

A REVISED LIST OF WARS BETWEEN AND WITHIN INDEPENDENT STATES, 1816–2002[†]

KRISTIAN SKREDE GLEDITSCH

*University of California, San Diego, California
and Centre for the Study of Civil War (PRIO), Oslo, Norway*

Gleditsch and Ward (1999) examined the criteria for membership in the international system employed by the Correlates of War (COW) project and developed a revised list of independent nation states since 1816. These revisions in turn have implications for other datasets based on the COW system membership classification. This article suggests various revisions to the COW project's list of wars to create a dataset compatible with the revised list of independent states. It identifies additional wars that qualify as interstate or civil wars as well as additional participating states to these wars. I show how the COW project's criteria, based on recognition by France and the UK to identify states as system members in the Nineteenth century and early Twentieth century, understate the total amount of conflict between and within the independent states identified by the Gleditsch and Ward list. An appendix to the article displays a revised list of wars since 1816, with updates for 1997 to 2002 based on data compiled by the Department of Peace and Conflict Research at Uppsala University, and details several changes to the current release of the COW war data over the previous 1994 ICPSR release. The article concludes by outlining an agenda for future collection and improvement of data on wars.

KEY WORDS: wars, independent states, conflict definitions, measuring conflict

Received for publication September 2002.

[†]A previous version of this paper was presented at the conference on "Identifying Wars: Systematic Conflict Research and its Utility in Conflict Resolution and Prevention", Uppsala University, 8–10 June 2001. Paul Collier, David Cunningham, Ismene Gizelis, Nils Petter Gleditsch, John Mueller, Nicholas Sambanis, William R. Thompson, and Michael D. Ward provided helpful comments on earlier drafts. I am grateful for financial support from the Human Security Program at Harvard University and the Research Council of Norway. The data described in this paper are available at <http://weber.ucsd.edu/~kgledits/expwar.html>. The revised data should be seen as a first effort. There may be other conflicts and participants that ought to be included in this list of wars, and the current start and end dates may need revision for many individual conflicts. I am grateful for any comments that can help enhance these data on conflicts within and among states as well as the lists of independent states on which it is based.

Address correspondence to Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, Department of Political Science, University of California, San Diego & Centre for the Study of Civil War, PRIO, La Jolla, CA 92093-0521, USA. kgleditsch@ucsd.edu

WHY A NEW LIST OF WARS?

The empirical study of war and conflict has seen intense activity over the last decades. The reliability of empirical research on armed conflict as well as its ability to advance theoretical progress in research on war and peace hinges critically on the quality of the data. In contrast to other key variables such as democracy and trade, the measurement of violent conflict has received little attention in empirical research. Although there exists a large body of work on conceptualizing conflict theoretically (see, e.g., the review in Most and Starr, 1989), most applied researchers tend to assume that available data on conflict by and large will reflect their theoretical concepts. The Correlates of War project's data on wars have served as the standard for most research on violent conflict. In this paper, I demonstrate that the existing COW war data contain some systematic problems that limit their applicability for many research purposes and may confound our inferences.

Gleditsch and Ward (1999) point out that some of the COW project's decisions regarding what states are deemed to be members of the international system lack face validity and seem questionable for many research questions. In this article, I show that the COW project's decisions about system membership have implications for the data on wars, which many researchers appear to have overlooked. For example, the COW list of interstate war by construction excludes some wars commonly regarded as interstate and participants in these wars. Likewise, the COW project's coding rules excludes civil wars within states not recognized as system members and not under the control of a colonial power. I suggest a series of revisions to the COW war data based on the list of independent nation states in Gleditsch and Ward (1999).

My argument is not that the COW war data necessarily are incorrect. But they are based on a list of independent states that explicitly focuses on recognition by two European major powers. The use of the alternative Gleditsch and Ward (1999) list of independent states in recent data collection efforts suggests that other researchers have found the COW system membership to be too restrictive for their research purposes (see, for example, Fordham and Sarver, 2001; Leeds et al., 2002; Thompson, 2001).¹ Although the Euro-centric emphasis might have been appropriate given the initial research aims of the COW project, it may not serve equally well for all research purposes. My purpose is to provide constructive criticism and enhance the applicability of the empirical war data.

WARS AS MAJOR ARMED CONFLICTS

In the most general sense, the term *conflict* simply denotes some form of incompatibility between parties, and could include a very large range of phenomena (see Gleditsch, 2002 for an extended discussion). The term *war* is generally used to refer to particularly severe armed conflict. The COW project has proposed an operational definition of war that has gained widespread acceptance, which delineates cases of violent armed conflict as wars if the event involves more than 1,000 battle deaths (see Singer and Small, 1972, p. 30, Small and Singer, 1982, p. 50). I will return to the specific criteria for determining whether the battle death threshold has been met for

different types of conflict in more detail later.

A high battle-death threshold will exclude many forms of conflicts such as international crises that may not involve any casualties or minor armed disputes with few fatalities. Identifying major conflict events by a high battle death threshold, however, has certain advantages for research on conflict and peace. Although latent tension and lower level conflicts may be of interest in their own right, it is difficult to get reliable information about the broader set of such events for different time periods and regions of the world. Differences in media coverage of certain areas can easily lead to underreporting of conflicts in areas where foreign reporters are thin on the ground. These issues make it difficult to identify anything resembling the population of all such events for a broad historical period such as the last two centuries. Without actual data on the population and a possible biased sample of events, we lack a reliable basis for making statements about the total amount of global conflict or comparisons between different regions of the world or time periods. Using a fatality threshold is not devoid of problems, and the 1,000 deaths criterion could be criticized as an arbitrary number. However, a relatively high threshold of 1,000 does help to ensure that the conflict incidents included are relatively well defined. My purpose in this article is to reexamine existing data on wars between and within independent nations rather than to advocate a new approach to study of conflict or the definition of war. Hence, I leave all issues concerning definition aside for now, and simply try to apply an operational definition of war based on battle deaths similar to that used in the COW project.

The Correlates of War project's International and Civil War data (see Singer and Small, 1972, Small and Singer, 1982) have served as a standard source for research on armed conflict within and between states. The latest publicly released version of the COW war data (Version 3.0) is available from <http://cow2.pss.la.psu>. This contains data on the participation of nation states in international and civil wars between 1816 and 1997. Two earlier books (Singer and Small, 1972, Small and Singer, 1982) provide the most comprehensive sources of documentation of the data in print. Version 3.0 introduces a series of changes from the prior 1994 release of the data deposited with the Inter-University Consortium of Political and Social Research at the University of Michigan (ICPSR 9905) (Singer and Small, 1994). Major changes such as the revisions to the war typology are outlined in Sarkees (2000). Changes to individual data points, however, are not discussed in Sarkees (2000), and have not been documented by the COW project (personal communication with Sarkees, 2001).²

The COW project distinguishes between international and intrastate or civil wars. The international wars come in two types: 1) *interstate wars*, where the participants are adjudged to be members of the interstate system, and 2) *extra-state wars*, where system members engage in armed conflict with entities that are not deemed to be full members of the interstate system. Prior to Version 3.0, extra-state wars were labeled as extra-systemic wars. Small and Singer (1972, 1982) distinguished between two types of *extra-systemic wars*. Conflicts are considered *imperial wars* when waged with distinct political entities that do not fulfill all of the Correlates of War system membership criteria. The category *colonial wars* include wars "in which the adversary was a colony, dependency or protectorate composed of ethnically different people and located at some geographical distance or, at least, peripheral to the center of

government of the given system member” (Small and Singer, 1982, p. 52). Version 3.0 of the COW war data has reclassified extra-systemic wars fought within the territories of states as intra-state wars. The 3.0 data do not explicitly identify colonial or imperial wars, but distinguish between conflicts with a colony and conflicts with a “non-state actor.”

Some researchers have questioned the rationale for distinguishing between civil and extra-state wars (e.g., Collier and Hoeffler, 1998; Fearon and Laitin, 2003). I will return to the usefulness of the COW typology of wars later. Since the war categories are considered mutually exclusive by the COW project, any war that is classified as extra-state will be excluded in lists of interstate or civil wars generated from these data. This appears to have been overlooked by many researchers who have focused either on civil or inter-state war.

Finally, the COW project has used different versions of the battle death threshold for different types of wars, and the specific criteria have been revised over the course of the project. According to Small and Singer (1982), interstate wars must have a minimum of 1,000 battle deaths over the duration of the dispute (p. 55), extra-state wars must have average annual battle deaths over 1,000 (p. 56), while intra-state wars must have at least 1,000 battle deaths per year (p. 213). Only the military battle deaths contribute to the threshold for inter-state and extra-state wars, whereas the battle death count for civil wars includes both military and civilian deaths. Initially, only the battle deaths of the formally recognized system members were considered for extra-systemic wars. The COW project has later changed these criteria, and will now also consider casualties on the side of the non-recognized party for extra-state wars.³ Many have questioned whether the Correlates of War criteria have been consistently applied (see, for example, Sambanis, 2001). Recently some members of the COW community have advocated that a 1,000 annual deaths criterion should be applied regardless of type. I will return to the issue of how a battle death threshold ought to be implemented later.

REEXAMINING THE WAR DATA IN LIGHT OF THE REVISED LIST OF INDEPENDENT STATES

The COW project’s typology of war awards a central place to the coding decisions about whether or not a state should be considered a system member. As explained in greater detail in Gleditsch and Ward (1999), the criteria used by the COW project to determine whether states are members of the interstate system differ markedly for the periods before and after 1920. Singer and Small (1972, p. 20) considered two criteria before 1920, namely whether candidates had a population greater than 500,000 and whether entities were “sufficiently unencumbered by legal, military, economic, or political constraints to exercise a fair degree of sovereignty and independence.” In practice, formal diplomatic relations with Britain *and* France at or above the level of *chargé d’affaires* in the capital city were used to determine whether states were independent members of the interstate system. After 1920, Singer and Small (1972, p. 21) relied on whether a nation “either (a) was a member of the League of Nations or the United Nations at any time during its existence, or (b) met the half-million population minimum and received diplomatic missions from *any two* (rather




Figure 1: Number of states. Gleditsch and Ward (1999) versus the COW list.

than the *specific two*) *major* powers.”⁴ In addition to the explicit criteria, the COW project excludes and includes a number of states based on *ad hoc* decisions.⁵

Figure 1 illustrates the aggregate differences in the number of states between the COW system membership list and Gleditsch and Ward (1999). The criteria used by the COW data exclude a large number of states considered independent in the Gleditsch and Ward list prior to 1920. After 1920, the aggregate difference between the two data sets is relatively small. The seeming divergence toward the end of the time period stems from the COW project’s decision to include a number of states with very small populations, such as San Marino and Monaco, as system members when these states become members of the United Nations in the 1990s. The figures for the Gleditsch and Ward data used here do not include microstates with fewer than 250,000 inhabitants. As described in greater detail in Gleditsch and Ward (1999), the start and end dates used in many of these microstates in the COW system membership list seem questionable as they do not correspond to their commonly accepted dates of independence.⁶

Many political entities that were not colonies and that were commonly regarded as independent states have been excluded from the COW list. Wars involving such units have been classified as extra-systemic or extra-state wars. This excludes many wars often regarded as interstate in other sources such as Blainey’s (1988) classical text on the causes of war. For example, the Serbo-Bulgarian war in 1885 and a war between Bolivia and Peru in 1841 do not show up in the COW interstate war data, although they involve autonomous units and bear little resemblance to colonial con-

flicts. These wars are extra-state only in the sense that these states did not fulfill the COW project's criteria of formal recognition by both France and the UK.

