clearly with political goals.

Rebel estimate: 1,000

Rebel estimate (low): 1,000

Rebel estimate (high): 1,000

The UCDP estimates the RAFD had 1,000 troops in 2006.

Rebel strength: Weaker

The Chadian army stands at about 25,000 troops and was clearly somewhat stronger than the RAFD.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The RAFD had a leadership that generally was able to exercise some control over the organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The RAFD had relatively little support within Chad and seemed to be primarily dependent on Sudanese support. Unlike the FUCD, the UCDP does not indicate that Sudan provided weapons to RAFD, only access to territory.

Territorial Control: No

The RAFD operated out of eastern Chad and Western Sudan, both of which were very chaotic and

the group did not appear to control territory.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: Some

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External Supporters: Sudan

The RAFD operated out of bases located in Sudan.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: France

France provided direct military aid to the government of Chad.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Peace Agreement

The RAFD signed a peace agreement with the government of Chad in October 2007 and exited the conflict.

Dyad ID 634: Chad vs. UFDD

Rebel Political Wing: No

The UFDD was an alliance of Chadian rebel groups and did not have a political wing. The UCDP indicates that the group was interested in organizing political parties in Chad to oppose the government, but it does not appear that the alliance was directly affiliated with them.

Rebel estimate: missing

No estimate of the number of troops possessed by the UFDD was found.

Rebel strength: Weaker

The Chadian army stands at about 25,000 troops and was clearly somewhat stronger than the UFDD.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Low

The UFDD was an alliance and had a leadership but that leadership had difficulty exercising control over the constituent parts.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

The UFDD had relatively little support within Chad and seemed to be primarily dependent on Sudanese support. UCDP reports that Sudan provided extensive support to the organization, which increased its ability to procure arms and to challenge the government militarily.

Territorial Control: No

The UFDD operated out of eastern Chad and Western Sudan, both of which were very chaotic and the group did not appear to control territory.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: Some

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External Supporters: Sudan

The UFDD operated out of bases located in Sudan and received extensive support from the government of Sudan.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: France

France provided direct military aid to the government of Chad.

Non-state military support to Government: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Continuation as another dyad.

The UFDD merged with other rebel groups in January 2008 to form the National Alliance.

Dyad ID 656: Chad vs. Front for the National Liberation of Chad (FROLINAT)

Note: This dyad is not included in the PRIO/Uppsala Armed Conflict Dataset. Rather the conflict from 1965 to 1988 is listed as "Chad vs. Libya and Various Organizations." However, my research indicates that the Front for the National Liberation of Chad (FROLINAT) was the main rebel group in this period.

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

FROLINAT originally formed as an opposition political party. However, it was based in Algeria, not in Chad.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by FROLINAT. However, it is clear that the group was weaker than the Chadian army.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: low

There was a central leadership of FROLINAT. However, from its inception the group was beset by high degrees of fractionalization and many other rebel groups split off from FROLINAT throughout the conflict.

Terrcont: unclear

FROLINAT operated primarily in northern Chad, along the border with Libya. However, none of the sources indicated whether the group controlled territory in that region.

Newendate: unclear

At some point in the 1980s, FROLINAT became so fractionalized that it was no longer a relevant actor. It is not clear exactly when that happened, however.

Chad Conflict (1965-1991) Chad has faced near continuous conflict since independence. Civil war began in 1965 when a northern rebel group, FROLINAT, arose to challenge the southern dominance of the government. FROLINAT splintered quickly and in 1972 it split into several parts, two of which—the First Liberation Army and Second Liberation Army—are included here as dyads. In 1976, the Second Liberation Army also splintered leading to two organizations—the Armed Forces of the North (FAN), led by Hissen Habre, and the People’s Armed Forces (FAP), led by Gukuni Woddeye. By 1979, the country as a whole, and the capital N’Djamena, were divided among control of a number of factions. Negotiations led to an agreement, the Lagos Accord, signed by all the major factions which resulted in the establishment of a Government of National Union (GUNT) and the establishment of a Chadian National Army (FAT). Habre quickly rejected the agreement because of the large role played by Gukuni, and in 1982 the FAN overthrew the GUNT and Habre became president. FAT and subsequently GUNT both took to the battlefield as insurgents. In August 1986, the Revolutionary Democratic Council (CDR), which had been fighting as part of GUNT, broke away from that organization and launched its own challenge against Habre’s government. The GUNT then agreed to work with Habre to oppose the CDR. In 1988, the government and CDR signed a ceasefire, but Habre continued to face armed challenges from a number of groups. In 1990, Habre was overthrown in by Idriss Deby’s Popular Salvation Movement (MPS). Throughout the 1990s and 2000s, Deby has faced armed challenge led by a variety of groups. This included a coup attempt in 1991, led by Malldoum Baba Abbas.

Dyad ID 658: Chad vs. First Liberation Army

Territorial Conflict: No

Although most rebel groups in this period represented northerners in Chad, the conflict was primarily over who would control the government.

Rebel Political Wing: No

Azevedo (1998) describes the First Liberation Army as primarily a loose coalition of guerilla organizations.

Rebel estimate: 2,000

Rebel estimate (low): 2,000

Rebel estimate (high): 2,000

Azevedo (1998) estimates that the First Army had about 2,000 troops from 1969 to 1972.

Rebel strength: Weaker

The First Liberation Army was clearly weaker than the Chadian army, particularly with French support.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The First Army was led by Abba Siddick and generally stayed loyal to him, but also operated as a coalition of guerilla organizations.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

The First Army had relatively little popular support but was able to obtain weapons and fighting capacity due to its support from Libya.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Parts of northeastern Chad

Effective territorial control: Moderate

The First Army was based in northeastern Chad and controlled some territory there.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External Supporters: Libya

Libya supported some (although not all) of the Chadian rebels.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: France

France provided direct military aid to the government of Chad.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

The First Army continued to battle the government after 1972, but at a low level.

Dyad ID 659: Chad vs. Second Liberation Army (Frolinat)

Territorial Conflict: No

Although most rebel groups in this period represented northerners in Chad, the conflict was primarily over who would control the government.

Rebel Political Wing: No

The Second Liberation Army was a military organization led by Hissen Habre and did not appear to have a political wing.

Rebel estimate: unclear

No estimate was found of the number of troops possessed by the Second Liberation Army in this period.

Rebel strength: Weaker

The Second Liberation Army was clearly weaker than the Chadian army, particularly with French support.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The Second Army was led by Habre' although there was some infighting which led to his ouster by Gukuni Woddeye in 1976.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

The Second Army had relatively little popular support but was able to obtain weapons and fighting capacity due to its support from Libya.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Parts of northern Chad including Tibesti

Effective territorial control: Moderate

The First Army was based in Tibesti in northern Chad and controlled some territory there.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External Supporters: Libya

Libya supported some (although not all) of the Chadian rebels. After Libya annexed the Aouzou Strip in 1973, relations between Habre and Kadhafi deteriorated and Libya no longer supported him, but prior to that the Second Liberation Army received Libyan support.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: France

France provided direct military aid to the government of Chad.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

The Second Army continued to battle the government after 1971, but at a low level.

Dyad ID 660: Chad vs. Armed Forces of the North (FAN)

Rebpolwing: unclear

None of the available sources indicated whether FAN functioned as a political organization prior to its seizing power in N'djamena in June 1982.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: parity

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by FAN. However, the Chadian government was quite weak and was able to fight FAN for as long as it was due to the intervention of Libya in 1980-1981.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of Eastern Chad

Effterrcont: unclear

Onwar.com reports that prior to a Chadian government offensive in 1980, the FAN controlled most

important towns in Eastern Chad. Additionally, the group was able to regain those towns in 1981.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1971

It is not clear exactly when the FAN broke off from FROLINAT and became an independent actor. The first reference I could find to the group was in 1971, so I dated the dyadic conflict as starting on the first day of that year.

Newenddate: 6/30/1982

In June, 1982, FAN overthrew the existing government and took control and thus became the government rather than a Side B actor.

Dyad ID 661: Chad vs. FAP

Territorial Conflict: No

Although most rebel groups in this period represented northerners in Chad, the conflict was primarily over who would control the government.

Rebel Political Wing: No

FAP was a splinter from the Second Liberation Army, led by Gukuni Woddeye, and did not appear to have a political wing.

Rebel estimate: unclear

No estimate was found of the number of troops possessed by the FAP in this period.

Rebel strength: Weaker

The FAP was clearly weaker than the Chadian army, particularly with French support.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The FAP was led by Gukuni Woddeye, who did generally control the actions of the organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

The Second Army had relatively little popular support but was able to obtain weapons and fighting capacity due to its support from Libya.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Parts of Chad including parts of N'Djamena

Effective territorial control: Moderate

By this period in the conflict, the territory of Chad and the capital N'Djamena was divided between control of the government and the various rebel groups.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External Supporters: Libya

UCDP reports that Libya provided military support to FAP in 1977 and 1978.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: France

France provided direct military aid to the government of Chad.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Peace Agreement

On August 21, 1979, the FAP, along with the other Chadian factions, signed the Lagos Accord, which resulted in Gukuni becoming President of Chad.

Dyad ID 662: Chad vs. FAT

Territorial Conflict: No

Rebel Political Wing: No

FAT was the former military of Chad which had been overthrown by Hissen Habre's FAN.

Rebel estimate: unclear

No estimate was found of the number of troops possessed by the FAT.

Rebel strength: Weaker

The FAT was clearly weaker than the newly established army led by FAN.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The FAT had a leadership that generally controlled the organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

While the FAT did not have much popular support, it is unclear that the new government did either and both had comparable abilities to fight and procure arms.

Territorial Control: No
After its ouster, the FAT did not control territory
Conflict Type: Civil War
Transnational Constituency Support: No
Rebel External Support: No
Rebel Presence in External States: No
Rebel Support: No
UCDP reports no external support to FAT.
Government Support: Explicit
Type of Government Support: Military
Names of Government Supporters: France
France provided direct military aid to Habre's government once he took over.
Non-state military support to Governments: No
Ended?: Yes
Type of Termination: Low Activity
After 1979, the government-FAT dyad did not again reach 25 battledeaths in a year.

Dyad ID 663: Chad vs. GUNT

Territorial Conflict: No
Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link
Rebel Political Wing Legal: No
GUNT was the former government of Chad which had been overthrown by Hissen Habre's FAN.
Rebel estimate: 4,000
Rebel estimate (low): 1,500
Rebel estimate (high): 4,000
The UCDP reports that GUNT had 4,000 troops in 1983 and 1984 and 1,500-3,000 in 1985.
Rebel strength: Parity
The Chadian military only had about 5,000 troops in this period and so was comparable in strength to GUNT.
Central Control: Yes
Strength Central Control: Low
The GUNT was an umbrella of factions fighting against Habre's government.
Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

Neither GUNT nor the government of Chad had much popular support, both were able to obtain weapons through foreign support.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Parts of northern Chad

Effective territorial control: Low

GUNT was based in northern Chad, but political control in Chad was generally lacking in this period.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Troops

Name of Rebel Supporters: Libya

Libya had between 4,000 and 10,000 troops stationed in northern Chad in this period.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: France, United States, Egypt, Sudan

UCDP reports that France, the United States, Egypt and Sudan all provided weapons to Habre's government.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

After the CDR broke off from GUNT in 1986, GUNT agreed to work with Habre's government against it. However, UCDP does not code a specific agreement in the dyad.

Dyad ID 664: Chad vs. CDR

Territorial Conflict: No

Rebel Political Wing: No

CDR was a military organization that broke off from GUNT and did not appear to have a political wing.

Rebel estimate: unclear

I could find no estimate for the number of troops possessed by CDR.

Rebel strength: Weaker

The CDR was a faction that broke away from GUNT, and after GUNT united with the government the GUNT/government forces were clearly stronger than CDR's.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

CDR was a faction led by Ibn Oumar who generally controlled the organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

The CDR did not have much popular support (although the government also had little), Libyan support gave CDR access to weapons and training.

Territorial Control: unclear

No reference was found to territory controlled by the CDR.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Troops

Name of Rebel Supporters: Libya

Libya had 10,000 troops stationed in northern Chad in 1987.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Troops

Names of Government Supporters: France, Zaire

UCDP reports that France and Zaire both had troops based in Chad to support the government.

The United States also provided military support to the government.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

The government-CDR dyad did not again reach 25 battle deaths after 1987.

Dyad ID 767: Chad vs. AN

TBA

Dyad ID 777: Chad vs. Military faction (forces of Malldoum Bada Abbas)

Territorial Conflict: No

Rebel Political Wing: No

Although Abbas was interior minister and Vice President, the coup did not appear to be associated with any particular political organization

Rebel estimate: unclear

No estimate was available on how many troops were loyal to Abbas.

Rebel strength: Weaker

The majority of the military sided with the government, not Abbas.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

A faction of the military was loyal to Abbas, it was unclear how organized this group was.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

The Coup makers were not able to mobilize much support but had access to the weapons and fighting capacity of the military more broadly.

Territorial Control: No

Abbas' forces did not control any territory.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

Abbas did not receive external support of any kind.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Training

Names of Government Supporters: France

UCDP reports that France provided training and support to the Chadian military in 1991.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Victory

Victory Side: B

The coup was unsuccessful.

Sources:

- UCDP
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Azevedo, Mario. 1998. Roots of Violence: A History of War in Chad. Australia: Gordon and Breach.

Dyad ID 783: Chad vs. UFR

Rebel Political Wing: No

The UFR was an alliance of Chadian rebel groups and did not have a political wing.

Rebel estimate: 2,600

Rebel estimate (low): 2,600

Rebel estimate (high) 2,600

The UCDP estimates that the UFR had 2,600 troops in 2009.

Rebel strength: Weaker

The Chadian army stands at about 25,000 troops and was clearly somewhat stronger than the UFR.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Low

The UFR was an alliance of eight rebel groups formed by Sudan and had a leadership but that leadership had difficulty exercising control over the constituent parts.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

The UFR had relatively little support within Chad and seemed to be primarily dependent on Sudanese support. UCDP reports that Sudan provided extensive support to the alliance, which increased its ability to procure arms and to challenge the government militarily.

Territorial Control: No

The UFR operated out of eastern Chad and Western Sudan, both of which were very chaotic and the group did not appear to control territory.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: Some

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External Supporters: Sudan

The UFR operated out of bases located in Sudan and received extensive support from the government of Sudan.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: France

France provided direct military aid to the government of Chad.

Non-state military support to Government: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

After 2009, the UFR-government dyad did not generate 25 battledeaths in 2010.

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 68

ID 92

ID 92

Incompatibility: Colombia vs. Leftist Organizations

Colombia has been the most conflict-torn country of South America in the post-World War II period. In the 1950s, the country was nearly torn apart by "la violencia," conflict between supporters of the two major parties—the liberals and conservatives. In 1958, the two warring parties signed an agreement to create a power-sharing government for 16 years which would guarantee alternation of the executive and the sharing of other political powers. This agreement ended la violencia, but paved the way for further violence as the new government turned its attention to the very armed peasant organizations they had used in their conflict as a potential threat. Additionally, the radical left in Colombia felt that they had been sold out by the agreement and began organizing for revolution.

Four main organizations formed to challenge the government in the 1960s. The largest, and the group that would prove most significant in the conflict, was the Popular Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), a Marxist organization that unified many different peasant groups from la violencia. The Popular Liberation Army (EPN) was a Maoist organization that split off from the Colombian Communist Party. The National Liberation Army (ELN) was a larger group led by Colombians who trained in Cuba after the Cuban Revolution and were inspired by Castro. The Movement of April 19 (M-19) was made up of members of the left-wing party ANAPO and primarily carried out terrorist attacks such as kidnappings, taking hostages, and seizing weapons.

The early 1960s was a period of relative stability in Colombia as these groups focused on organizing rather than on launching attacks. However, by the latter part of the 1960s, the Colombian government was engaged in armed warfare with all four of these groups. The insurgents gained some initial success but a deal between the Soviet Union and Colombia in 1968 cut off much support to the rebels and the Colombian army was able to largely cripple their ability to wage sustained operations. In the 1970s, the rebels regrouped and by the end of the 1970s, Colombia was experiencing full-fledged warfare again.

From the late 1970s through the 1980s the guerilla organizations continued to make progress in

their struggle against government forces. Groups such as the FARC increasingly turned to terrorist tactics such as kidnapping to gain publicity and to intimidate the government. Additionally, while these groups maintained their leftist orientation, they became much more closely tied in with the growing Colombian narcotics trade, which provided them with an increasing source of funding. In 1989, when the Cold War ended, the Colombian government took the opportunity to negotiate with the rebel organizations. Several groups, including M-19 and the EPN signed peace deals and ceased the armed struggle. The FARC and ELN, however, did not participate in negotiations and continue to wage armed conflict against the government through the end of 2003. Additionally, several other insurgent groups have emerged in the large areas of the country outside of the government's control (potentially as much as 50% of the country), including factions of both the FARC and the ELN, the Worker's Self Defense Movement (MAO), and the Quintin Lame Commandos. Also entering the conflict in this period were right-wing paramilitaries, private-organizations that attacked the left-wing rebels and their alleged supporters, and were also heavily involved in illegal drug-trafficking to obtain funding. The conflict shows no signs of being terminated as of the end of 2003.

Note on dates: only FARC and ELN active in 1992-2002

During the mid-1960s, the embers of la violencia were dying out, but guerrilla activity was increasing. In 1964 the National Liberation Army (Ejrcito de Liberacin Nacional–ELN) was formed by students who were disenchanted with the pro-Soviet Communist Party of Colombia (Partido Comunista de Colombia–PCC) and inspired by the Cuban Revolution. In 1966 another guerrilla movement–the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia–FARC)–began operating. In 1968, however, a new guerrilla group–the Popular Liberation Army (Ejrcito Popular de Liberacin–EPL)–was formed as the armed branch of the Communist Party of Colombia– Marxist-Leninist (Partido Comunista de Colombia–MarxistaLeninista –PCC-ML), a pro-Chinese group. The United States Military Assistance Program (MAP) facilitated the development of the Colombian armed forces and the US has consistently provided military aid to Colombia.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 237: Colombia vs. FARC

Multiple entries for the FARC. Consolidate into a single record Growing out of the turmoil and fighting in the 1950s between liberal and conservative militias, the FARC was established in 1964 by the Colombian Communist Party to defend what were then autonomous Communist-controlled rural areas. Location/Area of Operation: Colombia with some activities-extortion, kidnapping, logistics, and R&R-in Venezuela, Panama, and Ecuador. External Aid: Cuba provides some medical care and political consultation. A trial is currently underway in Bogota to determine whether three members of the Irish Republican Army-arrested in Colombia in 2001 upon exiting the FARC-controlled demilitarized zone (despeje)-provided advanced explosives training to the FARC.

Rebels: FARC

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: alleged. Reported links between the FARC and the Irish Republican Army, but this is probably not a sustained, long-term relationship.

Rebpresosts: some. Some troops located in Venezuela

Rebsupport: explicit. Cuba provides limited assistance

Rtypesup: non-military

Govsupport: Explicit. The US has provided extensive military assistance

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

This dyad is best described in two phases. The first describes the early years of the conflict from 1966 to 1977. The second periods covers the conflict from 1978 to the present, when the FARC was in a stronger position militarily.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>
- Library of Congress Country Study

Period 1: 1966 to 1977

Rebpolwing: no

The FARC did not form a political movement until 1984.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 500

Rebstrength: much weaker

Onwar.com estimates that in 1966-1968, the FARC had about 500 rebels. In September 1971, Keesing's Record of World Events estimated that the Colombian army had about 25,000 troops in mid-1967.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Departments of Huila, Tolima, Quindio and Valle

Effterrcont: moderate

There were several Colombian departments that were referred to as "independent republics" by guerillas because the government had little control over them. Keesing's Record of World Events reported in September 1971 that the FARC was primarily active in the departments of Huila, Tolima, Quindio and Valle.

Newstartdate: 12/1/1966

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the FARC and the government first reached 25 battledeaths in December 1966.

Period 2: 1978 to Present

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

In 1984, the FARC formed a political wing, the Patriotic Union, that had candidates who competed in elections.

Rebestimate: 12,500

Rebestlow: 5,000

Rebesthigh: 20,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute provides the following estimates for the troop strength of the FARC: In 1987 and 1988: 10,000-12,000; in 1989: 5,000; in 1990 and 1991: 5,000-6,000; in 1992: 5,000-7,000; in 1993: no estimates; in 1994, 1995 and 1996: 5,700; in 1997: 7,000; in 1998: 10,000; in 1999: 10,000-17,000; in 2000, 2001 and 2002: 15,000-20,000. These estimates are in comparison to over 100,000 troops for the Colombian military.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: low

The FARC has been beset by factionalization in this period, and may have more than a dozen different factions at any point in time.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Departments of Huila, Caquet, Tolima, Cauca, Boyac, Santander, Antioquia, Valle del Cauca, Meta, and Cundinamarca and the intendancy of Arauca.

Effterrcont: moderate

Onwar.com reported that these areas were "FARC strongholds."

Dyad ID 342: Colombia vs. ELN

Multiple records for ELN. Consolidate into a single record

Marxist insurgent group formed in 1965 by urban intellectuals inspired by Fidel Castro and Che Guevara.

Rebels: ELN

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. Limited presence in Venezuela border regions

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: explicit. Extensive US military assistance

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The ELN was formed when it broke away from the Colombian Communist Party, however, it has not participated in the Colombian political process.

Rebestimate: 3,250

Rebestlow: 1,500

Rebesthigh: 5,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the troop strength of the ELN: In 1989: 2,000; in 1990: 1,500-3,000; in 1991: 1,500-2,000; in 1992: 1,500-4,000; in 1993: no estimate; in 1994, 1995 and 1996: 2,500; in 1997: 3,000; in 1998: 3,500; in 1999 and 2000: 5,000; in 2001 and 2002: 3,000-5,000. These values are in comparison to more than 100,000 for the Colombian army.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: low

The ELN has been beset by fractionalization during this period.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: parts of southern Colombia

Effterrcont: moderate

The area of Southern Colombia is almost entirely out of the government's control and is controlled largely by FARC and ELN.

Newstartdate: 8/15/1966

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and the ELN first reached twenty-five battledeaths on August 15, 1966.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>
- Library of Congress Country Study

Dyad ID 343: Colombia vs. EPL

Multiple records for EPL. Consolidate into a single record. Organized in early 1968, the EPL was headed by proChinese communists who formed the Communist Party of Colombia—

Marxist-Leninist (Partido Comunista de Colombia-Marxista– Leninista–PCC-ML) upon breaking with the Soviet-line PCC in July 1965.

Rebels: EPL

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: explicit. Military assistance by the US

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The EPL has functioned as a guerrilla organization and does not participate in the Colombian political process.

Rebestimate: 1,150

Rebestlow: 800

Rebesthigh: 1,500

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute provides the following estimates for the troop strength of the EPL: in 1989: 800; in 1990 and 1991: 800-1,500.

Newstartdate: 12/1/1969

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and the EPL first reached 25 battledeaths in December 1969.

Newenddate: 12/31/1989

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that, although the EPL continued to operate after 1989, it was so marginal that it did not generate 25 battledeaths in any year.

Source:

- Library of Congress Country Study

Dyad ID 495: Colombia vs. M-19

The 19th of April Movement (Movimiento 19 de Abril–M-19) traces its origins to the allegedly fraudulent presidential elections of April 19, 1970, in which the populist party of former military dictator Rojas Pinilla, the National Popular Alliance (Alianza Nacional Popular–Anapo), was denied an electoral victory.

Rebels: M-19

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: alleged. In early 1986, the M-19 reportedly attempted to establish a common guerrilla front with members of Peru's Shining Path (Sendero Luminoso) and Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement (Movimiento Revolucionario Tupac Amaru) and with Ecuador's Alfaro Lives, Damn It! (Alfaro Vive, Carajo!) group.

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: explicit. Cuba provided logistical support and training; also arms

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: explicit. Extensive US assistance

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

In its early years, the M-19 was alleged to have connections to the leftist political party, ANAPO. However, those connections were denied and as the conflict progressed it became increasingly clear that the group operated independently.

Rebestimate: 800

Rebestlow: 100

Rebesthigh: 1,500

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates that in 1987 and 1988 the M-19 had between 100 and 1,500 troops.

Terrcont: no

The M-19 operated primarily as a terrorist organization and did not maintain control of territory.

Newstartdate: 4/19/1970

It is not clear when this dyad reached 25 battledeaths. However, the group formed after a left-wing candidate lost the presidential election on April 19, 1970.

Newenddate: 12/31/1988

It is not clear when this group exited the conflict. However, it does appear that it was no longer an actor after 1988.

Source:

- Library of Congress Country Study

A number of smaller guerilla groups were also present in Colombia. These included the Workers' Self-Defense Movement (Movimiento Autodefensa Obrera-MAO), the Workers' Revolutionary Party (Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores-PRT), Free Homeland (Patria Libre), and the

Quintn Lam Command. The Quintn Lam Command received substantial support from Colombia's small Indian population. (Library of Congress Country Study)

No further information available

Chapter 69

ID 93

ID 93

Incompatibility: Dominican Republic vs. Military Faction

Dyad ID 493: Dominican Republic vs. Military Faction

On April 24, 1965, a group of supporters of former Dominican President Bosch, who had been overthrown in a coup in 1963, supported by some junior officers of the military, took to the streets and seized control of the National Palace and installed an interim president. The attempted coup d'état turned into a civil war, however, when the conservative supporters of the overthrown government fought back. Additionally, the United States military intervened because U.S. President Lyndon Johnson accused the rebels of having ties to communists. This military intervention eventually gave way to a Organization of American States led peacekeeping force, which kept the lid on conflict while new elections were organized.

The widespread dissatisfaction with Reid and his government, coupled with lingering loyalties to Bosch, produced a revolution in April 1965. The vanguard of the 1965 revolution, the perredeistas (members of the PRD) and other supporters of Bosch, called themselves Constitutionals. The movement counted some junior military officers among its ranks. Anti-government took to the streets on April 24, seized the National Palace, and installed Rafael Molina Urea as provisional president. Conservative military forces, led by army general Elias Wessn y Wessn, struck back against the Constitutionals on April 25. These conservative forces called themselves Loyalists. On April 28, the United States intervened in the civil war. President Lyndon B. Johnson ordered in forces that eventually totaled 20,000, to secure Santo Domingo and to restore order. Johnson had acted in the stated belief that the Constitutionals were dominated by communists and that they therefore could not be allowed to come to power. The intervention was subsequently granted some measure of hemispheric approval by the creation of an OAS-sponsored peace force, which supplemented the United States military presence in the republic.

Rebels: Military faction (Constitutionalists)

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: Explicit. The US and later the OAS occupied the island to prevent the Constitutionalists from coming to power.

Gtypesup: troops.

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The people who carried out the coup d'etat were primarily supporters of ex-President Bosch, who had been overthrown himself in a coup d'etat in 1963.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: stronger

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the supporters of ex-President Bosch. However, it does appear that the faction would have been able to gain control of much of the country had it not been for the U.S. military intervention.

Newendate: 8/31/1965

Keesing's Record of World Events in September 1965, reported that the conflict was terminated on August 31, 1965, with the signing of a peace agreement between all the major parties.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Onwar.com
- Library of Congress Country Study

Chapter 70

ID 94

ID 94

Incompatibility: Territory, West Papua

Dyad ID 498: Indonesia vs. OPM

The archipelago of Indonesia is one of the most ethnically diverse states in the world and throughout its independent history has faced armed conflict from a number of groups demanding self-determination. In 1963, the area of West New Guinea, or West Papua, which had been a Portuguese colony, was integrated into Indonesia and became the Indonesian province of Irian Jaya. The Papuan population was not consulted about the integration, however, and within a couple of years an insurgency broke out in the region which continues, albeit at a relatively low level, to the present day. By 1965, the Free Papua Organization (OPM) had called for independence for the island and set up a "revolutionary" government there. The conflict continued at a low level into the 1970s and then escalated against in 1976-1978 when the Papuans launched attacks against Indonesian government offices in the province. The conflict is still not resolved as of the end of 2003, however, it has never escalated to the point where it has registered as an armed conflict since 1978.

The Papuans reside in the area of western New Guinea, or West Papua, now also known as the Indonesian province of Irian Jaya. Local resistance to Indonesian rule, in part the result of abuses by government officials, led to the organization of the Free Papua Movement (OPM) headed by local leaders and prominent exiles. The OPM advocated the unification of Irian Jaya and the neighboring state of Papua New Guinea. Border incidents were frequent as small bands of OPM guerrillas sought sanctuary on Papua New Guinea territory.

Rebels: OPM

Transconstsupp: tacit. Sympathy by people of Papua New Guinea, although no evidence of direct support.

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Rebels operated from Papua New Guinea, and also had leadership based in Europe. Does not appear that PNG was cooperating with the rebels, however.

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Library of Congress Country Study

Notes on Coding

Note: The armed conflict analyzed here occurred in two periods, one marking the outbreak of the insurgency in 1965 and the other measuring the period from 1976-1978 when the conflict was at its most intense.

Period 1: 1965

Note: There is very little information available on this period.

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The OPM was both a political and a military organization, and attempted to set up a parallel government in Irian Jaya.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the OPM in this period. It is clear that the group was much weaker than the Indonesian army, which is quite large, however, the army was spread across many conflictual areas in Indonesia.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of Irian Jaya

Effterrcont: unclear

It is clear that the OPM controlled some parts of Irian Jaya as they were able to establish a parallel government. However, none of the sources gave information which would allow for coding the degree of control exercised.

Period 2: 1976-1978

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The OPM was both a political and a military organization, and attempted to set up a parallel government in Irian Jaya.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 10,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events in July 1977 reported that the OPM claimed to have 10,000 rebels. This force was clearly much weaker than the overall Indonesian army, however, due to other internal and external security threats the army had only 15,000-20,000 forces deployed in the province.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of Irian Jaya

Effterrcont: unclear

It is clear that the OPM controlled some parts of Irian Jaya as they were able to establish a parallel government. However, none of the sources gave information which would allow for coding the degree of control exercised.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1976

The conflict between the OPM and the government reached 25 battledeaths again in 1976 but it is impossible to date when that happened more precisely.

Newenddate: 12/31/1978

The conflict between the OPM and the government de-escalated after 1978 and did not reach 25 battledeaths again.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Minorities at Risk Group Profiles
- Onwar.com

Chapter 71

ID 95

ID 95

Incompatibility: Peru vs. Leftist Guerilla Movements of 1980s-1990s

In 1980, Sendero Luminoso (Shining Path) began a terror campaign against Peruvian governmental officials. The group was formed by Abimael Guzmán, a Maoist university professor, and they hoped that by conducting terrorism against the government they would force the military to overthrow the fledgling democratic institutions in Peru and that popular dissatisfaction with a military government would lead to civil war. The strategy was not successful, however, as the Peruvian military stayed within its traditional role and attempted to fight the insurgency largely within the constraints of a (mostly) democratic political system. Throughout the 1980s, Sendero Luminoso was able to continue the conflict against a government that became increasingly frustrated with the inability to stop the guerillas. Additionally, another actor joined the conflict in 1983 when the Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement (MRTA), another leftist organization, began carrying out attacks against the government.

On April 5, 1992, as frustration with Peruvian democracy ran high, Alberto Fujimori seized power in a military-backed coup. One of his initial actions as presidency was to escalate the conflict against the guerillas, a move that proved largely successful. In September 1992, Abimael Guzmán was captured. In 1993, he called for peace initiatives with the government, and with the exception of a break-away faction often referred to as Sendero Rojo, the organization stopped fighting. Sendero Rojo, led by Oscar Ramírez Durand, continued the armed conflict through 1999 but was defeated by the government. Additionally, the army scored major gains against MRTA, largely defeating them as an insurgent group, and the only thing the group was able to accomplish after 1993 was the seizing of the Japanese embassy in 1996 and the holding of 500 hostages until 1997. However, the hostage drama ended with the storming of the embassy and the deaths of every member of MRTA present, an action that appears to have completely defeated the group.

Sendero Luminoso 1950-1280-0 and 1950-1290-0 listed twice. Consolidate into a single record.

The Maoist insurgent group, Sendero Luminoso, was formed in the late 1960s by university professor Abimael Guzmán with the stated goal of destroying existing Peruvian institutions and replacing them with a peasant revolutionary regime. The leader of Sendero Luminoso, Abimael Guzmán, was captured on 12 September 1992 and since then violence by the rebel group has dropped dramatically. Sendero Luminoso had divided into two factions - "the pacifists," supporting the imprisoned leader Abimael Guzmán and a new group, "the hardliners," led by Oscar Ramírez Durand. Sometimes the "hard-line" Sendero faction has been referred to as "Sendero Rojo" but most frequently the original name Sendero Luminoso has been used. MRTA, formed by the radical university students Nestor Cerpa and Victor Polay in 1983, was a traditional Marxist-Leninist revolutionary movement.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 235: Peru vs. Sendero Luminoso

Rebels: Sendero Luminoso

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>
- Patrick Brogan

Rebpolwing: no

Sendero Luminoso was a Maoist political organization whose main strategy was to encourage the military to overthrow the democratic political system in the hopes of evoking a popular backlash.

Rebestimate: 5,000

Rebestlow: 2,000

Rebesthigh: 8,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the troop strength of Sendero Luminoso: in 1987 and 1988: 2,000-3,000; in 1989: 4,000-5,000; in 1990: 5,000; in 1991: 4,200; in 1992: 5,000; in 1993: 5,000-8,000. These estimates are in comparison to over 100,000 troops possessed by the Peruvian government.

Centcont: yes Strengthcent: high

Cotler (1991) writes that by the end of 1982 it was "already evident that SL was not simply a group of common criminals but a very cohesive military and political group" (p. 491).

Newstartdate: 8/22/1982

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between Peru and Sendero Luminoso reached 25 battledeaths on August 22, 1982.

Newenddate: 1/10/1994

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that on January 10, 1994, Sendero Rojo broke off from the rest of the organization which had decided to end the armed struggle. From that point on, conflict between the government and Sendero Luminoso actually referred to Sendero Rojo.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>
- Patrick Brogan

all values remain the same across groups

In the 1960's, radical groups saw the growing rural ferment as an opportunity to begin armed revolution in the countryside. One was the Movement of the Revolutionary Left (Movimiento de la Izquierda Revolucionaria–MIR), created in 1962 and led by Luis de la Puente Uceda. Operating in Cusco, the MIR was tracked down and destroyed by the military in October 1965, and De la Puente was killed in action. Another radical group was Guillermo Lobatn's Tpac Amaru (not to be confused with the MRTA), which suffered the same fate in Junn in January 1966 after six months of skirmishes. A third group, from the National Liberation Army (Ejrcito de la Liberacin Nacional–ELN), a Castroite force founded in 1962 and led by Hctor Bjar Rivera, was also defeated in early 1966 in Ayacucho.

Rebels: MIR, Tupac Amaru, ELN

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a
Govextpart: none
Sources:

- Library of Congress Country Study

Dyad ID 319: Peru vs. MRTA

Rebels: Movimiento Revolucionario Tupac Amaru

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The MRTA is a radical leftist group that opposed the existing political order but did not have a political organization.

Rebestimate: 350

Rebestlow: 200

Rebesthigh: 500

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the troop strength of the MRTA: In 1988: 300; in 1989, 1990 and 1991: 500; in 1992: 200-500; in 1993: 500. These estimates are in comparison to over 100,000 troops possessed by the Peruvian army.

Newstartdate: 3/14/1989

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and the MRTA first reached 25 battledeaths on March 14, 1989.

Newenddate: 12/31/1993

Although the MRTA continued fighting on a small-level after 1993, the conflict never reached 25 battledeaths.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database

- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>
- Patrick Brogan
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks
- Cotler, Julio (1991). "Peru since 1960." In Leslie Bethell, Ed. The Cambridge History of Latin America Volume VIII: Latin America since 1930 Spanish South America. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 451-508.

Peru vs. Leftist Guerilla Movements of 1965

In 1965, the Peruvian government faced guerilla insurgencies from two separate leftist organizations: the National Liberation Army (ELN) and the Movement of the Revolutionary Left (MIR). The organizations had mobilized peasants throughout the 1960s in protest of the high level of disparity of wealth in the country. The groups initiated conflict in rural areas of the country in July 1965. However, they were well overpowered by the government and the conflict had ended in the utter defeat of the rebels by the end of the year.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 499: Peru vs. MIR

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The MIR was a radical Marxist political party. However, it did not participate in the Peruvian elections.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the ELN. However, it is clear that the group was substantially weaker than the Peruvian army.

Dyad ID 500: Peru vs. ELN

Rebpolwing: no

The ELN was only a military organization and did not compete politically.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the ELN. However, it is clear that the group was substantially weaker than the Peruvian army.

Chapter 72

ID 98

ID 98

Incompatibility: Ghana vs. Military Factions

Dyad ID 502: Ghana vs. Military Faction of 1966

On February 24, 1966, while President Kwame Nkrumah was on a trip to China, a group of army officers led by Major-General Joseph A. Ankrah led a military coup and took power in the country. Nkrumah did not return to Ghana, but rather flew to Moscow. The coup leaders justified taking power by arguing that Nkrumah had been a corrupt dictatorial leader who presided over the economic collapse of Ghana. Shortly after taking power they announced the military leadership announced that it did not intend to stay in power, but rather would preside over the development of a new constitution and elections.

Error in the dates. There should be three coups one in 1966, one in 1981 and another in 1983

President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, while on a visit to Communist China, was deposed on Feb. 24 as the result of swift action in an Army coup which established in power a National Liberation Council led by Major-General Joseph A. Ankrah, the former Chief of Defence Staff of the Army.

Rebels: Military Faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a
Govextpart: none
Source:

- Keesings

1981 coup, not listed in spreadsheet Rawlings and a group of young officers formed the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC). This group launched a coup in 1979 (did not meet 25 deaths). The coup leaders returned the country to constitutional rule later that year. However, the new Limann administration proved ineffective and corrupt. These factors rapidly eroded the limited support the Limann government enjoyed among civilians and soldiers. The government fell on December 31, 1981, in another Rawlings-led coup.

Rebels: military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Library of Congress Country Study

1983 Coup In June of 1983, there was an unsuccessful coup attempt against the Rawlings government.

Rebels: military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup:n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The coup against Nkrumah was plotted and carried out by members of the army of Ghana who did not have a connection to a political movement.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: stronger

None of the sources available gave any indication to the number of troops that supported the coup. However, the overthrow was accomplished relatively easily.

Source:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- New York Times Archives

Dyad ID 503: Ghana vs. Military Faction of 1981

On December 31, 1981, a group of army officers overthrew the Ghanaian government of President Hilla Limann. Limann had been president since 1979, when a previous military government led by Flight Lieutenant Jerry Rawlings was in power. Following the 1981 coup, a new government, again led by Rawlings, was established.

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

In the aftermath of the coup d'état, Rawling's new government outlawed all political parties, suggesting that the plotters of the coup were not affiliated with an existing political party.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much stronger

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops participating in the coup d'état. However, Rawlings was very popular in the military and most officers supported his reinstatement.

Source:

- Keesing's Record of World Events

Dyad ID 504: Ghana vs. Military Faction of 1983

Flight Lieutenant Jerry Rawlings took power in Ghana in a military coup on December 31, 1981 and established a military government. That government experienced high degrees of instability in its early years, however. In November 1982, an attempted coup d'état was unsuccessful and many members of the government were arrested and charged with participating. On June 19, 1983, another set of officers attempted a coup d'état which was again unsuccessful. Fighting between

the supporters of the coup and the army that stayed loyal resulted in more than two dozen deaths, and Rawlings was able to hold onto power.

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The coup d'état of 1983 was led by military officers who were involved in the military government and was not associated with a political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops participating in the coup d'état. However, it is clear that considerably fewer soldiers participated than stayed loyal to the government.

Source:

- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 73

ID 99

ID 99

Incompatibility: Territory, Mizoram

Dyad ID 505: India vs. MNF

The Mizos in the 1960s lived primarily in the northeastern Indian state of Assam, one of only two majority-Christian states in the country. As Christians, the Mizos are both ethnically and religiously distinct from the dominant Indian population. Additionally, the group has faced economic discrimination and grievance has been generated by a national Indian economic policy that disadvantaged the northeastern states. This discrimination has led to some calls for greater rights for the Mizo, leading up to some groups demanding full independence. In the mid 1960s, an armed revolt broke out in Assam led by the Mizo National Front (MNF). The MNF, with about 10,000 insurgents, demanded independence for the Mizo Hills region from India, and began in 1965 attacking government positions and personnel. The Indian army responded to the insurgency violently and by evacuating the civilian population from the areas where the MNF operated, and by 1968 the revolt had been largely defeated. The conflict continued at a low level of intensity until a political agreement in 1986 created a state of Mizoram within India.

In Mizoram the Mizo National Front fought a running battle with the Indian security forces throughout the 1960s. In 1966, the MNF launched its rebellion with a major military strike that allowed the rebels to temporarily wrest control of key cities and towns in Mizo-majority areas in Assam. A major government counterinsurgency campaign followed but the rebellion continued until political negotiations were opened in late 1984. An accord between the state and federal governments and the Mizo National Front was reached in 1986 and it resulted in the creation of the state of Mizoram out of the territory of Assam.

Rebels: MNF

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The MNF competed in local elections but did not have much electoral success prior to the outbreak of conflict.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 10,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events in March 1969 reported that in October 1966 the MNF was estimated to have about 10,000 troops.

Newendate: 12/31/1968

The armed conflict continued after 1968 but at a considerably lower intensity than it had during those years. It is not clear when in 1968 the conflict dropped in intensity.

Sources:

- Patrick Brogan
- Minorities at Risk Group Profiles
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Library of Congress Country Study

Chapter 74

ID 100

ID 100

Incompatibility: Nigeria vs. Military Faction

Dyad ID 494: Nigeria vs. Military Faction

On January 15, 1966, a group of junior officers in the Nigerian army killed the Federal President and several other political leaders. Following these deaths, the remaining ministers in the cabinet handed power over to the military, and General Aguiyi-Ironsi, the Commander in Chief of the Army, became President. The coup took place in a time of civil unrest in Western Nigeria, where allegations of electoral fraud in regional elections three months earlier had led to the outbreak of rioting and looting. In the few days following the coup d'état there was some conflict between different factions of the military but the new government was able to firmly assert control.

A coup d'état carried out on Jan. 15 by young officers of the Nigerian Army and leading to the death of the Federal Prime Minister, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, and at least three other political leaders, induced the remaining Ministers of the Federal Cabinet to hand over power, without recourse to the constitutionally required approval of Parliament, to the Commander-in-Chief of the Army, General Aguiyi-Ironsi. The latter thereupon abrogated the Federal Constitution, established a Military Government, and appointed military Governors in each of the four Regions in succession to the civil Governors.

Rebels: Military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The coup d'etat was led by members of the military that were not affiliated with a political movement.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: stronger

None of the sources identified gave any indication as to the number of officers that participated in the coup d'etat.

Source:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Onwar.com

Dyad ID 793: Nigeria vs. Boko Haram

TBA

Chapter 75

ID 101

ID 101

Incompatibility: Territory, Namibia

Dyad ID 516: South Africa vs. SWAPO

Southwest Africa was a German colony until at the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 the German government agreed to give up all its colonies. In 1920, South Africa was given a mandate over the former German colony. In 1966, amidst growing nationalist and anti-colonial sentiments in southern Africa, the United Nations revoked the South African mandate. South Africa refused to give up control of the colony, however. The revocation of the mandate did have the effect of mobilizing greater anti-colonial sentiments in the colony and resulted in the formation of the South-west African People's Organization (SWAPO), a guerilla organization which began an insurrection against the South African occupation. Initially, SWAPO was not able to achieve much militarily, however, when neighboring Angola gained independence from Portugal in 1975, the new Angolan government allowed SWAPO to set up bases on its territory. From 1975 to 1988, SWAPO continued to wage warfare against the South African forces deployed in Southwest Africa, however, despite the insurrection and high levels of international pressure the conflict continued. In December 1988, there was a breakthrough, when multi-party negotiations produced an agreement by which South Africa agreed to withdraw from Southwest Africa and grant the colony independence (as Namibia), and at the same time, Cuba agreed to withdraw its forces from the civil war in Angola (see conflict id 2310). The conflict ended and Southwest Africa became the independent state of Namibia.

In 1966 a United Nations resolution terminated South Africa's mandate over the former German colony of South West Africa, also known as Namibia. The white-minority government of South Africa, however, refused to give up its administration and domination of the territory. Black nationalist Africans promptly established a guerrilla liberation front, the South West Africa People's

Organization (SWAPO), and began to harass the whites. When the Portuguese were driven out of neighboring Angola, the guerrillas were offered aid and bases there, as well as training by Cuban soldiers. Zambia also provided SWAPO with territorial access. In 1976, the UN condemned South Africa for "illegal occupation" of the territory.

Rebels: SWAPO

Transconstsupp: tacit. Support by anti-apartheid groups in Africa, elsewhere.

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: Extensive. Bases located in Zambia and Angola at invitation of these governments.

Rebsupport: explicit. Extraterritorial bases in Zambia and Angola

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

SWAPO was primarily a military organization, however, it was recognized by many international actors as the legitimate government of Namibia. It was not recognized by South Africa.

Rebestimate: 7,500

Rebestlow: 6,000

Rebesthigh: 9,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the troop strength of SWAPO in the latter years of the conflict: in 1987 and 1988: 6,000-9,000; in 1989: 9,000. These estimates are in comparison to the 21,000 troops that South Africa had deployed in Namibia in this period.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Onwar.com
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks
- Library of Congress Country Study
- www.infoplease.com

Chapter 76

ID 102

ID 102

Incompatibility: Syria vs. Military Faction

Dyad ID 518: Syria vs. Military Faction

On February 23, 1966, the government of Prime Minister Salah el Din Bitar, which had been formed only two months earlier, was overthrown in a military coup. The coup was led by Colonel Selim Hatoum, a military officer who was a prominent supporter of extremists in the Syrian legislature, and was opposed to Bitar's moderate Baathist-led coalition. Fighting between members of the military supporting and opposed to the coup produced many casualties before Hatoum's forces took power. In the days following the coup, many moderate Baathists were arrested, although Bitar escaped arrest and went into hiding. Hatoum formed a new coalition.

On February 23, 1966 army units seized the government in the bloodiest of the many coups d'etat since 1949. One of the first acts of the Regional Command after seizing the radio station was the announcement of the appointment of Major General Hafiz al Assad as minister of defense. On March 1, 1966, a new government was formed.

Rebels: military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

According to Keesing's Record of World Events, Hatoum was a supporter of extremists in the Syrian legislature. After the coup a cabinet was formed that was dominated by extremists.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: stronger

None of the sources identified gave any indication of the number of troops that supported the coup. However, those in favor of the coup were able to take power pretty quickly.

Source:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Library of Congress Country Study

Dyad ID 519: Syria vs. Muslim Brotherhood

The secularist, Baathist regime of Syrian President Assad faced opposition from a number of extremist Sunni Muslim groups beginning in the mid-1960s. These groups wanted to overthrow the Assad regime and to put in place an Islamist government. Although there were a wide variety of different groups, they were commonly referred to as the "Muslim Brotherhood." Beginning in the late 1970s, the conflict between the Syrian government and the Muslim Brotherhood escalated as Brotherhood groups began attacking key government positions and personnel. In 1980, the groups organized a full-scale insurrection in the town of Aleppo. In 1982, full-scale insurrection broke out in Hama as well. The Syrian army responded to the insurrection with incredibly high-levels of repression, killing more than 10,000 civilians, and by the end of 1982, the Muslim Brotherhood had been largely defeated.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s there were a number of religiously motivated violent attacks, many instigated by the Muslim Brotherhood and directed at Assad's regime, members of the ruling Baath Party, and members of the Alawi religious sect. At the outset, rather than blaming the Muslim Brotherhood, the government blamed Iraq and disaffected Palestinians. It is rumored, that the group received financial assistance from private sources in Saudi Arabia, the Gulf countries, and the revolutionary committees in Iran. It is also speculated that they received weapons smuggled from Iraq and Lebanon and training and assistance from Al Fatah of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). In the 1980s, Syria continued to rely heavily on the Soviet Union, which re-supplied the Syrian armed forces with sophisticated weapons, and with which it concluded a Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation on October 8, 1980.

Rebels: Muslim Brotherhood

Transconstsupp: tacit. Sympathy by Islamist groups in the region. Alleged that Islamist groups in the Gulf Region were providing funds, but this has not been confirmed.

Rebextpart: Alleged. There has been alleged cooperation between the MB and the PLO, but this cannot be confirmed.

Rebpresosts: no

Rebsupport: alleged. Syria blamed Iraq and Jordan for militarily supporting the group and harboring leaders, but this has not been confirmed.

Rtypesup: military, alleged.

Govsupport: explicit. The USSR provided a large amount of military assistance.

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The Muslim Brotherhood was really a set of Islamist organizations that were not separate political organizations.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the Muslim Brotherhood. However, it is clear that the group was weaker than the Syrian army.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Library of Congress Country Study
- Onwar.com

Dyad ID 821: Syria vs. Free Syrian Army (FSA)

Syria faced protests in 2011, along with many other Middle Eastern/North African countries. The government responded with large-scale repression, which led many members of the Syrian army to defect. Some of these defecting soldiers organized into the Free Syrian Army (FSA) and began attacking Syrian military targets in 2011.

Rebel Political Wing: no

The FSA is an organized military group and its activities grew out of a large-scale protest movement in Syria, but it does not appear to be affiliated with a particular political organization.

Rebel Estimate: 25000

Rebel Estimate (low): 4000

Rebel Estimate (high): 40000

Rebstrength: weaker

The UCDP reports that estimates of the number of troops for the Free Syrian Army range from "several thousand" to 40,000 by the end of 2011. We have placed the best estimate in the middle of that range.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The FSA did have a command structure. However, there were many other armed groups in Syria in addition to the FSA and the FSA did not coordinate their activities.

Mobilization Capacity: High

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The FSA demonstrated an ability to mobilize troops and was generally drawn from the Sunni, a larger group in Syria than the support base of the government. However, the group had difficulty obtaining weapons with which to challenge the Syrian army (which was well equipped) and this inability limited its fighting effectiveness.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Parts of Syria

Effective level of control: Low

Throughout its campaign, the FSA has been able to control some parts of Syria, but this control is contested by the Syrian military.

Conflict Type: civil war

Transconstsupp: tacit

Support and sympathy from across the region.

Rebextpart: minor. Some foreign funding from private charities and fighters from across the region.

Rebpresosts: Extensive. Bases in Turkey, some in Lebanon.

Rebsupport: Explicit

Rtypesup: Military. Sanctuary and arms from Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Qatar

Govsupport: Explicit

Gtypesup: Military. Iran and Russia provided arms to the government

Govextpart: no

The FSA is made up of former members of the Syrian military who seek to overthrow Bashar al-Assad.

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 77

ID 103

ID 103

Incompatibility: Cambodia (Kampuchea) vs. various organizations

Cambodia (Kampuchea) vs. various organizations

Cambodia was one of the countries that was most devastated by proxy violence during the Cold War. Following independence from France in November 1953 (see conflict id 1020), the country was run as a one-party socialist state led by the former monarch Sihanouk (who abdicated the throne in 1955, making his father monarch). Throughout Sihanouk's reign he largely tried to keep Cambodia out of the regional conflicts, but in the end was unable to do so. For years he pursued a policy favorable to North Vietnam, seeing that side as the one most likely to win the conflict in Vietnam (see conflict id 1520). However, beginning in 1967, Sihanouk's government faced a large-scale insurgency led primarily by the Khmer Rouge, a Cambodian communist organization that was not on friendly terms with the government of North Vietnam. As the conflict escalated, Sihanouk was forced to turn to anti-communist members of his government to try to stem the insurgency. One of these members was the General Lol Nol, who he appointed as prime minister in 1969. In 1970, while Sihanouk was on a diplomatic mission in other countries, Lon Nol led a successful coup d'etat which kept him out of power. Sihanouk fled to Beijing. Whereas Sihanouk's government had been on largely favorable terms with the North Vietnamese, the new government was staunchly anti-communist and Cambodia became firmly embroiled in the Vietnamese war. North Vietnam helped forge an alliance between the Khmer Rouge and supporters of Sihanouk, referred to as the National United Front of Kampuchea (FUNK). For three years, the FUNK, backed up by strong military support from North Vietnam, battled against the Republican government, led by Lol Nol, which received military assistance from South Vietnam and the United States. In 1973, the signing of the Paris Peace Accords, which ended the conflict in Vietnam, reduced the international presence in Cambodia, although there was still some support provided. In 1975, following five years of guerilla insurgency, the FUNK was able to take Phnom Penh. However,

while the North Vietnamese called for a power-sharing government among the members of the alliance, the Khmer Rouge leadership decided to rule alone and placed Sihanouk in jail. The Khmer Rouge, led by Pol Pot, ruled Cambodia for four years as one of the most brutal governments in history. They set about to radically reengineer the society and the economy by seizing all the means of production and executing anyone perceived as being an intellectual. In all, somewhere around 2 million Cambodians were killed by the Khmer Rouge in four years of government. Over the course of the Khmer Rouge government, relations between Cambodia and Vietnam deteriorated until in 1978, the Vietnamese army helped to create an anti-Khmer Rouge communist rebel group, the Kampuchean United Front for National Salvation (KUFNS) and deployed 200,000 troops into Cambodia. In January 1979, the Vietnamese/KUFNS force seized Phnom Penh and a government led by the KUFNS was established. The conflict did not end with the establishment of a new communist government in Phnom Penh, this time supporter by Vietnam. Rather, in the early 1980s three separate rebel groups representing the three former governments formed an alliance to challenge the government (and also went by the name Democratic Party of Kampuchea-PDK). The first group was the Khmer Rouge, who resumed their armed struggle almost immediately after being removed from power. The second was a new group formed by members of the Sihanouk government such as the former Prime Minister, the Khmer People's National Liberation Front (KPNLF). The third group was formed by Sihanouk himself, the United National Front for an Independent, Neutral, Peaceful, and Cooperative Cambodia (FUNCINPEC) which formed in 1981 and shortly established the Sihanouk National Army (ANS) to become FUNCINPEC/ANS. The Khmer Rouge/PDK, KPNLF and FUNCINPEC/ANS continued to challenge the government throughout the 1980s without much success, however, in the late 1980s with the end of the Cold War, Vietnam removed its troops from Cambodia, and the international community increased the pressure on the parties to negotiate. A peace agreement was signed between the parties in 1991 and a new power-sharing government led by FUNCINPEC was formed. KPNLF transformed into a political party and largely ceased the armed struggle. The Khmer Rouge, however, was unhappy with the speed of implementation of the agreement and continued the armed struggle. The conflict continued through 1988, however, by that point the Khmer Rouge had very little domestic support remaining and their ability to wage war had largely dissipated.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 364: Cambodia vs. Khmer Rouge

This dyadic conflict can be seen in three distinct periods. The first covers the period when the group batted against Sihanouk's government from 1967 to 1970. The second covers 1970-1975, when the Khmer Rouge joined with Sihanouk to form the National United Front of Kampuchea (FUNK) and is covered under the coding for the Cambodia, Vietnam, USA vs. FUNK dyad. The third period covers the conflict from 1979, when the Khmer Rouge was removed from power, through 1998 when they stopped fighting.

Period 1 1967-1970

Rebpolwing: no

The Khmer Rouge was a communist organization that battled the Sihanouk government militarily but did not compete in the Cambodian political process.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the Khmer Rouge in this period. However, it is clear that the group was not military equal to the Cambodian military.

Newstartdate: 5/1/1967

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the Cambodian government and the Khmer Rouge first reached 25 battledeaths in May 1967.

Newenddate: 3/17/1970

On March 17, 1970, President Sihanouk was deposed in a coup d'état. Shortly after, the Khmer Rouge joined with Sihanouk to form the National United Front of Kampuchea, which started the second phase of its conflict with the Cambodian government.

Period 3 (1979-1998)

Rebpolwing: no

Despite the signing of a peace agreement with the government in 1991, the Khmer Rouge continued to compete militarily rather than politically.

Rebestimate: 30,000

Rebestlow: 1,000

Rebesthigh: 45,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks give the following estimates for the troop strength of the Khmer Rouge/PDK from 1987 to 1998: In 1987: 30,000; in 1988: 30,000-40,000; in 1989: 25,000-40,000; in 1990 and 1991: 30,000-45,000; in 1992: 27,000-35,000; in 1993: 8,000-10,000; in 1994: 6,000-15,000; in 1995 and 1996: 5,000-10,000; in 1997: 1,000-4,000; in 1998: 1,000-3,000. These estimates are in comparison to over 100,000 troops for the government.

Newstartdate: 1/9/1979

On January 9, 1979, the Khmer Rouge government was overthrown primarily by Vietnamese troops. The group quickly began a new armed struggle aimed at regaining power.

Newenddate: 12/25/1998

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that on December 25, 1998, the head of the Khmer Rouge

(following the death of Pol Pot) surrendered.

Dyad ID 364: Cambodia vs. FUNK

Rebpolwing: no

FUNK was an alliance between the Khmer Rouge and former President Sihanouk and did not represent a domestic political opposition.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the sources gave any indication as to the troop strength of the FUNK.

Newendate: 4/17/1975

On April 17, 1975, Khmer Rouge forces took power in Phnom Penh.

Dyad ID 378: Cambodia vs. KPNLF

Rebpolwing: no

The KPNLF was a military organization and did not convert to a political organization until after it exited the conflict in 1991.

Rebestimate: 12,500

Rebestlow: 10,000

Rebesthigh: 15,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the troop strength of the KPNLF: In 1987: 11,000; in 1988: 11,000-15,000; in 1989, 1990 and 1991: 10,000-15,000. These estimates are in comparison to the following estimates for the Cambodian government: in 1987: 140,000 (including support from Vietnam); in 1988: 35,000-40,000; in 1989, 1990 and 1991: 50,000-70,000.

Newstartdate: 6/22/1980

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between Cambodia and KPNLF first reached 25 battledeaths on June 22, 1980.

Newendate: 10/23/1991

On October 23, 1991, KPNLF, along with several other parties, signed a peace agreement, ending the conflict.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Onwar.com

- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks
- SarDesai, D.R. (2003). Southeast Asia: Past & Present. 5th Edition. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Dyad ID 379: Cambodia vs. FUNCINPEC/ANS

Rebpolwing: no

FUNCINPEC/ANS was a military organization and did not begin competing politically until after it exited the conflict in 1991.

Rebestimate: 15,000

Rebestlow: 5,000

Rebesthigh: 20,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks give the following estimates for the troop strength of FUNCINPEC/ANS: In 1987: 5,000; in 1988: 8,000-18,000; in 1989: 10,000-20,000; in 1990 and 1991: 15,000-20,000. These estimates are in comparison to the following estimates for the Cambodian government: in 1987: 140,000 (including support from Vietnam); in 1988: 35,000-40,000; in 1989, 1990 and 1991: 50,000-70,000.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1982

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between Cambodia and FUNCINPEC/ANS first reached 25 battledeaths in 1982.

Newenddate: 10/23/1991

On October 23, 1991, FUNCINPEC/ANS, along with several other parties, signed a peace agreement, ending the conflict.

Dyad ID 553: Cambodia vs. KUFNS

Rebpolwing: no

KUFNS was a new communist movement largely established by Vietnam that did not compete in the Cambodian political process.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the KUFNS. However, the reason the group was successful in seizing power was because it was backed up by 200,000 Vietnamese troops.

Newstartdate: 9/1/1978

It is not clear exactly when the KUFNS began fighting or when the dyad reached 25 battledeaths. However, onwar.com reports that the group was formed in late 1978, and so the start-date is set as the beginning of September.

Newendate: 1/9/1979

On January 9, 1979, the KUFNS, backed by 200,000 Vietnamese troops, seized Phnom Penh.

Chapter 78

ID 107

ID 107

Incompatibility: Territory, Biafra

Dyad ID 528: Nigeria vs. Biafra

From 1967-1970, the Nigerian government fought an incredibly bloody war (up to 2 million dead) with the breakaway region of Biafra, which had been the Eastern Republic in the Nigerian Federation. Disputes between the federal government of Nigeria and the Eastern Republic escalated throughout the 1960s and were primarily over oil revenues. The Nigerian government saw its profits from oil revenues reach unprecedented levels in the early years after independence, and although most of this oil originated in eastern Nigeria, the Eastern Republic received very little of the profits. Tensions between the republic and the federal government heightened when ethnic conflict erupted in northern Nigeria in 1966. The population in northern Nigeria is primarily Muslim and Hausa-Fulani, and violence targeted against northern Igbos (who were the vast majority of the population in the Eastern Republic) resulted in thousands of deaths. In 1967, out of frustration with anti-Igbo violence and lack of appropriate oil revenues, the Eastern Republic, led by Colonel Ojukwu, declared itself an independent Republic of Biafra. The federal government responded quickly to the conflict by deploying troops to Biafra. The rebels enjoyed initial success by defeating the troops sent and by actually gaining control of another territory of Nigeria, the Midwestern Republic. However, by the end of 1967, the Nigerian forces had reversed things and made gains on the Biafrans. The conflict was very bloody and raged for almost three years, however, by January 1970, the Nigerian army had captured the last strongholds of the Biafran government, the Biafran army surrendered, and the republic was reintegrated back into Nigeria.

The Igbo region of Biafra attempted to secede in 1967. The Eastern Region Consultative Assembly (Biafra) voted May 26 to secede from Nigeria. Army units attempted to advance into secessionist territory in July, but rebel troops easily stopped them. By the end of 1967, federal forces had re-

gained the Midwestern Region and secured the delta region. Biafran propaganda, which stressed the threat of genocide to the Igbo people, was extremely effective abroad in winning sympathy for the secessionist movement. Humanitarian aid, as well as arms and munitions, reached the embattled region from international relief organizations and from private and religious groups in the United States and Western Europe. The bulk of Biafra's military supplies was purchased on the international arms market with unofficial assistance provided by France through former West African colonies. Biafra's independence was recognized by Tanzania, Zambia, Gabon, and the Ivory Coast, but it was compromised in the eyes of most African states by the approval of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, and Portugal. Britain extended diplomatic support and limited military assistance to the federal government. The Soviet Union became an important source of military equipment for Nigeria. Modern Soviet-built warplanes, flown by Egyptian and British pilots, interdicted supply flights and inflicted heavy casualties during raids on Biafran urban centers. On January 6, 1970, Biafran resistance collapsed.

