The Categorically Disaggregated Conflict (CDC) Dataset Codebook
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The Categorically Disaggregated Conflict (CDC) Dataset provides a categorization of 331 intrastate armed conflicts recorded between 1946 and 2010 into four categories:

1. Ethnic governmental;
2. Ethnic territorial;
3. Non-ethnic governmental;
4. Non-ethnic territorial.

The dataset uses the UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset v.4-2011, 1946 – 2010 (Themnér & Wallensteen, 2011; also Gleditsch et al., 2002) as a base (and thus is an extension of the UCDP/PRIO dataset). Therefore, the dataset employs the UCDP/PRIO’s operational definition of an aggregate armed conflict:

a contested incompatibility that concerns government and/or territory where the use of armed force between two parties, of which at least one is the government of a state, results in at least 25 battle-related deaths (Themnér, 2011: 1).

The dataset contains only internal and internationalized internal armed conflicts listed in the UCDP/PRIO dataset. Internal armed conflict ‘occurs between the government of a state and one or more internal opposition group(s) without intervention from other states’ (ibid.: 9). Internationalized internal armed conflict ‘occurs between the government of a state and one or more internal opposition group(s) with intervention from other states (secondary parties) on one or both sides’(ibid.). For full definitions and further details please consult the
codebook of the UCDP/PRIO dataset (ibid.) and the website of the Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University: http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/definitions/.

The categorization of the aggregate intrastate armed conflicts into the four categories follows the coding criteria described in Bartusevičius (2015). The dataset contains the following variables:

A. All original variables contained in the UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset v.4-2011, 1946–2010 (Themnér & Wallensteen, 2011; also Gleditsch et al., 2002).

B. Variables introduced in the CDC.

For ‘A’ variables please consult the codebook of the original dataset (Themnér, 2011). ‘B’ variables are described below.

1) 'SideAName' – Full name in English of ‘SideA’ as coded in the UCDP Actor Dataset v. 2.1-2011 (2011) (variable 'Name_Orig_FullEng').

2) 'SideBName' – Full name in the original language and English (in parentheses) of ‘SideB’ as coded in the UCDP Actor Dataset v. 2.1-2011 (2011) (variables 'Name_Orig_Full' and 'Name_Orig_FullEng').

3) 'Difference' – the variable identifies whether SideA and SideB were ethnically different (as defined in Bartusevičius, 2015), and (if yes) what were the differences (1 – Language; 2 – Religion; 3 – 'Race'). The names of the languages and religions are taken from the Ethnologue (Lewis, Simons, & Fenning, 2013) and World Christian Database (Johnson, 2007) (hereafter WCD).

4) 'Language' – the variable takes the value of 1 if SideA and SideB spoke different native languages and 0 if SideA and SideB spoke the same native language. To distinguish between two dialects of the same language and two separate languages CDC uses Ethnologue’s listing of languages. Ethnologue follows ISO 639-3
inventory of identified languages (http://www-01.sil.org/iso639-3) as the basis for the listing of languages. The primary criterion for distinguishing between individual languages and dialects of the same language in *Ethnologue* is mutual intelligibility. See *Ethnologue*’s website for further details (http://www.ethnologue.com/about/problem-language-identification). Note that CDC considers individual languages composing one ‘macrolanguage’ as representing the same language.

5) 'Religion' – the variable takes the value of 1 if SideA and SideB followed different religions and 0 if SideA and SideB followed the same religion.

6) 'Race' – the variable takes the value of 1 if SideA and SideB represented different ‘races’ and 0 if SideA and SideB represented the same ‘race’.

7) 'Religion2' – same as 'Religion' but disregards confessional differences within main religions (i.e., Sunni Islam and Shia Islam; Orthodox Christianity, Catholicism, and Protestantism).

8) 'Ethnic' – the variable takes the value of 1 if SideA and SideB are different in at least one of the three characteristics (i.e., language, religion and 'race',) and 0 if SideA and SideB are the same in all three characteristics.

9) 'Ethnic2' – the variables takes the value of 1 if SideA and SideB are different in at least two of the three characteristics (i.e., language, religion, and 'race') and 0 if SideA and SideB are the same at least in two of the three characteristics.

10) 'Ethnic2 (religion2)' – same as 'Ethnic2' but disregards confessional differences within main religions (i.e., Sunni Islam and Shia Islam; Orthodox Christianity, Catholicism and Protestantism).
11) 'Category' – identifies the category of the conflict: 1 – ethnic governmental; 2 – ethnic territorial; 3 – non-ethnic governmental; 4 – non-ethnic territorial.

12) ‘Category_r2’ – same as 'Category' but applying 'Religion2' criterion.

13) ‘Category_e2’ – same as 'Category' but applying 'Ethnic2' criterion.

14) ‘Category_e2r2’ – same as 'Category’ but applying 'Religion2' and 'Ethnic2' criterion.

15) 'Coding description' – provides a detailed description of the four coding steps described in the paper:

1. Identification of the parties to a conflict (i.e., the names of SideA and SideB);
2. Determination of the composition of the parties to a conflict (i.e., individuals and groups constituting SideA and SideB);
3. Determination of the ethnic differences of the parties to a conflict (i.e., linguistic, religious, and racial differences between groups represented by SideA and SideB);
4. Determination of the pattern of confrontation between parties to a conflict (i.e., determination of whether conflict involved intra-ethnic fighting; and [if yes] determination of the scale of the intra-ethnic fighting).

16) ‘Uncertainty’ (‘1’ – coding is deemed highly certain; ‘2’ – coding is deemed uncertain due to availability of data; ‘3’ – coding is deemed uncertain due to the nature of conflict [described in the coding descriptions]; ‘4’ – coding is deemed ambiguous due to availability of data and the nature of conflict [described in the coding descriptions]).

17) 'EPRcodes' – identifies the composition of the government as coded in the Ethnic Power Relations (EPR) dataset (Cederman, Min, & Wimmer, 2009). The variable
lists groups (and their statuses) represented in the government (SideA), i.e., 'Monopoly', 'Dominant', 'Senior partner' and 'Junior partner' and groups represented in SideB. This variable provides an opportunity to compare the coding of SideA based on the author’s identified primary and secondary sources and the coding of SideA based on country experts as described in the EPR dataset.

*Please note that this project is ongoing. The coding descriptions and coding sources are constantly updated. The information contained in the coding descriptions will be more extensive as new data becomes available. Comments, suggestions, and updates from area/country experts are especially welcome and should be sent to: henrikas@ps.au.dk.*

*Please also note that, while the coding of conflicts in the CDC has been finalised, the coding descriptions, for some conflicts, remain unavailable. Every single conflict has been carefully considered, and the material (together with sources) used to inform the coding of every case is kept in the author’s personal notes. Potential users willing to know the individual coding decisions for cases where coding descriptions are temporarily unavailable are welcome to contact the author.*
Coding descriptions

(As this is an ongoing project, some of the coding descriptions may not be fully edited; therefore, the text below may contain some occasional typos)

Cross-references (click on the country names):

1. Bolivia (ID: 1, year 1946, category 3)
2. Bolivia (ID: 1, year 1952, category 3)
3. Bolivia (ID: 1, year 1967, category 3)
4. China (ID: 3, year 1946, category 3)
5. Greece (ID: 4, year 1946, category 3)
6. Iran (ID: 6, year 1946, category 2)
7. Iran (ID: 6, year 1966, category 2)
8. Iran (ID: 6, year 1979, category 2)
9. Iran (ID: 6, year 1993, category 2)
10. Iran (ID: 6, year 1996, category 2)
11. Iran (ID: 7, year 1946, category 2)
12. Philippines (ID: 10, year 1946, category 3)
13. Philippines (ID: 10, year 1969, category 3)
14. Russia (Soviet Union) (ID: 11, year 1946, category 2)
15. Russia (Soviet Union) (ID: 12, year 1946, category 2)
16. Russia (Soviet Union) (ID: 13, year 1946, category 2)
17. Russia (Soviet Union) (ID: 14, year 1946, category 4)
18. China (ID: 18, year 1947, category 4)
19. Hyderabad (ID: 19, year 1947, category 1)
20. Paraguay (ID: 22, year 1947, category 3)
21. Paraguay (ID: 22, year 1954, category 3)
22. Paraguay (ID: 22, year 1989, category 3)
23. Myanmar (ID: 23, year 1949, category 2)
25. Myanmar (ID: 24, year 1948, category 3)
26. Myanmar (ID: 24, year 1990, category 3)
27. Myanmar (ID: 25, year 1948, category 2)
28. Myanmar (ID: 25, year 1964, category 2)
29. Myanmar (ID: 25, year 1991, category 2)
30. Myanmar (ID: 26, year 1949, category 2)
31. Myanmar (ID: 26, year 1990, category 2)
32. Myanmar (ID: 26, year 1996, category 2)
33. Costa Rica (ID: 27, year 1948, category 3)
34. India (ID: 29, year 1948, category 3)
35. India (ID: 29, year 1969, category 3)
36. India (ID: 29, year 1990, category 3)
37. North Yemen (ID: 33, year 1948, category 3)
38. North Yemen (ID: 33, year 1962, category 3)
39. North Yemen (ID: 33, year 1979, category 3)
40. Yemen (ID: 33, year 2009, category 3)
41. Myanmar (ID: 34, year 1949, category 2)
42. Myanmar (ID: 34, year 1961, category 2)
43. Guatemala (ID: 36, year 1949, category 3)
44. Guatemala (ID: 36, year 1954, category 3)
45. Guatemala (ID: 36, year 1963, category 3)
46. Israel (ID: 37, year 1949, category 2)
47. Israel (ID: 37, year 2000, category 2)
48. China (ID: 39, year 1950, category 2)
49. China (ID: 39, year 1956, category 2)
50. China (ID: 39, 1959, category 2)
51. Indonesia (ID: 40, 1950, category 4)
52. Thailand (ID: 43, year 1951, category 3)
53. Thailand (ID: 43, year 1974, category 3)
54. Cuba (ID: 45, year 1953, category 3)
55. Cuba (ID: 45, year 1956, category 3)
56. Cuba (ID: 45, year 1961, category 3)
57. Indonesia (ID: 46, year 1953, category 3)
58. Indonesia (ID: 46, year 1958, category 3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>South Vietnam</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
91. Myanmar (ID: 67, year 1993, category 2)
92. Myanmar (ID: 67, year 2005, category 2)
93. Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire) (ID: 68, year 1960, category 2)
94. Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire) (ID: 69, year 1960, category 4)
95. Ethiopia (ID: 70, year 1960, category 3)
96. Ethiopia (ID: 70, year 1976, category 3)
97. Nepal (ID: 72, year 1960, category 3)
98. Nepal (ID: 72, year 1996, category 3)
99. France (ID: 73, year 1961, category 3)
100. Iraq (ID: 74, year 1961, category 4)
101. Iraq (ID: 74, year 1973, category 4)
102. Iraq (ID: 74, year 1995, category 4)
103. Ethiopia (ID: 78, year 1964, category 2)
104. Venezuela (ID: 80, year 1962, category 3)
105. Venezuela (ID: 80, year 1982, category 3)
106. Venezuela (ID: 80, year 1992, category 3)
107. Malaysia (ID: 83, year 1963, category 4)
108. Sudan (ID: 85, year 1963, category 2)
109. Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire) (ID: 86, year 1964, category 1)
110. Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire) (ID: 86, year 1967, category 1)
111. Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire) (ID: 86, year 1977, category 1)
112. Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire) (ID: 86, year 1996, category 1)
113. Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire) (ID: 86, year 2006, category 1)
114. Gabon (ID: 87, year 1964, category 3)
115. Burundi (ID: 90, year 1965, category 3)
116. Burundi (ID: 90, year 1991, category 3)
117. Burundi (ID: 90, year 1994, category 3)
118. Burundi (ID: 90, year 2008, category 3)
119. Chad (ID: 91, year 1966, category 1)
120. Chad (ID: 91, year 1976, category 1)
121. Chad (ID: 91, year 1986, category 1)
122. Chad (ID: 91, year 1989, category 1)
123. Chad (ID: 91, year 1997, category 1)
124. Chad (ID: 91, year 2005, category 1)
125. Colombia (ID: 92, year 1964, category 3)
126. Dominican Republic (ID: 93, year 1965, category 3)
127. Indonesia (ID: 94, year 1965, category 2)
128. Indonesia (ID: 94, year 1976, category 2)
129. Indonesia (ID: 94, year 1981, category 2)
130. Indonesia (ID: 94, year 1984, category 2)
131. Peru (ID: 95, year 1965, category 3)
132. Peru (ID: 95, year 1982, category 3)
133. Peru (ID: 95, year 2007, category 3)
134. Ghana (ID: 98, year 1966, category 3)
137. India (ID: 99, year 1966, category 2)
138. Nigeria (ID: 100, year 2009, category 3)
139. Nigeria (ID: 100, year 1966, category 1)
140. South Africa (ID: 101, year 1966, category 2)
141. Syria (ID: 102, year 1966, category 1)
142. Syria (ID: 102, year 1979, category 1)
143. Cambodia (ID: 103, year 1967, category 3)
144. Cambodia (ID: 103, year 1978, category 3)
145. Nigeria (ID: 107, year 1967, category 2)
146. Guinea (ID: 111, year 2000, category 3)
147. Philippines (ID: 112, year 1970, category 2)
148. Philippines (ID: 112, year 1993, category 2)
149. Sudan (ID: 113, year 1983, category 1)
150. Sudan (ID: 113, year 1971, category 3)
151. Sudan (ID: 113, year 1976, category 3)
152. Madagascar (ID: 114, year 1976, category 3)
153. Morocco (ID: 115, year 1971, category 3)
154. Pakistan (ID: 116, year 1971, category 2)
155. Sri Lanka (ID: 117, year 1971, category 3)
156. Sri Lanka (ID: 117, year 1989, category 3)
157. Uganda (ID: 118, year 1971, category 1)
158. Uganda (ID: 118, year 1974, category 3)
159. Uganda (ID: 118, year 1979, category 1)
160. Uganda (ID: 118, year 1994, category 1)
161. United Kingdom (ID: 119, year 1971, category 2)
162. United Kingdom (ID: 119, year 1998, category 2)
163. El Salvador (ID: 120, year 1972, category 3)
164. El Salvador (ID: 120, year 1979, category 3)
165. Oman (ID: 121, year 1969, category 1)
166. Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) (ID: 122, year 1967, category 1)
167. Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) (ID: 122, year 1973, category 1)
168. Uruguay (ID: 123, year 1972, category 3)
169. Chile (ID: 125, year 1973, category 3)
170. Bangladesh (ID: 126, year 1975, category 2)
171. Pakistan (ID: 129, year 1974, category 2)
172. Pakistan (ID: 129, year 2004, category 4)
173. Eritrea (ID: 130, year 1997, category 3)
174. Eritrea (ID: 130, year 2003, category 3)
175. Angola (ID: 131, year 1975, category 1)
176. Angola (ID: 131, year 1998, category 1)
177. Ethiopia (ID: 133, year 1964, category 2)
178. Ethiopia (ID: 133, year 1976, category 2)
179. Ethiopia (ID: 133, year 1993, category 2)
180. Ethiopia (ID: 133, year 1994, category 2)
181. Indonesia (ID: 134, year 1975, category 2)
182. Indonesia (ID: 134, year 1992, category 2)
183. Indonesia (ID: 134, year 1997, category 2)
184. Morocco (ID: 135, year 1975, category 2)
185. Mozambique (ID: 136, year 1977, category 3)
186. Afghanistan (ID: 137, year 1978, category 3)
187. Afghanistan (ID: 137, year 2003, category 3)
188. India (ID: 139, year 1979, category 2)
189. India (ID: 139, year 1992, category 2)
190. India (ID: 139, year 1995, category 2)
191. Nicaragua (ID: 140, year 1977, category 3)
192. Nicaragua (ID: 140, year 1982, category 3)
193. Somalia (ID: 141, year 1982, category 3)
194. Somalia (ID: 141, year 1986, category 3)
195. Somalia (ID: 141, year 2001, category 3)
196. Somalia (ID: 141, year 2006, category 3)
197. Iran (ID: 143, year 2005, category 1)
198. Iran (ID: 143, year 1979, category 3)
199. Iran (ID: 143, year 1986, category 3)
200. Iran (ID: 143, year 1991, category 3)
201. Iran (ID: 143, year 1997, category 3)
202. Iran (ID: 143, year 1979, category 3)
203. Saudi Arabia (ID: 145, year 1979, category 3)
204. Liberia (ID: 146, year 1980, category 1)
205. Liberia (ID: 146, year 1989, category 1)
206. Liberia (ID: 146, year 2000, category 1)
207. Spain (ID: 147, year 1978, category 2)
208. Spain (ID: 147, year 1985, category 2)
209. Spain (ID: 147, year 1991, category 2)
210. Tunisia (ID: 148, year 1980, category 3)
211. Gambia (ID: 149, year 1981, category 3)
212. South Africa (ID: 150, year 1981, category 1)
213. India (ID: 152, year 1982, category 2)
214. India (ID: 152, year 1992, category 2)
215. India (ID: 152, year 2003, category 2)
216. Kenya (ID: 153, year 1982, category 1)
217. India (ID: 156, year 1983, category 4)
218. Sri Lanka (ID: 157, year 1984, category 2)
219. Cameroon (ID: 158, year 1960, category 1)
220. Cameroon (ID: 158, year 1984, category 3)
221. Turkey (ID: 159, year 1984, category 2)
222. Suriname (ID: 162, year 1987, category 1)
223. Togo (ID: 163, year 1986, category 3)
224. South Yemen (ID: 164, year 1986, category 3)
225. Burkina Faso (ID: 165, year 1987, category 3)
226. Comoros (ID: 167, year 1989, category 3)
227. Ethiopia (ID: 168, year 1975, category 2)
228. Ethiopia (ID: 168, year 1996, category 2)
229. India (ID: 169, year 1989, category 2)
230. India (ID: 170, year 1990, category 2)
231. India (ID: 170, year 1994, category 2)
232. Indonesia (ID: 171, year 1990, category 2)
233. Indonesia (ID: 171, year 1999, category 2)
234. Panama (ID: 172, year 1989, category 3)
235. Papua New Guinea (ID: 174, year 1989, category 2)
236. Romania (ID: 175, year 1989, category 3)
237. Mali (ID: 177, year 1990, category 2)
238. Mali (ID: 177, year 1994, category 2)
239. Mali (ID: 177, year 2007, category 4)
240. Niger (ID: 178, year 1994, category 2)
241. Rwanda (ID: 179, year 1990, category 3)
242. Rwanda (ID: 179, year 1996, category 3)
243. Rwanda (ID: 179, year 2009, category 3)
244. Senegal (ID: 180, year 1990, category 2)
245. Russia (Soviet Union) (ID: 181, year 1990, category 2)
246. Russia (Soviet Union) (ID: 182, year 1990, category 2)
247. Trinidad and Tobago (ID: 183, year 1990, category 1)
248. Djibouti (ID: 184, year 1991, category 1)
249. Djibouti (ID: 184, year 1999, category 1)
250. Georgia (ID: 185, year 1991, category 3)
251. Haiti (ID: 186, year 1989, category 3)
252. Haiti (ID: 186, year 1991, category 3)
253. Haiti (ID: 186, year 2004, category 3)
254. Sierra Leone (ID: 187, year 1991, category 3)
255. Turkey (ID: 188, year 1991, category 3)
256. Turkey (ID: 188, year 2005, category 3)
257. Serbia (Yugoslavia) (ID: 189, year 1991, category 2)
258. Serbia (Yugoslavia) (ID: 189, year 1991, category 2)
259. Algeria (ID: 191, year 1991, category 3)
260. Angola (ID: 192, year 1991, category 2)
261. Angola (ID: 192, year 1994, category 2)
262. Angola (ID: 192, year 2002, category 2)
263. Angola (ID: 192, year 2007, category 2)
265. Azerbaijan (ID: 193, year 2005, category 2)
266. Bosnia-Herzegovina (ID: 194, year 1992, category 2)
267. Croatia (ID: 195, year 1992, category 2)
268. Croatia (ID: 195, year 1995, category 2)
269. Egypt (ID: 196, year 1993, category 3)
270. Georgia (ID: 197, year 1992, category 2)
271. Georgia (ID: 198, year 1992, category 2)
272. Georgia (ID: 198, year 2004, category 2)
273. Georgia (ID: 198, year 2008, category 2)
274. Moldova (ID: 199, year 1992, category 4)
275. Tajikistan (ID: 200, year 1992, category 3)
276. Azerbaijan (ID: 201, year 1993, category 3)
277. Azerbaijan (ID: 201, year 1995, category 3)
278. Bosnia-Herzegovina (ID: 202, year 1993, category 4)
279. Bosnia-Herzegovina (ID: 203, year 1993, category 2)
280. Russia (Soviet Union) (ID: 204, year 1993, category 3)
281. Mexico (ID: 205, year 1994, category 1)
282. Mexico (ID: 205, year 1996, category 3)
283. Russia (Soviet Union) (ID: 206, year 1994, category 2)
284. Russia (Soviet Union) (ID: 206, year 1999, category 2)
285. Yemen (ID: 207, year 1994, category 2)
286. Pakistan (ID: 209, year 1990, category 1)
287. Pakistan (ID: 209, year 1995, category 1)
288. Pakistan (ID: 209, year 2007, category 3)
289. Niger (ID: 212, year 1995, category 2)
290. Comoros (ID: 213, year 1997, category 4)
291. Congo (ID: 214, year 1993, category 1)
292. Congo (ID: 214, year 1997, category 1)
293. Congo (ID: 214, year 2002, category 1)
295. Lesotho (ID: 217, year 1998, category 3)
296. Serbia (Yugoslavia) (ID: 218, year 1998, category 2)
297. Ethiopia (ID: 219, year 1977, category 2)
298. Ethiopia (ID: 219, year 1998, category 4)
299. Russia (Soviet Union) (ID: 220, year 1999, category 2)
300. Uzbekistan (ID: 221, year 1999, category 3)
301. Uzbekistan (ID: 221, year 2004, category 3)
302. Central African Republic (ID: 222, year 2001, category 1)
303. Central African Republic (ID: 222, year 2006, category 1)
304. Central African Republic (ID: 223, year 2009, category 1)
305. Macedonia (ID: 223, year 2001, category 1)
306. United States of America (ID: 224, year 2001, category 1)
307. Cote d’Ivoire (ID: 225, year 2002, category 1)
308. India (ID: 227, year 1989, category 2)
309. India (ID: 227, year 1993, category 2)
310. India (ID: 227, year 2009, category 2)
311. Myanmar (ID: 228, year 1997, category 2)
312. Thailand (ID: 248, year 2003, category 2)
313. Nigeria (ID: 249, year 2004, category 4)
315. *Israel* (ID: 251, year 1990, category 2)
316. *Israel* (ID: 251, year 2006, category 2)
317. *Mauritania* (ID: 253, year 1975, category 4)
318. *Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire)* (ID: 254, year 2007, category 2)
322. *Russia (Soviet Union)* (ID: 257, year 2007, category 4)
323. *India* (ID: 258, year 2008, category 2)
324. *India* (ID: 259, year 2008, category 2)
325. *Ethiopia* (ID: 262, year 1977, category 2)
326. *Ethiopia* (ID: 262, year 1983, category 2)
327. *India* (ID: 263, year 1997, category 2)
328. *Myanmar* (ID: 264, year 2009, category 2)
330. *Tajikistan* (ID: 266, year 2010, category 1)
331. *Mauritania* (ID: 267, year 2010, category 1)

References
**Bolivia**

SideBName: *Popular Revolutionary Movement*

Startdate2: 6/1/1946

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Bolivians 'Monopoly' in 1946*

Coding description:


2. SideA: Since December 1943, the government of Bolivia was under the rule of Gualberto Villarroel. Villarroel ruled the country in a coalition with the Revolutionary Nationalist Movement (Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario, MNR) – Villarroel’s cabinet included 3 MNR members (see, Charles & Weston, 1968: 94) – and military faction known as RADEPA (a group of Chaco war veteran officers).

   SideB: PRM was spearheaded by the FDA – Anti-Fascist Democratic Front. The FDA was an alliance of Rosca (tin oligarchy) traditionalist parties and the PIR (Partido de la Izquierda Revolucionaria, Revolutionary Left Party). The conflict involved popular participation – the FDA collaborated with teachers, students and workers to mobilize the protest (John, 2006: 156). Villarroel himself was reportedly seized by a crowd 'including market women who stabbed him with the long pins from their ponchos' (Ibid).

3. Bolivian population is composed of three racial groups: 'whites' (of European descent), mestizos (of mixed European and Amerindian descent), and Amerindians (indigenous peoples). According to Bolivian census of 2001, 62% of Bolivians considered themselves to
be descendants of indigenous peoples. Among these Quenchua (31 %) and Aymara (25 %) were the majority (the data is cited in Galindo, 2010: 97). The remaining were mestizos and 'whites', who have traditionally dominated Bolivian political life.

SideA: Villarroel was 'white'. The RADEPA members were predominantly 'white' as well (army officers were typically drawn from the 'white people'). The founders (and thus presumably the leadership) of the MNR were of 'blanco' and 'cholo' middle-class origin (Charles & Weston, 1968: 88-90, 100). Thus, in a racial respect, the MNR leadership were white ('blancos') and of mixed Spanish and Indian descent ('cholos'). 'Cholo' and 'mestizo' have often been used interchangeably to define people of mixed Spanish and Indian descent. Charles & Weston (Ibid: 90), for example, makes no distinction between these terms. Other authors note that these two terms have different meanings (see, for example, Hudson & Hanratty, 1989: Chapter 2, Sections: Ethnic Groups, and Mestizos and Cholos; or Gisselquist, 2005).

SideB: Given that Popular Revolutionary Movement was composed of diverse social groups (intellectuals, teachers, university students, workers, etc.) its composition was most likely heterogeneous in racial respect.

Thus, so far, I have not found any information suggesting that SideA and SideB were composed or represented any particular racial, linguistic or religious group.

ID: 1

Location: Bolivia

SideBName: Movimiento nacionalista revolucionario (National Revolutionary Movement)

Startdate2: 4/9/1952

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified
Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Bolivians 'Monopoly' in 1951*

Coding description:


2. SideA: In 1952, when the conflict started, Bolivia was under the rule of military junta (led by Hugo Ballivian Rojas).

   SideB: See above (ID: 1, year 1946).

3. SideA: The military junta was predominantly ‘white’; SideB: The MNR was composed of ‘whites’ and mestizos (or ‘cholos’) (see above; ID: 1, year 1946).

So far, thus, I have not found any information suggesting that SideA and SideB were composed or represented any particular racial, linguistic or religious group.

ID: 1

Location:

*Bolivia*

SideBName: *Ejército de liberación nacional (National Liberation Army)*

Startdate2: 3/1/1967

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1
EPRcodes: *Bolivians 'Dominant' in 1967*

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Bolivia; SideB: Ejército de liberación nacional (ELN)

2. SideA: In 1967, Bolivia was under the military rule of René Barrientos Ortuño. It is known that Barrientos regime mainly relied on militaries. As of now, however, I could not find any particular information on their ethnic identities and their de facto role in Barrientos regime.

   SideB: The National Liberation Army was led by Argentinian – Che Guevara. In the initial phase ELN was composed of 50 men: 29 Bolivians, 17 Cubans and 3 Peruvians (Estudio del "Diaro del Che Guevara en Bolivia", 1968: 49).

3. SideA: Given that Barrientos was of mixed Quechua and Spanish descent (i.e., mestizo) (Dunkerley, 1992: 2), and that other member of the government were militaries (and thus, presumably, 'white'), I assume that government was heterogeneous in racial respect.