Moreover, the restrictive COW system membership definition excludes many efforts by European powers to colonize or gain influence over states outside the central subsystem, such as the Opium wars, the Italo-Ethiopian wars, and the prolonged Anglo-Afghan wars. For many research purposes, it does not seem appropriate to exclude wars between Afghanistan and the UK from a list of interstate wars simply because Britain did not formally recognize the independence of the entity it was trying to gain control over. Put bluntly, a war between two states that are autonomous prior to the outbreak does not cease to be interstate just because one party refuses to acknowledge the other.

Small and Singer (1982, pp. 331–340) included a list of international and civil wars that exceeded the fatality threshold but were excluded from the war data due to the system membership status of the participants in an appendix. Using the revised dates of independence in Gleditsch and Ward (1999), there are at least 29 wars classified as extra-systemic or civil wars in the COW war data that should be considered interstate wars. Five further wars altogether excluded from the COW data qualify as interstate wars by the Gleditsch and Ward criteria. These 35 additional wars are displayed in Table 1. Some of these conflicts may have been excluded based on the requirement that states must have been independent for at least six months before to be considered an interstate wars (see Singer and Small, 1972, p. 33; Small and Singer 1982, p. 53). Table A.1 in the Appendix displays the full list of interstate wars since 1816 with the suggested revisions.

In addition, the COW criteria imply that many states have been excluded as participants in interstate wars included in the data. For example, despite the number of ANZAC monuments indicating the extensive participation of Australia and New Zealand in the World War I (see, e.g., Laffin, 1965), neither country is considered a state by the COW project until 1920, and these states were thus not included as participants in the COW war data. Table 2 indicates states that should be added as participants to existing interstate wars by the Gleditsch and Ward (1999) criteria.

Finally, a series of independent states that experienced civil wars or extra-systemic conflicts with other entities exceeding more than 1,000 fatalities have been excluded from the COW war data altogether since the units were not recognized as system members by the COW project (see Small and Singer, 1982, pp. 331–340). Table 3 identifies 22 wars involving countries that qualify as independent states by the revised criteria in Gleditsch and Ward (1999).

UPDATING THE WAR DATA FROM 1997 TO 2002

The COW war data currently in the public domain are available only up to 1997. For many purposes it is useful to have more recent data. I suggest an update to war data for 1997 to 2002 based on the armed conflict data compiled at the Department of Peace and Conflict Research at Uppsala University (see Eriksson et al., 2003, Gleditsch et al. 2002). The additional wars for the 1997 to 2002 period as well as the implied changes to the end data of wars that were ongoing as of 1997 are listed in Table 4.

Table 1
Omitted Interstate Wars

Turko-Persian (1821, ES-303)	Persia/Iran was never colonized by any foreign power.
Cisplatine (Argentina-Brazil) (1825–1828, new)	Argentina and Brazil were independent states.
Greek War of Independence (1827–1828, CW-504)	Greece became an independent state on 17 May 1827 during the war of independence. May have been excluded due to the six months independence rule.
First Anglo-Burmese (1823–1826, ES-305)	Burma was an independent kingdom prior to British colonialization.
Russo-Persian (1826–1828, ES-310)	Persia/Iran was never colonized by any foreign power.
War of the Peruvian-Bolivian Confederation (1836–1839, new)	War between a transitory confederation of Peru and Bolivia against Chile and Argentina. Neither of the sides were colonies.
Afghan-Persian (1837–1838, new)	Both Afghanistan and Persia were independent states.
First British-Afghan (1838–1842, ES-313)	Afghanistan was not a colony at this point.
First Opium (1839–1840, ES-315)	China was never colonized by any foreign power.
Franco-Algerian (1839–1847, ES-317)	This was a war of conquest. Blainey (1988) describes a war preceding the invasion of Algiers in 1830, with fighting continuing until 1847, and it is possible that France and Algeria might have been involved in an interstate war as early as 1830.
Peruvian-Bolivian (1841, ES-318)	Bolivia was not a colony.
Franco-Moroccan (1844, ES-321)	Morocco was not a colony at this point.
Uruguayan Dispute (1845–1852, ES-320)	Uruguay became an independent state in 1830.
Burmese (1852–1853, ES-329)	Burma was an independent kingdom prior to British colonialization.
Haiti-Santo Domingo (1855–1856, new)	Neither party to the conflict was a colony.
Second Opium (1856–1860, ES-331)	China was never colonized by any foreign power.
French Indochinese (1858, ES-337)	This was a war of conquest in Indochina. As the Indochinese states had not been colonized at the time it should be regarded as an interstate war.
Spain vs. Santo Domingo (1863–1865, ES-341)	The Dominican Republic became an independent state in 1845. This war reflects a Spanish effort to re-conquer the island that ultimately failed.
British-Ethiopian (1867–1868, ES-343)	Ethiopia was not a colony.
Tonkin (1873–1885, ES-349)	Vietnam was not a colony at the outset of this war.
Second British-Afghan (1878–1880, ES-356)	Afghanistan was not a colony at this point.
Boer War of 1880 (1880–1881, ES-360)	The Boer republics were independent states at the time of the war.
Franco-Indochinese (1882–1884, ES-363)	France was fighting sovereign states at the outset of the war.

(Continued on next page)

First Franco-Madagascan (1883–1885 ES-366)	Madagascar was an independent kingdom.
Russo-Afghan (1885, ES-370)	Afghanistan was not a colony at this point.
Serbo-Bulgarian (1885, ES-371)	Bulgaria became an autonomous principality following the defeat of the Ottomans on 3 March 1878.
Second Burmese (1885–1886, ES-367)	This war completed the British colonization of Burma, but Burma was a sovereign kingdom at the outset.
First Italo-Ethiopian (1887, ES-372)	Ethiopia was not a colony in 1887, and Italy did not subdue Ethiopia until the 1936 invasion.
Franco-Madagascan (1894–1895, ES-380)	Madagascar was an independent kingdom.
Italo-Ethiopian (1895–1896, ES-384)	Ethiopia was not a colony in 1895, and Italy did not subdue Ethiopia until the 1936 invasion
Costa Rica-Nicaragua (1897, new)	Both sides were independent states, so this should be included as an interstate war.
Boer (1899–1902, ES-395)	The two Afrikaner republics —Transvaal and the Orange Free State— are independent states.
First Sino-Tibetan (1918, ES-405)	Tibet achieved effective independence after the fall of the Qing dynasty, and successfully expelled all Chinese troops in 1913. This armed conflict reflects an attempt by China to re-conquer Tibet.
Sino-Tibetan (1950–1951, ES-426)	This represents a Chinese invasion of Tibet. Tibet was an independent state at least at the outset of the war.
Yugoslavia (1993, new)	This refers to the conflict between the republics of Yugoslavia and Croatia after the latter state's independence. The activities of ethnic militias inside the states of the former Yugoslavia could be considered civil wars.

The current version of the Uppsala data encompasses all incidents of armed conflicts that are deemed to involve more than 25 casualties in a single year over the period 1946 to 2002 (Gleditsch et al., 2002, p. 618–620). The project codes armed conflicts as wars if they involve more than 1,000 battle deaths in a single year (Gleditsch et al., 2002, p. 619). Conflicts that did not reach 1,000 battle deaths in a single year, but involved more than 1,000 battle deaths over the span of the conflicts, are coded as *intermediate* armed conflicts. Armed conflicts that involve less than 1,000 battle deaths over the course of the conflict, but more than 25 in a given year, are coded as *minor* armed conflict.

Table 2
Omitted participants

La Plata (1851–1852, IS-019)	Uruguay was an independent state.
Lopez (1864–1870, IS-049)	Uruguay was an independent state.
World War I (IS-106, 1914–1918)	Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Nepal, and South Africa were independent states.

Table 3: Omitted civil or extra-systemic wars

Argentina (1819–1820)	Argentina was an independent state.
Siam-Kedah (1821)	Siam/Thailand was an independent state.
Haiti-Santo Domingo (1823)	Haiti was not a colony. Santo Domingo was annexed to Haiti, so this should be included as a civil war, possibly an extra-systemic war.
Central America (1823)	Mexico was an independent state. The United Provinces of Central America became independent following the war.
Central America (1827–1829)	The United Provinces of Central America was an independent state.
Argentina (1828–1831)	Argentina was an independent state.
Chile (1829–1830)	Chile was an independent state.
Oman (Muscat)-Zanzibar (1829–1837)	Oman was an independent state by the Gleditsch and Ward (1999) criteria, so this should be included as a civil or possibly extra-systemic war.
Central America (1831–1845)	The United Provinces of Central America was an independent state.
Argentina (1833–1834)	Argentina was an independent state.
China-Kashagaria (1847–1848)	China was an independent state.
Nicaragua (1855–1857)	Nicaragua was an independent state.
China-Khokhand (1857)	China was an independent state.
Ethiopia (1861)	Ethiopia was an independent state.
Siam-Cambodia (1862–1863)	Siam/Thailand was an independent state.
Uruguay (1863–1872)	Uruguay was an independent state.
Afghanistan (1868–1888)	Afghanistan was an independent state.
Ethiopia (1867)	Ethiopia was an independent state.
Oman (1883-1884)	Oman was an independent state.
Ethiopia-Egyptians (1885–1895)	Ethiopia was an independent state by the Gleditsch and Ward (1999) criteria, so this should be included as a civil or possibly extra-systemic war.
Oman (1957)	Oman was an independent state.
Cameroon (1959–1961)	Cameroon became independent in 1960.

The Uppsala project's definition of war was devised in part to be compatible with the definition of war used by the COW project. No interstate wars were active in 1997, but a number of civil wars are coded as ongoing as of 1997 in Version 3.0 of the COW data. Given the similar annual battle death criterion for civil wars in the COW project noted previously, one should expect that the Uppsala war data and the COW war data should identify a relatively similar set of civil wars in the time period where the two data sources overlap. Although the incidents included tend to be the same, however, there are considerable differences between the dating of wars in the Uppsala University Conflict Data and the COW civil war data. Even though the coding criteria outlined for civil war in the documentation for the COW data hold

Table 4
1997–2002 Updates

TYPE	WAR	COMMENT
IS	Eritrea-Ethiopia (1998–2000, new)	
IS	India-Pakistan (1999, new)	
IS	NATO-Yugoslavia (1999, new)	
CW	Afghanistan vs. Rebels (1978–2001, CW-698)	This war ends in 1992 in the COW 2001 data, but is coded as a war through 2001 in the Uppsala data.
CW	Somalia vs. Clan Factions (1982–1997, CW-713)	This conflict is considered an intermediate armed conflict past 1992 in the Uppsala data.
CW	Sri Lanka vs. Tamils and JVP (1983–1993 and 1995–2001, CW-715, CW-724)	End date is coded as “missing” in Correlates of War data, final years based on the Uppsala data. In this case, the COW data distinguishes between the war against the Tamil tigers (715) and the war against the JVP (724). In most other cases, conflicts with different organizations and groups within a state are considered a single war in the COW data.
CW	Sudan vs. SPLA (1983–1992 and 1995–2002, CW-717)	End date is coded as “missing” in Correlates of War data, final years based on the Uppsala data.
CW	Colombia (M-19, FARC, & Drug Lords) (1984–1993 and 1998–2002 CW-719)	End date is coded as “missing” in Correlates of War data, final years based on the Uppsala data
CW	India (Sikhs and Kashmiris) (1985–1993 and 1999–2002, CW-722)	End date is coded as “missing” in the COW data. According to the Uppsala conflict data, India experiences three separate conflicts that reach the level of civil war — Assam, Punjab, and Kashmir.
CW	Turkey vs. Kurds (1991–2002, CW-734)	End date is coded as “missing” in the COW data. Intermediate conflict beyond 1997 in Uppsala data.
CW	Algeria vs. Islamic Rebels (1992–2001, CW-739)	End date coded as “missing” in COW data. Not war in 1992 according to Uppsala data.
CW	Tadzhikistan vs. Popular Democratic Army (1992–1997, CW-740)	War only through 1996 according to the Uppsala data.
CW	Angola vs. UNITA of 1992 (1992–1994 and 1998–2001, CW-743)	End date of COW 743 is 1994 and a new war (757) is coded as starting in 1997. This seems essentially the same conflict, and it seems more appropriate to regard it as a continuation rather than a new war.
CW	Burundi vs. Hutu (1993–8, 2000–2002 CW-745)	End date is coded as “missing” in the COW data. This is a war in 1998 and 2000–2002 only in the Uppsala data.
CW	Russia vs. Chechens (1994–1996 & 1998–2001, CW-748)	Not considered war in 1994 in Uppsala data.
CW	Uganda vs. Lords Resistance Army (1996–2001, CW-753)	End date coded as “missing” in the COW data. Not considered war after 1991 by the Uppsala data, intermediate from 1996 to 2001.