Rebels: Republic of Biafra

Transconstsupp: explicit. Humanitarian and religious groups provided finances and supplies

Rebextpart: minor. External groups flew in military supplies

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: explicit. Several former French colonies assisted in supplying arms.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: explicit. Support by the UK and the USSR. Egypt and the UK sent pilots to help in the fighting.

Gtypesup: troops, military.

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

The secession of Biafra was led by the government of the Eastern Republic within the Nigerian federation.

Rebestimate: 50,500

Rebestlow: 5,000

Rebesthigh: 94,000

Rebstrength: parity

In September 1967, Keesing's Record of World Events estimated that the Biafran army had about 5,000 troops, as compared to about 7,000 for the Nigerian army. Onwar.com estimates for the conflict that the Biafran army had 94,000 troops as compared to 100,000 for the Nigerian army.

Newendate: 1/12/1970

Keesing's Record of World Events reports that the Biafran government announced its surrender on January 12, 1970.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Onwar.com
- Library of Congress Country Study

Chapter 79

ID 111

ID 111

Incompatibility: Guinea vs. Military Faction

Dyad ID 57: Guinea vs. RFDG

In September 2000, an insurgency broke out in Guinea along the border with Liberia and Sierra Leone. Several different groups launched attacks against Guinean governmental positions there, but the organization Rally of Democratic Forces of Guinea (RFDG) claimed responsibility for all of them. The Guinean government alleged, and most international observers accepted, that the rebels received support from the Liberian government and from the insurgent Revolutionary United Front (RUF) in Sierra Leone. The RFDG waged a year-long campaign against the government but by the end of 2001 had been largely defeated.

Notes on Coding

Note: The PRIO/Uppsala Armed Conflict Database lists this conflict as "Guinea vs. Military Faction" but it does not appear that the RFDG was a faction of the military.

Rebpolwing: no

The RFDG appears to be an insurgent organization formed outside of Guinea that received a high-degree of external support and did not have a link to a domestic political organization.

Rebestimate,Rebestlow,Rebesthigh: 5000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that the RFDG had 5,000 troops in 2000, as compared to 9,700 for the army.

Centcont: unclear

Strengthcent: unclear

None of the available sources gave any indication whether the rebels had a central command and how strong it was.

Newstartdate: 9/1/2000

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict reached 25 battledeaths on September 1, 2000.

Newenddate: 12/31/2001

Although the conflict was not formally resolved through a peace agreement, it did not again reach 25 battledeaths after 2001.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 80

ID 112

ID 112

Incompatibility: Territory, Mindinao

Philippines vs. Mindinao

The southern Phillipine region of Mindinao has a population that is ethnically and religiously distinct from the general Philipino population, and has been the location of much conflict in that country's sixty-year independent history. Whereas the majority Philipino population is Christian, the Moros in Mindinao are overwhelmingly Muslim. The Mindinao region is the poorest in the Philippines and has been the site of both a communist insurgency (see conflict id 1100) and a secessionist movement. In response to economic and social discrimination and government repression, Mindinao groups began organizing politically and militarily in the late 1960s. The main group was the Mindinao National Liberation Front (MNLF) which formed in 1968 and spent four years organizing before it launched an armed struggle for secession in 1972. The Philippine government responded quickly to the MNLF insurgency, however, it was not able to completely repress the rebellion and over the next few years the MNLF gained greatly in popularity. By 1976, the insurgency had generated such high costs for the Philippine government in the form of loss of life, creation of refugees, and pressure for Islamic countries sympathetic to the Mindinao causes that the government decided to negotiate with the rebels. The government agreed to grant autonomy to all Mindinao provinces that voted for it. The MNLF, however, opposed the referendum provision because thirty years of government-encouraged migration of Christian Filipinos to Mindinao had made the Moros a minority in the region. The armed struggle continued. By 1980, the conflict had largely abated. The Phillipine government had invested money in development for Mindinao which reduced the grievance of the population and provided a generous amnesty offer for combatants. For five years, the conflict continued, but at a much lower level of intensity. In 1985, however, the MNLF took advantage of general unrest in the Phillipines and escalated the conflict. By this point, the organization had fractionalized and there were three main factions battling the Phillipine

government, the MNLF, the new-MNLF, later named the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF), and the MNLF-Reformist Group. Despite some attempts at negotiations, the conflict continued through the late 1980s and into the early 1990s. In the early 1990s, the conflict became more complicated with the emergence of the Abu Sayyaf Group, a militant Islamist organization dedicated to the establishment of an Islamic state in Mindanao. Abu Sayyaf functioned more as a terrorist than a traditional insurgency organization and primarily carried out kidnappings and attacks against civilian targets. The 1990s saw several rounds of negotiations which had some success at lowering the intensity of the conflict. In 1993, the government and MNLF signed a cease-fire that, despite several violations, largely terminated the conflict between those groups. In 1996, a more comprehensive agreement was signed that incorporated the MNLF leadership into the government of an autonomous Mindanao region. In 2001, however, a faction of the MNLF rejected the agreements and resumed the armed struggle. The MILF and Abu Sayyaf have continued to fight through the 1990s and the conflict between the government and those groups is still ongoing. In recent years, the Philippine government has gained from the United States-led War on Terror because the U.S. army has begun conducting joint exercises with the Philippine army, particularly against Abu Sayyaf.

The southern region of Mindanao is predominantly Muslim and residents have been angered by a wave of Christian migrants from the north. The MNLF became the symbol for independence that the Moro rallied around. By 1975 the MNLF was considered a popular revolutionary movement supported by almost all Muslims in the Philippines as well as abroad. Threats of an embargo from oil-producing countries that supported MNLF led to negotiations in 1975-76. When the MNLF dropped its demand for full independence, breakaway factions emerged: the MNLF-Reformist Group and the "New MNLF" that later became MILF. In 1987, the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (ARMM) was passed in Congress. Later, the Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG) based on the islands of Basilan and Jolo, were responsible for several attacks on civilians in the area. The conflict continued, but a more long-lasting solution seemed to be at hand during the four years of negotiations (1992-1996) between the newly elected President Ramos and the MNLF. Even though the MILF did not participate in the 1996 agreement, the group had committed not to stand in the way of peace, and fighting decreased. As to foreign involvement, the porous border between Mindanao and the Malaysian province of Sabah has led to the establishment of training facilities, and a safe refuge for rebel groups. The government has received much help from the US, which has an outspoken "special relationship" with the Philippines. Apart from training, and joint military exercises, the US has been helpful with sharing intelligence about the location of guerillas in the archipelago.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 242: Philippines vs. MILF

Rebels: MILF

Transconstsupp: Tacit. Sympathy by Islamic organizations

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. Some presence reported in Malaysia

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: Explicit. Military support and assistance by the US

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

MILF was a military, not a political, organization.

Rebestimate: 15,000

Rebestlow: 9,000

Rebesthigh: 120,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database gives the following estimates of the troop strength of MILF: In 1994: 22,330; in 1995: 19,000-120,000 (with best estimates being between 19,000-30,000); in 1996: 7,000-120,000 (with best estimates being between 20,000 and 40,000); in 1997: 8,000-120,000 (with best estimates being between 8,000 and 25,000); in 1998: 9,000-15,000; in 1999: no estimate; in 2000: 11,500-15,000; in 2001: 11,000-12,000; in 2002: 12,500; in 2003: 10,000-12,000.

Newstartdate: 2/4/1990

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict first reached 25 battledeaths on February 4, 1990.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>
- Patrick Brogan

Dyad ID 247: Philippines vs. MNLF

Rebels: MNLF

Transconstsupp: Tacit. Sympathy by Islamic organizations

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. Some presence reported in Malaysia

Rebsupport: Explicit. Libya and Malaysia provided military support while the Organization of the Islamic conference provided diplomatic support

Rtypesup: military. Also endorsement by Muslim nations.

Govsupport: Explicit. Military support and assistance by the US

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

This dyadic conflict is best described in three phases. The first covers the initial period of fighting between the government and the MNLF from 1972 to 1980. The second covers the resumption of fighting in 1985 through the signing of a cease-fire in 1993. The third covers the conflict between the Philippine government and a faction of the MNLF which began in 2001 and continued until they were defeated by the government in 2002.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage
- Patrick Brogan

Period 1 1972-1980

Rebpolwing: no

The MNLF was both a political and military organization, however, it did not compete in the Philippines political arena.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 13,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events reported in April 1980 that the Philippine government had about 35,000 troops deployed in southern Philippines to battle about 13,000 rebels there.

Mobcap: high

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that by the mid-1970s, the MNLF movement had become very popular and was supported by almost all Muslims in the Philippines and many abroad.

Newstartdate: 12/31/1972

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the MNLF and the government first reached 25 battledeaths sometime in 1972, but does not give a specific date.

Newenddate: 12/31/1980

By the end of 1980 the conflict between the MNLF and the government had largely abated. It is hard to date when the conflict lowered in intensity more precisely.

Period 2 1980-1993

Rebpolwing: no

MNLF was a military, not a political, movement.

Rebestimate: 17,500

Rebestlow: 12,000

Rebesthigh: 23,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database provides the following estimates for the troop strength of the MNLF: In 1989: 23,000; in 1990: 15,000; in 1991 and 1992: no estimate; in 1993: 12,000. These estimates are in comparison to over 100,000 troops for the Philippine government.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1985

It is not clear when exactly the MNLF reinitiated a large-scale insurgency, but it was sometime during 1985.

Newenddate: 12/31/1993

In December, 1993, the MNLF and the government signed a cease-fire. There were some violations of the agreement but in general that agreement ended the armed conflict in this dyad.

Period 3 2001-2002

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The MNLF faction that broke off and resumed the armed struggle in 2001 was led by the former governor of Mindanao, who was upset over the lead-up to a referendum on autonomy for the region.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 600

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimated that in 2001, the MNLF faction had 600 troops.

Newstartdate: 11/19/2001

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that on November 19, 2001, the conflict between the government and the MNLF faction reached 25 battledeaths.

Newenddate: 1/30/2002

By the end of January, 2002, the MNLF faction had been largely defeated.

Dyad ID 249: Philippines vs. Abu Sayyaf Group

Rebels: Abu Sayyaf

Transconstsupp: tacit. Support by extremist Islamic groups

Rebextpart: alleged. Reportedly links with Al-Qaeda

Rebpresosts: some. Reports of presence in Malaysia

Rebsupport: none. Weak evidence that Libya assisted the group, but this is unlikely.

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: explicit. The US has been actively involved in military cooperation with the government

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

Abu Sayyaf is a terrorist organization dedicated to the establishment of an Islamic state in Mindinao and does not participate in the domestic political process.

Rebestimate: 650

Rebestlow: 30

Rebesthigh: 1,200

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database gives the following estimates for the troop strength of Abu Sayyaf: In 1991: 30; in 1992 and 1993: no estimate; in 1994: 200-580; in 1995: 580-650; in 1996: 580; in 1997: no estimate; in 1998: 350-1000; in 1999: no estimate; in 2000: 1,200; in 2001: 1,004; in 2002: 300; in 2003: 300-450.

Newstartdate: 6/6/1994

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the Philippines and Abu Sayyaf reached 25 battledeaths on June 6, 1994.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>
- SarDesai, D.R. (2003). Southeast Asia: Past & Present. 5th Edition. Boulding, CO: Westview Press.
- Minorities at Risk Group Profiles
- Patrick Brogan
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks

Dyad ID 252: Philippines vs. MNLF - NM

TBA

Dyad ID 507: MIM/Mindinao Independence Movement

The Mindinao region of the Philippines was historically dominated by Muslims, however, migration by Christians from other parts of the Philippines made Muslims a minority in Mindanao by the 1960s. In 1968, the Mindinao Independence Movement (MIM) was formed which called for Mindanao to be an independent state. In 1972, the Mindinao National Liberation Front (MNLF) was formed, which superseded MIM as the dominant group in the conflict.

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: No

The MIM was a political and military organization calling for independence for Mindanao.

Rebel estimate: unclear

Rebel strength: Weaker

I could find no reference to how many troops the MIM had, but clearly the organization was considerably weaker than the Philippine army.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The MIM appears to have had a clear leadership that exercised control over its activities.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The MIM was a small organization, which was outmatched by the Philippine army in its ability to fight and procure arms.

Territorial Control: No

I found no indication that the MIM controlled territory in Mindinao.

Conflict Type: Secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

I found no indication of external support to MIM in this period.

Government Support: No

Non-state military support to Government: No

I found no indication of external support to the Philippine government in relation to MIM in this period.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Continuation as another dyad

The MIM was subsumed by the MNLF in the early 1970s.

Sources:

- UCDP
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Dyad ID 647: Philippines vs. MNLF - HM

Although the Philippine government signed a peace agreement with the MNLF in 1997, clashes have continued in Mindinao primarily because other rebel groups have refused to accept the agreement and because some parts of MNLF have continued fighting. In 2007, a faction of MNLF led by Habier Malik, declared jihad against the Philippine government, calling for better treatment for MNLF prisoners, and accusing the government of harassing its members and accusing them of being members of Abu Sayyaf Group. The government responded by attacking the faction's camps, and the group was unable to fight at a noticeable level again after 2007.

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: Yes

This faction had some relation to the overall MNLF, which was the government of Mindinao.

Rebel estimate: 400

Rebel estimate low: 400

Rebel estimate high: 400

Rebel strength: Much Weaker

UCDP estimates that the Habier Malik-led faction of MNLF had about 400 fighters. The Philippine army, meanwhile, had over 100,000 soldiers, so was much stronger than this faction.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: High

This faction was small, but clearly led by Habier Malik.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

Although the MNLF is popular in Mindinao, this faction had little ability to mobilize support, fight, or procure arms.

Territorial Control: No

I found no indication that this faction of MNLF controlled territory in Mindinao.

Conflict Type: Autonomy

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

UCDP gives no indication of external support to this faction of MNLF in this period.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: United States

The United States provided military support to the Philippines government in its fight against terrorist groups, including those in Mindinao.

Non-state military support to Government: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

After 2007, the government-MNLF-HM dyad did not again reach 25 battle deaths.

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 81

ID 113

ID 113

Incompatibility: Sudan vs. various

Sudan has been in conflict for decades. In the early years of the 21st century, negotiations between the Sudanese government and the SPLM led to a peace agreement that largely resolved the north-south conflict and led to the eventual establishment of an independent state of South Sudan. Around the time those negotiations were ongoing, conflict began between rebel groups in Darfur and the Sudanese government. At the beginning, there were two main groups—the Sudanese Liberation Movement (SLM/A) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM). These groups generally had similar goals—greater representation for Darfur in a democratic Sudan—but differed on the role that religion would play in the Sudanese state. Conflict in Darfur has been intense with much violence against civilians. In addition, there have been a string of negotiations and the deployment of a large African Union peacekeeping force which have had little effect on lowering the violence. Throughout the conflict, the JEM and SLM/A have experienced fractionalization. In 2006, a leadership dispute within the SLM/A led to the emergence of a new organization led by Minni Minawi (SLM/A-MM). In May 2006, Minawi signed a peace agreement with the Sudanese government, leading some members of his group to leave and join other rebel groups. This included the formation of the National Redemption Front (NRF), an alliance of organizations made up of those opposed to the Darfur Peace Agreement. The NRF largely dissolved by the end of 2006 as members joined other organizations, including the SLM/A-Unity faction, which engaged in conflict through 2009.

Dyad ID 433: Sudan vs. SLM/A

Period 1: 2003

Territorial Conflict?: No

Even though these groups fought in a specific territory, Darfur, UCDP codes the conflict as over the government of Sudan.

Rebel Political Wing: No

SLM/A was a military organization without a political wing.

Rebel estimate: 6,000

Rebel estimate (low): 1,000

Rebel estimate (high): 11,000

The UCDP gives a range of 1,000-11,000 troops for the SLM/A.

Rebel strength: Weaker

The SLM/A was considerably weaker than the Sudanese army, which was estimated to have over 100,000 troops.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Low

The SLM/A did have a leadership, but was beset by fractionalization throughout the conflict.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The SLM/A was able to mobilize support in Darfur, but was outmatched on all of these dimensions by the Sudanese government.

Territorial Control: Yes

Territory Name: Parts of Darfur

Level of effective territorial control: Moderate

The various rebel groups in Darfur have been able to establish control over some territory there, but it is contested.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External Supporters: Eritrea

In 2003, SLM/A received support from Eritrea

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Chad

In 2003, Chad supported the Sudanese government.

Non-state military support to Governments: No Ended?: No

Period 2: 2004-2009

Transnational Constituency Support: tacit

UCDP reports that SLM/A has received some support from the Fur diaspora, but it is unclear at what level.

Rebel Presence in External States: Some

SLM/A has operated to some extent out of Chad.

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External State Supporters: Eritrea, Libya, Chad

At various points, UCDP reports support from Eritrea, Libya, and Chad to SLM/A.

Government Support: No

Chad switched from supporting the government to the rebels after 2003. China provided military support to Sudan, but not for the conflict in Darfur.

Ended? No

The SLM/A was active into 2010.

Dyad ID 434: Sudan vs. JEM

Period 1: 2003

Territorial Conflict?: No

Even though these groups fought in a specific territory, Darfur, UCDP codes the conflict as over the government of Sudan.

Rebel Political Wing: No

JEM was a military organization without a political wing.

Rebel estimate: 6,000

Rebel estimate (low): 3,000

Rebel estimate (high): 12,500

The UCDP gives a range of 3,000-12,500 troops for the JEM.

Rebel strength: Weaker

The JEM was considerably weaker than the Sudanese army, which was estimated to have over

100,000 troops.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Low

The JEM did have a leadership, but also experienced some fractionalization throughout the conflict.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The JEM was able to mobilize support in Darfur, but was outmatched on all of these dimensions by the Sudanese government.

Territorial Control: Yes

Territory Name: Parts of Darfur

Level of effective territorial control: Moderate

The various rebel groups in Darfur have been able to establish control over some territory there, but it is contested.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External Supporters: Eritrea

In 2003, JEM received support from Eritrea

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Chad

In 2003, Chad supported the Sudanese government.

Non-state military support to Government: No

Ended?: No

Period 2: 2004-2009

Rebel Presence in External States: Some

JEM has operated to some extent out of Chad.

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External State Supporters: Eritrea, Libya, Chad

At various points, UCDP reports support from Eritrea, Libya, and Chad to JEM.

Government Support: No

Chad switched from supporting the government to the rebels after 2003. China provided military support to Sudan, but not for the conflict in Darfur.

Ended?: No

The JEM continued fighting into 2010.

Dyad ID 520: Sudan vs. Sudanese Communist Party

On July 19, 1971, an armored division led by Major Hashem el Atta and units of the Presidential Guard captured President General al Nemery at his residence. Atta declared the government dissolved and himself the new leader. Despite the attempted takeover, however, most of the military stayed loyal to Nemery and over the next four days conflict raged between the military and Atta's forces until, on July 22, Nemery was restored to power. The coup plotters were arrested and tried and the government called for all members of the Sudanese Communist Party, who had supported the coup, to be arrested.

The small communist movement, with considerable support among educated Sudanese and involvement in student and union organizations, was among the opposition elements to the Bashir government. The Sudanese Communist Party (SCP) played an important role in the first years of Nimeiri's rule but was harshly suppressed and forced underground after participation in an unsuccessful coup against Nimeiri in 1971. Major Hashem el Atta, was on July 19 reported to have seized power in a coup. The Government of Iraq had recognized the new regime on July 19. The Nimeiri government crushed the rebels and soon regained power.

Rebels: Sudanese Communist Party

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The coup plotters were directly linked with the Sudanese Communist Party.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the sources gave any indication of the number of troops which supported Atta's coup attempt. However, it is clear that they were outmatched by the part of the military that remained loyal to Nemery.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Library of Congress Country Study

Dyad ID 521: Sudan vs. Islamic Charter Front

On July 2, 1976, as Sudanese President Nemery returned from a trip abroad, armed civilians attempted to kidnap him and to take control of the government. They were unsuccessful and the security forces retaliated with violent reprisals against those accused of participating in the coup attempt. By the end of the day, order had been restored and the government had regained full control. In the aftermath of the attempted coup, the Sudanese government accused Libya of training and supplying the insurgents, a charge which the Libyan government denied. Whether or not the plotters were supported by Libya, it appears that they were led in part by the Islamic Charter Front, the political wing of the militant Muslim Brotherhood.

Conservative opposition to Nimeiri coalesced in the National Front, formed in 1974. The National Front included people from Sadiq's wing of Umma; the NUP; and the Islamic Charter Front, then the political arm of the Muslim Brotherhood. Their activity crystallized in a July 1976 coup attempt. Government soldiers quickly restored order by killing more than 700 rebels in Khartoum. In a complaint to the UN security Council the Sudanese Government stated that the Sudan had been the target of "an act of banditry designed by Libya to create chaos and to effect the overthrow of the legally-constituted Government" of the Sudan. The complaint also stated that Libya had provided training, arms, ammunition and transport for about 1,000 mercenaries. The Libyan Government denied on the following day that it was in any way involved in the attempted coup. Egyptian President Sadat had subsequently, in a message to the Sudanese President, expressed readiness to "respond fully to any request" for help by President Nemery. General Abdul Ghani Gamazi the Egyptian Minister of War, confirmed on July 7 that Egypt was giving the Sudan aid.

Rebels: Islamic Charter Front

Transconstsupp: tacit. Sympathy by Islamist groups in other states and other Muslim Brotherhood units

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: alleged. Claimed that Libya had been assisting the rebels

Rtypesup: military, alleged.

Govsupport: explicit. Egypt strengthened its security relationship with Sudan after the coup. However, because the coup was entirely contained by Sudanese forces, Egyptian support is listed as being endorsement.

Gtypesup: endorsement.

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The Islamic Charter Front was the political wing of the Muslim Brother, a militant Islamic fundamentalist organization.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 1,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events reports that after the attempted coup, the government said it had been organized by 1,000 "mercenaries," most of whom were from foreign countries.

Sources:

- Library of Congress Country Study
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Dyad ID 630: Sudan vs. NRF

TBA

Dyad ID 631: Sudan vs. SLM/A - MM

Territorial Conflict?: No

Even though these groups fought in a specific territory, Darfur, UCDP codes the conflict as over the government of Sudan.

Rebel Political Wing: No

SLA-MM was a military organization without a political wing.

Rebel estimate: 6,000

Rebel estimate (low): 1,000

Rebel estimate (high): 11,000

The UCDP gives a range of 1,000-11,000 troops for SLA-MM. Estimating how many troops were loyal to which faction of the SLA is challenging.

Rebel strength: Weaker

The SLA-MM was considerably weaker than the Sudanese army, which was estimated to have over 100,000 troops.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Low

The SLA-MM did have a leadership, but also experienced some fractionalization throughout the conflict.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The SLA-MM was able to mobilize support in Darfur, but was outmatched on all of these dimensions by the Sudanese government.

Territorial Control: Yes

Territory Name: Parts of Darfur

Level of effective territorial control: Moderate

The various rebel groups in Darfur have been able to establish control over some territory there, but it is contested.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: Some

The various rebel groups operated to some extent out of Chad.

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External Supporters: Chad

Chad provided support to Darfuri rebel groups, including SLA-MM.

Government Support: No

China provided military support to Sudan, but not for the conflict in Darfur.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Peace Agreement

Victorious Side: NA

The SLA-MM exited the conflict in 2006 when its leadership signed the Darfur Peace Agreement. Many of the fighters in the organization, however, continued fighting as part of other organizations.

Dyad ID 641: Sudan vs. SPLM

TBA

Dyad ID 645: Sudan vs. Faction of SPLM

Rebels: SPLM/SPLA

Transconstsupp: none.

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: explicit. During various periods of the conflict, Iraq, Libya, Iran, China supplied arms to the government

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Dyad ID 648: Sudan vs. SLM/A-Unity

Territorial Conflict?: No

Even though these groups fought in a specific territory, Darfur, UCDP codes the conflict as over the government of Sudan.

Rebel Political Wing: No

SLM-Unity was a military organization without a political wing.

Rebel estimate: 5,000

Rebel estimate (low): 5,000

Rebel estimate (high): 5,000

The UCDP estimates that SLA-Unity had 5,000 troops in 2008.

Rebel strength: Weaker

The SLA-Unity was considerably weaker than the Sudanese army, which was estimated to have over 100,000 troops.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Low

The SLA-Unity did have a leadership, it was unclear how many troops were loyal to that leadership as opposed to fighting for other organizations.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The SLA-Unity was able to mobilize support in Darfur, but was outmatched on all of these dimensions by the Sudanese government.

Territorial Control: Yes

Territory Name: Parts of Darfur

Level of effective territorial control: Moderate

The various rebel groups in Darfur have been able to establish control over some territory there, but it is contested.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: Some

The various rebel groups operated to some extent out of Chad.

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External Supporters: Chad

Chad provided support to Darfuri rebel groups, including SLA-Unity.

Government Support: No

China provided military support to Sudan, but not for the conflict in Darfur.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

Victorious Side: NA

The SLA-Unity exited the conflict after 2008 because it was no longer very active. This was primarily to many people leaving the organization to join other rebel groups.

Dyad ID 808: Sudan vs. Forces of George Athor

In elections in May 2010, George Athor competed for government of a state in southern Sudan and lost to the SPLM/A candidate. He accused the SPLM of electoral fraud and targeted the SPLM.

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link Rebel Political Wing Legal: Yes

These forces were associated with a candidate, George Athor, who competed in elections.

Rebel estimate: 2,000

The UCDP estimates that the Forces of George Athor had 2000 troops.

Rebel strength: Much Weaker

The Sudanese government and SPLM were clearly much stronger than the Forces of George Athor.

Central Control: Yes Strength Central Control: High

These forces appeared to be loyal to George Athor.

Mobilization Capacity: Low Arms Procurement Capacity: Low Fighting Capacity: Low

George Athor had some support, but it was low compared to that of the government or the SPLM.

Territorial Control: No

The Forces of George Athor appeared to control no territory.

Conflict Type: Civil War Transnational Constituency Support: No Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No Rebel Support: No

The Forces of George Athor did not have any external support.

Government Support: No

The Sudanese government did not appear to receive any support in this conflict.

Dyad ID 812: Sudan vs. Sudanese Peoples Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A)-North

In 2011, Sudan split into two states—the Republic of Sudan and the Republic of South Sudan. South Sudan was controlled largely by the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A). The areas of South Kordofan and Blue Nile remained in Sudan, but the SPLM/A was popular there. In May 2011, an election was held for governor of South Kordofan and the party of Sudanese President Omar el-Bashir won. The SPLM/A-North contested the results of the election, and engaged in conflict with the Sudanese army in South Kordofan and Blue Nile.

Rebel Political Wing: explicit link

Rebel Political Wing legal: yes

The SPLM/A-North was both a political and a military organization.

Rebel Estimate: 47000

Rebel Estimate (low): 47000

Rebel Estimate (high): 47000

Rebstrength: weaker

According to UCDP, SPLM/A-North had 47000 troops, as compared to 109,300 troops for the Sudanese military.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: High

The SPLM/A-North was a well-organized military organization made up primarily of remnants of the SPLM/A.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

The SPLM/A-North was generally more popular than the Sudanese government in South Kordofan and Blue Nile, although not in Sudan as a whole. As a remnant of the SPLM-A, which had organized a decades long insurgency, the organization had access to weapons and was generally an experienced fighting force.

Territorial Control: No

I found no evidence that SPLM/A-North controlled territory in South Kordofan or Blue Nile district.

Conflict Type: civil war

Transconstsupp: Explicit. Support and sympathy from South Sudanese. Rebextpart: alleged. Unclear how much support was given by South Sudanese. Rebpresosts: Some. Leadership allowed to move freely in South Sudan. Rebsupport: Explicit Rtypesup: Non-military. Support from South Sudan in the form of finances and supplies. Alleged military support as well, but not confirmed. Govsup: None Gtypesup: NA Govextpart: no

While SPLM/A-North is made up of former members of the SPLM/A, which now operates as the government of the independent South Sudan, the rebel group is fighting primarily for regime change, not for independence.

Dyad ID 813: Sudan vs. vs. SSLM/A

In 2011, Sudan split into two states, the Republic of Sudan and the Republic of South Sudan. Before the split, however, all of Sudan was governed by a Government of National Unity established by the Comprehensive Peace Accord of 2005, and the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement/Army generally administered the north. Prior to independence in 2011, the South Sudan Liberation Movement/Army (SSLM/A) formed to challenge the SPLM/A's rule in South Sudan, and this insurgency continued after South Sudan became independent.

As such, UCDP treats this as two dyads, one between the government of Sudan and the SSLM/A prior to South Sudan's independence, and one between the government of South Sudan and the SSLM/A afterwards.

Rebel Political Wing: no

The SSLM/A was opposed to the SPLM/A's rule, but did not appear to represent an independent political movement.

Rebel Estimate, Rebel Estimate (low), Rebel Estimate (high): unclear Rebstrength: weaker

UCDP gives no indication of the number of troops possessed by the SSLM/A, but it was clearly weaker than the government of South Sudan, which it was contesting.

Central Control: Yes Strength Central Control: Low

The SSLM/A was formed and led by Peter Gadet, who had been a militia leader in South Sudan for years. However, Gadet at one point called for a ceasefire and indicated his willingness to negotiate, but the rest of the organization did not follow suit.

Mobilization Capacity: Low Arms Procurement Capacity: Low Fighting Capacity: Low

The SSLM/A was not as popular in South Sudan as the SPLM/A generally, and was not much of a match for it militarily.

Territorial Control: Yes Name of Territory: Parts of South Sudan Effective Control: Low

Throughout its insurgency, the SSLM/A was able to gain control of some parts of Southern Sudan, but not exercise significant influence over them.

Conflict Type: civil war

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 82

ID 114

ID 114

Incompatibility: Madagascar vs. Monima National Independence Movement

Dyad ID 540: Madagascar vs. Monima National Independence Movement

In 1971, an uprising broke out in southern Madagascar targeted against government police and military targets. The revolt was led by the Monima National Independence Movement, a leftist political party. Southern Madagascar was the poorest region of the country and the area hardest hit by economic problems that plagued the country in the 1970s. The rebels revolted against the government in protest of their poor economic position and of discriminatory policies such as poll and cattle taxes that were collected in cash. The revolt was quickly defeated by the police forces.

The National Movement for the Independence of Madagascar (Mouvement National pour l'Indpendance de Madagascar–Monima) led a peasant uprising in Toliara Province. The creator and leader of Monima was Monja Jaona, a ctier from the south who also participated in the Revolt of 1947. The main issue was government pressure for tax collection at a time when local cattle herds were being ravaged by disease. The protesters attacked military and administrative centers in the area, apparently hoping for support in the form of weapons and reinforcements from China. Such help never arrived, and the revolt was harshly and quickly suppressed.

Rebels: Monima

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The Monima National Independence Movement was a political party.

Rebestimate: 2,500

Rebestlow: 1,000

Rebesthigh: 6,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Brown (1995) reports that the best estimates in the aftermath of the conflict are of 1,000 rebels killed and 1,500 (or up to 5,000) arrested. However, the official figure given by the government was 45 rebels killed and 847 arrested. It is not known what percentage of the rebels were arrested or killed.

Source:

- Brown, Mervyn (1995). *A History of Madagascar*. Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener Publishers.
- Library of Congress Country Study

Chapter 83

ID 115

ID 115

Incompatibility: Morocco vs. Military Faction

Dyad ID 541: Morocco vs. Military Faction

On July 10, 1971, some military officers, led by General Mohammed Medbouh and Colonel Mohammed Ababou attempted a coup d'etat against Moroccan King Hassan. To carry out the coup, the officers told 1,400 cadets that the King was being held and they had to rescue him, when in fact he was at a birthday party. Some of the cadets recognized the king and despite the deaths of several of the guests at the party, the coup was unsuccessful. The vast majority of the armed forces remained loyal to Hassan and the plotters were defeated.

A coup was attempted by Colonel Ababou, however the coup attempt failed. Despite the collapse of the rebellion, the Libyan radio on July 11 praised it as "a genuine courageous Arab revolution", and on July 12 called on "the free Moroccan officers" to try again. Meanwhile, on the morning of July 11 the Libyan Embassy in Rebut had been surrounded by loyal Moroccan troops, and according to some reports troops entered some of the Embassy buildings in search of rebels who might have taken refuge there. It was subsequently reported that the Moroccan Embassy in Libya had been closed.

Rebels: Military Faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: explicit. Endorsement by Libya

Rtypesup: endorsement

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The coup attempt was organized by some officers in the military and not by a political party.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 1,400

Rebstrength: weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events reports that the leaders of the coup attempt enlisted 1,400 cadets to carry it out, although the cadets did not know that it was a coup.

Source:

- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 84

ID 116

ID 116

Incompatibility: Territory, East Pakistan

Dyad ID 542: Pakistan vs. Mukti Bahini: Liberation Force

Since partition with India in 1947, the government of Pakistan, which consisted almost exclusively of people from Western Pakistan, faced demands for autonomy from the primarily Bengali population of East Pakistan. In elections in 1970, a party led by Mujibur Rahman, an East Pakistani representative, gained a majority and Rahman was set to become Prime Minister. The minister intervened, however, and would not allow him to take power and placed him in jail. From prison, he urged the population of East Pakistan (which he referred to as Bangladesh) to rise up against the West Pakistani military. Violent clashes between the civilians in East Pakistan and the Pakistani military led to massive refugee flows into India, and from March to November 1971, an insurgent organization, Mukti Bahini: Liberation Force grew from nothing to have nearly 100,000 troops. In late 1971, the Indian army intervened in East Pakistan and the Pakistani army surrendered on December 16, 1971. Bangladesh declared independence and formed a new government (which was for a while not recognized by Pakistan).

On March 26, 1971 Pakistani President Yahya Khan outlawed the Awami League, a political party in East Pakistan which worked for Bengali autonomy. Major Ziaur Rahman proclaimed the independence of Bangladesh. A Bangladeshi government in exile was formed in Calcutta. Ziaur Rahman and others organized Bengali troops to form the Mukti Bahini (Liberation Force). More than 250,000 refugees crossed into India in the first few days of the war. The influx continued over the next six months and reached a total of about 10 million. On March 31, the Indian parliament passed a resolution in support of the "people of Bengal." The Mukti Bahini, formed around regular and paramilitary forces, received equipment, training, and other assistance from India. In response to Indian military movements along and across the Indian-East Pakistani border, the Pakistan Air

Force attacked military targets in northern India on December 3, and on December 4 India began an integrated ground, naval, and air invasion of East Pakistan. Bangladesh gained independence.

Rebels: Mukti Bahini

Transconstsupp: tacit. Sympathy by Bengalis in India.

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. Movement's leadership was based in India.

Rebsupport: Explicit. India invaded East Pakistan to support the rebels

Rtypesup: troops

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Mukti Bahini: Liberation Force had close ties to East Pakistani political parties, and responded to a call by Mujibur Rahman, who became the first prime minister of independent Bangladesh, to rise up against the Pakistani government.

Rebestimate: 90,000

Rebestlow: 30,000

Rebesthigh: 150,000

Rebstrength: parity

Keesing's Record of World Events in December 1971 reported three different estimates for the number of troops possessed by Mukti Bahini: one source estimated between 80,000 and 100,000, another source estimated between 50,000 and 150,000 and one source estimated between 30,000 and 40,000. It goes on to report that the Pakistani army had roughly 80,000 to 100,000 troops in East Pakistan.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Onwar.com
- Library of Congress Country Study

Chapter 85

ID 117

ID 117

Incompatibility: Sri Lanka vs. JVP

Dyad ID 256: Sri Lanka vs. JVP

This conflict is best described in two phases. The Sri Lankan government fought two separate armed conflicts with the JVP: one in 1971 and one in 1989-1990.

Period 1: 1979

The Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (JVP) is a Maoist political party which formed in Sri Lanka in the 1960s. It competed in political elections and won some seats in parliament. Prior to 1971, it had supported a left-wing coalition government, however, disagreement with that left wing government led to violent protests, which were met by harsh reprisals from the government security forces. On April 6, 1971, the conflict escalated when members of the JVP attacked government facilities and tried to take over the government. They were unsuccessful and over the next two weeks the security forces responded with severe repression, which resulted in over a thousand casualties and in many arrests. The JVP was promptly defeated.

Period 2: 1989-1990

In the mid 1980s, the JVP reemerged as an organization opposed to the Sri Lankan government. By this point, however, the organization had changed from a radical leftist one to a Sinhalese nationalist organization. In the late 1980s, the JVP was violently opposed to the Sri Lankan government's attempt to negotiate with and offer of autonomy to the Tamils (see conflict id 2580). In 1988, the group began a campaign of violent riots, strikes, and attacks against government positions. In 1989,

the conflict erupted into full-scale warfare. The conflict continued through 1990, but by the end of that year the government had killed many of the leaders and arrested many alleged supporters of the JVP and the conflict had for the most part ended.

The Sinhalese, Maoist Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (JVP) emerged as a political movement in 1965. Under the leadership of Rohana Wijeweera it subsequently grew into an organized political party and took on an increasingly public role from the mid-1970s. In the 1970 elections the JVP supported the United Front coalition, but soon after the new government's inauguration to power, JVP intensified its violent rhetoric. President Bandaranaike was forced to call on India to provide basic security functions. Indian frigates patrolled the coast and Indian troops guarded Bandaranaike International Airport at Katunayaka while Indian Air Force helicopters assisted the counteroffensive. The JVP re-emerged as a dissident force within the Sinhala community in early 1987. The conflict ended in 1990 with what must be termed an unconditional military victory by the government.

Rebels: JVP

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: explicit. India sent troops and maintained security during the 1970's

Gtypesup: Troops

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Period 1

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The JVP competed in elections and was a participant in the legislature prior to its revolt.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the sources gave any indication as to the number of troops supporting the JVP. In the aftermath of the attempted coup, 18,000 people were arrested, but most of those were released and it is not clear that the ones convicted actually participated.

Newendate: 4/30/1971

It is not clear exactly when this conflict ended, but the Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the security forces were able to regain complete control within a couple of weeks, so it is dated at ending at the end of the month.

Period2

Rebpolwing: no

Although the JVP did later reemerge as a political party (around 1999), in this period it only opposed the government through violence.

Rebestimate: 2,100

Rebestlow: 1,200

Rebesthigh: 3,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in this period the JVP had between 1,200 and 3,000 armed supporters. In comparison, the Sri Lankan military had about 22,000 personnel.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1989

It is not clear when in 1989 this phase of the conflict passed 25 battledeaths, so it is dated as beginning on the first day of the year.

Newenddate: 12/31/1989

By the end of the year, the JVP had been almost completely defeated and was no longer relevant as a fighting force.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Library of Congress

Chapter 86

ID 118

ID 118

Incompatibility: Uganda vs. various

Uganda vs. HSM, UDCM/UPDCA, UPA, and faction of UPDA

Shortly after Yoweri Museveni overthrew Tito Okello in 1986 and took power in Uganda, several insurgent groups emerged launching a military challenge against his rule. Each of these groups drew its personnel largely from former members of the Ugandan army under the rule of Idi Amin, Milton Obote, or Okello, all of whom had hailed from Northern Uganda. Museveni, by contrast, presided over an army that was primarily made up of southern Ugandans. There were three major rebel groups that opposed Museveni in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the Ugandan People's Democratic Army (UPDA) which began with about 5,000 troops challenging Museveni. The group was beset by fractionalization, however, and by 1987 another rebel group, the Ugandan People's Army (UPA) had split off and joined the battle. In June 1988 the UPDA signed a peace agreement with the Ugandan government and many of its fighters were integrated into the Ugandan National Army, but a faction of the UPDA refused to accept the agreement and continued fighting for a few years until in 1990 it was no longer viable. The UPA continued fighting until 1991 but the death of its leader in 1990 was a major blow to the organization and it was soon out of the conflict. Another rebel group present in the north at this time, the Holy Spirit Movement (HSM), had as its goal to overthrow Museveni and to replace the Ugandan constitution with the Ten Commandments. The HSM had some initial success but suffered crushing military defeats and by 1989 was defeated militarily. A high-ranking officer of the HSM, Joseph Kony, formed a new rebel group, the Ugandan Democratic Christian Movement (UDCM) or the Ugandan People's Democratic Christian Army (UPDCA) and continued to oppose Museveni. By 1993, however, the security situation in northern Ugandan had largely improved due to military success by the Ugandan army.

Notes on Coding:

Dyad ID 148: Uganda vs. UPA

Rebels: UPA

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: n/a

Rtypesup: none

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebestimate: 5,000

Rebestlow: 3,000

Rebesthigh: 7,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Ofcansky (1996) writes that in April 1988 3,000 former UPA troops accepted an amnesty offered by Museveni and disarmed. Since the rebel group continued to operate after that point that means that they had more than 3,000 troops at that time. The rebestimate and rebesthigh are guesses based on knowing that they had more than 3,000, and the 3,000 for rebestlow is just that bottom number.

Sources:

- Ofcansky, Thomas P. (1996). *Uganda: Tarnished Pearl of Africa*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Uppsala Conflict Database

Dyad ID 149: Uganda vs. HSM

Rebels: HSM

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 5,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events reported in November 1987 that the Holy Spirit Movement had forces that "were estimated to total more than 5,000." Despite this number of troops, the HSM was never able to challenge the army militarily, often charging into battle unarmed and relying on spirits to protect them.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Dyad ID 151: Uganda vs. LRA

***Break 2180-1530-0 into two phases. 2180-1530-0 (pre-2001) and 2180-1530-0.1 (post-2001). After this date, Sudan is no longer allowing territorial access to LRA. On 11 April former LRA soldiers reported that the Sudanese government had withdrawn all its support to the LRA. On 8 August the Sudanese President Umar al-Bashir even stated publicly that Sudan had totally withdrawn its support for the LRA ***

PRE-2001 Rebels: LRA

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: Extensive. Bases were located in Southern Sudan at invitation of Sudanese govt.

Rebsupport: military. Extraterritorial bases and military supplies from Sudan.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: Explicit. The DR Congo was assisting in operations against the LRA.

Gtypesup: troops

Govextpart: major. The Sudanese SPLA was assisting the government in fighting the rebels

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>

2001 and after Rebels: LRA

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: Extensive. Bases were located in Southern Sudan, although Sudan was now cooperating to limit rebel activities..

Rebsuport: none.

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: Explicit. The DR Congo was assisting in operations against the LRA.

Gtypesup: troops

Govextpart: major. The Sudanese SPLA was assisting the government in fighting the rebels

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>

Rebpolwing: no

The Lord's Resistance Army is a group with the stated goal of overthrowing Museveni and replacing the Ugandan constitution with the Ten Commandments. To date the group has only pursued its objectives through violent struggle rather than through the political system.

Rebestimate: 4,000

Rebestlow: 1,000

Rebesthigh: 6,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute in 1996 estimated the LRA troop strength at 2,000, in 1997 estimated it at 1,000-4,000 and in 1998 estimated it at 6,000. In any case, the LRA was never a match for the Ugandan army and survived by operating in terrain that was easy to defend and through attacks on civilians.

Centcontrol: yes

Strengthcent: high

The LRA was led by Joseph Kony, who exercised strong control over the group.

Dyad ID 152: Uganda vs. WNBF

Rebels: WNBF

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: Extensive. Bases located in Sudan and Zaire (DRC)

Rebsuport: none. While Sudan backs the LRA, links to the WNBF are unclear

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: major. The Sudanese SPLA was assisting the government

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>

Note: There was much less information available on the West Nile Bank Front than on the other two groups in this conflict.

Rebpolwing: no

The West Nile Bank Front did not work through the Ugandan political system in any way.

Rebestimate: unclear

None of the sources offered any information about the troop strength of the WNBF.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Agence France Press
- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks
- Uganda: IRIN Special Report on the ADF rebellion (19991208). Report from the Integrated Region Information Network, accessed via the World Wide Web at <http://www.africa.upenn.edu/Hornet/irin-1230899c.html>

Dyad ID 153: Uganda vs. ADF

Rebels: ADF

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: major. Members of the ex-FAR (Armed Forces of Rwanda), ex-FAZ (Armed Forces of Zaire)

Rebpresosts: Extensive. Bases in Sudan and Zaire.

Rebsupport: none. While Sudan backs the LRA, ties to the ADF are unclear

Rtypesup: n/a.

Govsupport: Explicit. DR Congo assists in policing its territory against ADF forces.

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: major. The SPLA was assisting the government.

Rebpolwing: no

The Alliance of Democratic Forces is composed of a group of opponents of Museveni's rule and does not articulate a clear political agenda.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 1,500

Rebstrength: low

The only reference to the troop strength of the ADF was in the 1999 Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks (SIPRI) which identified the group as possessing 1,500 troops. It is clear that the group was considerably weaker than the Ugandan government, however, it was able to continue its activities due to support from Sudan and Zaire (including Zaire allowing ADF to set up bases outside on its territory) and due to the distance it was from the Ugandan government.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>

Dyad ID ?: Uganda vs. UDCM/UPDCA

Rebels: UDCM (also UPDCA, UDCA)

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Note: The Armed Conflict Dataset lists these as two different groups. However, the references I found referred to them as both groups led by Joseph Kony after the defeat of the Holy Spirit Movement and so I am counting them as one rebel group.

Rebestimate: 500

Rebestlow: 200

Rebesthigh: 800

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 1990 the UDCM/UPDCA had between 200 and 800 troops and in 1991 the group had 500 troops. These estimates are in comparison to 70,000

troops possessed by the Ugandan army.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Uganda vs. ADF, LRA, and WNBF

In the early years after taking power Ugandan President Museveni faced opposition from a number of different rebel groups (see conflict id 2180, dyad 1520). By the early 1990s, however, the security situation in northwestern Uganda had largely improved. The main remaining rebel group opposing Museveni was the Ugandan People's Christian Army led by Joseph Kony, a fundamentalist Christian leader seeking to overthrow Museveni and replaced the Ugandan constitution with the Ten Commandments and in the early 1990s that group was increasingly marginalized. Kony decided to reorganize opposition to the government and launched a new group, the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) with support from the government of Sudan, which was acting in response to Museveni's support for the Sudanese People's Liberation Army (SPLA). In 1994 the security situation again deteriorated in northern Uganda as the LRA carried out attacks and kidnappings against civilians. In 1996 two more rebel groups emerged to challenge Museveni, the Alliance of Democratic Forces (ADF), a somewhat nebulous grouping of opponents of the government that operated from a platform espousing an Islamist ideology, and the West Nile Bank Front (WNBF), a group led by a former minister in Idi Amin's government. Each of these groups was supported by Sudan and by Zaire under Mobutu. In 1996-1997 the level of conflict was high in Uganda but over the next several years Museveni had several successes that shifted the momentum strongly into his favor. First, the SPLA dealt a crushing blow to the WNBF in 1997, effectively ending that group's ability to challenge the government. Second, the Ugandan army's intervention into two successive conflicts in the former Zaire allowed them to gain a strong advantage over the WNBF. Finally, an agreement between the governments of Uganda and Sudan in 2001 to each stop supporting the other's rebel groups led to a decrease in the access of the LRA and ADF to weapons and funding. The conflict between the Ugandan government and those two groups continues in 2004 but at a lower level of intensity than in earlier periods.

*** UDCM and UPDCA are name variants of the same group. The Uppsala website refers to the same group as Ugandan Democratic Christian Army, UDCA. 2180-1520-3 and 2180-1520-3 should be merged into a single record. NOTE: There appears to be two Ugandan People's Armies. The first emerged in 1972 (listed below as 2180-1560-0); I could not find data on this group.***

After Yoweri Museveni's National Resistance Army (NRA) ousted President Apolo Milton Obote from power in January 1986, several guerilla groups, opposing Museveni's rule, soon appeared. These were predominantly composed of former government soldiers of the Uganda National Liberation Army (UNLA), of which most came from northern and eastern Uganda. The most important of these groups was the Uganda People's Democratic Army (UPDA), which had been launched sometime between May-July 1986. Already from its foundation, the UPDA suffered from disunity as some fighters left the UPDA in 1987 in order to form the Uganda People's Army (UPA). Simultaneously a new armed opposition group appeared in early 1987 in northern Uganda, the

Holy Spirit Movement (HSM). The HSM leader, Alice Lakwena, was able to gather thousands of followers by preaching a mixture of Christian and local religious beliefs. By the end of 1987 the HSM had been more or less defeated, forcing Alice Lakwena to flee to Kenya. The movement did, however, continue to oppose the government until 1990 under the leadership of Joseph Kony. The UPDA, unable to effectively challenge the regime, signed a peace agreement with the government in June 1988. However, a faction of the UPDA, led by Justin Odong Latek, refused to accept the accord and continued to resist the NRA. In 1990 Joseph Kony, along with parts of the HSM, founded a new guerilla group, the Uganda Democratic Christian Army (UDCA) which made raids against military and civilian targets in northern Uganda. Joseph Kony once again launched a new rebel group during this time, the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA). The LRA, financially and militarily backed by Sudan, became the main threat to Museveni's rule in 1994-95, making attacks into Uganda from southern Sudan. By 1996 the LRA was joined by two more rebel groups, the West Nile Bank Front (WNBF) and the Allied Democratic Front (ADF), both active in western Uganda and supported by Sudan and Zaire. In March 1997 the WNBF was more or less destroyed by the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA), which was cooperating militarily with the Ugandan regime against Ugandan rebel groups. By 2001, however, rebel activity had decreased dramatically. This was largely due to a rapprochement between the Ugandan and Sudanese governments, whereby both agreed to stop supporting each other's rebel movements. Sudan, in the spirit of the agreement, stopped aiding the LRA, whereby LRA attacks into Uganda decreased. Similarly, ADF attacks in Uganda diminished in 2000-01, as the NRA had successfully destroyed several ADF bases in eastern Democratic Republic of Congo.

Notes on Coding:

Dyad ID 554: Uganda vs. Military Faction of 1971

On January 25, 1971, while Ugandan President Obote was in Singapore, the commander of the army Major-General Idi Amin led a coup d'état which removed the Obote regime from power. The now-overthrown leader went to Tanzania where he was welcomed by the government there. On January 26, Amin proclaimed himself Head of State. Over the next few days there were clashes between Amin's faction of the military and troops still loyal to Obote in the Karamoja region, however, by early February resistance had been quelled.

Spreadsheet lists this as a conflict from 1971 to 1977. This is incorrect. The coup began and ended in 1971. There was another coup in 1977, listed below The Government of President Obote was overthrown on Jan. 25 by troops led by Major-General Idi Amin, commander of Uganda's Army.

Rebels: military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: no

This coup d'état arose out of the military and was not driven by any political faction within Uganda.

Rebestimate, rebestlow: 10,200

Rebesthigh: 11,200

Rebstrength: much stronger

Keesing's Record of World Events reported that the armed forces in Uganda, of which Amin was the head, consisted of about 5,700 troops. The police force also supported the coup, which consisted of about 5,500 men. It is not clear how many of the troops supported Amin, although it was an overwhelming majority. Keesing's reports that as many as 1,000 troops stayed loyal to Obote in the days after the coup, and so the best estimate variable is coded as the total number of military plus police minus 1,000.

Source:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Patrick Brogan
- BBC: http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/january/25/newsid_

Uganda 1981-1988

This conflict is best described in two periods. The first refers to conflicts between the Ugandan government and a set of rebel groups when Milton Obote was president from 1981 to 1985. The second refers to conflict activity in the few years after Yoweri Museveni took power in 1986.

Conflict Summary Period 1 After Tanzania's invasion and overthrow of Idi Amin in 1979 (see conflict id 2180, dyad 1570) elections were held in 1980 to determine who would rule Uganda. The elections brought Milton Obote, who had been Uganda's first post-independence president, back to power amid widespread allegations of electoral fraud. In the aftermath of the elections a number of rebel groups formed which were opposed to Obote's rule. In Amin's home region of the West Nile the Ugandan National Rescue Front (UNRF) formed, led in part by the former finance minister under Amin, and began violently challenging the government. Yoweri Museveni, whose political party the Ugandan Patriotic Movement (UPM) had competed in the 1980 elections, formed the National Resistance Movement (NRA) in the Buganda territory. The Ugandan Freedom Movement

(UFM), made up of members of the short-lived government of Yusuf Lule (the first president of Uganda after Imin whose regime had lasted 68 days) also began operating in the Buganda region. The UFM was never able to accomplish much militarily and in December 1983 a new group, the Uganda Federal Democratic Movement (UFDM) formed, claiming to be the successor to the UFM but that group was also marginal throughout the conflict. In 1982 a new organization, the Ugandan Popular Front (UPF) formed as an umbrella group seeking to coordinate the activities of all of the groups opposed to Obote. Of these rebel groups by far the most successful was the NRA, and throughout the early to mid 1980s the group continued to gain in military strength until in 1986 Museveni's forces seized Kampala and he took power.

Period 2 After Museveni took power the rebel groups which had been opposed to Obote stopped fighting. However, a set of new rebel groups emerged to challenge his rule. Three main rebel groups were active in the two years following Museveni's ascension. The Holy Spirit Movement (HSM) was a group led by Alice Lakwena that had as its goal to overthrow Museveni and replace the Ugandan constitution with the Ten Commandments. The organization was able to rally a good number of soldiers (over 5,000), however was completely outgunned by the NRA and suffered a series of crushing defeats through 1987 that rendered it ineffectual. The Ugandan People's Democratic Army (UPDA) formed by the former Prime Minister under Milton Obote was also able to rally 5,000 troops to challenge Museveni, but in 1988 signed a peace agreement with the government in Kampala. Finally, Force Obote Back Again (FOBA) formed in eastern Uganda/Western Kenya to challenge Museveni's rule there but had little noticeable success.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 148: Uganda vs. UPA of 1987-1991

The Ugandan People's Army (UPA) began an armed campaign against Museveni's government in 1987. The group claimed to represent northeastern Ugandans who had been prominent members of the military and government in previous Ugandan administrations. The UPA leadership claimed that Museveni's government had committed atrocities against the population of northeastern Uganda. For four years, the conflict raged at a high level, producing over 1000 battledeaths a year in both 1989 and 1991. However, by the end of 1991, the group had been defeated by the Ugandan army and the conflict was largely over.

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The UPA claimed to be fighting on behalf of members of the military and government from previous administrations. However, it does not appear that the group had a political organization of its own.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 2,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimates that in 1990, the UPA had 2,000 troops as compared to 75,000 possessed by the Ugandan government.

Newstartdate: 12/3/1987

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government and the UPA reached 25 battledeaths on December 3, 1987.

Newenddate: 12/31/1991

Although some conflict continued between the government and the UPA after 1991, it did not again reach 25 battledeaths in a year.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks

Dyad ID 149: Uganda vs. HSM

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 5,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events reported in November 1987 that the Holy Spirit Movement had forces that "were estimated to total more than 5,000." Despite this number of troops, the HSM was never able to challenge the army militarily, often charging into battle unarmed and relying on spirits to protect them.

Uganda found itself in near continual civil war from the early 1970s through the beginning of the 21st century. The various conflicts went through many phases and encompassed many different actors. In 1971, Major General Idi Amin seized power by overthrowing the government of Milton Obote. In 1972, Obote organized former officers from his army as Kikoosi Maloom (KM) which trained and organized in both Sudan and Tanzania. KM launched an invasion in September 1972 but was defeated in a matter of a few days. In the late 1970s, a more effective effort to overthrow Amin was organized. KM re-launched its insurgency. In addition, the rebel group Front for National Salvation (FRONOSA), led by Yoweri Museveni, also launched an attack against Amin's government. In March 1979, these groups joined together to form the Uganda National Liberation Front (UNLF) which, backed up by an invasion by the Tanzanian military, was able to overthrow Amin. After Amin's overthrow, Obote returned to power. In 1986, he was overthrown by Museveni. Museveni's government was able to consolidate control over most of Uganda, but still faced insurgency in a number of areas. In northern Uganda, there was a rebellion led by Alice Aluma's Holy Spirit Movement (HSM). The HSM was unsuccessful but successor organizations, including the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) and the Lord's Army continued the struggle. Infighting between the LRA and the Lord's Army led to the latter's destruction but the LRA continued fighting out of bases in Sudan and DRC for decades. Museveni's government also faced challenges from the West Nile region. The West Nile Bank Front (WNBF) and a splinter organization, the Ugandan National Rescue Front II (UNRF II) battled against the Ugandan government with the support of Sudan and DRC. In 2002, UNRF II signed a peace agreement with the Ugandan government and exited the conflict.

Dyad ID 431: Uganda vs. UNRF 2

Rebel Political Wing: No

UNRF II had a stated goal of fighting for multiparty democracy, however, did not appear to have a particular political affiliation.

Rebel estimate: 3000

Rebel estimate (low): 3000

Rebel estimate (high): 3000

UCDP reports that UNRF II had around 3,000 troops in 1998.

Rebel strength: Weaker

The Ugandan army had between 30,000 and 60,000 troops and received foreign support, so was clearly stronger militarily than UNRF II.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

UNRF II was made up of fighters who broke away from WNBF and had some moderate level of organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

UNRF II had little popular support in Uganda having been largely created by Sudan. Sudan provided some weapons but not enough to make it a match for the Ugandan government.

Territorial Control: No

UNRF II operated largely out of Sudanese territory and so did not establish control of territory in Uganda.

Conflict Type: Civil war

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: Extensive

UNRF II was based largely in Sudan.

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Name of Supporters: Sudan

UNRF II, along with WNBF, was essentially created by Sudan to destabilize Uganda.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Libya

UCDP reports that Libya provided training and expertise to the Ugandan government.

Non-state military support to Government: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

UNRF II continued to launch attacks into Uganda after 1987, but did not reach 25 battledeaths in the dyad again.

Sources:

- UCDP
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Dyad ID 555: Uganda vs. Military faction of Charles Arube

TBA

Dyad ID 556: Uganda vs. UNLF

Rebel Political Wing: No

UNLF was an umbrella organization dedicated to the overthrow of Amin and did not have a political affiliation.

Rebel estimate: 4500

Rebel estimate (low): 4500

Rebel estimate (high): 4500

UCDP reports that that UNLF had about 4500 troops at the time of its invasion

Rebel strength: Weaker

UNLF was clearly weaker than Amin's army and would not have been able to defeat it without major Tanzanian support.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

UNLF was an umbrella organization made up of independent organizations with separate agendas. Despite this, it was able to generally coordinate military activity.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

UNLF was unable to mobilize much popular support within Uganda. However, the organization had significant external support from Tanzania which increased its access to arms and its fighting capacity.

Territorial Control: No

Prior to the invasion, UNLF was based largely in Tanzania.

Conflict Type: Civil war

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: extensive

UNLF was based out of Tanzania.

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Troops

Names of External Supporters: Tanzania

Tanzania provided massive military support to FRONOSA, KM, and subsequently to UNLF.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Libya, Soviet Union

UCDP reports that Libya and the Soviet Union provided military support to the Ugandan government in this period.

Non-state military support to Government: minor

UCDP reports that the Islamic Development Bank provided economic support to Amin's government.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Victory

Victory Side: B

On April 11, 1979, the UNLF, backed up by Tanzania, overthrew the Ugandan government.

Dyad ID 574: Uganda vs. UPM/NRA

Rebels: National Resistance Army

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Patrick Brogan
- Library of Congress Country Study
- Onwar.com

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The National Resistance Army (NRA) was formed by Yoweri Museveni after his political party, the Ugandan Patriotic Movement (UPM) did not do well in elections in 1980 in which there were widespread allegations of electoral fraud.

Rebestimate: 9,000

Rebestlow: 6,000

Rebesthigh: 12,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events in August 1986 reported that the National Resistance Army was believed to have possessed between 6,000 and 12,000 troops. Ofcansky (1996) writes that the NRA had 6,000 troops in August 1983 and that by the next year it had 9,000.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Buganda

Effterrcont: moderate

Ofcansky (1996) writes that "By January 1983, the NRA controlled approximately 4,000 square miles of territory north and northwest of Kampala" (p. 54). This area was in the Buganda region of Uganda.

Newstartdate: 2/6/1981

Newenddate: 1/29/1986

Ofcansky (1996) writes that the NRA commenced guerilla operations on February 6, 1981. On January 29, 1986, Museveni was sworn in as President.

Dyad ID 575: Uganda vs. UFM/UFDM

Note: My research suggests that both of these groups are the same. Keesing's Record of World Events reported in June 1984 that "In December 1983 a Uganda Federal Democratic Movement

(UFDM) was formed, led by Mr. Lawrence B Semakula who was thought to be a former civil servant. The UFDM claimed to be the successor to the UFM and described itself as an armed movement, most of whose members were in Uganda.”

Rebpolwing: no

The Ugandan Freedom Movement was a small group made up of supporters of former President Yusuf Lule that operated primarily in the Buganda region. They never had a clear agenda.

Rebestimate: 500

Rebestlow: 300

Rebesthigh: 700

Rebstrength: much weaker

The only reference to the number of troops possessed by the UFM is in Ofcansky (1996) who writes that in 1982 ”about 300 UFM/A insurgents launched a mortar attack on Lubira Barracks in Kampala.” Assuming that these were not all of their troops, the estimate is made at 500, with 300 as the low end and 700 as the high. In either case, it is clear that the group was much weaker than the Ugandan army, and indeed the group suffered a crushing defeat in 1982 that meant they were largely inconsequential through the rest of the conflict.

Newstartdate: 2/9/1981

Newenddate: 1/29/1986

On February 9, 1981, the UFM attacked army barracks and police stations in the area around Kampala, their first military action. Shortly before Museveni took Kampala and was sworn in as President on January 29, 1986, the UFM surrendered to the NRA and pledged to support his government.

Dyad ID 700: Uganda vs. Kikosi Maalum

Rebel Political Wing: Acknowledged link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: No

KM was the military organization of the former government of Obote and so was made up of elements of his former regime.

Rebel estimate: 1500

Rebel estimate (low): 1500

Rebel estimate (high): 1500

According to Keesing’s Record of World Events, KM had about 1,500 troops when it invaded Uganda.

Rebel strength: Weaker

KM was clearly weaker than Amin’s army, even with the support of about 1,000 Tanzanian troops.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: High

Obote was in control of KM.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

KM was unable to mobilize much popular support within Uganda. However, the organization had significant external support from Tanzania which increased its access to arms and its fighting capacity.

Territorial Control: No

Prior to the invasion, KM was based largely in Tanzania.