   SideB: According to Lamberg (1970: 29), the Bolivians recruited into ELN were mine workers, taxi drivers and students and, thus, presumably, were also heterogeneous in racial respect.

So far, I could not find any information suggesting that SideA and SideB were composed or represented any particular racial, linguistic or religious group.

ID: 3

Location:

*China*

SideBName: *People's Liberation Army*

Startdate2: 1/1/1946

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data for 1946

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 5

Location:

Greece

SideBName: Dimkratikos stratos ellados (Democratic Army of Greece)

Startdate2: 3/1/1946

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Greeks 'Monopoly' in 1946

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 6

Location:

Iran
SideBName: Kurdish Democratic Party of Iran

Startdate2: 5/1/1946

Difference: (1) Language (Western Farsi vs. Kurdish); (2) Religion (Shias vs. Sunnis)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Iranians 'Dominant', Kurds 'Separatist Autonomy' in 1946

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Iran; SideB: Kurdish Democratic Party of Iran (KDPI).

2. SideA: Government of Iran was dominated by Iranians. SideB: KDPI was exclusively composed of Iranian Kurds (see, for example, Roosevelt, 1947).

3. SideA: Iranians spoke Western Farsi (a member of Persian macrolanguage) and were predominantly Shias (98% according to WCD).

   SideB: The majority of Kurds endorsed Sunni Islam and spoke Kurdish (Edmonds, 1971: 96). Note that Kurdish is considered as a 'macrolanguage' in Ethnologue. It contains a number of languages (the main ones are Kurmanji, Sorani and Kermanshah) that are not always mutually intelligible (see, for example, Thackston, 2006: vii).

   While closely related (both belong to the subgroup of Western Iranian languages), Western Farsi and Kurdish are coded as separate languages in Ethnologue.

   There are no racial differences between Iranians and Iranian Kurds.

4. Gunter notes that in 'all of the Kurdish revolts of the twentieth century, for example, significant numbers of Kurds have supported the government because of tribal antipathies for those rebelling' (2004: 198). However, the author provides no explicit information (nor references) on whether Iranian Kurds fought on the side of Iranian Government in the 1946 conflict.
Roosevelt also claims that some of the Kurdish tribes sided with the Iranian Army in the 1946 episode (1947: 268). Yet, it seems that this was the case only in the second part of the conflict. Indeed, Roosevelt states that before the conflict broke out, in late 1945, soviets managed to convince most of Kurdish tribes (except the Mamesh, the Mangur, and the Dehborki) to mobilize for common independence struggle and join Qazi Mohammad – the leader of the KDPI (see also McDowall, 1996: 241). And it was only when the Iranian army strengthened their positions and when it was understood that long-awaited military support from the Soviet Union will not come that some of the tribesmen turned their support to Iranians.

The tribes that did not join Qazi and his KDPI in the initial phase (i.e., the Mamesh, the Mangur and the Dehborki) sided with the Iranian army but never fought against the KDPI (though were ready for this, see Roosevelt, 1947: 266).

Also, Roosevelt points out that 'Kurdish prisoners were conscripted in the Kurdish army' after one of the battles between the KDPI and Iranian army, which, once again, implies that Kurdish individuals fought on the side of Iranian army. Yet, it is not clear from the text what the proportion of Kurdish in Iranian army was, and whether Kurdish participation in Iranian army was systematic.

Thus, the information gathered so far suggests that the conflict was primarily fought between Iranians and Kurdish.

ID: 6

Location: Iran

SideBName: Kurdish Democratic Party of Iran

Startdate2: 1/1/1966

Difference: (1) Language (Western Farsi vs. Kurdish); (2) Religion (Shias vs. Sunnis)
Category: 2

Uncertainty: 2

EPRcodes: Iranians 'Senior partner', Azeri 'Junior Partner', Kurds 'Powerless' in 1966

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Iran; SideB: Kurdish Democratic Party of Iran (KDPI).

2. SideA: Government of Iran was dominated by Iranians. SideB: KDPI was composed of Iranian Kurds (see above; ID: 6, year 1946).

3. See above (ID: 6, year 1946).

4. Information on the 1966 episode is very scarce. In fact, it is not even clear which event UCDP/PRIO dataset refers here to. The start date is imprecise ('Startprec2' is set to '5'). The online UCDP Conflict Encyclopaedia provides only one sentence on this episode (see Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2013/01/26). There was a military campaign against Tehran launched by the Revolutionary Committee (an offshoot from the KDPI) in March, 1967, information on which is very limited (see, for example, McDowall, 1996: 253; Martin van Bruinessen, 1986: 17). However, it is not clear, whether this is the event that UCDP/PRIO dataset refers here to.

Smith claims that there 'were no Kurdish uprisings to speak of between 1965 and the late 1970s' (Smith, 2009:18).

ID: 6

Location: Iran

SideBName: Kurdish Democratic Party of Iran

Startdate2: 1/1/1979
Difference: (1) Language (Western Farsi vs. Kurdish); (2) Religion (Shias vs. Sunnis)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Iranians 'Senior partner', Azeri 'Junior Partner', Kurds 'Powerless' in 1979

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Iran; SideB: Kurdish Democratic Party of Iran (KDPI).

2. SideA: Government of Iran was dominated by Iranians. SideB: KDPI was composed of Iranian Kurds (see above; ID: 6, year 1946).

3. See above (ID: 6, year 1946).

4. The conflict appears to have had a sectarian element. Indeed, As Entessar (1994: 924) notes, a small fraction of Kurds, who endorsed Shia Islam, tended to support Khomeini side (i.e., Iranian government) during the conflict (see also, McDowall, 1996: 269-272).

A doubt over ethnic character of this conflict casts the fact that two Kurds – Karim Sanjabi and Daroush Foruhar were appointed ministers (foreign and labour respectively) in the first post-revolutionary cabinet of Iran (Entessar, 1984: 925).

There is also some evidence that Kurds fought on the side of Iranian Government. Entessar notes that during the conflict, besides fighting Iranian forces, the KDPI also fought against KDP-Provisional Leadership (Iraq-based Kurds), whose leaders received aid from Khomeini and have 'on occasion supported and fought alongside the Iranian forces against the Iraqis as well as anti-Khomeini Kurds' (1984: 929). It seems, however, that the KDP-Iran collaboration mainly took place in 1982, and that the first clashes between the KDP and the KDPI were recorded only in 1980 (Martin von Bruinessen, 1986: 14, 17). Indeed, as Entessar notes, the first phase of the conflict (early 1979) was limited to clashes between the KDPI 'peshmergas' (Kurdish fighters) and Islamic 'pasdarans' (revolutionary guards). Also, there is some evidence that the KDPI tried to avoid confrontation with the local tribesmen (Martin von Bruinessen, 1986: 18).
ID: 6

Location:

*Iran*

SideBName: *Kurdish Democratic Party of Iran*

Startdate2: 1/1/1993

Difference: (1) *Language (Western Farsi vs. Kurdish); (2) Religion (Shias vs. Sunnis)*

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Iranians ‘Senior partner’, Azeri ‘Junior Partner’, Kurds ‘Discriminated’ in 1993*

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Iran; SideB: Kurdish Democratic Party of Iran (KDPI).

2. SideA: Government of Iran was dominated by Iranians. SideB: KDPI was composed of Iranian Kurds (see above; ID: 6, year 1946).

3. See above (ID: 6, year 1946).

4. The 1993 and 1996 episodes were continuation of the KDPI struggle against Tehran. So far, I could not find any explicit information suggesting that the government forces included any Kurdish members in their ranks during the clashes of 1993 and 1996.

McDowall indicates that some of the extreme Shia tribes of Kurdish origin allied with the government in 1993 (1996: 278). However, there is no explicit information on whether these tribes engaged in a direct military confrontation against the KDPI.
Iran

SideBName: Kurdish Democratic Party of Iran

Startdate2: 1/1/1996

Difference: (1) Language (Western Farsi vs. Kurdish); (2) Religion (Shias vs. Sunnis)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Iranians 'Senior partner', Azeri 'Junior Partner', Kurds 'Discriminated' in 1996

Coding description:

[See the description of the previous episode]

ID: 7

Location:

Iran

SideBName: Republic of Azerbaijan

Startdate2: 1/1/1946

Difference: (1) Language (Western Farsi vs. Southern Azerbaijani)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 2

EPRcodes: Iranians 'Dominant', Azeri 'Separatist autonomy' in 1946

Coding description:

2. SideA: Government of Iran was dominated by Iranians; SideB: Republic of Azerbaijan represented Iranian Azeri (also called Azerbaijani Turks or just Azerbaijani).

3. SideA: See above (ID: 6, year 1946). SideB: majority of Azeris followed Shia Islam (98% according to WCD) and spoke Southern Azerbaijani (a member of Azerbaijani macrolanguage). Though there is considerable degree of mutual intelligibility, South Azerbaijani and Western Farsi are considered as two separate individual languages in Ethnologue.

There are no racial differences between Iranians and Iranian Kurds.

4. So far, I have not found any information suggesting that the conflict involved any intra-ethnic fighting. I could only establish that conflict involved substantial inter-ethnic killing. According to Shaffer (2002), thousands of Azeris were executed by Iranians after surrender to Tehran's troops (57; see footnote 30).

ID: 10

Location:

**Philippines**

SideBName: *Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan (People’s Liberation Army)*

Startdate2: 7/1/1946

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Christian lowlanders 'Monopoly', Moro 'Powerless', 'Sino-Chinese' discriminated in 1946*

Coding description:
1. SideA: Government of Philippines; SideB: Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan ('Huk').

2. SideB: Since the independence in 1946 (until 1972) the Government of Philippines was dominated by Nacionalista and Liberal Parties. Neither of these represented any particular ethnic group. Indeed, as Dolan notes, each 'party tried to appeal to all regions, all ethnic groups, and all social classes and fostered national unity by never championing one group or region' (1993: 219).

SideB: Huk did not represent any particular ethnic group either (ibid.: 46-47). It was a communist, primarily politically-organized movement (Averch, Denton & Koehler, 1970: 12)

3. SideA: As mentioned above, Nacionalista and Liberal parties (and, thus, the government) did not represent any particular ethnic group. However, it is known, that the government was dominated by Christians (e.g., Winter & Cava, 2006: 25-26).

SideB: As mentioned above, Huk was not an ethnic organization; therefore, it did not represent any particular linguistic, racial or religious group.

4. Historical accounts put little emphasis on the ethnic part of the conflict (see, for example, Kerkvliet, 1979). Some authors claim that, in the later stages of rebellion, Pampagueno people (Kampangan speaking Christians) were more willing to join Hucks than other peoples in the Huk controlled areas (Mitchell, 1969; Lachica, 1971). This claim, however, has been challenged in the literature (e.g., Averch, Denton & Koehler, 1970: 12).

The Armed Forces of the Philippines were ethnically diverse (though certain groups were disproportionately represented) (Dolan, 1993: Chapter 5, Section 'Recruitment and Personnel').

Thus, information gathered so far suggests that neither SideA nor SideB were composed or represented any particular racial, linguistic or religious group.

.................................................................

ID: 10

Location:
Philippines

SideBName: Communist Party of the Philippines

Startdate2: 9/1/1969

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Christian lowlanders 'Monopoly', Moro 'Powerless', 'Sino-Chinese' discriminated in 1969

Coding description:

2. SideA: See above (ID: 10, year 1946); SideB: CPP and its military wing – New People's Army – did not have any ethnic base and (at least in the later stages of the conflict) enjoyed widespread support from many different regions and groups of people (see, for example, Magno & Gregor, 1986; Molloy, 1985: 827-828).
3. Thus, neither SideA nor SideB represented any particular linguistic, racial or religious group.

Russia (Soviet Union)

SideBName: Metsavennad (Forest Brothers)

Startdate2: 1/1/1946
Difference: (1) Language (Russian vs. Estonian)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Russians 'Senior partner', Ukrainians 'Junior partner', Estonians 'Discriminated' in 1946

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

---------------------------------------------------------------

ID: 12

Location:

Russia (Soviet Union)

SideBName: Latvian National Guerrilla Association, Association of the Latvian Fatherland Guards

Startdate2: 1/1/1946

Difference: (1) Language (Russian vs. Latvian)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Russians 'Senior partner', Ukrainians 'Junior partner', Latvians 'Discriminated' in 1946

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

---------------------------------------------------------------
ID: 13

Location:

Russia (Soviet Union)

SideBName: Bendras demokratinio pasipriesinimo sajudis (United Democratic Resistance Movement)

Startdate2: 1/1/1946

Difference: (1) Language (Russian vs. Lithuanian)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Russians 'Senior partner', Ukrainians 'Junior partner', Lithuanians 'Discriminated' in 1946

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

Id: 14

Location:

Russia (Soviet Union)

SideBName: Ukraine Partisan Army

Startdate2: 1/1/1946

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 4
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Russians 'Senior partner', Ukrainians 'Junior partner' in 1946

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 18

Location:

China

SideBName: Taiwanese insurgents

Startdate2: 2/28/1947

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 4

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Chinese (Han) 'Monopoly', Taiwanese 'Powerless' in 1946

Coding description:


2. Both SideA and SideB were predominantly Han Chinese (e.g., Brown, 2004: 1).

3. No linguistic, racial or religious differences between Government of China and Taiwanese insurgents have been recorded.

ID: 19
**Hyderabad**

SideBName: *Communist Party of India*

Startdate2: 6/1/1947

Difference: (1) Language (Urdu vs. Telugu) (2) Religion (Muslims vs. Hindus)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 3

EPRcodes: *No data*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 22

Location:

**Paraguay**

SideBName: *Opposition coalition* (*Febreristas, Liberals and Communists*)

Startdate2: 3/1/1947

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Paraguayans 'Monopoly' in 1947*
Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Paraguay; SideB: Opposition coalition (Febreristas, Liberals and Communists).

2. Neither SideA nor SideB represented any particular ethnic group.

3. Paraguayan population is very homogeneous, mainly composed of 'mestizos' (see ID: 1, year 1946, on the term 'mestizo') (e.g., Hanratty & Meditz, 1990: 80).

As of now, I have not identified any linguistic, racial or religious differences between Government of Paraguay and the Opposition coalition.

ID: 22

Location:

Paraguay

SideBName: Military faction (forces of Alfredo Stroessner)

Startdate2: 5/5/1954

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Paraguayans 'Monopoly' in 1954

Coding description:


2. The conflict was a one-day military coup. Neither forces of the government nor the forces of Alfredo Stroessner represented any particular ethnic group.
3. As mentioned above, Paraguayan population is largely composed of 'mestizos'. As of now, I have not identified any linguistic, racial or religious differences between Government of Paraguay and the Military Faction.

For a brief overview of this episode see Hanratty & Meditz (1990: Chapter 1: The Stronato).

ID: 22

Location: Paraguay

SideBName: Military faction (forces of Andres Rodriguez)

Startdate2: 2/3/1989

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Paraguayans 'Monopoly' in 1989

Coding description:


2. The conflict was a one-day military coup which removed Alfredo Stroessner from power (see above, ID: 22, year 1954). Neither SideA nor SideB represented any particular ethnic group.

3. As mentioned above, Paraguayan population is mainly composed of 'mestizos'. So far, I have not identified any linguistic, racial or religious differences between Government of Paraguay and the Military faction.

For a brief overview of this episode see, for example, Snyder (1992: 390-391).
Myanmar

SideBName: Karen National United Party

Startdate2: 1/15/1949

Difference: (1) Language (Burmese vs. Kareni Languages) (2) Religion (Buddhists vs. Christians)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Bamar (Barman) 'Senior Partner', Kachin 'Junior partner', Kayin (Karen)

'Separatist autonomy' in 1949

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Myanmar; SideB: Karen National United Party (KNUP) (UCDP/PRIO makes a mistake here – KNUP was established only in 1953; therefore, I suppose UCDP/PRIO refers here to Karen National Union (KNU), an organization that commenced their rebellion against the government exactly in January 1949).

2. SideA: Since the independence in 1948 until the coup of 1962 the government of Myanmar was dominated – with several interruptions – by the Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League (AFPFL) which was predominantly Bamar (or Burman) (Than, 1997: 170). After the coup (until 2011), Burma was ruled by military regimes which were also predominantly Bamar (Hlaing, 2007: 150).

SideB: KNU represented Karen people.
3. SideA: Bamar spoke Burmese and were predominantly Theravada Buddhists (96% according to WCD).

SideB: The term 'Karen' is a collective name for twenty ethnic sub-groups that live in Burma and Thailand (Harriden, 2002: 85; see also Buadaeng, 2007) that 'do not share a common language, culture, religion or material characteristics’ (Cheesman, 2002: 199). However, Karen languages are all distinct from Burmese according to Ethnologue.

It is known that KNU was dominated by Christians (KNU leadership was mainly Christian) (e.g., Rajah, 1990: 102; Harriden, 2002: 94). Yet, KNU officials at the village or township level, as well as the foot-soldiers, were predominantly Buddhists (ibid.: 128; also Horstmann, 2011: 90) (thus, the coding of the religious differences depends on what we put emphasis on – the leadership or the foot-soldiers).

I have not identified any racial differences between Karen people and Bamar.

4. There is information that during the initial period of the conflict, Tatmadaw (government's armed forces) explicitly targeted – on several occasions – Karen Christians (e.g., South, 2008: 30-31). So far, I have not found any information suggesting that the conflict, in the initial phase, involved any intra-Bamar or intra-Karen fighting.

ID: 23

Location:

Myanmar

SideBName: Karen National Union

Startdate2: 2/9/1995

Difference: (1) Language (Burmese vs. Kareni Languages) (2) Religion (Buddhists vs. Christians)

Category: 2
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Bamar (Barman) 'Dominant', Kayin (Karen) 'Separatist autonomy' in 1995

Coding description:

[This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of Myanmar and KNU – see above, ID: 23, year 1949]

ID: 24

Location:

Myanmar

SideBName: Communist Party of Burma, Communist Party of Burma–Red Flag, People's Volunteer Organization–"White Band" faction

Startdate2: 2/1/1948

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Bamar (Barman) 'Senior Partner', Kachin 'Junior partner' in 1948

Coding description:


2. SideA: See above (ID: 23, year 1949); SideB: The leadership of the Communist Party of Burma (CPB) was almost exclusively Bamar. However, its foot-soldiers were composed of different ethnic groups (Pedersen, 2008: 48, Footnote 5; also Lintner, 1990). Communist Party of Burma-Red Flag was a splinter group from the CPB. People's Volunteer Organization
"White Band" faction was composed of Burmese army mutineers who were predominantly Bamar (Yone & Mandelbaum, 1950: 184).

3. Thus, SideA included members of ethnic group (Bamar) that constituted part of SideB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID: 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SideBName: All-Burma Students Democratic Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startdate2: 3/20/1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPRcodes: Bamar (Marman) 'Dominant' in 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coding description:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. SideA: Government of Myanmar; SideB: All-Burma Students Democratic Front (ABSDF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SideA: See above (ID: 23, year 1949); SideB: ABSDF did not represent any particular ethnic group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. As of now, I have not found any information suggesting that SideA and SideB were composed or represented any particular racial, linguistic or religious group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID: 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Myanmar

SideBName: Arakan People's Liberation Party, Mujahid Party

Startdate2: 1/1/1948

Difference: (1) Language (Burmese vs. Rohingya and Rakhine)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 2

EPRcodes: Bamar (Barman) 'Senior Partner', Kachin 'Junior partner' in 1948

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 25

Location:

Myanmar

SideBName: Arakan National Liberation Party, Communist Party of Arakan

Startdate2: 1/1/1964

Difference: (1) Language (Burmese vs. Rohingya and Rakhine)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Bamar (Marman) 'Dominant', Buddhist Arakanese 'Separatist autonomy', Muslim Arakanese 'Separatist Autonomy' in 1964

Coding description:

2. SideA: See above (ID: 23, year 1949); SideB: ANLP represented Arakanese Muslims (Rohingyas) – ethnic group concentrated in the north of Burma’s Arakan State. CPA did not represent any particular ethnic group but majority of CPA members were southern Arakan people – Rakhine (CPA and ANLP was in alliance, Grundy-Warr & Wong, 1997: 83)

3. SideA: See above (ID: 23, year 1949); SideB: Rohingyas spoke Rohingya and followed Islam; Rakhine spoke Arakanese or Rakhine (which is, to some degree, mutually intelligible with Burmese; however, Ethnologue codes it as an 'individual' language) and mainly followed Theravada Buddhism (80% according to WCD).

I have not identified any racial differences between Rohingya, Rakhine and Bamar.

4. So far, I have not found any reliable information suggesting that the conflict involved systematic intra-Bamar, intra-Rohingya or intra-Rakhine fighting.

ID: 25
Location:

Myanmar

SideBName: Arakan Rohingya Islamic Front, Rohingya Solidarity Organisation

Startdate2: 12/29/1991

Difference: (1) Language (Burmese vs. Rohingya) (2) Religion (Buddhists vs. Muslims)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Bamar (Barman) 'Dominant', Buddhist Arakanese 'Separatist autonomy', Muslim Arakanese 'Separatist Autonomy' in 1991
Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Burma; SideB: Arakan Rohingya Islamic Front (ARIF), Rohingya Solidarity Organization (RSO).

2. SideA: See above (ID: 23, year 1949); SideB: Both, ARIF and RSO represented Rohingya people (e.g., Seth, 2004: 112-113).


4. So far, I have not found any reliable information suggesting that the conflict involved systematic intra-Bamar or intra-Rohingya fighting.

ID: 26

Location:

Myanmar

SideBName: Mon Freedom League–Mon United Front

Startdate2: 2/1/1949

Difference: (1) Language (Burmese vs. Mon) (2) Religion (Buddhists vs. Ethnoreligionists)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Bamar (Barman) 'Senior Partner', Kachin 'Junior partner', Mon 'Powerless' in 1949

Coding description:


2. SideA: See above (ID: 23, year 1949); SideB: MFL-MUF represented Mon people (e.g., Walton, 2008: 902).
3. SideA: See above (ID: 23, year 1949); SideB: Mon spoke Mon, which is coded as an 'individual' language in Ethnologue. Note, however, that Mon people can read Burmese and are generally bilingual in Burmese (Ethnologue; see also South, 2003: Chapter 2). Mon were predominantly animists (according to WCD, 75% were animists and 20% Buddhists).

I have not identified any racial differences between Mon and Bamar.

4. So far, I have not found any reliable information suggesting that the conflict involved systematic intra-Bamar or intra-Mon fighting.

ID: 26
Location:

*Myanmar*

SideBName: *New Mon State Party*

Startdate2: 3/27/1990

Difference: (1) Language (Burmese vs. Mon) (2) Religion (Buddhists vs. Ethnoreligionists)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Bamar (Barman) 'Dominant', Mon 'Separatist autonomy' in 1949*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]
Myanmar

SideBName: Beik Mon Army

Startdate2: 12/23/1996

Difference: (1) Language (Burmese vs. Mon) (2) Religion (Buddhists vs. Ethnoreligionists)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Bamar (Barman) 'Dominant', Mon 'Separatist autonomy' in 1996

Coding description:

2. SideA: See above (ID: 23, year 1949); SideB: BMA represented Mon people.
4. So far, I have not found any reliable information suggesting that the conflict involved systematic intra-Bamar or intra-Mon fighting.

..............................................................

ID: 27

Location:

Costa Rica

SideBName: National Liberation Army

Startdate2: 3/3/1948

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Costa Ricans 'Dominant' in 1948

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 29

Location:

India

SideBName: Communist Party of India

Startdate2: 9/18/1948

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 2

EPRcodes: Hindi 'Senior partner', Assamese 'Junior partner', Bengali 'Junior partner', Kannada 'Junior partner', Malayalam 'Junior partner', Marathi 'Junior partner', Muslims 'Junior partner', Oriya 'Junior partner', Punjabi-Sikhs 'Junior partner', Scheduled Castes & Tribes 'Junior partner', Tamil 'Junior partner', Telugu 'Junior partner in 1948

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of India; SideB: Communist Party of India (CPI).

2. SideA: Since the independence in 1947 the Government of India was dominated, with several interruptions, by Congress (in particular during the period of 1947-1989) (Sidharan, 2012: 318-326). Congress was a multi-ethnic party, which traditionally 'marketed itself as a party of the minorities' (Chandra, 2000: 27). Thus, although Hindu have typically dominated
in numerical terms, India’s governments have generally been ethnically heterogeneous. Most of the ethnic minorities were also represented in the parliament. Also note that the national army (which was predominantly Hindu) included substantial number of foot-soldiers and officers from the ethnic minorities (Khalidi, 2001-2002). Therefore, the coding of the following conflicts between Government of India and ethnic minorities should be treated in light of the fact that members of these ethnic minorities could have been represented, to some extent, in the government and the national army.

SideB: CPI did not represent any particular ethnic group. It is known, however, that large part of CPI recruits in the 1948-1951 episode were Telugu-speaking peasants of Telangana—the region where CPI-inspired rebellion took place (e.g., Bhaskaran, 2011: 99; also Ram, 1973). So far, however, I could not find any reliable information on the composition of CPI itself. However, given that it was primarily a communist party and that it did not represent any particular ethnic group, I presume that its composition was heterogeneous in ethnic respect.

3. Given that both sides were ethnically heterogeneous, I presume that SideA included members of ethnic groups constituting SideB (note also that EPR codes Telugu as a ‘Junior Partner’ in 1948).

4. As of now, I have not found any information suggesting that the conflict involved inter-ethnic fighting.

...........................................................................................................................................................

ID: 29

Location:

India

SideBName: Communist Party of India–Marxist-Leninist

Startdate2: 1/1/1969

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB
Category: 3
Uncertainty: 2


Coding description:


2. SideA: See above (ID: 29, year 1948); SideB: CPI-ML did not represent any particular ethnic group. Gupta, however, notes that the vast majority of the party members were Hindu (2007:171). It is also known that CPI-ML in the 1969 episode was joined by Santal tribesmen (e.g., Duyker, 1987). However, concrete data on the composition of the rebels is not available.

3. Thus, SideA included members of ethnic groups constituting SideB.

4. So far, I could not find any information suggesting that the conflict involved inter-ethnic fighting.

ID: 29
Location:

India

SideBName: People’s War Group

Startdate2: 1/1/1990

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB
Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1


Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 33

Location:

**North Yemen**

SideBName: *Opposition Coalition*

Startdate2: 3/1/1948

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Zaydis 'Senior partner', Sunni Shafi'il (Arab) 'Junior partner' in 1948

Coding description:


2. SideA: since the independence from the Ottoman Empire in 1918, North Yemen was ruled by Imam Yahya Muhammad who belonged to Zaidiyah branch of Shia Islam (Zaidism). At
the time of the conflict, the Zaydis dominated the political, social and, probably, the economic, life in North Yemen (Wenner, 1993: 95).

SideB: The opposition to conservative Imam's regime largely came from the progressive elements within the Imam's own circle (among whom was Imam's own son, Amir Sayf al-Islam Ibrahim) (1952: 61) (also note that the cabinet formed after the rebellion included members of Yahya's cabinet, ibid.: 64). It is known, however, that several non-Yemenis, namely, al-Fadil al-Wartalani (Algerian) and Jama Jamil (Iraqi), have significantly contributed to the organization and execution of the rebellion. It is also known that the counter-coup (rebels succeeded to remove Imam and install their power for several weeks) led by Amir Ahmad (another son of Yahya) largely relied on the tribal fighters from the north (ibid.) (also, it is known that Yahya built his army from the northern Zaydi tribes, al-Abdin, 1979:36). However, detailed data on their ethnic characteristics is not available.