(Continued on next page)

CW	CDR/Zaire vs. rebels (1996–2001, CW-757)	This conflict does not reach the level of war in 1996 according to the Uppsala data. Whereas COW indicates that the conflict ends in 1997 (when Kabila assumes power), it is considered at the level of war until 2000 in the Uppsala data and intermediate in 2001.
CW	Congo vs. Denis Sassou Nguemo (1997–9, CW-760)	Whereas COW indicates that the conflict ends in 1997, it is considered at the level of war until 1999 in the Uppsala data.
CW	Guinea-Bissau (1998, new)	
CW	Rwanda (1998–2001, new)	This is coded as more than 1,000 casualties in 1998 and 2001 in the Uppsala data, and as an intermediate conflict in 1999–2000.
CW	Yugoslavia/Kosovo (1998–9, new)	
CW	Sierra-Leone (1998–2000, new)	
CW	Philippines - Mindanao (2000–1, new)	
CW	US vs. Al-Qa'ida (2001, new)	Retaliation campaign, the U.S.A. is supported by troops from Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Netherlands, Poland, Russia, Turkey, and United Kingdom
CW	Nepal vs. CPN-M/UPF (2002)	

that civil wars must involve more than 1,000 battle deaths in a single year (Sarkees, 2000, p. 129, Small and Singer, 1982, p. 213), it appears as if the data in many cases have been coded based on whether they involve more than 1,000 battle deaths over the duration of the entire conflict.⁷ For example, the conflict in Burundi (CW-745) is coded as a war starting in 1993 and ongoing as of the end of 1997 in the COW data, but is coded as a minor conflict through 1996 in the Uppsala data, and only considered a war after 1997. Including some annual observations coded as qualifying in the intermediate category in the Uppsala armed conflict data greatly reduces many of the inconsistencies between the start and end dates of wars in the Uppsala and the COW data. Since the COW project does not provide annual point estimates of the battle deaths or a description of its sources for individual observations it is impossible to ascertain whether a strict annual, an annual average, or a total event based battle death criterion has been used. To make this update as compatible as possible with the rest of the civil war data based on the COW project's data, I have included years of intermediate conflicts as part of civil wars if they followed directly after years classified as wars in the Uppsala data. In the concluding paragraph, I will return to the issue of how this should be handled in future data collection.

CONSEQUENCES OF REVISING THE WAR DATA

The validity of war data is important, both when considering individual wars and in aggregate analyses. At the level of individual wars, it is clearly problematic if a

Table 5
Origin of Interstate War Observations

ORIGIN OF OBSERVATION	WARS	SHARE OF TOTAL
Classified as interstate in COW	79	66.95%
Classified as extra-state in COW	28	23.73%
Previously classified as civil war	1	0.85%
New wars not in COW, pre-1997	5	4.24%
New wars, 1997–2001	5	4.24%
Total	118	100%

data set of war between states does not include major wars discussed in a theoretical work on the causes of interstate war. Major discrepancies sometimes appear between the cases discussed by researchers and the cases actually included in their dataset.⁸ In this section, I aim to show how the identification and classification of wars based strictly on the COW system membership list have consequences for analyses of conflict that researchers often have ignored.

Irrespective of the merits of individual changes, does the revised list of wars differ noticeably in the aggregate from the existing COW data? Are we likely to change any substantive conclusions? To answer this question, I first summarize the overall differences between the revised war data and the existing data. I then turn to some of the problematic consequences of the existing COW data and how the revised data can help overcome these.

The revised data set contains 118 interstate wars. Table 5 displays the origin of the observations. Disregarding the new observations for the 1997–2002 period, more than 30 percent of the interstate wars in the revised dataset are not included in the existing COW data. Of the 34 additional interstate wars in the revised data, 29 wars in the revised data are found in the existing COW data either as extra-systemic or civil wars. Five wars, were entirely excluded by COW, as none of the antagonists were considered a system member. Similarly, the revised dataset contains many new civil wars within independent states that were not considered system members by COW. Table 6 indicates the distribution of the intra-state war observations in the revised war data. The revised criteria for independent states suggest an additional 25 civil wars. Finally, after reclassifying many of conflicts in Version 3.0 of the COW data, the revised data contain 81 remaining extra-state wars.

Table 6
Origin of Intrastate War Observations

ORIGIN OF OBSERVATION	WARS	SHARE OF TOTAL
Classified as intra-state war in COW	213	87.65%
New wars not in COW, pre-1997	25	10.29%
New wars, 1997–2001	6	2.47%
Total	243	100%




Figure 2. Comparison of interstate wars, revised versus original COW data.

The new observations constitute a relatively small share of the overall data on war. However, wars are relatively rare events, so each single incidence or data point can have a strong influence on our findings and conclusions. The relative differences are also larger for some time periods and geographical regions. Figure 2 displays the incidence of interstate war in the revised data. The height of the shaded area under the curve displays the total number of ongoing interstate wars for each year. The light sections of the area indicate observations that are found in both lists. The dark area indicates wars that are either not in the COW data at all or not classified as interstate wars. There is a substantial difference for the Nineteenth century. The original COW data contain few interstate wars in the Nineteenth century, but the revised data suggests that the number of wars in the Nineteenth century was substantial. The year 1885 saw the highest number of ongoing conflicts for any one given year over the entire period. However, only two of the seven ongoing interstate wars in 1885 are listed by COW. The incidence of interstate in the Nineteenth century is all the more remarkable, given the limited number of independent states. Hence, if one accepts the validity of the criteria for independent states suggested by Gleditsch and Ward (1999), the COW war data severely understates the amount of interstate war in the Nineteenth century.

The initial work on the COW system membership list was quite explicit about its restrictions to a Euro-centric global system. Many researchers, however, have clearly considered the COW list as the population of all wars. Even though Small and Singer (1982, p. 52) warned that “an understanding of international war cannot rest on interstate wars alone,” most analyses of global violence have focused exclusively on the COW interstate wars. The exclusion of a large number of wars from the interstate list

can clearly have serious consequences for our conclusions. Publications from the COW project have frequently commented on the seemingly different relationships at the systemic level in the Nineteenth and Twentieth centuries (e.g., Singer, Bremer, and Stuckey, 1972). However, because of the discontinuity between the pre-1920 and post-1920 criteria for system membership, such findings in part follow by construction. If we define away a large share of the independent states in the system before 1920, it is not surprising that the number of interstate wars seems much lower and that structural characteristics may look different.

The additional observations can also help researchers overcome the so-called rare event problem, as the additional interstate wars in Table 1 provide *bona fide* cases to evaluate our theories about wars. Pillar (1983) has suggested that there is a strong relationship between the status of combatants and war outcomes. Whereas wars between sovereign states are more likely to end in negotiated outcomes, civil wars are more likely to end in extermination or capitulation of one of the parties. Although some of the additional cases in Table 1 are wars of independence or wars of conquest related to colonization, Pillar's data on how wars end indicate that many of the conflicts in Table 1 resemble other interstate wars and indeed do end in negotiation.⁹ This suggests that these disputes resemble the pattern of other interstate wars between sovereign states. If wars are rare events, and we need as much data as possible to better evaluate our hypotheses, it would seem unwise to exclude wars between states just because one of the parties do not fit the COW project's criteria for system membership.

COW's euro-centric focus implies that states in some geographical regions are systematically less likely to be considered system members, depending on the extent to which France and the UK have sufficient interest to establish extensive representation in the region. This creates problems for the study of regional rivalries and wars in these regions (e.g., Diehl, 1998). In Latin America, states gained independence substantially earlier than they gained formal recognition by the UK and France. Many of these states have a long history of conflict and cooperation before they appear as system members in the COW list. Consider the case of Argentina, which is commonly regarded as independent from Spain since 1816,¹⁰ but does not appear as a state in the COW project's list until 1841. Between 1816 and 1841, Argentina participated in two interstate wars against other states (the 1825–1828 Cisplatine against Brazil and the 1836–1839 war against the Peruvian-Bolivian confederation) and had three civil wars (1819–1820, 1828–1831, and 1833–1834). The interstate wars were important in the battle for regional supremacy in the early history of the Southern Cone. Interestingly, Argentina's diplomatic recognition by France and the UK coincides with a civil war (Argentina vs. Unitarios, 1841–1842) where the same countries actively supported the overthrow of the Argentine dictator Rosas.¹¹ Paradoxically, if Argentina had remained under the control of Spain, these omitted civil wars would have qualified as extra-state conflicts. As Argentina was independent of Spain but not considered a system member by the COW criteria, these civil wars fall in limbo. The euro-centric biases in the COW system membership list makes the derived war data poorly suited for studying the role of conflict in state building in areas where the UK and France were slow to establish diplomatic connections, such as Latin America in the 19th century (see, e.g., Centeno, 2002).

FUTURE DATA COLLECTION AND REVISION

The COW project has provided researchers with the most comprehensive data on contemporary and historical cases of major armed conflicts. Given its restrictive criteria for system membership, however, many wars have been omitted or misclassified. The list of wars identified here would seem to be more appropriate for many research questions.

The current data have been compiled largely by combining available data sources. I hope that the list may provide a useful starting point for future data collection efforts. I now step aside from the specific data proposed here to discuss some recommendations for such data collection. In general, it would be helpful to have additional documentation on each individual war. Such information would make it easier to assess what sources and criteria have been used to classify the individual cases and ascertain whether individual events are pertinent to their particular research questions. A research project on the diffusion of conflict, for example, may involve a hypothesis that countries close to the location of the area where conflict takes place may be exposed to spillover effects of the war and conflict expansion. One would not expect to see spillover effects and expansion to neighbors for countries participating in conflicts in distant locations, such as Cuban involvement in the Angolan civil war. Spillover effects to neighboring states, however, may also occur from conflicts in territories that are not independent. Wars in the former Portuguese colonies in Africa, for example, generated large numbers of refugees in countries bordering on these colonies. Although the current COW war data help to identify the participating states, they do not indicate the actual location of the battles beyond what continent the war occurred in. One way to make progress here would be to generate case descriptions for each individual war in the revised list, similar to the summaries provided for the Interstate Crisis Behavior data (see Brecher and Wilkenfeld, 1997).

Establishing a clearer chronology of individual wars with estimates of casualties over phases of the conflict could also help in identifying when conflicts should be characterized as wars and their appropriate start and end dates based on a battle death criterion. A total event based criterion may be appropriate for some research questions whereas an annual minimum threshold may be more appropriate for other purposes. If we wish to study how wars end, for example, it would seem appropriate to use a total event based threshold, and not let ongoing conflicts drop out of the sample if the number of battle deaths did not quite reach 1,000 over a period of 12 consecutive months. However, if we are interested in ascertaining whether a conflict is active at a high level at a particular point in time, it would be more appropriate to classify wars based on whether the conflict claimed more than a 1,000 minimum over a contiguous 12 month period. More disaggregated data would make it possible for users to filter the information on war to create data in different formats appropriate for particular research questions.