Conflict Type: Civil war

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: extensive

KM was based in Tanzania.

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Troops

Names of External Supporters: Tanzania

Tanzania provided 1,000 troops to support KM.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Libya

Keesing's Record of World Events reports that Libya provided support to the Ugandan government.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Victory

Victory Side: A

Enddate: 9/20/1972

The KM forces were defeated by September 20.

Dyad ID 701: Uganda vs. Fronasa

Rebel Political Wing: No

FRONOSA was a guerilla warfare organization without a political wing.

Rebel estimate: 1500

Rebel estimate (low): 70

Rebel estimate (high): 3000

UCDP reports that FRONOSA started with only about 70 troops but had 3000 by the time the invasion had begun in full force..

Rebel strength: Weaker

FRONOSA was clearly weaker than Amin's army and would not have been able to defeat it without major Tanzanian support.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: High

Museveni exercised a large degree of control over FRONOSA's actions.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

FRONOSA was unable to mobilize much popular support. However, the organization had significant external support from Tanzania which increased its access to arms and its fighting capacity.

Territorial Control: No

Prior to the invasion, FRONOSA was based largely in Tanzania.

Conflict Type: Civil war

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: extensive

FRONOSA was based in Tanzania.

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Troops

Names of External Supporters: Tanzania

Tanzania provided massive military support to FRONOSA, KM, and subsequently to UNLF.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Libya, Soviet Union

UCDP reports that Libya and the Soviet Union provided military support to the Ugandan government in this period.

Non-state military support to Governments: minor

UCDP reports that the Islamic Development Bank provided economic support to Amin's govern-

ment.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Continuation as another dyad

On March 26, 1979, the KM and FRONOSA joined with other groups to form the UNLF.

Dyad ID 703: Uganda vs. Funa

Rebel Political Wing: No

FUNA was an organization made up of members of Amin's former military and did not appear to have a political wing.

Rebel estimate: 5000

Rebel estimate (low): 2000

Rebel estimate (high): 7100

UCDP reports that FUNA had between 5000 and 7100 troops in 1980 and 2000 in 1981.

Rebel strength: Weaker

FUNA was weaker than the Ugandan military, especially with the foreign support provided to the government.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Unclear

FUNA had a leadership, however, there is little information available about its structure.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

FUNA had relatively little popular support, however, it was made up of the former military and so still had access to weapons and was experienced as a fighting force.

Territorial Control: No

FUNA operated out of the West Nile region of Uganda, which was very tumultuous and chaotic without clear political authority in this period.

Conflict Type: Civil war

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

UCDP reports that there were allegations of Libyan support to FUNA and that Sudan provided free movement along the border, but that there was no other confirmed external support.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Tanzania

UCDP reports that Tanzania provided military support and that Cuba, North Korea and Ethiopia provided training and expertise to FUNA.

Non-state military support to Government: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

FUNA fractionalized and after 1981 the government-FUNA dyad never reached 25 battledeaths.

Dyad ID 704: Uganda vs. UNRF

Rebpolwing: no

The Ugandan National Rescue Front was made up of former members of Amin's government and did not try to articulate a political program.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 3,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Ofcansky (1996) writes that the UNRF had 3,000 troops. The group was never able to accomplish much outside of controlling a small amount of territory in the Ugandan periphery.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Terengo County

Effterrcont: low

Ofcansky (1996) writes that "the UNRF operated mainly in Terengo County, a remote area between Arua and Moyo. A smaller UNRF force conducted guerrilla activities along the Sudan border."

Newstartdate: 1/1/1981

Newenddate: 12/6/1986

There was no specific reference to when the UNRF insurrection started. Keesing's Record of World Events reports that on December 6, 1986, the leader of the UNRF formally ended the insurrection and agreed to be incorporated into the Museveni-led government.

Dyad ID 706: Uganda vs. UPDA

This group opposed Museveni's rule. It signed an accord in 1988, after which a faction of the UPDA continued to fight (above).

Rebels: Ugandan People's Democratic Army

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none
Rebpresosts: none
Rebsuport: none
Rtypesup: n/a
Govsuport: none
Gtypesup: none
Govextpart: none
Rebpolwing: No

The UPDA was a militant group made up of supporters of former President Obote and did not have a political organization.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 1,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimates that in 1987 and 1988 that the group only had 1,000 troops. Regardless of the number of troops the group never presented a coherent challenge to Museveni.

Sources:

- Patrick Brogan
- Library of Congress

Dyad ID 706: Uganda vs. UPDA

Rebels: Faction of UPDA

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 5,000

Rebstrength: weaker

In July 1990, Keesing's Record of World Events reported that a peace agreement had been signed between the Ugandan government and the Ugandan People's Democratic Movement (whose military wing was the UPDA) and that the UPDA had 5,000 troops at that time. The UPDA was

obviously weaker than the Ugandan Army and never had any prospect of being able to win the war.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Dyad ID 708: Uganda vs. Lord's army

Rebel Political Wing: No

Lord's Army was a Christian fundamentalist organization operating out of northern Uganda without a political wing.

Rebel estimate: 2000

Rebel estimate (low): 2000

Rebel estimate (high): 2000

UCDP reports that Lord's Army had around 2,000 troops.

Rebel strength: Much weaker

Lord's Army was much smaller than the Ugandan military and poorly equipped. In addition, it was weaker than the Lord's Resistance Army, based in the same area, with which it engaged in conflict.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

Lord's Army was led by Severino Lukuyo. He had a moderate degree of control of his fighters.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: low

Lord's Army had little popular support, was poorly equipped and generally unable to fight well.

Territorial Control: No

Lord's Army operated out of Kitgun, but did not appear to control territory there.

Conflict Type: Civil war

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Libya

UCDP reports that Libya provided training and expertise to the Ugandan government.

Non-state military support to Government: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Other

Lord's Army was defeated, but not by the Ugandan state, rather by the Lord's Resistance Army.

Dyad ID ?: Uganda/Libya vs. UNLA

Amin invades Tanzania in September of 1978. Tanzania wins the war with the assistance of the UNLA, a Ugandan exile group and sets up a new government.

Rebels: UNLA

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. The group was based in Tanzania

Rebsupport: Explicit. Tanzania led the invasion which put the UNLA in power

Rtypesup: Troops

Govsupport: Explicit. Libya sent 2000 troops to assist Amin.

Gtypesup: Troops

Govextpart: minor. The PLO (Palestinians) supported the Amin government. The PLO had been using Uganda as a training site.

Rebpolwing: acknowledged link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The UNLA was made up of supporters of former president Obote who had ruled Uganda from independence to 1971.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 1,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Ofcansky (1996) reports that the UNLA had 1,000 troops. This force was clearly not strong enough to defeat Amin without the Tanzanian support.

Source:

- Patrick Brogan
- Library of Congress Country Study
- Ofcansky, Thomas P. (1996). Uganda: Tarnished Pearl of Africa. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Dyad ID ?: Uganda and Libya vs. Tanzania and UNLA

Uganda in the 1970s was under the rule of Idi Amin, the notorious African dictator with a horrendous human rights record. Amin presided over the complete devastation of Uganda and alienated many of Uganda's former allies including Britain, the United States, and Julius Nyerere's Tanzania. In 1978, Nyerere approved the deployment of Tanzanian troops to remove Amin from power. The invading Tanzanian army was accompanied by about 1,000 members of the Ugandan National Liberation Army (UNLA), a group of supporters of former Ugandan President Milton Obote, who Amin overthrew in 1971, that had been based in Tanzania. The Tanzanian army/UNLA alliance made quick gains despite Libya's deployment of 2,000 troops and the presence of several hundred Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) supporting Amin and on April 10, 1979, Kampala fell and Amin fled to Libya.

Notes on Coding:

Dyad: Uganda/Libya vs. Tanzania

Rebpolwing: does not apply

Tanzania was an external state participant in the conflict and did not have a political wing.

Rebestmate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 45,000

Rebstrength: stronger

Ofcansky (1996) reports that the Tanzanian People's Defense Force deployed 45,000 troops to Uganda. That force was clearly superior to the Ugandan government's even with Libya's support.

Dyad ID ?: Uganda vs. UPA of 1972

In 1971, Idi Amin overthrew Ugandan president Milton Obote, who had ruled since independence, and took power. Obote and many of his supporters went to Tanzania and in September 1972 about 1,500 of them launched an attack back into Uganda aimed at overthrowing Amin. They achieved some initial success, occupying at least three Ugandan towns, but were defeated in a matter of days. The conflict raised tensions between Uganda and Tanzania, with Amin accusing Tanzanian President Julius Nyerere of being behind the invasion, but tensions were lowered with the signing of an agreement on October 5, 1972.

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: acknowledged link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The UPA was made up of supporters of Milton Obote, who had ruled Uganda from independence through 1971 when he was overthrown by Idi Amin.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 1,500

Rebstrength: weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events reports that the UPA had about 1,500 troops when it attacked

from Uganda. The force was clearly weaker than the might of the Ugandan army.

Start date: 4/17/1972

End date: 4/18/1972

Uppsala indicates two phases of conflict between the Ugandan government and the UPA. The first is this one and the second one takes place from 1989 to 1991 when Yoweri Museveni was in power. The above coding only refers to the first phase.

Sources:

- Ofcansky, Thomas P. (1996). Uganda: Tarnished Pearl of Africa. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Dyad ID ?: Uganda vs. faction of UPDA

Rebpolwing: No

The faction of UPDA that rejected negotiations did not have a political organization.

Rebestimate: 2,000

Rebestlow: 1,300

Rebesthigh: 5,000

In 1990, Keesing's Record of World Events estimated that the UPDA had 5,000 troops. The Uppsala Conflict Database estimated that in 1989 the group had 1,300 troops and in 1990 it had 2,000. The estimates are in comparison to 70,000 troops possessed by the Ugandan government (Correlates of War).

Dyad ID ?: Uganda vs. FOBA

This group was formed by Ugandan exiles in Kenya in 1987 to try to restore Milton Obote to power. There is very little information available on this group but it appears that it was completely marginal.

Dyad ID ?: Uganda vs UPC

Cannot find evidence of the group's military activities. The UPC was an organized political party

The Ugandan People's Congress (UPC) was the political party of Milton Obote. I believe their inclusion on Side B is a mistake because I find no reference that the group was active militarily after Museveni took power.

Dyad ID ?: Uganda vs. UNLA

The Ugandan National Liberation Army (UNLA) was the Ugandan army under Milton Obote. I believe their inclusion on Side B is a mistake because I find no reference that the group was active militarily after Museveni took power. Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks
- Ofcansky, Thomas P. (1996). Uganda: Tarnished Pearl of Africa. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Correlates of War

Dyad ID ?: Uganda vs. UPF

The Ugandan Popular Front (UPF) was formed as an organization in exile to coordinate the activities of the rebel groups opposed to Obote's reign. Because of this, most of the variables included in this dataset do not apply to the group.

Dyad ID ?: Uganda vs. Military Faction of 1977

In 1977, opposition in Uganda to Idim Amin's incredibly oppressive regime was growing. In January 1977, Amin claimed to have uncovered a plot to overthrow him through a coup d'état and the security services committed violence against those suspected of participating in the planning of the coup. It is not clear whether there in actuality was a coup d'état plan, but there was a high level of violence in Kampala in the following months. The violence continued throughout the year as the country became increasingly unstable.

Second Coup, 1977. Not listed in the spreadsheet In reports from Nairobi (Kenya) on Feb. 13, 1977, it was indicated that widespread unrest in Uganda during the previous weeks had led to mass arrests and killings by members of the Ugandan Army and security forces. According to these reports President Amin had ordered a "purge" after uncovering an attempted coup to overthrow his Government by Jan. 25, 1977. The coup planners had the support of Tanzania.

Rebels: military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. Planning took place in Tanzania

Rebsupport: explicit. Tanzania supported the objectives of the coup planners. Eventually launched its own war against Uganda

Rtypesup: endorsement

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Note: It is not entirely clear that there was a coherent "military faction" that was planning a coup so that this should be treated as an armed conflict.

Rebpolwing: unclear

It is not clear whether the people accused of planning a coup were actually planning one so it is difficult to code whether they represented a political organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

Since the violence was based on an alleged coup plot, it is not clear if there even was a coup planned and, if there was, how many people planned to participate. However, the vast majority of Amin's government stayed loyal.

Newstartdate: 1/27/1977

In January, 1977, Amin claimed to have found evidence that members of the government were plotting a coup against him by January 27, 1977.

Newenddate: 12/31/1977

Uganda was so unstable in this period that it is not easy to determine when the violence related to this alleged coup attempt ended.

Source:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- New York Times Archives

Dyad ID ?: Uganda vs. KM

Rebel Political Wing: Acknowledged Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: No

KM was the military organization of the former government of Obote and so was made up of elements of his former regime.

Rebel estimate: 950

Rebel estimate (low): 950

Rebel estimate (high): 950

UCDP reports that KM had about 950 troops prior to joining with FRONOSA to form UNLF.

Rebel strength: Weaker

KM was clearly weaker than Amin's army and would not have been able to defeat it without major Tanzanian support.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: High

Obote was in control of KM.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

KM was unable to mobilize much popular support within Uganda. However, the organization had significant external support from Tanzania which increased its access to arms and its fighting capacity.

Territorial Control: No

Prior to the invasion, KM was based largely in Tanzania.

Conflict Type: Civil war

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: extensive

KM was based in Tanzania.

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Troops

Names of External Supporters: Tanzania

Tanzania provided massive military support to FRONOSA, KM, and subsequently to UNLF.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Libya, Soviet Union

UCDP reports that Libya and the Soviet Union provided military support to the Ugandan government in this period.

Non-state military support to Governments: minor

UCDP reports that the Islamic Development Bank provided economic support to Amin's government.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Continuation as another dyad

On March 26, 1979, the KM and FRONOSA joined with other groups to form the UNLF.

Chapter 87

ID 119

ID 119

Incompatibility: Territory, Northern Ireland

United Kingdom vs. Irish Republican Army

The United Kingdom, a historically protestant country, occupied Ireland, a historically Catholic country, until the 1920s. The occupation led to conflict between the two sides. In the 1920s, Britain divided the island into two parts, a Catholic Irish one and a Protestant British one. The Republic of Ireland was granted independence while Northern Ireland remained within the United Kingdom. Northern Ireland has a substantial Catholic population and that population experienced both social and economic discrimination under British rule. The 1960s saw violent confrontations between Irish Catholics and the British police forces in Northern Ireland, culminating in major protests in the late 1960s. In 1970, the Irish Republic Army (IRA) formed to coordinate violent attacks against British police, and civilian, targets and over the next more than two decades the group waged a terrorist campaign to try to force Britain to grant Northern Ireland's independence and merger with the Republic of Ireland. Various peace initiatives were tried throughout the course of the conflict but until the 1990s, these initiatives bore little fruit. In 1993, however, the first talks occurred between the British government, the IRA and Sinn Fein (the political wing of the IRA). Over the next five years, the peace process moved in jumps and starts but on April 10, 1998, all the parties at the negotiating table agreed to sign the "Good Friday" agreement which created a power-sharing government in Northern Ireland, and the IRA agreed to stop fighting. However, a splinter group of the IRA, the real IRA, rejected the agreement and pledged to continue fighting, and they have done so at a low level of intensity since.

The IRA was made up by volunteers who had been fighting for Irish independence from Britain. Following independence in the south of Ireland, the IRA re-emerged at various times to conduct campaigns to try to end British rule in Northern Ireland, as well. In 1998, hardliners under the

name 'the real IRA' carried out a bombing campaign against police stations. In the last decade, a comprehensive peace process has been ongoing in Northern Ireland, leading up to the Good Friday accords of 1998. The real IRA, which had intensified its campaign in 1998, was not represented at the peace talks. Power-sharing in Northern Ireland's Executive government went on until 14 October 2002. On this date, the British government once again suspended the Northern Irish institutions and installed direct rule from London. By the end of 2003, the negotiations had not progressed and the Northern Irish institutions were still suspended.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 216: United Kingdom vs. Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA)/IRA

Rebels: PIRA

Transconstsupp: Explicit. Irish Diaspora groups in the US and Irish in the Republic of Ireland.

Rebextpart: minor. Diaspora groups in the US have funded military operations. The PLO (Palestine) has also given support to the group.

Rebpresosts: some. Some presence in Ireland and in the UK.

Rebsupport: Explicit. Endorsement by Ireland, but this has not been turned into active support. Libya has been known to supply arms.

Rtypesup: military, Libya. Endorsement, Ireland

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Irish Republic Army was linked with a political organization, Sinn Fein. However, the British government refused to talk to Sinn Fein until 1993.

Rebestimate: 300

Rebestlow: 250

Rebesthigh: 300

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 1989, the IRA had 300 troops and in 1991, it had 250 "frontline activists." This is in comparison to over 18,000 troops that the United Kingdom has stationed in Northern Ireland.

Newenddate: 12/31/1991

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the Northern Ireland conflict did not reach 25 battledeaths in 1992 and did not do so in any subsequent year.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>

Dyad ID 248: United Kingdom vs. Real IRA

Rebels: Real IRA

Transconstsupp: Explicit. Irish Diaspora groups in the US and Irish in the Republic of Ireland.

Rebextpart: minor. Diaspora groups in the US have funded military operations.

Rebpresosts: some. Some presence in Ireland and in the UK.

Rebsupport: None

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The Real IRA is the faction of the IRA that rejected the Good Friday Accords and decided to continue the armed struggle and is not affiliated with Sinn Fein.

Rebestimate: 150

Rebestlow: 100

Rebesthigh: 200

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 1998, the Real IRA had between 100 and 200 troops.

Newendate: 8/18/1998

On August 18, 1998, the Real IRA declared a cease-fire. Since then there have been a number of bombings attributed to the organization, but it has not claimed responsibility for any of them.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>

Chapter 88

ID 120

ID 120

Incompatibility: El Salvador vs. FMLN and other guerilla organizations

El Salvador vs. FMLN and other guerilla organizations

In the 19th and 20th centuries, El Salvador's economy was completely dominated by the coffee trade. The dynamics of the coffee plantation economy led to a massive disparity of wealth between the landowners and peasant workers in the country. The early part of the 20th century saw some protests by peasants seeking access to land and higher wages for their work but the protests were brutally suppressed by the alliance between wealthy landowners and the military that controlled the government. The numbers of unemployed, landless peasants continued to increase throughout the 20th century and by 1970, a number of political organizations had formed to campaign for more egalitarian economic policies. By 1975, several of these organizations decided to pursue an armed struggle against the government to force it to pursue more progressive policies, although they were unable to accomplish very much militarily in the early stages. In 1980 the left-wing guerillas were increasingly frustrated with the unwillingness of the right-wing members of government to implement any reform policies and they formed a political front, the Farabundo Marti Front for National Liberation (FMLN) to coordinate their attacks against the government. Throughout the 1980s, the FMLN, and its constituent organizations, engaged in urban terrorism and rural guerrilla warfare against the government. In January 1992, the FMLN and Salvadoran government signed a peace agreement in Mexico City, and the conflict was ended. In December 1992, the FMLN registered as a political party and has achieved political success in the post-conflict period.

These rebel organizations were under the umbrella organization of the FMLN. Should consolidate into a single record for the FMLN: 2200-1610-0

Following the overthrow of President Carlos Humberto Romero in October 1979, El Salvador's various left-wing groups became increasingly critical of the alleged right-wing tendencies of the

new ruling junta. From 1980 they mounted a concerted military and diplomatic campaign to overthrow the government. Inspired by Agustin Farabundo Mart's earlier revolt, anti-regime guerrilla forces created the Farabundo Mart Front for National Liberation (FMLN) as their political arm. A settlement between the Government and FMLN was achieved in a UN-brokered agreement announced in December 1991 and signed at on 16 January 1992.

Rebels: FMLN

Transconstsupp: Tacit. Sympathy by leftist groups in the region

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: Explicit. Support by Nicaragua and Cuba.

Rtypesup: Military

Govsupport: Explicit. Military assistance, training by the US

Gtypesup: Military

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Patrick Brogan

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 225: El Salvador vs. FMLN

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The FMLN was formed as a political organization to try to push for the demands of the left-wing guerilla groups. Its greatest success, however, was as an organization to coordinate the militarily activities of the groups. The FMLN was officially recognized as a political party in December 1992, after the conflict had ended, but was not legal prior to that point.

Rebestimate: 6,000

Rebestlow: 4,500

Rebesthigh: 15,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events reported in 1985 that the FMLN was estimated to have between 6,000 and 15,000 troops. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks give the following estimates for the troop strength of the FMLN: In 1987 and 1988: 4,500-6,000; in

1989: 7,000; in 1990: 6,000-8,000; in 1991: 6,000-7,000. This number is in comparison to tens of thousands of troops possessed by the Salvadoran military.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of Rural El Salvador

As a guerilla organization, the FMLN and its constituent organizations were able to set up parallel political administrations in parts of the periphery of El Salvador.

Newstartdate: 9/1/1980

Dunkereley (1990) writes that the FMLN was formed in the Autumn of 1980.

Newenddate: 12/31/1991

Although the conflict was not formally resolved until the full implementation of a peace agreement in 1992, the fighting had stopped by the end of 1991.

Dyad ID 508: El Salvador vs. Popular Liberation Forces (FPL)

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal:

The FPL was a left-wing political organization that also had a military wing.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the FPL. However, it is clear that in this period the organization was relatively small and was well-overpowered by the military.

Newenddate: 9/1/1980

The FPL did not stop fighting in the Autumn of 1980. However, the FPL and the other left-wing guerilla movements formed the umbrella organization FMLN to coordinate their activities and so I count the FPL as exiting the conflict at that point.

Dyad ID 510: Government vs. People's Revolutionary Army (ERP)

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal:

The ERP was a left-wing political organization that also had a military wing.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the ERP. However, it is clear that in this period the organization was relatively small and was well-overpowered by the

military.

Newendate: 9/1/1980

The ERP did not stop fighting in the Autumn of 1980. However, the ERP and the other left-wing guerilla movements formed the umbrella organization FMLN to coordinate their activities and so I count the ERP as exiting the conflict at that point.

Dyad ID 514: El Salvador vs. Military Faction

Conflict Summary: On March 25, 1972, some members of the Salvadoran military captured President Fidel Sanchez Hernandez of El Salvador and kept him captive for 12 hours as they tried to overthrow his government. The group was led by Colonel Benjamin Mejia and by Senor Jose Napoleon Duarte. Duarte had lost to Colonel Arturo Molino in recent elections but Duarte disputed the results. The vast majority of the military remained loyal to Hernandez, however, and he was quickly re-captured and the attempted overthrow was blocked.

El Salvador, Military Faction

*This event is listed as April 25 in the spreadsheet. Should be revised to March 25, 1972.***

A group of young army officers, led by Colonel Benjamin Mejia, launched a coup on March 25, 1972. Their immediate goal was the establishment of a "revolutionary junta." It seemed clear, however, that the officers favored the installation of Duarte as president. The coup attempt never gained the support of more than a minority within the officer corps, and that only in the army. Loyalist forces regained effective control of San Salvador by early that evening.

Rebels: military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: n/a

Rtypesup: none

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

One of the two leaders of the coup was Jose Napoleon Duarte, who had lost a recent presidential election.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the sources provided gave any indication as to the number of troops supporting the coup attempt. However, Keesing's Record of World Events reports that the bulk of the military stayed loyal to President Hernandez.

Source:

- Onwar.com
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 89

ID 121

ID 121

Incompatibility: Oman, Iran, Jordan, United Kingdom vs. PFLOAG and South Yemen

Oman, Iran, Jordan, United Kingdom vs. PFLOAG and South Yemen

In the late 1960s, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Oman and the Arab Gulf (PFLOAG) formed. PFLOAG was a Marxist-Leninist organization that called for the overthrow of the "conservative" regimes in the Middle East, including that of the sultanate of Oman. In 1968, the organization began waging armed struggle against the Omani government and was able to gain control of much of Dhofar province on the border with South Yemen. The organization received assistance from the Soviet Union and China, who funneled arms through South Yemen, and it also received direct military assistance from South Yemen. The Omani government, meanwhile, received military support from Iran, Jordan and the United Kingdom. In the early stages of the conflict, PFLOAG was able to capture a fair amount of territory and create a nuisance for the government of Oman. However, the foreign support provided to the government, combined with the global rise in oil prices in the early 1970s, meant that Oman gained greater resources to pursue the war. In 1974 and 1975 the rebel forces suffered some crushing defeats, many of their members defected to the government side, and by the end of 1975 they had lost control of Dhofar province and were largely marginalized as a fighting force.

2210-1630-1 refers to S. Yemen, which was backing PFLOAG. This entry should be removed

The primary objective of the Omani liberation movement named the Popular Front for the Liberation of the Occupied Arabian Gulf (in 1972 renamed the Popular Front for the Liberation of Oman and the Arab Gulf and in 1974 further renamed the People's Front for the Liberation of Oman) was the removal of Sultan Said ibn Taimur. Qabus ibn Said engaged neighboring states, apprehensive of the growth of left-wing movements in the region, in dispatching economic and military assistance. In 1973 the shah of Iran, fulfilling his self-perceived role as guardian of the Persian Gulf follow-

ing the departure of the British, dispatched ground forces (eventually numbering more than 3,000) and air units to Dhofar to assist the sultan. Oman received annual financial aid of about US\$200 million from Abu Dhabi to assist military and civil development projects and about US\$2.5 billion from Saudi Arabia, with which relations had improved. Britain, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Pakistan provided training in military schools for armed forces personnel. Oman's co-operation with Iran was strongly denounced by the Libyan leader, Colonel Kadhafi.

Rebels: PFLOAG

Transconstsupp: explicit. The Palestinian Liberation Organization supported the group.

Rebextpart: none.

Rebpresosts: extensive. Fighters were based in Yemen

Rebsupport: explicit. Extraterritorial bases in Yemen, also support from China and Iraq

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: Explicit. Military supplies and troops from Iran. Military equipment, training, from UK, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, others.

Gtypesup: Troops, from Iran. Military.

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Library of Congress Country Study
- Keesings
- <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/1984/CSA.htm>

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 561: Oman, etc. vs. PFLOAG

Rebpolwing: no

The PFLOAG was a Marxist-Leninist organization committed to violent overthrow of the state and did not have a political organization.

rebestimate: 2,000

rebestlow: 1,500

rebesthigh: 3,000

rebstrength: weaker

Keesings's Record of World Events reported in June 1974 that in September, 1973, it was estimated that 2,000 troops remained with PFLOAG after 1,000 had defected to the government side (making the total before that point 3,000). In February 1975, Keesings's Record of World Events estimated that PFLOAG had at least 1,500 men. These troop sizes are in comparison to an Omani army of up

to 14,000 men, supported by about 300 British officers, 2,000 Iranian troops, and several hundred Jordanian engineers.

Newendate: 12/31/1974

It is not clear when the fighting stopped completely in Oman. However, by the end of 1975 the rebels had been handily defeated and were no longer able to challenge the government effectively.

Chapter 90

ID 122

ID 122

Incompatibility: Rhodesia vs. ZANU and ZAPU

Rhodesia vs. ZANU and ZAPU

Summary: Southern Rhodesia was a settler colony in southern Africa in which the small white minority was completely dominant politically and economically. In the 1960s, as colonialism came to an end, the British government began pressuring its colony of Southern Rhodesia to accept majority rule. The white elites in the country refused, however, and in 1965 the white government there declared an independent Rhodesia. The early 1960s saw the emergence of two African political movements dedicated to majority rule, the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) and the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), each of which had a military wing. In 1965, these two groups waged armed struggle against the Rhodesian government but were not able to accomplish much militarily. In 1972, the conflict between the white-dominated government and ZANU and ZAPU reached the level of a full-scale civil war. The guerilla organizations had used the period following their first failed insurgency to regroup militarily and to forge ties with neighboring states and rebel groups such as Front for the Liberation of Mozambique (FRELIMO), an insurgent group trying to gain independence for Mozambique from Portugal. Beginning in 1972, the two rebel groups pursued a strategy of guerilla warfare and were able to achieve some success, although they were still no match for the Rhodesian army. International and regional pressure forced the Rhodesian government to open negotiations with the rebels in 1974. Negotiations in 1974 and 1975 achieved little as the government continued to oppose majority rule. In 1976 the conflict heated up as regional leaders such as Kenneth Kuanda of Zambia and Julius Nyerere of Tanzania began to see armed struggle as the only way to achieve majority rule and provided greater support to the rebels. Additionally, South Africa, which desired regional stability, placed sanctions on the government to force it to negotiate. In 1977 and 1978 the conflict continued to heat up and the military situation was shifting to favor the rebels over the government. Finally, in late 1979

a comprehensive peace agreement was signed which set the stage for majority rule but provided security guarantees to the white Rhodesians.

ZANU and ZAPU were temporarily merged during the conflict. In any case, the value of the variables is the same

The government of Ian Smith, who had become Rhodesian prime minister in 1964, proclaimed a unilateral declaration of independence on Nov. 11, 1965. Britain called the proclamation an act of rebellion but refused to reestablish control by force. Two nationalist organizations, the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) led by Robert Mugabe and the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) led by Joshua Nkomo, operating from bases in Mozambique and Zambia, respectively, carried out guerrilla warfare campaigns against the white government throughout the 1970s. Smith appealed to right-wing politicians in the United States and Britain in a failed attempt to gain recognition for his government. Later in 1979, under pressure from Britain, an agreement was reached to provide for a legally independent, democratically governed Zimbabwe. (From: encyclopedia.com)

Rebels: ZANU and ZAPU

Transconstsupp: tacit. Sympathy by Black Africans, anti-colonial movements

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases in Mozambique and Zambia

Rebsupport: explicit. Neighboring governments allowed territorial access. Reports of military training by USSR and Cuba.

Rtypesup: military

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Onwar.co
- Wikipedia.com

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 560: Zimbabwe vs. ZANU

The conflict in this dyad is best described in two periods. The first covers the early stages of the combat from 1972 to 1975. The second covers the period when the conflict reignited after the failure of negotiations in 1975.

Period 1: 1972-1975

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

ZANU started as a political organization that also had a military wing. Hull (1976) writes that the organization was banned in August, 1964.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 500

Rebstrength: much weaker

The only estimate I could find for the number of troops possessed by the rebels was Hull (1976, p. 152) who writes that in early 1976 the two rebel organizations together had 1,000 rebels in Rhodesia, plus 5,000-10,000 training in other countries. I could find no reference for whether ZANU or ZAPU had more so I have divided that value evenly by two for both of them. This troop strength is in comparison to a Rhodesian army of 5,000 troops, a police force of 8,000 and reserves of 45,000.

Mobcap: low

In this early phase of the conflict the guerilla movements did not have much success at motivating popular support.

Armsproc: medium

ZANU was supplied with arms by China

Newstartdate: 12/21/1972

On December 21, 1972, guerillas attacked a white farmer in Rhodesia, the first confrontation of the war.

Period 2: 1976-1979

Rebestimate: 12,000

Rebestlow: 11,000

Rebesthigh: 14,000

The only reference I could find to the number of troops possessed by the guerillas in this period was in Walter (2002), who writes that after the war, 22,000 guerillas participated in the disarmament process. She also writes that not all of the guerillas demobilized, suggesting that the total fighting force for the two groups was somewhat higher than that. Since none of the sources give an indication of whether ZANU or ZAPU had more troops, I have divided the total estimate in half, adding 1,000 to each to represent the troops that did not disarm with low and high estimates on either side of that.

Mobcap: high

In this phase of the conflict, the guerillas received high levels of popular support and ZANU was the most popular. ZANU became the dominant political party in Zimbabwe after the conflict ended.

Newstartdate: 2/1/1976

Walter (2002) writes that ZANU and ZAPU reignited the armed struggle in February, 1972 after the failure of peace negotiations.

Newenddate: 12/17/1979

The Rhodesian government agreed to a cease-fire on December 17, 1979, effectively ending the conflict.

Dyad ID 565: Zimbabwe vs. ZAPU

The conflict in this dyad is best described in two periods. The first covers the early stages of the combat from 1972 to 1975. The second covers the period when the conflict reignited after the failure of negotiations in 1975.

Period 1: 1972-1979

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

ZAPU started as a political movement that also had an armed wing. Hull (1976) writes that the organization was banned in September, 1962.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 500

Rebstrength: much weaker

The only estimate I could find for the number of troops possessed by the rebels in this period was Hull (1976, p. 152) who writes that in early 1976 the two rebel organizations together had 1,000 rebels in Rhodesia, plus 5,000-10,000 training in other countries. I could find no reference for whether ZANU or ZAPU had more so I have divided that value evenly by two for both of them. This troop strength is in comparison to a Rhodesian army of 5,000 troops, a police force of 8,000 and reserves of 45,000.

Mobcap: low

The guerilla organizations were not able to mobilize much popular support in this period.

Armsproc: moderate

ZAPU was supplied with arms by the Soviet Union.

Period 2: 1976-1979

The only reference I could find to the number of troops possessed by the guerillas in this period was in Walter (2002), who writes that after the war, 22,000 guerillas participated in the disarmament process. She also writes that not all of the guerillas demobilized, suggesting that the total fighting force for the two groups was somewhat higher than that. Since none of the sources give an

indication of whether ZANU or ZAPU had more troops, I have divided the total estimate in half, adding 1,000 to each to represent the troops that did not disarm with low and high estimates on either side of that.

Mobcap: moderate

The guerilla organizations were able to mobilize much more popular support in this period. However, ZANU was clearly the most popular of the two organizations.

Sources:

- Hull, Richard W. (1976). "The Conflict in Rhodesia." *Current History* 71(421): 149-152, 185.
- Walter, Barbara F. (2002). *Committing to Peace: The Successful Settlement of Civil Wars*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Martin, David and Phyllis Johnson (1981). *The Struggle for Zimbabwe: The Chimurenga War*. London, UK: Faber and Faber.

Dyad ID 712: Zimbabwe vs. ZANU-PF

TBA

Chapter 91

ID 123

ID 123

Incompatibility: Uruguay vs. MLN or Tupamoros

Dyad ID 491: Uruguay vs. MLN or Tupamoros

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the government of Uruguay faced a challenge from a militant left-wing organization, the National Liberation Movement (MLN) or Tupamoros. In 1970, the group pursued a strategy of kidnapping foreigners in Uruguay to gain attention and to increase pressure on the government. Over the next two years the group was able to recruit enough members and mobilize enough popular support to stay militarily viable, however, they were eventually defeated by the military.

The Tupamaros, a leftist guerrilla organization, opposed the government of Uruguay and engaged in terrorist activities with raids, bombings, bank robberies, kidnappings, and assassinations. The army effectively destroyed the Tupamaros in 1972, and its leaders were imprisoned for long terms or forced into exile. After the remaining Tupamaro prisoners were freed under an amnesty decree in March 1985, the MLN-T publicly renounced armed struggle and committed itself to left-wing parliamentary politics. In 1990 the Tupamaros constituted a marginal political force of some several hundred members.

Rebels: MLN a.k.a Tupamaros

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: no

The MLN was a military, not a political, organization.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by the MLN. However, it is clear that the organization was weaker than the overall Uruguayan military and was able to survive primarily through terrorist activities, kidnappings, and staying in the periphery.

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- Library of Congress Country Study
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Latin America, obtained via Lexis-Nexis

Chapter 92

ID 125

ID 125

Incompatibility: Chile vs. Military Faction

Dyad ID 490: Chile vs. Military Faction

On September 11, 1973, General Augusto Pinochet, supported by the Chilean army, navy and air force overthrew President Salvador Allende and replaced his left-wing government with a new cabinet. Allende had been elected President with a plurality of the vote but a very small percentage, and Chilean politics was highly divided between the left and the right. The period leading up to the coup d'état was characterized by a high level of insecurity in the country including strikes and violence by right-wing groups.

In August 1973, the rightist and centrist representatives in the Chamber of Deputies undermined the president's legitimacy by accusing him of systematically violating the constitution and by urging the armed forces to intervene. The military launched a coup the morning of September 11. It was widely reported that at the covert level the United States worked to destabilize Allende's Chile by funding opposition political groups and media and by encouraging a military coup d'état. Most scholars have concluded that these United States actions contributed to the downfall of Allende, although no one has established direct United States participation in the coup d'état.

Rebels: Military Faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: explicit. It was known that the US at least endorsed the coup, but the exact level of involvement is unknown

Rtypesup: endorsement. May have been additional support as well.

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

Pinochet was opposed to Allende's left-wing policies and was clearly more of a supporter of the right-wing. However, the coup was led by the military, not an organized political movement.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much stronger

None of the sources give any clear indication of the number of troops that supported the coup. However, the air force, army and navy all supported Pinochet and Allende was completely out-matched.

Source:

- Library of Congress Country Study
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 93

ID 126

ID 126

Incompatibility: Territory, Chittagong Hill Tracts

Dyad ID 223: Bangladesh vs. JSS/SB/Shanti Bahini

The Chittagong Hill Tribes is a minority ethnic group that resides largely in the Chittagong Hill Tracts, a region of southeastern Bangladesh. When Bangladesh was part of the British colony of India, the Tribes had a large degree of autonomy, including over the issue of migration into the region. However, when what is now Bangladesh became part of East Pakistan at partition in 1947, this autonomy was largely revoked. When Bangladesh became independent from Pakistan in 1971, the Tribes did not gain back their autonomy. In fact, both Pakistan and Bangladesh encouraged migration into the area, which enraged members of the Chittagong Hill Tribes that feared they would become a minority in that area. Shortly after independence, movements calling for autonomy for the province emerged and in 1972, the Jana Samhati Samiti (JSS) was formed to demand greater autonomy. In 1975, the armed wing of the JSS, the Shanti Bahini (SB) became waging guerilla warfare in the province to try to pressure for greater autonomy. The Bangladeshi government deployed a substantial military force to the province in the late 1970s and 1980s, but they were not able to completely defeat the rebels and low-intensity conflict continued throughout that period. In 1989, after the failure of several years of dialogue with groups from the Chittagong Hill Tribes, the Bangladeshi government decided to unilaterally grant a degree of autonomy to the province. Shanti Bahini was unsatisfied with the offer, however, and continued the fight and the conflict reached a peak in intensity from 1989 to 1992. In 1992, a democrat government was elected in Bangladesh and the new government offered a policy of negotiating with the rebels. The JSS/SB responded with a three-month unilateral cease-fire and negotiations commenced. The negotiations were not able to produce a comprehensive peace agreement until 1997, however, despite occasional violence, the conflict did not reach a noticeable level of intensity from 1992 through 1997. In 1997, the government and the rebels signed a deal granting a good amount of

autonomy to the province, however, a faction of the JSS/SB is unsatisfied with the deal and still continues fighting, although the violence is at a low level.

Aspirations for autonomy among the tribal people of the Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT) had already been expressed long before Bangladesh' independence from Pakistan in 1971. The Jana Samhati Samiti (JSS) was formed in March 1972 to front the tribal populations demand for autonomy. Later the same year its armed wing, the Shanti Bahini, was established. Bangladesh has frequently asserted that India is aiding the rebels, providing them with bases, armaments, and military training. India has denied this. The first democratically elected government of Bangladesh came into office in 1992. This led to improved Indo-Bangladeshi relations, which in turn paved the way for an agreement with the Indian government to facilitate the repatriation of CHT-refugees, thus indirectly also preventing rebel use of Indian Territory. The new government used this window of opportunity to pursue a series of measures designed to find a political solution to the conflict. Negotiations were concluded with the signing of a peace agreement between the parties on 2 December 1997.

Rebels: JSS/SB

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. Some forces appear to be located in India.

Rebsupport: alleged. Bangladesh accuses India of supporting the group, which India denies.

Rtypesup: military, alleged

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

Although the Jana Samhati Samiti is an organization devoted to pushing for greater autonomy for the province, I could find no evidence that it has participated in the Bangladeshi political process.

Rebestimate: 5,000 rebestlow: 2,000 rebesthigh: 7,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that the JSS/SB had between 2,000 and 7,000 guerrilla soldiers across the course of the conflict, with 5,000 being the most common estimate. This troop strength is in comparison to about 70,000 Bangladeshi soldiers deployed to the province.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Patrick Brogan
- Minorities at Risk Group Profiles

Chapter 94

ID 129

ID 129

Incompatibility: Territory, Baluchistan

Dyad ID 544: Pakistan vs. Baluchi Separatists

The Baluchi are an ethnic group that lives along the border with Afghanistan and Iran. The Baluchi are economically disadvantaged within Pakistan and Baluchistan, the province where the majority of the Baluchi live, has traditionally been the poorest province in the country. Prior to 1973, Baluchistan was given a large degree of autonomy from the central government, however, in the aftermath of the secession of East Pakistan, which became Bangladesh, the Pakistani government removed the provincial authority in Baluchistan and took control of the province. This move was very unpopular among the Baluchi and led to an uprising by militants demanding Baluchi secession. For the next four years the Pakistani government, which had an overwhelming military advantage, was unable to completely defeat the Baluchi militants. The conflict did not end until 1977 when the government of Pakistan was overthrown in a military coup. The new government declared a general amnesty for Baluchi guerillas, released thousands of political prisoners, and introduced policies designed to alleviate poverty in the province. These policies led to an end of the armed struggle, although there have been continuing grievances by Baluchi against the Pakistani government.

Under British rule, Baluchs enjoyed widespread autonomy, and were also granted autonomy when Pakistan initially gained independence. However, provincial autonomy was revoked in 1955, when several provinces were merged. Baluch nationalists, inflamed by the continued economic deprivation of the region and the revocation of traditional autonomy, rebelled against central control in 1973, when the Bhutto government dismissed the Baluchistan provincial government. Pakistan received support from Iran. The uprising was not suppressed until 1977, when the Bhutto government was removed.

Rebels: Baluchi Separatists

Transconstsupp: tacit. Sympathy by Baluchis in other countries, notably Iran.

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: Explicit. Iran provided military equipment and contributed some troops.

Gtypesup: troops, military.

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: alleged link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The rebels were believed to have been linked to the provincial government which was removed in 1973.

Rebestimate: 7,000

Rebestlow: 6,000

Rebesthigh: 8,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events in March 1975, estimated that the Baluchi guerillas had between 6,000 and 8,000 troops. This number was in comparison to 100,000 troops that the Pakistani army had deployed in the province.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Patrick Brogan
- Onwar.com
- Minorities at Risk Group Profiles
- Library of Congress Country Study

In the mid-1970s, the government of Pakistan faced an armed challenge from separatists operating in the Baloch region of the country. In the first decade of the 21st century, the conflict reignited as several Baloch organizations challenged the government. The Baluchistan Liberation Army (BLA) organized in Afghanistan and began attacking the government in June 2004. The group has continued to operate in Baluchistan, but the conflict has generally been at a low intensity. Baluch Ittehad was an organization formed by a coalition of political parties working for greater

autonomy or independence. After the leader of the coalition was killed in 2006, the organization split into tribal factions. The Baluchistan Republican Army (BRA) formed in 2007 out of remnants of Baluch Ittehad. The BRA and BLA generally draw support from different tribes in Baluchistan.

Dyad ID 638: Pakistan vs. Baluch Ittehad

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: Yes

Baluch Ittehad was a rebel group formed by a coalition of Baluch nationalist political parties.

Rebel estimate: unclear

UCDP provides no estimate for the number of troops held by Baluch Ittehad.

Rebel strength: Much weaker

Pakistan had a large army, even though many of these troops were not based in Baluchistan.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

Although this was a coalition of rebel groups, its leadership generally coordinated its actions, as shown by the fact that the coalition generally collapsed after its leader was killed.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

Baluch Ittehad enjoyed some popular support in Baluchistan but was generally much weaker on all dimensions than the Pakistani government.

Territorial Control: No

There was no evidence that Baluch Ittehad controlled territory in Baluchistan.

Conflict Type: secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

There was no indication of external support to Baluch Ittehad.

Government Support: No

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Pakistan receives some military support from the United States, but not in relation to the Baluchistan conflict.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Continuation as another dyad

After the death of its leader, Baluch Ittehad collapsed but its fighters joined with BLA or later fought with BRA.

Source:

- UCDP

Dyad ID 639: Pakistan vs. Baluchistan Liberation Army

Rebel Political Wing: No

The BLA was an insurgent group formed out of Afghanistan and did not appear to be linked to any political organization.

Rebel estimate: 5000

Rebel estimate (low): 700

Rebel estimate (high): 5000

UCDP estimates that about 700 troops in 2005 and 5000 in 2006.

Rebel strength: Much weaker

Pakistan had a large army, even though many of these troops were not based in Baluchistan.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The BLA appears to have a leadership that generally controls its activities.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The BLA enjoys some popular support in Baluchistan, although it draws primarily from one tribe there. However, it is generally much weaker on all dimensions than the Pakistani government.

Territorial Control: No

The BLA primarily carries out terrorist attacks and does not control territory.

Conflict Type: secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Alleged

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Name of Supporters: India, Afghanistan

UCDP reports that there have been allegations of external support to BLA, but these have not been confirmed.

Government Support: No

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Pakistan receives some military support from the United States, but not in relation to the Baluchistan conflict.

Ended?: No

The conflict between the Pakistani government and the BLA is ongoing, although at a low level of intensity.

Dyad ID 774: Pakistan vs. Baluchistan Republican Army

Rebel Political Wing: Alleged Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: Yes

There is some evidence that the BRA is linked to the Baluchistan Republic Party, but that link is not acknowledged.

Rebel estimate: unclear

UCDP provides no estimate for the number of troops held by the BRA.

Rebel strength: Much weaker

Pakistan had a large army, even though many of these troops were not based in Baluchistan.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The BRA had a leadership that generally coordinated its actions.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

BRA enjoyed some popular support in Baluchistan but was generally much weaker on all dimensions than the Pakistani government and drew support from one main tribe in Baluchistan.

Territorial Control: No

There was no evidence that BRA controlled territory in Baluchistan.

Conflict Type: secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Alleged

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Name of Supporters: India, Afghanistan

UCDP reports that there have been allegations of external support to BRA, but these have not been confirmed.

Government Support: No

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Pakistan receives some military support from the United States, but not in relation to the Baluchistan conflict.

Ended?: No

The conflict between the government and the BRA continued after 2009, but at a low level of intensity.

Chapter 95

ID 130

ID 130

Incompatibility: Government, Eritrea

Dyad ID 435: Eritrea vs. EIJM

When Eritrea declared independence in May 1993, the precursor of EIJM had already been in existence for over a decade. The EIJM has been very fractious in 1993 a militant faction led by Mohammed Ahmed (Abu Suhail) broke away, since then this has been the most military active rebel group in Eritrea. The Eritrean Islamic Jihad has been based in Sudan and most operations have been concentrated in the border area. In spring 1997 the conflict reached the threshold for inclusion for the first time when clashes between EIJM and the government of Eritrea were reported. The conflict has then continued on a low level, no efforts on negotiations or third party actions have been taken.

Rebels: Eritrean Islamic Jihad Movement

Transconstsupp: tacit. Islamist groups may be sympathetic

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases located in Sudan

Rebsupport: Explicit. Sudan provides bases to the group

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>

Chapter 96

ID 131

ID 131

Incompatibility: Angola

Angola

The almost thirty year war that began in Angola in 1975 had roots going back a decade earlier. Angola was a Portuguese colony and the Portuguese held onto their colonial possessions longer than most other European powers. Beginning in the mid-1960s, three armed rebel groups, the Movement for the Popular Liberation of Angola (MPLA), the Union for the Total Liberation of Angola (UNITA) and the National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FNLA) waged a violent struggle to force Portugal to grant independence (see conflict id 1660). In 1974, following a coup in Portugal, that country agreed to pull out of its colonies, and a peace deal was signed between the three armed groups and the government. Portugal mainly wanted out of a costly conflict, however, and did not play much of a role in the transition to independence. A transitional power-sharing government between the MPLA, FNLA and UNITA collapsed in the months prior to independence and the three anti-colonial groups began fighting each other. Upon independence on November 11, 1975, Angola was already immersed in a civil war that would continue for decades. The civil war in Angola from the onset of independence had strong external components, as the conflict became intertwined with both global Cold War and the regional anti-apartheid struggles. At the time of independence, the MPLA emerged as the strongest rebel group with the financial backing of the Soviet Union and military support from Cuba. UNITA quickly gained access to support from South Africa and from Zaire (who was heavily supported by the United States). The FNLA, who was unable to obtain an external patron, was quickly overwhelmed by the MPLA and in 1976 were driven into exile in Zaire. From 1976 on, the conflict in Angola was between the MPLA and UNITA and their external patrons. From 1976 to 1981, the conflict in Angola was at a relatively low level of intensity as the MPLA was military dominant and UNITA waged low-level guerilla warfare and built up its force. By the early-1980s, however, the conflict had again reached a high

level of intensity as UNITA had much increased its military capacity and the conflict ground on at an extremely high level almost uninterrupted for the next ten years. In 1991, a peace agreement was signed at Bicesse, Portugal, that paved the way for national elections in 1992. MPLA defeated UNITA in elections that international observers certified as "free and fair" but UNITA leader Jonas Savimbi refused to recognize the elections and the group returned to war. In the initial period after the election UNITA was able to gain control of much of the country, however, the MPLA was quickly able to regroup and to take back most of the major cities. The war raged until 1994 when another agreement signed at Lusaka, Zambia, led to a decrease in the intensity of the conflict. However, the collapse of the Lusaka Accords in 1998 brought full-scale war to Angola once again. In the 1990s, the Angolan conflict expanded beyond that country's borders as Zairean President Mobutu allowed UNITA to establish rear bases on Zairean territory. The use of Zaire as a launching pad for UNITA's attacks was one of the reasons that Angola intervened in the war to oust Mobutu from power and, subsequently, to defend his successor, Laurent Kabila (see conflict id 1860). The intervention in Zaire/Democratic Republic of the Congo lessened the military capacity of UNITA and the group found its ability to wage war in Angola weakened in the late 1990s and early 2000s. On February 13, 2002, the MPLA achieved a major victory when the army shot and killed Jonas Savimbi. Within a month new negotiations had begun between the two parties and by the end of the year a cease-fire had been implemented and the conflict appeared to be over.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 7: Angola, Cuba and Namibia vs. UNITA

This dyad is best described in four periods. The first, from 1975 to 1981, incorporates the first six years after independence in which UNITA was quickly defeated and then spent years waging low intensity conflict. The second period ranges from 1981 to 1991, the period in which the two sides were very evenly matched and leading up to a peace accord which brought national elections. The third, from 1992 to 1994 ranges from UNITA's rejection of those elections to the signing of another, partially implemented, peace accord at Lusaka, Zambia. The final period covers the last four years of the conflict, from 1998 to 2002, following the breakdown of the Lusaka agreement, the fighting in Zaire/the DRC, and culminating in Savimbi's death and the subsequent peace agreement.

Period 1 (1975-1981)

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

Prior to the end of colonialism, UNITA participated in a transitional power-sharing government with MPLA and FNLA.

Rebestimate: 3,000

Rebestlow: 2,000

Rebesthigh: 3,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

James III (1992) writes that "UNITA strength estimates ranged from two thousand to three thousand in early 1975" (p. 95). This force was quite weak when compared to the tens of thousands of Cuban troops that were in the country supporting the MPLA.

Period 2 (1981-1991)

Rebpolwing: no

Although UNITA had participated in Angolan politics in the years prior to independence, in this period they focused on armed struggle. It was not until after the signing of a peace accord in 1991 that they competed in elections.

Rebestimate: 50,000

Rebestlow: 15,000

Rebesthigh: 65,000

Rebstrength: weaker

James III (1992, p. 95-96) writes that UNITA had roughly 15,000 troops in 1984. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the troop strength of UNITA in 1987-1991: In 1987 and 1988-40,000; in 1989-50,000; in 1990-65,000; in 1991-60,000. This is in comparison to the following numbers for the Angolan government army: In 1987-50,000 (plus 40,000 troops from Cuba); in 1988-50,000 (plus 50,000 troops from Cuba); in 1989-100,000 (plus 50,000 from Cuba); in 1990 and 1991-100,000.

Newendate: 5/1/1991

In May, 1991, UNITA and the Angolan government signed the Bicesse Accords which paved the way for elections in 1992 and brought a temporary end to the conflict.

Period 3 (1992-1994)

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The third period of the conflict began when UNITA rejected the results of elections in 1992. However, UNITA had participated in those elections and they were generally recognized by the international community as "free and fair."

Rebestimate: 45,000

Rebestlow: 30,000

Rebesthigh: 60,000

Rebstrength: parity

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following troop estimates for UNITA: In 1992-30,000-50,000; in 1993-45,000; in 1994-60,000. This is in comparison to the

following estimates for the Angolan government: In 1992-30,000-50,000; in 1993-50,000; in 1994-90,000.

Mobcap: moderate

In elections in 1992, UNITA received 40% of the vote compared to 49% for the MPLA, demonstrating that they did still have a strong degree of popular support.

Newstartdate: 9/1/1992

UNITA re-opened the armed struggle when it lost elections in September 1992.

Newenddate: 11/20/1994

A peace agreement was signed between UNITA and the government at Lusaka, Zambia, on November 20, 1994. The agreement incorporated UNITA into the government.

Period 4 (1998-2002)

Rebpolwing: no

The fourth period of the conflict began when UNITA rejected the Lusaka Peace Accords and pulled out of the government.

Rebestimate: 20,000

Rebestlow: 10,000

Rebesthigh: 60,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the troop strength of UNITA: In 1998-30,000; in 1999-50,000-60,000; in 2000-20,000-50,000; in 2001-10,000-30,000; in 2002-10,000-20,000. These numbers are in comparison to the following estimates for the government: In 1998, 1999 and 2000-110,000; in 2001-130,000; in 2002-100,000.

Terrcont: no

By this period of the conflict UNITA had been largely driven out of Angola and into neighboring Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Newenddate: 3/13/2002

On March 13, 2002, less than a month after the death of Jonas Savimbi, the Angolan government announced a unilateral cease-fire. Talks which began later than month produced a peace agreement which held as of the end of 2003.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks

- Hare, Paul (1998). *Angola's last best chance for Peace: An Insider's Account of the Peace Process*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- James III, W. Martin (1992). *A Political History of the Civil War in Angola 1974-1990*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Dyad ID 568: Angola and Cuba vs. FNLA

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

Prior to independence, FNLA was involved in a power-sharing transitional government with MPLA and UNITA.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the sources available provided any reference to the troop strength possessed by the FNLA. However, the group was able to accomplish very little militarily and was quickly driven out of the country by the MPLA, which received heavy Cuban and Soviet support.

Newendate: 12/31/1976

It is hard to determine when FNLA stopped being an actor in the conflict. It appears that by early 1976 the group had been defeated militarily and no longer was a player. However, the group continued to claim that it was in control of much of the north of the country through 1976. By 1977, however, the FNLA was completely in exile in Zaire.

Chapter 97

ID 133

ID 133

Incompatibility: Territory, Ogaden

Dyad ID 54: Ethiopia vs. ONLF

The Ogaden region of Ethiopia, which has a majority Somali population, has historically been an area of much conflict in that country. For years, armed groups have struggled on behalf of the Ogaden for that region to secede from Ethiopia and to merge with Somalia (see conflict id 2330, dyad 1740). In 1996, armed conflict broke out again when the Ogaden National Liberation Front (ONLF) declared war against the Ethiopian government and attacked government positions. Conflict continued from 1996 through the end of 2003, although the ONLF has not been able to accomplish much militarily. Additionally, the group was afflicted by fractionalization, with one faction of the organization remaining committed to armed struggle and another seeking to compete politically in the Somali region. The armed faction has worked with other Ethiopian rebel groups such as the Oromo Liberation Front.

Somali groups in the Ogaden region of Ethiopia fought to demand integration into Somalia. As chaos spread throughout Ethiopia after Haile Selassie's downfall, Mogadishu increased its support to several pro-Somali liberation groups in the Ogaden, the strongest of which was the WSLF. By late 1975, the WSLF had attacked many Ethiopian outposts in the Ogaden. In June 1977, Mogadishu committed SNA (Somali National Army) units to the fighting. By late 1977, the combined WSLF-SNA strength in the Ogaden probably approached 50,000, of which 15,000 appeared to be irregulars. After the Somali government committed the SNA to the Ogaden, the conflict ceased to be a guerrilla action and assumed the form of a conventional war. The USSR and Cuba supported Ethiopia militarily, with Cuba providing troops.

Rebels: Western Somali Liberation Front (WSLF)

Transconstsupp: tacit. Support by ethnic Somalis in the region.

Rebextpart: no. Not needed, the Somali government gave its own support.

Rebpresosts: Extensive. Group was based in Somalia

Rebsupport: Explicit. The group assisted by the Barre government in Somalia. In 1977, Somalia sent in troops to assist the rebels.

Rtypesup: troops, military.

Govsupport: Explicit. The USSR and Cuba gave support. Cuba sent troops

Gtypesup: troops, military

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: acknowledged link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that in June 1988, one faction of the ONLF broke off and merged with the Ethiopian-Somali Democratic League to form a new political party, the Somali Democratic Party. The other faction has rejected this move and is not affiliated with the political movement.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 8,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that the ONLF had 8,000 troops in 2008, as compared to 120,000 for the Ethiopian military.

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- Library of Congress Country Study
- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Dyad ID 447: Ethiopia vs. al-Itahad al-Islami

Al-Itahad al-Islami fought for the unification of the Ogaden region in Ethiopia with Somalia into an Islamic state. (Allied with the Ogaden National Liberation Front id # 2330-1730-0). Some elements associated with AIAI maintain ties to al-Qaida. Sustained significant losses at the hands of the Ethiopian military in the late 1990s, and members are now relegated to operating in small cells.

Rebels: Al Itahad Al Islami.

Transconstsupp: yes. Appears to be tacit. No official organization listed as granting support. Receives funds from Middle East financiers and Western diaspora remittances.

Rebextpart: yes, major. Rebels from Ethiopia, Somalia, and Kenya support the group. Possible support from Al-Qaida.

Rebpresosts: yes, extensive bases in Somalia.

Rebsupport: explicit. Past weapons deliveries from Sudan and Eritrea.

Rtypesupport: military.

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists
- International Boundaries News Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Dyad ID 522: Ethiopia and Cuba vs. WSLF

The Ogaden is a region of Ethiopia on the border with Somalia that is majority Somali. For decades, there have been armed groups in the Ogaden pushing for the secession of that region and its merger with Somalia. Additionally, when Somalia became independent in 1962, it made a key component of its national constitution the desire to unite all the Somali people under one country (which would include joining the Ogaden with Somalia). In the early 1970s, the military dictator in Somali began clamoring for Ogaden to break off from Ethiopia and a rebel group, the Western Somali Liberation Front (WSLF) formed and began organizing to launch an attack. In 1976, the combined forces of the Somali army and the WSLF attacked into Ethiopia, and were able to achieve some initial success. However, the Soviet Union, which had been a supporter of Somalia, switched allegiance and supported Ethiopia instead, and the Ethiopian army, backed up by Cuban soldiers, and supplied by Soviet weapons, was able to repel the Somali invasion. The WSLF continued the armed struggle from 1978 to 1983, however, without the direct support of the Somali army they were overpowered by the Ethiopian army. Tension over the Somali region has continued, and fighting continues to this day between another Somali rebel group and the Ethiopian government (see conflict id 2330, dyad 1730), however, the prospects of the region successfully achieving secession from Ethiopia are very low.

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The WSLF was a military organization seeking the secession of the region, not a political organization.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 20,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events reported in January 1978 that the WSLF forces were estimated at about 20,000 troops. At the same time, Keesing's reports that there were at least 60,000 Ethiopian troops deployed in the Ogaden.

Source:

- Keesing's Record of World Events

Dyad ID 792: Ethiopia vs. Ogaden Liberation Front

TBA

Chapter 98

ID 134

ID 134

Incompatibility: Territory, East Timor

Dyad ID 344: Indonesia vs. Fretelin

This conflict is best described in two periods. In the first, there was a war between the Indonesian military and Fretelin over the status of East Timor. In the second period, the East Timorese continued to attack the government, but at a much lower level of intensity, and they focused more on a campaign to gain international recognition.

Period 1 (1975-1984) The Eastern half of the island of Timor was a Portuguese colony until 1975. In 1974, following a military coup in Lisboa, the new Portuguese government committed itself to pulling out of all of its colonies. As independence approached, a number of Timorese groups mobilized to gain power in the province, the most vocal of which was Fretelin, an organization with a Marxist orientation. The Indonesian government argued that a communist-controlled island in the archipelago would be too great a threat, and used that threat to justify an invasion of East Timor in 1975. The invasion was followed by massive civilian atrocities, as hundreds of thousands of Timorese lost their lives. From 1975 until the mid 1980s, war continued between Fretelin and the Indonesian army as the former struggle for the independence of the island, but the Indonesian army was able to gain the upper hand and by 1985, most of Fretelin's fighting force had been defeated.

Period 2 (1985-1998) In the second phase of the conflict, Fretelin continued to push for independence for East Timor. However, instead of pushing their goals through large-scale conflict, as they had for a decade, the group focused on lower intensity conflict and on obtaining international support for the Timorese cause. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, as the threat of communism receded, international pressure on Indonesia to pull out of the territory increased. The government in Jakarta continued to refuse, however, the massive economic and political crisis that afflicted

Indonesia in 1998 presented an opportunity for the opposition forces in East Timor and the region saw large-scale protests for independence. Fighting broke out between the protesters and the Indonesian army until an international force intervened to prevent the army from massacring pro-independence civilians. In 1999, a referendum was held in which the vast majority of the Timorese population voted for secession.

East Timor broke away from Portugal when the socialist movement FRETILIN declared independence on 28 November 1975. The Indonesian General Suharto claimed that the creation of a communist state threatened national security, and within weeks a large-scale military operation had incorporated East Timor into Indonesia. During the 1980s, several armed resistance groups were formed, all of which were united in 1987 when the FRETILIN leader Jos Xanana Gusmao established the political umbrella-organisation CNRT. The government of Indonesia received support from the US and Australia for its policy towards East Timor - especially in the 1970s and 1980s, as FRETILIN was perceived as a perceived communist threat. Portugal became active in supporting the East Timorese independence movements politically. After the change of government in Indonesia in 1997, Portugal and Indonesia undertook discussions mediated by the UN, which led a decision to create a referendum on East Timor's future status. A UN mission administered the referendum in August 1999, with 78.6% voting for independence. An UN-sanctioned regional peacekeeping force arrived in September, and on 31 October 1999 the last Indonesian soldiers left.