This notwithstanding, the fact that the opposition included members of the previous regime (as well as members of the royal family) suggests that neither SideA nor SideB represented any particular ethnic group.

3. No linguistic, racial or religious differences between Government of Yemen and the Opposition Coalition have been identified.

4. There is some information that part of the rebellion forces deserted to the counter-coup army (Khadduri, 1952: 67; al-Abdin, 1979: 45).

ID: 33

Location: North Yemen

SideBName: Royalists

Startdate2: 10/1/1962
Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Zaydis 'Senior partner', Sunni Shafi’i (Arab) 'Junior partner' in 1962

Coding description:


2. SideA: Since the anti-royalist coup in September (1962) – which removed Imam Muhammad al-Badr (son of Imam Yahya Muhammad (see above, ID: 33, year 1948)) – North Yemen was under the rule of republicans who did not represent any particular ethnic group. It is known, however, that Zaydis outnumbered Shafi’is in the cabinet (despite the fact that Zaydis and Shafi’s constituted equal parts of the population (Wenner, 1993: 99)). It is also known that republicans received significant support from Zaydi tribal elements (ibid.: 99, 103). Thus, as Wenner notes, Zaydis 'continued to dominate the political elite of the republic' (ibid.).

SideB: Royalists were led by the deposed Imam Muhammad al-Badr (who was Zaydi). Like his predecessors, al-Badr largely relied on northern Zaydi tribes (Wenner, 1993: 97). Thus, like in the previous episode (see above, ID: 33, year 1948), Zaydis fought on both sides of the conflict, suggesting that the conflict was non-ethnic.

3. Thus, no linguistic, racial or religious differences between Government of Yemen and the Opposition Coalition have been identified.

4. According to Wenner, particular tribes tended to support particular parties to a conflict, but there were also examples of tribes switching their allegiances: 'some tribal confederations found themselves split, with some clans/elements siding with the royalists, and some with the republicans. There are too many instances to tally, moreover, of tribes switching their allegiances, often during the course of the conflict – sometimes for base reasons, sometimes on matters of principle' (ibid.102-103).
ID: 33

Location:

**North Yemen**

SideBName: *National Democratic Front*

Startdate2: 3/1/1979

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Zaydis 'Senior partner', Sunni Shafi'i (Arab) 'Junior partner' in 1979*

**Coding description:**


   SideB: National Democratic Front (NDF) was a union of several leftist organizations which did not represent any ethnic group. Its leadership included both Shafis and Zaydis and it received support in widely-scattered regions of North Yemen (ibid.: 263) (though its main support came from South Yemen and Southern parts of North Yemen which were predominantly Shafi).

3. Thus, no linguistic, racial or religious differences between Government of Yemen and the Opposition Coalition have been identified.

4. As in previous conflicts in North Yemen, government employed tribal Zaydi fighters in its struggle against NDF (Burrowes, 1985: 295).
ID: 33

Location: Yemen

SideBName: *al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula*

Startdate2: 12/17/2009

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data for 2009; EPR data for 2005: Northern Zaydis 'Senior partner', Northern Shafi'i 'Junior partner, Southern Shafi'i 'Junior partner'

Coding description:


2. SideA: Since unification in 1990, Yemen was under the rule of Ali Abdullah Saleh (see above, ID: 33, year 1979) and his General People's Congress. As Poirier points out, 'Since 1997, it almost exclusively controls the state's institutions such as the presidency, the government, parliament and local councils and authorities' (2011: 204). Thus, the political life in Yemen was, once again, largely dominated by Zaydis (see above, ID: 33, year 1979). Though, it is known that Shafis were represented in General People's Congress and the ministerial cabinet (Alley, 2010: 393, 399). The security apparatus was also dominated by Zaydis: 'President Salih, his extended family, and the strong shaykhs of the hashid tribe (those who hold nearly all the command positions in the Yemeni armed forces) share common Zaydi traditions' (Day, 2008: 429). Note, however, that, at the time of this conflict (unlike previously) Zaydi-Shafi divide was not such a salient issue in Yemeni politics (see, for example, Bonnefoy, 2009: 1-2).
SideB: AQAP emerged from the union between two al-Qaeda local branches: al-Qaeda in Yemen and al-Qaeda in Saudi Arabia. AQAPs leadership and membership is primarily Yemeni and Saudi (Barfi, 2010: 1-10). It is known that AQAP recruits include Yemeni tribesmen (The Australian, 2010; Barfi, 2010: 8-10) as well as foreigners (Egyptians, Pakistanis, and Somalis, Barfi, 2010: 10). Thus, AQAP, presumably, does not represent any particular ethnic group.

3. Thus, so far, I could not establish any linguistic, racial or religious differences between Government of Yemen and the AQAP.

........................................................................................................................................................................

ID: 34

Location:

**Myanmar**

SideBName: *Pawngywng National Defense Force*

Startdate2: 1/1/1949

Difference: (1) Language (Burmese vs. Jinghpaw, Maru, Lashi, Zaiwa, Rawang, Lisu) (2)

*Religion (Buddhists vs. Christians, Ethnoreligionists)*

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 2

EPRcodes: *Bamar (Barman) ‘Senior partner’, Kachin ‘Junior partner’, Shan ‘Junior partner’ in 1949*

Coding description:


2. SideA: See above (ID: 23, year 1949); SideB: PNDF was composed of mutinied Kachin soldiers (from Burmese army).
3. SideA: See above (ID: 23, year 1949); SideB: Like Karen (see above, ID: 23, year 1949), Kachin people do not constitute a homogeneous ethnic group. According to Lahtaw (2007: 239; also Grundy-Warr & Dean, 2003: 82), name 'Kachin' is an umbrella term for six linguistic tribes from the northern part of Burma’s Kachin State – Jinghpaw, Lhaovo (Maru), Lachik (Lashi), Zaiwa (Azi), Rawang and Lisu (note, however, that the term ‘Kachin’ is sometimes also used synonymously to Jinghpaw – the main tribe of ‘Kachin people’). Jinghpaw, Maru, Lashi, Zaiwa, Rawang and Lisu are coded as individual languages in Ethnologue. However, as noted in Ethnologue, Jinghpaw serves as a Lingua franca for Zaiwa, Lasi and Maru. Grundy-Warr and Dean also note that Jinghpaw has historically been used in most rituals’ of all six tribes (2003: 82).

According to Lahtaw, Kachins are predominantly Christians (2007: 240). WCD codes the six tribes as follows. Jinghpaw: 58% Christians, 32% Ethnoreligionists (animists) and 10% Buddhists. Maru: 90 % Ethnoreligionists, 6% Affiliated Christians and 4% Agnostics. Lashi: 90% Ethnoreligionists, 9.99% Buddhists and 0.01% affiliated Christians. Zaiwa: 70% Ethnoreligionists, 20% Buddhists, 7% Affiliated Christians and 3% Agnostics. Rawang: 60% Affiliated Christians and 40% Ethnoreligionists. Lisu: 80% Christians and 20% Ethnoreligionists.

There are no racial differences between Bamar and Kachin people.

4. So far (besides the fact that PNDF was composed of Kachin soldiers) I could not find any detailed information on the patterns of confrontation between the parties to the conflict.

ID: 34

Location:

Myanmar

SideBName: Kachin Independence Organization

Startdate2: 2/1/1961
Difference: (1) Language (Burmes vs. Jinghpaw, Maru, Lashi, Zaiwa, Rawang, Lisu) (2) Religion (Buddhists vs. Christians, Ethnoreligionists)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 2

EPRcodes: Bamar (Barman) 'Dominant', Kachin 'Regional autonomy' in 1961

Coding description:

3. SideA: See above (ID: 23, year 1949); SideB: See above (ID: 34, year 1949).
4. No detailed information on the patterns of confrontation between the parties to the conflict has been found so far.

.......................................................... ..........................................................

ID: 36

Location:

Guatemala

SideBName: Military faction

Startdate2: 7/18/1949

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Guatemalans (Mestizo) 'Monopoly' in 1949
Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 36
Location:

*Guatemala*

SideBName: *Forces of Carlos Castillo Armas*

Startdate2: 6/18/1954

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Guatemalans (Mestizo) 'Monopoly' in 1954*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 36
Location:

*Guatemala*

SideBName: *Fuerzas Armadas Rebeldes (Rebel Armed Forces)*

Startdate2: 7/1/1963
Difference: *SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Guatemalans (Mestizo) 'Monopoly' in 1963*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 37

Location:

*Israel*

**SideBName:** *Palestinian insurgents*

**Startdate2:** 1/1/1949

Difference: *(1) Language (Hebrew vs. Arabic) (2) Religion (Jews vs. Muslims)*

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Ashkenazim (Jewish) 'Monopoly', Israeli Arabs 'Discriminated' in 1949*

Coding description:


2. SideA: Government of Israel was dominated by Jewish People; SideB: Palestinian Insurgents were composed of several organizations operating both within the territory of Israel and Palestine areas that Israel did not conquer during the 1948 Arab-Israeli War: Arab Salvation Army, All Palestine Government, The Arab Higher Committee and the Fida'iyyun
group (Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/11/5). These organizations were largely composed of Palestinian people.

3. SideA: Jewish people speak Hebrew and mainly follow Judaism; SideB: Palestinian people are predominantly Arab (Levantine) speaking Muslims.

4. So far, I have not found any reliable information suggesting that the conflict involved intra-Jewish or intra-Arab fighting.

ID: 37

Location:

**Israel**

SideBName: *Harakat al-Tahrir al-Watani al-Filastini (Palestinian National Liberation Movement), Palestinian National Authority*

Startdate2: 11/1/2000

Difference: (1) Language (Hebrew vs. Arabic) (2) Religion (Jews vs. Muslims)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Ashkenazim (Jewish) 'Senior partner', Israeli Arabs 'Regional autonomy', Mizrahim (Jewish) 'Senior partner', Russians (Jewish) 'Junior partner', Palestinian Arabs 'Discriminated' in 2000*

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Israel; Palestinian National Liberation Movement (Fatah), Palestinian National Authority (PNA).

2. SideA: Government of Israel was dominated by Jewish People; SideB: Fatah and PLA represented Palestinian people.
3. SideA: See above (ID: 37, year 1949); SideB: See above (ID: 37, year 1949).

4. So far, I could not find any reliable information suggesting that the conflict involved systematic intra-Jewish or intra-Arab fighting.

..............................................................................................................................................................................................

ID: 39

Location:

*China*

SideBName: Tibet

Startdate2: 10/7/1950

Difference: (1) Language (Mandarin vs. Tibetic Languages) (2) Religion (Heterogeneous vs. Tibetan Buddhists)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Chinese (Han) 'Monopoly', Tibetans 'Separatist autonomy' in 1950

Coding description:


2. SideA: Government of China was dominated by Han Chinese; SideB: ‘Tibet’ represented Tibetan people.

3. SideA: Han Chinese spoke Mandarin and were religiously plural (according to WCD, 38.50% were Agnostics, 21.80% Chinese folk-religionists, 18% Mahayana Buddhists, 10.50% Atheists, 10.40% affiliated Christians (church members), 0.6% Daoists and 0.2% Confucianists.
SideB: Tibetan people spoke a variety of Tibetic languages, which are not always mutually intelligible. However, all Tibetic languages are distinct from Mandarin. The most widely used spoken form of Tibetic Languages has been the Central Tibetan (or Standard Tibetan) which is also currently an official language of the Tibet Autonomous Region. Note that, despite variation in the spoken Tibetic Languages, most Tibetan people shared single writing system (Norbu, 1995: 299).

There are no racial differences between Han Chinese and Tibetan people.

4. So far, I could not find any reliable information suggesting that the conflict involved systematic intra-Chinese or intra-Tibetan fighting.

ID: 39
Location: China
SideBName: Tibet
Startdate2: 5/1/1956

Difference: (1) Language (Mandarin vs. Tibetic Languages) (2) Religion (Heterogeneous vs. Tibetan Buddhists)

Category: 2
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Chinese (Han) 'Monopoly', Tibetans 'Separatist autonomy' in 1956

Coding description:

[This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of China and Tibet – see above]
ID: 39

Location:

China

SideBName: Tibet

Startdate2: 5/1/1959

Difference: (1) Language (Mandarin vs. Tibetic Languages) (2) Religion (Heterogeneous vs. Tibetan Buddhists)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Chinese (Han) 'Monopoly', Tibetans 'Powerless' in 1959

Coding description:

[This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of China and Tibet – see above]

ID: 40

Location:

Indonesia

SideBName: Republic of South Moluccas

Startdate2: 8/5/1950

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 4
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Javanese 'Dominant', Amboinese 'Separatist autonomy in 1950

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Indonesia; SideB: Republic of South Moluccas.

2. SideA: Between 1950 and 1957, Indonesia undergone the so called 'Liberal Democracy Era', during which executive power was exercised by the prime minister and the cabinet (the powers of the president, Sukarno, were, at least formally, limited). Between 20 December 1949 and 6 September 1950, Indonesian government was in the hands of The Republic of the United States of Indonesia Cabinet, which was ethnically heterogeneous (see, Kahin, 1952: 448-449). The Prime Minister, Mohammad Hatta, was a member of Minang – a Minangkabau-speaking, predominantly Muslim ethnic group. Note, however, that half of the Cabinet members were Javanese (Sukarno was Javanese as well) and majority were Muslims. One member of the cabinet was Christian Amboinese (see below) – Johannes Lemena, Minister of Health. Since 7 September 1950 (note that the conflict started on 5 August 1950) Indonesian Government was in the hands of Mohammed Natsir’s (Prime Minister) cabinet, which was similar to the previous cabinet in ethnic respect, though now it included more Christians, two of whom were Amboinese (see below).

Despite the fact that the ministerial cabinets included non-Javanese, it is commonly argued that Javanese have dominated Indonesia's political life since the very independence in 1949, up until now (e.g., Woo, 1988: 342; Lundry, 2009: 407; Woodward, 2008: 45). While it remains unclear whether the Government of Indonesia and Indonesia's political life was de facto dominated by Javanese during the Liberal Democracy Era, it seems, this was largely the case for the post-1957 period, in particular for the period of Suharto's military dictatorship (1967-1998).

Since 1957 (when a martial law was imposed) executive power gradually moved into Sukarno's and his army commander's hands (Hindley, 1962: 915). In 1959 Sukarno took over the post of the Prime Minister and officers of the army were brought into his cabinet – there were 12 army officers in Sukarno's cabinet (Lev, 1963-64: 355). In general, during this period, Sukarno relied on (and balanced between) the army and the Communist Party of
Indonesia (communists also held seats in Sukarno’s cabinet), both of which were predominantly Javanese (Crouch, 2007: Feith, 2009: 64, 117). (Also note that the state bureaucracy was also predominantly Javanese, Lundry, 2009: 61).

Since 1967 (when, General Suharto, also Javanese, took over the power from Sukarno) militaries (with Suharto at the fore) had complete control of the executive and the state: ‘After the elimination of the PKI [Communist Party of Indonesia] and the dismissal of Sukarno, the army’s domination of the government was unchallenged, and in the following years the remaining centers of independent power in the political parties and other civilian organizations were completely subjugated’ (Crouch, 2007: 346). Suharto’s military regime (and thus Javanese dominance) persisted until 1998 (Lundry, 2009:90).

SideB: Republic of South Maluccas was mainly composed of Christian Amboinese, though it received some support from Muslim Amboinese as well (ibid.: 128).

3. SideA: Javanese spoke Javanese and were predominantly Muslim (81%). SideB: Amboinese spoke Amboinese and were predominantly Christians (note, however, that significant number (around one third) of Amboinese were Muslims, Lundry, 2009: 106-107)

4. The conflict involved systematic intra-ethnic fighting. Indonesian army was predominantly Javanese. Javanese have always dominated Indonesian army. It is estimated that in 1960s some 60 to 80% of the army officers were Javanese (Crouch, 2007: 37). In 1990s, the proportion of Javanese among army officers was even higher (McElhatton, 2008: Footnote 15).

Republic of South Molucca’s troops were predominantly Christian Amboinese (who had been demobilized from the Royal Netherlands East Indies Army Amboinese Soldiers (Lundry, 2009: 103). Yet, it is known, that during the 1950-1951 episode, significant part (one battalion) of Indonesia forces fighting against the Republic of South Moluccas were Christian Amboinese (ibid.: 130). It seems therefore that the conflict was of non-ethnic nature. This is also suggested by the fact that large part of the local Amboinese population (both Muslim and Christian), including Amboinese leaders, supported the (pro-Indonesian) Republican camp (ibid.: 101-133). Also note (see above) that the Government of Indonesia included Amboinese ministers. In short, while the division between Amboinese Christians and
Amboinese Muslims, as well as the division between Amboinese and Javanese played some role in the conflict, the issue at stake was of more political nature – the division between Republican/Nationalist camp (those supporting the idea of Moluccas within a unitary state of Indonesia) and the Separatist camp (those supporting independent Moluccas), both of which had their supporters among local Amboinese.

ID: 43
Location:

**Thailand**

SideBName: *Military faction (navy)*

Startdate2: 6/30/1951

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Thai 'Dominant' in 1951*

Coding description:


2. SideA: Government of Thailand was dominated by Thai (e.g., Suwannathat-Pian, 2008: 161; Kiong & Bun, 2001: 20); SideB: Military Faction was composed of Thailand's navy officers and soldiers.

The conflict took place between Thailand's navy faction on the one hand and army and police subordinate to the Government of Thailand on the other (Fineman, 1997: Chapter Seven).

3. Thus, neither side represented any particular ethnic groups.
ID: 43

Location:

**Thailand**

SideBName: *Communist Party of Thailand*

Startdate2: 10/1/1974

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Thai 'Senior partner', Chinese 'Junior partner' in 1974*

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Thailand; SideB: Communist Party of Thailand (CPT)

2. SideA: See above (ID: 43, year 1951); SideB: CPT had its base in several regions of Thailand (North, Northeast and South) and was ethnically diverse (Heaton, 1982: 782). The leadership was predominantly Chinese (Girling, 1984: 385-403; van de Kroef, 1976: 96), but also included Thai (e.g., Ettinger, 2007: 669; Reeves, 1987: 941). It is also known that CPI recruits included Thai (e.g., de Beer, 1978: 147).

3. Thus, CPT included members of ethnic group (i.e. Thai) which dominated the Government of Thailand.

ID: 45

Location:
**Cuba**

SideBName: *Cuban Revolution Movement (Fidelistas)*

**Startdate2:** 7/26/1953

**Difference:** *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

**Category:** 3

**Uncertainty:** 1

**EPRcodes:** *Whites 'Dominant' in 1953*

**Coding description:**

[Currently unavailable]

---

**Cuba**

SideBName: *Cuban Revolution Movement (Fidelistas)*

**Startdate2:** 12/5/1956

**Difference:** *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

**Category:** 3

**Uncertainty:** 1

**EPRcodes:** *Whites 'Dominant' in 1956*

**Coding description:**

[Currently unavailable]
ID: 45

Location:

**Cuba**

SideBName: *Cuban Revolutionary Council*

Startdate2: 4/17/1961

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Whites 'Irrelevant', Blacks 'Irrelevant' in 1961*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 46

Location:

**Indonesia**

SideBName: *Darul Islam (Islamic State)*

Startdate2: 1/1/1953

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 2

EPRcodes: Javanese 'Dominant' in 1953

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Indonesia; SideB: Darul Islam.

2. SideA: See above (ID: 40, year 1950): SideB: Darul Islam was an Islamist movement aimed at establishing Islamic State and installing sharia law for all Indonesia (Aspinall, 2007: 249). It was a universalistic movement which did not represent any particular ethnic group (Ibid: 251). The founder and leader of Darul Islam was Javanese (Kartosuwirjo) (Fealy, 2004: 111). Note, however, that Darul Islam's stronghold (as well as place of origin) was West Java, where Sundanese were the largest ethnic group (with Javanese being the second). Also note that Darul Islam's rebellion was joined by rebels operating in largely non-Javanese areas (e.g., Aceh or West Kalimantan) (Lundry, 2009: 66-84).

3. So far, however, I could not find any reliable information confirming that parties to a conflict represented any particular linguistic, religious or racial groups.

4. I have also found no information suggesting that the conflict was fought along ethnic lines.

ID: 46

Location: Indonesia

SideBName: Darul Islam (Islamic State), Permesta Movement, Pemerintah Revolusioner Republik Indonesia (Revolutionary Government of the Indonesian Republic)

Startdate2: 1/1/1958

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified
Category: 3
Uncertainty: 2
EPRcodes: Javanese 'Dominant' in 1958

Coding description:


3. Given that SideB included Darul Islam (see above), I presume that the conflict was of non-ethnic nature (i.e., SideB included members of ethnic group constituting SideA).

4. So far, I have not found any reliable information on the patterns of confrontation between parties to a conflict.

.............................................................................................................................................................................

ID: 50

Location:

Argentina

SideBName: Military faction (forces of Eduardo A. Lonardi Doucet)

Startdate2: 6/16/1955

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Argentinians 'Monopoly' in 1955

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]
ID: 50

Location:

Argentina

SideBName: Military faction (Colorados)

Startdate2: 4/2/1963

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Argentinians 'Monopoly' in 1963

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 50

Location:

Argentina

SideBName: Ejército revolucionario del pueblo (People’s Revolutionary Army)

Startdate2: 8/11/1974

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Argentinians 'Monopoly' in 1974

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 52

Location:

**South Vietnam**

SideBName: *Front national de libération* (*National Liberation Front*)

Startdate2: 4/1/1955

Difference: *SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB*

Category: 4

Uncertainty: 4

EPRcodes: Kihn (Vietnamese) 'Dominant' in 1955

Coding description:


It is not clear which conflict UCDP/PRIO refers here to. UCDP/PRIO codes the start of conflict as April 1955 (the coding precision is set to '3' which means that the month and the year are coded precisely). The problem is that NLF was not established until 20 December 1960 (Cima, 1989: Chapter One: Second Indochina War). While the residue of Viet Minh communists operated in South Vietnam after the Geneva Accord in 1954, to my knowledge, before 1959 there were no serious military encounters between communists and the Government (see, for example, Gravel, 1971: 314-346).
There was another conflict in South Vietnam at the time – exactly in April 1955 the Battle of Saigon took place (the first military encounter took place on 31 March 1955) – a conflict, which was fought, in the initial phase, between Government of South Vietnam and Binh-Xuye (Fall, 1955: 252).

2. SideA: In 1955, Government of South Vietnam was (de facto) in the hands of Ngo Dinh Diem (who was the prime minister since June 1954) and his family members (Sacks, 1967: 516; also Jacobs, 2010: 154) – the so called 'Ngo clan'. In October 1955 Diem assumed the position of Chief of State and by doing so completely deposed the Emperor Bao Dai from power (who, until October 1955 (note that conflict started in April 1955), had still played some role in the executive being himself the Chief of State).

Diem was a devout (or even fanatical) Christian (Roman Catholic) (Jacobs, 2001: 599-601). His family members were Christians as well (Jacobs, 2004: 28). It is known that 'government shamelessly favoured Catholics: a disproportionate share of U.S. aid went to [catholic] refugees [fleeing from the North Vietnam]; Northern Catholics held privileged positions in the Vietnamese National Army (VNA) and state bureaucracy'(Jacobs, 2001: 619) (see also Gunn & Slighoua, 2011: 47). Thus, it seems that the Government was dominated by Christians, who composed only 10% of total Vietnam's population at the time (ibid.: 612). It is also known that Buddhists, who were the majority in South Vietnam (figures range from 70% to 85%, e.g., Roberts, 1965: 242) were discriminated under Diem's dictatorship (ibid.).

It is also known, however, that Buddhists were not excluded from the executive. For example, on 19 November 1954, Diem appointed Nguyen Van Vy the Chief of Staff of NVA (Jacobs, 2006: 67), who was a Buddhist. Several key figures in the NVA were Buddhists as well. For example, general Duong Van Minh (who was the Minister of Defence in Diem's cabinet until late March in 1955, and who led the NVA in the battle of Saigon) or general Tran Van Don (who was at one point appointed Chief of Staff of the NVA). Diem's cabinet also included Buddhists: Tran Van Do (foreign minister), as well as the above mentioned Doung Van Minh were Buddhists. I cannot, however, confirm with certainty the proportions of Christians and Buddhists in the executive. I also cannot ascertain their de facto power.

In racial and linguistic respect, SideA was predominantly Vietnamese (Diem and the 'Ngo clan' were Vietnamese). In general, since 1954, South Vietnam was in the hands of
Vietnamese elite (e.g., Cima, 1989: Chapter 2: Society in the 1954-75 period: South Vietnam). It is also known that ethnic minorities – not just Buddhists – were systematically discriminated under Diem's dictatorship (ibid.).

SideB: If UCDP/PRIO refers here to the Battle of Saigon, then SideB was composed of Binh-Xuye – an organized crime enterprise or – as Crozier puts it – 'a band of near gangsters of whom the Prime Minister [i.e., Diem] disapproved because of their unsavoury connections with gambling and prostitution' (1955: 51). The leader of Binh-Xuye was half Chinese, half Vietnamese. So far, I could not establish what the composition of the Binh-Xuye troops was. However, it seems that it did not represent any particular linguistic or religious group: 'Although the Binh Huyen often is spoken of as a "sect", it has no religious basis. Headed by a gang of ex-river pirates, it can only be described as "Murder, Inc." (Grant, 1956: 439). And, given the fact that Binh-Xuyen consisted of some 5 000 troops (Crozier, 1955: 51), it must have included significant number of Vietnamese of whom, as noted above, majority where Buddhists.

If UCDP/PRIO refers here to the initial phase of the conflict between communists in South Vietnam and the Government, then NLF was made of the residue of the Viet Minh (e.g., Gravel, 1971: 134-346), whose most members were Vietnamese Buddhists (Jacobs, 2001: 606.).

3. Thus (regardless which conflict the UCDP/PRIO refers here to) SideA must have included members of ethnic group constituting SideB. The coding, however, remains ambiguous. As shown above, Christians were favoured over Buddhists within the Government and thus, it is likely, that the former were dominating over the latter. On the other hand, even if Buddhists were dominated (and discriminated) by Christians, their members held some of the key positions in the executive and thus have significantly contributed to the fighting effort again the SideB, which (whether NLF or Binh Xuyen) included Vietnamese Buddhists as well.

4. If UCDP/PRIO refers here to the Battle of Saigon, then the conflict, in the initial phase was largely limited to the confrontation between NVA soldiers and Binh Xuyen troops (Fall, 1955: 252).
India

SideBName: Naga Nationalist Council

Startdate2: 1/1/1956

Difference: (2) Religion (Heterogeneous vs. Christians)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1


Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of India; SideB: Naga Nationalist Council (NNC).

2. SideA: See above (ID: 29); SideB: NNC represented Naga people – an amalgamation of various tribes inhabiting the territories of the north eastern India's states: Nagaland, Manipur, Asam and Arunachal Pradesh (as well as the territories of Burma's Sagaing Division and Kachin state) (Baruah, 2003: 322).