It would also be advantageous to collect information on wars without imposing typologies of war as part of the data collection effort itself. The shifting classifications of many individual conflicts in the COW project's data on war, for example, illustrate some inherent ambiguities in their typology of war. For example, the armed violence in Vietnam after 1945, which is often considered a single conflict, shifts

between all three categories over different phases of the conflict. This conflict is initially considered an extra-state conflict, while Vietnam is a French colony. It then becomes a civil war between the government and communist rebels in the Republic of Vietnam after independence. As the USA's military presence on the South Vietnamese side becomes greater, the conflict becomes classified as an interstate war. Internationalization of a conflict, however, does not necessarily remove the domestic conflict. The typology of wars suggested by the COW project imposes mutually exclusive categories, even though many individual wars may have elements of more than one category and are not easily classified as either interstate or intrastate wars. The more recent conflict in Bosnia following the republic's independence from Yugoslavia similarly has elements of both interstate and civil conflict. More disaggregated data on wars without a mutually exclusive typology imposed on the structure of the data themselves would allow researchers to generate subsets with the relevant events for particular research questions, without presupposing that categories are mutually exclusive and that a classification appropriate for one project must preclude other possible classifications that may be useful for other purposes.

Although the conceptual distinction between interstate conflict between states and intrastate conflicts within states is relatively well-defined, the concept of extra-state or extra-systemic wars is murkier and such wars are often difficult to distinguish from intrastate or interstate wars. Wars were originally considered extrasystemic by the COW project if the non-system member was a distinct group from the core population of the system member. The last extra-systemic war in the 1994 version of the COW data was the Tigrean war (1978–1991, IW-454). This conflict was waged entirely on the territory of the Ethiopian state, and could plausibly also be regarded as a civil war in Ethiopia. Accepting the ambiguities in the distinction between civil and extra-systemic wars, Version 3.0 of the COW data argues that wars against “non-system members” should be considered civil wars if fought within “the internationally accepted boundaries of the member state” (Sarkees, 2000, p. 129). This, however, is primarily a legal criterion rather than an identifying characteristic of the war itself. Assessing whether some territory is part of the core territory of a state or not is often a political question (Gleditsch and Ward, 2001). France, for example, insisted that Algeria was a regular *département* or an integrated part of France.¹² It not clear why other conflicts in the COW data such as Western Sahara (1975–1983, ES-441), fought on contiguous territory land annexed to Morocco and Mauritania, or Namibia (1976–1988, ES-440)—which is directly contiguous to and was occupied by South Africa—should be considered extra-systemic rather than civil wars by this criterion. Some researchers have proposed that the extra-state wars should be added to a list of civil wars while other researchers prefer to keep colonial and imperial wars separate from other civil wars within states (for contending views, see Fearon and Laitin, 2003, Gates, 2002). Both of these decisions may be appropriate for different research purposes. My personal view is that extra-state wars in principle can be classified with other secessionist conflicts, which typically take place in peripheral parts of the core state. Although some internal conflicts or civil wars between state and nonstate actors revolve around control over an existing state or government, many are attempts by distinct groups to establish new nation states or unite with existing nation states. Whether the conflict is waged on the core territory of a state itself

(however this may be defined) is largely irrelevant in this respect. Colonialism could occur both abroad and at home, and the distinction between nation-building and colonialism lies partly in the eye of the beholder (see, for example, Hechter, 1975). Rather than insisting on classifying wars in mutually exclusive categories in the data collection, it would seem more useful to consider all wars not fought between independent states and identify the location of conflict and its relationships with the core territory and institutions of the existing state as attributes of the conflict and potential explanatory variables (see Buhaug and Gates 2002 for an example of an analysis along these lines). More disaggregated data on wars would allow us to treat some of the contending conjectures about the differences of colonial and imperial conflicts as testable hypotheses rather than assumptions and typologies imposed on the structure of the data.

APPENDIX: ARMED CONFLICTS, 1816–2002

The tables below contain in summary form the armed conflicts taking place from 1816 to 1998. The starting point for the data are the Correlates of War International and Civil War data (Singer and Small, 1972, 1994, Small and Singer, 1982). These have been revised to reflect changes in the delineation of states suggested in Gleditsch and Ward (1999), and updated for 1998–2002 with the Uppsala conflict data. The COW01 and COW94 columns display the labels used in the 2001 and 1994 version of the data. Entries with suggested revisions are displayed in italics. All the revisions and changes between the 1994 and 2001 versions are documented in footnotes.

Table A
Interstate wars, 1816–2002

ID	COW01	COW94	WAR NAME	TIME SPAN
<i>ES-303</i>	<i>IW-303</i>	<i>Turko-Persian</i> ¹³	1821	
IS-001	IW-001	Franco-Spanish	1823	
<i>ES-305</i>	<i>IW-307</i>	<i>First Anglo-Burmese</i> ¹⁴	1823–1826	
***	***	<i>Cisplatine (Argentina-Brazil)</i> ¹⁵	1825–1828	
<i>ES-310</i>	<i>IW-313</i>	<i>Russo-Persian</i> ¹⁶	1826–1828	
<i>CW-504</i>	<i>IW-304</i>	<i>Greek War of Independence</i> ¹⁷	1827–1828	
IS-004	IW-004	Russo-Turkish	1828–1829	
***	***	<i>War of the Peruvian-Bolivian Confederation</i> ¹⁸	1836–1839	
***	***	<i>Afghan-Persian</i> ¹⁹	1837–1838	
<i>ES-313</i>	<i>IW-325</i>	<i>First British-Afghan</i> ²⁰	1838–1842	
<i>ES-315</i>	<i>IW-329</i>	<i>First Opium</i> ²¹	1839–1840	
<i>ES-317</i>	<i>IW-331</i>	<i>Franco-Algerian</i> ²²	1839–1847	
<i>ES-318</i>	<i>IW-334</i>	<i>Peruvian-Bolivian</i> ²³	1841	
<i>ES-321</i>	<i>IW-336</i>	<i>Franco-Moroccan</i> ²⁴	1844	
<i>ES-320</i>	***	<i>Uruguayan Dispute</i> ²⁵	1845–1852	
IS-007	IW-007	Mexican-American	1846–1848	
IS-010	IW-010	Austro-Sardinian	1848–1849	
IS-013	IW-013	First Schleswig-Holstein	1848–1849	

(Continued on next page)

Table A
Interstate wars, 1816–2002 (continued)

ID	COW01	COW94	WAR NAME	TIME SPAN
IS-016	IW-016		Roman Republic	1849
<i>IS-019</i>	<i>IW-019</i>		<i>La Plata</i> ²⁶	1851–1852
<i>ES-329</i>	<i>IW-345</i>		<i>Burmese</i> ²⁷	1852–1853
IS-022	IW-022		Crimean	1853–1856
***	***		<i>Haiti-Santo Domingo</i> ²⁸	1855–1856
IS-025	IW-025		Anglo-Persian	1856–1857
<i>ES-331</i>	<i>IW-348</i>		<i>Second Opium</i> ²⁹	1856–1860
<i>ES-337</i>	<i>IW-351</i>		<i>French Indochinese</i> ³⁰	1858
IS-028	IW-028		Italian Unification	1859
IS-031	IW-031		Spanish-Moroccan	1859–1860
IS-034	IW-034		Italo-Roman	1860
IS-037	IW-037		Italo-Sicilian	1860–1861
IS-040	IW-040		Franco-Mexican	1862–1867
IS-043	IW-043		Ecuadorian-Colombian	1863
<i>ES-341</i>	<i>IW-358</i>		<i>Spanish-Santo Dominican</i> ³¹	1863–1865
IS-046	IW-046		Second Schleswig-Holstein	1864
<i>IS-049</i>	<i>IW-049</i>		<i>Lopez</i> ³²	1864–1870
IS-052	IW-052		Spanish-Chilean	1865–1866
IS-055	IW-055		Seven Weeks	1866
<i>ES-343</i>	***		<i>British-Ethiopian</i> ³³	1867–1868
IS-058	IW-058		Franco-Prussian	1870–1871
<i>ES-349</i>	<i>IW-363</i>		<i>Tonkin</i> ³⁴	1873–1885
IS-060	***		First Central American	1876
IS-061	IW-061		Russo-Turkish	1877–1878
<i>ES-356</i>	<i>IW-373</i>		<i>Second British-Afghan</i> ³⁵	1878–1880
IS-064	IW-064		Pacific	1879–1883
<i>ES-360</i>	<i>IW-377</i>		<i>Transvaal Revolt (Boer War of 1880)</i> ³⁶	1880–1881
<i>IS-065</i>	***		<i>Anglo-Egyptian</i>	1882
<i>ES-363</i>	<i>IW-379</i>		<i>Franco-Indochinese</i> ³⁷	1882–1884
<i>ES-366</i>	<i>IW-380</i>		<i>First Franco-Madagascan</i> ³⁸	1883–1885
IS-067	IW-067		Sino-French	1884–1885
IS-070	IW-070		Central American	1885
<i>ES-370</i>	<i>IW-374</i>		<i>Russo-Afghan</i> ³⁹	1885
<i>ES-371</i>	<i>IW-385</i>		<i>Serbo-Bulgarian</i> ⁴⁰	1885
<i>ES-367</i>	<i>IW-386</i>		<i>Second Burmese</i> ⁴¹	1885–1886
<i>ES-372</i>	<i>IW-401</i>		<i>First Italo-Ethiopian</i> ⁴²	1887
IS-072	IW-072		Franco-Thai	1893
IS-073	IW-073		Sino-Japanese	1894–1895
<i>ES-380</i>	<i>IW-388</i>		<i>Franco-Madagascan</i>	1894–1895
<i>ES-384</i>	<i>IW-394</i>		<i>Italo-Ethiopian</i> ⁴³	1895–1896
IS-076	IW-076		Greco-Turkish	1897
***	***		Costa Rica-Nicaragua ⁴⁴	1897
IS-079	IW-079		Spanish-American	1898
<i>ES-395</i>	<i>IW-403</i>		<i>Boer</i> ⁴⁵	1899–1902
IS-082	IW-082		Boxer Rebellion	1900
IS-083	***		Sino-Russian	1900

(Continued on next page)

Table A
Interstate wars, 1816–2002 (continued)

ID	COW01	COW94	WAR NAME	TIME SPAN
IS-085		IW-085	Russo-Japanese	1904–1905
IS-088		IW-088	Third Central American	1906
IS-091		IW-091	Fourth Central American	1907
IS-094		IW-094	Spanish-Moroccan	1909–1910
IS-097		IW-097	Italo-Turkish	1911–1912
IS-100		IW-100	First Balkan	1912–1913
IS-103		IW-103	Second Balkan	1913
<i>IS-106</i>		<i>IW-106</i>	<i>World War I⁴⁶</i>	<i>1914–1918</i>
<i>ES-405</i>		<i>IW-426</i>	<i>First Sino-Tibetan⁴⁷</i>	<i>1918</i>
IS-109		IW-109	Russo-Polish	1919–1920
IS-112		IW-112	Hungarian-Allies	1919
IS-115		IW-115	Greco-Turkish	1919–1922
IS-116		IW-116	Franco-Turkish	1919–1921
<i>IS-117</i>		<i>IW-110</i>	<i>Lithuanian-Polish⁴⁸</i>	<i>1919–1920</i>
IS-118		IW-118	Sino-Soviet	1929
IS-121		IW-121	Manchurian	1931–1933
IS-124		IW-124	Chaco	1932–1935
IS-125		***	Saudi-Yemeni	1934
IS-127		IW-127	Italo-Ethiopian	1935–1936
IS-130		IW-130	Sino-Japanese	1937–1941
IS-133		IW-133	Changkufeng	1938
IS-136		IW-136	Nomohan	1939
IS-139		IW-139	World War II	1939–1945
IS-142		IW-142	Russo-Finnish	1939–1940
IS-145		IW-145	Franco-Thai	1940–1941
<i>IS-147</i>		<i>IW-427</i>	<i>First Kashmir⁴⁹</i>	<i>1947–1949</i>
IS-148		IW-148	Palestine	1948–1949
IS-151		IW-151	Korean	1950–1953
<i>ES-426</i>		<i>IW-431</i>	<i>Sino-Tibetan⁵⁰</i>	<i>1950–1951</i>
IS-154		IW-154	Russo-Hungarian	1956
IS-157		IW-157	Sinai	1956
IS-160		IW-160	Assam/Sino-Indian	1962
IS-163		IW-163	Vietnamese	1965–1975
IS-166		IW-166	Second Kashmir	1965
IS-169		IW-169	Six Day	1967
IS-172		IW-172	Israeli-Egyptian	1969–1970
IS-175		IW-175	Football	1969
IS-178		IW-178	Bangladesh	1971
IS-181		IW-181	Yom Kippur	1973
IS-184		IW-184	Turco-Cypriot	1974
IS-187		IW-187	Vietnamese-Cambodian	1975–1979
IS-189		IW-189	Ethiopian-Somalian	1977–1978
IS-190		IW-190	Ugandan-Tanzanian	1978–1979
IS-193		IW-193	Sino-Vietnamese	1979
IS-199		IW-199	Iran-Iraq	1980–1988
IS-202		IW-202	Falklands	1982