Rebels: Fretilin

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: no

Rebsupport: Explicit. Diplomatic support by Portugal.

Rtypesup: Endorsement.

Govsupport: Explicit. The US recognized the annexation of E. Timor and provided the Indonesian government with military training and support.

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Onwar.com
- Library of Congress Country Study

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

Fretelin is an organization that has fought for the independence of East Timor through armed struggle, rather than politically.

Period 1

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 30,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Onwar.com estimated that in the period leading up to the mid-1980s, Fretelin had about 30,000 troops.

Period 2

Rebestimate: 2,000

Rebestlow: 200

Rebesthigh: 4,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database provides the following estimates for the troop strength of Fretelin: In 1989, 200-4,000; in 1990: 1400; in 1991: 200; in 1992: 100-296; in 1993: 200-350; in 1994: 600-800; in 1995: 176-200; in 1996: 70-200; in 1997: 199; in 1998: 200-6,000. Meanwhile, the Indonesian army had several thousand troops deployed in East Timor.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Minorities at Risk Group Profiles
- Onwar.com

Chapter 99

ID 135

ID 135

Incompatibility: Territory, Western Sahara

Dyad ID 98: Morocco and Mauritania vs. POLISARIO

The Western Sahara is a region of Northern Africa that was colonized by Spain in the 1800s and was granted independence in 1975. The Saharawi population of Western Sahara is primarily nomadic and is ethnically different from the population of Morocco. Upon independence in 1975, Morocco and Mauritania laid claim to parts of Western Sahara. Several insurgent groups rose up to challenge these claims, and the dominant group, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Saguiet el Hamara and Rio de Oro (POLISARIO), declared the independence of the region. POLISARIO was able to gain control of a large area of Western Saharan territory, although the Moroccan army seized the major population and economic centers of the region. Throughout the late 1970s and 1980s, POLISARIO waged guerilla warfare against the Moroccan army (Mauritania renounced its claim to part of Western Sahara in 1979), but the army was slowly able to gain the upper hand. By 1989, the Moroccan government controlled much of the territory and many Saharawis had been driven into exile in Algeria. Although there has been low level fighting since 1989, this fighting has never reached a high enough level for the dispute to be classified as an armed conflict. The final status of the territory, however, is still very much in dispute.

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

POLISARIO has declared itself as the official government of Western Sahara, and is recognized as such by many countries in the international community.

Rebestimate: 10,000

Rebestlow: 5,000

Rebesthigh: 15,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 1989, POLISARIO had between 5,000 and 10,000 troops. Onwar.com estimates that, over the course of the conflict, POLISARIO had 15,000 troops. These numbers are in comparison to about 150,000 troops possessed by the Moroccan army.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of Western Sahara

Effterrcont: moderate

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that in the initial stages of the conflict POLISARIO controlled much of Western Sahara. The Moroccan army responded by seizing the most important parts of the region and then slowly extending its zone of control so that by 1989, it controlled about 90% of the region.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Minorities at Risk Group Profiles
- Onwar.com
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 100

ID 136

ID 136

Incompatibility: Government, Mozambique

Dyad ID 99: Mozambique vs. Renamo

Mozambique gained independence from Portugal in 1975. Unlike in neighboring Angola, only one insurgent group presented a real challenge to colonialism, and in the aftermath of independence, that group, the Front for the Liberation of Mozambique (FRELIMO) took power. After independence, FRELIMO made two policy decisions that would have major effects on the subsequent civil war. First, the government aligned itself with the Soviet Union and began pursuing socialist policies like the collectivization of agriculture. Second, FRELIMO began providing support to the African National Congress in South Africa (see conflict id 2510) and Robert Mugabe's Zimbabwe African National Union in Rhodesia (see conflict id 2220). FRELIMO's support of their rebels led the governments of South Africa and Rhodesia to see Mozambique as a threat to their stability and in 1976, they worked together to create an organization to challenge the government. That organization, the National Mozambican Resistance (RENAMO) started an armed struggle against the government in 1977. The group was entirely reliant on foreign funding and arms, however, it was able to gather some domestic support with its anti-government position, particularly in the rural areas that had been badly affected by policies such as the collectivization of agriculture. The conflict between FRELIMO and RENAMO intensified through the late 1970s and by 1980, the country was immersed in full-scale civil war which would continue for 12 years. In the 1980s, the government realized the inability of the army to defeat the rebels militarily and began looking for other ways to combat them. In the early 1980s, following the end of the Rhodesian civil war and the beginning of majority rule in Zimbabwe, the governments of Mozambique and Zimbabwe signed an agreement whereby the Zimbabwean military would intervene to cut off RENAMO from parts of Mozambique (Zimbabwe was trying to keep a route open to the coast without having to go through South Africa). In 1985, Mozambique signed an agreement with South Africa in which

they committed to stop supporting each other's rebel groups-Mozambique followed through on its end of the deal and ended support to the ANC, however, South Africa did not stop funneling support to RENAMO. The conflict continued at a high level of intensity but at a relative stalemate throughout the late 1980s, with RENAMO unable to gain control of the capital but FRELIMO unable to defeat RENAMO. In the late 1980s, the end of the Cold War brought increasing pressure on the parties to negotiate and a decline in the aid provided to each. In 1990, direct talks between FRELIMO and RENAMO began in Rome and in 1992, a comprehensive peace agreement calling for power sharing in government and the military was reached and the conflict was terminated.

Following independence from Portugal in 1974, the former liberation movement FRELIMO gained power. Mozambique's independence threatened the white regimes in both Rhodesia and South Africa, since the new, Marxist, government openly supported ZANU and ANC. After Zimbabwe's independence in 1980, sponsorship of RENAMO was taken over by South Africa, who rapidly built up its force in the early 1980s. The movement lacked coherence, however, and did not have any ideology beyond its hostility to FRELIMO. In the late 1980s, global and regional developments stopped the flow of global support for the war, and the former supporters started to put strong pressure on the parties to reach a negotiated settlement. On October 1992, the 12th round of negotiations was completed and a comprehensive peace agreement, the Acordo Geral de Paz, was signed.

Rebels: Renamo

Transconstsupp: explicit. Right wing political and religious groups in the US, S. Africa and elsewhere sympathized with the group.

Rebextpart: no

Rebpresosts: yes, extensive. The group maintained bases in S. Africa, Kenya, and in Rhodesia (until 1980).

Rebsupport: Explicit. Rhodesia (until 1980) and South Africa supported the group militarily, including by allowing territorial access. Later, Kenya was used for bases.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: Explicit. The government received support from the USSR, East Germany, Cuba, N. Korea, and various Western European governments.

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

RENAMO was a military organization, funded almost exclusively by foreign patrons, that positioned itself in opposition to the government, but did not develop a political organization of its own until the conflict ended.

Rebestimate: 20,000

Rebestlow: 10,000

Rebesthigh: 22,000

Rebstrength: parity

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute provides the following estimates for the troop strength of RENAMO: in 1987: 20,000; in 1998: 22,000; in 1989, 1990 and 1991: 10,000-20,000; in 1992: 21,000. These estimates are in comparison to the following estimates for FRELIMO: In 1987 and 1988: 25,000; in 1989: 37,000; in 1990: 60,000; in 1991: 36,000; in 1992: 62,000.

terrcont: yes

terrname: Parts of rural Northern Mozambique

effterrcont: low

FRELIMO's main support was in southern Mozambique and in the urban centers of the country. In the rural and northern areas of the country, RENAMO was able to exert a level of control. However, Venncio and Chan (1998) report that, "In contrast to other successful guerilla movements, RENAMO has not displayed any capacity to substitute the infrastructure it destroyed with a parallel civil administration able to care for the populations of the so-called 'liberated areas'. It seems to have lacked the personnel, the know-how and the finances required to set up any kind of administrative structure" (p. 12).

Newenddate: 10/4/1992

On October 4, 1992, RENAMO and FRELIMO signed a peace accord in Rome.

Sources:

- Venncio, Moiss and Stephen Chan (1998). War and Peace in Mozambique. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.
- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Patrick Brogan

Chapter 101

ID 137

ID 137

Incompatibility: Government, Afghanistan

Afghanistan vs. Various Organizations

Afghanistan has been one of the most conflict-torn countries in the world in the last three decades. Communist-backed coups in 1973 and 1978 produced a secular communist Afghan government that was opposed by many of the country's Islamic residents. Additionally, the presence of strong Soviet support for the regime led to much opposition. In 1978, an insurgency broke out, led primarily by Afghans who had organized at Islamic schools in Pakistan. In 1979, the Soviet army invaded Afghanistan, and they would stay for another ten years. There were several separate insurgent groups battling the Soviets and the communist government, and they were collectively referred to as the "Mujahideen." The Mujahideen were unable to completely defeat the Soviet army, which overpowered them, however, they were able to make it costly for the Soviets to remain in Afghanistan. And in 1989, the Soviet army withdrew. With the withdrawal of the Soviets, many international observers expected the Afghan government to be short-lived, however, despite armed opposition by the Mujahideen and an attempted military coup in 1990, President Najibullah was able to maintain control through 1992. By that time, however, the insurgency had reached a very high-level and opposition within Najibullah's own government had grown and on April 15, 1992, he was removed by members of his own party and a new government was established. The new government only lasted a week, however, before it was removed by an alliance of Mujahideen factions and members of the military based in the north. A power-sharing government led by the leader of Jamiat i-Islami was established, however, divisions within the Mujahideen alliance quickly emerged and within months there was fighting between factions of the Mujahideen, primarily Jamiat i-Islamic (which was now the government of Afghanistan) and Hezb-i-Islami. For several years the country was riven with factional fighting and was largely lacking a functioning government. In 1995, however, a new group, the Taliban, was successful in gaining control of large

swaths of territory and in September 1996, the Taliban captured Kabul. They quickly imposed a strict interpretation of Islamic law and reestablished order throughout much of the country. The various groups opposed to the Taliban formed a new alliance, the United Islamic Front for the Salvation of Afghanistan (UIFSA), which was based in the north of the country and was commonly referred to as the Northern Alliance. Besides controlling some territory in northern Afghanistan the UIFSA was unable to accomplish much against the Taliban until in late 1991, the United States and other nations began supporting the group in its effort to overthrow the Taliban. Facing aerial bombardment by United States and other North Atlantic Treaty Organization armies, the Taliban quickly crumbled and in November 2001, the UIFSA took Kabul. A coalition government made up of representatives of the various ethnicities of Afghanistan was established and supported by a large foreign military presence. The Taliban was largely defeated and in 2002, the conflict was largely latent. However, by 2003, the Taliban had regrouped and had reemerged as a fighting force dedicated to overthrowing the coalition government and restoring control of the country. The conflict remained ongoing as of the end of 2003.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 327: Afghanistan vs. Taliban

This conflict is best addressed in three periods. The first covers the period from the formation of the Taliban in 1994 to its seizing power in Kabul in 1996. The second period begins with the resurgence of the group in 2003 and its opposition to the United States backed coalition government. In 2003-2005, the Taliban was very small, but by 2006 it had increased in size and in its ability to challenge the coalition forces, so the 2006-2010 period is treated as a separate phase.

Period 1: 1994-1996

Rebpolwing: no

The Taliban was formed by Islamic students trained in Pakistan and did not compete in the Afghan political arena.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 25,000

Rebstrength: parity

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 1995, the Taliban had less than 25,000 troops and in 1996, it had 25,000 troops. These estimates are in comparison to 60,000 troops possessed by the Afghan army.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: high

The Taliban was led by Mullah Omar Mohammad and had a clear command structure.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of Southern Afghanistan

Effterrcont: moderate

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that by the end of 1995, the Taliban controlled 10 of Afghanistan's 30 provinces. Within these provinces the group sought to overthrow warlords and remove existing political parties and implement Islamic law.

Newstartdate: 2/1/1995

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the Taliban and the government reached 25 battledeaths in February 1995. No more specific date is given.

Newenddate: 9/28/1996

On September 28, 1996, the Taliban took control of Kabul.

Period 2: 2003-2006

Rebpolwing: no

The Taliban in this period exists as simply a military opposition to the coalition government and does not present a political opposition.

Rebestimate: 1,500

Rebestlow: 1,000

Rebesthigh: 2,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 2003-2005 the Taliban had between 1,000 and 2,000 troops.

Period 3: 2006-2010

Rebestimate: 15,000 Rebestlow: 4,000 Rebesthigh: 25,000 Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that the Taliban had between 4,000 and 25,000 troops between 2006 and 2010.

Dyad ID 411: Afghanistan vs. Jamiat-i-Islami

Rebpolwing: no

Jamiat-i-Islami was an Islamic fundamentalist organization opposed to the secular communist government of 1978-1992 and did not participate in the domestic Afghani political process.

Rebestimate: 12,000

Rebestlow: 10,000

Rebesthigh: 55,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database gives the following estimates for the troop strength of Jamiat-i-

Islami: in 1989: 12,000; in 1990: less than 12,000; in 1991: 155,000 for all the groups in the Mujahideen, but no individual estimate is given for Jamiat-i-Islami; in 1992: less than 10,000. These forces were clearly weaker than the Afghan government when it was supported by the Soviet army.

Newstartdate: 9/1/1978

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between Afghanistan and Jamiat-i-Islami first reached 25 battledeaths in September 1978.

Newenddate: 4/28/1992

On April 28, 1992, Jamiat-i-Islami took Kabul and became the government of Afghanistan.

Dyad ID 412: Afghanistan vs. Hezb-i-Islami

This dyadic conflict is best described in two periods: one from 1978-1992 in which Hezb-i-Islami battled the communist Afghan government which was backed by the Soviet Union (until 1989), and the second from 1992-1995 in which the group battled the new government formed by another Mujahideen faction, Jamiat-i-Islami.

Period 1: 1978-1992

Rebpolwing: no

Hezb-i-Islami was an Islamic fundamentalist organization military opposed to the secular communist government of 1978-1992 and the subsequent Jamiat-i-Islami government and did not participate in the domestic Afghani political process.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the available sources provided any indication as to the number of troops possessed by Hezb-i-Islami in the period when they battled the Soviet-backed Afghan government. However, it is clear that the group was weaker than the Soviet army deployed in Afghanistan.

Newstartdate: 9/1/1978

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the Afghan government and Hezb-i-Islami reached 25 battledeaths in September, 1978.

Newenddate: 4/28/1992

On April 28, 1992, the Afghan government was overthrown and a new government led by Jamiat-i-Islami took power.

Period 2: 1992-1995

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 50,000

Rebstrength: parity

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 1996, Hezb-i-Islami had about 50,000 troops.

Newstartdate: 6/1/1992

For a couple of months after the new government took power there was no conflict between the Government of Afghanistan and Hezb-i-Islami. However, Hezb-i-Islami did not recognize the Jumiati-i-Islami government and by the end of June 1992, armed conflict had erupted again.

Newenddate: 12/31/1995

In late 1995, Hezb-i-Islami, facing an increasing threat from the growing Taliban movement, signed a peace treaty with the Jumiati-i-Islami government. Some conflict continued but by the end of 1995, the conflict had largely died down.

Dyad ID 413: Afghanistan vs. Hezb-i-Wahdat

Rebpolwing: no

Hezb-i-Wahdat was an alliance of several Shiia Iranian parties that formed in 1989 to coordinate the overthrow of the Afghan government once the Soviet army pulled out.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 86,000

Rebstrength: parity

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 1993-1995, Hezb-i-Wahdat had approximately 86,000 troops.

Newstartdate: 1/1/1989

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that Hezb-i-Wahdat formed in 1989, it is not clear when the dyadic conflict crossed 25 battledeaths.

Newenddate: 12/31/1985

In January 1985, Hezb-i-Wahdat signed a peace agreement with the government. Some conflict continued but by the end of the year the conflict had been largely terminated.

Dyad ID 422: Afghanistan vs. Junbish-i Milli-yi Islami

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: No

Junbish-I Milli-yi Islami was an alliance of non-Pashtun militias in northern Afghanistan. It existed at a time when the Afghan government essentially did not exist.

Rebel estimate: 65,000

Rebel estimate (low): 65,000

Rebel estimate (high): 65,000

UCDP estimates that Junbish-I Milli-yi Islami had 65,000 active troops.

Rebel strength: Parity

The government had between 45,000 and 105,000 troops in this period, but Afghanistan was essentially a failed state.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The leadership of this movement exercised fairly strong control over its activities.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

Although this organization did not have large popular support or military prowess, neither did the Afghan state, which had essentially collapsed into warlord politics in this period.

Territorial Control: Yes

Territory Name: Parts of northern Afghanistan around Mazar-i-Sharif

Level of effective territorial control: Moderate

This organization established control over territory in northern Afghanistan.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External Supporters: Uzbekistan, Pakistan, Iran

UCDP reports that Uzbekistan, Pakistan, and Iran provided support to Junbish-i Milli-yi Islami.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Saudi Arabia, India

UCDP reports that Saudi Arabia and India provided support to the Afghan government in this period.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

This dyad did not reach 25 battle deaths after 1995.

Dyad ID 423: Afghanistan vs. UIFSA

Rebpolwing: no

The United Islamic Front for Salvation of Afghanistan was established as a group to coordinate military opposition to the Taliban and was not a political movement.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 115,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 1998, the UIFSA had about 115,000 troops. In 1999, the Taliban government was estimated to have about 200,000 troops at its disposal.

Newstartdate: 10/13/1996

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the government of Afghanistan and the UIFSA reached 25 battledeaths on October 13, 1996.

Newenddate: 11/18/2001

On November 18, 2001, the UIFSA, supported by United States and other North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces, took Kabul.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Onwar.com

Dyad ID 476: Afghanistan vs. Military Faction (of 1990)

Brief background: On March 6, 1990, the Afghan Defense Minister, in coordination with Hezb-i-Islami, attempted a coup d'etat against the President. The bulk of the army stayed loyal, however, and the coup was unsuccessful.

Rebpolwing: no

The attempted coup was led by the Defense Minister and he did not try to gain influence through the Afghan political process.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the sources gave any indication as to the number of troops that participated in the coup attempt. However, it is clear that the majority of the Afghan army stayed loyal to the President.

Newenddate: 3/8/1990

Following the coup attempt there was fighting for a few days in Kabul, but by March 8 it had largely died down.

In 1978, Hizb-i Demokrati-i Khalq-i Afghanistan, or the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, took power in a coup d'etat and established a Communist government. That government quickly

established close ties with the Soviet Union. The communist government was opposed by large parts of the Afghan population and in December 1979 large numbers of Soviet troops were deployed to Afghanistan. The communist government, backed by Soviet troops, were opposed by a huge number of Islamic rebel groups, referred to collectively as the Mujahideen. Identifying specific groups within the Mujahideen can be difficult, but the most prominent were Jamiat-i-Islami, Hezb-i-Islami, Harakat-i Inqilab-i Islami-yi Afghanistan, Mahaz-i Milli-yi Islami-yi Afghanistan, Jabha-yi Nijat-i Milli-yi Afghanistan, Ittihad-i Islami Bara-yi Azadi-yi Afghanistan, Harakat-i Islami-yi Afghanistan, and Hizb-i Islami-yi Afghanistan - Khalis faction. These actors battled the government until the Soviets withdrew in 1989. After the Soviet withdrawal, the Mujahideen groups continued to battle the Afghan government. In addition, these groups also fought against each other as the common Soviet threat was gone. In 1992, the Mujahideen were able to overthrow the government and take power, however, there was constant in-fighting between the various groups. By 1994, the Afghan state has essentially collapsed and the Taliban began to make military gains. By 1996, the Taliban had taken Kabul and become the government of Afghanistan. From 1996-2001, fighting continued in Afghanistan but the Taliban gradually extended its control over virtually all of the country. Following the September 11, 2001 attacks in the U.S., however, the U.S. began supporting Afghan rebels and international involvement in the country again increased. From 2003-2010 civil war has continued in Afghanistan with the Taliban and other actors fighting against the government and its international allies.

Dyad ID 727: Afghanistan vs. Hizb-i Demokratik-i Khalq-i Afghanistan

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: Yes

The 1978 coup was led by the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, which was a political party that had held seats in parliament.

Rebel estimate: 600

Rebel estimate (low): 600

Rebel estimate (high): 600

UCDP estimates that about 600 troops participated in the coup.

Rebel strength: Parity

UCDP reports that the President was defended by 1800 troops, and the coup had the support of about 600.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: High

The coup was led by a well organized central command.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

It is unclear how much popular support the communist movement had. However, due to support in the military the arms procurement and fighting capacity was comparable to the government's supporters.

Territorial Control: No

Prior to the coup, the communists did not control any territory in Afghanistan.

Conflict Type: Coup d'etat

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

The UCDP reports that there have been allegations of Soviet support to the coup plotters, but that there is no evidence of this.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Soviet Union

UCDP reports that the Soviet Union had provided military support to the Afghan government since 1965.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Victory

Victory Side: B

The coup was successful.

Dyad ID 731: Afghanistan vs. Harakat-i Inqilab-i Islami-yi Afghanistan

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: No

The various elements of the Mujahideen were military and political organizations. The Afghan government was modeled after the Soviet system as a one-party state.

Rebel estimate: 2,500

Rebel estimate (low): 2,000

Rebel estimate (high): 3,000

UCDP estimates that Harakat-I Inqilab-I Islami-yi Afghanistan had between 2,000 and 3,000 active troops.

Rebel strength: Much weaker

As part of a large fractionalized Mujahideen movement each individual organization was much weaker than the government, backed up by tens of thousands of Soviet troops.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The organization was part of a large and fluid movement but had an organization structure.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The Mujahideen generally had a fair amount of support, but each individual organization within it was not widely supported. In addition, while these organizations received support from a variety of sources, they did not have technology that matched that of the Soviet military.

Territorial Control: Yes

Territory Name: Much of Afghanistan outside of Kabul

Level of effective territorial control: Moderate

The Mujahideen generally was able to establish control over much of Afghan territory outside of Kabul. The Soviet army was able to quickly defeat resistance, but after it withdrew authority was re-established.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External Supporters: United States, United Kingdom, Pakistan, China, Saudi Arabia

Each of these states provided military support to the Mujahideen.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Soviet Union

The Soviet Union provided high levels of support to the Afghan government.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

This dyad did not reach 25 battle deaths after 1988.

Dyad ID 732: Afghanistan vs. Mahaz-i Milli-yi Islami-yi Afghanistan

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: No

The various elements of the Mujahideen were military and political organizations. The Afghan government was modeled after the Soviet system as a one-party state.

Rebel estimate: 2,500

Rebel estimate (low): 2,000

Rebel estimate (high): 3,000

UCDP estimates that Mahaz-I Milli-yi Islami-yi Afghanistan had between 2,000 and 3,000 active troops.

Rebel strength: Much weaker

As part of a large fractionalized Mujahideen movement each individual organization was much weaker than the government, backed up by tens of thousands of Soviet troops.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The organization was part of a large and fluid movement but had an organization structure.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The Mujahideen generally had a fair amount of support, but each individual organization within it was not widely supported. In addition, while these organizations received support from a variety of sources, they did not have technology that matched that of the Soviet military.

Territorial Control: Yes

Territory Name: Much of Afghanistan outside of Kabul

Level of effective territorial control: Moderate

The Mujahideen generally was able to establish control over much of Afghan territory outside of Kabul. The Soviet army was able to quickly defeat resistance, but after it withdrew authority was re-established.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External Supporters: United States, United Kingdom, Pakistan, China, Saudi Arabia
Each of these states provided military support to the Mujahideen.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Soviet Union

The Soviet Union provided high levels of support to the Afghan government.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

This dyad did not reach 25 battle deaths after 1989.

Dyad ID 733: Afghanistan vs. Jabha-yi Nijat-i Milli-yi Afghanistan

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: No

The various elements of the Mujahideen were military and political organizations. The Afghan government was modeled after the Soviet system as a one-party state.

Rebel estimate: 2,250

Rebel estimate (low): 1,500

Rebel estimate (high): 3,000

UCDP estimates that Jabha-yi Nijat-I Milli-yi Afghanistan had between 1,500 and 3,000 active troops.

Rebel strength: Much weaker

As part of a large fractionalized Mujahideen movement each individual organization was much weaker than the government, backed up by tens of thousands of Soviet troops.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The organization was part of a large and fluid movement but had an organization structure.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The Mujahideen generally had a fair amount of support, but each individual organization within it was not widely supported. In addition, while these organizations received support from a variety of sources, they did not have technology that matched that of the Soviet military.

Territorial Control: Yes

Territory Name: Much of Afghanistan outside of Kabul

Level of effective territorial control: Moderate

The Mujahideen generally was able to establish control over much of Afghan territory outside of Kabul. The Soviet army was able to quickly defeat resistance, but after it withdrew authority was re-established.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External Supporters: United States, United Kingdom, Pakistan, China, Saudi Arabia

Each of these states provided military support to the Mujahideen.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Soviet Union

The Soviet Union provided high levels of support to the Afghan government.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

This dyad did not reach 25 battle deaths after 1988.

Dyad ID 735: Afghanistan vs. Ittihad-i Islami Bara-yi Azadi-yi Afghanistan

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: No

The various elements of the Mujahideen were military and political organizations. The Afghan government was modeled after the Soviet system as a one-party state.

Rebel estimate: 1,250

Rebel estimate (low): 1,000

Rebel estimate (high): 1,500

UCDP estimates that Ittihad-I Islami Bara-yi Azadi-yi Afghanistan had between 1,000 and 1,500 active troops.

Rebel strength: Much weaker

As part of a large fractionalized Mujahideen movement each individual organization was much

weaker than the government, backed up by tens of thousands of Soviet troops.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The organization was part of a large and fluid movement but had an organization structure.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The Mujahideen generally had a fair amount of support, but each individual organization within it was not widely supported. In addition, while these organizations received support from a variety of sources, they did not have technology that matched that of the Soviet military.

Territorial Control: Yes

Territory Name: Much of Afghanistan outside of Kabul

Level of effective territorial control: Moderate

The Mujahideen generally was able to establish control over much of Afghan territory outside of Kabul. The Soviet army was able to quickly defeat resistance, but after it withdrew authority was re-established.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External Supporters: United States, United Kingdom, Pakistan, China, Saudi Arabia

Each of these states provided military support to the Mujahideen.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Soviet Union

The Soviet Union provided high levels of support to the Afghan government.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

This dyad did not reach 25 battle deaths after 1988.

Dyad ID 737: Afghanistan vs. Harakat-i Islami-yi Afghanistan

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: No

Harakat-i Islami-yi Afghanistan was a Shiite political and military organization. Afghanistan was a one-party state modeled after the Soviet Union.

Rebel estimate: 2,000

Rebel estimate (low): 2,000

Rebel estimate (high): 2,000

UCDP estimates that Harakat-I Islami-yi Afghanistan had 2,000 active troops in 1984.

Rebel strength: Much weaker

As part of a large fractionalized Mujahideen movement each individual organization was much weaker than the government, backed up by tens of thousands of Soviet troops.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The organization was part of a large and fluid movement but had an organization structure.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The Mujahideen generally had a fair amount of support, but each individual organization within it was not widely supported. In addition, while these organizations received support from a variety of sources, they did not have technology that matched that of the Soviet military.

Territorial Control: Yes

Territory Name: Some of central Afghanistan

Level of effective territorial control: Low

A variety of Shiite groups, including Harakat-I Islami-yi Afghanistan controlled territory in central Afghanistan.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

UCDP reports that although Iran supported other Shiite resistance groups, they had broken ties with Harakat-I Islami-yi Afghanistan.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Soviet Union

The Soviet Union provided high levels of support to the Afghan government.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

This dyad did not reach 25 battle deaths after 1984.

Dyad ID 760: Afghanistan vs. Hizb-i Islami-yi Afghanistan - Khalis faction

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: No

The various elements of the Mujahideen were military and political organizations. The Afghan government was modeled after the Soviet system as a one-party state.

Rebel estimate: 2,000

Rebel estimate (low): 1,000

Rebel estimate (high): 3,000

UCDP estimates that Hizb-I Islami-yi Afghanistan-Khalis faction had between 1,000 and 3,000 active troops over this period.

Rebel strength: Much weaker

As part of a large fractionalized Mujahideen movement each individual organization was much weaker than the government, backed up by tens of thousands of Soviet troops.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The organization was part of a large and fluid movement but had an organization structure.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The Mujahideen generally had a fair amount of support, but each individual organization within it was not widely supported. In addition, while these organizations received support from a variety of sources, they did not have technology that matched that of the Soviet military.

Territorial Control: Yes

Territory Name: Much of Afghanistan outside of Kabul

Level of effective territorial control: Moderate

The Mujahideen generally was able to establish control over much of Afghan territory outside of

Kabul. The Soviet army was able to quickly defeat resistance, but after it withdrew authority was re-established.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External Supporters: United States, United Kingdom, Pakistan, China, Saudi Arabia

Each of these states provided military support to the Mujahideen.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Soviet Union

The Soviet Union provided high levels of support to the Afghan government through 1989. In that year, it withdrew its troops, but it continued to support the government into 1991.

Non-state military support to Governments: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

This dyad did not reach 25 battle deaths after 1991.

Chapter 102

ID 139

ID 139

Incompatibility: Territory, Tripura

India vs. Tipuri

The Tipuri are a tribe that lives in what is now northeastern India, near the border with Bangladesh. The Tipuri are historically a majority in the region, however, since independence the Indian government has encouraged migration of Bengali speakers into the region. This migration has made the Tipuri an ethnic and economic minority in the region and has led to much grievance. In 1978, the Tripuri National Volunteer Force (TNV) was formed as the first armed insurgent group pressing for Tripuri demands, including greater autonomy and the restoration of a Tripuri majority in the region. The TNV waged ten years of armed struggle, although it was not able to accomplish much militarily. In 1988, the group signed an accord with the Indian government which increased the representation of Tripuri in the state government and restored some tribal land. Although the TNV accepted this agreement, other Tripuri groups were not satisfied with the concessions they received and in 1990 armed conflict broke out again with the formation of the All Tripura Tribal Front (ATTF). The ATTF was an organization promoting greater autonomy for Tripuri. In 1991, it was joined by another major rebel group, the National Liberation Front of Tripura (NLFT). The ATTF and NLFT waged armed conflict against the Indian government through 1993, when a left-wing pro-Tripura party came to power. Following this election, the ATTF signed an agreement to surrender, and some of its members did, however many factions of the organization continued fighting. Additionally, the NLFT stayed committed to armed struggle and the conflict continued from 1993 to 2003 at a low-level of intensity. No serious negotiations have taken place between the Indian government and the rebels.

ATTF is listed twice. Consolidate into a single record.

The genesis of the territorial insurgency in Tripura lies to a large extent in the demographic changes

that have occurred. An influx of Bengali settlers from East Pakistan resulted in the transformation of Tripura's population from a predominantly tribal to a non-tribal province in the period from 1950 to the 1990s. The Tripura National Volunteers (TNV) ended their decade-long insurgency in 1988 on the condition of restoration of tribal land and an increase in the number of tribal representative in the state assembly. The onset of the present insurgency came with the formation of the All Tripura Tribal Front (ATTF) on 11 July 1990. Both ATTF and the National Liberation Front of Tripura (NLFT), the other major rebel group established in 1991, have stated the desire for secession from India. The latter has also taken an assertive pro-Christian stance. The Indian government has also accused the Pakistan Inter Service Intelligence of supporting the tribal insurgents, a claim which Pakistan denies.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 262: India vs. ATTF

Rebels: ATTF

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases located in Bangladesh.

Rebsupport: alleged. India accused Pakistan of providing intelligence support, which Pakistan denies.

Rtypesup: military, alleged

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Rebpolwing: alleged link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that, "In 1993 the left-wing party widely accused of being the key force behind the ATTF's campaign of violence came into power."

Rebestimate: 900

Rebestlow: 200

Rebesthigh: 1,600

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database gives the following estimates for the troop strength of the ATTF: In 1992 and 1993: 1,600; in 1995 and 1996: 200; in 1997: 150; in 1998: 150-200; in 1999 and 2000: 200-300; in 2001: 300-600; in 2002 and 2003: 500-600. This is in comparison to over a million troops possessed by the Indian army (although not all of those troops are deployed in Tripura).

Newstartdate: 10/12/1992

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the India-ATTF dyad first reached 25 battledeaths on October 12, 1992.

Dyad ID 269: India vs. NLFT

Rebels: NLFT

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases located in Bangladesh.

Rebsupport: alleged. India accused Pakistan of providing intelligence support, which Pakistan denies.

Rtypesup: military, alleged

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: acknowledged link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the NLFT is "known to be associated with the opposition Indigenous National Party of Tripura."

Rebestimate: 800

Rebestlow: 150

Rebesthigh: 1,500

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database gives the following estimates for the troop strength of the NLFT: In 1995 and 1996: 150; in 1997, 1998 and 1999: 150-500; in 2000: 150-800; in 2001: 825-1500; in 2002: 800-1500; in 2003: 800. These estimates are in comparison to over a million troops possessed by the Indian army (although not all of those troops are deployed in Tripura).

Cencont: no

The NLFT has splintered and has two competing factions both claiming to represent the real organization.

Newstartdate: 10/31/1995

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the India-NLFT dyad first reached 25 battledeaths on October 31, 1995.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Minorities at Risk Group Profiles
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Dyad ID 515: India vs. TNV

Rebels: TNV

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. A few troops apparently operating in Bangladesh.

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: none

Govextpart: n/a

Rebpolwing: no

The TNV was a militant organization that pressed for greater Tripuri autonomy through armed struggle, rather than politically.

Rebestimate: 200 Rebestlow: 84 Rebesthigh: 450

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database gives estimates ranging from 84 to 450 for the number of troops possessed by the TNV, which is much smaller than the Indian military.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Patrick Brogan
- Minorities at Risk Group Profiles
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 103

ID 140

ID 140

Incompatibility: Government, Nicaragua

Nicaragua vs. Sandinistas, Nicaragua vs. Contras

This conflict is best described in two periods, the first with the Sandinistas struggling to take power in Nicaragua; the second, with the contras struggling against the Sandinista government.

Period 1 (Nicaragua vs. FSLN) From 1932-1979, Nicaragua was run by a dictatorship led by the Somoza family. The Somoza dictatorship received a high level of support from foreign actors, such as the United States. In the 1970s, the Somoza dictatorship became increasingly repressive as economic recession increased domestic Nicaraguan opposition to the regime. This repression also led to U.S. pressure on President Anastasio Somoza to allow some opening of the political process. The declining economy and drop in domestic and international support for Somoza increased the opportunity for opponents of the regime to mobilize. In the late 1970s, this opposition generally took two forms: a nonviolent opposition, made up of various opposition political parties, and a violent opposition, dominated by the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN). The FSLN adopted a strategy of guerilla warfare to overthrow the regime, and initially was not able to achieve much success. However the group mobilized more forces through the late 1970s, the regime continued to lose both domestic and international support, and by mid-1978, the FSLN controlled parts of northern Nicaragua and represented a significant challenge to Somoza's regime. Under U.S. pressure, Somoza agreed to negotiate with the rebels but was unwilling to accede to their demands, however, by 1979, the regime was overwhelmed and Somoza and his supporters fled the country. The FSLN took power in Managua and its leader, Daniel Ortega, became President of the country in elections in 1984 that were endorsed by the international community as "free and fair."

Period 2 (Nicaragua vs. Contras) Most countries recognized the new FSLN-led government,

however, the United States, which opposed any Marxist-oriented governments in Latin America, failed to do so. In fact, in the 1980s, the United States began supporting Nicaraguan counter-revolutionaries, or "contras." The contras were primarily members of the old Somoza-era National Guard that had fled to Honduras when his regime had been overthrown. With the support of the United States Central Intelligence Agency the Contras in 1983 were able to launch an armed struggle against the government of Daniel Ortega. Despite the support from the United States and the willingness of the Honduran government to allow the contras to launch incursions into Nicaragua from its territory, the contras were not able to achieve much military success against a Nicaraguan government armed by the Soviet Union and Cuba. By the late 1980s, the contras had realized that the military campaign was a failure, and in 1987-1989 the parties reached agreements that led to the disarmament of the contras and to new national elections in 1990.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 231: Nicaragua vs. FDN/Contras

These records refer to the same group. Consolidate into a single record. Also, the dates listed are incorrect Anti-Sandinista exile groups, backed by the United States Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), began in the spring of 1981 to plan operations against the government of Nicaragua. Based in Honduras, the FDN consisted largely of former members and officers of the National Guard in alliance with other groups, deserters from the FSLN militia, and disgruntled Miskito. Advisory, financial, and material help from the CIA were crucial. According to the United States Department of State, military and nonmilitary assistance between 1982 and 1990 amounted to US\$300 million.

Rebels: Contras

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases located in Honduras and Costa Rica

Rebsupport: Explicit. The United States and Central American governments provided extensive military support and the use of extraterritorial bases.

Rtypesup: military.

Govsupport: Explicit. Military assistance from Cuba and the USSR

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The Contras were a group of former members of the national guard opposed to the Sandinista-led government and did not form a political organization.

Rebestimate: 13,500

Rebestlow: 10,000

Rebesthigh: 15,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that in 1985, the contras had about 10,000 troops. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the number of troops possessed by the contras: In 1987 and 1988: 12,000-17,000; in 1989: 12,000. These numbers are in comparison to more than 70,000 troops in the Nicaraguan army.

Newstartdate: 2/19/1983

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict reached 25 battledeaths on February 19, 1983.

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- Patrick Brogan
- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks
- Bulmer-Thomas, Victor (1990). "Nicaragua since 1930" in Leslie Bethel, Ed. The Cambridge History of Latin America Vol. VII: Latin America since 1930: Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dyad ID 567: Nicaragua vs. FSLN

In the 1960's Sandinista guerrillas, began the long, low-level guerrilla war against the Luis Anastasio Somoza Debayle government that would in the late 1970s grow into a full-scale, decade long, civil war. After the formal unification of the Sandinista guerrillas in March, 1979, heavy fighting broke out all over the country. By then the FSLN was better equipped, with weapons flowing from Venezuela, Panama, and Cuba, mostly through Costa Rica. The FSLN launched its final offensive during May. On June 18, a provisional Nicaraguan government in exile, consisting of a five-member junta, was organized in Costa Rica. By the second week of July, President Somoza had agreed to resign.

Rebels: FSLN. Sandinista Front for National Liberation

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. Group leaders and troops maintained in Costa Rica

Rebsupport: explicit. Supported by Cuba, Venezuela, Panama, and Costa Rica.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

Early in its armed struggle, the FSLN was loosely affiliated with the Frente Amplio Opositor, an opposition political movement. In 1979, the FSLN formed its own political organization, the Movimiento Pueblo Unido.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 3,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Bulmer-Thomas (1990) writes that the FSLN had about 3,000 troops by the end of 1978, as compared to 10,000 troops possessed by the government.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: moderate

Shortly after its formation, the FSLN split into three factions. However, by the height of its armed struggle, in late 1978, it had reformed into one organization led by Daniel Ortega.

Mobcap: high

The FSLN had a high level of popular support, as evidenced by its great success in internationally endorsed elections after the conflict ended.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of Northern Nicaragua

Effterrcont: moderate

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the FSLN controlled parts of Northern Nicaragua in 1978 and 1979.

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- Patrick Brogan

Chapter 104

ID 141

ID 141

Incompatibility: Territory/Government, Somalia

Somalia vs. Various Organizations

This conflict is best described in three periods.

Period 1: 1978-1991

When Somalia became independent in 1960, it had great promise to be one of the most prosperous and peaceful countries in Africa. Instead, it has been one of the most conflictual. The country was democratic for the first nine years of its existence, but that democracy was plagued by corruption. In 1969, a military coup brought General Siad Barre to power, and he would remain president of the country until 1991. In 1977-1978, Somalia went to war with Ethiopia over the Ogaden, a region of Ethiopia that is majority Somali. The war was a disaster, with the Somali army being soundly defeated by Ethiopia and Barre's regime suffered a major drop in public approval in its aftermath. The roots of the Somali civil war came in 1978 when a coup d'etat against Barre failed. The leader of the coup, Colonel Abdulaahi Yusuf, escaped to Ethiopia and formed a rebel group, the Somali Salvation Democratic Front (SSDF) to challenge Barre's regime. As Barre saw internal criticism mount and felt pressure from armed groups, he turned increasingly to members of his own and closely allied clan families to hold important government and military positions. This policy led to the emergence of even more armed groups to challenge Barre's regime. Each of these rebel groups was closely allied to one clan or clan family. In 1981, the Somali National Movement (SNM) was formed. The SNM was a group made up primarily of northern Somalis (members of the Issac clan family) and in 1982 it began waging an armed struggle against the government. The military responded with massive retaliation, and for a while was able to overwhelm the rebellion. However, by the end of the 1980s, the power of Barre's regime had weakened and popular disapproval of him had reached such a high level that almost the entire country was immersed in full-scale civil

war. In 1989, two new major rebel groups formed. The United Somali Congress (USC) was an organization representing the Hawiye clan that presented a major armed challenge to the Barre regime. The Somali Patriotic Movement (SPM) was made up of members of the Ogadeen clan family and also began challenging Barre. From 1989 to 1991 these various organizations worked together and on January 29, 1991, Barre was overthrown.

Period 2: 1991-1996

The alliance between the various rebel groups broke down within days after the fall of Barre. First, the USC split over the question of who would rule Somalia: Ali Mahdi Mohamed was declared president by some of the key ranking members but General Mohamed Farah Aydeed rejected that decision and took his faction of the USC to war against the new "government." The SNM and SPM also rejected the new government, the SNM responded by declaring an independent Republic of Somaliland in the north and the SPM continued to wage armed struggle against Ali Mahdi's government. The civil war which broke out after this war lasted through 1996 as the various organizations sought to gain control over the country. During this period, the United Nations and United States deployed a massive humanitarian mission to facilitate the distribution of aid, a mission which ended when 18 U.S. soldiers were killed and their bodies were dragged through the streets of Mogadishu on international television. In late 1996, the various Somali parties agreed to a cease-fire, although it was not upheld, but the conflict remained at a relatively low level of intensity from 1997 to 2000. Throughout this period Somalia was a state in name only, with the country being divided between different warlords and lacking any real governmental apparatus.

Period 3: 2001-2002

In late 2000, Somali clan elders met in Djibouti and elected members to a Transitional National Government (TNG) that was to be the new government of the country. The TNG did not have much more success than the previous ten years of attempts to form a government in Mogadishu. In 2001, a set of opposition groups formed a new rebel group, the Somali Reconciliation and Restoration Council (SRRC) to challenge the TNG. Fighting continued for a year-and-a-half at a relatively low level until on October 27, 2002, a cease-fire was signed between the TNG and the opposition groups. As of the end of 2003, the conflict is still not resolved and Somalia still does not have a government, but there is not enough fighting to label it a civil war either.

SNM listed twice, consolidate into a single record. SSDF listed twice, consolidate into a single record. The military faction 2410-1880-1 became the SPM 2410-1900-2. These two groups can be merged into one.

The conflict in Somalia over government power began already in 1978. In the late 1980s there were several groups fighting the government, and in January 1991 the government of Siad Barre was overthrown by the USC (United Somali Congress). It was however not a clear government with control over the whole territory. A USC faction led by Aideed also refused to accept the new government led by Mahdi and the two groups continued the conflict over government power. In December the United States initiated the Operation Restore Hope, with the mission to create a secure environment in Somalia. After service personnel were killed, the US withdrew. In 1997 a cease-fire was signed by the factions and in 2000 a transitional government was formed. After having been inactive for four years, the conflict began again in 2001 when the umbrella organiza-

tion the Somali Reconciliation and Restoration Council (SRRC) began its armed struggle against the transitional government.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 207: Somalia (Barre) vs. SNM

SNM was formed in London with, according to its spokesmen, the purpose of overthrowing Siad Barre's dictatorship.

Rebels: SNM

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. Was formed in London.

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Somali National Movement had both a political and a military wing. The military wing helped to overthrow Barre, and the political wing set up de-facto political control in northern Somalia. In 1991, after the overthrow of Barre, the SNM declared an independent Republic of Somaliland, and has functioned as the government of that Republic since.

Rebestimate: 10,000

Rebestlow: 5,000

rebesthigh: 10,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the troop strength of the Somali National Movement: In 1989 and 1990: 10,000; in 1991: 5,000-10,000. These troop numbers are in comparison to the following estimates for the Somali army: In 1989: 61,000; in 1990: 65,000; in 1991: 30,000.

Newendate: 12/31/1991

The SNM declared northern Somalia independent in 1991 and, although the Republic of Somaliland was not recognized by the USC, the two groups did not continue fighting after 1991.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Dyad ID 208: Somalia (Barre) vs. SPM

note that this group emerged in 1989. Not in 1980 as the spreadsheet reports. These refer to the same group. The military faction became the SPM

The SPM emerged in 1989 after a group of Ogaden officers deserted the army and took up arms against Siad Barre, to overthrow the regime and establish a democratic form of government

Rebels: Military Faction/SPM.

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The Somali Patriotic Movement was a movement of Ogadeen former officers unhappy with the Barre regime and was not a political organization.

Rebestimate: 5,000

Rebestlow: 1,000

Rebesthigh: 10,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the troop strength of the Somali Patriotic Movement: In 1989: 3,000; in 1990: 1,000-3,000; in 1991: 5,000-10,000. This is in comparison to the following estimates for the Somali army: In 1989: 61,000; in 1990: 65,000; in 1991: 30,000.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Dyad ID 209: Somalia vs. (Barre) SSDF

In October three parties, the Somali Salvation Front (SSF), Somali Workers Party (SWP) and the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Somalia (DFLS) joined together to form the SSDF. The new unified party promised to intensify the military and political struggles against the Siad Barre regime.

Rebels: SSDF

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The SSDF was a movement formed in exile by an ex-military officer to challenge the government of Siad Barre. It was not a political movement.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 1200

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimated that in 1989 and 1990 the SSDF had 1200 troops. This number was in comparison to more than 60,000 troops possessed by the Somali army.

Newendate: 12/31/1991

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the SSDF had stopped waging armed struggle on a large-scale by the end of 1991.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Dyad ID 210: Somalia (Barre) vs. USC

Rebels: USC

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The USC did have both a political and a military organization. However, the political organization

was in exile and did not play any political role within Somalia. Rather, the only function of the USC prior to the overthrow of Barre was as a military organization.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 1,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimates that in 1990, the USC had 1,000 troops. This estimate was in comparison to 60,000 troops for the Somali government.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: low

The USC did have an executive body that was officially in charge of the organization. However, the organization was fractionalized and within days after accomplishing its goal of overthrowing Barre had split into two factions.

Newendate: 1/29/1991

On January 29, 1991, Siad Barre was overthrown and the USC became, effectively, the new government of Somalia, although the civil war did not end, it just went into a new phase with other rebel groups challenging the USC.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Dyad ID 211: Somalia (USC) vs. USC Faction

After the fall of the Barre regime, this group opposed the Mahdi government as well as US/UN peacekeeping troops.

Rebels: USC faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: alleged. Claimed that Libya was providing some financial assistance.

Rtypesup: non-military, alleged.

Govsupport: Explicit. Ethiopia provided military equipment to Mahdi.

Gtypesup: military.

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The USC-faction challenged Mahdi's "government" militarily but not as a political organization.

Rebestimate: 6,000

Rebestlow: 1,000

Rebesthigh: 10,000

Rebstrength: parity

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the troop strength of the USC-faction: In 1992: 2,000-6,000; in 1993: no estimate; in 1994 and 1995: 10,000; in 1996: 1,000. These numbers are in comparison to the following estimates for the government: In 1992: 2,000-6,000; in 1993: no estimate, in 1994 and 1995: 10,000; in 1996: no estimate. The USC was very evenly divided between these two factions throughout the civil war.

Newendate: 12/31/1996

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the USC Faction and the government did not reach 25 battledeaths in a year again after 1996.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Dyad ID 212: Somalia (TNG) vs. SRRC

Date on SRRC listed as 1980. However, this group formed in 2001 to oppose the transitional government.

Rebels: SRRC

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none, unknown. Possibly Ethiopia

Rebsupport: Explicit. Ethiopia provided military assistance and training

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: Explicit. Military assistance from Saudi Arabia, Libya, Eritrea, Djibouti.

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The SRRC was an organization of opposition groups to the Transitional National Government but did not represent a political movement on its own.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the sources gave any indication as to the troop strength of the SRRC.

After years with no government of any type, in 2004 a "transitional" government was established in Somalia made up of representatives of various clans. That government had difficulty establishing much control over the country, and faced an insurgency led by a fluid and fractionalized opposition. The government received direct support from Ethiopia, without that support it would

have unlikely been able to continue to exist. Due to the fluid and changing nature of the insurgent, it can be difficult to identify specific organizations and to get much information about them. There are four main organizations in this period (2006-2009). The first, the Alliance for the Re-liberation of Somalia/Union of Islamic Courts (ARS/UIC) grew out of the Supreme Islamic Council of Somalia and was an organization led by Sheik Hassan Dahir Aweys and opposed to Ethiopia and the transitional government. That organization waged armed struggle against the Somali government until the end of 2008. In that year, ARS/UIC split into two factions-one based in Djibouti and one in Asmara. The Djibouti faction signed a peace deal with the Somali transitional government and largely stopped fighting. The Asmara faction merged with other organizations to form Hizbul Islam, which continued the conflict in 2009. Another organization to join Hizbul Islam was Harakat Ras Kamboni, which joined the conflict in September 2008. Two months later, Harakat Ras Kamboni announced its intention to forge a united front with ARS/UIC and in 2009 they (along with smaller organizations) merged to form Hizbul Islam. The other main insurgent in the conflict is Al Shabaab. Al Shabaab broke off from ARS/UIC in 2008, apparently over opposition to ARS/UIC's willingness to include non-Islamists in its ranks and refusal to work with a global jihad movement. By 2008, Al Shabaab was the strongest insurgent group in the conflict, a position that continued into 2010.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Dyad ID 632: Somalia vs. ARS/UIC

Territorial Conflict?: No

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: Unclear

Each of the Somali insurgent groups had a political organization dedicated to establishing Islamic government over a greater-Somalia. It is unclear whether these organizations were "legal" given the precarious nature of the Somali state.

Rebel estimate: 1000

Rebel estimate (low): 1000

Rebel estimate (high): 1000

It is very difficult to ascertain the number of troops this group had, 1,000 is a rough estimate from the UCDP.

Rebel strength: Weaker

Both ARS/UIC and the Somali government were very weak, the Somalia government in 2006 was estimated to possess 3,600 troops, and was generally somewhat stronger than this insurgent organization from 2006-2008.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Low

The ARS/UIC did have a leadership, however, the organization splintered into two factions, one based in Asmara and one based in Djibouti.

Mobilization Capacity: moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: unclear

Fighting Capacity: moderate

Neither the government nor the ARS/UIC was particularly able to mobilize support or fight very effectively but seemed evenly matched. No reference was found to ARS/UIC's ability to obtain weapons.

Territorial Control: No

Territory Name: NA

Level of effective territorial control: NA

The ARS/UIC did not appear to control territory

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: Tacit

The ARS/UIC likely had the support of Somalis living in other countries.

Rebel External Support: Minor

The UCDP reports that ARS/UIC received some support from Ethiopian insurgents, including OLF.

Rebel Presence in External States: Extensive

ARS/UIC operated out of Eritrea and Djibouti

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External State Supporters: Eritrea

According to UCDP, Eritrea provided arms, logistics, and training to ARS/UIC

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Ethiopia

Throughout this period, Ethiopia had thousands of troops in Somalia. Without that support, the government would likely not have persisted.

Non-state military support to Government: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Continuation as another dyad

Victorious Side: NA

This dyad terminated in two ways-part of the organization signed a peace agreement and integrated with the government, part continued fighting as part of Hizbul Islam. Because the main military wing of the organization continued fighting, we code termination as continuation as another dyad.

Dyad previously active?: No

Dyad ID 770: Somalia vs. Al-Shabaab

Territorial Conflict?: No

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: Unclear

Each of the Somali insurgent groups had a political organization dedicated to establishing Islamic government over a greater-Somalia. It is unclear whether these organizations were "legal" given the precarious nature of the Somali state.

Rebel estimate: 5,000

Rebel estimate (low): 2,500

Rebel estimate (high): 7,500

The UCDP gives no specific rebel estimate for Al-Shabaab. However, it reports that a 2009 estimate for the total strength of the Somali opposition was 5,000-10,000. Since Al-Shabab was the stronger insurgent organization in this period, we have estimated that the majority of the total troops were possessed by Al-Shabaab.

Rebel strength: Parity

Al-Shabab was a formidable fighting force, at least as strong as the government's troops.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

The central decision-making body in Al-Shabab is secretive, but generally seems to control the forces. However, there has been some disagreement among local commanders and some fractionalization, although much less than in other Somali insurgent organizations.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

Al-Shabab has shown an ability to mobilize supporters and to fight well. In addition, despite a UN arms embargo, Al-Shabab has been able to procure arms from external sources.

Territorial Control: Yes

Territory Name: Much of central and southern Somalia, including much of Mogadishu

Level of effective territorial control: Moderate

In 2010, UCDP reported that Al-Shabab controlled much of southern and central Somalia, includ-

ing much of the capital. Al-Shabab worked with some local leaders to administer Sharia law in the territory it controlled.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: Explicit

As an organization which aligned itself with Al Qaeda, Al-Shabab had some transnational support from Jihadi movements.

Rebel External Support: Minor

UCDP reports that Al-Shabab was alleged to have received support from Yemeni rebels.

Rebel Presence in External States: Some

UCDP reports that Al-Shabab had some presence in Eritrea.

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External State Supporters: Eritrea

UCDP reports that Eritrea provided a variety of types of support to Al-Shabab.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Ethiopia

Throughout this period, Ethiopia had thousands of troops in Somalia. Without that support, the government would likely not have persisted.

Non-State Military Support to Government: No

Ended?: No

Type of Termination: NA

Victorious Side: NA

Dyad previously active?: No

The conflict between the government of Somalia and Al-Shabab continued in 2010.

Source:

- UCDP

Dyad ID 771: Somalia vs. Harakat Ras Kamboni

Territorial Conflict?: No

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: Unclear

Each of the Somali insurgent groups had a political organization dedicated to establishing Islamic

government over a greater-Somalia. It is unclear whether these organizations were "legal" given the precarious nature of the Somali state.

Rebel estimate: 750

Rebel estimate (low): 500

Rebel estimate (high): 1,000

Estimating the troop strength of the various Somali insurgents is difficult, this range comes from UCDP which bases it on a 2010 estimate from US intelligence sources.

Rebel strength: Weaker

Both the Somali government and Harakat Ras Komboni were very weak, however, in the government-Harakat Ras Komboni dyad (not including all the other insurgent groups), Harakat Ras Komboni was weaker.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Unclear

It appears that the organization was led by Sheikh Muhammad Mahmud Ali, but it is unclear what level of control he exercised.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Unclear

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

Neither the government nor Harakat Ras Komboni was particularly able to mobilize support or fight very effectively but seemed evenly matched. No reference was found to Harakat Ras Komboni's ability to obtain weapons.

Territorial Control: Yes

Territory Name: Parts of southern Somalia

Level of effective territorial control: Low

In 2008, UCDP reported that the Somali insurgents (including Harakat Ras Komboni) controlled much of southern Somalia.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: Unclear

The Somali people are spread across several countries in the Horn of Africa, it is unclear to what extent Harakat Ras Komboni received support from this diaspora.

Rebel External Support: No

No reference was found to military support from external non-state sources.

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Harakat Ras Komboni was based primarily within Somalia.

Rebel Support: No

Type of Rebel Support: NA

Names of External State Supporters: NA

The UCDP reports that it is unlikely that Harakat Ras Komboni benefited from support from Eritrea, who was the main state supporting Somalia's insurgents.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Ethiopia

Throughout this period, Ethiopia had thousands of troops in Somalia. Without that support, the government would likely not have persisted.

Non-state military support to Government: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Continuation as another dyad

Victorious Side: NA

In November 2008, Harakat Ras Komboni joined with other groups to form Hizbul Islam.

Dyad previously active?: No

Dyad ID 804: Somalia vs. Hizbul-Islam

Territorial Conflict?: No

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: Unclear

Each of the Somali insurgent groups had a political organization dedicated to establishing Islamic government over a greater-Somalia. It is unclear whether these organizations were "legal" given the precarious nature of the Somali state.

Rebel estimate: 2,500

Rebel estimate (low): 1,000

Rebel estimate (high): 4,000

The UCDP gives no specific rebel estimate for Hizbul Islam. However, it reports that a 2009 estimate for the total strength of the Somali opposition was 5,000-10,000. Since Al-Shabab was the stronger insurgent organization in this period, we have estimated a lower number for Hizbul Islam of that total.

Rebel strength: Weaker

Both the Somali government and Hizbul Islam were weak fighting forces, in the government-Hizbul Islam dyad (not including the other Somali insurgents), Hizbul Islam was the weaker party.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Low

Hizbul Islam was led by Sheikh Hassan Mahdi, but the alliance had difficulty articulating a single set of demands and also experienced fractionalization as it lost leads to the Transitional National Government.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Unclear

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

Neither the government nor Hizbul Islam was particularly able to mobilize support or fight very effectively but seemed evenly matched. No reference was found to Hizbul Islam's ability to obtain weapons.

Territorial Control: No

Territory Name: NA

Level of effective territorial control: NA

Hizbul Islam did not appear to control territory, engaging in clashes with the government primarily in Mogadishu.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: Unclear

The Somali people are spread across several countries in the Horn of Africa, it is unclear to what extent Hizbul Islam received support from this diaspora.

Rebel External Support: No

No reference was found to military support from external non-state sources.

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Hizbul Islam was based primarily within Somalia.

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External State Supporters: Eritrea

In 2009, UCDP reported that Hizbul Islam received material/logistics support, access to territory, and economic support from Eritrea.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Names of Government Supporters: Ethiopia

Throughout this period, Ethiopia had thousands of troops in Somalia. Without that support, the government would likely not have persisted.

Non-State Military Support to Government: No

Ended?: No

Type of Termination: NA

Victorious Side: NA

The conflict between the government of Somalia and Hizbul Islam continued in 2010.

Dyad previously active?: Yes

Hizbul Islam was an alliance from a number of other organizations, including ARS/UIC and Harakat Ras Komboni.

Chapter 105

ID 143

ID 143

Incompatibility: Government, Iran

Dyad ID 246: Iran vs. Mujahadeen e Khalq

Mujahadeen e Khalq is an organization that has challenged the Iranian government for over thirty years. Formed in the 1960s, the organization is a radical Shi'i Islamic organization that originally formed to use guerilla warfare to challenge the Shah of Iran. There was a brief period of peace following the Iranian revolution and the establishment of the Islamic Republic, however, disagreements between Mujahadeen e Khalz and the ruling clergy over the alleged rigging of elections quickly led the organization to renew the armed struggle. The group supported Iraq in the Iran-Iraq war, which hurt their popular support within Iran, and in 1987, it moved operations to Iraq, although it continued to attack into Iran. The conflict was never officially resolved, however, since 2001 the conflict has not flared up and the organization has allowed the United States occupation in Iraq to disarm it.

These entries refer to the same group. Should be consolidated into one record

The Mujahideen e Khalq's (MEK) roots lie in the early 1960's in a nationalistic, liberal, lay-religious party, called the Liberation Movement. It was the younger members of the Liberation Movement who formed MEK, which became the more religiously oriented, anti-American offspring to the Liberation Movement. After the 1979 Iranian Revolution, MEK ended up opposing the regime through violent means. After a major violent incident in June 1981, leaders of the group fled to Paris. In 1987 most of the group moved to Iraq, where they remain today. The main secondary support of the Mujahideen e Khalq came from the Iraqi regime.

Rebels: MEK

Transconstsupp: none.

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: Extensive. Nearly all of the group's forces are based within Iraq.

Rebsupport: Explicit. The Iraqi government actively supported the group by providing bases and military assistance.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

rebpolwing: explicit link

rebpolwinglegal: yes

One of the initial disagreements between Mujahadeen e Khalq and the Iranian revolutionary government was over the rigging of elections.

Rebestimate: 10,000

Rebestlow: 4,500

Rebesthigh: 15,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database gives the following estimates for the troop strength of Mujahadeen e Khalq: in 1991, 1992, and 1993: 4,500; in 1997, 1999 and 2000: 15,000; in 2001: 6,000-8000. These estimates are in comparison to over half a million troops possessed by the Iranian government.

Armsproc: medium

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, Mujahadeen e Khalq received arms from the Iraqi government.

Source:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para>

In the first decade of the 21st century, Iran faced a challenge from two new insurgent groups. The Free Life Party of Kurdistan (PJAK) fought for a more democratic Iran that would give greater autonomy to its various ethnic and nationalist groups. Jondallah was a group receiving support primarily from the Baluch and fighting both on behalf of greater autonomy for the Baluch and a more democratic Iran generally. Both conflicts continued at a low intensity into 2010.

Dyad ID 459: Iran vs. PJAK

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: No

PJAK is a political organization with a military wing, there are a variety of Kurdish organizations that are banned in Iran.

Rebel estimate: 1,500

Rebel estimate (low): 1,500

Rebel estimate (high): 1,500

The UCDP estimates that PJAK had about 1,500 troops.

Rebel strength: Much weaker

Iran has a strong military and PJAK is clearly much weaker than it.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: High

PJAK had a clear command structure that coordinated the efforts of the organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

PJAK had support in the Kurdish regions of Iran, but was clearly outmatched in its ability to mobilize supporters, fight, or procure arms by the government of Iran.

Territorial Control: No

I found no indication that PJAK controlled territory in the Kurdish region of Iran.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: Explicit

It appears that PJAK received support from Kurds living in Turkey

Rebel External Support: Minor

UCDP reports that PJAK was alleged to have received support from PKK.

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Rebel Support: Military

Names of External State Supporters: Turkey

UCDP reports that Turkey provided military support to PJAK.

Government Support: No

Non-State Military Support to Government: No

Ended?: No

The conflict between Iran and PJAK continued after 2009.

Dyad ID 640: Iran vs. Jondallah

Rebel Political Wing: No

Jondallah is primarily a military organization, although with political goals.

Rebel estimate: unclear

The UCDP gives no estimate for the number of troops possessed by Jondallah.

Rebel strength: Much weaker

Iran has a strong military and Jondallah is clearly much weaker than it.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

Jondallah has a command structure that appears to coordinate the efforts of the organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

Jondallah does not appear to have a high degree of popular support, or much ability to fight or procure arms.