3. SideA: See above (ID: 29, year 1948); SideB: Naga people did not constitute a homogeneous ethnic group. They have no common language. Naga tribes (there are at least 40 tribes among Nagas (e.g., Thong, 2010: 595)) speak at least 30 different languages which fall into at least two completely distinct branches of Tibeto-Burman (Burling, 2003: 172) and which are not always mutually intelligible (Eaton, 1997: 249). Yet, the vast majority of Nagas
are Christians (the numbers for 1990s range between 90 to 95%, see, for example, Barua, 2003: 328). Note, however, that Nagas started systematic conversion to Christianity just in the second half of the 20th century; therefore, the per cent of Christians among Nagas could have been considerably lower in the 1950s than in the 1990s. It is known, for example, that in 1981 there were just 80% of Christians among Nagas (Thong, 2010: 602) – 10% less than in the 1990s. While there is no exact numbers of Christians among Nagas in 1950s, is it very likely that NNC was predominantly Christian, given that its predecessor, the Naga Club, was composed mainly of Christians (Goswami, 2007: 287-288).

There were no racial differences between Naga people and ethnically heterogeneous
Government of India.

4. In early 1956 (when the actual conflict started), two divisions of the Indian Army and 35 battalions of the Assam Rifles (paramilitary forces) were deployed in the Naga areas to confront the NNC rebels (Mullik, 1972: 312-314). The recruits of Assam Rifles were drafted from all India and, therefore, like the National Army, were heterogeneous in ethnic respect. I could not establish, however, what was the precise composition of the SideA military forces in 1956. I could, however, identify that in the later stages of the conflict (1960s and 1970s) government largely relied on Sikh troops in the conflict against NNC (Khalidi, 2001-2002: 547-548). In fact, Indian government always employed 'alien' troops to deal with ethnic rebellions (ibid.). There is evidence that Army troops in Nagaland were indeed 'alien': 'Unfamiliar with both the terrain and the populace, the Indian Army faced a number of difficulties in its initial operations [in 1956]' (Rajagopalan, 2007: 84).

Note that in the later stages of the conflict there were some intra-Naga fighting, see Goswami (2007) for details. However, it is not clear whether Naga factions fought each other independently or as allies of the government.
India

SideBName: National Socialist Council of Nagaland – Isaac-Muivah faction

Startdate2: 8/5/1992

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Tangkhul) (2) Religion (Heterogeneous vs. Christians)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1


Coding description:


2. SideA: See above (ID: 29, year 1948); SideB: NSCN was an offshoot of the NNC (see above), composed of Nagas who refused surrendering their arms after the Shillong Accord (1975), according to which NNC agreed to terminate their military activities. In 1988 NSCN split into two factions NSCN-IM (lead by Isaac C. Swu and T. Muivah) and NSCN-K (lead by S.S. Khaplang). NSCN-IM, right after the split, was dominated by Tangkhul tribesmen while NSCN-K by Konyak (Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/11/15; also Hussain, 2008: 550).

3. SideA: See above (ID: 29, year 1948); SideB: Tangkhul spoke Tangkhul language and were predominantly Christians (86% according to WCD).

4. So far, I could not find any reliable information suggesting that the conflict involved intra-ethnic fighting.
ID: 54

Location:

**India**

SideBName: National Socialist Council of Nagaland – Isaac-Muivah faction


Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Tangkhul) (2) Religion (Heterogeneous vs. Christians)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1


Coding description:

[This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of India and NSCN-IM – see above]

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

ID: 54

Location:

**India**

SideBName: National Socialist Council of Nagaland – Khaplang faction
Startdate2: 1/23/2005

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Tangkhul) (2) Religion (Heterogeneous vs. Christians)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1


Coding description:


2. SideA: See above (ID: 29, year 1948); SideB: NSCN-K was dominated by Konyak tribe (see above, ID: 54, year 1992).

3. SideA: See above (ID: 29, year 1948); SideB: Konyak spoke Konyak language and were predominantly Christian (99% according to WCD).

4. So far, I could not find any reliable information suggesting that the conflict involved intra-ethnic fighting.

ID: 56

Location: Myanmar

SideBName: Karenni National Progressive Party
Startdate2: 1/1/1957

Difference: (1) Language (Burmese vs. Karenni Languages) (2) Religion (Buddhist vs. Christians)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Bamar (Barman) 'Senior partner', Kachins 'Junior partner', Shan 'Junior partner', Kayin (Karens) 'Separatist autonomy' in 1957 (note that EPR does not distinguish between Karens and Karenni)

Coding description:


2. SideA: See above (ID: 23, year 1949); KNPP represented Karenni people (also called Red Karen), who are closely related to Karen people (see above, ID: 23, year 1949). Like Karen, Karenni people were not a homogeneous ethnic group. Indeed, as Grundy-Warr & Dean argue, 'Karenni identity is more of a spatial political label than one that adequately covers all the various distinctive ethnic communities in the territory' (2003: 82). There are at least seven sub-groups within Karenni: the Keku, the Kayah, the Bre, the Yangtalai, the Geba, the Zayein and the Paku. Keku (Geko), Bre (Brek), Yangtalai (Yintale), Geba, Zayein and Paku are listed as individual languages in Ethnologue, while Kayah as a group of five individual languages (Manumanaw, Yinbaw, Yintale, Eastern Kayah and Western Kayah). Note that these languages are distinct from Burmese.

Karenni people were predominantly Christians and Animists: Keku – 70% and 30% (respectively); Bre – 80% and 20%; Yangtalai – 5% and 45% (50% Buddhists); Geba – 80% and 20%; Zayen – 20% and 50% (30% Buddhists); Paku – 25% and 75%; Manumanaw – 80% and 20%; Yinbaw – 30% and 30% (40% Buddhists); Eastern Kayah – 25% and 75%; Western Kayah – 25% and 75%. It is also known that KNPP itself was predominantly Christian (Horstmann, 2011: 96).

There are no racial differences between Burmese and Karenni people.
4. It is known that KNPLF (a splinter group from KNPP) fought KNPP on several occasions (International Crisis Group, 2003: 5). There is also some evidence that in later stages of the conflict (in 2005 episode, see below) KNPLF helped the Government to confront KNPP (Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/11/16). However, the information on this is rather fragmented – so far, I could not confirm what was the scale of the KNPLF collaboration with the government and thus whether there was any systematic intra-Karenni fighting.

ID: 56
Location: Myanmar

SideBName: Karenni National Progressive Party
Startdate2: 1/1/1987
Difference: (1) Language (Burmese vs. Karenni Languages) (2) Religion (Buddhists vs. Christians)
Category: 2
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Bamar (Barman) 'Dominant', Kayin (Karens) 'Separatist autonomy' in 1987 (note that EPR does not distinguish between Karens and Karenni)

Coding description:

[This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of Myanmar and KNPP – see above]
Myanmar

SideBName: Karenni National Progressive Party

Startdate2: 1/1/1992

Difference: (1) Language (Burmese vs. Karenni Languages) (2) Religion (Buddhists vs. Christians)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Bamar (Barman) 'Dominant', Kayin (Karens) 'Separatist autonomy' in 1992 (note that EPR does not distinguish between Karens and Karenni)

Coding description:

[This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of Myanmar and KNPP – see above]

ID: 56

Location:

Myanmar

SideBName: Karenni National Progressive Party

Startdate2: 1/1/1996

Difference: (1) Language (Burmese vs. Karenni Languages) (2) Religion (Buddhists vs. Christians)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1
EPRcodes: Bamar (Barman) 'Dominant', Kayin (Karens) 'Separatist autonomy' in 1996 (note that EPR does not distinguish between Karens and Karenni)

Coding description:

This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of Myanmar and KNPP – see above

ID: 56
Location:

Myanmar

SideBName: Karenni National Progressive Party

Startdate2: 1/16/2005

Difference: (1) Language (Burmese vs. Karenni Languages) (2) Religion (Buddhists vs. Christians)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Bamar (Barman) 'Dominant', Kayin (Karens) 'Separatist autonomy' in 2005 (note that EPR does not distinguish between Karens and Karenni)

Coding description:

This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of Myanmar and KNPP – see above

ID: 61
Location:

2. SideA: Since 18th century up until now, Oman was under the rule of Sultans of Al Bu Sa’id family. It is important to note, however, that until the second half of the 20th century, their power over the interior Oman was only nominal (Sultans' de facto control was limited to Muscat and the coastal areas). The interior was in the hands of the Imamate of Oman (for details, see Wilkinson, 1971). Al Bu Sa’idis are Arab Ibadis (a sect of Islam distinct both from Sunni and Shia) (Peterson, 2004: 32, Footnote 1).

SideB: State of Oman/Free Oman was led by Talib bin Ali Hinai, a brother of Ghalib bin Ali al-Hinai, the Imam of the above-mentioned Imamate of Oman. Imamate of Oman was dominated by Arab Ibadi as well. It is known, in general, that both, the Sultanate and the Imamate controlled Ibadi dominated regions of Oman (Wilkinson, 1971: 368).

3. Arab Ibadis speak Arabic and, as mentioned above, follow Ibadi Islam.

4. Talib forces consisted of Omani expatriates living in Saudi Arabia (Meagher, 1985: Chapter 3). The rebels were eventually joined by sheikh Suleiman bin Himyar – the leader of the 15 000 strong Bani Riyam tribe (ibid.) (predominantly Ibadi). Sultans forces were predominantly Baluchi (the largest non-Arab minority in Oman) led by British officers (ibid.; also Peterson, 2004: 35; and Metz, 1994: Chapter 7: Oman: Organization and Equipment of the Armed Forces) (Sultan's forces were eventually joined by British foot soldiers). It turns out, thus,
that the military confrontation took place largely between different ethnic groups (i.e., Baluchi and British versus Talib led Omani (so far, I could not establish their linguistic and religious affiliation) and Bani Riyam tribesmen who were mainly Ibadi). Note, however, that the leadership of both sides (which, as mentioned above, was Arab Ibadi), participated in the fighting as well (Meagher, 1985: Chapter 3). Hereby, I code the conflict as non-ethnic, using ethnicity of the leadership as a main criterion.

ID: 62

Location:

**Iraq**

SideBName: *Military Faction (Free Officers Movement)*

Startdate2: 7/14/1958

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Sunni Arabs 'Senior partner', Shi'a Arabs 'Junior partner', Kurds 'Powerless' in 1958*

Coding description:


2. SideA: since the independence in 1932 (up until 1958), Iraqi government was in the hands of Hashemite Monarchs. In 1958, when the conflict started, Iraq was under the rule of King Faisal II. Hashemite Monarchs, including Faisal II, were Sunni Arabs. It is known that Iraq politics under Hashemites were dominated by Sunni Arabs: the executive, the administration and the army were predominantly Sunni Arabs (Wimmer, 2003: 114-115; also Batatu, 1978: 765).
In 1958, the Free Officers Movement staged a coup (see below), removed the royal family from power and formed the new executive. The newly formed executive was ethnically heterogeneous. Qasim's (the leader of the Free Officers Movement, and the prime minister of Iraq in 1958-1963) cabinets included Arab Sunnis, Arab Shias and Kurdish (ibid.: 812-813, 844-845). The Sovereignty Council, which was established to exercise the functions of the Presidency of the Republic, was composed of one Arab Sunnite, one Arab Shi'ite and one Kurdish. Qasim himself (who was the dominant figure in the executive) was of mixed Arab and Kurdish descent. However, the Commander’s Council (which was a military institution that played a significant role in the executive) was predominantly Arab Sunni (810-811). Qasim’s rule was ended in 1963 by a military coup (see below).

Between 1968 and 2003 Iraq was under the rule of Arab Socialist Ba’ath Party. Originally, Iraqi Ba’athists were ethnically heterogeneous. However, by 1968, the party was dominated by Arab Sunnis: 'out of the total of fifty-three members of the top command that led the party from November 1963 to 1970, 84.9 % were Sunni Arabs, 5.7 % Shi’a Arabs, and 7.5 % Kurds, whereas for the period 1952-November 1963, the comparable figures were 38.5; 53.8; and 7.7 %. A similar process appears to have taken place in the intermediate and lower layers of the ‘active membership’ (ibid.: 1078). Under the Ba’ath rule, the dominance of Sunni Arabs in Iraq only increased, reaching its peak under Saddam Hussein (1978-2003) (Katz, 2007: 116).

SideB: Most of the Free Officers Movement were Arab Sunnis as well (Batatu, 1978: 788; also Eppel, 2004: 152).

3. Thus, SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB.

4. The conflict was a one-day military coup during which the King and other members of the Royal family were killed. The coup did not involve any inter-ethnic fighting and killing (e.g., Batatu, 1978: 800-803). As a matter of fact, 'A few rounds of shelling had sufficed to shake it down [the monarchy]. Except for the feeble resistance of the guard at Nuri's [the prime minister] house, not a hand had been lifted in its defense' (ibid.: 803). Note, however, that the coup was followed by mass mob violence – the mobs were formed by people supporting the anti-royalist side (so far, I could not establish their ethnic composition).
ID: 62

Location:

Iraq

SideBName: Military faction (forces of Abd as-Salam Arif), National Council of the Revolutionary Command

Startdate2: 2/8/1963

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Sunni Arabs 'Senior partner', Shi'a Arabs 'Junior partner', Kurds 'Separatist autonomy' in 1963

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Iraq; SideB: Military faction (forces of Abd as-Salam Arif), National Council of the Revolutionary Command.

2. SideA: the Government of Iraq was in the hands of Qasim's regime (see above, ID: 62, year 1958), which was ethnically heterogeneous (i.e., composed of Sunni Arabs, Shia Arabs, and Kurdish).

SideB: The conflict was a military coup organized, essentially, by the Iraqi Ba'athists (Batatu, 1978: 966), who's leadership during the first hours of the coup (the morning of 8 February 1963) styled themselves over the radio as the 'National Council of the Revolutionary Command themselves' (ibid.: 975). The leadership of the Ba'ath party at the time of the coup was composed of Shia and Sunni Arabs (ibid.: 968). The general membership of the party, in 1963, was also predominantly Shia and Sunni Arab (see above, ID: 62, year 1958).
3. Thus, SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB.

4. The evidence on the patterns of confrontation between parties to the conflict suggests that the conflict was of non-ethnic nature (e.g., ibid.: 974-994, especially 983-985).

ID: 62
Location: Iraq

SideBName: Supreme Council for the Islamic Revolution in Iraq
Startdate2: 8/1/1982
Difference: (2) Religion (Sunnis vs. Shias)
Category: 1
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Sunni Arabs 'Monopoly', Shi'a Arabs 'Powerless' in 1982

Coding description:
2. SideA: Government of Iraq was dominated by Sunni Arabs (see above, ID: 62, year 1958); SideB: SCIRI was founded in Iran to organize Shia resistance to Saddam's regime (Pirnie & Edward, 2008: 31; Uppsala Conflict Data Program (2012/11/20).
3. Thus, the conflict was waged between Sunni Arabs and Shia Arabs. There were no linguistic or racial differences between the parties to the conflict.
4. So far, I have not found any information suggesting that confrontation between parties to a conflict involved intra-ethnic fighting.
ID: 62
Location:

*Iraq*

SideBName: *Supreme Council for the Islamic Revolution in Iraq*

Startdate2: 1/1/1987

Difference: (2) *Religion (Sunnis vs. Shias)*

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Sunni Arabs 'Monopoly', Shi'a Arabs 'Powerless' in 1987*

Coding description:

[This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of Iraq and SCIRI – see above]

ID: 62
Location:

*Iraq*

SideBName: *Supreme Council for the Islamic Revolution in Iraq*

Startdate2: 1/1/1991

Difference: (2) *Religion (Sunnis vs. Shias)*

Category: 1
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Sunni Arabs 'Monopoly’, Shi’a Arabs 'Powerless' in 1991

Coding description:

[This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of Iraq and
SCIRI – see above]

ID: 62

Location: Iraq

SideBName: Jaish al-Mahdi (Al-Mahdi Army), Ansar al-Islam (Supporters of Islam), Jama’at
Al-Tawhid wa Al-Jihad (The Monotheism and Jihad Group)


Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 3

EPRcodes: Sunni Arabs 'Powerless', Shi’a Arabs 'Senior partner', Kurds 'Junior partner' in
2004

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 63

Location:
Lebanon

SideBName: Independent Nasserite Movement/Mourabitoun militia

Startdate2: 5/15/1958

Difference: (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Maronite Christians 'Senior partner', Sunnis (Arab) 'Senior partner', Armenian Orthodox 'Junior partner', Druze 'Junior partner', Eastern Orthodox Christians 'Junior partner', Greek Catholics 'Junior partner', Shi’a Muslims (Arab) Junior Partner in 1958

Coding description:


2. SideA: According to the so-called National Pact (an unwritten agreement between Christian and Muslims leaders, which came into being in 1943 – the year of the independence from France), political power in Lebanon was to be proportionally distributed among recognized religious groups (mainly Maronite Christians, Sunnis, Shias and Druze). The National Pact also stipulated that the three top government positions should be distributed as follows: the president should be a Maronite; the prime minister, a Sunni; and the speaker of the Chamber of Deputies (the parliament), a Shia. The ratio of the parliament members was to be six Christians to five Muslims (including Druze) (Collelo, 1989: Chapter 1: World War II and Independence, 1939-41).

The National Pact was formally upheld during the year of conflict (1958), and thus the government was formally ethnically heterogeneous. However, during the presidency of Camille Chamoun, the balance of religious groups in the executive was altered in favour of Christians: 'Christians, alleging their numerical superiority, occupied the highest offices in the state and filled a disproportionate number of civil service positions' (ibid.: Chapter 1: Independent Lebanon, 1943-76: The Shamun Era, 1952-58; see also Uppsala Conflict Data
Program (2012/11/21)). The parliament was also dominated by Christians after the 1957 elections, which, according to UCDP/PRIO, did not occur without Chamoun's gerrymandering (ibid.). Finally, it is known that the de facto power, at the time, was largely in the hands of Chamoun (Salibi, 1961: 34), a Maronite Christian.

SideB: INM claimed that their struggle had no sectarian basis. However, its composition - at least in the later stages – was entirely Muslim: 45% Sunni, 45 % Shia and 10% Druze (data of 1987 – Collelo, 1989: Chapter 4: Political Parties and Groupings: Independent Nasserite Movement).

3. Thus, SideA and SideB largely represented different religious communities (i.e., Christians and Muslims). There were no linguistic or racial differences between the parties to a conflict.

4. The conflict started in May 1958, when Muslim elite called for open revolt and security forces subordinate to Chamoun responded with widespread repression (Uppsala Conflict Data Program (2012/11/21)). It is known that Chamoun attempted to deploy the Lebanese Army (which included both, Christians and Muslims), but could not: 'The Lebanese army, commanded by General Fuad Chehab, was ordered to quell the insurrection; but the general was reluctant. In response to Government pressure, he agreed to contain the insurrection by purely defensive action without attempting to crush it' (Salibi, 1958: 370). Thus, Chamoun was forced to rely on his security forces and Christian militiamen. The militias included so-called Phalanges and Syrian Socialist Nationalist Party (SSNP) both of which were predominantly Christian (ibid.: 374; Collelo, 1989: Appendix B). It seems thus that the conflict was primarily limited to the Christian-Muslims clashes.

UCDP/PRIO notes that 'The fighting cannot be said to have been carried out purely along confessional lines though, as several Christian militias fought each other during the approximately five months of battles, as did Muslim groups of differing clan- and political loyalties' (Uppsala Conflict Data Program (2012/11/21)). However, UCDP/PRIO does not provide any sources supporting this, neither it indicates what the scale of intra-Christian or intra-Muslim fighting was (or what their role was in the conflict between Chamoun forces and INM). So far, thus, I could not find any reliable information confirming that conflict involved intra-ethnic fighting.
ID: 63

Location:

**Lebanon**

SideBName: *Lebanese National Movement*

Startdate2: 9/2/1975

Difference: *SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Maronite Christians 'Senior partner', Sunnis (Arab) 'Senior partner', Armenian Orthodox 'Junior partner, Druze 'Junior partner', Eastern Orthodox Christians 'Junior partner', Greek Catholics 'Junior partner', Shi’a Muslims (Arab) Junior Partner in 1975*

Coding description:


2. *SideA: The conditions introduced in the National Pact were formally upheld during the years of the Lebanese Civil War (1975-1989) as well; thus, during the first year of the conflict, Lebanese Government was formally ethnically heterogeneous (see above, ID: 63, year 1958). Note, however, that Lebanese Government cannot, in precise terms, be regarded as representing SideA, as the members of the same cabinet at most times contained elements of some or all of the parties fighting each other (Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/11/22). Indeed, UCDP/PRIO notes that it does not regard the entire Lebanese Government as constituting one party to a conflict (i.e., SideA). Instead, it specifies that SideA, in this particular episode (at the outbreak of conflict in 1975), is regarded as represented by the following actors: 'President Frangieh, the militias under his control (the Zghorta Liberation Army) and the national forces of the army, police, and gendarmerie. On*
the side of the status quo [i.e., the government] can also be found the forces of such politicians as Pierre Gemayel (the Phalangists) and Camille Chamoun (the National Liberal Party and its 'Tigers' militia). The latter groups are, however, not representatives of the government at this stage’ (ibid.).

SideA was predominantly Christian. The president and his Zghorta Liberation Army (also called Marada Brigade) were Christians (Makdisi & Sadaka, 2005: 63). The army and the security forces, at the start of the conflict, included both Christians and Muslims (see above). Gemayel and his Phalangists, as well as Chamoun and his 'Tigers' were all Christians (Salibi, 1958: 374; Collelo, 1989: Appendix B).

SideB: According to UCDP/PRIO, SideB, in 1975, was 'Kamal Jumblatt's Lebanese National Movement (LNM), an umbrella group including parties such as the Druze-based Progressive Socialist Party (PSP) of Jumblatt himself, the Independent Nasserite Organization (or Mourabituoun, one of the main rebel groups of the 1958 crisis), the Syrian Social Nationalist Party (SSNP) and the Lebanese Communist Party (LCP), to mention just a few of the larger groups. Several Palestinian organizations also joined the LNM, such as the PFLP (Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine) and the DFLP (Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine). The PLO - the largest Palestinian group - was never a member, but at times supported the LNM in combat' (Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/11/22).

The majority of LNM members were Muslims: PSP was predominantly Druze; Independent Nasserite Organization was mainly Muslim; Palestinian organizations (PFLP and DFLP) were Muslim as well. However, two significant units within LNM were Christian: LCP, a 3000-strong organization, was composed of Orthodox and Armenian Christians; SSNP, an organization of the same size (which in the 1958 episode fought on the side of Chamoun and Christians, see above) was Christian as well (Collelo, 1989: Appendix B).

3. Thus, while this conflict has often been portrayed as an exemplary case of 'sectarian' conflict (i.e., Christians versus Muslims), it appears that members of the same religious community (i.e., Christians) were represented on both sides of the conflict. There were no linguistic or racial differences between the parties to a conflict.
4. Exactly the first clashes between Zghorta Liberation Army (which, as mentioned above, was primarily Christian) and LNM (which, as noted above, included substantial proportion of Christians) in early September are treated as the start of the conflict by UCDP/PRIO. Thus, initial stages of conflict involved intra-Christian fighting.

The conflict was eventually (mid-September) joined by the Lebanese Army and Security forces. While it is known that the army split along religious lines in January, 1976 (into the Christian-Led Lebanese Army (LA) and the Muslim Lebanese Arab Army (LAA)) (Collelo, 1989: Chapter 5: The 1975 Civil War: The Early Stages of Combat), I could not establish with certainty what was its role in the initial phase of the conflict and whether Muslim units of the army (Lebanese Army included both, Christians and Muslims, see above) were used to confront the LNM in late 1975.


ID: 63

Location: Lebanon

SideBName: Lebanese National Movement

Startdate2: 9/1/1982

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1
EPRcodes: Maronite Christians 'Senior partner', Sunnis (Arab) 'Senior partner', Armenian Orthodox 'Junior partner', Druze 'Junior partner', Eastern Orthodox Christians 'Junior partner', Greek Catholics 'Junior partner', Shi'a Muslims (Arab) Junior Partner in 1982

Coding description:


2. SideA: During the 1982 episode, UCDP/PRIO views the government (and thus SideA) as 'being controlled by Bashir Gemayel (son of Pierre Gemayel, the leader of Phalangists, see above, ID: 63, year 1975) in his position as the President of Lebanon. As the LF's forces were also under his command those troops are viewed as being an extended arm of the government' (Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/11/25).

LF – Lebanese Front – an umbrella organization for the main right-wing Christian parties and militias established in early 1976 to counter the LNM. The core of LF was composed of Phalangists, NLP and Zghorta Liberation Army (see above, ID: 63, year 1975). LF possessed its own Christian militia, the Lebanese Forces. In 1982, when the conflict erupted, LF was largely under control of Phalangists with Bashir Gemayel at the fore.

As it was mentioned above (ID: 63, year 1975, Step 2, SideA) Phalangists, LNM and Zghorta Liberation Army were predominantly Christian (Bashir Gemayel was Christian as well).

SideB: while the composition of LNM had somewhat changed since 1975, its main constituent units remained largely the same in 1982 (see above, ID: 63, year 1975, Step 2, SideB).

3. Thus, Christians were represented on both sides, and, as described below, fought each other on a systematic scale. There were no linguistic or racial differences between the parties to a conflict.

4. UCDP/PRIO treats the events of the mid-September as the start of the 1982 episode. These events include killing of the president Bashir Gemayel along with 26 others in Beirut on 14 September. The killings were carried out by SSNP (who, as mentioned above were predominantly Christians), a member of LNM. In the later stages (1985-1986), there was
also systematic intra-Christian fighting within SideA (Uppsala Conflict Data Program (2012/11/26).

ID: 63

Location:

Lebanon

SideBName: Lebanese Army (Aoun), Lebanese Forces

Startdate2: 3/14/1989

Difference: (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 2

EPRcodes: Maronite Christians 'Senior partner', Sunnis (Arab) 'Senior partner', Armenian Orthodox 'Junior partner, Druze 'Junior partner', Eastern Orthodox Christians 'Junior partner', Greek Catholics 'Junior partner', Shi’a Muslims (Arab) Junior Partner in 1989

Coding description:


2. SideA: During the 1989 episode, UCDP/PRIO considers Selim Hoss' government, which was composed of Sunni Muslims, as constituting SideA, (Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/11/27).

SideB: SideB was composed of two parties, Lebanese Army under General Michel Aoun and Lebanese Forces under Samir Geagea. Aoun was Christian. Lebanese Army, at that time, was mainly Christian as well (ibid.). Geagea was Christian. Lebanese Forces was an umbrella organization that coordinated the Christian militias of the LF (see above, ID: 63, year 1982 Step 2, SideA).
3. It appears, thus, that during this conflict Muslims and Christians were largely representing different parties to the conflict (i.e., SideA and SideB respectively). There were no linguistic or racial differences between the parties to a conflict.

4. The conflict started in mid-March, when forces subordinate to Hoss' government attacked Aoun's Lebanese Army. In mid-April Geagea's Lebanese Forces joined Aoun in its fight against the government. While it is known that Aoun's army and Geagea's Lebanese Forces clashed in 1990, so far, I could not establish whether there was any intra-Christian or intra-Muslim fighting in the initial period of conflict. Also I was unable to find out whether Hoss' government received any political or military support from Christian units (such as SSNP or LCP, see above, ID: 63, year 1975, 1982).

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

ID: 64

Location:

Malaysia

SideBName: Communist Party of Malaya

Startdate2: 1/1/1958

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Malays 'Senior partner', Chinese 'Junior partner', East Indians 'Junior partner' in 1958

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Malaysia; SideB: Communist Party of Malaya (CPM).
2. SideA: Since the independence in 1957, Malaysia's (until 1963 Malaya's) politics have been dominated by the Alliance (a coalition of a number of political parties) and its successor, the National Front (e.g., Horowitz, 2001: 402). Alliance was founded and traditionally dominated by Malays National Organization (UMNO), Malaysian Chinese Association (MCA) and Malaysian Indian Congress (MIC), which represented Malays, Chinese, and people of Indian origin respectively. Thus, since the very independence, Malaysia's governments were formed by members of different ethnic groups (mainly Malays, Chinese and Indians). Note, however, that Malays were always dominant in numerical terms (both in Alliance and the cabinets).