(Continued on next page)

Table A
Interstate wars, 1816–2002 (continued)

ID	COW01	COW94	WAR NAME	TIME SPAN
IS-205	IW-205		Israel-Syria (Lebanon)	1982
<i>IS-208</i>	<i>IW-208</i>		<i>Sino-Vietnamese</i> ⁵¹	<i>1985–1987</i>
IS-211	IW-211		Gulf War	1990–1991
***	<i>IW-214</i>		<i>Azeri-Armenian (Nagorno-Karabakh)</i> ⁵²	<i>1992–1993</i>
***	***		<i>Yugoslavia</i> ⁵³	<i>1993</i>
***	***		<i>Eritrea-Ethiopia</i>	<i>1998–2000</i>
***	***		<i>India-Pakistan</i>	<i>1999</i>
***	***		<i>NATO-Yugoslavia</i>	<i>1999</i>

Table A2
Civil wars, 1816–2002

ID	COW01	COW94	WAR NAME	TIME SPAN
CW-500	IW-300		Russia vs. Georgians	1816–1825
***	***		<i>Argentina (1819–1820)</i> ⁵⁴	<i>1819–1820</i>
CW-501	CW-602		Two Sicilies vs. Anti-Monarchists	1820–1821
CW-502	CW-601		Spain vs. Royalists	1821–1823
***	***		<i>Siam-Kedah (1821)</i> ⁵⁵	<i>1821</i>
CW-503	CW-603		Sardinia vs. Sardinian Rebels	1821
CW-504	IW-304		Ottoman Empire vs. Greeks	1821–1827 ⁵⁶
***	***		<i>Haiti-Santo Domingo</i> ⁵⁷	<i>1823</i>
***	***		<i>Central America (1823)</i> ⁵⁸	<i>1823</i>
CW-505	CW-604		Ottoman Empire vs. Janissaries	1826
***	***		<i>Central America (1827–1829)</i> ⁵⁹	<i>1827–1829</i>
***	***		<i>Argentina (1828–1831)</i> ⁶⁰	<i>1828–1831</i>
***	***		<i>Chile (1829–1830)</i> ⁶¹	<i>1829–1830</i>
CW-507	CW-607		Portugal vs. Conservatives	1829–1834
***	***		<i>Oman (Muscat)-Zanzibar</i> ⁶²	<i>1829–1837</i>
CW-508	IW-317		Russia vs. Circasians	1829–1840
CW-509	IW-315		Netherlands vs. Belgians	1830–1831
CW-510	CW-610		France vs. Liberals	1830
CW-511	IW-312		Ottoman Empire vs. Albanians	1830–1831
<i>CW-512</i>	<i>IW-316</i>		<i>Russia vs. Poles of 1831</i>	<i>1831</i>
<i>CW-513</i>	<i>IW-319</i>		<i>Ottoman Empire vs. Egyptians</i> ⁶³	<i>1831–1832</i>
***	***		<i>Central America (1831–1845)</i> ⁶⁴	<i>1831–1845</i>
CW-514	CW-613		Mexico vs. Liberals of 1832	1832–1832
***	***		<i>Argentina (1833–1834)</i> ⁶⁵	<i>1833–1834</i>
CW-515	CW-616		Spain vs. Carlists of 1834	1834–1840
CW-516	***		Brazil vs. Farrapos	1835–1845
CW-517	IW-322		Mexico vs. Texans	1835–1836
CW-518	IW-323		Ottoman Empire vs. Bosnians of 1836	1836–1837
<i>CW-519</i>	<i>IW-328</i>		<i>Ottoman Empire vs. Mehmet Ali</i> ⁶⁶	<i>1839–1840</i>
CW-521	CW-619		Colombia vs. Progressives	1840–1842

(Continued on next page)

Table A2
Civil wars, 1816–2002 (continued)

ID	COW01	COW94	WAR NAME	TIME SPAN
	<i>CW-522</i>	<i>CW-622</i>	<i>Argentina vs. Unitarios</i> ⁶⁷	<i>1841–1842</i>
	CW-523	IW-333	Ottoman Empire vs. Bosnians of 1841	1841
	CW-524	CW-625	Spain vs. Carlists of 1847	1847–1849
	CW-525	CW-626	Caste War (Mexico vs. Yucatan Maya)	1847–1855
	***	***	China-Kashagaria ⁶⁸	1847–1848
	CW-527	CW-628	Two Sicilies vs. Liberals	1848–1849
	CW-528	CW-631	France vs. Republicans	1848
	CW-529	CW-634	Austria-Hungary vs. Viennese	1848
	CW-530	IW-340	Austria-Hungary vs. Magyars	1848–1849
	CW-531	CW-636	France vs. Royalists	1851
	CW-532	CW-637	Chile vs. Liberals	1851
	CW-533	IW-346	First Turco-Montenegrin	1852–1853
	CW-534	CW-640	Peru vs. Liberals of 1853	1853–1855
	***	<i>CW-641</i>	<i>(No name) Colombia</i> ⁶⁹	<i>1854</i>
	***	***	<i>Nicaragua (1855-1857)</i> ⁷⁰	<i>1855–1857</i>
	CW-535	CW-643	Peru vs. Conservatives	1856–1858
	***	***	<i>China-Khokhand</i> ⁷¹	<i>1857</i>
	CW-537	CW-646	Mexico vs. Liberals of 1858	1858–1861
	CW-538	IW-352	Second Turco-Montenegrin	1858–1859
	CW-539	CW-649	Venezuela vs. Liberals	1859–1863
	CW-540	CW-652	China vs. Taipings	1860–1864
	CW-542	CW-653	China vs. Niens	1860–1868
	CW-543	CW-654	China vs. Miaos	1860–1872
	CW-544	CW-655	Colombia vs. Liberals of 1860	1860–1862
	CW-545	CW-658	USA civil war (Union vs. Confederacy)	1861–1865
	CW-547	IW-354	Argentina vs. Buenos Aires of 1861	1861
	***	***	<i>Ethiopia (1861)</i> ⁷²	<i>1861</i>
	CW-548	***	Turkey vs. Montenegro	1862
	***	***	<i>Siam-Cambodia</i> ⁷³	<i>1862–1863</i>
	CW-550	IW-355	Russia vs. Poles of 1863	1863–1864
	CW-551	CW-661	Argentina vs. Montoneros	1863
	***	***	<i>Uruguay (1863-1872)</i> ⁷⁴	<i>1863–1872</i>
	CW-552	***	China vs. Muslims of 1863	1863–1877
	CW-553	CW-664	Argentina vs. Federalists	1866–1867
	CW-554	IW-360	First Cretan (Ottoman Empire vs. Cretans)	1866–1867
	***	***	<i>Ethiopia (1867)</i> ⁷⁵	<i>1867</i>
	CW-555	CW-667	Venezuela vs. Conservatives	1868–1871
	CW-557	CW-670	Spain vs. Liberals	1868
	***	***	<i>Afghanistan (1868-1888)</i> ⁷⁶	<i>1868–1888</i>
	CW-558	CW-673	Argentina vs. Entre Rios Province	1870–1871
	CW-560	CW-676	France vs. Communards	1871
	CW-561	CW-679	Spain vs. Carlists of 1872	1872–1876
	<i>CW-562</i>	<i>IW-366</i>	<i>Argentina vs. Mitre led Rebels</i> ⁷⁷	<i>1874</i>
	CW-563	IW-367	Balkan War (Ottoman vs. Christian Bosnians)	1875–1877
	CW-564	CW-681	United States of America vs. Sioux Indians	1876
	CW-565	***	Mexico vs. Rebels	1876
	CW-567	CW-682	Colombia vs. Liberals of 1876	1876–1877

(Continued on next page)

Table A2
Civil wars, 1816–2002 (continued)

ID	COW01	COW94	WAR NAME	TIME SPAN
	CW-568	CW-685	Japan vs. Satsumas	1877
	CW-569	CW-688	Argentina vs. Buenos Aires of 1880	1880
	***	***	<i>Oman (1883-1884)</i> ⁷⁸	1883–1884
	CW-570	CW-691	Colombia vs. Liberals of 1884	1884–1885
	***	***	Ethiopia-Egyptians ⁷⁹	1885–1895
	CW-572	IW-392	Second Cretan (Ottoman Empire vs. Cretans)	1888–1889
	CW-573	CW-694	Chile vs. Congressists	1891
	CW-574	CW-697	Brazil vs. Rio Grande do Sul	1893–1894
	CW-575	CW-700	Brazil vs. Naval Royalists	1893–1894
	CW-577	CW-703	Peru vs. Liberals of 1894	1894–1895
	CW-578	CW-706	Brazil vs. Canudos	1896–1897
	CW-579	IW-395	Third Cretan (Ottoman Empire vs. Cretans)	1896–1897
	CW-580	IW-396	Druze-Turkish	1896
	CW-582	CW-709	Colombia vs. Liberals of 1899	1899–1903
	CW-583	***	Venezuela vs. Castro Led Rebels	1899
	CW-584	***	Venezuela vs. Matos Led Rebels	1901–1903
	CW-585	IW-406	Ilinden (Ottoman Empire vs. VMRO Rebels)	1903
	<i>CW-587</i>	<i>CW-712</i>	<i>Uruguay vs. Blancos</i>	<i>1904</i>
	CW-588	CW-715	Russia vs. Workers/Peasants	1905–1906
	CW-589	CW-718	Rumania vs. Peasants	1907
	CW-590	CW-721	Morocco vs. Fez Caids of 1907	1907–1908
	CW-591	CW-724	Iran vs. Constitutionalists	1908–1909
	CW-592	CW-727	Mexico vs. Liberals & Radicals	1910–1920
	CW-593	CW-730	Morocco vs. Fez Caids of 1911	1911
	CW-594	CW-733	Paraguay vs. Liberals	1911–1912
	CW-595	CW-736	China vs. Republicans of 1911	1911
	CW-597	CW-739	China vs. Republicans of 1913	1913
	CW-598	CW-742	China vs. Pai-Lings	1914
	CW-599	***	Russia vs. Kirghiz & Kazables	1916–1917
	***	IW-409	Russian Nationalities	1917–1921
	CW-600	CW-745	Russia vs. Anti-Bolsheviks	1917–1921
	CW-602	IW-408	China vs. Yunnan Rebels	1917–1918
	CW-603	CW-746	Finland vs. Communists	1918
	CW-604	CW-748	Hungary vs. Anti-Communists	1919–1920
	CW-605	***	USSR vs. Peasants in Ta	1920–1921
	CW-607	***	Mexico vs. Huerta Led Rebels	1923–1924
	CW-608	***	Bulgaria vs. Agrarian League	1923
	CW-609	CW-751	Honduras vs. Conservatives	1924
	CW-610	CW-754	Afghanistan vs. Anti-Reformists of 1924	1924–1925
	CW-612	CW-757	China vs. Kuomintang	1926–1928
	CW-613	CW-760	Mexico vs. Cristeros	1926–1930
	CW-614	CW-763	Afghanistan vs. Anti-Reformists of 1928	1928–1929
	CW-615	IW-416	China vs. Muslims of 1928	1928
	CW-617	***	Mexico vs. Escoban Led Rebels	1929
	CW-618	***	Saudi Arabia vs. Ikhwan	1929–1930
	CW-619	CW-766	China vs. War Lords	1929–1930
	CW-620	CW-769	China vs. Communists of 1930	1930–1935