Territorial Control: No

I found no indication that Jondallah controlled territory anywhere in Iran.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Alleged

Type of Rebel Support: Economic

Names of External State Supporters: United States

UCDP reports that Iran accuses the U.S. of providing economic support to Jondallah, but there is no evidence to confirm this.

Government Support: No

Non-State Military Support to Government: No

Ended?: No

The conflict between Iran and Jondallah continued after 2009.

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 106

ID 144

ID 144

Incompatibility: Territory, Arabistan

Dyad ID 546: Iran vs. APCO

The province of Khuzistan in Iran has a population that is ethnically distinct from the overall Irani population. There is some dispute over whether Arabs constitute a majority or a sizable minority in Khuzistan, however, in any case much of the population of that province is different from the Persian population of Iran. Additionally, Khuzistan is one of the richest provinces in Iran since it is where much of the country's oil wealth is concentrated. In the late 1970s, the Arab Political and Cultural Organization (APCO) began lobbying for greater autonomy for the province within Iran and for the population of the province to receive a greater proportion of the oil revenues. The Iranian government did agree to allow APCO to set up provincial councils in the province, however, Arab nationalists were still unhappy with the presence of Irani revolutionary security forces in the province. In 1979 and 1980, there were several violent clashes between APCO and the Iranian government, including the bombing of oil pipelines and APCO seizing the Iranian embassy in London and holding the embassy workers there hostage. By the end of 1980, the conflict had largely died down.

The province of Khuzistan had formerly been known as Arabistan and had until the discovery of oil there at the beginning of the century been dominated by Arabs. The Arabs claimed that as much as 80 per cent of the population there was still of Arab origin, the remainder being Persians who had settled there after oil had been found. After the revolution the Arabs organized themselves in various political and cultural societies, collectively forming the Arab Political and Cultural Organization under the overall leadership of Shaikh Mohammed Taher Shobeir Khaghani. Their demands included greater control over local government affairs. The Arabs were said to have been backed by Iraq in particular, with also Palestinian and other involvement. On April 30, 1980 a group of

armed Iranians (calling themselves the Group of the Martyr) who wished to draw attention to the demands of the Arab minority, seized the Iranian embassy in London.

Rebels: APCO

Transconstsupp: tacit. Arabs in other states.

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: yes, extensive. Militants in London seized the Iranian embassy. Also claimed that group was active in Iraq.

Rebsupport: Explicit. Iran claims that Iraq was backing the group militarily, however, this has not been confirmed. It is known that Iraq openly sympathized with Iranian Arabs.

Rtypesup: endorsement. military, alleged.

Govsupport: none. The UK raided the captured Iranian embassy and returned it to Iran. However, this was more of an effort at local policing and to free captured British hostages

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

APCO was allowed to set up provincial councils in Khuzistan province.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the sources gave any indication as to the number of troops that supported APCO's demands, however, it is clear that the group was considerably weaker than the Irani army.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Minorities at Risk

Chapter 107

ID 145

ID 145

Incompatibility: Territory/Government, Saudi Arabia

Dyad ID 548: Saudi Arabia vs. JSM

Several hundred activists, mostly from the former Ikhwan tribe 'Utayba, formed an armed movement under Juhayman al-'Utaybi. 'Utaybi's group violently took over the Grand Mosque in Mecca, the holiest of all Islamic sites, on 20 November 1979. It drew support only from the manual workers and students of tribal origin, of the lower classes and foreign laborers (from Egypt, Yemen and Pakistan). 'Utaybi's group was reacting, in an extreme fashion, to the sudden affluence and Western lifestyle which had begun to emerge in the Kingdom. (Kostiner, J. Middle East Review of International Affairs: Volume 1, No. 2 - July 1997 <http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/1997/issue2/jv1n2a8.html>)

Rebels: Juhayman Movement

Transconstsupp: tacit. Sympathy by radical Islamists

Rebextpart: none. Although there were non-nationals involved, it does not appear that the group was supported by an organized group.

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: None

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Kostiner, J. Middle East Review of International Affairs: Volume 1, No. 2 - July 1997
<http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/1997/issue2/jv1n2a8.html>

Chapter 108

ID 146

ID 146

Incompatibility: Government, Liberia

Liberia vs. various rebel groups

This conflict is best described in two stages, the one leading up to Taylor's ascension to power in Liberia, and the period encompassing armed opposition to his rule.

Period 1 In late 1989, a group of about 500 armed rebels, led by Charles Taylor, entered Liberia from neighboring Cote D'Ivoire and began challenging the regime of President Samuel Doe. The National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL) had some military success in gaining control of parts of Northern Liberia and also committed massacres against the civilian population. In 1990, a faction of the NPFL led by Prince Yormie Johnson split off and began fighting as the Independent National Patriotic Front of Liberia (INPFL). The conflict between Doe's government and Taylor and Johnson's groups quickly reached a high level of intensity and West African leaders saw Liberia as a threat to regional stability. In 1990, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) deployed a peacekeeping mission that was designed to stop the fighting in Liberia. However, in September 1990, INPFL rebels in Monrovia captured and killed Doe. A ceasefire agreement brokered by ECOWAS in 1991 quickly collapsed, and fighting continued between the INPFL, NPFL and a new insurgent group made up of supporters of former President Doe, the United Liberation Movement of Liberia for Democracy (ULIMO). In September 1992, the INPFL dissolved and stopped pursuing the conflict. Fighting continued, however, between ECOMOG forces, the NPFL, ULIMO, which had split into two factions, ULIMO-J and ULIMO-K. Despite continued fighting, peace agreements in 1993, 1994, and 1995 led to the creation of a transitional government, with Taylor occupying an important position. In 1996, the NPFL transitioned into a political party, the National Patriotic Party, and in elections in 1997 Charles Taylor became President of Liberia.

Period 2 Despite Taylor's ascension to the presidency, the conflict did not end in 1996. Supporters of former President Doe continued to violently oppose Taylor's presidency as part of ULIMO-J. In the subsequent years, additional insurgent groups arose to challenge Taylor's hold on power, the most prominent of which was Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy (LURD), a group led by Liberian dissidents based in Guinea. The conflict continued at a low level of intensity through 2003 when the attacks against Taylor's government increased. In 2003, LURD and other rebel groups launched attacks into Monrovia, and negotiations in June 2003 in Accra, Ghana, produced a peace agreement. Taylor agreed to leave Liberia and go into exile, and the international community agreed to send peacekeepers in 2004. The conflict was still ongoing as of the end of 2003 but there was cautious optimism that it could be resolved soon.

Burkina Faso should be removed as an actor. NPFL and INPFL are listed twice and should each be consolidated into a single record. INPFL was no longer an actor after 1992.

On 24 December 1989, an armed insurrection began in the north-eastern Nimba County. The rebel forces claimed to represent a new opposition movement, the National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL), led by Charles Taylor, a former government official. A breakaway faction, the Independent National Patriotic Front (INPFL), gained control in central Monrovia. ECOMOG sent forces to support to government in 1990. President Doe was captured and killed by the INPFL. Another opposition group formed by former supporters of Doe, the United Liberation Movement of Liberia for Democracy (ULIMO), began to clash with the NPFL in November 1991. During 1992, the NPFL repeatedly clashed with ECOMOG troops from neighboring West African countries. In early 1993, ECOMOG started to disarm ULIMO which had split into two factions: ULIMO-K and ULIMO-J. A series of new incidents in the northern Lofa County started in 1999 as Guinea-based dissidents under the name of Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy (LURD) fought the government. Liberia accused Guinea of supporting the dissidents. In August 2003 Charles Taylor left over power to ex-president Moses Blah and Taylor went into exile in Nigeria.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 93: Liberia vs. NPFL

Rebels: NPFL

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: yes, extensive. Cote d'Ivoire provided territory. Also reports of training in Burkina Faso and Libya

Rebsupport: explicit. Help from Cote d'Ivoire, Libya, Burkina Faso

Rtypesup: military. Provision of bases on territory, arms.

Govsupport: explicit. ECOMOG troops (particularly Guinea and Nigeria) were sent in to support the government.

Gtypesup: troops

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

After the signing of a peace agreement in August 1995, the NPFL changed into a political party, the National Patriotic Party. However, prior to that time, the group competed militarily for power in Liberia, rather than through the political process.

Rebestimate: 10,000

Rebestlow: 200

Rebesthigh: 14,000

Rebstrength: much stronger

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the troop strength of the NPFL: In 1990: 200-14,000; in 1991: 7,000; in 1992-1995: 10,000. This is in comparison to the following estimates for the Liberian government: in 1990: 5,000-7,800; in 1991: no estimate; in 1992: 250; in 1993: 200-400; in 1994: 200-400; in 1995: no estimate. At the same time, the Liberian government was supported by the following forces from ECOMOG: In 1990: 2,500-6,000; in 1991: 7,000; in 1992: 8,000-12,000; in 1993 and 1994: 15,000-17,000; in 1995: 7,000.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of Western Liberia

Effterrcont: moderate

Keesing's Record of World Events reported in October 1990 that the NPFL had established an interim government at Gbarnga, Liberia, to control the areas of the country it controlled.

Newstartdate: 12/31/1989

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the Liberian government and the NPFL reached 25 battledeaths on December 31, 1989.

Newenddate: 8/26/1995

On August 19, 1995, the NPFL signed a cease-fire that was set to go into effect on week later. The NPFL held to the ceasefire.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts
- Patrick Brogan

Dyad ID 94: Liberia vs. INPFL

Rebels: INPFL

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: explicit. ECOMOG troops.

Gtypesup: troops

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The INPFL did participate temporarily in a transitional government brokered by ECOMOG. However, the group only sought to achieve its control of the country through military force, rather than through a political organization.

Rebestimate: 2,200

Rebestlow: 400

Rebesthigh: 4,000

Rebstrength: stronger

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimates that in 1990 the INPFL had between 400 and 4,000 troops. After the defeat of Doe, the new Liberian government only had a few hundred troops and was only able to stay in power because of support from ECOMOG.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: parts of Central Monrovia

Effterrcont: moderate

In the early 1990s, the INPFL was able to gain control of parts of central Monrovia. They were prevented from capturing the whole capital in the aftermath of their assassination of Doe by the presence of ECOMOG troops.

Newstartdate: 9/9/1990

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the INPFL and the Liberian government reached 25 battledeaths on September 9, 1990.

Newenddate: 9/30/1992

The INPFL dissolved in September 1992 and ceased to participate as a fighting force in the conflict.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts

Dyad ID 95: Liberia vs. LURD

Rebels: LURD

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: Extensive. Bases located in Guinea apparently at invitation of gov't.

Rebsupport: explicit. Supplies and bases on territory by Guinea

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

LURD was a rebel group opposed to Taylor's regime that received support from Guinea and Sierra Leone. They only opposed Taylor's regime militarily and not politically.

Rebestimate: 6,500

Rebestlow: 3,000

Rebesthigh: 10,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates the LURD had between 3,000 and 10,000 troops in 2003. This number is in comparison to 7,000 to 15,000 troops for the Liberian army.

Armsproc: moderate

LURD received support, including arms, from Guinea and Sierra Leone.

Newstartdate: 1/1/2000

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between LURD and the Liberian government first reached 25 battledeaths sometime in 2000, but did not give more specifics.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Patrick Brogan
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks

Dyad ID 352: Liberia vs. MODEL

MODEL was a rebel group which broke away from LURD in 2003 and fought against Liberian President Charles Taylor. A few months after it began fighting, Taylor resigned and LURD and MODEL signed a peace agreement with the Liberian government.

Rebel Political Wing: No

MODEL was primarily a military organization and was not affiliated with a political party.

Rebel estimate: 3000

Rebel estimate (low): 1000

Rebel estimate (high): 5000

The UCDP estimates that MODEL had between 1000 and 5000 troops.

Rebel strength: Weaker

Liberia's army was weak during this period, but MODEL was relatively small and the army was clearly stronger than MODEL and LURD individually.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

MODEL had a central command that generally controlled the organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

MODEL made little effort to mobilize popular support, and primarily operated by terrorizing the population.

Territorial Control: Yes

Territory Name: Parts of Western Liberia

Level of effective territorial control: Moderate

As it advanced, MODEL was able to capture control of some Liberian territory, including some ports.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Explicit

Type of Support: Military

Names of Rebel Supporters: Cote D'Ivoire

MODEL was formed by Cote D'Ivoire after Taylor provided support to Ivorian rebels.

Government Support: No

Non-State Military Support to Government: No

UCDP reports that there were unconfirmed reports of support from Libya and Nigeria.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Peace Agreement

On August 18, 2003, MODEL, LURD, and other Liberian organizations signed a peace agreement

with the government.

Source:

- UCDP

Dyad ID 525: Liberia vs. Military Faction

On August 12, 1980, a group of junior military officers, led by Master Sergeant Doe, killed Liberian President William Tolbert and took power. Tolbert was one of the descendants of American slaves who had moved to Liberia, a group that only made up 5% of the population but dominated the economic and social structure of the society. Doe became President and many members of the People's Progressive Party (PPP), a new opposition party that had experienced much harassment at the hands of the Tolbert government, was given many cabinet positions.

On April 12, 1980, President William R. Tolbert, Jr. was killed in a coup led by Master Sergeant Samuel K. Doe.

Rebels: Military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: alleged link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

It is not clear that Doe and the junior officers who followed him were directly linked with the PPP. However, the PPP was the main opposition party to President Tolbert and they were immediately incorporated into Doe's government.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: stronger

None of the sources gave any indication to the number of junior officers that supported Doe in the coup d'état.

Source:

- Onwar.com

- Lexis-Nexis: Search "Liberia", April 1980, North American News Sources
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 109

ID 147

ID 147

Incompatibility: Territory, Basque

Dyad ID 366: Spain vs. ETA

The Basque country is in northern Spain along the border with France. The Basques are a minority within Spain that speak a different language and that have a long history of opposition to centralized Spanish rule. In the early 1960s, a militant Basque separatist movement developed, primarily led by the organization Basque Fatherland and Liberty (ETA). The ETA is primarily a terrorist organization that targets Spanish government political and security personnel. Since the early 1960s, the ETA has waged a low-level assassination and terror campaign against the Spanish government. The government has granted the Basque region a large-degree of autonomy but has been unwilling to consider the independence of the region, which is the main demand the rebels are making. The government and ETA have also been at polar opposites on the issue of negotiations: with the government refusing to negotiate a political agreement until the violence has stopped and the ETA refusing to lay down their arms until a political agreement is in place. The conflict continued at a low-level of intensity through 2003.

The inhabitants of this area, the Basque people, have for centuries claimed their cultural distinctiveness from other people residing in Spain and France. Its prosperity, together with the sense of cultural uniqueness, has motivated the Basques to aspire to political independence from the Spanish central government in Madrid. The ETA was formed in 1959, with the outspoken goal to liberate the Basque regions of Vizcaya, Alava and Guipuzcoa, the bordering Navarra region as well as the Basque parts of France from Spanish (and French) rule. In early 1992, however, the ETA suffered a severe setback when several of its leading members were arrested. The conflict has not been at an active level since.

Rebels: ETA

Transconstsupp: tacit. Basques in France

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: some. Some militants located in France.

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: Explicit. France assists with policing, including extradition of militants on its territory.

Gtypesup: non-military.

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The ETA has a political wing that competes in Basque regional elections. Keesing's Record of World Events in October 1998 reported that this political wing was Euskal Herritarrok, and had previously been named Herri Batasuna.

Rebestimate: 550

Rebestlow: 50

Rebesthigh: 3,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that in the mid-1990s the ETA was estimated to have about 50 armed members, with a "base" of 3,000 members. However it also reported that there were about 500 ETA members in jail, these 500 were presumably involved in the conflict at some point. In any case, the organization is substantially smaller than the Spanish military and police forces.

Mobcap: low

The ETA is a relatively small organization and, although independence is popular among the Basque, the ETA's political wing is not the majority party in the region.

Newstartdate: 9/1/1974

The Uppsala Conflict Database report that the conflict first reached 25 battledeaths in September, 1974.

Newenddate: 12/31/1992

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the government-ETA conflict did not produce more than 25 battledeaths per year after 1992.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events

- Minorities at Risk Group Profiles

Chapter 110

ID 148

ID 148

Incompatibility: Government, Tunisia

Dyad ID 551: Tunisia vs. Resistance Arme Tunisienne

On January 27, 1980, a group of armed Tunisians crossed the border from Algeria and seized the police and military headquarters in the town of Gafsa. The group, which called itself the Tunisian Armed Resistance, announced that the attack was a beginning of a movement to overthrow the Tunisian government. The Tunisian security forces fought back and by the evening of the 27th had retaken the facilities, although the violence had produced many casualties. The Tunisian government accused Libyan President Moamer Kadhafi of masterminding the attempted insurgency and of providing training to the groups. This accusation was denied by the Libyan government.

Early on Jan.27 a party of some 50 armed men seized the army and police barracks and other buildings in the town of Gafsa and took a number of hostages; they were then engaged in heavy fighting by the Tunisian security forces, who succeeded in regaining control of the town in the evening of Jan.27. Tunisian authorities maintained that although a majority of the raiders had crossed into Tunisia from Algerian territory the attack had been planned and organized in Libya at the instigation of the Libyan Government. While accepting the Algerian Government's denial of any official involvement in the Gafsa attack, the Tunisian Government demonstrated its belief that the Libyan Government was implicated by suspending diplomatic relations with Libya on Jan.30. For its part, the Libyan Government consistently denied any official involvement, although the Libyan leader, Col. Moamer al Kadhafi, made several statements expressing support for the "popular revolution. In response to a Tunisian request the French Government on Jan.28 sent military transport aircraft and Puma helicopters to Tunisia accompanied by a group of French military advisers.

Rebels: Resistance Arme Tunisienne

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Attacks launched from Libya and Algeria

Reb suport: explicit. Libya gave diplomatic support and allegedly gave military support.

Rtypesup: endorsement (known), military (alleged)

Govsuport: Explicit. France sent in military support

Gtypesup: military. Troops were sent to Tunisia, but the rebellion had already been repressed.

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The Tunisian Armed Resistance was a group that had previously not existed and did not compete in the Tunisian political process.

Rebestimate: 175

Rebestlow: 50

Rebesthigh: 300

Rebstrength: weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events reports that the Tunisian government said that the rebels numbered 50, while other reports cited them as numbering as many as 300.

Source:

- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 111

ID 149

ID 149

Incompatibility: Government, Gambia

Dyad ID 547: Gambia vs. SRLP

On July 29, 1981, supporters of the left-wing Socialist and Revolutionary Labor Party (SRLP), backed by some members of the military, attempted a coup d'état against Gambian President Dawda Jawara. The coup d'état might have been successful as it received a good amount of support, however, on July 31, Senegal honored the terms of a mutual defense agreement and sent 2,700 troops to support Jawara. The coup plotters were quickly defeated and hundreds of people were killed in the fighting.

A left-wing coup intended to overthrow President Sir Dawda Jawara was staged in Banjul, the Gambian capital, on the night of Nov 29-30, 1981, but eventually failed, despite apparent initial popular support, following the intervention of Senegalese troops from Nov 31. The coup attempt was perpetrated by members of the Socialist and Revolutionary Labour Party (SRLP) led by Mr Kukli Samba Sanyang and received backing from important elements of the Gambian paramilitary Field Force.

Rebels: SRLP

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: Explicit. Troops entered from Senegal to support the govt.

Gtypesup: troops.

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The radical left in Gambia had had a series of political parties, one of which was the Socialist and Revolutionary Labor Party. The party was legal but had had very little success in Gambian elections.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the sources gave any indication as to the number of troops supporting the coup d'état. However, it is clear that those attempting the coup were no match for the government supporters once Senegal intervened.

Mobcap: moderate

Keesing's Record of World Events reports that the coup initially received popular support.

Source:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Lexis-Nexis: Search "Gambia" in African News Sources

Chapter 112

ID 150

ID 150

Incompatibility: Government, South Africa

South Africa vs. Anti-Apartheid Organizations

Although white South African represented less than 20% of the country's population, they dominated the political and economic sphere of South Africa from before independence in 1910 up through the introduction of majority rule in 1994. In 1948, the South African government introduced a policy of "apartheid," which created separate (and unequal) housing and education for the country's majority African population and crystallized the political, economic, and social exclusion of black South Africans. In response, a number of organizations formed to promote equality for blacks, including the African National Congress (ANC), a leftist organization that had black, white, colored, and asian members, the Pan-African Congress (PAC), a more militant African-nationalist organization that was made up exclusively of blacks, and the Azanian People's Organization (AZAPO), a small organization led by black intellectuals. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, these three groups organized resistance to apartheid, but harsh state repression suppressed this resistance and from 1961 to 1975, there was little protest of apartheid. In the mid-1970s, however, violent opposition to apartheid broke out which would continue for two decades. In the 1960s, to avoid state repression, the ANC had created bases in independence African countries such as Zambia and Tanzania and begun to organize support there. In the early 1970s, a growing black-nationalist youth movement in South Africa generated more protest against the apartheid policies. In 1975, thousands of Africans protested the poor quality of schooling for blacks in Soweto, and the state responded by massacring over 500 of the protesters. Unlike in the early 1960s, this harsh repression did not have the effect of reducing protest against the state, but rather increased it, as the ANC and PAC organized violent demonstrations and their military wings conducted urban guerilla-warfare type activities against government installations. The 1980s in South African were increasingly violent as many cities became virtual war-zones. The power of the state was never

directly threatened by the military operations of groups like the ANC and the PAC, which were significantly weaker than the strength of the army. However, the effect of civil war on the economy led many white South African businesspeople to push for negotiations with the ANC (the largest, and also most moderate, of the anti-apartheid organizations). At the same time, international pressure on South Africa to end the violent repression and to replace the oppressive apartheid policies increased. In 1991, in response to these pressures, the new South African Prime Minister F.W. DeKlerk decided to release African National Congress leader Nelson Mandela from his thirty-year imprisonment, to unban the ANC and to begin negotiations with it and the other groups. Conflict and negotiations continued side-by-side through 1993, when a comprehensive agreement was signed. The agreement called for the creation of a transitional Government of National Unity for five years and then the implementation of full majority rule, with protection for minority interests. In national elections in 1994, the ANC won a large majority and Nelson Mandela became the country's first post-apartheid President.

Azapo is the military wing of the PAC. These are not distinct groups. Consolidate 2510-2040-1 and 2510-2040-2 into a single record

The African National Congress formed as a political party in 1912 to oppose racism in South Africa. The group renounced its peaceful platform in the 1960's and became an armed faction. After the fall of apartheid, the ANC has been the dominant political party in South Africa.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 558: South Africa vs. ANC

Rebels: African National Congress

Transconstsupp: tacit. Support by groups across Africa and in Europe/N.America

Rebextpart: none.

Rebpresosts: extensive, bases located throughout Africa. Particularly in Mozambique

Rebsupport: Explicit. Military assistance from the USSR. Granting of bases by African states.

Rtypesup: Military

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

Blacks were not allowed to compete for political office in apartheid South Africa and prior to the 1993 signing of a comprehensive agreement, the ANC countered apartheid through organizing protest and through violent terrorist and guerilla warfare tactics. It was only after the conflict ended that the ANC became a political party.

Rebestimate: 10,000

Rebestlow: 6,000

Rebesthigh: 10,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the troop strength of the ANC: In 1987, 1987, 1988 and 1989: 10,000; in 1990, 1991 and 1992: 6,000-10,000; in 1993: no estimate. These estimates are in comparison to the following estimates of the troop strength for the South African army: In 1986 and 1987: 106,400; in 1988: 222,000; in 1989: 136,000; in 1990: 77,400; in 1991: 158,700; in 1992: 72,400; in 1993: 70,000.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: high

The ANC had a very strong central leadership, even after Mandela and other key leaders were jailed.

Newendate: 11/18/1993

The South African negotiations were characterized by several agreements signed over years and so many potential end dates could be used. November 18, 1993, was the day that the parties agreed to the new constitution.

Source:

- Library of Congress Country Study

The Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC) was established in April 1959 by ANC dissidents who opposed that group's multiracial orientation and advocated black liberation within an exclusively black nationalist context. Like the ANC, the PAC was recognized by the United Nations (UN) and by the Organization of African Unity (OAU). The PAC's military wing, the Azanian People's Liberation Army (Azapo) also engaged in an underground armed struggle against white-dominated political and cultural institutions.

Rebels: Pan African Congress, Azapo

Transconstsupp: tacit. Sympathy by groups across Africa

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive, bases in other African countries. Particularly Lesotho

Rebsupport: Explicit. Access to territory by African nations.

Rtypesup: military. Extraterritorial bases.

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Library of Congress Country Study)

Chapter 113

ID 152

ID 152

Incompatibility: Territory, Manipur

India vs. Armed Groups in Manipur

The region of Manipur in northeastern India was historically independent but became part of India in 1949. Almost immediately after its incorporation into India, some groups began calling for the secession of the region and the creation of an independent state of Manipur. Unlike many of the other territorial conflicts in India, the insurgents in Manipur are generally not organized along ethnic or tribal lines, but rather the armed struggles are led by leftist groups that cross ethnic divisions. Although several different armed groups have waged war against the Indian government to try to bring about the independence of the region, two major groups have been the leaders in the conflict. The United National Liberation Front (UNLF) is a Marxist-organization that formed in the early 1960s to challenge the government, although it did not enter into full-scale armed struggle with the Indian army until 1993. The People's Liberation Army (PLA) is a Maoist organization that formed in 1978 and in the early 1980s initiated armed conflict with the government. Through the 1980s, the conflict persisted at a low-level of intensity, but by 1989 it appeared that a large troop deployment in Manipur had given the Indian army the upper hand and that the PLA had been defeated. In 1992, however, the PLA reinitiated the conflict and the UNLF joined the next year. In 1997, the Kuki National Front, an organization made up of members of the Kuki Tribe, entered the conflict to press the Indian government to grant greater autonomy to Kuki in the region. Despite some attempts by the Indian government to resolve the conflict peacefully, the war is ongoing as of the end of 2003.

2530-2050-0 and 2530-2060-2 both refer to the PLA. Consolidate into a single record

Manipur is situated in the volatile northeastern region of India. A militant movement which saw Manipur's merger with India in 1949 as an illegal annexation emerged already in the 1960s with the

aim to "liberate Manipur through armed struggle". The United National Liberation Front (UNLF) was formed in November 1964, while the People Liberation Army (PLA) was formed after the re-emergence and radicalization of the movement in 1978. Both desire an independent Manipur through violent means and embrace a leftist ideology. In the case of PLA this includes a vision of a trans-tribal, revolutionary front covering the entire Northeast region. Both PLA and UNLF have allegedly also had training camps in Myanmar and Bangladesh. The Indian government has furthermore accused Pakistan of providing secondary support to the rebels, through ISI officials stationed in Bangladesh. The Pakistani government refutes these allegations. Violence has since 2001 remained at an unstable plateau of low activity.

A third warring party on the rebel side has also had a stake in the territorial incompatibility with the government. The Kuki National Front was established in 1988, with the primary objective of securing a separate, independent state for the Kuki tribe.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 325: India vs. PLA

Rebels:PLA

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases in Myanmar and Bangladesh.

Rebsupport: alleged. Allegations that Bangladesh and Pakistan were assisting the groups. However, this is denied by the governments.

Rtypesup: military, alleged.

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The PLA is a Maoist organization pushing for secession that does not compete politically.

Rebestimate: 550

Rebestlow: 500

Rebesthigh: 600

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 2000, the PLA had between 500 and 600 troops. No estimates are given for any other year of the conflict.

Newstartdate: 7/13/1982

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the Indian government and the PLA reached 25 battledeaths on July 13, 1982.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Dyad ID 336: India vs. UNLF

Rebels: UNLF

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases in Myanmar and Bangladesh.

Rebsupport: alleged. Allegations that Bangladesh and Pakistan were assisting the groups. However, this is denied by the governments.

Rtypesup: military, alleged.

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

The UNLF is a Marxist organization pushing for secession that does not compete politically.

Rebestimate: 650

Rebestlow: 500

Rebesthigh: 800

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 2000, the UNLF had between 500 and 800 troops. No estimates are given for any other year of the conflict.

Newstartdate: 8/21/1994

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the Indian government and the UNLF reached 25 battledeaths on August 21, 1994.

For decades, the Indian government has faced an insurgency involving a variety of different insurgent groups in Manipur. The main ones have been the United National Liberation Front (UNLF) and the People's Liberation Army (PLA). In 2008, these groups were joined by the People's Revolutionary Party of Kangleipak (PREPAK) and the Kangleipak Communist party (KCP).

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Dyad ID 338: India vs. KNF

Rebels: KNF

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases in Myanmar.

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: none

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Dyad ID 764: India vs. KCP

Rebel Political Wing: No

KCDP was primarily a military organization and not directly affiliated with a political party.

Rebel estimate: 285

Rebel estimate (low): 100

Rebel estimate (high): 370

The UCDP estimates that KCP had 100 troops in 2008 and 370 in 2009.

Rebel strength: Much weaker

India has a large army which is much more powerful than KCP.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

KCP has a command structure that appears to coordinate the efforts of the organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

KCP has some support in Manipur, but is clearly overmatched in its ability to mobilize support, fight, and obtain arms by the Indian government.

Territorial Control: No

I found no indication that KCP controlled territory in the Manipur region of India.

Conflict Type: Secessionist
Transnational Constituency Support: No
Rebel External Support: No
Rebel Presence in External States: No
Rebel Support: No
There are no indications of external support to KCP.
Government Support: Explicit
Type of Government Support: Logistics
Name of Government Supporters: Myanmar
Myanmar committed to help India fight KCP.
Non-State Military Support to Government: No
Ended?: No
The conflict between India and KCP continued after 2009.
Source:

- UCDP

Dyad ID 766: India vs. PREPAK

Rebel Political Wing: No
PREPAK was primarily a military organization and not directly affiliated with a political party.
Rebel estimate: 450
Rebel estimate (low): 200
Rebel estimate (high): 700
The UCDP estimates that PREPAK had between 200 and 700 troops in 2008.
Rebel strength: Much weaker
India has a large army which is much more powerful than PLA.
Central Control: Yes
Strength Central Control: Moderate
PREPAK has a command structure that appears to coordinate the efforts of the organization.
Mobilization Capacity: Low
Arms Procurement Capacity: Low
Fighting Capacity: Low
PREPAK has some support in Manipur, but is clearly overmatched in its ability to mobilize support, fight, and obtain arms by the Indian government.

Territorial Control: No

I found no indication that PREPAK controlled territory in the Manipur region of India.

Conflict Type: Secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

There are no indications of external support to PREPAK.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Logistics

Name of Government Supporters: Myanmar

Myanmar committed to help India fight PREPAK.

Non-State Military Support to Government: No

Ended?: No

The conflict between India and PREPAK continued after 2009.

Chapter 114

ID 153

ID 153

Incompatibility: Government, Kenya

Dyad ID 536: Kenya vs. Military Faction

On August 1, 1982, members of the Kenyan Air Force, backed by students from Nairobi University, seized the Nairobi airport and the radio station and announced that they were going to overthrow President Daniel Arap Moi. The grievance of the coup plotters was not explicitly stated, although there was much dissatisfaction in the country with corruption in the government and with poor economic performance. The coup plotters were unsuccessful and the military faction was quickly defeated by the army and the security service, which stayed loyal to Moi.

An attempted coup against President Moi; the coup attempt failed.

Rebels: Military Faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: none

Govextpart: n/a

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The coup plotters were members of the Air Force, not an organized political opposition.

Rebestimate: 750

Rebestlow: 550

Rebesthigh: 1000

Keesing's Record of World Events reports that in the aftermath of the coup attempt 550 air force officers were convicted of participating in the coup. Assuming that not all of the supporters were tried, the estimate is placed at 750.

Source:

- Lexis-Nexis
- "Economist" magazine search
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 115

ID 156

ID 156

Incompatibility: Territory, Punjab/Khalistan

Dyad ID 387: India vs. Sikh Insurgents

The Sikh represent a minority religion in India, with both Hinduism (the religion practiced by the majority of the Indian population) and Islam having a greater number of adherents. Through India's nearly 60 year independent history, Sikh groups have called for the creation of an independent state of Khalistan, which would be majority Sikh. In the late 1970s there was much intercommunal violence in the state of Punjab (where the majority of Indian Sikhs reside) and the Indian government intervened militarily to stop the violence. This intervention heightened tensions between the government and the Sikhs and in 1980s, several Sikh militant organizations launched an armed struggle against the Indian government to push for greater autonomy, leading up to secession. The Indian government at first pursued a policy of negotiating with the rebels, but was unable to suppress the rebellion. In elections in Punjab in 1989, Sikh militants gained a majority of the seats and by 1990 they had achieved major success against the government. This success forced the Indian government to deploy a massive military force and by 1993 had defeated the rebellion.

Sikh insurgents demand autonomy/independence for Punjab. A demand for greater autonomy under a reformed federalist India had been articulated already in the early 1970s. This demand got a more extreme interpretation in the early 1980s, when the organized militant outfits publicly voiced their preference for confrontation rather than negotiation. From the onset, the Sikh insurgents were highly fractionalized: as many as 24 militant outfits have been active

Rebels: Sikh insurgents

Transconstsupp: explicit. Diaspora communities in N. America and Europe.

Rebextpart: no

Rebpresosts: some, reports that some fighters were based in Pakistan

Rebsupport: alleged. India claims that Pakistan was giving territorial access and military supplies. This has been denied by Pakistan

Rtypesup: military, alleged.

Govsupport: None

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

rebpolwing: explicit link

rebpolwinglegal: yes

Members of Sikh militant groups won elections in the state of Punjab in 1989.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 9,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimates that in 1987 and 1988, the Sikh insurgents had about 9,000 troops. This is in comparison to over a million for the Indian army, although until 1990 the Indian government had not deployed very many troops to Punjab.

Centcont: No

The Sikh insurgents really comprise a large number of groups (more than 20) rather than one coherent opposition group.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>
- Patrick Brogan
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks
- Minorities at Risk Group Profiles

Chapter 116

ID 157

ID 157

Incompatibility: Territory, Eelam

Sri Lanka vs. Tamil Insurgents

The twenty-year conflict between insurgent groups representing the Sri Lankan Tamil population and the Sinhalese government has been very deadly, producing over 65,000 casualties and attracting high levels of international attention. The conflict began in the mid-1980s, but its roots lay in the policies pursued by the Sri Lankan government since its independence from Britain in 1948. Sri Lanka has a majority Sinhalese population, which is Buddhist and speaks Sinhalese. However, it has a sizable Sri Lankan Tamil minority, which is Hindu and speaks Tamil. Following independence, the Sinhalese majority controlled the government and attempted to build a strong, centralized state with Sinhalese as the official language and Buddhism as the official religion. These policies were unable to stem the growth of Tamil nationalism, however, and by the late 1970s, the Tamil-majority areas of northern Sri Lanka saw massive protests for greater autonomy for the Tamils. In 1983, several insurgent groups began an armed campaign for secession of the Tamil-regions of northern Sri Lanka (which they referred to as Tamil Eelam), the most prominent of which were the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), the Tamil Eelam Liberation Organization (TELO) and the People's Liberation Organization of Tamil Eelam (PLOTE). These groups carried out a mixture of insurgent and terrorist tactics to challenge the Sri Lankan government's control of Tamil territories. The LTTE proved the most successful, and by the late 1980s the other organizations had largely dissolved and LTTE had established supremacy as the main armed representative of the Tamil cause. In 1987, the Indian government deployed a major "peacekeeping mission" of 75,000-90,000 troops to the island to try to terminate the conflict. However, the LTTE did not agree with the Indian mandate, and fighting continued between the Indian force and the rebel organization. In 1989, after some progress in negotiations with the LTTE, the Sri Lankan government agreed to dismiss the Indian mission, but within months after their departure,

full-scale warfare resumed. The conflict continued throughout the 1990s and into the 21st century despite several attempts at international mediation, and despite the signing of a cease-fire in February 2002, the conflict was ongoing as of the end of 2003.

***2580-2090-0 and 2580-2100-0 both refer to the LTTE. Consolidate into a single record: 2580-2090-0 Create a new record for the LTTE 2580-2090-0.1 for after 1991 when India is no longer actively supporting Tamils ***

The constitutional status of this predominantly Tamil area in the northeast of the island has remained the core incompatibility throughout the violent insurgency up until today. The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) was established in May 1976, setting out to pursue separatist demands. Intense intra-factional fighting in the late 80s virtually destroyed the more inexperienced and undisciplined challengers to LTTE hegemony (TELO and PLOTE). During the 1980s the LTTE received support from the Tamil-led state-government of the Indian state of Tamil Nadu. In 1991 the Indian government fired the Tamil Nadu state government on the grounds of its allegiance to the rebels. As a result, during the 1990s the LTTE had to rely on a wide network of offices and cells across the globe to raise funds from the Tamil diaspora. Indian involvement in the conflict, however, has not been limited to secondary support from the political leadership in Tamil Nadu. During the 1980s India more or less supported the Tamil demand for far-reaching self determination, and the Indian-Sri Lankan accord from 1987 provided for the establishment of a regional provincial council in the Tamil areas and the disarmament of Tamil militants. The Indian Peace Keeping Force (IPKF) was subsequently deployed on the island to guarantee the implementation of the political solution and the cessation of the hostilities. The Indo-Sri Lanka accord, however, did not include the LTTE, and soon after the IPKF arrived it became deeply entangled in regular warfare with the Tamil Tigers. The last IPKF troops withdrew from Sri Lanka in March 1990. A new round of fighting erupted. Negotiations are currently underway.

2580-2100-1 TELO 2580-2100-2 PLOTE

May keep these as distinct groups, however the values of the variables do not differ between them These were rival groups of the LTTE. PLOTE was a more radical Marxist group. Less info is available for TELO. Both were defeated by the LTTE in the mid-1980's. Neither of these groups reached the level of organization and external support that the LTTE did.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 243: Sri Lanka vs. LTTE

Pre- 1991 (1975-1990)

Rebels: LTTE

Transconstsupp: Explicit. Tamils in India and the Tamil Diaspora

Rebextpart: yes, major. Groups in Tamil Nadu.

Rebpresosts: Extensive. Bases in South Indian state of Tamil Nadu.

Rebsupport: Explicit. From the Indian State of Tamil Nadu. Unclear what the central Indian

government's role was, but there was clear support from the state government.

Rtypesup: Military. Bases, logistical , and material support.

Govsupport: none. Note on Indian involvement: India sent a peacekeeping force which eventually fought against the Tigers. However, India cannot be said to have taken a pro-Government stance. The peacekeeping force was meant to police a political solution.

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

1991and after After 1991 LTTE is no longer receiving support from Tamil Nadhu state in India.

Rebels: LTTE

Transconstsupp: Explicit. Tamils in India and the Tamil Diaspora

Rebextpart: yes, major. Groups in Tamil Nadhu.

Rebpresosts: some. Few troops in South Indian state of Tamil Nadhu.

Rebsupport:: none.

Rtypesup: n/a.

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>
- Patrick Brogan
- Onwar.com

Rebpolwing: no

The LTTE has fought for the independence of Tamil Eelam militarily and has not competed as a political organization.

Rebestimate: 6,000

Rebestlow: 2,000

Rebesthigh: 10,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the troop strength of the LTTE: In 1988 and 1989: 2,000; in 1990: 2,000-3,000, in 1991: 8,000; in 1992 and

1993: 7,000; in 1994, 1995 and 1996: 6,000-10,000; in 1997: 5,000-8,000; in 1998: 6,000-8,000; in 1999, 2000 and 2001: 6,000-7,000; in 2002: 6,000. These estimates are in comparison to over 100,000 for the Sri Lankan government.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Jaffna Peninsula

Effterrcont: High

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that in an offensive in 1990, the LTTE gained control over the Jaffna Peninsula. They created a civilian political wing to administer government in the province and were able to rule it until 1995.

Newstartdate: 7/1/1983

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between Sri Lanka and the LTTE first reached 25 battledeaths on July 1, 1983.

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>
- Patrick Brogan
- Onwar.com

Dyad ID 526: Sri Lanka vs. TELO

Rebels: TELO

Transconstsupp: explicit. Tamils in India and in the Tamil diaspora

Rebextpart: none, unknown

Rebpresosts: no, unknown

Rebsuport: none, unknown

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing : no

TELO was a military organization and did not compete in the domestic Sri Lankan political process.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources gave any indication as to the number of troops possessed by TELO. However, it is clear that the organization was considerably weaker than the Sri Lankan army.

Newstartdate: 7/1/1983

No information was available on when the TELO-Sri Lankan government dyad reached 25 battledeaths. So, the same date is used as for the Sri Lanka-LTTE dyad.

Newenddate: 12/31/1988

It is not clear exactly when TELO dropped out of the conflict. However, it is clear that the organization was no longer relevant by the end of 1988.

Source:

- Library of Congress Country Study

Dyad ID 687: Sri Lanka vs. EPRLF

TBA

Chapter 117

ID 158

ID 158

Incompatibility: Government, Cameroon

Dyad ID 539: Cameroon vs. Military Faction

On April 6, 1984 a faction of about 500 members of the Republican Guard seized the radio station and attempted to overthrow President Paul Biya. The Republican Guard was a unit of about 1,000 troops that were outside of the regular army and who served to protect the President and defend the Presidential palace. The leadership of the faction was upset over Biya's decision to transfer some members of the Guard to other units. There was fighting in Yaound, the capital, for four days before the rebels were completely defeated.

On April 6, 1984, dissident members of the presidential palace guard violently sought to seize political power in Yaounde.. The revolt was apparently ignited by an order by Cameroon's President Paul Biya , a southern Christian, to transfer all palace guards who came from the predominantly Muslim north. Armed forces loyal to Biya won victory over the rebels after several days of heavy fighting, in which a least 500 were killed. Biya consolidated his political power and continually won re-election into the late 1990s.

Rebels: Military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: None

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: None

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The members of the Republic Guard attempted a coup out of dissatisfaction with Biya's policy toward the unit, rather than as a rival political group.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 500

Rebstrength: weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events reports that about half of the 1,000 unit Republican Guard joined the rebellion.

Source:

- Onwar.com
- Lexis-Nexis [Search: "Cameroon", in European News, from 4/1/1984 to 4/31/1984]
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Dyad ID 692: Cameroon vs. UPC

TBA

Chapter 118

ID 159

ID 159

Incompatibility: Territory, Kurdistan

Dyad ID 333: Turkey vs. PKK

Kurds represent a significant minority (around 20%) of the Turkish population, and have traditionally faced much discrimination. The use of Kurdish language is outlawed and Kurds are encouraged to reject their culture to gain greater access to Turkish society and economy. In the late 1970s, several different Kurdish militant organizations formed to push for rights and greater autonomy for the Kurds. The most important of these groups was the Kurdish Worker's Party (PKK), an organization which started an armed struggle against the Turkish government in 1984 and called for the creation of an independent state of Kurdistan. The PKK used based in northern Iraq (which also has a large Kurdish population) to launch attacks against government positions in the Kurdish areas of Turkey. The civil war produced a large number of casualties, but throughout the 1980s the Turkish army was able to gain the upper hand. In 1991, however, with the defeat of Saddam Hussein in the Persian Gulf War, the PKK (and other Kurdish groups) gained greater access to Iraq and were able to use Iraqi territory to better defend themselves from Turkish attacks. The Turkish army intervened in Northern Iraq, however, and was able to inflict serious casualties on the PKK, and by the end of the 1990s, the group had been severely militarily weakened. At that time, in fact, the group decided to change its strategy, dropped its call for an independent Kurdistan and called only for greater autonomy within Turkey. In 1999, the leader of the PKK was captured. As of the end of 2003, the armed conflict between Turkey and the PKK continues, however, at a lower level of intensity, as Turkish victories and a shift of strategy have led to decreased conflict.

2600-2130-0 PKK/Kadek should be dropped. This refers to a name change within the PKK organization

The PKK was founded in 1974 as a Marxist-Leninist group with the goal of establishing an in-

dependent and democratic Kurdish state. In August 1984 PKK forces began ambushing Turkish troops on Kurdish territory. Syria, Greece and Iran have provided the PKK with shelter, training grounds and/or financial support. Other states or groups suspected of aiding the PKK were Cyprus, Armenia, the Turkish Dev Sol and other leftist organizations such as the Greek 17 November Revolutionary Organization. Iraq has also been a safe-haven for PKK fighters. The most important secondary support received by Turkey comes from the United States, which has given Turkey more than 1 500 tanks and up to 100 attack helicopters at no cost other than those for reparations and shipment.

Rebels: PKK/Kadek

Transconstsupp: Explicit. Kurdish groups in Iran, Iraq, Syria, and diaspora in Europe

Rebextpart: yes, major. Support from Kurds in other countries and by the Nov 17 rebel group in Greece.

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases in Greece, Syria, Iran, Iraq.

Rebsupport: Explicit. Syria, Iran, Greece have provided bases and funding.

Rtypesup: Military, financial.

Govsupport: Explicit. Military assistance from the US.

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: alleged link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

Minorities at Risk reports that the People's Democracy Party (HADEP) is alleged to have connections to the PKK, although the group denies them. HADEP is a legal political party, but has faced restrictions because parties with a Kurdish-platform are outlawed.

Rebestimate: 10,000

Rebestlow: 300

Rebesthigh: 12,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database give a range of troops from as low as 300 to as many as 12,000 for the PKK across this period. This is in comparison to hundreds of thousands of troops possessed by the Turkish army.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: moderate

Until his arrest in 1999, the PKK had one major leader across the course of the conflict: Abdullah calan. The group has experienced some fractionalization as a result of disagreement over strategies, but generally has stayed as one coherent group under Ocalan's leadership.

Newstartdate: 12/31/1984

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that at least 25 battledeaths occurred in 1984, but that it is impossible to determine when exactly that number was reached, so the start is dated at the end of that year.

Conflicttype: secessionist/civil war

From 1984 to 1999, the PKK was demanding the secession of the Kurds and the creation of a separate Kurdistan. Since 1999, however, the group has stopped demanding secession and instead is fighting for greater autonomy within Turkey.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Minorities at Risk
- Onwar.com

Chapter 119

ID 162

ID 162

Incompatibility: Government, Surinam

Dyad ID 559: Surinam vs. SLA/Jungle Commandos

In 1986, a rebellion broke out against the military government of Surinam. The rebellion was led by Ronny Brunswijk, a former Sergeant in the army and a member of the maroon ethnic group, which is made up of runaway slaves and is the ethnic group that faces the most ethnic and social discrimination in Surinam. Brunswijk's "Jungle Commandos" were a small group that was not able to mobilize much popular support, but it was able to attract some foreign mercenaries to help it wages its fight. Additionally, the government in Surinam was so weak due to years of corruption and economic mismanagement that it was unable to completely defeat the rebellion. The government did have some military success against the rebels in the early years of the conflict so that, after 1988, although the Jungle Commandos still existed the conflict continued at a very low level of intensity.

The National Military Council, led by Lieutenant Colonel Desire Bouterse (1946-), controlled the government of Suriname (formerly Dutch Guiana) between 1982 and 1988. In Suriname's eastern region in 1986, increased rebel resistance under Ronnie Brunswijk, a former bodyguard of Bouterse, resulted in a declared state of emergency in December, thus compelling Bouterse to hold general elections that brought a democratic civilian government to power in January 1988.

Rebels: SLA/Jungle Commandos

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The Jungle Commandos were a military, not a political, organization dedicated to the overthrow of the Surinam government.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the sources gave any indication as to the military strength of the Jungle Commandos. However, it is clear that they were weaker than the Surinam military and were primarily able to operate in the periphery of the country.

Sources:

- Onwar.com
- Lexis-Nexis
- Toronto Star (obtained through Lexis Nexis)
- The Independent (obtained through Lexis Nexis)

Chapter 120

ID 163

ID 163

Incompatibility: Government, Togo

Dyad ID 471: Togo vs. MTD

On September 23, a group of about 60 well-armed supporters of the exiled opposition party Movement for Togolese Democracy (MTD) attempted to take control of the military headquarters and overthrow Togolese President Eyadema. The state security services stopped the attempted coup and many of the 60 were arrested. Gunfire continued for a few days after the 23rd, and on September 25th France deployed troops to support the Togolese leader. On September 28, Zaire also sent troops as a show of solidarity.

An estimated 50 rebels opened fire on a military barracks near General Eyadema's residence and tried to take over a local radio station, the state-run Togolese radio said. Togo claimed that rebels originated in Ghana, which Ghana denied. France sent troops to assist the government in repressing the rebellion. The Government was victorious

Rebels: MTD. Togolese Movement for Democracy

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: yes, some. Leadership is based in Ghana

Rebsupport: alleged. Togo claimed that rebels originated from Ghana and that Ghana was supporting them. This was denied by Ghana.

Rtypesup: military, alleged. Use of extraterritorial bases

Govsupport: Explicit. French troops sent in to support gov.

Gtypesup: Troops. From France.

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: alleged link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The government accused those who attempted the coup of being supporters of the Movement for Togolese Democracy (MTD) an opposition party that had been exiled.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 60

Keesing's Record of World Events estimates that the rebels numbered about 60.

Armsproc: moderate

Keesing's Record of World Events reports that the 60 rebels were "well-armed."

Source:

- Lexis-Nexis; Search, "Ghana" in North/South American New Sources from 61/1986 to 12/31/1986
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 121

ID 164

ID 164

Incompatibility: Government, South Yemen

Dyad ID 564: South Yemen vs. Faction of Yemenite Socialist Party

In late 1985, major divisions had emerged in the ruling Yemenite Socialist Party, primarily between the President and some members of the Yemenite Socialist Party Political Bureau. On January 13, 1986, South Yemen's President Mohammed initiated a preemptive strike by ordering the assassination of four members of the Political Bureau. The assassination attempts were not entirely successful as three members escaped and immediately called for armed support. Civil war erupted between forces loyal to each of the two factions. At the outbreak, it looked like the President's forces had the upper hand, since the navy and air force stayed mostly on his side. However, much of the army threw its support behind the opponents of the president and, after ten days of heavy fighting in the capital, the President fled and the rebels were victorious.

Fighting erupted after an attempted coup against President Ali Nasser Mohammed al-Hassani by hard-line elements of his governing Yemeni Socialist Party. The coup attempt was believed to have been led by a doctrinaire Marxist, former President Abdel Fatah Ismail, who returned last year from self-exile in Moscow. But the handful of Western experts on Southern Yemen agreed that traditional tribal loyalties were an important factor. With more than 1,000 military personnel believed to be in Southern Yemen, the Soviet Union has been the main ally of the country's Marxist Government, the only one in the Arab world. However, Moscow had not backed either side, but was trying to effect a cease-fire.

Rebels: Faction of Yemenite Socialist Party

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none. Although USSR is a key ally, it has not taken sides on the conflict.

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Lexis-Nexis [particularly from the NY Times reports: 1/18/1986, 1/22/1986]

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The armed opposition to the government was led by members of the Yemenite Socialist Party Political Bureau, the ruling body in South Yemen.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebestlow: unclear

Rebesthigh: unclear

Rebstrength: stronger

None of the sources provided any estimate of the troop strength of the supporters of either side. However, the rebel forces were able to gain the upper hand pretty quickly.

Source:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Lexis-Nexis [particularly from the NY Times reports: 1/18/1986, 1/22/1986]

Chapter 122

ID 165

ID 165

Incompatibility: Government, Burkina Faso

Dyad ID 487: Burkina Faso vs. Popular Front

On October 15, 1987, the military leader of Burkina Faso, Captain Thomas Sankara and several of his close advisers were killed in a military coup. The coup was led by another Captain, Blaise Compaore, who was the main adviser to Sankara. Sankara had been a charismatic leader but had been unable to address the rampant poverty experienced by Burkina Faso. The Presidential Guard of Sankara put up resistance when Compaore's forces attacked, and nearly 100 people died in the fighting.

President Sankara is overthrown in a Coup by Compaore, the former minister of State and Justice.

Rebels: Popular Front

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: n/a

Rtypesup: none

Govsuport: n/a

Gtypesup: none

Govextpart: n/a

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

Captain Compaore, the leader of the Popular Front, was the main adviser to Sankara.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: unclear

None of the sources made any reference to the number of troops loyal to either Sankara or Compaore.

Sources:

- Lexis-Nexis
- The Toronto Star (accessed via Lexis Nexis)
- The New York Times (accessed via Lexis Nexis)

Chapter 123

ID 167

ID 167

Incompatibility: Government, Comoros

Dyad ID 158: Comoros vs. Presidential Guard

Comoros achieved independence from France in 1975 and in 1978, Ahmed Abdallah, backed by a mercenary force led by Bob Denard, seized power in a coup d'état. Denard's force became the Presidential Guard, the major security force supporting Abdallah, and Denard had a major economic and political position in the country. France and South Africa continued to support Abdallah's government until 1989 when they pressured him to expel Denard from the country. Abdallah responded to this pressure and, on the night of November 26, 1989, Abdallah was assassinated. Denard was widely believed to have been responsible and in the days following the assassination, he threw out the provisional president and installed a new president. South Africa and France increased pressure on the government of Comoros to remove Denard and on December 15, 1989, Denard left Comoros peacefully.

In 1978 Ahmed Abdallah, supported by the infamous mercenary Bob Denard and 50 of his men, seized power in a coup. Denard and his men had a very favoured economic status on the islands and became deeply involved in Comorian business activities. In 1989 this situation was set to change. France and South Africa - previous backers of Denard and the Presidential Guard, but now with new reform-minded governments pressured Abdallah to dispense with the mercenaries. Denard and the GP seized control of the government in a coup, ousting the provisional president and installing Mohammed Said Djohar as Comoro's third president in less than a week. Severe pressure was put on the mercenaries, and Denard eventually concede defeat, withdrawing peacefully from the island on 15 December 1989.

Rebels: Presidential Guard

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: yes, major. The rebels were French mercenaries.

Rebpresosts: No

Rebsuport: None

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: Explicit. France and S. Africa imposed sanctions when coup leaders took power briefly. France sent naval vessels, but these were not used. France declared that it would not use its troops to support the government but relied on other forms of pressure.

Gtypesup: non-military, financial.

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

Denard and the Presidential Guard had been the security forces for the President and assassinated him when they believed he had agreed to exile them from the country.

Rebestimate: 500

Rebestlow: 300

Rebesthigh: 700

Rebstrength: parity

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that the Presidential Guard had between 300 and 700 troops. This is in comparison to around 1000 troops possessed by the army.

Source:

- Uppsala Conflict Database

Chapter 124

ID 168

ID 168

Incompatibility: Territory, Afar

Ethiopia vs. Afar groups

The Afar reside along what is now the border between Ethiopia and Eritrea. In 1975, the Afar Liberation Front (ALF) declared an armed struggle to protect Afar interests. In 1989, the group joined with other ethnic-based rebel groups such as the Eritrean People's Liberation Front (see conflict id 1780) and the Tigrayan People's Liberation Front (see conflict id 1700) in an attempt to overthrow the Marxist leader Mengistu. In 1991, the joint operations of those groups, led by the TPLF, were successful, and Mengistu was overthrown. After that, the ALF ceased its armed struggle and joined a coalition government led by the TPLF. However, some members of the Afar continued to feel discriminated in Ethiopia and in 1995, the Afar Revolutionary Democratic Unity Front (AFDUF) began pushing for self-determination for the Afar violently. The government responded with violence and in 1996 the conflict reached a higher level of intensity. By the end of 1996 the intensity of the conflict had dropped and negotiations with the government produced a cease-fire in 1997 that most of the factions of the ARDUF appeared to adhere to.

The Afar is a pastoral nomadic people who reside in the area where the borders of Ethiopia, Eritrea, Djibouti and Somali meet. The first phase of the conflict, fought between 1975 and 1991, began just as a new military government had seized power in the country. On 3 June 1975, ALF declared an armed struggle against the government, a struggle that would continue until the overthrow of the Dergue in 1991. In the mid-1990s, the second phase of the conflict began, now involving the Afar Revolutionary Democratic Unity Front (ARDUF), a new rebel group who fought the EPRDF government (see Ethiopia conflict description). ARDUF is instead seeking self-determination, within Ethiopia, for the Afars of both Ethiopia and Eritrea. However, ultimately, ARDUF wants an all Afar independent state, including the Afar population in Djibouti. Negotiations have failed and

the conflict terminated due to low activity and has not been active from 1997 and onwards. Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 51: Ethiopia vs. ALF

Ethiopia against ALF rebels 1975-1991. See conflict description above.

Rebels: ALF

Transconstsupp: explicit. Afars in Djibouti. Note that Eritrea did not exist during this period.

Rebextpart: no

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: None

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Rebpolwing: no

The Afar Liberation Front was an armed group that did not compete politically in Ethiopia until it participated in the overthrow of Ethiopian President Mengistu, when it became a political party.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the sources gives any indication of the troop strength of the ALF. However, it is clear that they were the weakest party in the TPLF/EPLF/OLF/ALF coalition that overthrew Mengistu in 1991.

Mobcap: low

Minorities at Risk reports that the Afar only constitute 4% of the total Ethiopian population.

Dyad ID 52: Ethiopia vs. ARDUF

This entry refers to Gov't versus ARDUF rebels. The start date in the spreadsheet reports that 1975 was the first year of ARDUF activity, however, this is incorrect. 1996 was the first year of violence

Rebels: ARDUF

Transconstsupp: Explicit. Afar groups in Eritrea and Djibouti

Rebextpart: yes, major. ARDUF is also present in Eritrea. However, a different group FRUD is active in Djibouti.

Rebpresosts: yes, extensive. ARDUF is also active in Eritrea

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage
- ARDUF website

Rebpolwing: unclear

None of the sources gave any indication whether the ARDUF was just an armed group or also had a political wing.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the sources gave any indication of the number of troops possessed by the ARDUF. However, it is clear that the ARDUF was weaker than the total might of the Ethiopian military.

Mobcap: low

Minorities at Risk reports that the Afar only constitute 4% of the total Ethiopian population.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Minorities at Risk
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 125

ID 169

ID 169

Incompatibility: Territory, Kashmir

Dyad ID 355: India vs. Kashmir Insurgents

Kashmir is a region that has been very conflictual, both within India and as a subject of contention between India and Pakistan. Upon India's independence and partition into India and Pakistan in 1947, Kashmir was made part of India on a temporary basis. In 1948, India and Pakistan went to war over the region and the cease-fire that ended that war produced a de-facto border that has since divided the region between India and Pakistan. Throughout India's almost-sixty year independent history there has been a significant movement in Kashmir demanding secession from India (this movement is split over whether this secession should lead to an independent state of Kashmir or to the province being joined with Pakistan). In the late 1980s, this opposition became violent as the Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF) began attacking Indian government targets. For the next fourteen years, the conflict has continued at varying levels of intensity resulting in a high-state of instability in the region and producing thousands of casualties. The conflict is ongoing as of the end of 2003.

Kashmir insurgency. The insurgency has its origin in the state's disputed accession to India following the turbulent partition of the subcontinent in 1947. A series of anti-government demonstrations, strikes and violent attacks on government targets launched in July 1988 marked the onset of the Kashmir insurgency. In 1989, the first year of recorded conflict, the Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF), was the single dominant rebel group. By January 1990, there were as many as 40 different militant outfits. The main division is between the pro-Pakistani elements favoring accession to Pakistan and those favoring Kashmir's independence. India has repeatedly accused Pakistan of supporting the Kashmir separatists through provisions of arms, training of militants, as well as allowing infiltration along the border between the two countries. Pakistan has explicitly

denied these allegations. However, it is clear that infiltration by non-Kashmir militants across the Line of Control occurs. Conflict is ongoing.

Rebels: Kashmir insurgents

Transconstsupp: Explicit. Supported by militant Islamist groups. Also has a large network of diaspora supporters.

Rebextpart: yes, major. Non-local fighters from Pakistan and other parts of S.Asia/Middle East have participated in the fighting. Also recruitment among diaspora communities.

Rebpresosts: Extensive. Bases located in Pakistan.

Rebsupport: Explicit. Pakistan supports some of the Rebel groups. Note that Uppsala reports that Pakistani support is merely alleged. Pakistan denies providing military assistance to any group. However, it is clear from other reports that Pakistan is aiding some of the groups. Even if it is not actively aiding groups, it is tacitly permitting groups to use its territory for bases.

Rtypesup: Military. Particularly in the form of bases, but some groups may be given supplies

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage
- Patrick Brogan

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The JKLF and other militants have pursued the conflict violently and are not political organizations.

Rebestimate: 5000

Rebestlow: 300

Rebesthigh: 10000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database gives estimates of the number of troops possessed by Kashmiri Insurgents ranging from 300 to 10,000 over this period. This is in comparison to the over 1 million troops possessed by the entire Indian army and the over 500,000 Indian troops deployed in Kashmir.

Centcont: No

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the Kashmiri opposition movement was extremely fractionalized, with over 40 different organizations participating in the struggle.

Armsproc: moderate

The Kashmiri militants are supplied with arms by Pakistan.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 126

ID 170

ID 170

Incompatibility: Territory, Assam

India vs. Assamese and Bodos

India is a large multi-national state that faces challenges from several ethnic groups demanding increased autonomy, leading up to secession. In the northeast region of Assam, the Indian government faces these challenges from two main groups: the Assamese and the Bodos. The two conflicts are distinct, the Assamese and Bodos are seeking different objectives, but they are linked. Additionally, in both cases one of the major grievances driving conflicts has been the issue of migration of Bengali-speaking peoples into Assamese and Bodo areas. The Bodos were historically a majority in northern Assam but over the last twenty years have lost that status due to high rates of migration into Bodo territories. In the 1980s, two political organizations, the All Bodo Student Union (ABSU) and the Bodo People's Action Committee (BPAC), were formed to press the state to accede to a range of demands, including a Bodo state where Bodo would be the national language and greater access for the Bodo population to government jobs and higher education. In the early 1980s, these groups carried out some attacks to pressure the government to accede to their demands but, since the end of 1990, they have largely pursued a nonviolent approach. In the 1990s, however, two other Bodo groups have emerged, the National Democratic Front of Bodoland (NDFB-formerly the Bodoland Security Force (BDSF)) and the Bodoland Liberation Tiger Force (BLTF). Each group has different demands, the BLTF is seeking greater autonomy within India while the NDFB is demanding secession, and both have utilized more violence than the ABSU and BPAC. The Assamese are the dominant group in the state of Assam. However, they also feel threatened by the in-migration of Bengalis into northern India. In the 1970s, the United Liberation Front of Assam (ULFA) formed to push for the banning of migration into Assam and eventually for the formation of an independent state of Assam. The conflict stayed at a low level of intensity until 1990, when the ULFA began to push its demands more violently, and the Indian govern-

ment dissolved the provincial authority in Assam and assumed direct control over the province. In 1990 and 1991 the conflict continued at a moderate level of intensity, but the ULFA was not able to accomplish much militarily. In December 1991 negotiations between the government and some members of the ULFA over the terms of their surrender lead to a general amnesty in which thousands of ULFA fighters voluntarily disarmed. A faction of the organization rejected the negotiations, however, and continued the armed struggle, which continues at a low level of intensity through the end of 2003.