It is also known that Malays have traditionally dominated the army (Enloe, 1978: 273-279). Though, the army also included significant number of Chinese. For example, 50% of the pilots in the air force were Chinese (ibid.: 273). It is also known that Chinese composed a substantial part of the Special Branch, the intelligence arm of the police (ibid.: 278).

SideB: In the initial stages CPM was predominantly Chinese (ibid.: 274; also Horowitz, 2001: 400). Though, Hui notes that CPM included marginal Malay and Indian participation (1980: 147). In the later stages, CPM included significant number of Malays. In 1975, CPM established Malay Regiment. In 1989, when the CPM laid down its arms, its membership was as follows: 694 were Thailand nationals, 30 to 40 Singaporeans, 402 (Malaysian) ethnic Chinese and 77 (Malaysian) Malays (Far Eastern Economic Review, 1989: 37).

3. Thus, SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB: Chinese were represented in the government and the army, and Malays, though to a lesser degree, were represented in the CPM.

ID: 64

Location:

Malaysia

SideBName: Communist Party of Malaya
Startdate2: 1/15/1974

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Malays 'Senior partner', Chinese 'Junior partner', East Indians 'Junior partner' in 1974

Coding description:

[This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of Malaysia and CPM – see above]

ID: 64

Location:

**Malaysia**

SideBName: Communist Party of Malaya

Startdate2: 1/1/1981

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Malays 'Senior partner', Chinese 'Junior partner', East Indians 'Junior partner' in 1981

Coding description:
This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of Malaysia and CPM – see above

ID: 64

Location:

Malaysia

SideBName: Communist Party of Malaya

Startdate2: 1/1/1981

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Malays 'Senior partner', Chinese 'Junior partner', East Indians 'Junior partner' in 1981

Coding description:

[This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of Malaysia and CPM – see above]

ID: 65

Location:

Laos

SideBName: Pathet Lao
Startdate2: 11/12/1959

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Lao (incl. Phuan) 'Senior partner', Hmong 'Junior partner', Other Lao Sung 'Regional autonomy', Other Lao Thoeng 'Powerless', Yao 'Junior partner in 1959

Coding description:


2. SideA: The Royalist Government of Laos (between 1949 and 1975 Laos was constitutional monarchy under the name 'Kingdom of Laos') was dominated by Lao Loum (lowland Lao) (Ireson & Ireson, 1991: 923-924; also Zasloff, 1973: 11). Provincial and regional governors were Lao Loum as well (Ireson & Ireson, 1991: 924).

3. According to Ireson & Ireson, Pathet Lao recruited mainly among Lao Theung (upland Lao) and Lao Sung (highland Lao) (1991: 923). The former constituted the majority of the Pathet Lao troops (ibid.: 924). According to Zasloff, Lao Theung could have composed between 60 and 70% of Pathet Lao's fighters; yet, he notes that Pathet Lao also recruited among Lao Loum (there are no precise numbers, however). The leadership of Pathet Lao, with few exceptions, was entirely Lao Loum (ibid.: 4-6).

It is also known that the so-called 'secret army' financed and trained by CIA, which fought on the side of the Royal Government against Pathet Lao, recruited among Lao Theung, who, as mentioned above constituted the majority of the Pathet Lao forces (Lee, 1982: 203).

3. Thus, both Lao Loum and Lao Theung were represented on the both sides of the conflict.

4. So far, I could not find any detailed information on the patterns of confrontation between parties to a conflict. The composition of the SideB suggests, however, that conflict most likely involved intra-Lao Loum and intra-Lao Theung fighting.

........................................................................................................................................................................
ID: 65

Location:

Laos

SideBName: Lao Resistance Movement

Startdate2: 12/1/1989

Difference: (1) Language (Lao vs. Hmong) (2) Religion (Buddhists vs. Ethnoreligionists)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Lao (incl. Phuan) 'Senior partner', Hmong 'Junior partner' in 1989

Coding description:


2. SideA: Since the communist takeover in 1975, a number of Lao Theung and Lao Sung people (see above, ID: 65, year 1959) were installed in the state administration (Savada, 1995: Chapter 2: Population: Ethnic Diversity). Thus, the composition of the state apparatus became somewhat more heterogeneous in ethnic respect. However, Lao Loum remained to dominate the government and key administrative positions (Ireson & Ireson, 1991: 925; Savada, 1995: Chapter 4) (as mentioned above, the leadership of Pathet Lao, who took over the power in 1975, were Lao Loum, see ID: 65, year 1959). Lao People’s Revolutionary Party (LPRP) – which has dominated and controlled political life in Laos since communist takeover – was also predominantly Lao Loum (ibid.: Chapter 4: The Lao People's Revolutionary Party: Party Structure).

SideB: LRM was composed of Hmong people (Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/11/28). EPR codes Hmong as a 'Junior partner' in the LPRP controlled government. So far, however, I could not confirm whether this was indeed the case. It is known that some 20% of Hmongs fought on the side of the communists during the Laotian Civil War (i.e., the conflict between
Pathet Lao and the Royalist Government – see above, ID: 65, year 1959), the rest were fighting on the CIA-supported anti-communist side (Duffy et al., 2004: 6). Thus, it is likely that after the communist takeover some Hmongs (who are the sub-group of the Lao Sung – see above, ID: 65, year 1959), were installed in the state administration. Yet, their numbers in the executive and their de facto power remain unclear.

As mentioned above, Lao Loum dominated the LPRP, which has controlled the state since 1975. Lao Loum composed the vast majority of the LPRPs Central Committee – the second most important body in the hierarchy of the party (the first being Party Congress), which was charged with leading party between the congresses and included key government ministers, leading generals of the army, secretaries of provincial party committees, and chairpersons of mass organizations (Savada, 1995: Chapter 4: The Lao People's Revolutionary Party: Party Structure). The Fifth Party Congress held in 1991 elected only four non-Lao Loum members into the 59 member Central Committee (ibid.). To my knowledge, the only high-ranked Hmong officials in Lao People's Democratic Republic (LPDR) were Faydang Lobliayao and his brother Nhiavu Lobliayao, both of whom were members of Pathet Lao leadership during the civil war. In 1975, Faydang was appointed Vice-President of the Supreme People's Assembly and Nhiavu Chairman of the Nationalities Committee. However, their role was largely ceremonial without any administrative or decision-making power (Lee, 1982). It is known that the first time Hmong entered Politburo (the leadership of LPRP) was only in 2006 (Amnesty International, 2007: 4). Further, it is known that Hmong people have been systematically persecuted under the communist rule. The reason for this was Hmong's involvement in the 'secret army' and support for the Royalist side during the Laotian Civil War. Right after Pathet Lao took over the power, thousands of Hmongs were imprisoned or fled the country (Lee, 1982; Savada, 1995: Chapter 5: Threats to National Security: Internal Threats and Resistance Movements: The Hmong; also Chapter 4: Challenges to the Regime: Insurgents; Amnesty International, 2007).

3. Lao Loum speaks Lao and mainly follows Theravada Buddhism (93% according to WCD). Hmong include two groups: Hmong Der (White Hmong) and Hmong Leng (Blue Hmong) (Duffy et al., 2004: 2), who speak Hmong Daw and Hmong Njua (respectively) — two mutually intelligible languages (Hmong Daw and Hmong Njua fall under macrolanguage
Hmong in Ethnologue). Both Hmong Der and Hmong Leng are animists (99% according to WCD).

4. So far, I could not find any information suggesting that conflict involved intra-Hmong or intra-Lao Loum fighting.

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

ID: 67

Location:

**Myanmar**

SideBName: *Noom Suik Harn (Brave Young Warriors)*

Startdate2: 11/22/1959

Difference: *(1) Language (Burmese vs. Shan)*

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Bamar (Barman) 'Dominant', Shan 'Discriminated' in 1959*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

ID: 67

Location:

**Myanmar**

SideBName: *Shan State Army*
Startdate2: 1/1/1972

Difference: (1) Language (Burmese vs. Shan)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Bamar (Barman) 'Dominant', Shan 'Separatist autonomy' in 1972

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 67

Location:

Myanmar

SideBName: Shan State Revolutionary Army, Shan United Revolutionary Army

Startdate2: 1/1/1976

Difference: (1) Language (Burmese vs. Shan)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Bamar (Barman) 'Dominant', Shan 'Separatist autonomy' in 1976

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 67
Location:

*Myanmar*

**SideBName:** Mong Tai Army

**Startdate2:** 1/1/1993

**Difference:** (1) *Language (Burmese vs. Shan)*

**Category:** 2

**Uncertainty:** 1

**EPRcodes:** Bamar (Barman) 'Dominant', Shan 'Separatist autonomy' in 1993

**Coding description:**

[Currently unavailable]

.........................

**ID:** 67

Location:

*Myanmar*

**SideBName:** Shan State Army–South command

**Startdate2:** 12/27/2005

**Difference:** (1) *Language (Burmese vs. Shan)*

**Category:** 2

**Uncertainty:** 1

**EPRcodes:** Bamar (Barman) 'Dominant', Shan 'Separatist autonomy' in 2005
Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 68

Location:

Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire)

SideBName: État du Katanga (State of Katanga)

Startdate2: 7/1/1960

Difference:

[Heterogeneous vs. Heterogeneous]

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 4

EPRcodes: Error in the data - only Luba Kasai indicated for 1960

Coding description:


2. SideA: At the time of the conflict (July 1960), Government of Congo was ethnically heterogeneous. After general elections in June 1960, the MNC (Mouvement National Congolais) (Lumumba faction) emerged as the largest single party. Together with Abako (Alliance des Bakongo, a second largest party) and a number of other less numerous parties, MNC formed a coalition government. MNC was a nationalist/unionist party which did not represent any particular ethnic group or tribe (Young, 1965), while Abako – as the name of the party indicates – represented Bakongo people (Gibbs, 2000: 362). The leader of MNC, Patrice Lumumba was appointed as the Premiere and Defence Minister. The leader of Abako, Joseph Kasa-Vubu, was appointed as the President. Lumumba was a member of
Tetele people (or Batetele), while Kasa-Vubu was Bakongo (or Kongo). The government (the Cabinet Ministers, the Ministers of States and the Secretaries of State) included three members of Abako (ethnic Bakongo); one member of Balubakat (Associate des Baluba du Katanga) (Baluba); two members of CEREA (Centre de Regroupement Africain) (one Hutu, other, so far, unidentified); a member of COAKA (Coalition Kasaienne) (Lulua); two members of Conakat (Confederation des Associations du Katanga) (one Lunda, one Baluba); 15 members of MNC (one Tetele (Lumumba), one Ngbandi (Mobutu, see below), one Boa, one Kele (Lokele), two Mongo, one Baluba, and eight, so far, unidentified); a member of PP (Parti du Peuple) (Bakongo); three members of PNP (Parti National du Progres) (one Mongo, one Bakongo and one unidentified); three members of PSA (Parti Solidaire Africain) (two Pende and one unidentified); two members of PUNA (Parti de l'Unite Nationale) (both unidentified); a member of Reco (Regroupement Congolais) (unidentified); and a member of UNIMO (Union des Mongo) (Mongo) (Chambre de Representants de Belgique, 2001: 921; Merriam, 1961). Victor Lundula, a member of Tetele, was appointed commander-in-chief of the ANC (Armée Nationale Congolaise, the national army). Joseph Mobutu, a member of Ngbandi, was appointed as the Chief of Staff of the ANC (so far, I could not find any reliable information on the composition of the ANC foot-soldiers).

SideB: Katanga's provincial government was dominated by CONAKAT (Confédération des associations tribales du Katanga) (Lemarchand, 1962: 414), whose primary support came from the Lunda, Baluba of Katanga, and Bayeke (Ndikumana and Emizet, 2005:65), the provincial government itself was dominated by Lunda and Baluba of Katanga (the leader of CONAKAT, Moise Tshombe was Lunda), though it also included members of other ethnic groups (Baluba of Kasai, Tshokwe and others) (Chambre de Representants de Belgique, 2001: 924). Note, however, that CONAKAT was not supported by substantial part of the Katanga's population (Islam, 1985: 213; also Lemarchand, 1962: 416).

3. It appears thus, that both SideA and SideB were ethnically heterogeneous. However, I could not establish with certainty whether major ethnic groups of SideB (i.e., Lunda or Baluba of Katanga) were included in the central government (i.e., SideA).

4. So far, I have not found any detailed information on the patterns of confrontation between parties to the conflict in the early phase of the conflict (July – August, 1960),
besides the fact that the conflict involved confrontation between ANC troops (whose composition has not been identified so far) and Katangan Gendarmerie which was trained, organized and supported by Belgians. The recruits were predominantly 'Lendu'. It is also known that Tshombe relied on 'white' mercenaries (predominantly Belgian) (Islam: 1985: 213).

ID: 68

Location:

Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire)

SideBName: État minier du Sud-Kasaï (Independent Mining State of South Kasai)

Startdate2: 8/1/1960

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 4

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Error in the data - only Luba Kasai indicated for 1960

Coding description:


2. SideA: See above (ID: 69, year 1960); SideB: Independent Mining State of South Kasai was led by Albert Kolonji and Joseph Ngalula, both members of Luba of Kasai and leaders of MNC-K (Mouvement National Congolais-Kalonji, Congolese National Movement-Kalonji faction), which was predominantly Luba of Kasai (Nzongola, 2002: 83, 101-106).

3. As mentioned above (ID: 69, year 1960) the government was heterogeneous in racial, linguistic and religious respect. So far, I could not establish, whether among the Lubas
represented on SideA (see above, ID: 69, year 1960) were any Luba of Kasai. Luba of Kasai spoke Luba-Kasai and were predominantly Christians (98% according to WCD).

4. In the initial phase (August-September, 1960), the conflict involved confrontation between the ANC (subordinate to SideA) and fighters subordinate to Kalonji (SideB). It is known that Luba civilians resisted the ANC (Nimer, 1973: 325). It is also known that hundreds of Luba civilians were executed by the ANC. The UN secretary general Dag Hammarskjold described the ANC activities as having 'the characteristics of the crime of genocide' (Statement to the Security Council on 2 September, 1960). The executions potentially resulted from the fact that the ANC soldiers sent to Kasai included significant number of Lulua members – 'neighbours and bitter enemies of the Baluba' (Nimer, 1973:326) who had been fighting Luba since October, 1959 (Nzongola, 2002: 104).

Some authors refer to the Lulua-Luba conflict as 'inter-ethnic' conflict (e.g., Nzongola, 2002). Yet it is known that Lulua and Luba of Kasai were not linguistically and culturally distinct from each other (ibid.: 102-103). Indeed, Lulua and Luba of Kasai spoke two mutually intelligible dialects of the same language – Luba-Kasai (or Tshiluba) which is also sometimes referred to as 'Luba-Lulua'. Also, WCD makes no distinction between Luba and Lulua, collectively referring to them as 'Luba-Lulua' (or Western Luba). The members of Luba and Lulua, themselves, acknowledged their common origin and up until 1870 Lulua identified themselves as Luba (ibid. 103).

Thus, following the criteria employed in this study I consider Lulua and Luba as the same ethnic group. Accordingly, I code this conflict as 'non-ethnic', given the fact that ANC included significant number of members of ethnic group composing Side B.

ID: 70

Location:

Ethiopia

SideBName: Military faction (forces of Mengistu Neway)
Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Amhara 'Dominant' in 1960

Coding description:


2. SideA: Under Emperor Haile Selassie (1931-1974) and the military regime of Derg led by Mengistu Neway (1974-1991) political life in Ethiopia was dominated by Amhara: '...the Amhara has been perceived as a ruling group. Adoption of Orthodox Christianity and the Amharic language was the only way to gain political power or be employed in the state administration (Aalen, 2006: 246). Accordingly, the composition of the executive during this period was predominantly Amhara (Baxter, 1978: 283, 288; also Young, 1998: 191-193) (note however, that Selassie, was of mixed Oromo and Amhara descent).

Since the fall of the Derg regime in 1991, the Government was dominated by Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) – a coalition of four ethnically based parties: The Tigrayan People's Liberation Front (TPLF); The Ethiopian People's Democratic Movement (EPDM) (since 1994 The Amhara National Democratic Movement, ANDM); The Oromo Peoples' Democratic Organization (OPDO); Southern Ethiopian People's Democratic Movement (SEPDM). The four parties represented Tigray, Amhara, Oromo and various ethnic groups from the Southern Nations, Nationalities, and People's Region (respectively).

It is known that EPRDF (and thus the government) was largely dominated by TPLF: '...it is the Tigray People's Liberation Front (TPLF) which is the dominant force in the ruling EPRDF coalition. The TPLF was the creator of the coalition and the architect of the ethnic federal model, and TPLF leaders have since the fall of Mengistu had the most powerful positions in the country, including the post of Prime Minister' (Aalen, 2006: 250; also see Young 193).
Yet, TPLF (Tigray) did share power with other parties (Joireman & Szanya, 2000: 207), and many non-Tigray members (especially Amhara and, to a lesser degree, Oromo) were represented within the highest levels of the government (ibid.: 196). For example, the 17-member cabinet formed in 1995 included four Amhara, four Oromo, two Gurage, one Tigray, one Harari, one Kembata, one Somali, one Afar, one Weleyta and one Hadiya (note that the Prime Minister, who had extensive executive powers, was Tigray). These groups were also represented in the legislature (ibid.: 197). Top positions in the army were dominated by Tigrayans and Amharas (ibid.: 198). The foot-soldiers included different ethnic groups (though again, were predominantly Tigray) (ibid.: 220-221). Thus, it seems that the composition of the executive and the military was ethnically diverse. Yet, the de facto power of the non-Tigray groups in these realms remains unclear (ibid. especially, 195).

SideB: The military faction was composed of the commander of the Imperial Bodyguard, Mengistu Neway and his followers, security officials (including police chief) and a handful of radical intellectuals related to the officials including the Girmame Neway (Mengistu’s brother) (Ofcansky & Berry, 1993: Chapter 1: The Postwar Period, 1945-60: Reform and Opposition: The Attempted Coup of 1960 and its Aftermath). The members of the military faction originated from the same region as the ruling class (Clapham, 1960: 504) and, thus, were predominantly Amhara.

3. Thus, neither side represented any particular ethnic group.

Location: Ethiopia

SideBName: Ethiopian People’s Revolutionary Party, Tigrean People’s Liberation Front

Startdate2: 6/2/1976

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB
Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Amhara ‘Dominant’ in 1976

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 72
Location:

Nepal

SideBName: Nepali Congress
Startdate2: 2/1/1960
Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Hill Brahmins/Chетri excl. Thakuri 'Dominant' in 1960

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 72
Location:
**Nepal**

SideBName: Communist Party of Nepal–Maoist

Startdate2: 8/23/1996

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1


Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 73

Location:

**France**

SideBName: Organisation de l’armée secrète (Secret Army Organization)

Startdate2: 4/22/1961

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: French 'Monopoly' in 1961

Coding description:
SideBName: *Al-hizb al dimuqrāāti al-kurid (Kurdish Democratic Party of Iraq)*

Startdate2: 12/1/1961

Difference: *SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB*

Category: 4

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Sunni Arabs ‘Senior partner’, Shi’a Arabs ‘Junior partner’, Kurds ‘Separatist autonomy’ in 1961*

Coding description:


2. SideA: At the time of the conflict, Government of Iraq was ethnically heterogeneous (Arab Sunnis, Arab Shias and Kurdish; note, however, that Arab Sunnis were numerically dominant) (see above, ID: 62, year 1958).

SideB: KDP was composed of Iraqi Kurds (e.g., McDowall, 1996: 287-300).

3. Thus, SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB. The conflict also involved significant intra-ethnic fighting (see below).

4. According to van Bruinessen ‘The Kurdish nationalists in Iraq always faced at least equal numbers of Kurdish tribesmen fighting on the government side (1986: 16). This was particularly true for the 1961 episode. Government forces were supported by pro-
government Kurdish tribes (Zibari, Surchi, Harki, Baradusti and Khushynaw) (McDowall, 1996: 307-313). The scale of the tribal support was non-miniscule: 'Pro-government Kurdish forces, known as fursan (knights) by the government propagandists and more derisively as jash (little donkeys) by the rebels, amounted to about 10,000' (ibid.: 312). Kurdish were also represented in the regular forces (i.e., Iraq's army): 'The 2nd Infantry Division based at Kirkuk was predominantly Kurdish. In spite of desertions, there were probably as many Kurds ranged on the government as on the rebels side' (ibid.).

ID: 74

Location:

*Iraq*

SideBName: *Al-hizb al dimuqraati al-kurid (Kurdish Democratic Party of Iraq)*

Startdate2: 7/1/1973

Difference: *SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB*

Category: 4

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Sunni Arabs 'Monopoly', Kurds 'Separatist autonomy' in 1973*

Coding description:


2. SideA: At the time of the conflict, the government was dominated by Sunni Arabs (see above, ID: 62, year 1958); yet, the government side had been joined by a number of KDP members opposed to Mulla Mustafa (the leader of the KDP): 'Three prominent members, Hashim Aqrawi and Mulla Aziz of the central committee, and Aziz Aqrawu of the Politburo and a military commander, had all felt compromised by alliances with Iraq's imperialist enemies, and by the conflict with the ICP [Iraqi Communist Party]. When they had protested
the previous December [of 1973] Mulla Mustafa had expelled them. They charged Mulla Mustafa with anti-democratic practices and condemned him for the kidnapping and in some cases execution of certain Kurdish leaders. They and others joined the National Front [a popular front formed by Baath, ICP and pro-government KDP members] in Baghdad...The most bitter pill for Mulla Mustafa was the defection of his eldest son, Ubayd Allah' (McDowall, 1996: 337). Further, 'On the outbreak of war it [Baath] had removed Mulla Mustafa's five ministerial appointees, and replaced them with his leading Kurdish critics. Given the impossibility of conducting elections in war conditions, it selected 80 Kurds as members of the Legislative Council and appointed Hashim Aqrawi to select and chair the Executive Council. He had been a KDP Politburo member but had broken with Mulla Mustafa in late 1973. Another Kurd, Taha Muhi al Din Maaruf, was appointed Vice-President of the Republic' (ibid.: 339). The de facto power of these Kurds remains unclear, however, as the positions they occupied had limited executive power at that time (ibid.: 330, 336).

3. Thus, SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB. This conclusion, however, should be treated in light of the above mentioned uncertainty about the de facto power of Kurds represented in the government.

4. UCDP/PRIO codes the start of the conflict 1 July 1973 (with precision set to '3'); yet, it does not specify the event signifying the start of the conflict. It just mentions that 'In 1973 the tensions boiled over. Skirmishes occurred that developed into a full-scale war after the publication of an Autonomy Law in March 1974' (Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/12/10). Thus, it is not clear which events UCDP/PRIO considers as constituting the start of the conflict.

It is known that Iraqi planes bombed Kurdish positions in Late June 1973. Yet, to my knowledge, the parties to a conflict – although actively preparing for a war – restrained from any major military encounters until early 1974 (e.g., McDowall, 1996: 332-335).

So far, I could not find any explicit information that the conflict (neither in 1973 nor in 1974 or 1975) involved systematic intra-Kurdish fighting (e.g., McDowall, 1996: 333-340). Yet, it is
known that tribal Kurdish fighters ('fursan' – see above) composed significant part of the Iraqi army (ibid.: 312; 354-357).

ID: 74
Location:

**Iraq**

SideBName: *Patriotic Union of Kurdistan*

Startdate2: 3/1/1995

Difference: *SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB*

Category: 4

Uncertainty: 3

EPRcodes: *Sunni Arabs 'Monopoly', Kurds 'Separatist autonomy' in 1995*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 78
Location:

**Ethiopia**

SideBName: *Eritrean Liberation Front*

Startdate2: 3/15/1964

Difference: *(1) Language (Amharic vs. Tigre) (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)*
Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Amhara 'Dominant', Tigray 'Discriminated' in 1964

Coding description:


2. SideA: Government of Ethiopia was dominated by Amhara (see above, ID: 70, year 1960); SideB: At its inception in 1961 ELF was predominantly Muslim (Woldemikael, 1991: 32). It is known that initially it recruited primarily among Muslim Tigre (International Crisis Group, 2010: 3). As it expanded, ELF started to recruit Christian Tigray as well (ibid.). However, this seems not to be the case until 1965 (the conflict started in March, 1964): 'There were hardly any Christians in the E.L.F until 1965. Apart from the fact that few lived in the lowlands where the Front first became established, their participation was inhibited for some time by the Muslim make-up of the E.L.F, and the Arab posturing of its leadership. Most E.F.F. members saw it at the time as a Muslim movement, and its leaders could not resist the flattery of seeing Eritrea portrayed as part of the Arab world. Arabic is not the language of any group living in Eritrea, save the tiny Rashaida nomad tribe, but it is the lingua franca of educated Muslims and those who worked in the Middle East, and it became the official language of the Front. Its leader, Idris Mohammed Adam, held outspokenly hostile views about the Christians, because earlier they had supported union with Ethiopia' (Markakis, 1988: 57).

3. Amhara spoke Amharic and were predominantly Christians (99.5% according to WCD); Muslim Tigre spoke Tigre and were predominantly Muslims (95%).

4. So far, I could not find any information suggesting that conflict involved intra-Amhara or intra-Muslim-Tigre fighting.

ID: 80

Location:
**Venezuela**

SideBName: *Military faction (navy)*


Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Venezuelans 'Monopoly' in 1962*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

.................................................................

ID: 80

Location:

**Venezuela**

SideBName: *Bandera Roja (Red Flag)*

Startdate2: 4/1/1982

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Venezuelans 'Monopoly' in 1982*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]
ID: 80

Location:

**Venezuela**

SideBName: *Military faction (forces of Hugo Chávez)*

Startdate2: 2/4/1992

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Venezuelans 'Monopoly' in 1992*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 83

Location:

**Malaysia**

SideBName: *Clandestine Communist Organization*

Startdate2: 1/1/1963

Difference: *SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB*

Category: 4
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Malays 'Senior partner', Chinese 'Junior partner', East Indians 'Junior partner' in 1963

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Malaysia; Clandestine Communist Organization (CCO).

2. SideA: See above (ID: 64, 1958); SideB: CCO were predominantly Chinese (van der Kroef, 1964; 1966).

3. Thus, SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB.

ID: 85

Location:

Sudan

SideBName: Anya Nya

Startdate2: 1/1/1963

Difference: (1) Language (Arabic vs. Heterogeneous) (2) Religion

(Muslims vs. Christians, Ethnoreligionists)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Shayhiyya, Ja'aliyyin and Danagla (Arab) 'Dominant' in 1963

Coding description:

2. SideA: In 1956, colonial administration handed over power to Muslim elite from the North. Since then, Sudanese government has largely been dominated by the Muslims 'Northerners' (Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/12/13). It is known that the non-Muslims 'Southerners' were largely excluded from the state administration. According to Bell: 'In 1954, of the 800 administrative positions to be "Sudanized," the Southerners received only four' (1975: 106).

When the conflict broke out, the government was in the hands of the military regime led by Ibrahim Abboud (1958-1964). The regime was dominated by 'Northerners' (e.g., Poggo, 2002).

SideB: Anya Nya was composed of 'Southerners' (Metz, 1992a: Chapter 4: Southern and Western Sudan).

3. 'Northerners' spoke Arabic and were predominantly Muslims. 'Southerners' spoke various non-Arabic languages and were Animists and Christians.