(Continued on next page)

Table A2
Civil wars, 1816–2002 (continued)

ID	COW01	COW94	WAR NAME	TIME SPAN
	CW-622	IW-417	Russia vs. Central Asian Rebels	1931–1934
	CW-623	CW-771	El Salvador vs. Leftists	1932
	CW-624	***	Peru vs. Aprista Rebels	1932
	CW-625	CW-772	Brazil vs. Paolistas	1932
	<i>CW-627</i>	<i>CW-774</i>	<i>Austria vs. Socialists⁸⁰</i>	<i>1934</i>
	CW-628	CW-775	Spain vs. Asturian Miners	1934
	CW-629	CW-778	Spain vs. Fascists	1936–1939
	CW-630	CW-781	Greece vs. Communists	1944–1949
	CW-632	CW-784	China vs. Communists of 1946	1946–1950
	CW-633	CW-787	Paraguay vs. Leftists	1947
	CW-634	CW-788	Taiwanese Revolt (China vs. Taiwanese)	1947
	CW-635	CW-790	Yemen Arab Republic vs. Yahya Family	1948
	CW-637	CW-793	Costa Rica vs. National Union Party	1948
	CW-638	CW-796	Colombia vs. Conservatives	1948–1949
	CW-639	CW-799	Burma vs. Karens	1948–1951
	CW-640	CW-802	Colombia vs. Liberals of 1949	1949–1962
	CW-641	CW-805	Indonesia vs. Moluccans	1950
	CW-642	CW-808	Philippines vs. Huks	1950–1952
	CW-643	CW-811	Bolivia vs. Leftists	1952
	CW-644	CW-814	Indonesia vs. Darul Islam	1953
	CW-645	CW-817	Guatemala vs. Conservatives	1954
	CW-647	CW-820	Argentina vs. Army	1955
	CW-648	IW-436	China vs. Tibetans	1956–1959
	CW-649	CW-823	Indonesia vs. Leftists	1956–1960
	CW-650	CW-826	Lebanon vs. Leftists of 1958	1958
	CW-652	CW-829	Cuba vs. Castroites	1958–1959
	CW-653	CW-832	Iraq vs. Shammar Tribe & Pro-Western Officers	1959
	***	***	<i>Oman (1957)⁸¹</i>	<i>1957</i>
	***	***	<i>Cameroon (1959–1961)⁸²</i>	<i>1959–1961</i>
	CW-654	CW-835	Republic of Vietnam vs. NLF	1960–1965
	CW-655	CW-838	Zaire vs. Katanga & Leftists	1960–1965
	CW-657	CW-841	Laos vs. Pathet Lao of 1960	1960–1962
	CW-658	IW-437	Iraq vs. Kurds of 1961	1961–1963
	CW-659	CW-844	Algeria vs. Former Rebel Leaders	1962–1963
	CW-660	CW-847	Yemen Arab Republic vs. Royalists	1962–1969
	CW-662	CW-850	Laos vs. Pathet Lao of 1963	1963–1973
	CW-663	CW-853	Sudan vs. Anya Nya	1963–1972
	CW-664	CW-856	Rwanda vs. Watusi	1963–1964
	CW-665	CW-859	Dominican Republic vs. Leftists	1965
	CW-667	CW-862	Uganda vs. Buganda Tribe	1966
	CW-668	CW-863	Guatemala vs. Indians	1966–1972
	CW-669	***	Chad vs. Frolinat of 1966	1966–1971
	CW-670	CW-865	China vs. Red Guard	1967–1968
	CW-672	CW-868	Nigeria vs. Biafrans	1967–1970
	CW-673	CW-869	Burma vs. Ethnic Rebels	1968–1980
	CW-674	***	Thailand vs. Communists	1970–1973
	CW-675	CW-871	Cambodia vs. Khmer Rouge of 1970	1970–1975

(Continued on next page)

Table A2
Civil wars, 1816–2002 (continued)

ID	COW01	COW94	WAR NAME	TIME SPAN
	CW-677	CW-874	Jordan vs. Palestinians	1970
	CW-678	CW-877	Guatemala vs. Leftists of 1970	1970–1971
	CW-679	CW-880	Pakistan vs. Bengalis	1971
	CW-680	CW-883	Sri Lanka vs. Janatha Vimukthi-JVP	1971
	CW-682	IW-439	Philippines vs. Moros	1972–1980
	CW-683	CW-886	Burundi vs. Hutu of 1972	1972
	CW-684	CW-889	Philippines vs. NPA	1972–1992
	CW-685	CW-892	Zimbabwe vs. Patriotic Front	1972–1979
	CW-687	CW-893	Pakistan vs. Baluchi Rebels	1973–1977
	CW-688	***	Chile vs. Pinochet Led Rebels	1973–1973
	CW-689	IW-442	Ethiopia vs. Eritrean Rebels	1974–1991
	CW-690	IW-443	Iraq vs. Kurds of 1974	1974–1975
	CW-691	CW-895	Lebanon vs. Leftists of 1975	1975–1990
	CW-693	CW-898	Angola vs. UNITA of 1975	1975–1991
	CW-694	IW-451	Ogaden (Ethiopia vs. Somali Rebels)	1976–1983
	CW-695	CW-900	Guatemala vs. Leftists of 1978	1978–1984
	CW-697	IW-454	Ethiopia vs. Tigrean Liberation Front	1978–1991
	<i>CW-698</i>	<i>CW-901</i>	<i>Afghanistan vs. Mujahedin⁸³</i>	<i>1978–2001</i>
	CW-699	CW-904	Iran vs. Anti-Shah Coalition	1978–1979
	CW-700	CW-907	Nicaragua vs. Sandinistas	1978–1979
	<i>CW-702</i>	<i>CW-908</i>	<i>Cambodia vs. Khmer Rouge of 1978⁸⁴</i>	<i>1978–1991</i>
	CW-703	CW-910	El Salvador vs. Salvadorean Democratic Front	1979–1992
	CW-704	CW-913	Mozambique vs. Renamo	1979–1992
	<i>CW-705</i>	<i>CW-916</i>	<i>Chad vs. Frolinat of 1980⁸⁵</i>	<i>1980–1988</i> <i>1990</i>
	CW-707	CW-917	Nigeria vs. Muslim Fundamentalists of 1980	1980–1981
	CW-708	CW-919	Uganda vs. National Resistance Army	1980–1988
	CW-709	CW-922	Iran vs. Mujaheddin	1981–1982
	CW-710	CW-925	Peru vs. Shining Path	1982–1995
	CW-712	CW-928	Nicaragua vs. Contras	1982–1990
	<i>CW-713</i>	<i>CW-931</i>	<i>Somalia vs. Clan Factions⁸⁶</i>	<i>1982–1997</i>
	CW-714	CW-933	Burma vs. Kachin Rebels	1983–1995
	<i>CW-715</i>	<i>CW-934</i>	<i>Sri Lanka (Tamils and JVP)⁸⁷</i>	<i>1983–1993</i> <i>1995–2001</i>
	<i>CW-717</i>	<i>CW-937</i>	<i>Sudan vs. SPLA-Garang Faction⁸⁸</i>	<i>1983–1992</i> <i>1995–2002</i>
	CW-718	CW-939	Nigeria vs. Muslim Fundamentalists of 1984	1984
	<i>CW-719</i>	<i>CW-940</i>	<i>Colombia vs. M-19, FARC & Drug Lords⁸⁹</i>	<i>1984–1993</i> <i>1998–2002</i>
	CW-720	CW-941	Iraq vs. Kurds & Shiites	1985–1993
	<i>CW-722</i>	<i>CW-942</i>	<i>India vs. Sikhs & Kashmiris⁹⁰</i>	<i>1985–1993</i>
	CW-723	CW-943	Yemen People's Republic vs. Leftist Factions	1986
	CW-725	CW-946	Burundi vs. Hutu of 1988	1988
	CW-727	CW-949	Liberia vs. Anti-Doe Rebels	1989–1990
	CW-728	CW-950	Rumania vs. Anti-Ceausescu Rebels	1989–1989
	***	***	<i>South Africa (1989–1993)⁹¹</i>	<i>1989–1993</i> <i>1999–2002</i>

(Continued on next page)

Table A2
Civil wars, 1816–2002 (continued)

ID	COW01	COW94	WAR NAME	TIME SPAN
	<i>CW-729</i>	<i>CW-952</i>	<i>Rwanda vs. Tutsi</i> ⁹²	<i>1990–1993</i>
	<i>CW-730</i>	***	<i>Sierra Leone vs. RUF</i>	<i>1991–1996</i>
	<i>CW-733</i>	<i>CW-964</i>	<i>Yugoslavia/Serbia vs. Croatsians</i>	<i>1991–1992</i>
	<i>CW-734</i>	<i>CW-967</i>	<i>Turkey vs. Kurds</i> ⁹³	<i>1991–2002</i>
	<i>CW-735</i>	<i>CW-970</i>	<i>Burundi vs. Tutsi Supremacists</i> ⁹⁴	<i>1991–1992</i>
	<i>CW-736</i>	<i>CW-955</i>	<i>Georgia vs. Gamsakurdia and Abkaz</i> ⁹⁵	<i>1991–1994</i>
	<i>CW-737</i>	<i>IW-214</i>	<i>Azerbaijan vs. Nagorno-Karabakh</i> ⁹⁶	<i>1991–1994</i>
	<i>CW-738</i>	<i>CW-973</i>	<i>Bosnia/Herzegovina vs. Serbs</i> ⁹⁷	<i>1991–1995</i>
	<i>CW-739</i>	***	<i>Algeria vs. Islamic Rebels</i> ⁹⁸	<i>1992–2000</i>
	<i>CW-740</i>	<i>CW-976</i>	<i>Tadzhikistan vs. Popular Democratic Army</i> ⁹⁹	<i>1992–1997</i>
	<i>CW-742</i>	<i>CW-979</i>	<i>Liberia vs. NPFL & ULIMO</i> ¹⁰⁰	<i>1992–1995</i>
	<i>CW-743</i>	<i>CW-982</i>	<i>Angola vs. UNITA of 1992</i>	<i>1992–1994</i> <i>1998–2001</i>
	<i>CW-744</i>	***	<i>Zaire vs. Rebels</i>	<i>1993–1993</i>
	<i>CW-745</i>	***	<i>Burundi vs. Hutu of 1993</i> ¹⁰¹	<i>1993–1998</i> <i>2000–2002</i>
	<i>CW-747</i>	***	<i>Cambodia vs. Khmer Rouge of 1993</i>	<i>1993–1997</i>
	<i>CW-748</i>	***	<i>Russia vs. Chechens</i> ¹⁰²	<i>1994–1996</i> <i>1998–2001</i>
	<i>CW-749</i>	***	<i>Rwanda vs. Patriotic Front</i>	<i>1994</i>
	<i>CW-750</i>	***	<i>Yemen vs. South Yemen</i>	<i>1994</i>
	<i>CW-752</i>	***	<i>Pakistan vs. Mohajir</i>	<i>1994–1995</i>
	<i>CW-753</i>	***	<i>Uganda vs. Lords Resistance Army</i> ¹⁰³	<i>1996–2001</i>
	<i>CW-754</i>	***	<i>Liberia vs. National Patriotic Forces</i>	<i>1996–1996</i>
	<i>CW-756</i>	***	<i>Iraq vs. KDP Kurds</i>	<i>1996</i>
	<i>CW-757</i>	***	<i>DRC/Zaire vs. Kabila-ADFL</i> ¹⁰⁴	<i>1996–2000</i>
	<i>CW-760</i>	***	<i>Congo vs. Denis Sassou Nguemo</i> ¹⁰⁵	<i>1997–1999</i>
	***	***	<i>Guinea-Bissau (1998)</i>	<i>1998</i>
	***	***	<i>Rwanda (1998)</i>	<i>1998</i>
	***	***	<i>Yugoslavia (Kosovo)</i>	<i>1998–1999</i>
	***	***	<i>Sierra-Leone (1998–2000)</i>	<i>1998–2000</i>
	***	***	<i>Philippines (Mindanao)</i>	<i>2000–2001</i>
	***	***	<i>USA vs. Al Qa'ida</i>	<i>2001</i>
	***	***	<i>Nepal vs. CPN-M/UPF</i>	<i>2002</i>