2710-2240-1 and 2710-2240-2 may be deleted. All of these records refer to the UFLA
India Versus Assamese Insurgents The insurgency in Assam primarily emerged out of one single issue: the influx of illegal immigrants from Bangladesh/East Pakistan. The United Liberation Front of Assam, established on 7 April 1979, took on an operational agenda closely connected to the anti-foreign plank of the other Assamese groups. However, its political goal was broader, that is: "to establish a sovereign, independent Assam. In December 1991 talks commenced over the issue of ULFA's surrender, and a general amnesty was declared for rebels who lay down their arms. Within one year approximately 4 000 ULFA cadres had surrendered. A core of hardliners within the ULFA cadres, however, refused to surrender. The remaining ULFA cadres were forced to operate from neighboring countries. Bangladesh, Burma and Bhutan have been accused by the Indian government of aiding the rebels, but apart from operational bases on neighboring territory, it is not clear if there is active help. ULFA's links with the Pakistan Inter Services Intelligence seem somewhat more established, though they are denied by Pakistan. India has negotiated with Burma, Bangladesh and Bhutan to agree on joint efforts to curb rebel activity. Conflict remains active.

India Versus Bodo Insurgents: The Bodos were once in majority on the northern riverbank of Brahmaputra in Assam, but immigration during the last century has reduced them to a minority. The call for a "Bodo homeland" in this territory has been voiced by several groups. The primary warring parties in the conflict are, however, the Indian government on one side and the Bodo insurgent groups: the All Bodo Student Union (ABSU), National Democratic Front of Bodoland (NDFB), and Bodo Liberation Tiger Force (BLTF) on the other. While negotiations have taken place, the NDFB remains active. The group is closely linked with Assamese rebels (above).

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 296: India vs. ULFA

Rebels: UFLA

Transconstsupp: none

Rebelextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases located in Burma, Bangladesh, and Bhutan, though apparently not with the support of these governments.

Rebsupport: alleged. Claimed that Pakistan has been assisting the rebels, which Pakistan denies.

Rtypesup: military, alleged.

Govsupport: explicit. Neighboring countries (Bhutan, Bangladesh, Burma) have at various time acted to curb rebel activities on their border and have signed agreements allowing India to make limited cross-border attacks on rebels.

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The ULFA served as both an armed insurgent group and a political movement. Keesing's Record of World Events reported in January 1991 that the Indian government had decided to ban the organization because of its use of violence.

Rebestimate: 4,000

Rebestlow: 500

Rebesthigh: 4,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database gives estimates for the troop strength of the ULFA ranging from 500 to 4,000 in this period. This is in comparison to over 1 million troops for the Indian army.

Centcont: yes Strengthcent: low

The ULFA was a factionalized organization that split over the issue of negotiations with the government.

Newendate: 12/31/1991

In December 1991, the Indian government offered an amnesty to ULFA members and thousands of them surrendered. This led to a splinter in the organization and a faction of the ULFA, often called the "real ULFA" continued the armed struggle.

Chapter 127

ID 171

ID 171

Incompatibility: Territory, Aceh

Dyad ID 347: Indonesia vs. GAM

This conflict is best described in two periods.

Period 1 (1990-1991) Aceh is a region of Indonesia which had three attributes making it prime for conflict: the Acehnese are culturally and religiously different from the dominant Indonesian population, Aceh is a rich province, and it has a history of independence (it was an independent sultanate for 500 years prior to the 19th century). Beginning in the 1950s, the province has a long history of opposition to the Indonesian government and the Acehnese have pushed for greater autonomy from the central government for a long time. In 1976, the Free Aceh Movement (GAM) declared an independent Aceh, and that proclamation was met with a violent response by the central government. The organization operated at a very low-level throughout the 1980s, but the continued influx of migrants into Aceh increased the grievance of the population. In 1989, local Acehnese army recruits joined GAM and it launched a new armed struggle against the government. The organization was overmatched by the government, however, and was rather quickly defeated.

Period 2 In the late 1990s, Indonesia was in economic crisis and the grievances among the Acehnese population had only increased. In 1997, GAM again launched an armed struggle against the government and in 1999 and 2000 there were massive protests calling for independence. Negotiations produced brief respites from fighting in 2001, 2002, and 2003, however, none of the agreements were fully implemented and the conflict was ongoing as of the end of 2003. As the conflict has continued the GAM has become progressively stronger and has gained in its position contra the Indonesian government.

Aceh is located on the northern tip of the Indonesian island of Sumatra. The region is rich in natural resources such as oil and natural gas. The Free Aceh Movement (GAM) claims that if the region

would be allowed to use all the revenue from operations in the province, it would be able to establish an independent Muslim sultanate like Brunei Darussalam. Religious and economic grievances led to the Acehese rebellion led by Teungku Hasan M. di Tiro - founder and chairman of GAM - who declared an independent Aceh in December 1976 (first GAM rebellion was defeated). The increasing influx of migrant workers and their non-Islamic behaviour led to widespread dissatisfaction among the Acehese population throughout the 1980s. Some younger GAM members had been trained by Libya, and a discontent among local army recruits led to a reinvented GAM in 1989. Throughout the conflict, the GAM leadership and its government-in-exile in Sweden, have managed to lead the political movement. The Libyan government helped GAM with training 1986-89, but did not supply any arms or other backing for the group. Negotiations in the conflict suddenly began in the beginning of 2000. Still no resolution.

Rebels: GAM

Transconstsupp: no

Rebextpart: no

Rebpresosts: some. Reported that leadership resides in Sweden.

Rebsupport: alleged. Conflicting reports about Libya's involvement.

Rtypesup: military, alleged. FAS reports that there was Libyan support. Uppsala and Minorities at Risk do not count Libya as a supporting party.

Govsupport: Explicit. Military training by the US.

Gtypesup: military. In the form of training

Govextpart: none.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>
- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Notes on Coding

Period 1

Rebpolwing: no

The GAM is an independence movement and does not participate in the domestic Indonesian political process.

Rebestimate: 1,100

Rebestlow: 200

Rebesthigh: 2,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 1990 the GAM had between 200 and 2000 troops at its disposal. This is in comparison to 12,000 troops for the Indonesian army.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Aceh

Effterrcont: low

The GAM was able to exert a degree of control in Aceh, however, it could not in this period do very much that a normal governing body can.

Period 2

Rebpolwing: no

The GAM is an independence movement and does not participate in the domestic Indonesian political process.

Rebestimate: 14,000

Rebestlow: 800

Rebesthigh: 27,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database gives estimates for the troop strength of GAM ranging from 800 to 27,000 in this period. This is in comparison to an estimated 30,000-50,000 Indonesian troops deployed in Aceh.

Terrcont: yes Terrname: Aceh Effterrcont: moderate

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that by this period of the conflict GAM had been able to set up "alternative local administrations in parts of Aceh."

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Minorities at Risk Group Profiles

Chapter 128

ID 172

ID 172

Incompatibility: Government, Panama

Dyad ID 461: Panama vs. Military Faction

On October 3, 1989, a group of military officers seized Panamanian President Manuel Noriega and the military headquarters. They listed their major grievances as corruption in the army and were protesting Noriega's management of the military. The United States had also indicated its support for armed opposition to Noriega, although the military officers did not indicate that they would hand the leader over to the United States to face drug charges. Shortly after the attempted coup d'état, military forces loyal to Noriega surrounded the military headquarters and the military faction was defeated.

On 3 October a group of officers captured the military headquarters by force. They forced Noriega and his general staff to retire for a few hours until troops loyal to Noriega regained control of the installation after heavy fighting.

Rebels: Military faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: Explicit. Financial backing by the United States.

Rtypesup: non-military.

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The military officers who attempted the coup were opposed to Noriega's management of the military and did not have a political wing.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

It is not clear how many officers participated in the attempted coup. However, it is clear that the portion of the army that remained loyal to Noriega was stronger.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: high

The attempted coup was led by Major Moiss Giroldi Vega.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 129

ID 174

ID 174

Incompatibility: Territory, Bougainville

Dyad ID 337: Papua New Guinea vs. Bougainville Revolutionary Army (BRA)

The island of Bougainville has a population that is ethnically different from the bulk of the population of Papua New Guinea. Additionally, Bougainville has much mineral wealth in the form of a copper mine which, from prior to independence in 1975, was mined by a British-Australian mining company. One of the major factors motivating the grievance of the Bougainville population was that they received very little benefit from the large copper exports from the island. In late 1988, the Bougainville Revolutionary Army (BRA) was formed, calling for independence for the island and a greater percentage of the profits from the copper mine. The BRA targeted violence against the mining company and in December, 1988 the mine closed. The initial success of the BRA prompted the Papua New Guinean military to blockade the island, which created major hardships for the population. Negotiations from 1994 to 1997 produced little effect, but in October 1997 a truce was signed which led to a major decrease in the level of violence observed. A series of cease-fires and partial peace accords over the next four years led up to the 2001 Bougainville Peace Agreement which gave greater autonomy to the island and laid the groundwork for a vote on independence in 10-15 years.

Bougainville is an island located far east of the main territory of Papua New Guinea, and has always had more in common with nearby Solomon Islands. When Papua New Guinea became independent in 1975, the Bougainville provincial government voted for the formation of a separate state. In 1988 the Bougainville Revolutionary Army launched its first attacks demanding an independent state. Conflict activity decreased 1997, and following the signing of a truce in October 1997 where the parties agreed to immediate positive measures, almost no clashes were recorded. The peace process continued in the coming years through another cease-fire signed in January 1998, and

several meetings where different aspects of the future status of Bougainville were discussed. In 2001, these were settled within the framework of the Bougainville Peace Agreement.

Rebels: BRA

Transconstsupp: tacit. Sympathy by people of the Solomon Islands.

Rebextpart: no

Rebpresosts: some. Rebels located in the Solomon Islands.

Rebsupport: explicit. Mostly diplomatic support by Solomon Islands but claimed that there may be logistical support as well.

Rtypesup: endorsement. By Solomon Islands. Alleged that SI was allowing rebels to set up bases on its territory, but not clear if government actually encouraged this.

Govsupport: Explicit. Military assistance by Australia. Also logistical and financial assistance by Malaysia,

Gtypesup: military.

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage
- International Boundaries News Database

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

The BRA was an armed movement that fought for independence for the island and so did not participate in domestic political affairs.

Rebestimate: 2000

Rebestlow: 30

Rebesthigh: 20,000

Rebstrength: parity

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates the troop strength of the BRA as follows: In 1989: 30-200; in 1990: no information; in 1991: 20,000; in 1992: 100-1000; in 1993, 1994, and 1995: 2000, in 1996: 3000; in 1997: 200-1000; in 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001: no information. This is in comparison to the following estimates for the troops deployed by Papua New Guinea to the conflict: In 1989: 800-3200; in 1990: 500-3200; in 1991: 300-1100; in 1992: 500-4000; in 1993: 3800; in 1994: 3200; in 1995: 3800; in 1996: 1400-3500; in 1997: 3800-4700; in 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001: no information.

Mobcap: moderate

The BRA was able to mobilize a good segment of the population of Bougainville to its cause. However, there were also pro-government militias that fought against the BRA on the island.

Armsproc: low

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the BRA used primarily weapons that were leftover on the island from the Second World War.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Minorities at Risk Group Profiles

Chapter 130

ID 175

ID 175

Incompatibility: Government, Romania

Dyad ID 357: Romania vs. National Salvation Front

In December 1989, Romania was wracked by huge demonstrations against the government. The country had been led by Nicolae Ceausescu since 1974, a nationalist leader who had been popular until the country went through a dire recession in the 1980s. The demonstrations began in Timisoara, Romania, on December 17, 1989, and within days had spread to a much wider area of the country. The state security services responded by attacking the demonstrators, but on December 22 the Romania army defected from supporting the government and began backing the demonstrators. Ceausescu and his wife tried to flee the country but were stopped by the military and were hastily tried on December 25 and executed. In the aftermath of the overthrow of the government a new governing body, the National Salvation Front, was hastily thrown together by the organizers of the demonstrations.

On 17 December 1989 demonstrations against the Ceausescu regime broke out in Timisoara, a town of approximately 330,000 people close to the Hungarian border. After initial successes by the insurgents, Securitate (Romanian Secret Police) opened fire on civilians throughout the town. The demonstrations spread to Bucharest, and on 22 December the Romanian army defected to the demonstrators. Ceausescu was deposed.

Rebels: National Salvation Front

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

Although the organizers of the demonstration formed a government once Ceasescu was overthrow, while the conflict took place it was not clear who the organizers were and they did not compete in the domestic political system.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much stronger

None of the sources gave any indication of the number of people participating in the insurrection. However, once the military defected the National Salvation Front was much stronger than the government.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 131

ID 177

ID 177

Incompatibility: Territory, Azawad

Mali vs. Tuareg organizations

In the early 1990s, the return of many Malian Tuaregs who had left the country during droughts in the 1970s and 1980s combined with the government's failure to deliver promised resettlement aid led to the creation of several Tuareg organizations opposed to the government of Mali. Although a consistent level of low-intensity conflict was present throughout much of the 1990s, most of these Tuareg organizations were small and were not able to accomplish much militarily. Two organizations, however, were able to become strong enough to push the conflict into the category of a minor armed conflict. In June 1990, the Azawad People's Movement (MPA), an organization dedicated to pressuring Tuareg interests in Mali, had its first armed clashes with the government and fighting over the next seven months produced several casualties. On January 6, 1991, the MPA signed a peace agreement with the government in Algeria, which led to an immediate split in the organization. Low-intensity conflict continued between various Algerian groups and the Malian government through September, 1994 when the Islamic Arab Front of Azawad (FIAA) declared war against the government. The fighting continued until January 7, 1995, when the FIAA declared a total ceasefire.

The Touaregs are a pastoral, nomadic people, scattered among a number of West- and North African states. In 1988, encouraged by Libya, the Malian section of the movement split from the Nigerien one, and formed the Mouvement Populaire de Libération de l'Azawad (MPLA). The MPLA initiated an armed struggle against the Malian government in June 1990. The Arab component of the movement broke away and created Front Islamique Arabe de l'Azaouad (FIAA). The group was the first to take an explicitly ethnic and religious title and it had a more militant Islamic orientation. The question of potential foreign support to the warring parties remains largely

unclear. The Malian regime blamed Mauritania for allowing rebels to launch attacks from its territory. The regime also accused Libya of supporting the MPA. It has been suggested that the FIAA received support from ethnic Tuaj Arabs in Niger. However, none of these allegations have been confirmed. Following a series of preparatory meetings, four rounds of negotiations were held in Algiers from late December 1991 to March 1992. The rebels now negotiated together in the newly established umbrella organisation MFUA. On 11 April the National Pact was signed ending the conflict.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 96: Mali vs. MPA

Rebels: MPA

Transconstsupp: tacit. Sympathy from ethnic Tuareg in Niger. Also among expatriates

Rebextpart. No. Although there are several returning refugees that have taken part in the fighting, these do not amount to an organized transnational actor, i.e. there does not appear to be organized expatriate communities that are involved in rebel recruitment, funding, etc.

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: explicit. Libya provided military equipment.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage
- International Boundaries News Database

Rebpolwing: no

None of the sources made any reference to the MPA having a political wing.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the sources gave any indication of the troop strength of the MPA. However, it is clear that the group was substantially weaker than the Malian government.

Centcont: no

The MPA was beset by fractionalization, as best demonstrated by the group splintering when it signed a peace agreement with the Malian government.

Mobcap: low

Minorities at Risk reports that the Tuareg represent only 6% of the population of Mali.

Dyad ID 97: Mali vs. FIAA

Rebels: FIAA

Transconstsupp: tacit. From Tuaregs in Niger. Possibly sympathy from Arab and Muslim groups.

Rebextpart: no. Although there are several returning refugees that have taken part in the fighting, these do not amount to an organized transnational actor, i.e. there does not appear to be organized expatriate communities that are involved in rebel recruitment, funding, etc.

Rebpresosts: no, unknown. Group was alleged to have launched attacks from Mauritania, but this has not been confirmed.

Rebsupport: alleged. Mali alleges that Mauritania shelters rebels, but this is denied.

Rtypesup: military, alleged.

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

None of the sources made any reference to the FIAA having a political wing.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the sources gave any indication of the troop strength of the FIAA. However, it is clear that the group was substantially weaker than the Malian government.

Cencont: unclear

None of the sources gave any information that would indicate whether the FIAA had a central control and how strong that control was.

Mobcap: low

Minorities at Risk reports that the Tuareg represent only 6% of the population of Mali.

Newstartdate: 11/13/1994

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict reached 25 battledeaths on November 13, 1994.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Minorities at Risk

Dyad ID 650: Mali vs. ATNMC

TBA

Chapter 132

ID 178

ID 178

Incompatibility: Territory, Air and Azawad

Niger vs. Tuareg organizations

Throughout the 1990s, the government of Niger has faced armed resistance from several different guerilla groups fighting on behalf of Tuareg interests. The Tuareg are a primarily nomadic ethnic group who make up about 8% of the population of Niger and live primarily in the northern parts of the country near the Sahara. In the 1980s, severe drought compounded the government of Niger's failure to follow through on promises of development and humanitarian assistance to heighten Tuareg grievances. In May, 1990, armed rebellion broke out when armed Tuaregs attacked a prison in northeastern Niger, an action which was followed by severe reprisals by the government. In September 1991, the Air and Azawad Liberation Front (FLAA) formed as a guerilla organization to challenge government mistreatment of the Tuareg population and to push for greater autonomy and development. In 1992, the conflict reached a higher level of intensity and negotiations between the government and the FLAA produced a peace agreement at Paris, France on June 10, 1993. The signing of the agreement immediately led to a split within the FLAA, with the "old FLAA" being opposed to the agreement and a new organization, the Front for the Liberation of Tamoust supporting it. In September 1993, a new umbrella organization, the Coordination of the Armed Resistance (CRA) was formed to coordinate the various groups, and it engaged in armed struggle with the government of Niger for the next 13 months until on October 9, 1994, a peace agreement was signed between the CRA and the government at Ougadougou, Burkina Faso. In November 1996 a number of small Tuareg organizations united to form a new political movement, the Union of Forces of the Armed Resistance (UFRA). The UFRA at its formation expressed its commitment to the existing peace accords but by March 1997 began an armed struggle out of frustration with the slow pace of the peace agreement. In November, the government and UFRA signed a peace accord which ended the conflict.

These various groups are various factions and splinter groups of the same movement. Although they are listed as separate groups, they may be merged into a single record. If decided to retain their distinctiveness, the variables below remain unchanged

The Touaregs are a pastoral, nomadic people, scattered among a number of West- and North African states. 19 October 1991, the Front de libération de l'Ar et l'Azaouad (FLAA), was created with the stated aim of fighting for a federal system with greater self-determination, as well as for a better economic situation for the Touareg population. During the course of the conflict, the Touareg rebels have split into a number of different groups. An umbrella organisation - Coordination de la résistance armée (CRA) - was created in September 1993. As a peace deal went forward, factions of the CRA defected and formed the Union des forces de la résistance armée (UFRA). Foreign involvement in the conflict has been limited to material, military support to the government from France, China and Libya. The rebels have not received any outside help, but have rather sought help and cooperation from within the country.

Rebels: FLAA, CRA, UFRA

Transconstsupp: tacit. Support by Touaregs in Mali and among expatriates in Algeria and Libya.

Rebextpart: no. Although there are several returning refugees that have taken part in the fighting, these do not amount to an organized transnational actor, i.e. there does not appear to be organized expatriate communities that are involved in rebel recruitment, funding, etc.

Rebpresosts: no

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: explicit. France, China, and Libya, have provided government with military equipment.

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage
- International Boundaries News Database

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 110: Niger vs. FLAA

Rebpolwing: no

None of the sources available made any reference to a political wing of the FLAA.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the sources available made any reference to the number of troops possessed by the FLAA. However it is clear from the conduct of the fighting that the group was weaker than the army of Niger.

Centcont: no

The FLAA was beset by fractionalization since its formation, as demonstrated by the fact that the group immediately broke into two when the leader of the FLAA signed a peace agreement with the government.

Mobcap: low

According to Minorities at Risk, the Tuareg represent only 8% of Niger's population.

Newstartdate: 10/31/1992

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that October 31, 1992, is the date when the conflict reached 25 battledeaths. The armed struggle began much early, sometime in October 1991.

Dyad ID 111: Niger vs. CRA

Rebpolwing: no

None of the sources available made any reference to a political wing of the CRA.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the sources available made any reference to the number of troops possessed by the CRA. However it is clear from the conduct of the fighting that the group was weaker than the army of Niger.

Centcont: unclear

None of the sources available gave any indication about whether the CRA had a central command structure or how strong the control of the center was.

Mobcap: low

According to Minorities at Risk, the Tuareg represent only 8% of Niger's population.

Newstartdate: 5/16/1994

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict reached 25 battlefield deaths on May 16, 1994.

Since the mid-1990s, the government of Niger has periodically faced insurgency by Tuareg groups. Although these groups make demands related to greater autonomy, they also are fighting for governmental change and, as such, they are treated as being in a governmental conflict. Many Tuaregs went abroad in the 1970s and 1980s but were forced to return home in the late 1980s. Some of these had received military training in Libya and in 1991 they formed the Air and Azawad Liberation Front (FLAA). In 1993, the FLAA joined with other groups and began demanding territorial

autonomy, so the conflict changed incompatibility. In 1996, the Union of the Forces of the Resistance Army (UFRA) joined the conflict and fought for governmental change. In 1997, UFRA signed an agreement with the Nigerien government. In 2007, the Niger Justice Movement (MNJ) entered the conflict. The MNJ was upset that the government had not fully implemented a decentralization plan agreed to in the peace agreement. Negotiations in 2009-2010 have led to many MNJ fighters laying down their arms.

Dyad ID 112: Niger vs. UFRA

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: unclear

The Uppsala Conflict Database refers to the UFRA as a "political party." No reference was found to whether this group was legal in Niger.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the sources available made any reference to the number of troops possessed by the UFRA. However it is clear from the conduct of the fighting that the group was weaker than the army of Niger.

Centcont: unclear

None of the sources available gave any indication about whether the UFRA had a central command structure or how strong the control of the center was.

Mobcap: low

According to Minorities at Risk, the Tuareg represent only 8% of Niger's population.

Newstartdate: 10/19/1997

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the conflict between the UFRA and the government reached 25 battledeaths sometime between October 19, 1997 and November 29, 1997.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Minorities at Risk Group Profiles

Chapter 133

ID 179

ID 179

Incompatibility: Government, Rwanda

Dyad ID 127: Rwanda vs. FPR

Rwanda has two main ethnic groups, the Hutu (who represent approximately 85% of the population) and the Tutsi (who represent about 14% of the population). There is a long history of conflict between the Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda dating back to the colonial period. Historically, the Tutsi had political control of the country and this continued throughout most of the Belgian colonial rule. From 1959-1964, however, there was a "Hutu Revolution" in the country, in which Hutu took power and tens of thousands of Tutsi left Rwanda as refugees. Many of these refugees went to Uganda where they stayed for thirty years, becoming embroiled in internal conflicts there (see conflict id 2180). In the late 1980s, the Rwandan Tutsi refugees in Uganda began organizing into a coherent fighting force, the Rwandan Patriotic Front (FPR) and in 1990, the FPR launched attacks into northwestern Rwanda aimed at overthrowing the Hutu-dominated government there. Over the next three years the war between the FPR and the Hutu government was bloody, but the FPR proved to be stronger militarily and was prevented from capturing Kigali primarily by international pressure to negotiate. A peace accord signed at Arusha, Tanzania, in 1993 produced a peace agreement in which the parties agreed to share power in the government and military. There was partial implementation of the peace accords, however, Hutu militants within and outside the government used the period after Arusha to finalize plans for genocide against the Rwandan Tutsi population. On April 4, 1994, a plane carrying the President of Rwanda, Juvenal Habyarimana was shot down and the genocide began, resulting in the death of between 500,000 and 1 million Tutsi and moderate Hutu. The genocide continued for the next three months until the RPF, who had restarted the war shortly after the genocide broke out, took Kigali and 2 million Hutu fled the country, many into neighboring Zaire (see conflict id 2810, dyad 2360).

On 1 October 1990, the FPR launched an invasion from Uganda. In the first phase, 1990-1994, President Habyarimana and the Hutu party MRND was in power. In 1994, genocide was launched by extremist Hutu forces on moderate Hutus and all the Tutsi population. The FPR managed to stop the genocide and to take over power. The ex government forces (Ex-FAR) and the Hutu militia Interahamw fled to Zaire. The second phase refers to the Hutu rebel groups located in Zaire (above).

Rebels: FPR

Transconstsupp: Explicit. Tutsis in Burundi, DRC, refugee communities.

Rebextpart: yes, major. Recruitment among refugee populations.

Rebpresosts: extensive. Were present in Uganda and supported by the Ugandan govt.

Rebsup: Explicit. Assistance from Uganda.

Rtypesup: Military. Uganda allowed bases and provided military support

Govsup: Explicit. Belgium provided arms. Also military help from France, S. Africa.

Gtypesup: military.

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: no

After the Arusha Accords, the FPR was a participant in the Rwandan government. However, prior to Arusha the FPR existed solely as a military force and did not participate in the domestic Rwandan political process.

Rebestimate: 15,000

Rebestlow: 3,000

Rebesthigh: 20,000

Rebstrength: stronger

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute gives the following estimates for the troop strength of the FPR. In 1990 and 1991, no estimate; in 1992, 3,000-5,000; in 1993, 10,000-15,000; in 1994, 15,000-20000. This estimate is in comparison to the following estimates for the Rwandan army: in 1991, 5,200; in 1992 and 1993, 40,000; in 1994, 30,000. Despite the fact that the Rwandan army had more troops than the FPR, the FPR represented a more formidable fighting force because it was better organized, trained, and more combat-experienced.

Mobcap: low

The FPR represented the Rwandan Tutsi, who were a significant minority of the overall population.

Newendate: 7/19/1994

On July 19, 1994, the FPR took Kigali and established a new government there.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks
- Prunier, Gerard (1997). *The Rwanda Crisis: History of a Genocide*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Dyad ID 128: Rwanda vs. Opposition Alliance

When the Rwandan genocide ended in July 1994 with the Tutsi Rwandan Patriotic Front (FPR) taking Kigali (see conflict id 2810, dyad 2350), 2 million Hutu refugees fled Rwanda, including 1.2 million that went to Zaire. The refugees in Zaire included many of the members of the ex-Rwandan Armed Forces (ex-FAR) and many members of Interahamwe, an organization of Hutu youth militias that had been instrumental in the conduct of the genocide. The ex-FAR and Interahamwe used the protection of the refugee camps in eastern Zaire to regroup and to reorganize in order to launch attacks back into Rwanda. The continued instability in Western Rwanda resulting from these attacks was the main reason that in 1996 Rwanda supported Laurent Kabila as he attacked the refugee camps and began a campaign that would the next year remove Zairean President Mobutu from power (see conflict id 1860). Relations between Kigali and Kabila soured quickly, however, over continued harassment of Western Rwanda by ex-FAR and Interahamwe based in eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC, the former Zaire). By 1998, the intensity of this harassment had progressively increased as the various Hutu opposition groups based in DRC (including ex-FAR and Interahamwe) had reorganized and had 10,000 plus troops at their command. Over the next four years the battle between the Tutsi Rwandan Patriotic Army (RPA, the former FPR) and these Hutu opposition groups continued, but the fighting took place almost exclusively outside the territory of the Rwanda, both in the DRC and in Burundi. In 2002, a peace agreement between the governments of DRC and Rwanda meant that the Opposition Alliance could no longer base on Congolese territory and hurt their ability to continue to wage war. Despite this, the conflict continues at a low level of intensity to this day.

After the Rwandan genocide, the FPR took control of the government (see next entry). This conflict is with the Hutu exiles that have fled to the DRC.

Rebels: Opposition Alliance

Transconstsupp: explicit. Support by Hutus in the DRC and Burundi, refugee communities.

Rebextpart: yes, major. Recruitment among refugee populations.

Rebpresosts: Extensive. Groups are based in the DRC with government backing. Also may be some rebels located in Kenya.

Rebsupport: explicit. The DRC backs the Hutu rebels. Kenya and Tanzania may also be giving support, but this is denied. Later claims were made that Uganda is helping the rebels.

Rtypesup: military. Especially the granting of extraterritorial bases.

Govsupport: explicit. The US provided non-lethal military aid. Kenya and Burundi have also given police assistance.

Gtypesup: non-military.

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

Several of the various parties in the Opposition Alliance have organized political movements. However, the Rwandan government considers these organizations to be war criminals and does not allow them to participate.

Rebestimate: 40,000

Rebestlow: 10,000

Rebesthigh: 65,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute provides the following estimates for the troop strength of the opposition alliance. In 1998, 50,000-65,000 troops; in 1999, 30,000-50,000 troops; in 2000, 30,000-40,000; in 2001, 30,000-50,000; in 2002, 10,000-12,000. These estimates are in comparison to the following estimates for the Rwandan army. In 1998, 55,000; in 1999, 2000 and 2001, 40,000-60,000; in 2002, 30,000-75,000. The Opposition Alliance is not a match for the Rwandan army and has been able to survive because it has based on the territory of the DRC.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks

Dyad ID 128: Rwanda vs. FDLR

TBA

Chapter 134

ID 180

ID 180

Incompatibility: Territory, Casamance

Dyad ID 129: Senegal vs. MFDC

The Casamance is the southern region of Senegal bordering Guinea-Bissau which is separated from much of the rest of the country by Gambia. The population of Casamance is primarily from the Diola ethnic group and is substantially ethnically different from the general Senegalese population. The Diola have been systematically politically excluded in Senegal in its independent history. In 1947, the Movement of the Democratic Forces of the Casamance (MFDC) was formed to push for independence for the region. The MFDC was largely inactive until the 1980s, when it organized political protests, some of which were met with violence by the state security forces. The MFDC began responding with force and by 1983 the conflict had reached a higher level of intensity. Throughout the last twenty years a series of armed clashes have occurred between the MFDC and the state security forces. At the same time, a long string of negotiations have produced several cease-fires, although none of the cease-fires has actually been implemented. The conflict persists at a low-level equilibrium, with alternating violence and negotiations and no sign of an impending resolution.

The Mouvement des forces dmocratiques de Casamance (Movement of the Democratic Forces of the Casamance, MFDC) was created in 1947 as a separatist movement. The MFDC was quiescent until December 1982, when a local demonstration organized by activists from the Diola tribe led to the revival of the movement. Around Christmas 1982, the demonstration for the independence of Casamance led to violent clashes with the security forces. According to the Government of Senegal, the MFDC rebels received Iraqi or Libyan weapons via Mauritania, were based in the Gambia, and enjoyed the support of senior officers in the army of Guinea-Bissau. The Gambian and Guinea-Bissau denied the accusations. A security accord was signed between Senegal and

Guinea-Bissau in 1996, which allows the Senegalese troops to pursue rebel forces across the border into Guinea-Bissau. It was also reported that Guinea-Bissau launched an offensive against MFDC bases in 2001. The USA and France supplied weapons to the Senegalese Government. Conflict continues.

Rebels: MFDC

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: no.

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases located especially in Guinea-Bissau and Gambia.

Rebsupport: alleged. According to the Government of Senegal, the MFDC rebels received Iraqi or Libyan weapons via Mauritania, were based in the Gambia, and enjoyed the support of senior officers in the army of Guinea-Bissau. This has not been confirmed.

Rtypesup: military, alleged.

Govsupport: explicit. The USA and France supplied weapons to the Senegalese Government. Gambia and Guinea-Bissau have agreed to adopt measures restricting rebel activity on their territory.

Gtypesup: military.

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage
- International Boundaries News Database

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

None of the sources utilized provided any indication that the MFDC participates in the Senegalese political process.

Rebestimate: 2,000

Rebestlow: 300

Rebesthigh: 4,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that the MFD had between 300 and 4,000 troops in this period. In comparison, the Senegalese army is estimated to have approximately 10,000 troops in this period.

Centcont: no

Following a cease-fire agreement in 1991 the MFDC splintered into two factions: the Northern Front, which decided to lay down their arms and stop fighting, and a southern front, which continued the armed struggle.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Minorities at Risk Group Profiles

Chapter 135

ID 181

ID 181

Incompatibility: Territory, Nagorno-Karabakh

Dyad ID 370: Soviet Union vs. Government of Armenia and ANM

Although the Nagorno-Karabakh has a population which is majority Armenian, since the 1920s, it has been administered by Azerbaijan. In the late 1980s an armed revolt emerged within the Soviet Union in which the Government of Armenia and the governing body in Nagorno-Karabakh pushed for the region to break away from Azerbaijan and join Armenia. The Armenian government and Supreme Soviet of Nagorno-Karabakh waged an armed struggle against the Soviet Union, which imposed direct rule over the secessionist region. In 1991, the conflict continued, however, because of the dissolution of the Soviet Union it ceased to be a civil war within the Soviet Union and became a civil war within the newly independent Azerbaijan (see conflict id 2950).

Nagorno Karabakh is a region in Azerbaijan populated mainly by Armenians. The territorial status of Nagorno Karabakh is a long disputed question, which re-emerged during the 1980s under the reformist leadership of the Soviet Union. Armenia fought with the USSR over Nagorno Karabakh for two years. As the Soviet Union collapsed the conflict no longer continued and became a Azerbaijan-Armenia issue.

Rebels: Govt of Armenia an ANM

Transconstsupp: tacit. Support of Armenian diaspora

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: none

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The government of Armenia and the Supreme Soviet of the Nagorno-Karabakh were both the legitimate constitutional governments of those regions of the Soviet Union.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 160,000

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that in 1990 the Republic of Armenia had 160,000 troops. It is not clear how many of these troops were deployed to the Nagorno-Karabkh conflict.

Newendate: 12/31/1991

The conflict did not end in 1991, however, the Soviet Union ceased to exist in that year and so the conflict switched from being a civil war within the Soviet Union to a civil war within Azerbaijan (see conflict id 2950).

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 136

ID 182

ID 182

Incompatibility: Territory, Azerbaijan

Dyad ID 373: Soviet Union vs. Azerbaijani Popular Front

In the late 1980s, Moscow's control over the other republics in the Soviet Union weakened and nationalist movements arose across the Soviet Union. This trend could be seen in the republic of Azerbaijan as well, where the Azerbaijani Popular Front (APF) emerged in 1989 opposed to the communist party in Azerbaijan and calling for democratization and independence for the republic. The government in Moscow was opposed to these moves. The conflict escalated in January 1990, when demonstrations against the Azerbaijani Communist Party and for secession turned violent and the APF seized government buildings in the capital, Baku. On January 19, 1990, the Soviet army launched a wide-scale military action to suppress the rebellion and about 100 people were killed in the ensuing violence. On January 20, the Soviet army captured Baku and by a week later the resistance had been suppressed and the Azerbaijani Communist Party was restored to full power. The APF was defeated in the violent conflict, however, when Azerbaijan gained independence in 1991, the leader of the APF became the country's first president.

In March 1989, a movement called the Azerbaijani Popular Front (the APF) appeared. The APF was formed by Abulfaz Eltjibey as a protest group against the local communist leadership as well as against the regime in Moscow. On 19 January, radical members of the APF attacked and captured government buildings in Baku. Within a few hours, a large-scale Soviet intervention was launched to restore order; around a hundred people were killed in the bloodshed that followed. The Soviet troops had succeeded in restoring central authority and the communist party could maintain its influence. The local leadership was however replaced with new representatives. The conflict ended, thus, with the suppression of the APF.

Rebels: Azerbaijani Popular Front

Transconstsupp: tacit. Possible support from other Azeri/Turkic peoples in the region

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: no

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

According to the Uppsala Conflict Database, the Azerbaijani Communist Party recognized the APF as an official opposition party in August 1989.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the available sources offered any indication of the number of troops possessed by the APF. However, it is clear that the force was much overpowered by the Soviet army.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 137

ID 183

ID 183

Incompatibility: Government, Trinidad and Tobago

Dyad ID 219: Trinidad and Tobago vs. Jamaat al Muslimeen

On July 27, 1990, Jamaat al Muslimeen, an organization of Afro-Trinidadians who had converted to Islam, attempted a coup d'état. They took many hostages, including the prime minister, blew up the police station and seized the television station. They called for new elections within 90 days. Negotiations between the President and the group over the next few days stalled until on August 1, 1990, the rebels surrendered to the government.

On 27 July 1990 a group of insurgents from the Jamaat al Muslimeen stormed the parliament building in a coup attempt during a session of the House of Representatives. The group, which is a sect of mainly Afro-Trinidadian Muslim converts led by Yasin Abu Bakr, a former Trinidad policeman who is said to be an admirer of the Libyan leader Colonel Moammar Gadhafi. The rebels surrendered unconditionally on 1 August, and 25 hostages were released from the television station and another 17 (including Cabinet Ministers) were released from the parliamentary building (called the Red House).

Rebels: Jamaat al Muslimeen

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: no

Rebpresosts: no

Rebsupport: alleged. Claimed that Libya provides support.

Rtypesup: endorsement, alleged.

Govsupport: explicit. Jamaica pledged to send troops, however, these were not needed in the end.

Gtypesup: endorsement. Troops were not needed, therefore extent of support merely diplomatic.

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: no

Although the rebels made a demand for new elections when they attempted the coup d'état, they were not direct participants in the domestic political process.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 250

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that Jamaat al Muslimeen had 250 troops. This force is in comparison to 2,000 troops for the army.

Source:

- Uppsala Conflict Data Project

Chapter 138

ID 184

ID 184

Incompatibility: Government, Djibouti

Dyad ID 43: Djibouti vs. FRUD

The Issa are a majority ethnic group in Djibouti, comprising about 60% of the population and the Afar are a sizable minority, making up about 35% of the population. In the post-colonial period Djibouti was run by a one-party government with almost all governmental officials being Issa. The Front for the Restoration of Unity and Democracy (FRUD) was an Afar organization that in November 1991 launched an armed struggle against the Djiboutian government to push for multiparty democracy and greater inclusion of the Afar in the domestic political process. The government responded with force and a war raged for the next four years. Negotiations began in June 1994, which resulted in an immediate split in FRUD. The major part of the organization continued to negotiate with the government but a faction of FRUD opposed negotiations and continued the armed struggle. On December 26, 1994, a peace agreement was reached between the government and the FRUD (minus the break-away faction) which resulted in a cease-fire and a power-sharing government.

Djibouti has two major ethnic groups, Issas and Afars. The president, as most people in the political elite, was an Issa. The conflict broke out on 12 November 1991 when the mainly Afar opposition group FRUD (Front pour la restauration de l'unit et de la dmocratie) launched an attack on government troops. It demanded a more democratic regime based on a multi-party system and a government of national union. 7 February 2000 they signed peace agreement that finally ended the conflict.

Rebels: FRUD

Transconstsupp: tacit. Afars living in Somalia and Ethiopia.

Rebextpart: no

Rebpresosts: no
Rebsuport: none
Rtypesup: n/a
Govsuport: none
Gtypesup: n/a
Govextpart: none
Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage
- Keesings

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The FRUD was an organization with the stated goals of promoting multiparty democracy and a power-sharing government. From 1991-1994, however, Djibouti was a one-party state and it was illegal for other parties to participate.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 4,500

Rebstrength: parity

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimated that in 1991-1994 the FRUD had 4,500 troops. This is in comparison to the government's 3,400 in 1991, 3,800 in 1992, 3,900 in 1993 and 9,600 in 1994.

Terrcont: yes

Terrname: Parts of northern Djibouti

The Afar are primarily located in northern Djibouti. In 1991, FRUD took control of much of the northern part of the country. In July 1993, Keesing's Record of World Events reports that the government launched a counter-offensive which knocked the Afar back from much of the territory it held in the north.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Dyad ID 44: Djibouti vs. FRUD - AD

TBA

Chapter 139

ID 185

ID 185

Incompatibility: Government, Georgia

Dyad ID 239: Georgia vs. Anti-Government Alliance

Georgia left the Soviet Union and became an independent state in April 1991. In May of that year, Zviad Gamsakhurdia, a Georgian nationalist leader, was elected President in a landslide election. Shortly after he took power, opposition to Gamsakhurdia grew as he was accused of being an authoritarian leader and of repressing Georgia's minority populations. On September 11, 1991, 30 opposition groups united to demand Gamsakhurdia's resignation. He refused and armed clashes between supporters and opponents of the government followed. For the next two months a low-intensity conflict raged in the Georgian capital, Tbilisi, reaching a peak on December 22, 1991, when the Anti-Government Alliance lay siege to the Presidential residency which would a few weeks later result in the overthrow of Gamsakhurdia. He fled the country on January 6, 1992, but quickly rallied supporters, the Zviadists, who waged armed struggle against the new government to try to restore him to power (see conflict id 2870, dyad 2430).

This is the opposition coalition that deposed Zviad Gamsakhurdia.

Rebels: anti-government alliance

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: none
Govextpart: none
Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: no

The Anti-Government Alliance was a set of organizations opposed to Gamsakhurdia's rule. These organizations did not present one coherent political alternative, however.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 13,500

Rebstrength: parity

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that the Anti-Government Alliance had 13,500 troops in 1991. This number is in comparison to 7,500-30,000 in the army.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Dyad ID 289: Georgia vs. Zviadists

Conflict Summary: After being deposed in late December 1991 (see conflict id 2870, dyad 2420), former Georgian President Zviad Gamsakhurdia fled to Armenia. He quickly rallied his supporters, the Zviadists, and they launched an armed struggle to return him to power. In early 1992, the Zviadists controlled parts of Western Georgia, however, the force was not able to achieve much military success against the Georgian government. The conflict continued until the end of 1993 when, on December 31, Gamsakhurdia died.

During Georgia's last years as a republic part of the Soviet Union nationalist movements grew stronger and as nationalist passions intensified politicians like Zviad Gamsakhurdia gained popularity through anti-communist rhetoric and nationalist slogans. Criticism towards Gamsakhurdia increased after his direct election to the executive presidency and anti-Gamsakhurdia movements accused the President of authoritarian rule and of suppressing the ethnic minorities. On 22 December armed men from the anti-government alliance surrounded the presidential residency. On 2 January the opposition formed a Military council, which later became a State Council lead by former Soviet minister Eduard Shevardnadze; Gamsakhurdia was deposed. His supporters, the Zviadists, to armed resistance against Georgia's new rulers. The conflict ended after Gamsakhurdia's death on 31 December 1993.

Rebels: Zviadists

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: no

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Zviadists were the supporters of former Georgian President Zviad Gamsakhurdia, who had been elected in May 1991. He was overthrown, however, and not allowed to continue as president despite his assertions that he was the rightful leader of the country.

Rebestimate: 5,750

Rebestlow: 1,500

Rebesthigh: 10,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 1993 the Zviadists had 1,500 troops. Keesing's Record of World Events in October 1993 wrote that the Zviadists were "said to number some 10,000 in total." It is not clear whether the Keesing's figure refers only to armed supporters of the former President or also includes unarmed supporters. In comparison, the Georgian government had 20,000 troops in 1993.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 140

ID 186

ID 186

Incompatibility: Government, Haiti

From 1957-1986, Haiti was ruled by Francois Duvalier and his son, Jean-Claude Duvalier. Their regime was very repressive. Political turmoil in the mid-1980s led the younger Duvalier to flee into exile and a series of military governments established by coups followed. On April 2, 1989, soldiers from the Leopard Corps battalion mutinied against President Avril. The coup attempt was unsuccessful, but the political turmoil that followed resulted in democratic elections in 1990 which brought Jean-Bertrand Aristide to power. Shortly after taking power, Aristide was expelled. He returned in the mid-1990s after a UN backed mission but became steadily less popular. In 2004, violence heated up as members of the opposition to Aristide organized as the National Liberation and Resistance Front (FLRN). FLRN took control of northern Haiti and gradually advanced on Port-au-Prince. Facing US and French pressure, Aristide was forced to leave Haiti. In exile, however, he urged his supporters to fight against "foreign occupation," and they did so as OP Lavelas. Haiti remained tense after 2004 but the conflict did not generate 25 battle-related deaths.

On September 30, 1991, Aristide was overthrown by the Army, led by Gen. Raoul Cedras. Hundreds of his supporters were killed and Aristide was exiled.

Rebels: Tonton Macoute

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsup: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Dyad ID 244: Haiti vs. Military Faction (forces of Himmler Rebu and Guy Francois)

Rebel Political Wing: No

The military faction was made up of members of the Leopard Corps battalion and was not affiliated with a political party.

Rebel estimate: 450

Rebel estimate (low): 450

Rebel estimate (high): 450

There were 450 troops in the Leopard Corps battalion, these were likely aided by other troops but it is unclear how many.

Rebel strength: Weaker

The Leopard Corps was an elite battalion, but the majority of the armed forces stayed loyal to the President.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: High

The Leopard Corps had a clear command structure.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

The Leopard Corps was an elite battalion, and the coup attempt generally had some popular support, although the number of people directly participating was quite small.

Territorial Control: No

The military faction did not control territory.

Conflict Type: Coup d'etat

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

There are no indications of external support to the Leopard Corps.

Government Support: No Non-State Military Support to Government: No

There are no indications of external support to the government.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Victory

Victory Side: A

The coup attempt was unsuccessful.

Dyad ID 251: Haiti vs. Tonton Macoute/Military Faction

Haiti has experienced much conflict over the last century. For years the country was ruled by Francois and then Jean-Claude Duvalier, who were closely allied with Haiti's landowning elite and had their own private army, the Tonton Macoute. In 1987, Jean-Claude Duvalier fled into exile, and was replaced by a civilian-military government. In elections in December 1990, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, a Catholic priest who was a proponent of Haiti's peasants, won a landslide victory. A coup attempt in early 1991 against the interim president by a faction of the military, backed by the Tonton Macoute, failed, however, on September 30, 1991, Aristide was overthrown.

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Tonton Macoute and the faction of the military they were allied with had ties to supporters of the former president Jean-Claude Duvalier. In elections in 1990, the former interior minister under Duvalier was barred from participating.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: parity

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that the Tonton Macoute had 300,000 troops. I believe this must be a mistake. No other reference to the number of troops possessed by the Tonton Macoute, or to the number of the military that supported the coup could be found.

Dyad ID 440: Haiti vs. FLRN

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: Yes

FLRN was a military organization controlled by the political opposition to Aristide.

Rebel estimate: 700

Rebel estimate (low): 700

Rebel estimate (high): 700

UCDP estimates that FLRN had 700 troops in 2004.

Rebel strength: Parity

Haiti essentially had no army in this period, but the National Police was generally loyal to Aristide. There were more police but they were not clearly stronger than FLRN's forces.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

FLRN had a leadership structure that coordinated its activities.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate

Fighting Capacity: Moderate

While Aristide had initially been very popular in Haiti, he became less so over the end of the 1990s and the beginning of the 21st century. The FLRN forces were at least the match of the police force in their ability to fight and procure arms.

Territorial Control: Yes Name of Territory: Parts of northern Haiti Level of Effective Territorial Control: Moderate

The FLRN was essentially able to administer northern Haiti as it advanced on Port-au-Prince.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

There are no indications of external support to FLRN.

Government Support: No

Non-State Military Support to Government: No

There are no indications of external support to the government.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Victory

Victory Side: B

Date of Termination: 29 February, 2004

On 29 February, 2004, Aristide was forced into exile.

Dyad ID 441: Haiti vs. OP Lavalas (Chimeres)

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: Yes

OP Lavalas was a military organization associated with former President Aristide.

Rebel estimate: unclear

I could find no estimate for the number of troops OP Lavelas had.

Rebel strength: Weaker

OP Lavelas killed some people through demonstrations, but was clearly weaker than the forces of the new government.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Unclear

OP Lavelas clearly was organized, however, it is unclear to what extent as it was primarily made up of Aristide's supporters.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

OP Lavelas had little fighting capacity, and although Aristide had initially been popular his popularity within Haiti had declined significantly.

Territorial Control: No

OP Lavelas did not control territory in Haiti.

Conflict Type: Civil War

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

There are no indications of external support to OP Lavelas.

Government Support: No

Non-State Military Support to Government: No

There are no indications of external support to the government.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

Victory Side: NA

OP Lavelas remained active after 2004, but this dyad did not generate 25 battle deaths again after that year.

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 141

ID 187

ID 187

Incompatibility: Government, Sierra Leone/United Kingdom

Sierra Leone/United Kingdom vs. AFRC, RUF, Kamajors and ECOMOG

This conflict is best described in three periods, because there were different constellations of actors in each.

Conflict Summary:

Period 1: Sierra Leone and Kamajors vs. AFRC and RUF In 1991, the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) led by Foday Sankoh attacked Sierra Leone from Liberia. The government, supported by Nigeria and Guinea, launched a counterattack against the rebels but were unable to completely dislodge them. The conflict continued and Sierra Leone's civilian population suffered a long string of atrocities. The RUF was able to gain control of the diamond fields and by 1995 had gained enough strength to launch attacks against Freetown, the capital. In 1995, the military leader Valentine Strasser signed a contract with a South African mercenary firm, Executive Outcomes, to increase security, and was able to stop the RUF advance on Freetown and drive the RUF away from the diamond fields. A period of peace followed and democratic elections in 1996 produced a civilian government led by Tejan Kabbah. Kabbah pursued negotiations with the RUF and on November 30, 1996, a peace agreement was signed at Abidjan, Cote D'Ivoire. As part of the settlement Kabbah agreed to ask Executive Outcomes to leave, a decision that proved fateful as five months later, on May 25, 1997, a successful military coup brought the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC) to power. The AFRC invited the RUF to participate in the military government.

Period 2: Government of Sierra Leone (AFRC) and RUF vs. Kamajors and ECOMOG The Kamajors were traditional hunters that had been organized by Kabbah into a private security force to protect the mining areas of southeastern Sierra Leone. In the days after the coup that brought the AFRC to power, a spokesman for the Kamajors said that the organization would fight to re-

store Kabbah to power. The Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) came to the support of Kabbah and in March 1998, ECOMOG troops took Freetown, removing the AFRC and restoring Kabbah to power.

Period 3: Government of Sierra Leone, ECOMOG and United Kingdom vs. RUF and AFRC The RUF and AFRC continued to battle the Kabbah government, which now was backed by ECOMOG forces. In July 1999, a power-sharing arrangement was reached between the Kabbah government and the RUF which gave Sankoh the position of Vice President and put him in charge of the ministry which oversaw diamond extraction. The AFRC, which was not included in the agreement, continued to wage armed struggle against the government and even clashed with the RUF. However, the AFRC was no match for the government and ECOMOG without RUF support and quickly became irrelevant as a fighting force. The power-sharing agreement with the RUF did not last long and Sankoh quickly resumed fighting. In 2000 as the conflict re-escalated, the United Nations began deploying a peacekeeping mission and the United Kingdom deployed a fairly robust force, first with the intention of evacuating British citizens but the force soon began conducting joint military operations with the Sierra Leone army. Sankoh was arrested in May 2000 and a new cease-fire agreement with the RUF was reached on November 10, 2000, resulting in a de-escalation, although the conflict still continued at a low level of intensity.

Note that there are duplicate entries for these records as there was a change in intensity/type. Also, ECOMOG may be dropped as an actor because it was a pro-government force backed by other African countries. The RUF vs Govt entry should be broken up into two periods, pre-and post 1997 when the AFRC and ECOMOG become new actors. The Kamajors should be dropped because they were a pro-Government militia in support of Kabbah

A rebel group, the Revolutionary United Front (RUF), led by Corporal Foday Saybannah Sankoh invaded Sierra Leone from Liberia and attacked two Sierra Leonean towns on 23 March 1991. Fighting continues despite numerous peace talks. On 25 May 1997, a coup was staged by a military faction. The coup leaders then created the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC) and invited the RUF to participate in the new military Government (this government only lasted for a few months). The Kamajors fought briefly against this government. ECOMOG intervened and seized the capital in February 1998. The civil Government of Kabbah was reinstated on 10 March 1998. The AFRC continued the fighting together with the RUF against ECOMOG and the civilian Government. RUF negotiated a power-sharing agreement with the Government in July 1999. No activity by the AFRC was further reported and the conflict was considered terminated by 2001.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 130: Sierra Leone vs. RUF

Government versus the RUF until 1997.

Transconstsupp: none.

Rebextpart: yes, major. Troops from the Liberian NPFL fought with the RUF; mainly soldiers came to participate in looting.

Rebpresosts: yes, extensive. The RUF maintained a presence in Liberia.

Rebsupport: Explicit. Extensive support by Liberia; also possibly Burkina Faso, Libya.

Rtypesup: military. Provision of bases on Liberian territory.

Govsupport: explicit. By USA, UK, ECOWAS countries

Gtypesup: diplomatic and non-military. US and UK provided logistical, medical supplies. ECOWAS supported government diplomatically.

Govextpart: none

Government versus the RUF after 1997.

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: no

Rebpresosts: extensive extraterritorial bases in Liberia.

Rebsup: explicit. Help from Liberia

Rebtypesup. Military, financial. Liberia provided arms, bases. Libya gave funds. Burkina Faso and Gambia allowed the sale of conflict diamonds.

Govsupport: Explicit. ECOMOG countries send in troops in support of the Kabbah government. UK also provides troops

Gtypesup: troops.

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

Although the Revolutionary United Front existed exclusively as a rebel group for much of the conflict, it registered as a political party in November 1999 so that it could compete in national elections. It was allowed to do so.

Rebestimate: 5,000

Rebestlow: 2,000

Rebesthigh: 15,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) estimates the troop strength of the Revolutionary United Front throughout the conflict as follows. In 1995, the RUF had 2,000 troops. In 1996, the RUF had 2,000-4,000. In 1997, the RUF had 3,000-5,000. In 1998, the RUF and AFRC together had 15,000. In 1999, the RUF and AFRC together had 45,000 (SIPRI says that many of these were just ad-hoc armed rebels not really trained forces). In 2000, the RUF had 15,000. This is in comparison to the following estimates for the Sierra Leone government: in 1995, 5,000-6,000 troops; in 1996, 12,000-18,000 troops; in 1997, 14,000 troops; in 1998, 30,000 troops (plus 10,000-15,000 from ECOMOG); in 1999, 15,000-20,000 (plus 12,000 from ECOMOG) and in 2000, 10,000-15,000 (plus 800 from United Kingdom).

Mobcap: low

The RUF was never able to mobilize much popular support, instead operating by terrorizing the local population and by gaining control of Sierra Leone's diamond mines.

Dyad ID 131: Sierra Leone vs. AFRC

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: no

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: Explicit. Support from ECOMOG countries

Gtypesup: troops. ECOMOG sends troops to back the government

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Rebpolwing: no

The AFRC was the military government established through a coup in 1997 that was overthrown by ECOMOG in 1998. After that they tried to gain control militarily but not by competing in the domestic political process.

Rebestimate: 8,000

Rebestlow: 2,000

Rebesthigh: 14,000

Rebstrength: parity

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates the troop strength of the AFRC as follows. In 1997, it had 8,000-14,000 troops. In 1998, it had 2,000-4,000 troops. In 1999, no estimate is given. Clearly, the AFRC was at least equal to the government forces when it was able to overthrow them in a coup d'état, however, by 1999, the fighting power of the force had decreased significantly.

Dyad ID 132: Sierra Leone vs. Kamajors

Rebpolwing: no

The Kamajors were traditional hunters who were supporters of former President Kabbah. They fought against the RUF to restore him to power.

Rebestimate: 23,500

Rebestlow: 10,000

Rebesthigh: 37,000

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimated that in 1997 the Kamajors had between 10,000 and 37,000 troops.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- International Crisis Group Report "Sierra Leone: Time for a New Military and Political Strategy," April 11, 2001.

Dyad ID 714: Sierra Leone vs. WSB

TBA

Chapter 142

ID 188

ID 188

Incompatibility: Government, Turkey

Dyad ID 330: Turkey vs. Devrimci Sol

Devrimci Sol (Dev Sol) was a leftist organization formed in the 1970s to push for a Marxist revolution in Turkey. There was some armed struggle between the government and the group; however, the conflict reached a higher (although still quite low) level of intensity in 1991 when Dev Sol began challenging the American military presence in Turkey during the Persian Gulf War. The group was always very small and was only able to conduct a few small-scale terrorist attacks, and by the end of 1992 had been virtually completely defeated by the Ankara and Istanbul police forces. The group still exists, although it has been beset by fractionalization since 1992, but the armed conflict has not continued at a noticeable level of intensity.

Devrimci Sol, active 1991-1992, wanted to destroy the Turkish government and social system through a Marxist-Leninist style revolution. Dev Sol has reportedly cooperated with Palestinian organizations since the late 1970s and in 1991 militants trained in Lebanon's Syrian-held Bekaa Valley. It has also been claimed that Dev Sol cooperated with the PKK during 1991. There have been no negotiations, or even rumours of talks between the parties of the conflict. The government focused on letting the police hunt down the leftist militants resulting in a marked decrease in the number of active Dev Sol members that could continue to perpetrate violent acts. The use of armed force was hence terminated by low activity after 1992.

Rebels: Devrimci Sol

Transconstsupp: no

Rebextpart: yes, minor. Dev Sol had cooperated with Palestinian organizations since the late 1970's and during 1991 leftist militants had recently trained in Lebanon's Syrian-held Bekaa Valley, apparently with Syrian consent. Dev Sol cooperated with the PKK during 1991 according to a

Turkish security official.

Rebpresosts: some troops. Some troops in Lebanon and possibly Syria and Greece.

Rebsupport: alleged. Conflicting reports about Syria's involvement. Syria may have allowed group to operate on its territory. Also alleged Greek support. However, these are difficult to confirm.

Rtypesup: military, alleged. Use of territory for bases/training.

Govsupport: explicit. Some help from USA and Syria (Syria arrested/killed DS members on its territory in 1992).

Gtypesup: non-military.

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>

Rebpolwing: unclear

Rebpolwinglegal: unclear

Dev Sol is a political organization dedicated to revolution. It is not clear if it has a political wing that participates at all in Turkish domestic politics.

Rebestimate: 100

Rebestlow: 10

Rebesthigh: 100

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 1991 Dev Sol had between 50 and 100 militants and in 1992 it had between 10 and 100 militants. This is a much smaller force than the police forces of Ankara and Istanbul, not to mention the entire Turkish army.

Newstartdate: 7/13/1991

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that on July 13, 1991, the Istanbul police conducted raids on Dev Sol hideouts in Istanbul, and that 11 Dev Sol militants were killed.

Source:

- Uppsala Conflict Database

Dyad ID 457: Turkey vs. MKP

TBA

Chapter 143

ID 189

ID 189

Incompatibility: Territory, Slovenia

Dyad ID 281: Yugoslavia vs. Republic of Slovenia

Slovenia was one of the richest republics within the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. In the 1980s, Yugoslavia went through a period of severe economic recession and, at the same time, many of the ethnic groups in Yugoslavia began clamouring for greater autonomy from the national government, up to independence. In 1990 a pro-independence leader, Milan Kucan, was elected President, and tensions increased between the national Yugoslav government (which was becoming increasingly dominated by Serbia) and the Kucan government. On June 25, 1991, the Republic of Slovenia declared independence from Yugoslavia, and the Yugoslav National Army quickly intervened to try to keep the region from seceding. The Yugoslav Army was militarily stronger than the Slovenian national guard, however, the Slovenian forces were able to use guerilla warfare tactics to inflict high costs on the Yugoslav army. At negotiations brokered by the European Community in July, 1991, a ceasefire was reached and the Republic of Slovenia experienced de-facto independence until May 1992, when it was recognized by the United Nations and became officially independent.

The secession of the Republic of Slovenia in 1991 officially triggered the disintegration of Yugoslavia. After having won the first multiparty republican elections in April-May 1990, the pro-independence leader Milan Kucan began moving Slovenia in the direction of complete independence. On 25 June 1991, he declared Slovenia to be an independent state. Within a few days, the JNA (the Yugoslav National Army) units stationed in Slovenia were mobilized on full combat alert. When frontier crossings were taken by the JNA, the Slovenes struck back. The conflict was officially terminated by a peace agreement. In May 1992, the UN recognized Slovenia as an independent state, while the other remnants of the Yugoslavian state were drawn into further war.

Rebels: Republic of Slovenia

Transconstsupp: tacit. Support by Slovenes in other parts of Yugoslavia

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: None

Rebsupport: explicit. Diplomatic recognition by Germany. Germany was the first to recognize Slovenia.

Rtypsup: endorsement. Germany.

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

It was the legitimate government of the Republic of Slovenia that declared the republic independent from Yugoslavia.

Rebestimate: 50,000

Rebestlow: 30,000

Rebesthigh: 70,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimated that in 1991 the Republic of Slovenia had between 30,000 and 68,000 troops. The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that it had between 60,000 and 70,000 troops. This number is significantly smaller than the 169,000 troops in the Yugoslav National Army, however, the Yugoslav National Army faced armed conflict in a number of rebellions and the Slovenian forces had the advantage of being able to use guerilla tactics.

Mobcap: high

Slovenia had the largest percentage of its population in favor of independence of all the republics in Yugoslavia that seceded.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Chapter 144

ID 190

ID 190

Incompatibility: Territory, Croatia

Yugoslavia vs. Croatian Irregulars and Republic of Croatia

The republic of Yugoslavia had been a federal republic made up of several different autonomous regions throughout the Cold War. In the 1980s, however, the unity of the state began to be challenged after the dictator Tito, who had been very successful at holding the country together, died. Many of the various ethnic groups in Yugoslavia, including Croats began pushing for greater control over their own affairs. At the same time Serbia, led by Slobodan Milosevic, began to exert more control over affairs at the national level. Prior to 1991 armed conflict had occurred in Croatia, but the conflict in Yugoslavia reached a new level of intensity as first Slovenia and then, on June 25, 1991, Croatia declared independence. The Yugoslav army followed the leader of the Serbian government, and 1991 saw extreme conflict between the army and both the newly formed Croatian army and a set of mercenaries the "Croatian Irregulars") pushing for the independence of Croatia. The conflict was not resolved at the end of 1991, however, as Croatia became an independent country in 1992 the conflict ceased to be a civil war within Yugoslavia, and instead shifted to a civil war within Serbia, with the Yugoslav army supporting the Serbian population there's push for secession and unification with Serbia (see conflict id 2970).