4. So far, I have not found any reliable information suggesting that the conflict involved systematic intra-Northerner or intra-Southerner fighting.

---

**Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire)**

SideBName: *Conseil national de libération (National Liberation Council)*

Startdate2: 1/18/1964

Difference: *(1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Mpouno, Phende, Kusu, Tetela)*

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1
EPRcodes: Error in the data - only Luba Kasai indicated for 1964

Coding description:


2. SideA: When the conflict started (January, 1964), Government of Congo was ethnically heterogeneous. Kasa-Vubu, ethnic Bakongo, was the president (see above, ID: 68, year 1960); Cyrille Adoula, Budja (a subgroup of Bangala), was the prime minister. The cabinet, at the time of the conflict, included 24 ministers: one Bambala (a sub-group of Bushongo), two Bakongo, one Hemba, one Luba-Kasai, one Lulua, three Mongo, one Yaka, and 14, so far, unidentified. ANC was de facto controlled by Mobutu (Meditz & Merrill, 1994: Chapter 5: Evolution of the Armed Forces: The Congolese National Army), an ethnic Ngbandi (see above, ID: 68, 69, year 1960). So far, I could not find any detailed information on the composition of the ANC foot-soldiers. It could have included Baluba and Balemba – it is known that they fought (as ANC units) – along the white mercenaries (French, Belgian, South African, Rhodesian, Spanish and others) – in the later stages of the conflict (Clarke, 1968: 42-67)

SideB: CNL was an opposition group organized by former members of the Congolese parliament (which was dissolved in September 1963 by Adoula). It had its base in Brazzaville (the former French Congo) and became central coordinating apparatus for the rebellion (Meditz & Merrill, 1994: Chapter 1: The First Republic, 1960-65: Rural Insurgencies: The 'Second Independence'). The leadership of CNL included Christophe Gbenya (ethnic identity unknown), Bocheley Davidson (unknown), Pierre Mulele (Mbunda), Antoine Gizenga (Pende), and Gaston Soumialot (unknown).

The rebellion was launched in two fronts: 1) Pierre Mulele's faction in Kwilu province in January, 1964; 2) Gaston Soumialot's faction (so called 'Simbas') in Kivu province in April, 1964 (Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/11/29). Given that this study codes conflicts based on the initial stage of the confrontation, I treat Mulele's faction as representing SideB.

Mulele was ethnic Mbunda and recruited mainly among Mbunda and Pende (Gizenga's tribesmen) (Villafana, 2012: 69; also Ndikumana & Emizet, 2005: 69; and Meditz & Merrill, 1994: Chapter 1: The First Republic, 1960-65: Rural Insurgencies: The 'Second
Independence). It is known that Soumialot’s faction received support from Bakusu and Batetele people (ibid.; also Ndikumana & Emizet, 2005: 70).

3. So far, I could not establish whether Mbunda or Pende (nor Bakusu or Batetele) were represented (or fought) on the side of Government or ANC. Mbunda spoke Mbunda (a dialect of Mpuono), Pende spoke Phende, Bakusu spoke Kusu and Batetele spoke Tetela. All four groups were predominantly Christian (99%, 100%; 95% and 97% respectively). The groups represented in the government (see above) were also predominantly Christian.

There were no racial differences between SideA and SideB.

4. So far, I have not found any information suggesting that the conflict involved any intra-Mbundu or intra-Pende (nor intra-Bakusu or intra-Batetele) fighting. I could find, however, that ANC carried out reprisals among Mbunda and Pende civilians in Kwilu (Villafana, 2012: 70).

Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire)

SideBName: Opposition militias

Startdate2: 7/5/1967

Difference: (1) Language (Ngbandi vs. French, Spanish, Lunda)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Ngbandi 'Senior partner', Mbandja 'Junior partner', Ngbaka 'Junior partner' in 1967 – note that Lunda and Chokwe are not mentioned in EPR

Coding description:

2. SideA: Since November 1965 (up until 1997) Congo was under the rule of Joseph Mobutu. Under Mobutu, 'staffing of government ministries and of high-level posts was consciously balanced to ensure ethnic diversity (Meditz & Merrill, 1994: Chapter 2: Ethnic Groups: The Significance of Ethnic Identification). Thus ministerial cabinets under Mobutu were always heterogeneous in ethnic respect (see also Carey, 2002: 60). So far, I could only identify ethnicity of four (out of 13) ministers serving in the cabinet on July, 1967 (when the conflict started) – Mongo, Luba of Kasai, Bangala and Bakongo.

The de facto role of the cabinet remains unclear, however. It is well known that political power was concentrated in the hands of the president – Mobutu (after seizing power in 1965 Mobutu assumed presidency). Right after Mobutu assumed the presidency, parliament's powers were reduced to a mere ritual, all political parties were dissolved, political activities banned, regional governments became directly responsible to the central government, the office of the prime minister was eliminated (Meditz & Merrill, 1994: Chapter 1: The Second Republic, 1965-90: The Rebirth of Bula Matari: Toward Political Reconstruction).

Further, the constitution approved in 1967 provided that 'executive powers be centralized in the president, who was to be head of state, head of government, commander in chief of the armed forces and the police, and in charge of foreign policy. The president was to appoint and dismiss cabinet members and determine their areas of responsibility. The ministers, as heads of their respective departments, were to execute the programs and decisions of the president. The president also was to have the power to appoint and dismiss the governors of the provinces and the judges of all courts, including those of the Supreme Court of Justice' (ibid.: The Second Republic, 1965-90: The Rebirth of Bula Matari: The Quest for Legitimacy).

Thus, while the cabinet included members of other ethnic groups, Mobutu, member of Ngabndi, was clearly dominating the executive. It is also known that the inner circle of Mobutu's advisers was composed exclusively of Ngbandi as well (Carey, 2002: 60).
SideB: The opposition militias – who launched a mutiny and attacked the ANC in early July 1967 – included members of the so-called 6 Commando and 10 Commando – mercenary-led units composed of white mercenaries and former Katangese Gendarmes (Clarke, 1968: 73-78). The mercenaries included French, Belgian and Spanish fighters (ibid.: 69). Katangese Gendarmes were primarily composed of Lunda (I cannot, however, confirm this with certainty).

3. It appears, thus, that SideA and SideB were composed of different linguistic groups. Ngbandi spoke Ngbandi. French and Belgians spoke French; Spanish spoke Spanish. Lunda spoke Lunda. All of these groups were predominantly Christian.

The Opposition forces included both white mercenaries and local Katangese; therefore, there were no racial differences between SideA and SideB.

4. So far, I could not find any detailed information on the composition of the ANC units that fought the Opposition Forces. Also, I have not found any information suggesting that mercenaries were included in the ANC at the time of the conflict. It is known that several mercenary units were included in ANC in 1966 (they were used to subdue a mutiny of the other white mercenaries in July 1966). However, by July 1967, Mobutu seems to have dismantled most of the mercenary units within the ANC, and relied (during the 1967 mutiny) on African soldiers (there’s also evidence that the ANC soldiers conducted reprisals against white population in the course of the conflict) (ibid.: 76-77).

ID: 86

Location: Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire)

SideBName: Front de libération nationale congolais (Congolese National Liberation Front)

Startdate2: 4/1/1977

Difference: (1) Language (Ngbandi vs. Lunda)
Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Ngbandi ‘Senior partner’, Mbandja ‘Junior partner’, Ngbaka ‘Junior partner’ in 1977 - note that Lunda is not mentioned in EPR

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 86

Location:

Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire)

SideBName: Alliance des Forces démocratiques pour la libération du Congo-Kinshasa
(Alliance of Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Congo-Kinshasa)

Startdate2: 10/18/1996

Difference: (1) Language (Ngbandi vs. heterogeneous)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1


Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 86
Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire)

SideBName: Congrès National pour la Défense du Peuple (National Congress for the Defence of the People)


Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Rwanda)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 3

EPRcodes: No data for 2006; 2005: Luba Shaba 'Senior partner', Lunda-Yeke 'Senior partner', Ngbandi 'Junior partner', Mbandja 'Junior partner', Ngbaka 'Junior partner', Other Kivu groups 'Junior partner', Tutsi-Banyamulenge 'Junior partner'

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

Gabon

SideBName: Military faction (forces loyal to Léon M'Ba)

Startdate2: 2/18/1964

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Estuary Fang 'Dominant' in 1964

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 90
Location:

Burundi

SideBName: Military faction (forces loyal to Gervais Nyangoma)

Startdate2: 10/19/1965

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Hutu 'Senior partner', Tutsi 'Senior partner in 1965

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 90
Location:

Burundi
SideBName: *Parti pour la libération du peuple Hutu (Party for the Liberation of the Hutu People)*


Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Tutsi 'Senior partner', Hutu 'Junior partner' in 1991*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

Location:

*Burundi*

SideBName: *Conseil national pour la défense de la démocratie (National Council for the Defense of Democracy)*

Startdate2: 10/18/1994

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Tutsi 'Dominant', Hutu 'Powerless' in 1994*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]
ID: 90
Location:

**Burundi**

SideBName: *Parti pour la libération du peuple Hutu–Forces nationales de libération (Party for the Liberation of the Hutu People–Forces for National Liberation)*

Startdate2: 3/1/2008

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *No data for 2008; 2005: Tutsi 'Senior partner', Hutu 'Senior partner'*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 91
Location:

**Chad**

SideBName: *Front de libération national du Chad (National Liberation Front of Chad)*

Startdate2: 7/1/1966

Difference: *(1) Language (Sara languages vs. Heterogeneous) (2) Religion (Ethnoreligionists, Christians vs. Muslims)*
1. SideA: Government of Chad; SideB: Front de libération national du Chad (Frolinat).

2. SideA: Since the independence in 1960 (until 1978) the government, the bureaucracy and the army was largely dominated by the Sara people, the 'Southerners' (e.g., Martin, 1990: 39-40; Buijtenhuijs, 2001: 151; Collelo, 1990: Chapter 4: Political Background: Southern Dominance, 1960-1978; also Chapter 5: The Armed Forces: Origins and Early Development).

SideB: Frolinat was formed on 22 June 1966, as a union of the Union Nationale Tchadienne (UNT), led by Ibrahim Abatcha, with the Union Générale des Fils du Tchad (UGFT), led by Ahmed Moussa (Nolutshungu, 1995: 58). UCDP/PRIO codes 1 July 1966 as the start of the conflict (startprec – '4'); yet, it does not specify any particular event that is considered as the start of the conflict.

Frolinat (at the time of its inception) was composed entirely of Muslim 'Northerners' (e.g., Nolutshungu, 1995: 58). Yet, I could not find any specific information on their linguistic affiliations in 1966. At different times, Frolinat recruits included Ouaddaian people (Maba) (it is known that UGFT recruited mainly among Oiaddaian people), Arabs, Tubus (Daza and Teda) (e.g., Lemarchand, 1986: 37; Joffe, 1997: 35; Tubiana, 2008: 24). Neither of these groups spoke Sara-languages.

3. SideA: Sara spoke various Sara languages (for sub-divisions within Sara see, for example, Lemarchand, 1980) and were predominantly Animists and Christians; 'Northerner's were predominantly Muslim.

4. So far, I have not found any information suggesting that the conflict (in 1966) involved any systematic intra-Sara or intra-'Northerner' fighting.

ID: 91
Location:

Chad

SideBName: Forces armées du nord (Armed Forces of the North)

Startdate2: 2/28/1976

Difference: (1) Language (Sara languages vs. Dazaga) (2) Religion (Ethnoreligionists, Christians vs. Muslims)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Sara 'Senior partner', Toubou 'Junior partner' in 1976

Coding description:


SideB: FAN was a splinter group from Frolinat, which recruited among Daza (a sub-group of Tubu), the eastern Zaghawa, the central Hadjeray and few groups from south-western Chad (Buijtenhuijs, 2001: 151-152). It is known, however, that Tubu people (i.e., Daza) were dominant both within the leadership and foot-soldiers (ibid.).

3. SideA: See above (ID: 91, year 1966); SideB: Daza spoke Dazaga and were predominantly Muslim.

4. So far, I have not found any information suggesting that the conflict in 1976 involved any intra-Sara or intra-Daza fighting.
SideBName: Gouvernement d’union nationale de transition (Transitional Government of National Unity)

Startdate2: 1/1/1986

Difference: (1) Language (Dazaga vs. Tedaga)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 2

EPRcodes: Toubou 'Senior partner', Hadheray 'Junior partner', Zaghawa, Bideyat 'Junior partner, Sara 'Junior partner' in 1986

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Chad; SideB: Gouvernement d’union nationale de transition (GUNT).

2. Between 1982 and 1990, Sudan was under Hissene Habre's rule. The government under Habre included a number of different ethnic groups: 'Most high civilian and military appointments were from his own [Daza] or a closely related ethnic group, but he appointed southerners and other non-Toubou [Tubu] civilians to several executive and administrative positions' (Collelo, 1990: Chapter 4: Political Dynamics: Political Style).

However, key executive positions were in the hands of Daza: 'After just a few months under his rule, Chad became, to the great surprise of its citizens, an exclusively Gorane [Daza] state. To ensure control and keep his grip on the whole country, Habre installed his brethren in all strategic governmental positions: in the security services, the army, and finance. He planned and maneuvered in such a way that no act or decision, however pedestrian, that affected their interests could be taken without their knowledge...Within the Chadian
National Army, Habré created his personal army, the Presidential Security (SP), composed mainly of members of his tribe and those that had been won over to his cause. Elements of the SP not only enjoyed special rights and privileges but were allowed to engage in extortion, at a time when the rest of the army was reduced to beggary and abandoned to its own devices, without salary or other compensation' (United States Institute of Peace, 1992: 59).

SideB: GUNT was also ethnically heterogeneous; yet, its dominant forces (in 1986) were units loyal to Goukouni Oueddei (I could not find reliable sources to confirm this, however), majority of whom were Teda people (Goukouni was Teda himself).

3. SideA: See above (ID: 91, year 1976); SideB: Teda spoke Tedaga and were predominantly Muslim.

4. So far, I have not found any information suggesting that the conflict involved systematic intra-Daza or intra-Teda fighting.

ID: 91
Location:

Chad

SideBName: Islamic Legion, Revolutionary Forces of 1 April, Mouvement pour le salut national du Chad (Movement for the National Salvation of Chad)

Startdate2: 3/3/1989

Difference: (1) Language (Dazaga vs. Heterogeneous)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Toubou 'Senior partner', Sara 'Junior partner' in 1989
Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Chad; SideB: Islamic Legion, Revolutionary Forces of 1 April, Mouvement pour le salut national du Chad (MOSANAT).

2. SideA: See above (ID: 91, year 1986); SideB: UCDP/PRIO codes 3 March 1989 as the start of the conflict (startprec = '2'); yet, it does not specify any particular event that is considered as the start of the conflict. So far, I could not establish what happened on 3 March 1989 with regards to this particular conflict (there was a coup attempt on 1 April 1989 by the military faction later to be known as Revolutionary Forces of 1 April (see below) and intense fighting in March 1990 between government and an alliance of the three groups) and which of three groups started the conflict against the government first.

   Islamic Legion had already started its fight against the government in 1987 (Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/12/15). It was composed of Sahelian Arabs and Tuaregs (de Waal, 2004: 720).

   The military faction (later to be known as Revolutionary Forces of 1 April or the April 1 group), was led by Idriss Deby (previously chief-of-staff and Habre's military advisor), Mahamat Itno (previously interior minister) and Hassan Djamous (previously chief-of-staff) (Atlas & Licklider, 1999: 44) – all of whom were Zaghawa. The faction carried out a coup attempt on 1 April 1989. Habre's Palace Guards confronted the faction and forced it to flee for safety into Sudan. In Sudan the faction reorganized and was joined by Islamic Legion and mercenaries, mainly Zaghawa and northern Arabs from Darfur (Collins, 2006: 37).

   MOSANAT was Hadjeray organization (e.g., Debos, 2011: 423; Collelo, 1990: Chapter 5: Internal Security and Public Order: Internal Security Conditions)

   Later (March 1990) the three groups formed Mouvement Patriotique du Salut (MPS) and together toppled Habre's regime in December 1990.

   Thus, SideB was composed of Arabs, Tuaregs, Zaghawas and Hadjerays and led by Zaghawas.

3. SideA: See above (ID: 91, year 1986); SideB: Arabs spoke Arabic, Tuaregs Tamashek (a 'macrolanguage') and Zaghawas Zaghawa. Hadjeray is a collective term for 10 linguistically
heterogeneous groups: Dajas, Kingas, Junkun, Dangaleats, Mogoums, Sokoros, Sabas, Barains, Bidios and Yalnas (Olson, 1996: 217) (who spoke Daju, Kenga, Mukulu, Dangaleat, Mogum, Sokoro, Barein, Bidiyo and Arabic respectively). All of these groups were predominantly Muslim.

4. So far, I could not find any information suggesting that the conflict involved systematic intra-Daza, intra-Arab, intra-Tuareg, intra-Zaghawa or intra-Hadjeray fighting.

Chad

SideBName: Forces armées pour la République fédérale (Armed Forces of the Federal Republic), Mouvement pour la démocratie et le développement (Movement for Democracy and Development)

Startdate2: 10/30/1997

Difference: (1) Language (Zaghawa vs. Dazaga, Kanembu)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 3

EPRcodes: Zaghawa, Bideyat 'Senior partner', Toubou 'Powerless', Hadjeray 'Junior partner', Sara 'Junior partner' in 1997

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 91
Chad

SideBName: Rassemblement pour la Démocratie et la Liberté (Rally for Democracy and Liberty)

Startdate2: 12/18/2005

Difference: (1) Language (Zaghawa vs. Tama, Arabic, Maba)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 3

EPRcodes: Zaghawa, Bideyat 'Senior partner', Toubou 'Powerless', Hadjeray 'Junior partner', Sara 'Junior partner' in 2005

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

...............................................................

ID: 92

Location:

Colombia

SideBName: Fuerzas armadas revolucionarias colombianas (Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia)

Startdate2: 1/1/1964

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Colombians 'Monopoly' in 1964

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 93

Location:

Dominican Republic

SideBName: Military faction (constitutionalists)

Startdate2: 4/24/1965

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Dominicans 'Monopoly', Haitians 'Discriminated' in 1965

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 94

Location:

Indonesia
SideBName: Organisasi Papua merdeka (Organization for a Free Papua)

Startdate2: 7/28/1965

Difference: (1) Language (Javanese vs. Papuan languages) (2) Religion (Muslims vs. Christians, Ethnoreligionists)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Javanese 'Dominant', Papua 'Discriminated' in 1965

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 94

Location:

Indonesia

SideBName: Organisasi Papua merdeka (Organization for a Free Papua)

Startdate2: 1/1/1976

Difference: (1) Language (Javanese vs. Papuan languages) (2) Religion (Muslims vs. Christians, Ethnoreligionists)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Javanese 'Dominant', Papua 'Discriminated' in 1976

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]
ID: 94

Location:

**Indonesia**

SideBName: *Organisasi Papua merdeka (Organization for a Free Papua)*

Startdate2: 1/1/1981

Difference: (1) Language (Javanese vs. Papuan languages) (2) Religion (Muslims vs. Christians, Ethnoreligionists)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Javanese 'Dominant', Papua 'Discriminated' in 1981*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 94

Location:

**Indonesia**

SideBName: *Organisasi Papua merdeka (Organization for a Free Papua)*

Startdate2: 1/1/1984

Difference: (1) Language (Javanese vs. Papuan languages) (2) Religion (Muslims vs. Christians, Ethnoreligionists)
Category: 2
Uncertainty: 1
EPRcodes: Javanese 'Dominant', Papua 'Discriminated' in 1984
Coding description:
[Currently unavailable]

ID: 95
Location:

Peru
SideBName: Ejército de la liberación nacional (National Liberation Army), Movimiento de la izquierda revolucionaria (Movement of the Revolutionary Left)
Startdate2: 8/3/1965
Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified
Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1
EPRcodes: Peruvians 'Monopoly' in 1965
Coding description:
[Currently unavailable]

ID: 95
Location:
Peru

SideBName: Sendero Luminoso (Shining Path)

Startdate2: 8/22/1982

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Peruvians 'Monopoly' in 1982

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 95

Location:

Peru

SideBName: Sendero Luminoso (Shining Path)

Startdate2: 11/14/2007

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data for 2007; 2005: Peruvians 'Monopoly'

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]
No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Ga-Adangbe 'Senior partner', Asante (Akan) 'Junior partner', Ewe 'Junior partner', Northern Groups (Mole-Dagbani, Gurma, Grusi) 'Junior partner', Other Akans 'Junior partner'

Coding description:


2. SideA: At the time of the conflict, Ghana was under the rule of Kwame Nkrumah and his Convention People's Party (CPP), which was ethnically heterogeneous (e.g., Adekson, 1976: 252). The national army was ethnically heterogeneous as well (ibid.).

SideB: the leadership of the National Liberation Council included three Ewes, one Ashanti, one Ga and one Fante (ibid. 267) – all of whom were represented in the government and the army (ibid.). It seems, thus, that the conflict was of non-ethnic nature. Indeed, as Adekson suggests, 'the officers and men who participated [in the coup] were broadly representative of Ghana's ethnic groups, so that tribalism cannot reasonably be considered a factor (ibid.: 268).

3. Neither side, thus, represented any particular ethnic group.
Ghana

SideBName: Military faction (forces of Jerry John Rawlings)

Startdate2: 12/31/1981

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Asante (Akan) 'Senior partner', Ewe 'Junior partner', Ga-Adangbe 'Junior partner', Northern Groups (Mole-Dagbani, Gurma, Grusi) 'Junior partner', Other Akans 'Junior partner'
in 1981

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

Ghana

SideBName: Military faction (forces of Ekow Dennis and Edward Adjei-Ampofo)

Startdate2: 6/19/1983

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified
Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Ewe 'Senior partner', Asante (Akan) 'Junior partner', Ga-Adangbe 'Junior partner', Northern Groups (Mole-Dagbani, Gurma, Grusi) 'Junior partner', Other Akans 'Junior partner' in 1983

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

-----------------------------------------------

ID: 99
Location:

India

SideBName: Mizo National Front

Startdate2: 9/1/1966

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Mizo) (2) Religion (Heterogeneous vs. Christias)

Category: 2
Uncertainty: 1


Coding description:
1. SideA: Government of India; SideB: Mizo National Front (MNF)

2. SideA: See above (ID: 29, year 1948); SideB: MNF was composed of Mizo people.

3. SideA: See above (ID: 29, year 1948); SideB: Mizo spoke Mizo language and were entirely Christian (100% according to WCD).

4. So far, I could not find any information suggesting that the conflict involved intra-Mizo fighting. It is known that Indian government typically relied on 'alien' troops to deal with ethnic rebellions (see above, ID: 54, year 1956).

ID: 100

Location: 

**Nigeria**

SideBName: *Boko Haram*

Startdate2: 7/26/2009

Difference: *SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 4

EPRcodes: *No data for 2009; 2005: Yoruba 'Senior partner', Hausa-Fulani and Muslim Middle Belt 'Junior partner', Igbo 'Junior partner'*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 100
Location:

Nigeria

SideBName: Military faction (forces of Patrick Nzeogwu)

Startdate2: 1/15/1966

Difference: (1) Language (Hausa, Fulani languages vs. Igboid languages (2) Religion (Muslims vs. Christians)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Hausa-Fulani and Muslim Middle Belt 'Dominant' in 1966

Coding description:


2. SideA: When the conflict (military coup) started, the government was in the hands of the Nigerian National Alliance (NNA). In the 1964-1965 federal parliamentary elections, the NNA received 198 seats (out of 312) and subsequently formed the government (Metz, 1992b: Chapter 1: Independent Nigeria: Politics in the Crisis Years: The 1964-65 Elections). NNA was an alliance formed from the Northern People's Congress (NPC), Nigerian National Democratic Party (NNDP) and several other parties representing ethnic minorities in the Midwestern and Eastern regions (Midwest Democratic Front, Dynamic Party, Niger Delta Congress, Lagos State United Front and Republican). The NPC, the largest party within the NNA received most of the seats (162) (ibid.) and thus dominated the subsequently formed ministerial cabinet. The Prime Minister, Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, was member of the NPC as well. The NPC was dominated by Northerners (mainly Hausa and Fulani) (ibid.: Chapter 1: Emergence of Nigerian Nationalism) (Balewa was half Geri half Fulani). As a result Northerners held 13 seats (out of 17) in the cabinet (Mackintosh, 1965: 24). Note, however, that other ethnic groups (Yorube, Igbo and others) were not entirely excluded from the executive (see below).
The military faction was mainly composed of Igbos (e.g., Metz, 1992b: Chapter 1: Independent Nigeria: Politics in the Crisis Years: The 1964-65 Elections; Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2013/01/10) (note, however, that one of the leaders of the coup, Major Adewale Ademoyega, was Yoruba).

3. SideA: Hausa spoke Hausa and were entirely Muslim. Fulani spoke Fulfulde (Nigerian) (member of Fulah macrolanguage) and were entirely Muslims as well. Igbos spoke Igboid languages and were predominantly Christians.

4. During the coup the Prime Minister, Premier of the North Region and the leader of the NPC, Ahmadu Bello (Hausa), Premier of the West Region, Samuel Ladoke Akintola (Yoruba), as well as senior officers of the northern origins were assassinated (Metz, 1992b: Chapter 1: Independent Nigeria: Politics in the Crisis Years: The 1964-65 Elections). While Igbos were not entirely excluded from the executive (there were at least two Igbos in the cabinet: Jaja Anucha Wachuku (Minister of Aviation) and Raymond Njoku (Minister of Communications), not a single political leader of Igbo origin was killed during the coup (Oynade, 1998: 15; though, according to Metz (1992b: Chapter 4: Military Intervention and Military Rule: The Coups, Civil War, and Gowon's Government) one Igbo officer was killed). The president (whose role was largely ceremonial), Nnamdi Azikiwe – an Igbo – was overseas (unknown whether coincidently or not).

ID: 101

Location:

South Africa

SideBName: South West Africa People’s Organization

Startdate2: 1/1/1966

Difference: (1) Language (Afrikaans vs. Heterogeneous) (3) Race (Whites vs. Blacks)

Category: 2
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Afrikaners 'Monopoly' in 1966

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 102

Location:

*Syria*

SideBName: *Military faction (forces loyal to Nureddin Atassi and Youssef Zeayen)*

Startdate2: 2/23/1966

Difference: *(2) Religion (Sunnis vs. Shias (Alawis))*

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Alawi 'Senior partner', Christians 'Junior partner', Druze 'Junior partner', Sunni Arabs 'Junior partner', Sunni Kurds 'Junior partner' in 1966

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 102

Location:
Syria

SideBName: Muslim Brotherhood

Startdate2: 6/16/1979

Difference: (2) Religion (Shias (Alawis) vs. Sunnis)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Alawi 'Dominant' in 1979

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

Cambodia

SideBName: Khmer Rouge (Red Khmers)

Startdate2: 5/1/1967

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Khmer 'Senior partner', Cham and Malays 'Junior partner', Chinese 'Junior partner' in 1967

Coding description:
ID: 103
Location:

**Cambodia**

SideBName: *Kampuchean National United Front for National Salvation*

startdate2: 12/30/1978

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Khmer 'Senior partner, Khmer Loei (incl. Kui) 'Junior partner' in 1978*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 107
Location:

**Nigeria**

SideBName: *Republic of Biafra*

startdate2: 7/6/1967

Difference: *(1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Igboid languages)*
EPRcodes: Hausa-Fulani and Muslim Middle Belt 'Senior partner', Igbo 'Discriminated', Yoruba 'Junior partner' in 1967

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

Location: Guinea

SideBName: Rassemblement des Forces démocratiques de Guinée (Rally of Democratic Forces of Guinea)

Startdate2: 9/17/2000

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

EPRcodes: Susu 'Dominant' in 2000

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]
Philippines

SideBName: Mindanao Independence Movement
Startdate2: 8/20/1970
Difference: (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)
Category: 2
Uncertainty: 1
EPRcodes: Christian lowlanders 'Monopoly' in 1970
Coding description:
[Currently unavailable]

ID: 112
Location:

Philippines

SideBName: Abu Sayyaf Group, Moro National Liberation Front
Startdate2: 2/9/1993
Difference: (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)
Category: 2
Uncertainty: 1
EPRcodes: Christian lowlanders 'Dominant', Moro 'Regional autonomy' in 1993
Coding description:
[Currently unavailable]
ID: 113

Location:

*Sudan*

SideBName: *Sudanese People’s Liberation Movement/Army*

Startdate2: 5/17/1983

Difference: (1) Language (Arabic vs. Dinka) (2) Religion (Muslims vs. Christians, Ethnoreligionists)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Shaygiyya, Ja’aliyyin and Danagla (Arab) 'Dominant' in 1983

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Sudan; SideB: Sudanese People’s Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/a).