Table A3
Extra-systemic wars, 1816–2002

ID	COW01	COW94	WAR NAME	TYPE ¹⁰⁶	TIME SPAN
ES-301	IW-301		British-Maharattan	I	1817–1818
ES-302	IW-302		Kandyan Rebellion	C	1817–1818
ES-306	IW-309		First Ashanti	C	1824–1826

(Continued on next page)

Table A3
Extra-systemic wars, 1816–2002 (continued)

ID	COW01	COW94	WAR NAME	TYPE ¹⁰⁶	TIME SPAN
ES-307		IW-310	Javanese	C	1825–1830
ES-309		IW-314	Bharatpuran	C	1825–1826
ES-311		IW-324	First Zulu	I	1838–1840
ES-314		IW-327	Russo-Khivan	I	1839
ES-319		IW-335	Baluchi-British	C	1843
ES-322		IW-337	First British-Sikh	I	1845–1846
ES-323		IW-338	First British-Kaffir (Axe)	I	1846–1847
ES-325		IW-339	Cracow Revolt	C	1846
ES-326		IW-343	Second British-Sikh	I	1848–1849
ES-327		IW-344	Second Kaffir (eighth)	C	1850–1853
ES-330		***	British-Santal	***	1855–1856
ES-333		IW-350	Kabylia Uprising	C	1856–1857
ES-334		IW-347	First Franco-Senegalese	C	1857
ES-335		IW-349	Sepoy (Indian Mutiny)	C	1857–1859
ES-338		IW-353	First Buenos Aires	I	1859
ES-339		IW-356	Second Maori	I	1860–1870
ES-342		IW-359	British-Bhutanese	I	1865
ES-345		IW-361	Ten Years (Spanish-Cuban)	C	1868–1878
ES-347		IW-362	Second British-Ashanti	C	1873–1874
ES-350		IW-364	Dutch-Achinese	I	1873–1878
ES-346		IW-365	Franco-Algerian	C	1871–1872
ES-351		IW-368	Egypto-Ethiopian	I	1875–1876
ES-353		IW-371	Ninth British-Kaffir	C	1877–1878
ES-354		IW-369	Russo-Turkoman	I	1878–1881
ES-355		IW-370	Bosnian	C	1878
ES-358		IW-376	British-Zulu	I	1879
ES-359		IW-375	<i>Basuto (Gun War)</i>	C	1880–1881
ES-362		IW-378	Franco-Tunisian	I	1881–1882
ES-364		IW-382	British-Sudanese (Mahdist)	C	1882–1885
ES-368		IW-393	First Mandigo-French	I	1885–1886
ES-373		IW-387	Franco-Dahomey	I	1889–1892
ES-375		IW-384	<i>Second Franco-Senegalese¹⁰⁷</i>	C	1890–1891
ES-376		IW-381	Belgian-Congolese (Congo Arabs)	I	1892
ES-377		IW-390	Third British-Ashanti	C	1893–1894
ES-379		IW-389	Dutch-Balian	C	1894
ES-381		IW-391	Spanish-Cuban	C	1895–1898
ES-383		***	Japano-Taiwanese	***	1895
ES-387		IW-383	Mahdi Uprising (Sudan)	I	1896–1899
ES-385		IW-397	First Spanish-Philippine	C	1896–1898
ES-389		IW-398	Indian Muslim	C	1897–1898
ES-388		IW-399	British-Nigerian	I	1897
ES-391		IW-414	Hut Tax	C	1898
ES-392		IW-400	American-Philippine	***	1899–1902
ES-393		IW-419	Somali Rebellion	C	1899–1905
***		IW-404	Russo-Manchurian	I	1900
ES-396		***	UK Conquest of Kano & Sokoto (Nigeria)	***	1903

(Continued on next page)

Table A3
Extra-systemic wars, 1816–2002 (continued)

ID	COW01	COW94	WAR NAME	TYPE ¹⁰⁶	TIME SPAN
ES-397		IW-420	South West African Revolt	C	1904–1905
ES-399		IW-422	Maji-Maji Revolt	***	1905–1906
ES-400		IW-402	Second British-Zulu	C	1906
ES-401		IW-405	First Moroccan	C	1911–1912
ES-402		IW-423	Tibetan War Of Independence (vs. China)	C	1912–1913
ES-404		IW-407	Second Moroccan	C	1916–1917
ES-406		***	Caco Revolt	***	1918–1920
ES-408		IW-425	Third Anglo-Afghan	I	1919
ES-409		IW-410	Franco-Syrian	I	1920
ES-410		IW-411	Iraqi-British	C	1920–1921
ES-412		IW-413	Italo-Libyan (Sanusi)	C	1920–1932
ES-413		IW-412	Riffian Rebellion	C	1921–1926
ES-414		***	Moplah Rebellion (India)	***	1921–1922
ES-416		IW-415	Franco-Druze	C	1925–1927
ES-417		***	Say San's Rebellion (Burma)	***	1930–1932
ES-418		***	British-Palestinian	***	1936–1939
ES-420		IW-418	Indonesian	C	1945–1946
ES-421		IW-421	Franco-Indochinese	C	1945–1954
ES-422		IW-424	Franco-Madagascan	I	1947–1948
ES-424		IW-429	Malayan Rebellion	C	1948–1957
ES-425		IW-430	Indo-Hyderabad	I	1948
ES-428		IW-444	Tunisian Independence	C	1952–1954
ES-429		IW-432	Kenya (Mau Mau)	C	1952–1956
ES-430		IW-435	Moroccan Independence	C	1953–1956
ES-432		IW-433	Franco-Algerian	C	1954–1962
ES-433		IW-434	Cameroon	C	1955–1960
ES-434		IW-438	Angola-Portugal	C	1961–1975
ES-436		IW-440	Guinea (Bissau)-Portugal	C	1962–1974
ES-437		IW-441	Mozambique-Portugal	C	1964–1975
ES-439		IW-445	East Timor (Fretilin) ¹⁰⁸	I & C	1974–1977
ES-441		IW-448	Western Sahara ¹⁰⁹	I	1975–1983
ES-440		***	Namibian	***	1976–1988

NOTES

1. The Gleditsch and Ward (1999) data and extended documentation are available at <http://weber.ucsd.edu/~kgledits/statelist.html>.
2. Version 3.0 has a new set of numeric codes identifying the individual wars. Many wars have been reclassified from one category to another, and several of the dates and participants to wars have been changed. These changes are identified in the tables in the appendix.
3. This change in the application of the coding rules was apparently made in the 1990s. See comments by Phil Schafer on the COW2 discussion board at <http://cow2.la.psu.edu/forum/ShowMessage.asp?ID=20> (accessed on 7 January 2004).
4. Both Singer and Small (1994) and Sarkees (2000) state that countries must have a minimum population of 500,000 to be included in the COW system membership list. This is incorrect, as many

- states with population well below this threshold—for example, San Marino with a total population of less than 25,000—are included in the COW list by virtue of their UN membership.
5. For example, Singer and Small (1972, p. 21) excluded India, Slovakia, and Manchukuo, although they met the criteria. China, Mongolia, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen were included despite not meeting either of the post-1920 criteria. Given these qualitative judgments, the explicit criteria are not sufficient to replicate the COW system membership list.
 6. A supplement to the Gleditsch and Ward data with a revised set of start and end dates for microstates states is available at <http://weber.ucsd.edu/~kgledits/statelist.html> for researchers who wish to consider states of this size.
 7. I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for pointing this out of me.
 8. Mansfield and Snyder (1995), for example, discuss in some detail the case of Russia to illustrate their theory about democratization and interstate war. However, the specific conflicts mentioned such as Chechnya are not included in their dataset on interstate war.
 9. Although Pillar (1983) does not classify many of the wars in these data, a number of conflicts not considered interstate in the COW data such as the Russo-Persian, Spanish-Santo Dominican, Turko-Persian, Turko-Greek, First Anglo-Burmese, First Opium, Second Opium, Russo-Afghan, Serb-Bulgarian, and Italo-Ethiopian wars are all coded as involving negotiations, negotiated settlements, or armistices.
 10. The new state initially became independent under the name United Provinces of South America. It was subsequently renamed United Provinces of the Río de la Plata and later the Argentine Confederation.
 11. France and the UK were included as participants in this war in the 1994 version of the COW data, but are not included in the 2001 COW data.
 12. Algeria was considered a regular French department up to 1962, and these boundaries were to some extent “internationally recognized.” Algeria was for example included as part of NATO on maps in old editions of the *NATO Handbook*.
 13. Persia/Iran was never colonized by any foreign power.
 14. Burma was an independent kingdom prior to British colonialization.
 15. Argentina and Brazil were independent states.
 16. Persia/Iran was never colonized by any foreign power.
 17. Greece became an independent state on 17 May 1827 during the war of independence.
 18. War between a transitory confederation of Peru and Bolivia against Chile and Argentina. Neither of the sides were colonies.
 19. Both Afghanistan and Persia were independent states.
 20. Afghanistan was not a colony at this point.
 21. China was never colonized by any foreign power.
 22. This should be seen as a war of conquest. Blainey (1988) describes a war preceding the invasion of Algiers in 1830, with fighting continuing until 1847, and it is possible that France and Algeria might have been involved in an interstate war as early as 1830.
 23. Bolivia was not a colony.
 24. Morocco was not a colony at this point.
 25. Uruguay became an independent state in 1830.
 26. Uruguay was an independent state and should be added as a participant.
 27. Burma was not a colony.
 28. Neither party was a colony.
 29. China was never colonized by any foreign power.
 30. This was a war of conquest in Indochina. As the Indochinese states had not been colonized at the time it should be regarded as an interstate war.
 31. The Dominican Republic became independent in 1845. This war reflects a Spanish effort to reconquer the island that ultimately failed.
 32. Uruguay was an independent state and should be added as a participant.
 33. Ethiopia was not a colony.
 34. Vietnam was not a colony at the outset of this war.
 35. Afghanistan was not a colony at this point.
 36. The Boer republics were independent states at the time of the war.