Notes on Coding:

Dyad ID 272: Yugoslavia vs. Republic of Croatia

These entries should be counted as the same actor. Although the Croatian leadership and the irregulars were distinct, they had similar aims and fought together. If decided to keep separate entries, the variables remain unchanged as external support was similar for both actors

The republic of Croatia was, after Slovenia, the second to secede from the Yugoslavian state in 1991. During spring 1990, Franjo Tudjman commenced an aggressive nationalistic campaign to win the first multiparty republican elections. On 25 June 1991, the Croatian republic declared its independence from Yugoslavia. Parallel to this, various independent right-wing Croatian militias were set up in 1991. These irregular forces opposed the Croatian official leadership, and claimed to be able to organize defense for the Croatian people in a more efficient way than the Croatian National Guardsmen did.

Rebels: Republic of Croatia

Transconstsupp: tacit. Support by Croats in other parts of Yugoslavia.

Rebextpart: no

Rebpresosts: no

Rebsupport: explicit. Germany was the first to recognize the independence of Croatia.

Rtypesup: endorsement. By Germany.

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

It was the legitimate government of Croatia, led by Franco Tudjman, that declared the independence of the Republic.

Rebestimate: 45,000

Rebestlow: 30,000

Rebesthigh: 60,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimates that in 1991 the Republic of Croatia had between 30,000 and 42,000 troops. However, the Uppsala Conflict Database reports that in October 1991 the Croatian army comprised 42,000 troops but that by the end of November, 1991, it had 60,000. These numbers are considerably lower than the total Yugoslav National Army force of 169,000, however, the Yugoslav army was engaged in more than one conflict at a time and so could not deploy its total force to Croatia.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbook

Dyad ID 273: Yugoslavia vs. Croatian Irregulars

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The Croatian Irregulars were really a collection of mercenaries that waged conflict to promote Croatian interests in Yugoslavia, including independence. Some of these groups were allied with political parties that were allowed to participate in Croatian politics.

Rebestimate: 12,500

Rebestlow: 10,000

Rebesthigh: 15,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that the Croatian Irregulars had between 10,000 and 15,000 troops. This number is in comparison to the 169,000 troops of the Yugoslav National Army (JNA).

Centcontrol: no

The Croatian Irregulars were really a set of several independent militias rather than one unified insurgent group.

Newendate: 11/18/1991

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the Croatian Irregulars lost their last major stronghold on November 18, 1991, and ceased to function as an independent force after that, with many of their members becoming incorporated into the Croatian army.

Chapter 145

ID 191

ID 191

Incompatibility: Government, Algeria

Algeria vs. Islamic Groups

The secular Algerian government has faced a challenge from secular Islamic groups since the 1980s. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, there were two main groups challenging the government which were dedicated to making Islamic law (Sharia) the law of Algeria. The first, the Armed Islamic Movement (MIA), continued a violent campaign in the 1980s but was not able to accomplish much. The second group, the Islamic Salvation Front (FIS), chose to pursue a political, rather than a violent strategy, and competed in elections in 1991. The FIS had much more success and was set to win the second round of elections when the military intervened and cancelled the elections. Following the cancellation, armed conflict broke out in Algeria between Islamist groups and the government. The FIS stayed out of the combat for the first two years but by January, 1993, had endorsed the armed struggle and merged with the renewed MIA. The war in Algeria between the government and the Islamist groups was very bloody, resulting in somewhere around 100,000 deaths. The conflict was at a high level of intensity between 1993 and 2001. Throughout the conflict, new groups appeared, many of whom were more radical than the main opposition group, the FIS. In 1993, the Armed Islamic Group (GIA) began waging conflict and had a platform of opposition to any negotiations with the government. In 1996, the government decided to switch tactics and created paramilitary groups in the villages. In response, the GIA also switched tactics and began committing large-scale massacres of civilians. By 1997, the main locus of conflict has shifted away from the government-FIS axis to the government-GIA dyad and the FIS decided to abandon its armed struggle and declared a unilateral ceasefire. In 2000, the army and FIS signed a peace agreement which granted amnesty to all FIS/MIA members. The GIA refused to sign on to the agreement. Additionally, the GIS policy of carrying out civilian massacres led to the splintering of the group and another new group emerged, the Dawa wal Jihad, which also refused to accept

the negotiations but focused its attacks on governmental security forces, rather than civilians.

Groups 6 & 7 were added. These are on the Uppsala main list but were cut-off in the data spreadsheet. Note: Only the conflict with Exile and Redemption is listed as having started in July 1991. Conflict with the other parties did not begin until after 1992. Double-check the start dates for each dyad

A multiparty system was introduced and the country's first ever multi-party elections - for communal and provincial assemblies - were held in June 1990. With the holding of elections, a clear threat to the regime emerged in the form of an Islamist political party, the Front islamique du salut (FIS). After the first round of parliamentary elections in 1991, convincingly won by FIS, the democratic process was halted by the army and the second round was subsequently cancelled. Amidst increasing political violence, FIS was outlawed in March 1992. There has been a myriad of armed Islamic groups active throughout the conflict, each with their own strategies and religious beliefs.

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 1: Algeria vs. FIS

(FIS is the political wing. MIA and AIS are the armed groups and are supported by the FIS)

Transconstsupp: Explicit. Sympathy by like-minded Islamist groups in the region and among Muslims in Europe (e.g. International Islamic Relief Organization, Fdration algrienne en France (FAF))

Rebextpart: alleged. Group There were reports, from the Algerian government, that fighters from the Armed Islamic Group (GIA) and the Islamic Salvation Army (AIS) were receiving military training in Yemen by Yemeni Islah Party, an Islamist party in Yemen.

Rebpresosts: yes, some. Some reports of rebels in Morocco. Although possibly some limited presence elsewhere, this has not been confirmed

Rebsupport: alleged. Possibly some support/training/arms from Iran and Sudan, however difficult to tell which of the rebel groups received assistance.

Rtypesupp: military, alleged.

Govsupport: Explicit. France, Egypt, Tunisia, Morocco at various times assisted in counter-insurgency operations.

Gtypesup: military and financial.

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The FIS started out as a political movement and was set to win elections in 1991 when they were overturned.

Rebestimate: 12,500

Rebestlow: 10,000

Rebesthigh: 15,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimates that in 1993 and 1994, the FIS had 10,000-15,000 troops (they do not have estimates for the other years of the conflict). This is in comparison to 139,000-300,000 across the course of the conflict for the Algerian government.

Mobcap: high

The FIS were set to win elections when they were cancelled in 1991.

Dyad ID 2: Algeria vs. Exile and Redemption

(Takfir wa Hijra was only active in 1991. Later joined the MIA/FIS faction)

Transconstsupp: tacit/sympathy. Support by like-minded Islamist groups.

Rebextpart: no

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none. Assistance from France, others was not yet available in 1992.

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

Exile and Redemption was a militant organization that believed that it was not possible to create an Islamic state through elections, it would have to be accomplished militarily.

rebestimate: unclear

rebstrength: much weaker

None of the sources give any indication of the number of troops possessed by Exile and Redemption. However, they were no match for the Algerian government and were not able to accomplish much militarily across the course of the conflict.

Dyad ID 3: Algeria vs. GIA

Whereas the FIS and the AIS had only launched its armed struggle as a last resort, preferring to pursue their goals on the political arena, GIA rejected democracy and pluralism per se. It portrayed its struggle as Muslims fighting an apostate state, and viewed their declared jihad as not only a means of reaching their goals, but also as an end in itself.

Transconstsupp: tacit/sympathy. Support from Islamist groups in the region and in Europe. Also claimed that Al-Qaeda provided support.

Rebextpart: alleged. Alleged al-Qaeda involvement

Rebpresosts: some. Evidence that group had used Morocco, but probably not with gov't approval. Algeria accused Morocco, Syria, and Sudan of harboring the group; unsubstantiated.

Rebsupport: explicit. Was reported that Sudan provided arms in 1997. Iran also accused of aiding the group.

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: Explicit. Assistance from France, Egypt, Tunisia, Niger.

Gtypesup: military and financial

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

GIA was an organization that rejected negotiations of any type and sought to make Algeria an Islamic state through armed struggle. The organization did not have a political wing.

Rebestimate: 1,525

Rebestlow: 50

Rebesthigh: 3,000

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database provides the following estimates for the troop strength of the GIA: In 1993, 1994 and 1995: no estimate; in 1996: 2,000-3,000; in 1997: 50-100; in 1998: 2,000-3,000; in 1999: less than 3000; in 2000, 2001 and 2002: less than 1500; in 2003: 100. These estimates are in comparison to the following estimates for the Algerian army: in 1993: 121,700-139,000; in 1994, 1995 and 1996: 121,700-150,000; in 1997: 124,000-170,000; in 1998: 122,000-270,000; in 1999: 122,000-300,000; in 2000 and 2001: 124,000-300,000; in 2002: 136,700-400,000; in 2003: 127,000.

Centcont: yes

Strengthcent: low

The GIA does have a central command structure. However, the organization splintered in the late 1990s over the tactics that it pursued.

Dyad ID 4: Algeria vs. AQIM

For decades, Algeria has faced an insurgency led by Islamist groups. The main group initially was the Islamic Salvation Front (FIS) which was a political organization that used violence but was open to political means. In the early 1990s, the more radical Armed Islamic Group (GIA) formed, which saw Jihad not just as a means but as an end in itself. GIA committed many large-scale massacres against civilians. In the late 1990s, a faction of GIA broke off as the Salafist Group for Preaching and Combat (GSPC) and continued to fight against the Algerian state. In 2007, the group allied with Al Qaeda and it later changed its name to Al Qaida in the Maghreb (AQIM).

Rebel Political Wing: No

AQIM is a jihadist organization that has political goals, but operates exclusively as a militant organization.

Rebel estimate: 500

Rebel estimate low: 30

Rebel estimate high: 2000

UCDP estimates for AQIM range from 30 to 2000, with 500 being the most common number.

Rebel strength: Much Weaker

Algeria has a large army, and AQIM functions primarily through terrorist activities not as a conventional military organization.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

AQIM appears to have a clear command structure that coordinates its activities.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

AQIM operates primarily as a terrorist organization with little popular support or conventional military capacity.

Territorial Control: No

AQIM does not control territory in Algeria.

Conflict Type: Terrorist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

AQIM is allied with Al Qaeda, however there is no evidence of direct support from that organization or any other external actor to AQIM.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Name of Government Supporters: United States, Morocco, Chad, Mali, Niger

Since September 11, 2001, the United States has provided military support to Algeria in its battle against GSPC/AQIM. At various other points, UCDP identifies support to the government from Morocco, Chad, Mali, and Niger.

Ended?: No

Type of Termination: NA

AQIM remained active into 2010.

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 146

ID 192

ID 192

Incompatibility: Territory, Cabinda

Dyad ID 190: Angola vs. FLEC-FAC

Cabinda is a region of Angola that is separated from the rest of the country and rich in oil. Since independence in 1975, the Angolan government has faced an armed insurrection led by various factions of the Front for the Liberation of the Enclave of Cabinda (FLEC), the main ones being FLEC-Renewed (FLEC-R) and FLEC-Armed Forces of Cabinda (FLEC-FAC). FLEC-R has negotiated with the government, FLEC-FAC has refused to do so.

1994-1998 Note: This part of the conflict is split into two periods, because the government began receiving support in 1997.

Enter a new ID for 1997 and after: 2940-2510-0.1; After regime changes in Zaire and Congo-Brazz, the governments of these countries no longer support the rebels and support the government instead

Cabinda is a small, oil rich region, physically separated from the rest of the country by a sliver of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The rebels seek Cabindan independence from Angola. The degree of foreign involvement in the Cabindan conflict has over the years been significantly lower than in the conflict between the MPLA government and UNITA. However, when MPLA received support from thousands of Cuban troops, around 2000 of them were stationed in Cabinda, mainly to protect oil installations from attacks by FLEC. The various FLEC factions initially received logistical support from Zaire and Congo-Brazzaville. This support remained constant until 1997, when the regimes in both Zaire and Congo-Brazzaville were overthrown, with Angolan support. The downfall of these regimes considerably weakened the rebels.

Rebels: FLEC

Period 1: 1994-1996

Pre-1997: Transconstsup: no

Rebextpart: no

Rebpresosts: Extensive. Bases located in the DRC (Zaire), and in Congo-Brazzaville.

Rebsupport: Explicit

Rtypesup: military. Congo-B and DRC allowed bases on its territory

Govsupport: explicit. Cuban troops supported the MPLA government

Gtypesup: troops. 2000 Cuban troops stationed in Cabinda.

Govextpart: none

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: No

In 1975, FLEC-FAC formed a government in exile and has operated as both a political and military organization.

Rebel estimate: 500

Rebel estimate low: 400

Rebel estimate high: 600

UCDP gives estimates for the number of troops possessed by FLEC-FAC in this period from 400 to less than 600.

Rebel strength: Much Weaker

Angola has one of the more powerful armies in Sub-Saharan Africa, and FLEC-FAC is clearly much weaker.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

FLEC-FAC appears to have a leadership that generally coordinates its activities.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

FLEC-FAC has some popular support in Cabinda, but its ability to mobilize supporters, fight, and procure arms is clearly outmatched by the Algerian government.

Territorial Control: No

FLEC-FAC does not control territory in Cabinda.

Conflict Type: secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: Some

Republic of Congo allows FLEC-FAC to have bases in its territory.

Rebel Support: No

Beyond Congo's allowing it to base in its territory, UCDP gives no indication of external support to FLEC-FAC.

Government Support: No

Government External Support: No

The Angolan government did not receive support in this period.

Period 2: 1997-1998

Post-1997: Transconstsupp: no

Rebextpart: no

Rebpresosts: Some. Refugees in DRC and Congo-B continue to be active in FLEC, however without the support of the governments.

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: Explicit. Congo-B and DRC allowed Angola access to their territory to pursue rebels and cooperated in maintaining border security.

Gtypesup: military.

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- International Boundaries News Database
- Keesings

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Name of Government Supporters: DRC, Republic of Congo

Beginning in 1997, the DRC and Republic of Congo began allowing the Angolan army to operate in their territory and providing some military and logistics support.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

After 1998, the government-FLEC-FAC dyad did not reach 25 battledeaths again until 2002.

2002-2009 Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: No

In 1975, FLEC-FAC formed a government in exile and has operated as both a political and military organization.

Rebel estimate: 300

Rebel estimate low: 300

Rebel estimate high: 2000

UCDP gives estimates for the number of troops possessed by FLEC-FAC in this period ranging from 300 to 2000, with 300 being the most common estimate.

Rebel strength: Much Weaker

Angola has one of the more powerful armies in Sub-Saharan Africa, and FLEC-FAC is clearly much weaker.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

FLEC-FAC appears to have a leadership that generally coordinates its activities.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

FLEC-FAC has some popular support in Cabinda, but its ability to mobilize supporters, fight, and procure arms is clearly outmatched by the Algerian government.

Territorial Control: No

FLEC-FAC does not control territory in Cabinda.

Conflict Type: secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

UCDP gives no indication of external support to FLEC-FAC in this period.

Government Support: No

Government External Support: No

The Angolan government did not receive support in this period.

Ended? No

This dyad was still active into 2010.

Source:

- UCDP

Dyad ID 191: Angola vs. FLEC

Cabinda is a region which belongs to Angola, even though it is cut off from the rest of the country by a small stretch of territory belonging to the Democratic Republic of the Congo (the former Zaire). Cabinda is a small area which is very rich, containing a majority of the oil reserves found in Angola. Some politicians in Cabinda have pushed for the independence of the region from Angola since before the end of the colonial period. Since Angola gained independence from Portugal in 1975, there has been an armed struggle between various factions of the Front for the Liberation of the Cabinda Enclave (FLEC) and the Angolan government, although this conflict has been greatly overshadowed by the conflict with Jonas Savimbi's Union for the Total Liberation of Angola (UNITA, see conflict id 2310). In the 1990s, the conflict has reached a higher intensity, although still never producing more than a few hundred battledeaths in a single year. A long series of negotiations in the 1990s failed to produce a comprehensive peace agreement or serious cease-fire agreement. In 2002, after the Angolan government signed a peace agreement with UNITA it shifted a greater number of troops to Cabinda and began pursuing that war with greater vigor, increasing the number of casualties. However, despite the increased effort, the government has not, as of the end of 2003, been able to completely defeat the FLEC.

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The FLEC has been pushing for the secession of Cabinda from Angola since before Angola became independence. In national elections which were held in 1992, the FLEC called for a boycott of the election and did not participate.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 900

rebstrength: much weaker

There is little information on the number of troops controlled by the FLEC. The Uppsala conflict database identifies two factions of the FLEC, the FLEC-R, which in 1992 they estimate as having 500 troops, and the FLEC-FAC, which in 1994 and 1996 they estimate as having 400 troops. The estimate for the conglomerate group provided above, therefore, is those two numbers together. This number of troops is miniscule compared to the 100,000 the Angolan army is believed to possess.

Centcontrol: no

The FLEC has been beset by fractionalization since its inception.

Mobcap: moderate

The Uppsala conflict database reports that the FLEC has the support of 90

Source:

- Uppsala Conflict Database

Chapter 147

ID 193

ID 193

Incompatibility: Territory, Nagorno-Karabakh

Azerbaijan vs. Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh and Armenia

The region of Nagorno-Karabakh has been one under dispute for decades. The population of Nagorno-Karabakh is majority Armenian, however, when the region was in the Soviet Union it was placed under the control of Armenia. As the Soviet Union began to decline in the late 1980s, the Armenian population in Nagorno-Karabakh began pushing for independence from the Soviet Union and to be merged with an independent Armenia (see conflict id 2830), however, in 1991 when Azerbaijan declared itself an independent state it included Nagorno-Karabakh in the declaration. What had been a conflict between the Soviet Union and Armenia/Nagorno-Karabakh shifted to be a conflict between the newly independent Azerbaijan and the newly independent Armenia and the Nagorno Karabakh. The conflict raged at a high level of intensity from 1992 to 1994. Negotiations in Moscow on May 2-4, 1994, produced a cease-fire agreement and an agreement by parties for the deployment of a peacekeeping force. Ten years later the conflict has been effectively "managed" but not "resolved," peacekeeping forces keep the peace and Nagorno-Karabakh has de-facto independence, but the final status of the province remains unresolved.

2950-2520-0 2950-2530-0 ***These are the same conflict. Consolidate into a single record***

2950-2530-1 ***war between Azerbaijan and Armenia. Drop case***

Nagorno Karabakh is a region in Azerbaijan populated mainly by Armenians. The region declared itself independent after Azerbaijan broke away from the USSR. The President of Armenia made an announcement in March 1992 declaring that the status of Nagorno Karabakh was an internal matter of Azerbaijan. However, despite repeated denials of its involvement it is very clear that Armenia remained involved in the conflict. After negotiations in Moscow on 4-5 May 1994 with CIS delegates, the chair of the National Assembly in Azerbaijan signed a protocol calling for a

ceasefire in the war and the deployment of international peacekeeping forces on 9 May.

Rebels: Republic of Nagorno Karabakh

Transconstsupp: explicit. Ethnic kin in Armenia and among the Armenian diaspora.

Rebextpart: alleged. Inconclusive whether external support was military or simply financial

Rebpresosts: no. Not in any substantial way although there may have been a few fighters in Armenia.

Rebsupport: Explicit. Although Armenia officially denied taking part in the conflict it is clear that they did support the rebels unofficially. Therefore, this will be counted as explicit support.

Rtypesup: military. Armenia provided finances and military support, especially when it was also involved in an international war with Azerbaijan.

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Onwar.com
- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 361: Azerbaijan vs. Republic of Nagorno-Karabkh

Rebpolwing: no

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The forces of the Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh battling the Azerbaijani government began their secessionist campaign before there was an independent Azerbaijan. After Azerbaijan gained independence they pushed for secession, and so did not participate politically in the national Azerbaijani government.

Rebestimate: 10,000

Rebestlow: 1,500

Rebesthigh: 10,00

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimates the troop strength for the Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh throughout the conflict as follows: In 1992, the republic had 1,500-7,000 troops. In 1993 and 1994, the Republic had 10,000. This estimate is in comparison to the following

estimates for Azerbaijan: in 1992, the government had 20,000-25,000 troops; in 1993, it had 42,600. In 1994, it had 56,000.

Chapter 148

ID 194

ID 194

Incompatibility: Territory, Serb

Bosnia and Herzegovina vs. Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbian irregulars, and Yugoslavia

Bosnia and Herzegovina was a Yugoslav republic with a plurality Muslim population (approximately 40% of the population) but a sizable (about 30%) Serbian population. In the early 1990s, as Yugoslavia began to crumble, the leadership in Bosnia decided that it would be better off as an independent state. On March 1, 1992, Bosnia and Herzegovina declared itself independent, which prompted conflict between the Bosnian government and the Serbian population there, who feared being a minority population in the region. On April 7, 1992, a Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina was proclaimed, and the new Republic quickly had the backing of the Yugoslav National Army (JNA) and also gained support from "Serbian irregulars"-Serbian militias based in Serbia and Croatia. The new Bosnian state was at a disadvantage as it did not have a standing army, but rather a territorial defense force, and in the early period of the war the Bosnian Serbs, with the help of their allies, were able to consolidate control over much of eastern Bosnia. A policy of "ethnic cleansing" which led to the death of tens of thousands of Bosnian Muslims in the Serbian Republic brought international attention to the conflict and pressure on the Serbian combatants. In 1993, Yugoslavia renounced claims to Bosnia and the Serbian government stopped officially supporting the Serbian Republic. Unofficial support still continued to flow, however. As the conflict continued the Bosnian army grew stronger and continued human rights violations led to greater international pressure, culminating in a North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) led bombing campaign. In the fall of 1995 a series of peace agreements were forged and on December 14, 1995, the Dayton Peace Accords, a comprehensive peace agreement, divided Bosnia into ethnic zones and established a power-sharing governmental arrangement, and a massive United Nations peacekeeping force was deployed to the country to aid implementation.

All of these refer to the same conflict. 2960-2550-2, refers to Yugoslavia and should be deleted. The Serbian Republic of B&H and the Serbian Irregulars fought together. Serbian irregulars were non-local militias from other parts of the F Yugoslavia.

The declaration of Bosnian independence was not endorsed by the Serbs living in Bosnia. This group feared that they would be given a minority status in the new Bosnian state and preferred to remain within Yugoslavia. In January 1992, preparations for Serb autonomy within Bosnia had started and on 7 April, 'the Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina' was proclaimed. The Bosnian Serbs were assisted by independent militias set up by Serbs originating from Serbia or Croatia. Many of these irregular forces had previously been active in the conflict between the republic of Croatia and Croatian Serbs. Comprehensive peace negotiations started on 1 November in Dayton, USA. The peace talks led up to the signing of a peace agreement on 14 December.

Rebels: Serbian Republic of B&H (+Serbian irregulars)

Transconstsupp: explicit. Support by Serbs in other former Yugoslav republics.

Rebextpart: yes, major. Militias from Yugoslavia, Croatia, others joined in the fighting.

Rebpresosts: yes, some. Some troops located in other countries although most are local.

Rebsupport: explicit. Support by Russia (diplomatic), Yugoslavia (military).

Rtypesup: troops. While Russia was sympathetic to Serbs, Yugoslavia became an active third party. It is unclear whether Yugoslavia can be seen as militarily supporting the Serbian independence movement or if it had aims of its own (namely to annex the Serb Republic). However, Yugoslav troops fought with rebels.

Govsupport: explicit.

Gtypesup: non-military. Member states of the Islamic Conference as well as Turkey provided finances.

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Onwar.com
- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 292: Bosnia and Herzegovina vs. Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina declared itself as an independent republic and established a government. It was not recognized as independent, however.

Rebestimate: 62,500

Rebestlow: 40,000

Rebestimate: 85,000

Rebstrength: parity

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks report the troop strength of the Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina over the course of the conflict as follows. In 1992, the republic had 40,000-48,000 troops. In 1993, the republic had 80,000 troops. In 1994, the republic had 50,000 to 80,000 troops. In 1995, the republic had 75,000 to 85,000 troops. These troop numbers were smaller than the total armed force of the Bosnian republic at the peak of its power, however, the Serbian Republic received support from the Yugoslav National Army and the Serbian irregulars.

Dyad ID 300: Bosnia and Herzegovina vs. Serbian irregulars

Rebpolwing: no

The Serbian irregulars were Serbian militias from Croatia and Bosnia and they did not participate in the domestic political process in Bosnia.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: weaker

None of the sources provided any information on the number of Serbian irregulars in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is clear that, on their own, the Serbian irregulars were weaker than the Bosnian government forces.

Chapter 149

ID 195

ID 195

Incompatibility: Territory, Serb

Croatia vs. Serbian Republic of Krajina, Serbian Irregulars, and Yugoslavia

The collapse of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in the early 1990s led to a number of very bloody conflicts (see for example conflict ids. 2960, 3040, 3050, and 3210). Yugoslavia had been made up of a number of republics, most of which had a majority ethnic population that was dominant but also had a minority population that was a majority in another republic. The republic of Croatia was majority Croat, but there was a sizable Serbian population as well. In 1990, when it was clear that Croatia was on the path to independence, Serbs in Croatia began to clamour for self-determination and declared an autonomous Serbian Republic of Krajina. Conflict had already broken out before Croatia gained formal independence in 1992 when the new constitution of the Republic of Yugoslavia renounced claims to the former republic. In 1992 the government of Croatia fought to protect its territory against three groups, the "government" forces of the Serbian Republic of Krajina, Serbian militias (the Serbian Irregulars), and the army of the Republic of Yugoslavia, which was dominated by Serbia. These various forces allied against the Croatian government had different goals, with the Serbian Republic of Krajina fighting to protect the rights of Serbs within Croatia but some of the Serbian irregulars pushing for the Serbian Republic to break away from Croatia and join with Serbia. The international community was involved in trying to bring about a peaceful end to the conflict from the beginning. In February 2002, the United Nations deployed a 14,000 strong peacekeeping force with a mandate to facilitate the disarmament of Serbian enclaves within Croatia. The force was unable to prevent continued clashes, however, and the conflict continued through 1993. A cease-fire was signed between the Croat government and the Serbian Republic of Krajina in December 1993 and the conflict was largely inactive in 1994. In 1995, however, fighting flared up again as the Croatian army fought to regain territory captured by the Serbian Republic. Talks continued throughout the year and in December 1995,

the parties signed the Dayton Peace Accords, a comprehensive peace agreement dealing with all of the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, and it was agreed that the Serbian-held territories would eventually be integrated back into Croatia.

These are all the same conflict. 2970-2570-2 refers to Yugoslavia, who fought on behalf of local Serbs. Serbian irregular forces were non-local militias who were involved in the fighting, but they are non-distinguishable from the local rebels. These id's should be reduced to a single id #

In general terms, the matter of dispute between the warring parties concerned the right to the territory populated by the Serbs living in Croatia. Croatian Serbs declared autonomy for a 'Serbian Republic of Krajina' within Croatia. The war broke out as Croatia contested the Serbian claim of this area and continued to regard it as Croatian soil. Croatian Serbs were assisted by various independent militias, set up by non-local Serbs originating from Serbia. The Serbian irregulars merged increasingly with the JNA (Yugoslavian National Army) during 1992. The conflict ended partly through Serbian defeat, and partly through the signing of a peace agreement.

Rebels: Serbian Republic of Krajina

Transconstsupp: explicit. Support by Serbs in Yugoslavia.

Rebextpart: yes, major support. Serbian militias played a significant role in the fighting.

Rebpresosts: unknown. Probably some, minor, presence.

Rebsupport: Yes, explicit support from Yugoslavia

Rtypesup: military

Govsupport: Yes, explicit. Received weapons from Slovenia and Hungary

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: yes, minor. Some help from Bosnian Croats.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 291: Croatia vs. Serbian Irregulars

Rebpolwing: no

The Serbian Irregulars were Serbian militias based in Croatia. They did not participate in the domestic political process.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 16,000

Rebstrenth: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimated that in 1992 the Serbian Irregulars comprised 16,000 troops. This was considerably weaker than the Croatian government forces.

Dyad ID 303: Croatia vs. Serbian Republic of Krajina

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Serbian Republic of Krajina established a government and declared autonomy and so acted as a political unit. They were not recognized as autonomous by the Croatian government, however.

Rebestimate: 42,500

Rebestlow: 35,000

Rebesthigh: 50,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimated that in 1995 the Serbian Republic of Krajina had between 35,000 and 50,000 troops. This was a weaker force than that possessed by the Croatian government, who in 1995 were estimated to have 100,000 to 110,000 troops.

Chapter 150

ID 196

ID 196

Incompatibility: Government, Egypt

Egypt vs. Islamists Organizations

For the last several decades Egypt's secular government has been challenged by those who would rather see an Islamic government similar to that in Iran. In the 1980s there was some conflict in Egypt between the government and Islamist rebels (the most notable event being the assassination of President Anwar Sadat) but this conflict was tempered because many of the militant Islamists had gone to Afghanistan to battle the Soviet Union there. In the early 1990s many of them returned to Egypt and by 1993 the conflict was causing at least 25 deaths per year. The conflict mainly involved violent clashes between police officers and members of the Islamic groups, however, there were some massacres of civilians and other terrorist actions undertaken by the groups. The most extreme example was a massacre by al-Gamaa al-Islamiyya at Luxor in 1997 that resulted in the deaths of 60 people, primarily tourists. After the massacre at Luxor the ability of these groups to mobilize supporters was severely diminished and by the end of 1998 most violence between these groups and the Egyptian government had stopped.

Notes on Coding

Note: There is very little information about this conflict. In particular, there is almost no information that would allow for differentiating between the three groups identified as participants.

Dyad ID 241: Egypt vs. al-Gamaa al-Islamiyya

Govt vs al-Gama al Islamiyya. Al-Gama was the part of the Islamic movement that, unlike the more moderate Muslim Brotherhood, followed the pro-violence and anti-governmental teaching of Sayed Qutb, and later Omar Abd al-Rahman. Al-Gama and other Jihadist groups (above) split

in 1984. The goal of the Sunni Muslim al-Gama'a al-Islamiyya was to oust the government of President Mubarak and to replace it with an Islamic republic. There were no negotiations or agreements between al-Gama'a and the government but the eventual weakening of al-Gama'a resulted in a unilateral truce being called by imprisoned leaders during the spring of 1996 and the summer of 1997. This peace initiative was rejected by the government, which did not want to engage in talks with militants.

Rebels: Al-Gamaa al Islamiyya

Transconstsupp: yes, explicit. Explicit support by Muslim extremist groups, al-Qaeda.

Rebextpart: yes, major. Militants from across the Arab/Muslim world and among immigrant networks in Europe

Represosts: yes, some. Rebels located especially in Sudan but also in other states.

Rebsup: yes, explicit. Alleged support from Iran, but more substantial support from Sudan

Rebtypesupport: military. Assistance from Sudan for logistics and bases.

Govesup: Explicit support from the US.

Gtypesup. Military. Assistance with training and anti-terrorism measures

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>

Rebpolwing: no

Al-Gamaa al-Islamiyya is primarily a terrorist organization that has operated through political assassination. It has not openly participated in the Egyptian political process.

Rebestimate: 6,000

Rebestlow: 3,000

Rebesthigh: 9,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that all Islamist organizations in Egypt comprised somewhere between 5,000 and 15,000 members from 1993 to 1995. The database also says that Al-Gamaa al-Islamiyya is by far the largest of these groups so I have estimated their troop strength as 60% of that total number, with the best estimate being the middle of the range. Clearly the group is considerably weaker than the Egyptian government.

Chapter 151

ID 197

ID 197

Incompatibility: Territory, Abkhazia

Dyad ID 259: Georgia vs. Republic of Abkhazia

When the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991 Georgia, which had been one of the "Soviet Socialist Republics" declared independence. Not all of the population of Georgia was supportive of independence, however, and in particular the country's Abkhazian population was opposed to it. Tensions between the Abkhazian region and the Georgian national government increased until July 23, 1992, when an independent Republic of Abkhazia was declared. The Georgian national government was unwilling to allow the Republic to go and declared it illegal, and dispatched troops from the Georgian army to Abkhazia in August 1992. The Georgian troops captured Suchumi, the capital of Abkhazia, but only held it for a month until it was recaptured by Abkhaz forces. In September 1992, the first in a series of ceasefires was signed but little progress was made on implementation and violence continued. The conflict reached a stalemate in late 1993 with neither side able to make much more progress and a cease-fire was signed on December 1, 1993. Negotiations continued in 1994 with some progress being made and in May 1994 a Russian peacekeeping force was deployed to keep the two sides separate. Although the conflict has stayed latent and violence has been largely avoided for the last ten years the conflict cannot be called resolved because there are still fundamental differences between the two sides.

Abkhazians did not welcome the Georgian independence declaration from the Soviet Union in April 1991. On 23 July 1992 the Supreme Soviet of the autonomous republic of Abkhazia proclaimed the state's sovereignty. Georgian troops entered Suchumi, the capital of Abkhazia. The UN sent a small team of observers to Georgia in August 1993, and this event marked the start of a long process of international peacemaking efforts in the country. Following two days of negotiations an eight-point memorandum, where a ceasefire and further negotiations, among other things,

was agreed to on 1 December 1993.

Rebels: Republic of Abkhazia

Transconstsupp: yes, explicit support by Confederation of Caucasian Mountain Peoples and Russian nationalists.

Rebextpart: yes, major. support by the Confederation of Caucasian Mountain Peoples.

Rebpresosts: no. not known.

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: Explicit. Russia declared support for Georgian territorial integrity.

Gtypesup: military assistance.

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Keesings
- Patrick Brogan

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

It was the governing body of the autonomous republic of Abkhazia, the "Supreme Soviet" that declared independence in 1992.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 5,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute reports that the Republic of Abkhazia had 5,000 troops in 1993. This number is compared to 20,000 troops possessed by the Georgian government.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks

Chapter 152

ID 198

ID 198

Incompatibility: Territory, South Ossetia

Dyad ID 297: Georgia vs. Republic of South Ossetia

When the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, the former Soviet republic of Georgia became an independent state. The new government in Georgia was led by Zviad Gamsakhurdia who expressed a strong pro-Georgia ideology. This ideology alienated some of the minority ethnic groups in Georgia, including the inhabitants of South Ossetia. In December 1991, the government of South Ossetia voted to declare independence and to reintegrate with the Russian federation, and in January 1992 a referendum for independence passed with an overwhelming majority. The Georgian army was deployed to South Ossetia, however, at the same time as this conflict was occurring Gamsakhurdia was under attack and troops were pulled back to defend him in Tbilisi, the Georgian capital. When Gamsakhurdia fled to Armenia a new president, Eduard Shevardnadze took over. Shevardnadze maintained a policy opposed to Ossetian independence. However, he also expressed a willingness to negotiate with the region. On June 24, 1992, the two sides agreed to a ceasefire and to participate in a peacekeeping mission that would involve equal numbers of troops from Georgia, South Ossetia and Russia, and the conflict has been largely contained since then. The conflict is still not terminated, as the fundamental question of South Ossetia's status is unresolved, but the violence has been largely contained.

South Ossetia voted for independence from Georgia on 21 December 1991 and held a referendum on 19 January 1992. On both occasions an overwhelming majority was produced in favor of independence for the region and reintegration into the Russian Federation. The two fighting parties made some efforts to reconcile and negotiate an end to the problem, most of the time without progress but a somewhat more permanent solution came in June 1992. A ceasefire and the withdrawal of all armed forces from South Ossetia were agreed on and a peacekeeping force made up

of Russian, Georgian and Ossetian troops was established.

Rebels: Republic of South Ossetia

Transconstupp: tacit support/sympathy, by Russian nationalist parties in Russia

Rebextpart: none.

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Keesings
- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The South Ossetian government declared independence and their call was backed by a popular referendum in the region.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 3,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events reported in July 2002 that the South Ossetians had 3,000 nationalist fighters.

Centcont: no

Keesing's Record of World Events also reported in July 2002 that there was no unified command structure for these 3,000 troops.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 153

ID 199

ID 199

Incompatibility: Territory, Dneister

Dyad ID 367: Moldova vs. Dneistr Republic

Moldova gained independence from the Soviet Union on August 27, 1991. At the time of independence, the Moldovan government put in place a series of policies aimed at shifting the country away from the Russian language and culture and more toward Romanian language and culture, prompting fears among the country's other ethnic groups that the government would eventually push for unification with Romania. The Dneistr region of Moldova had a population that was primarily Russian and Ukranian. On September 2, 1991, the Supreme Soviet of the Dneistr voted to secede and join the Soviet Union. The government of Moldova refused to let the region go and violence broke out between the two groups. The conflict stayed at a low level until violence escalated in early 1992. The parties began negotiating in March 1992, signing and then breaking a ceasefire, but a lasting ceasefire was signed on July 21, 1992, between Moldova and Russia (the Dneistr was not a signatory to the agreement) ended the violence. The conflict is still not completely settled, as the fundamental issue of the political status of the Dneistr region has not been resolved, but it has been a peaceful conflict since July 1992.

In 1989 the Law on the Official Language of Moldova was adopted, which proclaimed Romanian the official language of the Republic. This event intensified the fears that Moldova would unite with Romania. In 1990 there were elections in Moldova and the parliament constituted after the elections consisted of a great majority of ethnic Moldovans. In May 1990 the people of Transnistria refused to recognise the new parliament and on 2 September 1990 they proclaimed their independence from Moldova. On 27 August 1991 Independence was declared. In the Declaration of Independence the Moldavians explicitly called the Dniester area as part of their historic and ethnic territory. The leaders in the Dniestr Regions were soon to react and on 2 September they voted to

join the USSR. Moldova have once and again offered Dniestr Republic a self-governing territory and a free economic zone, but the Dniestr Republic have continued to struggle for an independent state.

Rebels: Dniestr Republic

Transconstsup: tacit support. More sympathy than open support from Russians.

Rebextpart: no

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: explicit. Help from Russia

Rtypesup: endorsement, diplomatic/political. Russia negotiated with Moldova on behalf of Transnistrians.

Govsupport: Explicit. Help from Romania

Gtypesup: military. Provision of arms and specialists.

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

It was the governing body of the Dniestr region, the Supreme Soviet, that declared independence in September 1991.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 4,000

Rebstrength: parity

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that in 1992 the Dniestr region had 4,000 troops at its disposal. This is the same number that the Database identifies the Moldovan government as possessing.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Uppsala Conflict Database

Chapter 154

ID 200

ID 200

Incompatibility: Government, Tajikistan

Dyad ID 353: Tajikistan, Russia and Uzbekistan vs. UTO

Tajikistan gained independence from the Soviet Union in 1991. In the years following independence, the Supreme Soviet of Tajikistan, the same party which had held power during the Soviet period, continued to have the majority in the government. Shortly after independence, however, groups in Tajikistan which had been excluded from the political process during the Soviet period began protesting and pushing for greater involvement in the newly independent Tajikistan. There were three major parties clamoring for a greater role in the political process, they were the Islamic Renaissance Party, the Democratic Party and the Renaissance Movement, and the three groups collectively became known as the United Tajik Opposition (UTO). Armed skirmishes between the government and the UTO were frequent, and the conflict was at its peak of intensity in 1992 and 1993, with the conflict resulting in 20,000 battledeaths by the end of 1993. A series of negotiations and cease-fires occurred over the next three years and the intensity of the conflict decreased significantly. On June 27, 1997, a final peace agreement was signed in Moscow, which specified that the UTO would be given 30% of the seats in the government and that UTO troops would be integrated into the Tajik army.

These all refer to government v.s. UTO. Drop duplicate entries

Elections contested after fall of communism. The Islamic Renaissance Party (IRP), the Democratic Party and the Rastokhez (Renaissance) movement, who later together came to be known as the United Tajik Opposition, contested election results. Fighting ensues. The government was unsuccessful in halting the violence despite help from peacekeeping troops sent by the Commonwealth of Independent States, CIS. Instead, the conflict intensified during 1993. "The Moscow declaration", was signed on 27 June 1997. The agreement included, among other things that 30%

of all parliamentary seats should go to the UTO and that part of the UTO troops was to be integrated into the Tajik army. Russia and Tajikistan had also signed a friendship treaty, after which Yelstin stated Russia's commitment "to assist peacekeeping efforts on the part of the leadership of the Republic of Tajikistan".

Rebels: UTO

Transconstsupp: explicit. Islamist groups in the region provide sympathy, direct assistance. Hekmatiar's Pushtuns from Afghanistan support the UTO.

Rebextpart: alleged. Possible support from groups in Uzbekistan and Afghanistan

Rebpresosts: extensive. Bases located in Afghanistan.

Rebsupport: None.

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: Explicit. Russia and Uzbekistan backing government forces.

Gtypesup: military

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Onwar.com

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The United Tajik Opposition was made up of three political parties that were pushing for a greater role in the political process.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 16,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) estimated that in 1992 the Popular Democratic Army (later the UTO) had 16,000 troops. In the subsequent years of the conflict no estimate is available for their troop strength. In 1993, SIPRI estimated that the Tajik government only had 2,000-3,000 troops at its disposal; however, its forces were supported by Russia and Uzbekistan both of which had much greater military might than the UTO.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks

Dyad ID 415: Tajikistan vs. Movement for Peace in Tajikistan

In early November, 1998, the renegade Tajik First Brigade, under the command of Col Makhmud Khudoberdiyev, invaded the Tajik region of Leninabad and killed police and military officers there. Khudoberdiyev had in August 1997 attempted a coup which failed. The army responded with force to the invasion of Leninabad and within days the Movement for Peace in Tajikistan forces had been routed and forced to flee the country, and the conflict was over.

Movement for Peace in Tajikistan. An ex-army officer, Khudoberdiyev claimed that the Tajik government did not want peace and that the peace agreement reached at the end of 1996 could not create peace since all groups and regions was not represented. Khudoberdiyev had been involved in violence also in August 1997 when he tried to commit a state coup. Group defeated.

Rebels: Movement for Peace in Tajikistan. Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: None

Represosts: Some. Troop presence in Afghanistan and possibly Tajikistan

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: unclear

The supporters of the armed faction of the military led by Khudoberdiyev wanted the group to have 40% of the seats in the coalition government. The group was viable for so little time that it is unclear whether it was legal or not, in either case, it had virtually no impact on politics in Tajikistan.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 1,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the Movement for Peace in Tajikistan had 1,000 troops in the conflict, as compared to 5,000-7,000 possessed by the Tajik government.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 155

ID 201

ID 201

Incompatibility: Government, Azerbaijan

Azerbaijan vs. Husseinov Military Faction and OPON Forces

This conflict is best described in two periods, one for each dyad.

Conflict Summary:

Period 1 Azerbaijan gained independence upon the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 and in June 1992 Abulfaz Elchibey was elected President. Opposition to the Elchibey regime began almost immediately, however, and in early 1993 the President dismissed Suret Husseinov (note: Keesing's refers to this person as Surat Guseinov), a colonel in the military who Elchibey accused of plotting a coup. On June 4, 1993, Elchibey ordered the Azerbaijani army to attack the 709th brigade, the unit loyal to Husseinov. Husseinov's forces won and the victory prompted the leader to march on Baku, the capital, which he did largely unimpeded, and on June 18, 1993, Elchibey fled to Moscow. He was replaced by Heydar Aliyev, who negotiated with Husseinov and agreed to let him become Premier Minister, and on June 25, 1993, the legislature voted to transfer executive powers to Aliyev and impeach Elchibey. On October 3, 1993, Aliyev was elected president.

Period 2 Over the next two years a number of other political tensions escalated into violence. The most dramatic was a conflict between Aliyev and the OPON militia-a police militia attached to the Interior Ministry. On March 13, 1995 the OPON mutinied and attacked a police station in Baku and seized buildings in the northwest of the country. In response Aliyev ordered the militia disbanded and on March 17, 1993, the army attacked the militia, soundly defeating it.

****These events are a pair of coups****

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 362: Azerbaijan vs. Husseinov Military Faction

The first uprising was launched in 1993. In February, a military officer named Suret Husseinov withdrew from Baku to the north of Azerbaijan. Husseinov's forces launched a successful coup. The President then gave support to Heydar Aliyev, a former communist leader. Aliyev proclaimed himself President. After Husseinov had taken Baku, he agreed with Aliyev to share power and subsequently became Premier Minister.

Rebels: Husseinov Faction

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: extensive, presence in Russia

Rebsupport: explicit. Russia allowed Husseinov forces to use a base on its territory.

Rtypesup: military.

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Rebpolwing: no

Husseinov was a colonel in the Azerbaijani military and had not participated in the political process.

Rebpolestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: stronger

None of the sources identified the number of troops possessed by Husseinov. However, his forces were able to soundly defeat the government forces they came into conflict with.

Dyad ID 407: Azerbaijan vs. OPON

In autumn, the alliance between Husseinov and Aliyev broke down. Husseinov fled to Moscow after having been accused of plotting to overthrow Aliyev. Relations also strained between Aliyev and the OPON, the special police militia attached to the Ministry of Internal Affairs. In mid-March, the OPON mutinied. On 13 March, the President formulated a decree that disbanded the OPON due to their coup attempt. A few days later, the government forces stormed the OPON headquarters. Violent clashes broke out between the parties with at least 70 people being killed. President Aliyev's troops were victorious and the OPON was defeated and dissolved.

Rebels: OPON.

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a.

Govsuport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The OPON was a police militia under the command of the Interior Ministry. Although shortly after the conflict broke out on March 13, 1997, the OPON was disbanded, at the time of the outbreak of conflict it was a legal organization.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 3,000

rebstrength: weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events in March 1995 reported that the OPON contained 3,000 troops. Clearly it was no match for the Azerbaijani army.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 156

ID 202

ID 202

Incompatibility: Territory, Bihaca Krajina

Dyad ID 294: Bosnia and Herzegovina vs. Autonomous Province of Western Bosnia

At peace talks to resolve the various Bosnian conflicts (see conflict ids 2960 and 3050) in 1993, the President of Bosnia agreed in principal to a plan to divide Bosnia into three ethnic regions. One member of the State Presidency, Fikret Abdic, disagreed with the proposed ethnic division and argued that inter-ethnic relations were good in his region of Bihacka Krajina in northwest Bosnia. In September 1993 Abdic declared an "Autonomous Province of Western Bosnia" where all ethnic groups would be welcomed and treated equally. The Bosnian government denounced his declaration of an autonomous region as illegal and deployed a small number of troops to defeat his forces, however, the Bosnia Serb and Croat armies agreed to support Abdic to keep goods flowing to their front lines. Additionally, the Bosnian government could not afford to divert very many forces from the front lines of those other conflicts. The conflict continued at a low level of intensity until in 1994, after the implementation of a peace deal between Bosnia and the Croatian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bosnian President Izetbegovic and Croatian President Franco Tudjman agreed to cooperate militarily. On August 6, 1996, the combined armies of Croatia and Bosnia attacked Abdic's forces and the Autonomous Province of Western Bosnia was soundly defeated.

In 1992, the republic of Bosnia seceded from Yugoslavia and became an independent state. Violent conflict ensued between the Muslim-dominated Bosnian government and Croat and Serb communities in Bosnia. Early on, Serb and Croat autonomous regions within Bosnia were declared, and the armed violence spurred the ethnification of the Bosnian society. In September 1993, Abdic declared the 'Autonomous Province of Western Bosnia', the area around Bihac, to have the same

status that the three ethnically based states that were taking form. The new entity would constitutionally guarantee the equality of all national groups. Abdic was eventually defeated.

Rebels: Autonomous Province of Western Bosnia

Transconstsupp: no.

Rebextpart: yes, minor. Received assistance from Serbian militias although does not appear to have been a lasting alliance between the parties.

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsupport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: explicit. Members of the Islamic Conference & Turkey grant financial assistance.

Gtypesup: non-military assistance. Financial help

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The leader of the Autonomous Province of Western Bosnia, Fikret Abdic, was a Bosnian politician who was unhappy with the proposed division of the country along ethnic lines.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

No information was available on the number of troops possessed by the Autonomous Province of Western Bosnia. However it is clear that the military force possessed by Abdic was completely outmatched by the Bosnian government, the region was only able to challenge the government as long as it did because the vast majority of the Bosnian army was deployed to battle either the Serbs or the Croats.

Source:

- Uppsala Conflict Database

Chapter 157

ID 203

ID 203

Incompatibility: Territory, Croat

Bosnia and Herzegovina vs. Croatia, Croatian Irregulars, and Croatian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina

The federal republic of Yugoslavia dissolved in the early 1990s and in 1992 Bosnia and Herzegovina declared itself an independent state. Bosnia and Herzegovina was a state with a majority Muslim population but also had a significant Serb and Croat population. In 1992, conflict erupted between the Bosnian government and the Serb population there (see conflict id 2960). In July 1992, the Croats living in Bosnia declared an autonomous Croat Republic in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Over the next nine months a few more violent clashes occurred and in April 1993 the conflict escalated to full-scale warfare. The Bosnian government faced three different groups fighting on behalf of the Croats, the unrecognized government of the Croat Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, a set of militias from Croatia referred to as "Croatian irregulars" and the Croatian army itself. International pressure on Croatia forced Croatian President Franco Tudjman to pull most of his troops out of Bosnia in late 1993, but Bosnia still engaged in conflict with the other two parties. Finally, a peace agreement between the Bosnian government and the Croatian Republic was signed on March 1, 1994, calling for a federal republic of Bosnia with power-sharing between the two groups. Some clashes continued but implementation of the agreement began in May, 1994.

Note: these pairs should be reduced to a single dyad: Bosnian gov't v.s. Croats (Croatian Republic of B&H or HVO). Croatian Irregulars were non-local Croats who fought alongside the HVO. Croatia is also listed as an actor and should be removed; its role came through support of the HVO.

When Bosnia declared itself independent from Yugoslavia, an enclave of Croats fought to partition Bosnia along ethnic lines. The Croatian Republic of B&H (HVO) were local Croats who fought

the gov't, with the support of Croatia proper. Croatian irregulars were Croats from other parts of Yugoslavia, these groups ended up under the command of the HVO. In August 1993, the warring parties accepted an Owen-Stoltenberg peace proposal as a basis for further negotiations. The peace plan divided Bosnia-Herzegovina into a confederation of three ethnically based states, under a central government with limited powers.

Rebels: HVO (+ Croatian Irregulars)

Transconstsupp: explicit. Support of Croatian co-ethnics in other parts of the former Yugoslavia.

Rebextpart: yes, major. Croatian irregulars were non-local opposition forces.

Rebpresosts: some. Unclear if Croats had bases elsewhere, especially in Croatia. But, probable that troops did use Croatian territory.

Rebsupport: explicit. Explicit support by Croatian government

Rtypesup: troops. Croatia supplied troops to assist the HVO.

Govsupport: explicit. Members states of the Islamic Conference provided funding.

Gtypesup: non-military. Financial support by Muslim governments.

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Patrick Brogan
- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 293: Bosnia and Herzegovina vs. Croatian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Croatian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina declared itself an autonomous region and established a government. This government was not recognized as independent, however.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 50,000

Rebstrength: parity

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimates the troop strength of the Croatian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina at 50,000. This is a comparable force to the number of troops the Bosnian government had deployed to the Croatian sphere of conflict in the republic.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks
- Uppsala Conflict Database

Dyad ID 301: Bosnia and Herzegovina vs. Croatian irregulars

Rebpolwing: no

The Croatian irregulars were militias from Croatia that intervened on behalf of the Croats in Bosnia. Each militia had a political agenda, one in particular was seeking to restore the borders of Croatia from the fascist Ustasha regime during World War II. However, the Croatian irregulars did not participate in the domestic political process in Bosnia in any fashion.

Rebestimate: 16,000

Rebestlow: 1,000

Rebesthigh: 45,000

Rebstrength: weaker

It is not at all unclear how many troops the Croatian irregulars had in Bosnia. The Uppsala conflict database gives the range from 1,000 to 45,000 but reports that in January 2002 it appeared that 16,000 Croatian irregulars were in Bosnia. The Croatian irregulars on their own were no match for the Bosnian national government

Chapter 158

ID 204

ID 204

Incompatibility: Government, Russia

Dyad ID 350: Russia vs. Parliamentary Forces

In late 1991, the Soviet Union was dissolved and Russia became an independent nation again. In September 1993, Russian President Boris Yeltsin began pushing for constitutional reform that would seriously reshift the executive-legislative power balance in favor of the executive. This push led to conflict with some members of parliament. On September 23, 1993, the first clashes between forces loyal to the parliamentarians and those loyal to Yeltsin occurred and on October 3 the violence reached a higher level when supporters of the parliamentarians stormed the Moscow mayor's office. Over a two day period armed fighting took place between government forces and the supporters of the parliamentarians. The latter were not well-organized, more like a mob of supporters than an organized fighting force, but numbers in the tens of thousands. Despite these numbers they were no match for the government forces and on October 4 the parliamentarians admitted defeat, many were arrested, and a process was put in place that led to the greater consolidation of power under the executive.

The President's reformist approach and, in particular, his efforts to advance constitutional reform caused concern among the nationalist and communist parliamentary deputies in the Supreme Soviet (the Russian legislative body). When Yeltsin, on 21 September 1993, issued the decree 'On Gradual Constitutional Reform,' stating that the powers of the legislature should be suspended with immediate effect, the latent conflict between the two camps escalated rapidly. Conflict between the President and Parliament ensued, with President Yeltsin emerging victorious.

Rebels: Parliamentary Forces

Transconstsup: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: none

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsuport

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The parliamentary forces were supporters were opposed to the reform program initiated by Russian president Boris Yeltsin that would have increased the powers of the executive.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 40,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Keesing's Record of World Events in October 1993 wrote that the Financial Times reported that the demonstrators on behalf of the parliamentarians numbered approximately 40,000.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 159

ID 205

ID 205

Incompatibility: Government, Mexico

Dyad ID 230: Mexico vs. EZLN

A low-scale conflict broke out in Mexico on January 1, 1994 when the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN) seized four towns in the southern province of Chiapas. The Zapatistas made demands on the behalf of the indigenous populations of Chiapas who had reaped little benefit from years of economic development in Mexico. The EZLN timed the outbreak to coincide with the implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement. Clashes occurred between the Mexican government and the EZLN and a string of peace talks between the actors began in February 1994. The conflict has continued at a very low level of intensity with the EZLN shifting to more peaceful tactics of organization and protest. In 1996, the EZLN and the Mexican government signed a general agreement on indigenous rights but the agreement broke down after the EZLN accused the government of failing to fully implement it.

The rebels identified themselves as the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN - Ejercito Zapatista de la Liberacin Nacional) and they called for the reforms Zapata had fought and died for during the years of the revolution. EZLN detailed a series of demands for economic and social change in the region, culminating in a declaration of war against the Government and a statement of intent to depose President Salinas. The insurgency coincided with Mexico entering NAFTA in 1994. It was not until 16 February 1996 that a minimal accord on indigenous rights and culture was signed by representatives of the EZLN and the government.

Rebels: EZLN

Transconstsupp: no

Rebextpart: no

Rebpresosts: no
Rebsuport: none
Rtypesup: n/a
Govsuport: none
Govtypesup: none
Govextpart: none
Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: no

Although the EZLN was opposed to Mexico's ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party, it was not directly affiliated with any political party.

Rebestimate: 400

Rebestlow: 200

Rebesthigh: 600

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the EZLN had between 200 and 600 troops. It is clear that the EZLN was not a match for the Mexican army.

Centcont: yes Strengthcent: high

The EZLN is led by Subcommander Marcos, an elusive figure who always appears in public in a ski mask and whose identity is not definitively known. The leadership exercises strong control over the organization.

Mobcap: moderate

Since its initial military success, the EZLN has focused on mobilizing the population in Chiapas to push for greater rights for indigenous peoples there.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Uppsala Conflict Database

Dyad ID 299: Mexico vs. EPR

TBA

Chapter 160

ID 206

ID 206

Incompatibility: Territory, Chechnya

Dyad ID 348: Russia vs. Republic of Chechnya

The Republic of Chechnya was an Autonomous Republic in the Republic of Russia when the Soviet Union was still in existence. When the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, the Russian government under Boris Yeltsin considered Chechnya a state within Russia. On the other hand, the President of Chechnya, Dzochar Dudayev, declared Chechnya independent and seized key government buildings, killing state representatives in Grozny, the capital of Chechnya. Despite the differences between the Russian and Chechnyan governments there was little armed conflict until 1994 when Yeltsin decided to abandon a policy of supporting internal Chechnyan dissidents and deployed the Russian army to the province. Fighting raged on a heavy scale for the next two years until Dudayev's death in May 1996 prompted the two sides to initiate negotiations. A comprehensive cease fire was signed in August 1996 and the conflict was dormant until 1999. In August 1999 fighters from Chechnya infiltrated into the neighboring province of Dagestan and declared independence there (see conflict id 3240). The Russian army launched attacks against Chechnya again with the aim of ending the de-facto independence of the province. Since then the Russian army has generally had the upper hand but the conflict has been very destructive, producing huge numbers of casualties and refugees.

Chechnya has sought independence/autonomy from Russia since the end of the Soviet Union. In 1991, as the Soviet Union was falling apart, Dzochar Dudayev declared independence for Chechnya. The 'Chechens' were never one unified party, but rather consisted of several different anti-Russian groupings. Several rebel factions are listed under the umbrella of "Republic of Chechnya."

Rebels: Republic of Chechnya

Transconstsupp: explicit support. Conflict is linked to many Islamic radical movements which

offer support and finances. Alleged links with al-Qaeda.

Rebextpart: yes, minor support. Fighters from around the Muslim world have given support and joined the rebellion. Alleged links with al-Qaeda.

Rebpresosts: some troops, appear to be operating out of Georgia. Russia alleges that Georgia allows this, but Georgia has denied the claim

Rebsupport: alleged. Russia alleges that Georgia allows rebels to use its territory, which Georgia has denied. Most likely that Georgia does not have full control over mountainous regions in the north and is not actively backing the rebels.

Rtypesup: allegedly use of territory, but more likely that there is no active support.

Govsupport: none

Gtypesup: none

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Notes on Coding

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The government of the Republic of Chechnya was what initially declared independence in 1991 and was a legal government within the Russian federation.

Rebestimate: 15,000

Rebestlow: 5,000

Rebesthigh: 25,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute annual yearbooks report the following numbers of troops for the Republic of Chechnya across the conflict. In 1995, the range is 12,000-20,000. In 1996, the range is 5,000-10,000. In 1999, 2000 and 2001 the range is 8,000-25,000. The estimate here is listed as 15,000 since that is right around the middle of the range identified for most years. SIPRI identifies the Russian army as possessing 1.5 million troops, clearly considerably stronger than the Chechen forces.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks

Chapter 161

ID 207

ID 207

Incompatibility: Territory, South Yemen

Dyad ID 375: Yemen-Democratic Republic of Yemen

North and South Yemen were two separate states during the colonial and Cold War period that were merged in 1990 to form one state of Yemen. Even after the merger, however, both North and South Yemen maintained a separate military. In late 1993 a political crisis emerged over a dispute between the President of Yemen, who was from the north, and the Vice President, who was from the south. The conflict escalated through political assassinations until in April 1994 the two armies clashed with each other. The southern Yemenese politicians seceded and declared an independent Democratic Republic of Yemen in what had been South Yemen, but the southern army was soundly defeated by the north in July 1994.

The Republic of Yemen was founded on 22 May 1990 when the Arab Republic of Yemen (North Yemen) merged with the People's Republic of Yemen (South Yemen). A dispute between the President and the Vice-President and the Minister of Defense, both of which were former southern officials, was fuelled by political assassinations the situation became highly volatile. The south attempted to break away once again but was defeated by the north.

Rebels: Democratic Republic of Yemen (South Yemen).

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: no

Rebpresosts: no

Rebsupport: explicit support from Saudi Arabia.

Rtypesup: military assistance

Govsupport: explicit support from Iraq. Possible Jordanian support. Gtypesup: military assistance.

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The leadership of the independent Democratic Republic of Yemen was made up of former members of the Yemenese national government.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 27,500

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the Democratic Republic of Yemen had 27,500 troops. The forces fighting on behalf of South Yemen were clearly weaker than those fighting for north Yemen.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Uppsala Conflict Database

Chapter 162

ID 209

ID 209

Incompatibility: Government, Pakistan

Dyad ID 340: Pakistan vs. MQM

The Mohajir are a population of Urdu-speakers in Pakistan that migrated from India at the time of the partition of India and Pakistan. The Mohajir People Movement (MQM) emerged in 1986 and began challenging the state to recognize Mohajir rights and to allow for greater participation of Mohajir in the government. Some violence occurred over the next nine years but the conflict reached a new level of intensity in 1985, and the Pakistani army was deployed to Karachi. The army was able to deal a serious blow to the militants, and the next year they decided to pursue a peaceful strategy instead of a violent one. In 1997, the MQM participated in national elections.

From 1986 the leadership of the Mohajir Quami (People) Movement, provided a new direction to the ethnic strife, targeting the state and its local bodies of governance. In the autumn of 1986 MQM held its first public meetings, where its leader Altaf Hussain encouraged the Mohajir youth to collect their arms: "If our rights are not given to us, we will use every kind of force." This was the onset of the violent agitation by MQM for the recognition of Mohajir rights. In general terms, the incompatibility between the Pakistani government and the MQM concerned the right of the Mohajir to be recognized as a distinct ethnic group - i.e. as Pakistan's fifth nationality - and to secure corresponding rights.

(Note: first use of violence was in 1990. Listed as 1995 in the spreadsheet)

Rebels: MQM

Transconstsupp: none. the Mohajirs are Muslim immigrants from India, but it does not appear that Muslims in India are supporting the group.

Rebextpart: no

Rebpresosts: no
Rebsuport: none
Rtypesup: n/a
Govsuport: none
Gtypesup: no
Govextpart: none
Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The MQM was created with the intention of gaining more rights and political access for the Mohajir. In elections in 1997, the MQM competed freely and did quite well.