2. SideA: Between 1969 and 1985 Sudanese government was in the hands of Gaafar Nimeiry’s regime, which was dominated by Muslim ‘Northerners’ (see above, ID: 85, year 1963).

SideB: SPLM/A was 'Southerner' organization. It's leadership and recruits were mainly Dinka (Metz, 1992a: Chapter 4: Political Groups: Sudanese People's Liberation Movement; and Chapter 5: The Sudanese People's Liberation Army).

3. SideA: See above (ID: 85, year 1963); SideB: Dinka spoke Dinka (a 'macrolanguage') and were predominantly Christians and Animists.

4. So far, I could not find any information suggesting that the conflict (in 1983) involved any intra-Northerner or intra-Dinka fighting.
ID: 113

Location:

Sudan

SideBName: Sudanese Communist Party

Startdate2: 7/22/1971

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Shaygiyya, Ja'aliyyin and Danagla (Arab) 'Dominant' in 1971

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 113

Location:

Sudan

SideBName: Islamic Charter Front

Startdate2: 7/2/1976

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Shaygiyya, Ja'aliyyin and Danagla (Arab) 'Dominant' in 1976

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 114

Location:

**Madagascar**

SideBName: Mouvement National pour l’Independence de Madagascar (National Movement for the Independence of Madagascar)

Startdate2: 01/01/1971

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 2

EPRcodes: Cotiers 'Dominant' in 1971

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 115

Location:
**Morocco**

SideBName: *Military faction (forces of Mohamed Madbouh)*

Startdate2: 10/07/1971

Difference: *SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 2

EPRcodes: *Error in the data; only Berbers and 'Powerless' in 1971*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 116

Location:

**Pakistan**

SideBName: *Mukti Bahini (Liberation Force)*

Startdate2: 26/03/1971

Difference: *(1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Bengali)*

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Punjabi 'Senior partner', Bengali 'Discriminated', Pashtuns 'Junior partner', Sidhi 'Junior partner', Ahmadis 'Junior partner' in 1971*

Coding description:

2. SideA: Since independence in 1947 the government (as well as the civil service and the army) has largely been dominated by Punjabis (e.g., Alavi, 1989: 1527; Blood, 1995: Chapter 2: Social Structure: Punjabis; Talbot, 2004: 53-54), the largest Pakistan's ethnic group (after 1971). However, other major Pakistan's ethnic groups – Bengalis (until 1971), Pakhtuns, Sindhis, Muhajirs and Baloch – have always been represented (to a lesser or greater degree) in the executive and/or bureaucracy and/or the army. It is known, for example, that at least until mid-1970, Punjabis shared executive power with Muhajirs – they were represented in the highest governmental offices and the bureaucracy (e.g., Haq, 1995: 991; Alavi, 1989: 1527). It is also known, for example, that Pakhtuns were well represented among the military officers and foot-soldiers (e.g., Haq, 1995: 991; Ziring, 1974: Footnote 8). Further, East Pakistanis, most of whom were Bengali, composed 36% of the members of the elite Civil Service in 1968 (Blair, 1971: 2557). The degree to which these ethnic groups were represented in the executive, civil service and the army varied at different periods and their de facto power remains unclear, however.

When the conflict started (March 1971), Pakistan was under military regime led by Yahya Khan (the president and the Commander-in-Chief of Pakistan Army). Yahya and other members of the military junta effectively controlled the government (e.g., Blood, 1995: Chapter 1: Yahya Khan and Bangladesh). According to Ziring, Yahya's regime cannot be defined as a personal military dictatorship, because other members of the junta were involved in the actual decision making process: '...Yahya was neither an Ayub Khan [previous president] nor a potential dictator. In a word, he was absolutely dependent on his brother officers, who remained outside the public spotlight but very much involved in the decision making process.' (1974: 406-407).

The prominent members of the ruling junta included: General Abdu Hamid Khan, the Army Chief of Staff and Deputy Chief Martial Law administrator; Lieutenant General S. M. G. Peerzada, staff officer and virtual military Prime Minister; Lieutenant General Gul Hassan Khan, Chief of the General Staff; Major General Ghulam Omar, Secretary of the Pakistan National Security Council; Major General Mohammad Akbar Khan, the head of military
intelligence; Abubaker Osman Mitha, the Quartermaster General, head of special Pakistani commando force (Special Service Group) (Ziring, 1974: 411).

Though often considered Pakhtun, Yahya Khan was member of Qizilbash (Amin, 2000: Footnote 11), a Persian speaking Shia sect. Abdu Hamid Khan was Punjabi (Ziring, 1974: 411). S. M. G. Peerzada's ethnicity is unknown (so far, I could only establish that he was born in Bombay) (ibid.). Gul Hassan Khan was Pakhtun (Shah, 1997: 176). Ghulam Omar was Punjabi (Amin, 2000: Footnote 11). Mohammad Akbar Khan was Punjabi as well (Ziring, 1974: 411). Abubaker Osman Mitha was Memoni.

SideB: Mukti Bahini represented (and were composed of) Bengalis (e.g., Blood, 1995: Chapter 1: Yahya Khan and Bangladesh). Its nucleus was formed from the (defected) East Pakistan Rifles, provincial police, and Bengali members of the Pakistan Army stationed in the East Pakistan (Ziring, 1974: 418; LaPorte, 1972: 102).

3. SideA: Thus, at the time of the conflict, SideA was linguistically (Panjabi (Western), Pashto languages, Urdu, Persian, Memoni and others) and religiously (Sunni Islam and Shia Islam) heterogeneous (though, Punjabis were numerically dominant).

SideB: East Wing (i.e., Bangladesh) Bengalis spoke Bengali and were predominantly Sunni Muslims.

4. The government forces employed in the conflict against Mukti Bahini were dominated by Punjabis (in general, according to Amin (2000), by 1966 the foot-soldiers of the Army were predominantly Punjabi), but also included Pakhtuns, Balochis, and Sindhs (e.g., Bose, 2005: 4469).

The highest command of the operation was mainly Punjabi as well. For example, Major General Rao Farman Ali, one of the top planners of the Operation Searchlight (the military operation that started the conflict on 26 March 1971) and commander of the Pakistani forces in Dhaka during the operation, was Punjabi. Khadim Hussain Raja, another top planner of the Operation Searchlight and commander of the 14th Division of the Army (the main army unit employed during the first phase of the operation) was born in Jhelum District (Punjab province), and thus, was most likely Punjabi as well. General Tikka Khan, the
commander of (all) Pakistani forces in the East Wing during the operation was Punjabi as well (Amin, 2000: Footnote 11).

While Bengalis were excluded from the central government (see above), they were represented (though very underrepresented) in the army, both among officers and foot-soldiers. It is known, however, that when the fighting broke out, there was a widespread mutiny among the Bengali officers and soldiers (e.g., Bose, 2005: 4465). Indeed, as mentioned above, the nucleus of Mukti Bahihi was formed from the Bengali mutineers from the Pakistan Army (Ziring, 1974: 418; LaPorte, 1972: 102). Yet, Bose notes that 'While many Bengali army officers and police personnel eventually mutinied and joined the battle for liberation of Bangladesh, some Bengali officers and men remained loyal to a united Pakistan, fighting to the end for that cause and becoming POWs in India' (Bose, 2011: 398). As of now, however, I could not establish the proportion of Bengalis fighting on the side of the government against Mukti Bahihi.

As the conflict evolved the government also formed paramilitary forces from the local East Wing (i.e., Bangladesh) population, the so called 'Razakars' (Razakars formed two groups, the 'Al Badr' and the 'Al-Shams'). Bose claims that Razakars included local Bengalis (Bose, 2005: 4476 and Footnote 35). Macdermot states that in ‘areas where there were Biharis [Urdu speaking Muslims from Bihar, India], the Razakars were recruited largely from the Biharis, but in many areas they were recruited from Bengalis who were loyal to the West Pakistan’ (1973: 478). So far, however, I could not establish the scale of their involvement in the conflict. Note also that Razakars were formed only in the later stages of the conflict (April-May). There is also an indication that part of the local Bengalis collaborated with the government (e.g., Bose, 2005: 4467-4468; 2011: 398); once again, however, I could not find any precise information on the scale of such collaboration.

.................................................................

ID: 117

Location:

Sri Lanka
SideBName: *Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (People's Liberation Front)*

Startdate2: 30/04/1971

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Sinhalese 'Dominant' in 1971*

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Sri Lanka; SideB: Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (JVP)

2. SideA: Government of Sri Lanka was dominated by Sinhalese (Stokke, 1998); SideB: JVP was Sinhalese organization as well (ibid.: 101).

3. Thus, neither side represented any particular ethnic group.

........................................................................................................................................................................................

ID: 117

Location:

*Sri Lanka*

SideBName: *Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (People's Liberation Front)*

Startdate2: 13/02/1989

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Sinhalese 'Senior partner', Indian Tamils 'Junior partner', Moor (Muslims) 'Junior partner' in 1989*
Coding description:

[This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of Sri Lanka and JVP – see above]

ID: 118

Location:

Uganda

SideBName: Military faction (forces of Idi Amin)

Startdate2: 29/01/1971

Difference: (1) Language (Acholi, Lango vs. heterogeneous)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Langi/Acholi 'Senior partner', Far North-West Nile (Kakwa-Nubian, Madi, Lugbara, Alur) 'Junior partner' in 1971

Coding description:


2. SideA: At the time of the conflict, executive power was in the hands of Milton Obote. After the coup against his own government in 1966, Obote increasingly relied on security forces (Byrnes, 1992: Chapter 1: Independence: The Early Years). To strengthen his positions among the military, Obote began to recruit (and promote among officers) members of Acholi and Langi (Obote was Langi himself) (ibid.; also Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/12/20). It is known that Special Force Units of paramilitary police were also primarily recruited from Obote’s own region and ethnic group (ibid.).
SideB: Idi Amin, under Obote, was army commander. To strengthen his positions, Amin recruited among ethnic groups from the West Nile District (Lugbara, Madi, Kakwa (Amin was Kakwa) and people of Sudanese descent – 'Nubians'), Amin's Home region (ibid.: Chapter 5: National Security Since Independence: The First Obote Regime: The Growth of the Military).

3. SideA: Acholi spoke Acholi and were predominantly Christians. Langi spoke Lango and were predominantly Christians. Lugbara spoke Lugbara and were predominantly Christians. Madi spoke Ma'di (potentially also Ma'di Southern) and were predominantly Christian. Kakwa spoke Kakwa and were mainly Christians (49%) and Muslims (44%). Nubians spoke various Nubian languages and were entirely Muslims.

4. The conflict involved confrontation between two factions: forces loyal to Obote and forces loyal to Amin (e.g., Glentworth and Hancock, 1973: 250). While I cannot confirm with certainty their exact composition, the two factions, most likely, were composed of Acholi and Langi on the one hand and Lugbara, Madi, Kakwa and Nubian on the other hand (e.g., Kannyo, 1987: 393).

ID: 118
Location: Uganda
SideBName: Military faction (forces of Charles Arube)
Startdate2: 23/03/1974
Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified
Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1
EPRcodes: Kakwa-Nubian 'Dominant' in 1974
Coding description:
ID: 118

Location:

_Uganda_

SideBName: *Front for National Salvation, Uganda National Liberation Front, Former Uganda National Army*

Startdate2: 22/01/1979

Difference: (1) Language (Kakwa, Nubian languages vs. Heterogeneous)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Kakwa-Nubian 'Dominant' in 1979

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 118

Location:

_Uganda_

SideBName: *Lord's Resistance Army*

Startdate2: 21/02/1994

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Acholi)
Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Outh-Westerners (Ankole, Banyoro, Toro) 'Senior partner', Langi/Acholi 'Discriminated', Baganda 'Junior partner', Basoga 'Junior partner' in 1994

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 119

Location:

United Kingdom

SideBName: Provisional Irish Republican Army

Startdate2: 01/08/1971

Difference: (2) Religion (Protestants vs. Roman Catholics)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: English 'Senior partner', Catholics in N. Ireland 'Discriminated', Scots 'Junior partner', Welsh 'Junior partner' in 1971

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 119

Location:
United Kingdom

SideBName: Real Irish Republican Army

Startdate2: 15/08/1998

Difference: (2) Religion (Protestants vs. Roman Catholics)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: English 'Senior partner', Catholics in N. Ireland 'Regional autonomy', Scots 'Junior partner', Welsh 'Junior partner' in 1998

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

El Salvador

SideBName: Military faction (forces of Benjamin Mejia)

Startdate2: 25/03/1972

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data

Coding description:
ID: 120

Location:

**El Salvador**

SideBName: *Ejército revolucionario del pueblo (People’s Revolutionary Army), Fuerzas populares de liberación farabundo Marti (Farabundo Marti Popular Liberation Forces)*

Startdate2: 14/09/1979

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *No data*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 121

Location:

**Oman**

SideBName: *al-Jabha al-Sha’abiya li-Tahrir al-Khalij al-‘Arabi al-Muhtall (Popular Front for the Liberation of the Occupied Arab Gulf)*

Startdate2: 01/01/1969
Difference: (1) Language (Arabic vs. Shehri)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 3

EPRcodes: No data

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 122

Location:

Zimbabwe (Rhodesia)

SideBName: Zimbabwe African People’s Union

Startdate2: 05/09/1967

Difference: (1) Language (English vs. Ndebele, Shona) (3) Race (White vs. Black)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Europeans 'Monopoly', Africans 'Discriminated' in 1967

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 122

Location:
**Zimbabwe (Rhodesia)**

SideBName: *Zimbabwe African National Union, Zimbabwe African People’s Union*

Startdate2: 04/04/1973

Difference: *(1) Language (English vs. Ndebele, Shona) (3) Race (White vs. Black)*

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Europeans 'Monopoly', Africans 'Discriminated' in 1973*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 123

Location:

**Uruguay**

SideBName: *Movimiento de liberación nacional/Tupamaros (Movement of National Liberation/Tupamaros)*

Startdate2: 01/04/1972

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *No data*

Coding description:
ID: 125

Location:

**Chile**

SideBName: *Military faction (forces of Augusto Pinochet, Toribio Merino and Leigh Guzman)*

Startdate2: 11/09/1973

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Chileans 'Monopoly' in 1973*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 126

Location:

**Bangladesh**

SideBName: *Jana Samhati Samiti/Shanti Bahini (People's Solidarity Association/Peace Force)*

Startdate2: 01/02/1975

Difference: *(1) Language (Bengali vs. Chakma) (2) Religion (Muslims vs. Buddhists)*
Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Muslims 'Dominant', Tribal-Buddhists 'Discriminated' in 1975

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Bangladesh; SideB: Jana Samhati Samiti/Shanti Bahini (JSS/SB)

2. SideA: Government of Bangladesh was dominated by Bengali (e.g., Ahsan & Chakma, 1989: 960).

SideB: JSS/SB represented (and was composed of) Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT, a district in the southeast of Bangladesh) tribesmen. CHT are inhabited by the following peoples (listed according to their size): Chakma, Marma, Tripura, Tanchangya, Khami, Mrung, Bawm, Kheyang, Pankho, Chak and Lushai (Mohsin, 2003: 18). Some authors list few more groups, see, for example, Zaman (1982: 75). Chakmas, Marmas and Tripuras compose over 95% of the CHT tribes (65%, 24% and 7% respectively) (Zaman, 1982: 75). It is known that Shanti Bahini, the military wing of Jana Samhati Samiti, was dominated by Chakmas (ibid.: 78; Haque, 1981: 190).

3. SideA: Bengali spoke Bengali and were predominantly Muslim; SideB: Each CHT tribes spoke their own language/dialect, some of which were related to Bengali (e.g., Islam, 1981: 1215). Chakma, the largest group, which, as mentioned above, dominated JSS/SB, spoke Chakma – which is considered an 'individual language' in Ethnologue. CHT tribes were religiously heterogeneous (Buddhists, Hinduists, Christians and Animists). Yet, none of the eleven tribes listed by Mohsin (2003: 18) followed Islam. Chakma, the largest group, were predominantly Buddhists (90% according to WCD).

4. So far, I have not found any information suggesting that the conflict involved intra-Bengali or intra-Chakma fighting.

ID: 129

Location:
**Pakistan**

SideBName: Baluchi insurgents

Startdate2: 01/01/1974

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Baluchi)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Punjabi 'Senior partner', Baluchis 'Powerless', Pashtuns 'Junior partner', Sindhi 'Junior partner' in 1974

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 129

Location:

**Pakistan**

SideBName: Baluchistan Liberation Army

Startdate2: 01/08/2004

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 4

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Punjabi 'Senior partner', Baluchis 'Powerless', Pashtuns 'Junior partner', Sindhi 'Junior partner' in 2004
Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

Location:

Eritrea

SideBName: Harakat al Jihad al Islami - Abu Suhail faction (Eritrean Islamic Jihad Movement – Abu Suhail faction)

Startdate2: 01/04/1997

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Christians 'Senior partner', Muslims 'Junior partner' in 1997

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

Location:

Eritrea

SideBName: Harakat al Jihad al Islami - Abu Suhail faction (Eritrean Islamic Jihad Movement – Abu Suhail faction)
Startdate2: 17/07/2003

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Christians 'Senior partner', Muslims 'Junior partner' in 2003

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 131

Location:

Angola

SideBName: Frente nacional da libertação de Angola (National front for the Liberation of Angola), União nacional para a independência total de Angola (National Union for the Total Independence of Angola)

Startdate2: 11/11/1975

Difference: (1) Language (Kimbundu, Portuguese vs. Umbundu)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Mbundu-Mestico 'Monopoly', Ovimbundu-Ovambo 'Discriminated', Bakongo 'Powerless' in 1975

Coding description:
1. SideA: Government of Angola; SideB: Frente nacional da libertação de Angola (FNLA), União nacional para a independência total de Angola (UNITA).

2. SideA: Since the independence in November 1975, Government of Angola has been dominated by the Movimento popular de libertação de Angola (MPLA). The MPLA draw most of its support from Mbundu people (e.g., Collelo, 1991: Chapter 1: Rise of African Nationalism; also Malaquias, 2000). Its leadership, however, was mixed: Mbundu and Mestico (people of European (Portuguese) and African (Angolan) descent) (Radu, 1990: 127, 133; also Collelo, 1991: Chapter 2: Ethnic Groups and Languages: Mesticos). The leader of MPLA (and later the president of Angola), Agostinho Neto, was Mbundu. The President 'had wide-ranging powers as the leading figure in politics and the military' (Collelo, 1991: Chapter 4: Structure of Government: Executive Branch). The Political Bureau, one of the most influential decision-making bodies within MPLA (and thus the government), was mixed: Mbundu and Mestico (Collelo, 1991: Chapter 1: Independence and the Rise of the MPLA Government: The Final Days of the Neto Regime).

SideB: FNLA was predominantly Bakongo and UNITA was predominantly Ovimbundu (e.g., Collelo, 1991: Chapter 1: Rise of African Nationalism; also Malaquias, 2000). The latter also included Chokwes, Owambos and Cabindan Bakongos (Radu, 1990: 127), but the leader, Jonas Savimbi, was Ovimbundu and he had the de facto control of the UNITA: 'Most of what is known about the ideology, strategy, and goals of UNITA originates with the statements or writings of Jonas Savimbi, rather than institutional sources, although it is often difficult to distinguish the two. In part this is the result of Savimbi’s ability to articulate ideas and concepts better than his colleagues; in part it is the natural result of UNITA’s being a highly personalistic organization, with Savimbi as the founding father, the ideologue, strategist, and commander in chief. Unlike mujahedeen, contras, and Eritreans/Tigreans, UNITA has a well-established leader of undisputed authority. While the Khmer Rouge has a strong and united collective leadership, with Pol Pot as primus inter pares, UNITA’s is more clearly personalistic. Savimbi is the unchallenged leader and exercises strict control over all his forces. Such a style of leadership has important consequences for the nature, effectiveness, and survivability of UNITA' (Radu, 1990: 141).
Note that Savimbi circle included several non-Ovimbundus: 'UNITA’s second-ranking political leader, its secretary general and Savimbi’s right-hand, for example, is an aristocratic Cabindan [Bakongo], Miguel N’Zau Puna; the party's watchdog, Secretary of the Control Commission Ernesto Mulatto, is a Bembe from the north; the southern front commander, Vakulakuta Kashaka, is a Kwanyama [Owambo]...and the northern front leader and secretary for military mobilization is a Mbundu, Colonel Antonio Dembo' (ibid.: 141).

3. Mbundu spoke Kimbundu, Mesticos Portuguese, Bakongo Kikongo and Ovimbundu Umbundu. All groups were predominantly Christian.

4. It is important to note that MPLA government was supported by external powers, most notably by the Soviet Union and Cuba. Cuban troops started arriving in Angola already in the first half of 1975. By the end of the year Cuba had stationed some 25 000 troops in Angola (Foss, 2010: 14). By 1983 their numbers exceeded 50 000 (ibid.). MPLA forces, Forças Armadas Populares de Libertação de Angola (FAPLA), were also supported by Soviet, East German and Warsaw Pact military personnel (which included Romanians, Poles, Czechs, and Hungarians), as well as by European mercenaries (mainly Portuguese, Belgian and French), South Africans, Namibians and North Koreans (Radu, 1990: 136-137). Note, however, that external forces' (in particular Soviet and Cuban) limited their direct participation in the military operations (ibid.: 137-139). UNITA-FNLA alliance was supported by South African and Congolese troops (Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/12/8; also Radu, 1990: 129).

ID: 131

Location:

Angola

SideBName: União nacional para a independência total de Angola (National Union for the Total Independence of Angola)

Startdate2: 02/05/1998
Difference: (1) Language (Kimbundu, Portuguese vs. Umbundu)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Mbundu-Mestico 'Monopoly', Ovimbundu-Ovambo 'Discriminated' in 1998*

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Angola; SideB: União nacional para a independência total de Angola (UNITA).

2. SideA: Government of Angola was dominated by MPLA (see above, ID: 131, year 1975); in 1979, Neto was succeeded by José Eduardo dos Santos, a Mbundu (Collelo, 1991: Chapter 1: The Dos Santos Regime). Santos assumed the office of the President of Angola, President of the MPLA, and Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces. He keeps these offices to date.

It is known that Santos regime attempted to balance ethnic representation in the executive (ibid.) (already in late 1970s, Neto has appointed five Bakongo members into Political Bureau (Collelo, 1991: Chapter 1: Independence and the Rise of the MPLA government: The Final Days of the Neto Regime). Nevertheless, the party and the government remained largely Mbundu and Mestico (note that, in mid-1980s, many high-ranked mesticos were removed from the party and the government (Collelo, 1991: Chapter 1: The Dos Santos Regime: Second Party Congress). It is known that no Ovimbundu – the largest ethnic group (and the one whose members dominated UNITA) – was a member of the Political Bureau by 1991 (ibid.).

SideB: See above (ID: 131, year 1975).


4. So far, I could not confirm whether the conflict involved any systematic intra-Ovimbundu, intra-mestico or intra-Mbundu fighting. For the composition of the military forces, see above (ID: 131, year 1975).

.................................................................................................................................
ID: 133

Location:

Ethiopia

SideBName: Ogaden Liberation Front

Startdate2: 11/01/1964

Difference: (1) Language (Amharic vs. Somali) (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Amhara 'Dominant', Somali (Ogaden) 'Discriminated' in 1964

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

.................................................................

ID: 133

Location:

Ethiopia

SideBName: Western Somali Liberation Front

Startdate2: 01/10/1976

Difference: (1) Language (Amharic vs. Somali) (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 4
EPRcodes: Amhara 'Dominant', Somali (Ogaden) 'Discriminated' in 1976

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 133
Location: Ethiopia

SideBName: al-Itahad al-Islami (Islamic Unity)

Startdate2: 13/10/1993

Difference: (1) Language (Tigrigna, Amharic vs. Somali) (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)

Category: 2
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Tigry 'Senior partner', Amhara 'Junior partner', Oroma 'Junior partner', Somali (Ogaden) 'Discriminated' in 1993

Coding description:

2. SideA: See above (ID: 70, year 1960); Islamic Unity was Somali organization (Joireman & Szanya, 2000: 213-215). Note that there was some limited Somali representation in the government and the legislature (see ID: 70, year 1960).
3. SideA: While the government included a large number of ethnic groups (see ID: 70, year 1960), it was largely dominated by Tigray and (to a lower extent) Amhara who spoke Tigrigna and Amharic (respectively) and were predominantly Christians (88.5 and 99.5% respectively). SideB: Somali spoke Somali and were entirely Muslims.
4. So far, I could not find any information suggesting that the conflict involved intra-Tigray, intra-Amhara or intra-Somali fighting.

........................................................................................................

ID: 133

Location:

Ethiopia

SideBName: Ogaden National Liberation Front

Startdate2: 26/02/1994

Difference: (1) Language (Tigrigna, Amharic vs. Somali) (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Tigry 'Senior partner', Amhara 'Junior partner', Oroma 'Junior partner', Somali (Ogaden) 'Discriminated' in 1994

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Ethiopia; SideB: Ogaden National Liberation Front (ONLF)

2. SideA: See above (ID: 70, year 1960); SideB: ONLF was composed of Somali. Note that there was some limited Somali representation in the government and the legislature (see ID: 70, year 1960)

3. SideA: See above (ID: 70, year 1960); SideB: See above (ID: 133, year 1993)

4. So far, I have not found any information suggesting that the conflict involved any intra-Tigray, intra-Amhara or intra-Somali fighting.

........................................................................................................