37. France was fighting sovereign states at the outset of the war.
38. Madagascar was an independent kingdom.
39. Afghanistan was not a colony at this point.
40. Bulgaria became an autonomous principality following the defeat of the Ottomans on March 3, 1878.
41. This completed the British colonization of Burma, but Burma was a sovereign kingdom at the outset.
42. Ethiopia was not a colony in 1887, and Italy does not subdue Ethiopia until the 1936 invasion.
43. Ethiopia was not a colony. Italy does not subdue Ethiopia until the 1936 invasion.
44. Both sides were independent states.
45. The two Afrikaner republics—Transvaal and the Orange Free State—qualify as independent states.
46. Australia, Canada, and New Zealand qualify as members and should be included as participants.
47. Tibet achieved effective independence after the fall of the Qing dynasty, and successfully expelled all Chinese troops in 1913. This armed conflict reflects an attempt by China to reconquer Tibet.
48. Dates are inconsistent between different versions of the data sets. The 2001 COW data set codes this war as lasting from 15/7/1920 to 1/12/1920 whereas the 1994 COW data set codes it as lasting from 19/4/1919 to 9/10/1920. As the interstate war criterion is meant to apply to the entire course of the event I have used the earlier state date here.
49. The First Kashmir war was classified as an extra-systemic war in India in the 1994 release without any Pakistani participation. Note that the starting dates differ between the 1994 and the 2001 COW data. The starting date is 26/10/1947 in the COW 1994 and 17/7/1948 in the COW 2001 data.
50. This reflects a Chinese invasion of Tibet. Tibet was an independent state, at least at the outset of the war.
51. Dates are inconsistent between different versions of the data sets. COW01 codes this war as lasting from 01/05/1987 to 02/06/1987 whereas COW94 codes this war as lasting from 09/09/1985 to 02/06/1987.
52. End date based on the Uppsala data. This war was previously classified as a civil war (CW-961) that became interstate (IW-214) once Armenia and Azerbaijan gained independence. Whether it becomes an interstate war or remains a civil war in Azerbaijan depends upon whether Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh are seen as acting with the active participation of the Armenian government.
53. Based on the Uppsala data, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, and Yugoslavia added.
54. Argentina was an independent state.
55. Siam/Thailand was an independent state.
56. Greece became independent during this war. Hence, it should be treated as an interstate war following Greek independence after May 17, 1827 rather than a civil war within Turkey.
57. Haiti was not a colony. Santo Domingo was annexed to Haiti so this should be included as a civil or possibly extra-systemic war.
58. Mexico was an independent state. The United Provinces of Central America became independent following the war.
59. The United Provinces of Central America was an independent state.
60. Argentina was an independent state.
61. Chile was an independent state.
62. Oman was an independent state, so this should be included as a civil or possibly extra-systemic war.
63. This is probably the same as the extra-systemic war IW-319 involving Turkey called “First Syrian” in the 1994 COW data, which is not mentioned elsewhere in the 2001 COW data. These observations have the same duration and similar values on the other variables. Total number of deaths, however, was 18,000 in the 1993 data but is only 10,000 in the 2001 COW data.
64. The United Provinces of Central America was an independent state.
65. Argentina was an independent state.
66. This is probably the same as the extra-systemic war 328 involving Turkey and the UK called “Second Syrian” in the 1994 COW data.
67. France and the UK were included as participants in the 1994 COW data, but have been omitted in the 2001 COW data.
68. China was an independent state.
69. This war appeared in the COW 1994 data but was not listed in the codebook.

70. Nicaragua was an independent state.
71. China was an independent state.
72. Ethiopia was an independent state.
73. Siam/Thailand was an independent state.
74. Uruguay was an independent state.
75. Ethiopia was an independent state.
76. Afghanistan was an independent state.
77. This appeared in the 1994 COW data set both as an extrasystemic and a civil war (CW-680) in 1874. The duration dates are incorrect in the 1994 codebook.
78. Oman was an independent state.
79. Ethiopia was an independent state.
80. According to the COW 1994 codebook the ID number for this war is 744, however 774 is used in the actual data.
81. Oman was an independent state.
82. Cameroon became independent in 1960.
83. This war ends in 1992 in the COW 2001 data. It is coded as a war all through 2000 in the Uppsala data. Note that it is not obvious whether it should be treated as the same civil war after the fall of the Soviet backed regime in 1992, since the government in power changes to the previous opposition.
84. Start and end dates differ between the two data sets. In the 1994 COW data the conflict starts on 1/8/1979 whereas the start data in the 2001 COW data is 12/25/1978. End date for Vietnam was 10/23/1991 in the 1994 COW data, but is (NA)/9/1989 in the 2001 COW data.
85. War in 1990 according to the Uppsala data.
86. This conflict is considered an intermediate armed conflict past 1992 in the Uppsala data.
87. End date is coded as “missing” in the COW data, final years based on the Uppsala data. In this case, the COW data distinguishes between the war against the Tamil tigers (715) and the war against the JVP (724). In other cases conflicts with different organizations and groups within a state are considered a single war in the COW data.
88. End date is coded as “missing” in Correlates of War data, final years based on the Uppsala data.
89. End date is coded as “missing” in Correlates of War data, final years based on the Uppsala data.
90. End date is coded as “missing” in the COW data. According to the Uppsala conflict data, India experiences three separate conflicts that reach the level of civil war—Assam, Punjab, and Kashmir.
91. Not in the COW data, added on the basis of the Uppsala data.
92. Rwanda extends only to 1992 in the Uppsala conflict data. Although Rwanda obviously has experienced widespread violence after 1992 it is at best unclear whether this has the character of organized violence.
93. End date is coded as “missing” in the COW data. Intermediate conflict beyond 1997 in Uppsala data.
94. End data based on Uppsala data (only war in 1991 according to the COW data).
95. War only in 1993 according to the Uppsala data.
96. This war starts as CW-961 in the 1991 COW data and becomes IW-214 once Armenia and Azerbaijan become independent. Whether this war should be regarded as interstate or civil depends upon whether the Armenian government is seen as directly involved.
97. This begins on 1/5/1991 in the 1994 COW data, but not until 3/3/1992 according to the 2001 COW data.
98. End date coded as “missing” in the COW data. Not war in 1992 according to Uppsala data.
99. War only in 1993 according to Uppsala data.
100. Post 1990 conflict is classified as intermediate or minor armed conflict in the Uppsala data.
101. End date coded as “missing” in the COW data. War only in 1998 and 2000 according to Uppsala data.
102. Not considered war in 1994 in Uppsala data.
103. End date coded as “missing” in the COW data. Not considered war after 1991 by the Uppsala data, intermediate from 1996 to 2001.
104. This conflict does not reach the level of war in 1996 according to the Uppsala data. Whereas COW indicates that the conflict ends in 1997, it is considered at the level of war until 2000 in the Uppsala data.

105. Whereas COW indicates that the conflict ends in 1997, it is considered at the level of war until 1999 in the Uppsala data.
106. The 1994 release of the COW project data classified extra-systemic wars as either (I)mperial or (C)olonial.
107. UK rather than France appears as the participant in this war in the 1994 COW data.
108. Portugal is included as a participant in this war from 4/12/1974 to (NA)/8/1975 in the 1994 COW data, but does not appear in the 2001 COW data.
109. Algeria appears as participant in the 2001 COW data.

REFERENCES

- Blainey, Geoffrey (1988). *The Causes of War*, 3rd ed., Melbourne: Sun/Macmillan.
- Brecher, Michael, and Jonathan Wilkenfeld (1997). *A Study of Crisis*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Buhaug, Halvard, and Scott Gates (2002). “The Geography of Civil War.” *Journal of Peace Research* Vol. 39, pp. 417–433.
- Centeno, Miguel Angel (2002). *Blood and Debt: War and the Nation-State in Latin America*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Collier, Paul, and Anke Hoeffler (1998). “On Economic Causes of Civil War.” *Oxford Economic Papers*, Vol. 50, pp. 563–573.
- Diehl, Paul F. (Ed.) (1998). *The Dynamics of Enduring Rivalries*, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Eriksson, Mikael, Peter Wallensteen, and Margareta Sollenberg (2003). “Armed Conflict, 1989–2002,” *Journal of Peace Research* Vol. 40, pp. 603–619.
- Fearon, James D., and David D. Laitin (2003). “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War.” *American Political Science Review* Vol. 97, pp. 75–90.
- Fordham, Benjamin O., and Christopher C. Sarver (2001). “Militarized Interstate Disputes and United States Uses of Force.” *International Studies Quarterly* Vol. 45, pp. 455–466.
- Gates, Scott (2002). Empirically Assessing the Causes of Civil War. Typescript, International Peace Research Institute Oslo.
- Gleditsch, Kristian S. (2002). *All International Politics Is Local: The Diffusion of Conflict, Integration, and Democratization*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Gleditsch, Kristian S., and Michael D. Ward (1999). “A Revised List of Independent States Since 1816.” *International Interactions* Vol. 25, pp. 393–413.
- Gleditsch, Kristian S., and Michael D. Ward (2001). “Measuring Space: A Minimum Distance Database.” *Journal of Peace Research* Vol. 38, pp. 749–768.
- Gleditsch, Nils Petter, Peter Wallensteen, Mikael Eriksson, Margareta Sollenberg, and Håvard Strand (2002). “Armed Conflict 1946–2001: A New Dataset.” *Journal of Peace Research* Vol. 39, pp. 615–637.
- Hechter, Michael (1975). *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536–1966*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Laffin, John (1965). *ANZACs at War: The Story of Australian and New Zealand Battles*. London, New York: Abelard-Schuman.
- Leeds, Brett Ashley, Jeff M. Ritter, Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, and Andrew Long (2002). “Alliance Treaty Obligations and Provisions, 1815–1944.” *International Interactions* Vol. 28, pp. 237–260.
- Mansfield, Edward, and Jack Snyder (1995). “Democratization and the Danger of War.” *International Security* Vol. 20, pp. 5–38.
- Most, Benjamin A., and Harvey Starr (1989). *Inquiry, Logic, and International Politics*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

- Pillar, Paul R. (1983). *Negotiating Peace: War Termination as a Bargaining Process*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sambanis, Nicholas (2001). "A Note on the Death Threshold in Coding Civil War Events." Newsletter of the Conflict Processes Section of the American Political Science Association, available at <http://mailer.fsu.edu/~whmoore/cps/newsletter/june2001/>.
- Sarkees, Meredith (2000). "The Correlates of War Data on War: An Update to 1997." *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, Vol. 18, pp. 123–44.
- Singer, J. David, and Melvin Small (1972). *The Wages of War, 1816–1965: A Statistical Handbook*. New York: Wiley.
- Singer, J. David, and Melvin Small (1994). "Correlates of War Project: International and Civil War Data, 1816–1992" (ICPSR 9905). Codebook, Ann Arbor, MI: Interuniversity Consortium of Political Social Research.
- Singer, J. David, Stuart Bremer, and John Stuckey (1972). "Capability Distribution, Uncertainty, and Major Power War." In Bruce M. Russett, ed., *Peace, War, and Numbers*, pp. 19–48. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Small, Melvin, and J. David Singer (1982). *Resort to Arms: International and Civil Wars, 1816–1980*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Thompson, William R. (2001). "Identifying Rivals and Rivalries in World Politics." *International Studies Quarterly* Vol. 45, pp. 557–586.

CONTRIBUTOR

Kristian Skrede Gleditsch is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of California, San Diego, and a research associate of the Centre for the Study of Civil War at the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO). His research interests include conflict and cooperation, democratization, and spatial dimensions of social and political processes. He is the author of *All International Politics Is Local: The Diffusion of Conflict, Integration, and Democratization* (University of Michigan Press, 2002), and journal articles in the *American Journal of Political Science*, *American Political Science Review*, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, *International Interactions*, *Internasjonal Politikk*, *International Studies Quarterly*, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *Journal of Peace Research*, *Political Analysis*, and *Political Psychology*.