Rebestimate, rebesthigh, rebestlow: 160

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database reports that in February 1995 the MQM was estimated to have 160 troops. It is clear that the group, while able to mobilize a good number of people to participate in protests/riots, was no match for the Pakistani army and they were decisively defeated when the army intervened in Karachi in 1985.

Centcontrol: yes

Strengthcent: low

As a political party, the MQM did have a central leadership. However, the Uppsala Conflict Database reports that the movement experienced fractionalization throughout the 1990s.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Uppsala Conflict Database

Dyad ID 721: Pakistan vs. TNSM

TBA

Dyad ID 768: Pakistan vs. TTP

TBA

Chapter 163

ID 212

ID 212

Incompatibility: Territory, Eastern Niger

Niger vs. FARS and FDR

In 1995, as the government of Niger was completing a peace accord with multiple organizations demanding greater autonomy for the Tourag (see conflict id. 2800), it faced an uprising from a new source: the Democratic Front for Renewal (FDR), a group which organized ethnic groups to demand greater autonomy in eastern Niger. Over the next two years violent clashes occurred between the government and the FDR until the signing of a peace agreement on August 22, 1998. In the meantime another group, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of the Sahara (FARS) emerged in 1997 made up of Arab and Toubou militants and engaged in violent clashes with the government. That conflict was resolved on November 29, 1997, when the two groups signed a peace accord.

Notes on Coding:

There is very little information available about this conflict and indeed it appears that little is known about these two groups. It is clear that both had fairly centralized leadership and at least enough of a fighting capacity to force the government of Niger to make some concessions. Beyond that there is little information about the number of troops each group possessed or the fighting capacity of the rebels.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Dyad ID 113: Niger vs. FDR

The first tensions between the Nigerien government and political parties organizing ethnic Arab Choa, Kanouri and Toubou interests, began in May 1994 with the creation of the Democratic Front for Renewal (FDR). Nigerien government signed a peace accord with the FDR on 22 August, 1998. A splinter group, FARS, continued fighting the government (see entry 3150-2780-0).

Rebels: Democratic Front for Renewal (FDR)

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Represosts: no

Rebsupport: alleged. The Nigerian government accused Toubou (read FARS and FDR) and Tuareg (read UFRA) rebels to have been rallied by former Chadian President.

Rebtypesup: unknown, allegedly endorsement.

Govsupport: alleged. In mid July 1997, the FDR complained that the Nigerien army co-operated with the Chadian army in an attack against an FDR base near Lake Chad in Niger (on 19-07-97). According to the FDR, 17 Nigerien and Chadian soldiers were killed. The Nigerien government denied that such an incident had happened.

Gtypesup: unknown. Allegedly military

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Keesings
- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- International Boundaries News Database

Dyad ID 114: Niger vs. FARS

The FARS continued fighting the government after the FDR signed a peace agreement. After suffering heavy losses, the FARS entered into an alliance with the Tuareg rebel group Union of Forces of the Armed Resistance (UFRA). The formation of the alliance had an escalatory effect on the conflict leading to heavy fighting in September-November 1997. By mid November the Nigerien government, along with the FARS and UFRA, agreed to hold talks with Algerian mediation, leading to the signing of a peace agreement on 29 November 1997. The accord was successfully upheld until September 2001, when Nigerien troops clashed with FARS fighters near the Libyan border, killing the FARS leader Chahayi Barkaye.

Rebels: Revolutionary Armed Forces of the Sahara (FARS)

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebepresosts: none

Rebsupport: alleged. The Nigerian government accused Toubou (read FARS and FDR) and Tuareg (read UFRA) rebels to have been rallied by former Chadian President.

rtypesupport: allegedly endorsement

govsupport: none

govtypesup: n/a

govextpart: none

Source:

- Keesings
- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- International Boundaries News Database

Chapter 164

ID 213

ID 213

Incompatibility: Territory, Anjouan

Dyad ID 35: Comoros vs. MPA

In 1997 dissatisfaction with the Comoros central government led an organized protest movement on the island of Anjouan to call for greater autonomy up to independence and recolonization by France. On August 3, 1997, the leader of the Anjounaise Popular Movement (MPA), Abdallah Ibrahim unilaterally declared the independence of the island. On September 3, the government of Comoros dispatched 200-300 troops to defeat the secessionists where they were soundly defeated. Since then no fighting has taken place and negotiations have continued between the government and the separatists.

Tension on Anjouan began to mount early in 1997. There were large and often violent demonstrations, mostly organised by different separatist organisations, demanding wage arrears and protesting against the policies of President Taki. On 3 August the leader of the separatist organisation MPA, Abdallah Ibrahim, unilaterally declared the island independent from Moroni, the main island. He was calling for both independence and re-colonisation by France, since the aim was to either return to French rule, or to be an independent micro-state in association with France. On 3 September 1997, between 200 and 300 Comorian troops landed on Anjouan to subdue the independence movement. Negotiations on a new constitution took place and was accepted in 2001.

Rebels: MPA

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: not

Rebsuport: none

Rtypesup: n/a

Govsupt: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

(Source: U)

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: explicit link

rebpolwinglegal: unclear

The rebel MPA has formed a government on the secessionist island of Anjouan but prior to doing so was not a participant in politics in the Comoros government.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: unclear

Rebstrength: stronger

None of the sources provided any reference to the number of troops supporting the MPA. However, it is clear that the support was too much for the government to defeat the secessionists militarily.

New end date: 9/16/1997

On September 16, 1997, a military leader in Comoros reported that the government would make no more attempts to retake the island militarily, ending the armed conflict.

Sources:

- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Keesing's Record of World Events

Chapter 165

ID 214

ID 214

Incompatibility: Government, Congo-Brazzaville

Congo-Brazzaville vs. FDU and Angola and Congo-Brazzaville/Angola/Chad vs. Cobras, Cocoyes, Ninjas, Ntisoulous

Allegations of fraud in the 1993 political elections led to the outbreak of violence in Congo as the three main political factions created militias and fighting broke out over who would control the country. In 1994 a truce was negotiated between the three leaders and negotiations continued through 1996. In 1997, fighting broke out again as one of the leaders, former president Denis Sassou-Nguesso and his militia, the Cobras, began vying for power. In October 1997 Nguesso's United Democratic Forces (FDU), backed by thousands of troops from Angola took power in Brazzaville and the sitting president, Pascal Lissouba and another leader of one of the 1993-1994 militias, Bernard Koleas, fled the country. Fighting continued between the militias and in 1998 full-scale civil war erupted between the army (which was now made up of many ex-Cobras) and militias supporting the exiled politicians-the Ninjas (supporters of Koleas) and the Cocoyes (supporters of Lissouba). In November and December 1999 the Cocoyes and Ninjas reached an agreement to stop fighting and begin disarming, although one faction of the Ninjas, the Ntsiloulous, continued battling the government. They were still fighting as of the end of 2002.

***Duplicate entries for FDU (dropped). Dropped Angola as an actor, 3170-2820-1; Angola supported a rebel faction, and later the government after rebels took power in 1997. Duplicate entries for Ninjas, Cobras, Cocoyes, Ntsiloulous (dropped). *** Notes on Coding:

Dyad ID 36: Congo-Brazzaville/Angola/Chad vs. Ninjas

Rebpolwing: acknowledged link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Ninjas were a militia organized by former President Pascal Lissoubu, They remained loosely affiliated with him, however, they distanced themselves from him as they agreed to negotiate with the government and not to contest elections in 2002 despite the fact that Lissoubu had been exiled and was barred from participating.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 1,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimated that in 1998 the Ninjas had about 1,000 troops. This estimate is in comparison to about 1,500-3,000 troops for the government, backed up by 2,500 troops from Angola and some more from Chad.

Dyad ID 37: Congo-Brazzaville/Angola/Chad vs. Cocoyes

Rebpolwing: acknowledged link

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The Cocoyes were a militia organized by Bernard Koleas, who was prime minister at the time of Sassou-Nguesso's successful takeover of Brazzaville. They remained loosely affiliated with him, however, they distanced themselves from him as they agreed to negotiate with the government and not to contest elections in 2002 despite the fact that Koleas had been exiled and was barred from participating.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 1,000

Rebstrength: weaker

This estimate is a very rough estimate of the number of troops, and almost certainly estimates too low. None of the sources found made any reference to the number of Cocoye fighters there were. However, Africa Confidential reported in August 2000 that 800 Cocoye fighters had been cornered and laid down their arms, meaning that they had at least 800. In any case, the Cocoye were clearly weaker than the combined might of the Republic of Congo and Angola, however, they had the fighting capacity to persist in the conflict for a while.

Dyad ID 38: Congo-Brazzaville/Angola/Chad vs. Ntsiloulous

Rebpolwing: no

The Ntsiloulous were a branch of the Ninjas that split off and followed Pastor Ntoumi, who Africa Confidential (June 2002) described as "a mystical-military cult leader." Ntoumi had no apparent political agenda.

Rebestimate: 1,750

Rebestlow: 500

Rebesthigh: 3000

Rebstrength: weaker

Africa Confidential reported in June 2002 that Ntoumi controlled up to 500 Ninja fighters, and that other Ninjas not directly under his control were influenced by him. The Uppsala Conflict Database estimated that in 2002 Ntsiloulous had between 2,000 and 3,000 troops. These estimates are in comparison to 10,000 troops possessed by the government in 2002.

Sources:

- Africa Confidential
- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Uppsala Conflict Database
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks

Dyad ID 189: Congo-Brazzaville vs. FDU (1993-1994, 1997)

Former military ruler Dennis Sassou Nguesso seized power in the Republic of Congo during October 1997 with the help of Angolan troops. Pascal Lissouba had been elected democratically in 1992 after 28 years of one-party rule, including a lengthy period (1979-91) during which Sassou-Nguesso served as President. Sassou-Nguesso forces defeated government and militia troops loyal to President Lissouba and established a new Government.

Rebels: UDF (Sassou-Nguesso's party)

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: none

Rebpresosts: None

Rebsupport: explicit. Assistance from Angola

Rtypesupport: troops

Govsupport: none

Govtypesup: n/a

Rebpolwing: explicit link

Rebpolwinglegal: yes

The leader of the FDU, Denis Sassou-Nguesso, was a former president of Congo who had competed in elections before. His battle against the government began because of allegations of election fraud in 1993.

Rebestimate: 2,250

Rebestlow: 1,500

Rebesthigh: 3,000

Rebstrength: weaker

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimates that the FDU had between 1,500 and 3,000 troops in the Cobra militia that provided its military force. The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that the Congolese government had 10,000 troops in 1993 and 15,000 in 1997. However, it is not clear how many of these troops were loyal to President Pascal Lissouba.

Chapter 166

ID 216

ID 216

Incompatibility: Government, Guinea-Bissau/Senegal/Guinea

Dyad ID 58: Guinea-Bissau/Senegal/Guinea vs. Military Faction

On June 7, 1998, a faction of the Guinea-Bissau military led by General Ansumane Mane seized the airport and a barracks on the outskirts of the capital. The rebellion broke out over anger about potential prosecution of Mane for illegal arms transfers to separatist rebels in Senegal. Senegal and Guinea very quickly deployed 2,000 troops (total) to Guinea-Bissau which allowed the government of Joao Bernardo Vieira to stay in power. Despite a series of cease-fire agreements conflict continued over the next five months until a peace agreement was signed at Abuja, Nigeria on November 1. As part of the peace agreement Guinea and Senegal had to pull out of the country, to be replaced by an Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) peacekeeping mission. In March 1999 the two countries did so and the ECOWAS mission was deployed, but on May 7, 1999, the military junta violated the peace agreement and overthrew Vieira's government, thus ending the war. The peacekeeping mission was pulled out shortly thereafter.

In early June 1998, a rebellion started in the Guinea-Bissau army. Troops loyal to the Government were supported by Senegalese and Guinean soldiers during the heavy fighting that ensued. The leader of the rebellion, General Absumane Man, proclaimed himself head of a military junta and called on President Vieira's Government to resign. Peace talks took place in Abidjan on 15 and 16 September 1998. New negotiations under the auspices of ECOWAS led to the Abuja Peace Agreement on 1 November 1998. In late December 1998, ECOMOG troops arrived in Guinea-Bissau. After fighting resumed in early 1999, negotiations led to a cease-fire agreement and the commitment, on 17 February, by both Vieira and Man not to resort to armed conflict again. On 6 May 1999, fighting nevertheless erupted. President Vieira was overthrown the following day by the rebel military junta led by Man. On 10 May, Vieira signed an unconditional surrender. ECOMOG

troops left in early June 1999.

Rebels: military faction.

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: no

Represosts: no

Rebsuport: none

Rebtypesup: n/a

Govsupport: explicit. Senegal and Guinea provide support for the government.

Gtypesup: troops. Troops from Senegal and Guinea helped the Government throughout the conflict.

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: no

The military officers were not affiliated with a political movement.

Rebestimate: 4,500

Rebestlow: 3,000

Rebesthigh: 6,000

Rebstrength: stronger

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimates that the military faction had between 3,000 and 6,000 troops. It is clear that if it had not been for Senegal and Guinea's support of the government the rebels would have achieved victory much sooner.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks
- Uppsala Conflict Database

Chapter 167

ID 217

ID 217

Incompatibility: Government, Lesotho

Dyad ID 92: Lesotho-Military Faction

Violent protests which began in August 1998 in Maseru (the capital of Lesotho) over allegations of electoral fraud in an election in May 1997 which had delivered 79 out of 80 seats in the legislature to the ruling Lesotho Congress for Democracy (LCD) continued to escalate into September. On September 11 order in Lesotho had deteriorated to the point where splits in the army started to emerge and a number of junior officers joined the protesters and arrested some of their superiors leading to a crisis in the military. As the situation got worse, on September 22, 600 South African troops entered Lesotho as part of a South African Development Community (SADC) mission to restore order. The entering troops encountered fiercer opposition than they were expecting but by a week later many of the rebels had surrendered and most of the fighting had died down. At talks in Maseru on October 2, the LCD and opposition parties agreed to hold fresh elections by March 2000.

Opposition protests against the results of the May 1997 election, in which the ruling Lesotho Congress for democracy (LCD) won. These protests continued throughout the month and into September, when soldiers were reported to join the protestors. Under the auspices of the Southern African Development Community (SADC), 600 South African- and 200 Botswanan troops entered Lesotho on 22 September to help the government. They met unexpectedly heavy resistance from armed opposition supporters and mutineers from the Lesotho Defence Force (LDF). The rebellious military faction was defeated, although talks were held with the government about holding new elections.

Rebels: military faction.

Transconstsupp: none

Rebextpart: no

Represosts: no

Rebsuport: none

Rebtypesup: n/a

Govsuport: explicit. The South African Development community, particularly Botswana and South African intervenes with military forces.

Gtypesup: troops. 600 South African- and 200 Botswana troops entered Lesotho under the auspices of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) to help the government.

Govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: no

The protests in Lesotho were targeted against alleged election fraud. However, the military units rebelling against the government were not allied with a particular political party.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 1,800

Keesing's Record of World Events reports that 1,800 soldiers joined the rebellion against the government.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Uppsala Conflict Database

Chapter 168

ID 218

ID 218

Incompatibility: Territory, Kosovo

Yugoslavia vs. UCK and NATO

Kosovo was an autonomous province of Serbia in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and after the dissolution of Yugoslavia in the early 1990s remained a part of Serbia. The population of Kosovo was 90% Albanian and there was strong support for greater autonomy of Kosovo from Serbia among the Albanian populations. In the mid 1990s an insurgent group, the Kosovo Liberation Army (UCK), emerged which began launching violent attacks against Serbian military and police installations in Kosovo. The first major coordinated attack by the UCK occurred on April 22, 1996, and the conflict continued at a low level of intensity in 1996 and 1997. As the conflict heated up through 1997 the UCK gained access to a large stock of weapons from the collapsing Albanian army and in 1998 the conflict became a full-scale armed conflict. The UCK made major gains until June of 1998 when a Serbian counter-offensive regained territory won by the UCK and created a massive number of refugees and internally displaced persons. In talks at Rambouillet in February and March 1999 the UCK and Serbian authorities agreed in principal to a peace-plan calling for limited autonomy for Kosovo with a referendum in three years to decide the final status of the region, but the deal broke down out of Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic's unwillingness to allow a 28,000 person NATO peacekeeping force to be deployed. In response to the breakdown of the peace talks, NATO began a bombing campaign against Serbian targets in Kosovo and in Serbia proper in late March 1999. In June 1999, Milosevic agreed to NATO demands including the withdrawal of Serbian troops from Kosovo and the bombing campaign ended and a peacekeeping mission was deployed.

Duplicated entries for UCK (dropped). Entries for NATO members dropped as these members backed the rebel forces

The UCK (Kosovo Liberation Army) demands, stated in 1996, were that the Yugoslavian government should stop occupying and colonising Kosovo territory. For many UCK members, the long-term goal was to unite the Albanian populations of Kosovo, Macedonia and Albania. The UCK's official goal, however, was to make Kosovo an independent state. The conflict became violent in early 1996, when the UCK exploded a series of bombs in Serbian refugee camps and began attacking Serbian policemen. In early 1998, the conflict escalated dramatically. NATO leads an intervention against Yugoslav forces in 1999. Currently the region is administered by a NATO peacekeeping force.

Rebels: UCK

transconstsupp: explicit. Support from Albanians in Albania and especially Macedonia.

rebextpart: yes, minor. The UCK first organized in Kosovo, then spread operations to Macedonia after the NATO bombing. However, there are reports of Albanian militants from neighboring countries who took part in the fighting.

represosts: none. The UCK did eventually spread operations to Macedonia, but this mainly occurs after 1999, post-NATO bombings. Before that time, Macedonia effectively sealed its borders to cross-border militant activity.

Rebsupport: explicit, by Albania. Explicit, by NATO

Rebtypesup: endorsement of greater autonomy and cultural rights for Kosovo Albanians by Albanian government officials. However, Albanian officials did not explicitly support UCK goals of independence.

Troops sent by NATO forces against the Yugoslav government

Govesupport: none

Gtypesup: n/a

Govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Minorities at Risk Webpage

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 295: Yugoslavia-UCK

Rebpolwing: no

The UCK was primarily a force aimed at gaining the independence of Kosovo through violent means. There was a more moderate Albanian political movement, however, that group lost in popularity in the years leading up to the conflict as more Albanians became convinced that moderation would not work.

Rebestimate: 9,000

Rebestlow: 5,000

Rebesthigh: 30,000

Rebstrength: weaker

It is difficult to tell exactly how many troops the UCK had at their disposal. Keesing's Record of World Events reported in June 1999 that during the NATO bombing campaign the UCK launched an attack into Kosovo from Albania with 5,000 troops. In September 1999, Keesing's Record of World Events reported that the UCK composed 9,000 troops at the end of the conflict. Prior to the conflict, the political representative of the UCK reported that the group had 30,000 fighters. Regardless of the exact number of troops it is clear that the UCK was not a military match for the Serbian army.

Mobcap: high

The population of Kosovo was 90% Albanian and the UCK had strong support from that civilian population.

Armsproc: moderate

The International Crisis Group reported in September 1998 that the UCK had gained in fighting strength by obtaining a large number of weapons from the "disintegration in the spring of 1997 of the Albanian army."

Chapter 169

ID 219

ID 219

Incompatibility: Territory, Oromiya

Dyad ID 55: Ethiopia vs. OLF

The Oromo Liberation Front was formed in 1974 to push for the formation of an independent state in the Oromo regions of southern and eastern Ethiopia. In 1989 the activities of the OLF increased and they became linked with other ethnically based groups such as the Tigray People's Liberation Front (TPLF) and the Eritrean People's Liberation Front in the attempt to overthrow Ethiopian president Mengistu, which was successful in 1991. In July of 1991, the OLF joined with some other ethnically-based rebel groups and participated in a transitional government, but pulled out of that government in 1992 over dissatisfaction with TPLF dominance. There was some low-intensity conflict for the next seven years but the fighting did not really heat up again until 1999 when the OLF decided to renew its full armed struggle against the government.

The Oromo struggle for independence began in 1974 when the Oromo Liberation Front (OLF) was founded. The rebels operated mainly in the southern and western parts of Ethiopia. In 1991 OLF made some common operations with two other rebel movements in Ethiopia, Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF) and Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF), who ultimately ousted the Mengistu regime. In 1992 OLF pulled out of the transitional government but the conflict remained more or less inactive, except for small scale clashes with the new government. In 1998 the OLF congress decided that it still wanted an independent Oromiya and therefore should revitalise its armed struggle. Subsequently, the violence erupted again in 1999.

Rebels: Oromo Liberation Front

transconstsupp: no

rebextpart: no

rebpresosts: no
rebsupport: none
rebtotypesup: n/a
govsupport: none
govtypesup: n/a
govextpart: none
Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: yes

Rebpolwinglegal: no

The OLF was a participant in the transitional government in 1991-1992. However, they pulled out since then and do not compete in Ethiopian elections.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 7,000

Rebstrength: weaker

In 1990 and 1991 the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute reported that the OLF had 7,000 troops. None of the sources identified troop counts for the 1999-2001 phase of the conflict.

Sources:

- Keesing's Contemporary Archives
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks
- Uppsala Conflict Database

Chapter 170

ID 220

ID 220

Incompatibility: Territory, Dagestan

Dyad ID 368: Russia vs. Republic of Dagestan

The brief conflict between Russia and the Republic of Dagestan in 1999 was in large part the result of spillover from conflict with the separatist republic of Chechnya. Beginning on August 7, 1999, rebels from Chechnya captured seven villages on the border between Chechnya and Dagestan and on August 10 declared an independent Islamic state of Dagestan. The rebels were primarily Chechen and were led by Chechen commanders. On August 12 Russian forces began to retaliate and within two weeks the rebellion had largely died out and the Chechen commanders had returned to Chechnya.

Move for the independence of Dagestan made by Islamic radicals associated with the Wahhabi school of Islam. These rebels fought with Islamist groups in Chechnya to establish an Islamic state in the Caucasus region. Russia successfully ended the challenge by force.

Rebels: Dagestani separatists

transconstsupp: tacit; support by Islamic radical groups, especially those within the Wahhabi school of Islamic thought

rebextpart: not known; possible given Islamist orientation

rebpresost: none

rebsupport: no; none known

rebtypesup: n/a

govsupport: none

govtypesup: n/a

govextpart: none

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding:

Rebpolwing: no

Sources revealed no relationship between the Dagestani rebels and any political movement.

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 1,000

Rebstrength: weaker

Keesing's contemporary archives says that the "rebels numbered over 1,000." There was no way that this force could defeat the Russian government militarily.

Mobcap: low

The Chechen and Dagestani rebels that declared the independent state of Dagestan follow the Wahhabi brand of Islam which is not the religion of the majority of Dagestanis. Additionally, unlike Chechnya, Dagestan is very ethnically diverse, and so the rebel group would have a very difficult time rallying much popular support to its cause.

Source:

- Keesing's Contemporary Archives

Chapter 171

ID 221

ID 221

Incompatibility: Government, Uzbekistan/Kyrgyzstan

The Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU) seeks the establishment of an Islamic state. Conflict has mainly been low-level. In 1999, the IMU attempted to assassinate president Karmov. Uzbekistan successfully ended the challenge by force.

Rebels: IMU (listed as MIU in the spreadsheet)

transconstsupp: tacit support sympathy; popular among radical Islamist groups.

rebextpart: alleged. Some allegations of Al-Qaida support, although this has not been substantiated.

rebpresosts: some troops located abroad; fighting with the group was concentrated in the Ferghana valley which is on the border with Kyrgyzstan. Also claimed to be located in Afghanistan, Iran, Pakistan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan.

rebuport: Alleged. Possibly some support from Saudi Arabia, but unconfirmed.

rypesupport. Alleged, non-military (financial) assistance from Saudi Arabia

govsupport: explicit support, after 9/11/2001 the US government has assisted with counter-terrorist activities, although the conflict had subsided before then.

govtypesup: military

govextpart: none

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/>

Dyad ID 363: Uzbekistan/Kyrgyzstan vs. MIU

TBA

Dyad ID 444: Uzbekistan/Kyrgyzstan vs. JIG

TBA

Chapter 172

ID 222

ID 222

Incompatibility: Government, Central African Republic

Central African Republic vs. various

On May 28, 2001, a military faction, probably led by former President Andr Kolingba, attempted a coup against Central African Republic (CAR) President Ange-Felix Patass. The attempt failed and several days of fighting followed in the capital, Bangui, but by June 7 government forces, supported by Libyan soldiers, had regained full control. On October 26, Patass dismissed then armed forces chief of general staff General Francois Bozize. Following a several day standoff, Bozize fled to Chad. In August 2002, 22 people were killed in fighting along the Chad-CAR border between forces loyal to Bozize and government forces. In October 2002 Bozize and his forces seized large parts of Bangui before they were repelled by a coalition of the CAR and Libyan armies and soldiers from Jean Pierre Bemba's Congolese Liberation Front (FLC)-a rebel group in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Finally, on March 15, 2003, Bozize, backed by about 1000 soldiers, took control of the capital, dissolved the government, and declared himself President.

A military faction led an attempted a coup against the Patasse government and was mainly supported by members of the Yakoma tribe. With considerable outside support, the government repressed the coup and declared victory on June 8 of 2001. However, the mutineers launched new attacks in October under the leadership of sacked defence minister General Boziz. Initial insurgent efforts were unsuccessful, and Bozize fled to Chad. In March of 2003, Bozize lead another assault and ousted the Patasse government.

a) rebels: Military Faction 3250-2930-0

transconstsupp: no.

rebextpart: Yes, major. 300 mercenaries, mostly Rwandan Hutus and Angolans

rebpresosts: none.

rebsupport: no support

rtypesup: n/a

govsupport: Explicit support; from Libya

gtypesup: Troops; Libya sent 100 troops to fight on behalf of the government.

govextpart: yes, minor(?); The Mouvement pour la libération du Congo (MLC), a rebel group from the DRC provided 150-200 troops.

b) rebels: Faction of François Bozize 3250-2930-1

transconstsupp: no.

rebextpart: no

rebpresosts: some. Some troops located in Chad; Bozize was exiled in Chad for a period.

rebsupport: Alleged. Bozize initially fled to Chad. Government accused Chad of supporting the rebels (Nov , 2002 reports in Lexis-Nexis) although not clear if the Chadian government actually supported him in any direct way. Chad denies involvement.

rtypesup: allegedly military

govsupport: Explicit support; from Libya

gtypesup: Troops; The Libyan troops sent to CAR in 2001 remained in the country and continued to support president Patasse.

govextpart: yes, major; The Mouvement pour la libération du Congo (MLC), a rebel group from the DRC provided 1000 troops, augmenting the number of troops present before.

Sources:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database
- Lexis-Nexis

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 17: Central African Republic vs. Military Faction

rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 600

rebstrength: weaker

No clear estimation of number of troops involved at the time of the coup. However, at least 552 soldiers were convicted (either in presence or in absentia) for their participation in the coup, so the estimate for their troop strength is 600. The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that the government had 4,150 troops in this period.

Dyad ID 287: Central African Republic vs. Forces of Francois Bozize

rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 1000

rebstrength: weaker

When Bozize successfully took Bangui, he had 1000 troops with him. The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that in 2002, the Central African Republican army had 3,500 troops and in 2003 it had 2,550

Sources:

- Africa Confidential (Vol 42, No. 12, Vol 43. No. 19, Vol. 43, No. 24)
- Keesing's Record of World Events reports, May 2001, June 2001, November 2001, December 2001, August 2002, October 2002, March 2003).
- Uppsala Conflict Database

Dyad ID 628: Central African Republic vs. UFDR

TBA

Dyad ID 782: Central African Republic vs. CPJP

TBA

Chapter 173

ID 223

ID 223

Incompatibility: Government, Macedonia

Dyad ID 341: Macedonia vs. National Liberation Army (UCK)

On January 22, 2001 members of the self-proclaimed "National Liberation Army" (NLA) attacked a police station in Tearce in northwestern Macedonia near the border with Kosovo. The group was upset over discriminatory governmental policies against Macedonia's minority Albanian population, particularly in the areas of education, citizenship, ownership, language and representative government. Over the next several months further clashes between governmental officials and the NLA continued, reaching their peak in March 2001 in the city of Tetovo, Macedonia's second largest city and the center of Albanian political activity in the country. In late March the governmental launched an offensive against the rebels and by the end of the month the violence had largely died down.

The UCK demands an independent Albanian state which includes Kosovo and parts of Macedonia. The uprising took off during and immediately after NATO operations in Kosovo. The uprising appears to be under control after assistance from NATO and the granting of greater autonomy and cultural rights.

Rebels: UCK

transconstsupp: Explicit. Supported by Albanian groups in Kosovo.

rebextpart: Major. Supported by Kosovo Albanian troops

rebpresosts: some troops located abroad, mainly in Kosovo.

rebsupport: no support

rtypesup: n/a

govsupport: Explicit. Support given by NATO countries to help in policing, especially along the

Kosovo/Macedonia border.

gtypesup: military assistance

govextpart: no

Sources:

- Minorities at Risk Webpage
- International Boundaries News Database

Notes on Coding

Polwing: alleged link

Polwinglegal: legal

Around the time the NLA launched its violent uprising, a new political party, the National Democratic Party (NDP) emerged with a platform that sought to capture the dissatisfaction with the plight of Albanians in Macedonia. They have denied links with the KLA. The NDP is legal.

Rebestimate: 1150

Rebestlow: 300

Rebesthigh: 2000

Rebstrength: low

At the time of the outbreak, the KLA claimed to be 2000 strong and growing. The government claimed that the rebels only amounted to a few hundred.

Source:

- International Crisis Group Balkans Report 109: "The Macedonian Question: Reform or Rebellion"

Chapter 174

ID 224

ID 224

Incompatibility: Government, USA

Dyad ID 360: USA et al. vs. Al Qaida

On September 11, 2001, four airlines were hijacked in the United States. Two of the airlines were flown into the twin towers of the World Trade Center, both of which collapsed, another plane was flown into the Pentagon and the fourth crashed in Pennsylvania. In all, somewhere close to 4,000 people were killed. Investigations after the September 11 attacks revealed that the group responsible was almost certainly Al Qaida, an Islamic fundamentalist terrorist organization led by Osama Bin Laden that had also been responsible for bombings of the United States embassies in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania and Nairobi, Kenya, as well as other terrorist attacks. In the months following the bombings, the United States government declared a "War on Terror" and with a coalition of other nations began providing strong support to groups in Afghanistan opposed to that country's Taliban government, which the United States alleged was harboring Al Qaida. In 2002 the coalition forces overthrew the Taliban and a new coalition government was imposed.

September 11, 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon by Al-Qaida

Transconstsupp: explicit. Various groups in Muslim world

Rebextpart: yes. Extensive network in various countries

Rebpresosts: extensive. Network of bases in several countries

Rebsup: unknown

Rtypesup: unknown

Govsup: explicit. Cooperation by several governments

Gtypesup: military, diplomatic, financial, troops.

Govextpart: none

Notes on Coding:

This case is one of a terrorist attack and then the retaliation and so does not really fit many of the variables.

Rebpolwing: no

Although Al Qaida clearly had a political agenda, in no way did it try to influence domestic politics in the United States.

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the sources identified made any reference to the number of troops possessed by Al Qaida. It was clear, however, that Al Qaida is completely dwarfed militarily by the United States, its main strength is the ability to carry out terrorist attacks.

Sources:

- Keesing's Record of World Events
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbooks

Chapter 175

ID 225

ID 225

Incompatibility: Government, Cote D'Ivoire

Cote D'Ivoire vs. various

On September 19, 2002, members of the Ivorian armed forces attempted a coup d'etat which failed. It quickly developed into a civil war, however, with the Patriotic Movement of Ivory Coast (MPCI) seizing large areas of territory in the northern and central part of the country. The imposition of a 700-person French force enforced an October 17, 2002 ceasefire but both the government and the MPCI continued a massive recruitment effort to expand their fighting capacity. On November 28, 2002, two additional rebel groups, the Ivorian Popular Movement of the Great West (MPIGO) and the Movement for Justice and Peace (MJP) emerged in the West of the country, with heavy support from Liberian president Charles Taylor and involving Liberian and Sierra Leonean troops along with their Ivorian components. In January 2003, a peace deal was reached between the government, rebel groups, and unarmed opposition parties but implementation was slow. A United Nations chapter-seven force was deployed in 2003 and by the fall of the year organized fighting had largely ceased but the ceasefire was precarious.

President Laurent Gbago assumed office after elections which transferred power from a brief period of military rule. Gbago demobilized some military units which led to a mutiny among a faction of Ivorian troops. Muslims in the north responded to this political opening by demanding new elections and greater rights for their group. The MPCI is the best organized and largest of the rebel groups and is located primarily in the north. The MPIGO and MJP are smaller groups located in the west. France has sent a team of peacekeepers and is leading negotiation efforts.

Rebel groups: Mouvement Patriotique de Cte d'Ivoire (MPCI), Mouvement Populaire Ivoirien du Grand Ouest (MPIGO) and Mouvement pour la Justice et la Paix (MJP).

transconstsupp: Not known. Potentially has transnational support, though not verified. All rebel

groups demand greater rights for Muslims in the north, so may have sympathizers in the Muslim world.

rebextpart: Alleged for MJP & MPIGO; No for MPC. The Ivorian government claims that Liberians and members of the RUF in Sierra Leone are fighting with the MJP and MPIGO in the west of the country, although these claims have not been substantiated.

rebpresosts: No.

rebuport: Alleged. Many allegations, though not supported have been made. The government claims that the MPC has support from Burkina Faso, although Burkina Faso and the rebels deny the charge. There have also been reports of Liberians fighting with the MJP and MPIGO, although it is unclear if these are regular government troops or Liberian mercenaries.

rtypesup: unknown; allegedly military

govsupport: Alleged. The rebels claim, although it has not been proven, that the government receives assistance from Angola and Ghana. The rebels also claim that France supports the government, although France insists that its intervention is strictly neutral.

gtypesup: unknown; allegedly military

govextpart: no

Source:

- Uppsala University Armed Conflicts Database

Notes on Coding

Dyad ID 89: Cote D'Ivoire vs. MPC

Rebpolwing: Formal link

Legal: yes

While the MPC did not start out as a political movement, as part of the peace deal signed in January 2003, the group received ministerial positions in the Ivorian government. Since the conflict has ended the various rebel groups have allied into one group the "Forces Nouvelles" who may compete in elections in 2005 as a unified political party.

rebestimate: 8,500

rebestlow: 7,000

rebesthigh: 10,000

rebstrength: parity

In November 2003, the International Crisis Group reported that "The total of (MPC) recruits is difficult to ascertain. Some sources cite 3,000 to 5,000, with overall forces numbering between 7,000 and 10,000 including some 1,000 dozo fighters" (p. 14). The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that the army of Cote D'Ivoire had slightly more than 17,000 troops.

Armsproc: moderate

The International Crisis Group reported in November 2003 that Burkina Faso had helped the MPCCI to assemble an impressive arsenal.

Dyad ID 91: Cote D'Ivoire vs. MPIGO

Rebestimate: unclear

Rebstrength: much weaker

None of the sources provided any information on the number of troops possessed by MPIGO. However, it is clear that the group was no match for the Ivorian army.

Sources:

- International Crisis Group Africa Report No 67: "Cote D'Ivoire: The War is Not Over." November 28, 2003.
- Uppsala Conflict Database

Dyad ID 245: Cote D'Ivoire vs. MJP

Rebestimate, rebestlow, rebesthigh: 300

Rebstrength: much weaker

The Uppsala Conflict Database estimates that the MJP had 300 troops in Cote D'Ivoire. This was a much smaller force than the 17,050 troops possessed by the Ivorian army.

Dyad ID 439: Cote D'Ivoire vs. FN

TBA

Dyad ID 820: Cote D'Ivoire vs. Impartial Defense and Security Forces of Cote D'Ivoire (FDSI-CI)

In 2010, Cote D'Ivoire had a presidential election. Laurent Gbagbo, who had been president for a decade, lost to Alassane Outtara, but refused to accept defeat. Violence broke out in Cote D'Ivoire following the election. In 2011, FDSI-CI, a militia group backing Outtara, attacked government forces. Gbagbo was eventually removed and Outtara became President.

Rebel Political Wing: no

Although FDSI-CI fought to bring Outtara to power, I did not find evidence that the group was directly linked to him. Indeed, after coming to power, Outtara's military clashed with the leader of FDSI-CI

Rebel Estimate: 500 Rebel Estimate (low): 500 Rebel Estimate (high): 500 Rebstrength: weaker
UCDP estimates that FDSI-CI had 500 troops in 2011. No estimate is given for the Ivorian armed forces generally, but this one militia group was clearly weaker than the Ivorian army.

Central Control: Yes Strength Central Control: Moderate

FDSI-CI was led by Ibrahim Coulibaly, who appeared to largely coordinate the activities of the organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Low Arms Procurement Capacity: Moderate Fighting Capacity: Moderate
FDSI-CI was a small group, but was generally well armed and able to fight effectively.

Territorial Control: Yes Name of Territory: Northern parts of Abidjan Effective Control: Moderate
UCDP reports that FDSI-CI expanded its control over parts of northern Abidjan in 2011.

Conflict Type: civil war

Transconstsupp: No Rebextpart: No Rebpresosts: No Rebsupport: No Rtypesup: NA. Govsupport:
No Gtypesup: NA Govextpart: no

Sources:

- UCDP

Chapter 176

ID 227

ID 227

Incompatibility: Territory, Bodoland

Dyad ID 785: India vs. NDFB-RD

India has faced decades of insurgency led by the Bodo, a group that lives in Assam state. For years, the insurgency was led by the All Bodo Student's Union. When that group showed its willingness to negotiate, another group, the National Democratic Front of Bodoland (NDFB) entered the conflict and took a hard line. In 2004, NDFB entered negotiations, but a faction of NDFB led by Raijan Daimary rejected negotiations and in 2009 fighting between the government and NDFB-RD flared up.

Rebel Political Wing: No

NDFB-RD was primarily a military organization and not directly affiliated with a political party.

Rebel estimate: 100

Rebel estimate low: 100

Rebel estimate high: 100

UCDP estimates that NDFB-RD had at least 100 troops in 2009.

Rebel strength: Much Weaker

India has a large military that is clearly much more powerful than NDFB-RD.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

Raijan Daimary coordinates the activities of this faction.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

NDFB-RD was a very small organization without much popular support, access to arms, or ability to fight.

Territorial Control: No

NDFB-RD did not appear to control any territory in Bodoland.

Conflict Type: secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

There was no evidence of NDFB-RD receiving any external support in this period.

Government Support: No

Government External Support: No

The Indian government did not receive any support related to the Bodo conflict in this period.

Ended? No

The conflict between the government and NDFB-RD continued into 2010.

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 177

ID 254

ID 254

Incompatibility: Territory, Kongo Kingdom

Dyad ID 651: DRC vs. BDK

Bundu dia Kongo (BDK) is an organization that pushes for greater autonomy for the Kongo people within DRC. In 2008 there were clashes between BDK supporters and the Congolese government.

Note: This dyad is in two periods because BDK was banned in March 2008.

Period 1: 1/1/2007-2/28/2008

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: Yes

BDK was a political, religious, and military organization.

Rebel estimate: unclear

I could find no estimate of the number of troops possessed by the BDK.

Rebel strength: Weaker

BDK is small and clearly weaker militarily than the Congolese army.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: High

BDK is a well-structured organization that generally coordinates its political and military activities.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

BDK is popular within the Kongo Kingdom but is outmatched by the Congolese army in its ability to fight and procure arms.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Villages in Kongo Kingdom

Level of Effective Territorial Control: High

BDK set up parallel governments in some villages in the Kongo Kingdom.

Conflict Type: secessionist

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

There was no evidence of BDK receiving any external support.

Government Support: No

Government External Support: No

The Congolese government did not receive any support related to the Kongo conflict.

Period 2: 3/1/2008-12/31/2008

Rebel Political Wing: Explicit Link

Rebel Political Wing Legal: No

In March 2008, BDK was banned within DRC.

Ended? Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

The government-BDK dyad did not reach 25 battledeaths after 2008.

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 178

ID 255

ID 255

Incompatibility: Government,

Dyad ID 749: Niger vs. MNJ

Rebel political wing: No

These organizations were primarily military ones, even though they had political goals.

Rebel estimate: 700

Rebel estimate low: 700

Rebel estimate high: 700

I could find no estimate of the number of troops possessed by the MNJ.

Rebel strength: Weaker

MNJ is clearly weaker than the army of Niger, although that army is also quite weak..

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Low

MNJ had a command structure that coordinated its activities however in the negotiations period its fighters appeared to make separate decisions about whether to lay down arms.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The MNJ was quite popular among Tuaregs but did not have much ability to fight or procure arms.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Parts of eastern Niger

Level of Effective Territorial Control: Moderate

The MNJ was able to control some territory in eastern Niger.

Conflict Type: civil war

Although the MNJ was fighting on behalf of Tuareg interests, its primary goal at this point as to reform the government of Niger.

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: Alleged

Type of Rebel Support: Unclear

Name of Rebel Supporters: Libya

UCDP reports allegations that Libya supported MNJ but that the type of support was unclear.

Government Support: Explicit

Type of Government Support: Military

Name of Government Supporters: France

The UCDP reports that France aided the Niger government.

Government External Support: No

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

Conflict between the government and the MNJ appears to have largely ended by the end of 2008.

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 179

ID 258

ID 258

Incompatibility: Territory, Dimaraji

Dyad ID 765: India vs. DHD-BW

The Dimasa are a small group that live in Assam and Nagaland states in northeast India. Members of the group want their own state within India and in 2008 a faction calling itself Dima Haram Daogah-Black Widow faction (DHD-BW) entered in clashes with the government that resulted in more than 25 deaths. In June 2009, the leader of DHD-BW was arrested, some of its fighters surrendered to the security forces. Others continue to fight but at a very low level.

Rebel political wing: No

DHD-BW was primarily a military organization and did not appear to be affiliated with a political organization.

Rebel estimate: 373

Rebel estimate low: 300

Rebel estimate high: more than 373

In 2009, 373 fighters surrendered to the government, which UCDP reports was the bulk of the fighters.

Rebel strength: Much Weaker

India had a powerful military and this organization was clearly much weaker than it.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

DHD-BW had a clear command structure, as evidenced by the groups' collapse when its leader was arrested.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The Dimasa are a small group and DHD-BW is clearly outmatched in its ability to fight and procure arms by the Indian army.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Parts of Dimasa area.

Level of Effective Territorial Control: Moderate

DHD-BW was able to control some territory in the areas populated by the Dimasa.

Conflict Type: autonomy

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

There was no evidence of DHD-BW receiving any external support.

Government Support: No

Government External Support: No

There was no evidence of support to the Indian government related to DHD-BW.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

The conflict between the government and DHD-BW did not reach 25 battle deaths again after 2008.

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 180

ID 259

ID 259

Incompatibility: Territory, Islamic state

Dyad ID 772: India vs. PULF

The People's United Liberation Front (PULF) is an insurgent group that fights on behalf of Muslims in India's northeastern state of Manipur. PULF believes that these groups are the subject of discrimination.

Rebel political wing: No

PULF was formed as a self-defense group to protect Muslims in Manipur state and also fights for the desire to form a Muslim state in northeastern India, but is not directly affiliated with a political organization.

Rebel estimate: 110

Rebel estimate low: 75

Rebel estimate high: more than 150

UCDP estimates that PULF had between 75 and 150 troops.

Rebel strength: Much Weaker

India had a powerful military and this organization was clearly much weaker than it.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Unclear

PULF clearly has a command structure, but I could not find reference to how well coordinated the organization was.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

Muslims are a small group in Manipur state (where PULF operates) and PULF is clearly out-matched in its ability to fight and procure arms by the Indian army.

Territorial Control: No

I found no reference to PULF controlling territory in northeastern India.

Conflict Type: autonomy

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

There was no evidence of PULF receiving any external support.

Government Support: No

Government External Support: No

There was no evidence of support to the Indian government related to PULF.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

The conflict between the government and DHD-BW did not reach 25 battle deaths again after 2008.

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 181

ID 263

ID 263

Incompatibility: Territory, Kukiland

Dyad ID 338: India vs. KNF

The Kuki National Front (KNF) is a small group that fights for the goal of a Kuki state in what is now Manipur state in India. The KNF has engaged in intercommunal conflict with other groups in northeastern India. In 1997, however, the group began engaging the security forces, leading to more than 25 battledeaths.

Rebel political wing: No

The KNF appears to be primarily a military organization and I found no reference of its affiliation with a political wing.

Rebel estimate: 300

Rebel estimate low: 300

Rebel estimate high: 300

UCDP estimates that KNF had more than 300 troops in 1997.

Rebel strength: Much Weaker

India had a powerful military and KNF was clearly much weaker than it.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

KNF had a leadership that appeared to exercise control over its activities.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The Kuki are a small minority in Manipur state and the group had relatively little popular support. It was certainly outmatched in its ability to fight and procure arms by the Indian government.

Territorial Control: No

I found no reference to KNF controlling territory in Manipur state.

Conflict Type: autonomy

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

There was no evidence of KNF receiving any external support.

Government Support: No

Government External Support: No

There was no evidence of support to the Indian government related to KNF.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Low Activity

The conflict between the government and KNF did not reach 25 battle deaths again after 1997.

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 182

ID 264

ID 264

Incompatibility: Territory, Kokang

Dyad ID 798: Myanmar vs. MNDAA

Kokang is a region of Myanmar where groups wanted autonomy for years. The Communist Part of Burma (CPB) controlled the area for years, but the Myanmar Nationalities Democratic Alliance Army (MNDAA) broke away from the CPB and signed a ceasefire agreement with the government in 1989. MNDAA administered the region for two decades but in 2008 the Myanmar government mandated that all militias (including MNDAA) disarm and go under the command of the military. The MNDAA rejected this, armed conflict ensued, but the MNDAA was quickly defeated by the government.

Rebel political wing: explicit link

Rebel political wing legal: yes

The MNDAA was a military and political organization that administered parts of the Kokang region of Myanmar.

Rebel estimate: unclear

UCDP gives no estimate for the number of troops possessed by MNDAA.

Rebel strength: Much Weaker

MNDAA was a small group and was clearly much weaker than the army of Myanmar.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Moderate

MNDAA appeared to have a clear command structure that coordinated the activities of the organization.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

MNDAA was a relatively small organization that was outmatched in its support and ability to fight and procure arms by the Myanmar government.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: Much of Kokang region

Level of effective territorial control: moderate

MNDAA administered the Kokang region for decades.

Conflict Type: civil war

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

There was no evidence of MNDAA receiving any external support.

Government Support: No

Government External Support: No

There was no evidence of support to the Myanmar government related to MNDAA.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Victory

Victory Side: A

The MNDAA was defeated by the government very quickly.

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 183

ID 265

ID 265

Incompatibility: Territory, Lahu

Dyad ID 797: Myanmar vs. LNUP

The Lahu are a tribe based in the Shan region of Myanmar. In the early period of the Shan rebellion (the 1950s-1970s), the Lahu operated a pro-government militia that targeted the Shan rebels. However, in 1973 the government ordered these militias to be disbanded, and a militia led by Pu Kyaung Long (the Lahu National United Party, or LNUP) did not disband but instead declared war on the government. For several years it operated against the government and also coordinated the opium trade, but in 1982 it was destroyed by Shan rebels who wanted to monopolize the opium trade.

Rebel political wing: no

The LNUP was a militia and did not appear to have a political affiliation.

Rebel estimate: unclear

UCDP gives no estimate for the number of troops possessed by LNUP.

Rebel strength: Much Weaker

LNUP was a small group and was clearly much weaker than the army of Myanmar.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: High

LNUP had a clear leadership that coordinated the group's activities.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

LNUP was a small organization with little popular support, ability to fight or to procure arms that existed primarily to coordinate the opium trade.

Territorial Control: Yes

Name of Territory: A mountain in Shan state

Level of effective territorial control: moderate

LNUP controlled a mountain in Shan state.

Conflict Type: autonomy conflict

Transnational Constituency Support: No

Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: No

Rebel Support: No

There was no evidence of LNUP receiving any external support.

Government Support: No

Government External Support: No

There was no evidence of support to the Myanmar government related to LNUP.

Ended?: Yes

Type of Termination: Other

The LNUP was defeated by another rebel group.

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 184

ID 266

ID 266

Incompatibility: Government, Tajikistan

Dyad 809: Tajikistan vs. IMU

In 2010, the Uzbek rebel group Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU) moved into Tajikistan and attacked the Tajik government. Although the group had originally formed in Uzbekistan, it set its agenda as an Islamic caliphate in all of Central Asia.

Rebel political wing: no

The IMU was not a political movement, particularly in Tajikistan.

Rebel estimate: 1000

UCDP estimates that the IMU had 1000 troops in 2010.

Rebel strength: Weaker

UCDP estimates that the Tajik government had about 8800 troops, which was stronger than the IMU.

Central Control: Yes Strength Central Control: Moderate

The IMU generally had a good leadership structure.

Mobilization Capacity: Low Arms Procurement Capacity: Low Fighting Capacity: Low

IMU did not appear to have large support in Tajikistan, and generally was weaker in fighting capacity than the government.

Territorial Control: No

IMU did not control territory in Uzbekistan.

Conflict Type: civil war Transnational Constituency Support: No Rebel External Support: No

Rebel Presence in External States: Some Rebel Support: No

IMU did not receive external support, but was based in other central Asian states.

Government Support: No Government External Support: No

There was no evidence of support to the Tajik government in this period.

Ended?: No

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 185

ID 267

ID 267

Incompatibility: Government, Mauritania

Dyad 806: Mauretania vs. AQIM

The group Al Qaeda in the Islamic Magreb (AQIM), which has operated in Algeria for years, expanded its agenda to overthrowing other government. In 2010, it targeted the government of Mauritania.

Rebel political wing: no

AQIM was not a political organization, but only a military group.

Rebel estimate: 650 Rebel estimate (low): 300 Rebel estimate (high) 1000

UCDP estimates that AQIM had between 300 and 1000 troops in Mauritania.

Rebel strength: Weaker

AQIM was clearly weaker than the Mauritanian army.

Central Control: Yes Strength Central Control: Moderate

AQIM generally had a leadership that coordinated its activities.

Mobilization Capacity: Low Arms Procurement Capacity: Low Fighting Capacity: Low

AQIM was a group without a lot of popular support, and relied primarily on kidnappings and suicide attacks.

Territorial Control: No

AQIM did not control territory in Mauritania.

Conflict Type: civil war Transnational Constituency Support: No Rebel External Support: No Rebel Presence in External States: Some Rebel Support: No

AQIM had bases throughout northern Africa, and was part of the global Al Qaeda network, but there was no other indication of external support to the group.

Government Support: Explicit Name of Government Supporters: France; Mali; Niger; Algeria; United States Type of Government Support: Military Government External Support: No

UCDP reports that Mauritania received support from these states in its struggle against AQIM.

Source:

- UCDP database

Chapter 186

ID 268

ID 268

Incompatibility: Territory (Hararghe), Ethiopia

Dyad 811: Ethiopia vs. Issa and Gurgura Liberation Front (IGLF)

The ISSA and Gurgura Liberation Front was a military and political organization that operated in Eastern Somalia (Hararghe) and briefly clashed with the new Ethiopian government forces in 1992.

Rebel Political Wing: explicit link

Rebel Political Wing legal: yes

The IGLF was both a military and political organization.

Rebel Estimate, Rebel Estimate (low), Rebel Estimate (high): unclear

Rebel Strength: much weaker

No estimate was found for the number of troops possessed by the IGLF, but the group was clearly considerably weaker than the Ethiopian army.

Central Control: Yes

Strength Central Control: Low

The IGLF did have a leadership, but there were reports of part of the organization breaking away, although these were disputed.

Mobilization Capacity: Low

Arms Procurement Capacity: Low

Fighting Capacity: Low

The IGLF was generally outmatched by the Ethiopian army in its ability to fight, mobilize person-

nel, and procure arms.

Territorial Control: No

No reference was found to territorial control for the IGLF.

Conflict Type: civil war/ethnic conflict

The IGLF was one of many organizations operating in eastern Somalia, and it generally fought on behalf of the Issa and Gurgura clans.

Transnational constituency Support: yes

The Issa and Gurgura clans were in Somalia as well.

Rebel external participation: no

Rebels presents in other states: no

Rebel support: none

Government support: no

Government external participation: no

Source:

- Lexis Nexis Academic

Chapter 187

ID 269

ID 269

Dyad ID 815: Sudan vs. Republic of South Sudan

In January 2011, a referendum was held which determined that South Sudan would become an independent state. According to the Comprehensive Peace Agreement which had been signed by the government of Sudan and the rebel group SPLM/A in 2005, the disputed region of Abyei was also supposed to hold a referendum to determine if it would be part of Sudan or South Sudan. That referendum was not held, and the north claimed it. The region is disputed, and in May 2011, the dispute turned violent. Violence continued after South Sudan became independent, but UCDP treats that conflict then as part of an inter-state conflict between Sudan and South Sudan.

Rebel Political Wing: explicit link Rebel Political Wing legal: yes

When the Sudanese armed forces invaded Abyei, they clashed with South Sudanese police forces, who were directly affiliated with the government of South Sudan.

Rebel Estimate: 194000 Rebel Estimate (low): 194000 Rebel Estimate (high): 194000 Rebel strength: parity

The Republic of South Sudan has a large army, 194000 in 2011 according to UCDP.

Central Control: Yes Strength Central Control: High

The leadership of the Republic of South Sudan is well disciplined and generally coordinates the activities of its security forces.

Mobilization Capacity: Moderate Arms Procurement Capacity: Low Fighting Capacity: Moderate

The Republic of South Sudan is popular in Abyei and, as essentially an independent country, had considerable ability to mobilize troops. It is also an experienced fighting force after decades of insurgency. In general, however, the Sudanese army has better military equipment.

Territorial Control: Yes Name of Territory: Republic of South Sudan Effective Control: High

The Republic of South Sudan was essentially an independent state.

Conflict Type: civil war Transconstsupp: No Rebextpart: No Rebpresosts: No Rebsupport: No
Rtypesup: NA. Govsupport: No Gtypesup: NA Govextpart: no

Source: "UCDP

Source:

- UCDP

Chapter 188

ID 270

ID 70

Incompatibility: Government, South Sudan

Dyad ID 818: South Sudan vs. SSDM/A

The Republic of South Sudan became an independent state on July 9, 2011, and immediately faced insurgency by two groups-SSDM/A and SSLM/A, both of which had fought against the government of South Sudan prior to independence and both of whom received backing from Khartoum. The SSDM/A was led by George Athor, who had run for governor in Jonglei and lost to the candidate from the SPLM/A, the dominant party in South Sudan. Athor claimed fraud and demanded political change in South Sudan.

Rebel Political Wing: explicit link Rebel Political Wing legal: yes

Athor was a political figure, and SSDM/A was both a political and military organization.

Rebel Estimate: 2000 Rebel Estimate (low): 2000 Rebel Estimate (high): 2000 Rebstrength: much weaker

UCDP gives no estimate for the number of troops possessed by SSDM/A in the dyad with South Sudan, but estimates that in 2010 the group had 2000 troops. This compares to nearly 200,000 for the South Sudanese army, so the militia was clearly much weaker.

Central Control: Yes Strength Central Control: High

SSDM/A has a clear leadership structure, led by George Athor.

Mobilization Capacity: low Arms Procurement Capacity: Low Fighting Capacity: low

The rebel group had little ability to mobilize personnel and to field effective fighting forces.

Territorial Control: No

SSDM/A did not appear to control territory in southern Sudan.

Conflict Type: civil war

Transconstsupp: No Rebextpart: No Rebpresosts: Some. Bases located inside Sudan Rebsupport: Explicit. Support from Sudan Rtypesup: Military. Sudan provided bases and small arms. Govsupport: No Gtypesup: NA Govextpart: no

Dyad ID 819: South Sudan vs. SSLM/A

In 2011, Sudan split into two states, the Republic of Sudan and the Republic of South Sudan. Before the split, however, all of Sudan was governed by a Government of National Unity established by the Comprehensive Peace Accord of 2005, and the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement/Army generally administered the north. Prior to independence in 2011, the South Sudan Liberation Movement/Army (SSLM/A) formed to challenge the SPLM/A's rule in South Sudan, and this insurgency continued after South Sudan became independent.

As such, UCDP treats this as two dyads, one between the government of Sudan and the SSLM/A prior to South Sudan's independence, and one between the government of South Sudan and the SSLM/A afterwards.

Rebel Political Wing: no

The SSLM/A was opposed to the SPLM/A's rule, but did not appear to represent an independent political movement.

Rebel Estimate, Rebel Estimate (low), Rebel Estimate (high): unclear Rebstrength: weaker

UCDP gives no indication of the number of troops possessed by the SSLM/A, but it was clearly weaker than the government of South Sudan, which it was contesting.

Central Control: Yes Strength Central Control: Low

The SSLM/A was formed and led by Peter Gadet, who had been a militia leader in South Sudan for years. However, Gadet at one point called for a ceasefire and indicated his willingness to negotiate, but the rest of the organization did not follow suit.

Mobilization Capacity: Low Arms Procurement Capacity: Low Fighting Capacity: Low

The SSLM/A was not as popular in South Sudan as the SPLM/A generally, and was not much of a match for it militarily.

Territorial Control: Yes Name of Territory: Parts of South Sudan Effective Control: Low

Throughout its insurgency, the SSLM/A was able to gain control of some parts of Southern Sudan, but not exercise significant influence over them.

Conflict Type: civil war

Transconstsupp: No Rebextpart: No Rebpresosts: Extensive. Bases in Sudan Rebsupport: Explicit Rtypesup: Military. The government of Sudan provided bases and arms. Govsupport: None Gtypesup: NA Govextpart: no

Sources:

- UCDP

Chapter 189

ID 271

ID 271

Incompatibility: Government, Libya

In 2011, Libya became embroiled in protests, much like the rest of North Africa and the Middle East as part of the so-called "Arab Spring." The National Transitional Council, a military organization which also included former members of Gaddafi's regime, led an insurgency for several months and took power on August 22, 2011. Gaddafi and loyalists continued fighting until October 2011, when their final stronghold of Sirte was captured and Gaddafi was killed.

Dyad ID 823: Libya vs. National Transitional Council (NTC)

Rebel Political Wing: explicit link Rebel Political Wing legal: no

The National Transitional Council was a military organization, but also included political figures including former members of Gaddafi's regime.

Rebel Estimate, Rebel Estimate (low), Rebel Estimate (high): unclear Rebstrength: weaker

UCDP does not give an estimate for the number of troops possessed by the NTC, but the group was weaker military than the Libyan army. However, it received considerable support from external powers.

Central Control: Yes Strength Central Control: Moderate

The NTC had a command structure that could generally coordinate its activities.

Mobilization Capacity: moderate Arms Procurement Capacity: moderate Fighting Capacity: moderate

The NTC was able to mobilize popular support, and due to external assistance able to access military technology and to coordinate its fighting effort.

Territorial Control: Yes Name of Territory: Large Parts of Libya Effective Control: Moderate

Over the course of its insurgency, the NTC expanded its control over large parts of Libya.

Conflict Type: civil war

Transconstsupp: Explicit. Sympathy and support by forces across the region. Rebextpart: Minor. Some fighters and supplies from sympathetic "Arab Spring" forces. Rebpresosts: No Rebsupport: Explicit Rtypesup: Military. Egypt, France, Italy, Poland, Qatar, Sudan and United Arab Emirates, U.K and U.S. NATO forces all provided arms, logistics, supplies. Govsupport: No Gtypesup: NA Govextpart: no

Dyad ID 825: Libya vs. Forces of Muammar Gaddafi

Rebel Political Wing: explicit link Rebel Political Wing legal: no

The Forces of Muammar Gaddafi was made up of members of the former government of Libya, which had been overthrown by the NTC.

Rebel Estimate, Rebel Estimate (low), Rebel Estimate (high): unclear Rebstrength: weaker

UCDP does not give an estimate of the number of troops possessed by Forces of Muammar Gaddafi, but the force was clearly much weaker than that of the new Libyan army.

Central Control: Yes Strength Central Control: High

The Forces of Muammar Gaddafi was a former military and government and was generally cohesive and well coordinated.

Mobilization Capacity: low Arms Procurement Capacity: moderate Fighting Capacity: moderate

After being overthrown, the former government had little ability to mobilize popular support. It did continue to have access to a well organized and equipped military.

Territorial Control: Yes Name of Territory: Sirte Effective Control: High

After being overthrown, the Forces of Muammar Gaddafi were able to establish control over Sirte and some other areas until they were defeated and Gaddafi was killed.

Conflict Type: civil war

Transconstsupp: No Rebextpart: No Rebpresosts: No Rebsupport: No Rtypesup: NA. Govsupport: Explicit. Gtypesup: Military. Supplies and support from NATO forces and governments across the region. Govextpart: no

Source: "UCDP

Myanmar vs. Kachin Independence Organization (KIO)

The Kachin Independence Organization (KIO) is a military and political organization that formed in 1961 to advance Kachin interests. In 1993, the KIO and the Burmese government signed a ceasefire and that agreement held into 2011. In 2011, there were renewed clashes after Burmese military forces entered KIO held territory.

Rebel Political Wing: explicit link Rebel Political Wing legal: yes

The KIO is both a political and a military organization and it has been permitted by the Myanmar

government to administer territory in the Kachin area.

Rebel Estimate: 7000 Rebel Estimate (low): 6000 Rebel Estimate (high): 8000 Rebstrength: much weaker

UCDP estimates that the KIO had between 6000 and 8000 troops in 2011, as compared to 375,000 possessed by the Myanmar military.

Central Control: Yes Strength Central Control: High

KIO is generally a well organized political and military organization.

Mobilization Capacity: low Arms Procurement Capacity: low Fighting Capacity: low

The KIO is a relatively small group with little access to advanced weaponry or ability to effectively target state forces.

Territorial Control: Yes Name of Territory: Parts of Kachin territory Effective Control: High

After the 1993 ceasefire, the KIO was essentially allowed to administer territory in the areas it was based.

Conflict Type: ethnic conflict/civil war

Transconstsup: No. Rebextpart: No Rebpresosts: No Rebsupport: No Rtypesup: NA. Govsupport: No. Gtypesup: NA Govextpart: no

Source: " UCDP