ID: 134
**Location:**

*Indonesia*

**SideBName:** Frente revolucionária de Timor Leste independente (Revolutionary Front for an Independent East Timor)

**Startdate2:** 07/12/1975

**Difference:** (1) Language (Javanese vs. Heterogeneous) (2) Religion (Muslims vs. Christians)

**Category:** 2

**Uncertainty:** 1

**EPRcodes:** Javanese 'Dominant', East Timorese 'Powerless' in 1975

**Coding description:**

[Currently unavailable]

-----------------------------------------------

**ID:** 134

**Location:**

*Indonesia*

**SideBName:** Frente revolucionária de Timor Leste independente (Revolutionary Front for an Independent East Timor)

**Startdate2:** 15/12/1992

**Difference:** (1) Language (Javanese vs. Heterogeneous) (2) Religion (Muslims vs. Christians)

**Category:** 2

**Uncertainty:** 3
EPRcodes: Javanese 'Dominant', East Timorese 'Powerless' in 1992

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 134

Location:

Indonesia

SideBName: Frente revolucionária de Timor Leste independente (Revolutionary Front for an Independent East Timor)

Startdate2: 31/05/1997

Difference: (1) Language (Javanese vs. Heterogeneous) (2) Religion (Muslims vs. Christians)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 3

EPRcodes: Javanese 'Dominant', East Timorese 'Powerless' in 1997

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 135

Location:

Morocco
SideBName: Frente popular de liberación de Saguia el Hamra y Rio de Oro (Popular Front for the Liberation of Saguia el Hamra and Rio de Oro)

Startdate2: 04/11/1975

Difference: (1) Language (Arabic vs. Hassaniyya)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Error in the data; data only for Berbers 'Powerless' in 1975

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 136

Location:

Mozambique

SideBName: Resistência nacional moçambicana (Mozambican National Resistance)

Startdate2: 01/01/1977

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Ndau)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 3

EPRcodes: Tsonga-Chopi 'Senior partner', Makonde-Yao 'Junior partner' in 1977

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]
ID: 137

Location:

Afghanistan

SideBName: Hizb-i Demokratik-i Khalq-i Afghanistan (People’s Democratic Republic of Afghanistan)

Startdate2: 27/04/1978

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Pashtuns 'Dominant' in 1978

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 137

Location:

Afghanistan

SideBName: Taliban

Startdate2: 04/06/2003

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Pashtuns 'Senior partner', Tajiks 'Senior partner', Hazaras 'Junior partner', Uzbeks 'Junior partner' in 2003

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

.................................................................

ID: 139

Location:

India

SideBName: Tripura National Volunteers

Startdate2: 01/01/1979

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Kok Borok) (2) Religion (Heterogeneous vs. Ethnoreligionists)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1


Coding description:

2. SideA: See above (ID: 29, year 1948); SideB: TNV was composed of indigenous Tripura tribes (Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/12/1).

3. SideA: See above (ID: 29, year 1948); SideB: Tripura tribes spoke various dialects of Kok Borok, which is considered as an individual language in Ethnologue. According to WCD, Tripura people were predominantly 'Hinduized animists'.

4. So far, I could not find any information confirming that the conflict involved intra-Tripuri fighting. It is known, however, that Indian government typically relied on 'alien' troops to deal with ethnic rebellions (see above, ID: 54, 1956).

ID: 139
Location: India
SideBName: All Tripura Tiger Force
Startdate2: 12/10/1992
Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Kok Borok) (2) Religion (Heterogeneous vs. Hindus)
Category: 2
Uncertainty: 1
'Junior partner', Scheduled Castes & Tribes (non-SC/ST/OBCs) 'Junior partner', Tamil (non-SC/ST/OBCs) 'Junior partner', Telugu (non-SC/ST/OBCs) 'Junior partner' in 1992

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ID: 139

Location:

India

SideBName: National Liberation Front of Tripura

Startdate2: 01/10/1995

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Kok Borok) (2) Religion (Heterogeneous vs. Christians)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1


Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]
ID: 140

Location:

_Nicaragua_

SideBName: _Frente Sandinista de liberación nacional (Sandinista National Liberation Front)_

Startdate2: _10/10/1977_

Difference: _No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified_

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: _Nicaraguans (Mestizo) ‘Monopoly’ in 1977_

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

---

ID: 140

Location:

_Nicaragua_

SideBName: _Contras/Fuerzas democráticas nicaraguenses (Contras/Nicaraguan Democratic Forces)_

Startdate2: _17/04/1982_

Difference: _SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB_

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Nicaragua (Mestizo), Miskitos 'Powerless' in 1982

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 141

Location:

Somalia

SideBName: Somali Salvation Democratic Front

Startdate2: 01/01/1982

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data

Coding description:


2. SideA: Between 1969 and 1991 Somalia was under the military dictatorship led by Siad Barre. It is known that Barre’s regime (in particular in the 1980s) was dominated by members of Mareehaan sub-clan (e.g., Metz, 1993: Chapter 5: Internal Security Concerns; Ododa, 1985: 287; Uppsala Conflict Data Program 2012/12/19). Mareehaans dominated both the executive and the army (e.g., Metz, 1993: Chapter 5: National Security). It is known that the Red Berets (Duub Cas), Barre’s elite unit, was recruited mainly among Mareehaan (ibid.: Chapter 1: Somalia’s Difficult Decade, 1980-90: Siad Barre’s Repressive Measures).
SSDF was formed in October 1981 after a merger of three opposition groups: the Somali Salvation Front (SSF), the Somali Workers Party (SWP) and the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Somalia (DFLS) (e.g., Metz, 1993: Chapter 5: Internal Security Concerns: Sources of Opposition). While its membership came from different clans, SSDF was largely dominated by members of Majeerteen sub-clan (Luling, 1997: 293; Metz, 1993: Chapter 5: Internal Security Concerns: Sources of Opposition; and Chapter 2: Lineage Segmentation and the Somali Civil War; 293).

3. Mareehaan and Majeerteen are sub-clans of the same Daarood clan (e.g., Luling, 1997: 293). Both were composed of Somali people who spoke Somali and were predominantly Sunni Muslims.

ID: 141
Location:

Somalia

SideBName: Somali National Movement
Startdate2: 03/03/1986
Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified
Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1
EPRcodes: No data
Coding description:

2. SideB: See above (ID: 141, year 1982); SideB: SNM was dominated by Isaaq clan (e.g., Metz, 1993: Chapter 1: Somalia’s Difficult Decade, 1980-90: Oppression of the Isaaq; Ododa, 1985: 287).

3. Both, Mareehaan and Isaaq, are Somali people sharing same language (i.e., Somali) and religion (Sunni Islam).

.................................................................................................................................

ID: 141

Location:

Somalia

SideBName: Somali Reconciliation and Restoration Council

Startdate2: 12/05/2001

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

.................................................................................................................................

ID: 141

Location:

Somalia
SideBName: Supreme Islamic Council of Somalia

Startdate2: 24/10/2006

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 143

Location:

Iran

SideBName: Partî Jiyanî Azadî Kurdistan (The Free Life Party of Kurdistan)

Startdate2: 07/08/2005

Difference: (1) Language (Persian vs. Kurdish) (2) Religion (Shias vs. Sunnis)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Persians 'Senior partner', Kurds 'Discriminated', Azeri 'Junior partner' in 2005

Coding description:


2. SideA: See above (ID: 6, year 1946); PJAK was composed of Iranian Kurdish.
3. See above (ID: 6, year 1946).

4. PJAK mainly engaged Iranian security forces (in particular the Iranian Revolutionary Guards) (e.g., Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/12/11; Richard & Oppel, 2007).

ID: 143

Location: Iran

SideBName: *Mujahideen e Khalq (People's Mujahideen)*

Startdate2: 01/01/1979

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Persians 'Senior partner', Azeri 'Junior partner' in 1979*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 143

Location: Iran

SideBName: *Mujahideen e Khalq (People's Mujahideen)*

Startdate2: 1/01/1986
Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Persians 'Senior partner', Azeri 'Junior partner' in 1986

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 143
Location:

Iran

SideBName: Mujahideen e Khalq (People’s Mujahideen)

Startdate2: 01/01/1991

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Persians 'Senior partner', Azeri 'Junior partner' in 1991

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 143
Location:
**Iran**

SideBName: *Mujahideen e Khalq (People's Mujahideen)*

Startdate2: 01/01/1997

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Persians 'Senior partner', Azeri 'Junior partner' in 1997*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 144

Location:

**Iran**

SideBName: *Arab Political and Cultural Organization*

Startdate2: 31/05/1979

Difference: *(1) Language (Persian vs. Arabic)*

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Iranians 'Senior partner', Azeri 'Junior Partner', Arabs 'Powerless' in 1979*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]
ID: 145

Location:

**Saudi Arabia**

SideBName: *al-Jama’a al-Salafiyya al-Muhtasiba (The Salafi groups which practice hisba)*

Startdate2: 20/11/1979

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Sunni Wahhabi (Najdi) (Arab) 'Senior partner', Sunni Shafii/Sofi (Hijazi) (Arab)*

'Junior partner' in 1979

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 146

Location:

**Liberia**

SideBName: *Military faction (forces of Samuel Doe)*

Startdate2: 2/04/1980

Difference: *(1) Language (English vs. Heterogeneous)*

Category: 1
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Americo-Liberians 'Monopoly', Indigenous Peoples 'Discriminated' in 1980*

Coding description:


2. SideA: Since the foundation of Liberia in 1847 (until 1980) the government was dominated by the so-called Americo-Liberians, freed black slaves or free-born Blacks from the US (Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/12/27).

   SideB: The Military faction was composed of 'one master-sergeant (Samuel Doe), four staff sergeants (Quiwonkpa, Zuo, Dixon and Gban), one sergeant (Thomas weh Syen), eight corporals (Podier, Swen, Voine, Friday, Johnson, Bather, Norman and Penue) and one private first class (William Peters)' (Kandeh, 1996: 391) – all members of indigenous (non-Americo-Liberian) ethnic groups Liberians: Krahn (e.g., Doe), Gio (e.g., Quiwonkpa), Kru (e.g., Syen), Voine (e.g., Kissi) and others.

3. SideA: Americo-Liberians spoke English and were predominantly Christians; SideB: members of the military faction spoke different (non-English) indigenous languages (Kru languages, Dan, Kissi (Southern), and others) and included Christians and Animists.

4. So far, I have not found any information suggesting that the conflict involved any intra-ethnic fighting.

ID: 146

Location: Liberia

SideBName: *National Patriotic Front of Liberia*

Startdate2: 29/12/1989
Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Dan, Mann)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Krahn (Guere) 'Dominant', Americo-Liberians 'Discriminated', Gio 'Discriminated', Mano 'Discriminated' in 1989

Coding description:


2. SideA: At the time of the conflict, the government was in the hands of General Samuel Doe. Doe's regime (in late 1980s) was largely dominated by Krahn (e.g., Dolo, 2007: 45), but also included (and was supported by) significant number of Americo-Liberians (Ibrahim, 2000:50) and Mandingo (Boas, 2005: 80; Howe, 1996-1997: 148; Schwab, 2004: 45). The army was predominantly Khran (e.g., Boas, 2005: 80; Howe, 1996-1997: 148). The relative share of power and access to the executive by each of these ethnic groups remains unclear, however.


3. SideA: Krahn spoke Guere-Krahn languages (Glaro-Twabo, Krahn (Western) and Sapo) (potentially also Krahn (Eastern)) and were mainly Christians and Animists. Americo-Liberians spoke English and were predominantly Christians. Mandingo spoke Manya and were entirely Sunni Muslims.

SideB: Gio spoke Dan and were predominantly animists (90%). Mano spoke Mann and were also predominantly Animists (95%).

There were no racial differences between these groups.

4. So far, I have not found any information suggesting that the conflict (in 1989-1990) involved any systematic intra-Krahn, intra-Americo-Liberian (though, note that Taylor is of mixed Americo-Liberian and Gola descent), intra-Mandingo, intra-Gio or intra-Mano fighting.
ID: 146

Location:

**Liberia**

SideBName: Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy

Startdate2: 01/08/2000

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Manya) (2) Religion (Christians, Ethnoreligionists vs. Muslims)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Americo-Liberians 'Senior partner', Mandigo 'Discriminated', Gio 'Junior partner', Mano 'Junior partner' in 2000

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 147

Location:

**Spain**

SideBName: Euskadi ta azkatasuna (Basque Nation and Liberty)

Startdate2: 22/10/1978

Difference: (1) Language (Spanish vs. Basque)
EPRcodes: Spanish 'Monopoly', Basques 'Powerless' in 1978

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Spain; SideB: Euskadi ta azkatasuna (ETA).

2. SideA: Government of Spain was dominated by Spanish; ETA was composed of (and claimed to represent) Basques.

3. Spanish spoke Spanish and were predominantly Christians; SideB: Basques spoke Basque and were predominantly Christians as well. There were no racial differences between the parties to a conflict.

4. Between 1959 and 2010, ETA killed 829 people (The Guardian, 2010). The majority of ETA victims were Government officials: Civil Guard (203), National Police (146), Armed Forces (98), Local Police (24) and Public Guard (13) (ibid.).

ID: 147

Location:

Spain

SideBName: Euskadi ta azkatasuna (Basque Nation and Liberty)

Startdate2: 23/12/1985

Difference: (1) Language (Spanish vs. Basque)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Spanish 'Monopoly', Basques 'Regional autonomy' in 1985
Coding description:

[This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of Spain and ETA – see above]

ID: 147
Location:

Spain

SideBName: Euskadi ta azkatasuna (Basque Nation and Liberty)
Startdate2: 01/07/1991
Difference: (1) Language (Spanish vs. Basque)
Category: 2
Uncertainty: 1
EPRcodes: Spanish 'Monopoly', Basques 'Regional autonomy' in 1991
Coding description:

[This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of Spain and ETA – see above]

ID: 148
Location:

Tunisia

SideBName: Résistance Armée Tunisienne (Tunisian Armed Resistance)
Startdate2: 28/01/1980

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data

Coding description:
[Currently unavailable]

ID: 149

Location:

Gambia

SideBName: National Revolutionary Council

Startdate2: 30/07/1981

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Wolof 'Senior partner', Mandinka 'Junior partner', Fula 'Junior partner', Diola 'Junior partner', Aku (Creoles) 'Junior partner' in 1981

Coding description:
[Currently unavailable]
ID: 150

Location:

South Africa

SideBName: African National Congress

Startdate2: 07/08/1981

Difference: (1) Language (Afrikaans vs. Heterogeneous) (3) Race (Whites vs. Blacks)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Afrikaners 'Monopoly' in 1981

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

........................................................................................................................................................................

ID: 152

Location:

India

SideBName: People's Liberation Army

Startdate2: 01/07/1982

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Metei)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

Coding description:


2. SideA: See above (ID: 29, year 1948); although the PLA claimed to be 'trans-tribal', it was primarily composed of Meitei (e.g., South Asia Terrorism Portal (4/12/2012); also Cline, 2006: 137; and Singh, 2008: 1125).

3. SideA: See above (ID: 29, year 1948); SideB: Meitei spoke Meitei and were predominantly Hindu (85% according to WCD).

4. So far, I could not find any information suggesting that the conflict involved intra-Meitei fighting. It is known that Indian government typically relied on 'alien' troops to deal with ethnic rebellions (see above, ID: 54, year 1956).

ID: 152

Location:

India

SideBName: People's Liberation Army

Startdate2: 01/01/1992
Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Metei)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1


Coding description:

[This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of India and PLA – see above]

ID: 152

Location:

India

SideBName: United National Liberation Front

Startdate2: 23/10/2003

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Metei)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

Coding description:


2. SideA: See above (ID: 29, year 1948); SideB: UNLF was predominantly Meitei (e.g., South Asia Terrorism Portal, 5/12/2012; also Cline, 2006: 137).

3. SideA: See above (ID: 29, year 1948); SideB: See above (ID: 152; year 1982).

4. So far, I could not find any information suggesting that the conflict involved intra-Meitei fighting. As already mentioned, it is known that Indian government typically relied on 'alien' troops to deal with ethnic rebellions (see above, ID: 54, year 1956)

ID: 153

Location:

Kenya

SideBName: Military faction (forces of Hezekiah Ochuka)

Startdate2: 01/08/1982

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Dholuo)

Category: 1
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Kalenjin-Masai-Turkana-Samburu 'Senior partner', Luo 'discriminated', Kamba 'Junior partner', Kisii 'Junior partner', Luhya 'Junior partner', Mijikenda 'Junior partner' in 1982

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 156

Location:

India

SideBName: Sikh insurgents

Startdate2: 01/01/1983

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 4

Uncertainty: 1


Coding description:
1. SideA: Government of India; SideB: Sikh Insurgents.

2. SideA: Government of India was ethnically heterogeneous (see above, ID: 29, year 1948). Note that between 1982 and 1987 the president of India was Sikh (Zail Singh). The ministerial cabinet included Sikhs as well. Sikhs were also represented in the national army (see below).

SideB: 'Sikh Insurgents' is a term UCDP/PRIO uses to refer to various Sikh insurgent groups operating in Punjab in the early 1980s; thus, no particular group/organization is identified as a party to a conflict (i.e., SideB).

3. SideA: See above (ID: 29, year 1948); Punjabi Sikhs spoke Punjabi (Eastern) and followed Sikhism.

4. The date of the conflict start is coded imprecisely ('5') by UCDP/PRIO. Thus, I cannot use any particular event for determining the patterns of confrontation between SideA and SideB. It is known that Sikhs have always been disproportionally represented in the national army: 'Punjabis (Sikhs and non-Sikhs) continue to account for 10-15 percent of all ranks in the Indian Army despite the state containing just 2.45 percent of India's national population in 1981. Moreover, with the exception of Ghurkhas (recruited in Nepal), Sikhs remain the only community to have infantry regiments drawn exclusively from their own numbers: the Sikh Regiment (manned, though not officered, by high-caste Jat Sikhs) and the Sikh Light Infantry (manned entirely by Mazhabi, or Scheduled Caste, "untouchable" Sikhs ' (Kundu, 1994: 48).

Sikh representation in the officer corps was even higher: 'in 1962 almost 40 percent (30 of 79) of the Indian Army's brigadiers and over 45 percent (13 of 28) of its major generals were Sikhs. A Punjab with just 2.45 percent of India's population in 1981 still accounted for over 10 percent of all cadets attending the IMA's [Indian Military Academy] ten regular courses from 1978-82. A 1991 report estimates that Sikhs themselves continue to constitute a fifth of all Indian Army officers. Sikhs also make up "perhaps a quarter" of India Air Force pilots (all officers) and "substantial numbers" of the Indian Navy' (ibid.: 49).

It seems thus that the government could have hardly avoided relying on just 'alien troops' (see ID: 54, 1956) in this particular conflict. Indeed, it is known that Sikh soldiers, as well as
officers, participated in the Operation Blue Star – one of the major episodes of the conflict. As Kundu points out: '9th Division CO Maj. Gen. Kuldip Singh Brar found time to visit his non-Sikh and Sikh troops, and (without precedent) offer them the chance to refuse to participate with no repercussions. Not one took up this offer and they fought under Brar in the assault on the Golden Temple complex with perfect discipline. Even more importantly, the loyalty of Sikh commissioned officers remained untarnished both during and after Operation Blue Star. While non-Sikh Lt.-Gen. (Later General) K. Sundarji was in charge of the army in Punjab, his Sikh chief of staff, Lt. Gen. Ranjit Singh Dayal planned Operation Blue Star, Sikh Maj. Gen. Kuldip Singh Brar commanded the 9th Division's liberation of the Golden Temple and hostel complex, and Sikh Maj. Gen. Gurdial Singh led the army operation against pro-Bhin-dranwale militants encountered in Patiala's Gurudwara Dukhniiwan.

Non-Sikh Vice Admiral 2 also recalls how "Lieut.-General Oberoi, a Sikh, personally rushed from Delhi to help apprehend mutinous Sikh soldiers" (1994: 68). Further, it is known that 9th Division commanded by Brar was composed of three brigades, two of which were composed of Sikhs (Diwanji, 2004). Thus, SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB (note, however, that Operation Blue Star took place only in the later stages of conflict, June 1984).

| ID: 157 |
| Location: |
| **Sri Lanka** |
| SideBName: Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam, Tamil Eelam Liberation Organization |
| Startdate2: 10/09/1984 |
| Difference: (1) Language (Sinhala vs. Tamil) (2) Religion (Buddhists vs. Hindus) |
| Category: 2 |
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Sinhalese 'Dominant', Sri Lankan Tamils 'Separatist autonomy' in 1984

Coding description:


2. SideA: Government of Sri Lanka was dominated by Sinhalese (e.g., Stokke, 1998; Stokke & Ryntvet, 2000); SideB: Both LTTE and TELO were Tamil organizations (ibid.),

3. SideA: Sinhalese spoke Sinhala and were predominantly Buddhists; SideB: Tamils spoke Tamil and were predominantly Hindus.

4. It is known that Tamil organizations fought each other on numerous occasions. Yet, I have not found any information suggesting that any of these groups fought on the side of the government.

........................................................................................................................................................................

ID: 158

Location:

Cameroon

SideBName: Union des populations camerounaises (Union of the Populations of Cameroon)

Startdate2: 01/01/1960

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Bamileke languages)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 3

EPRcodes: Fulani (and other northern Muslim people) 'Senior partner', Bamileke 'Junior partner', Bassa/Duala 'Junior partner', Beti (and related peoples) 'Junior partner',
Northwestern Anglophones (Grassfielders) 'Junior partner', Southwestern Anglophones
(Bakweri etc.) 'Junior partner' in 1960

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 158
Location:

Cameroon

SideBName: Military faction (forces of Ibrahim Saleh)

Startdate2: 06/04/1984

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 3

EPRcodes: Beti (and related peoples) 'Senior partner', Fulani (and other northern Muslim
people) 'Junior partner', Bamileke 'Junior partner', Bassa/Duala 'Junior partner',
Northwestern Anglophones (Grassfielders) 'Junior partner', Southwestern Anglophones
(Bakweri etc.) 'Junior partner' in 1984

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 159
Location:
Turkey

SideBName: Partiya karkeren Kurdistan (Kurdistan Worker’s Party)

Startdate2: 15/08/1984

Difference: (1) Language (Turkish vs. Kurdish)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 4

EPRcodes: Turkish 'Monopoly', Kurds 'Discriminated' in 1984

Coding description:


2. SideA: Government of Turkey was dominated by Turks; SideB: PKK was Kurdish organization (e.g., Metz, 1996: Chapter 5: Internal Security Concerns: Kurdish Separatists; also McDowall, 1996: 418-442).

3. Turkish spoke Turkish and were predominantly Sunnis; Kurdish spoke Kurdish and were predominantly Sunnis. Note, however, that PKK leadership could barely speak Kurdish: 'For the PKK the intensity of Kurdish national feeling was accentuated by the loss of spoken Kurdish among its founding members' (ibid.: 419).

4. It is known that PKK carried out attacks against Kurdish population unwilling to cooperate or suspected of collaborating with the government. Indeed, some of the local Kurds collaborated with the government and fought against KPP (421-423). Further, it is known that in the later stages of conflict (1992) Iraqi Kurdish took part in the Turkish government operation against PKK (Metz, 1996: Chapter 5: Internal Security Concerns: Kurdish Separatists). Yet, it seems that the initial stage of the conflict (late 1984-early 1985) was largely limited to the confrontation between PKK and Turkish government forces (e.g., 418, 421).
ID: 162

Location:

**Suriname**

SideBName: *Surinamese Liberation Army*

Startdate2: 12/10/1987

Difference: *(1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Saramaccan, Aukan)*

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *No data*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

.................................................................

ID: 163

Location:

**Togo**

SideBName: *Movement togolaise pour la démocratie (Togolese Movement for Democracy)*

Startdate2: 23/09/1986

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 2
EPRcodes: Kabre (and related groups) 'Dominant' in 1986

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 164

Location:

**South Yemen**

SideBName: Yemenite Socialist Party - Abdul Fattah Ismail faction

Startdate2: 13/01/1986

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 165

Location:

**Burkina Faso**

SideBName: Popular Front
Startdate2: 15/10/1987

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 167

Location:

Comoros

SideBName: Presidential guard

Startdate2: 29/11/1989

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 2

EPRcodes: No data

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 168
**Location:**

*Ethiopia*

SideBName: *Afar Liberation Front*

Startdate2: 01/06/1975

Difference: (1) *Language (Amharic vs. Afari)* (2) *Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)*

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Amhara 'Dominant', Afar 'Discriminated' in 1975*

Coding description:


2. SideA: See above (ID: 70, year 1960); SideB: ALF was composed of Afar people (e.g., Shehim, 1985).

3. SideA: See above (ID: 70, year 1960); SideB: Afar spoke Afar and were entirely Muslims.

4. So far, I could not find any information suggesting that the conflict, in 1975, involved any intra-Amhara or intra-Afar fighting. It is known, however, that in the later stages of the conflict (1976 and onwards), a number of ALF members defected to the government side and subsequently assumed offices in the local administration (ibid.: 344-347).

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**ID:** 168

**Location:**

*Ethiopia*

SideBName: *Afar Revolutionary Democratic Unity Front*
Startdate2: 01/06/1996

Difference: (1) Language (Tigrigna, Amharic vs. Afari) (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Tigry 'Senior partner', Afar 'Discriminated', Amhara 'Junior partner', Oroma 'Junior partner' in 1996

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Ethiopia; SideB: Afar Revolutionary Democratic Unity Front (ARDUF).

2. SideA: See above (ID: 70, year 1960); SideB: ARDUF was Afar organization (e.g., Shehim, 1985). Note that there was some limited Afar representation in the government and the legislature (see above, ID: 70, 1960).


4. So far, I could not find any information suggesting that the conflict involved any intra-Tigray, intra-Amhara or intra-Afar fighting.

ID: 169

Location:

India

SideBName: Kashmir insurgents

Startdate2: 11/12/1989

Difference: (2) Religion (Heterogeneous vs. Muslims)

Category: 2
Uncertainty: 4


Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ID: 170

Location:

India

SideBName: United Liberation Front of Assam

Startdate2: 01/01/1990

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Assamese)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 3


Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]
ID: 170

Location:

**India**

SideBName: *United Liberation Front of Assam*

Startdate2: 01/01/1994

Difference: (1) *Language (Heterogeneous vs. Assamese)*

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 3


Coding description:


2. SideA: See above (ID: 29, year 1948); SideB: ULFA was composed of Assamese (e.g., Nath, 2002)

3. SideA: See above (ID: 29); SideB: Assamese spoke Assamese and were predominantly Hindu (85% according to WCD).

4. So far, I could not find any information suggesting that the conflict involved intra-Assamese fighting in 1994; though, there is evidence that ULFA surrenders (members of SULFA) assisted Indian army in their fight against ULFA in 1998 (ibid.).
ID: 171

Location:

Indonesia

SideBName: Gerakan Aceh Merdeka (Free Aceh Movement)

Startdate2: 22/06/1990

Difference: (1) Language (Javanese vs. Aceh)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Javanese 'Dominant', Achinese 'Powerless' in 1990

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Indonesia; SideB: Gerakan Aceh Merdeka (GAM).

2. SideA: See above (ID: 40, year 1950); SideB: GAM was Acehnese organization (e.g., Ross, 2005).

3. SideA: See above (ID: 40), year 1950; SideB: Acehnese spoke Aceh and were entirely Sunni (Shafi) Muslims (100% according to WCD).

4. So far, I have not found any information suggesting that the conflict involved systematic intra-Javanese or intra-Acehnese fighting.

...........................................................................................................

ID: 171

Location:

Indonesia
SideBName: Gerakan Aceh Merdeka (Free Aceh Movement)

Startdate2: 19/06/1999

Difference: (1) Language (Javanese vs. Aceh)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Javanese 'Dominant', Achinese 'Regional autonomy' in 1999

Coding description:

[This conflict is a continuation of the conflict between Government of Indonesia and GAM – see above]

ID: 172

Location: Panama

SideBName: Military faction (forces of Moisés Giroldi)

Startdate2: 03/10/1989

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Panamans 'Monopoly' in 1989

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]
ID: 174

Location:

**Papua New Guinea**

SideBName: *Bougainville Revolutionary Army*

Startdate2: 28/10/1989

Difference: (1) Language (*Heterogeneous vs. Bougainvillean languages*)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *No data*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 175

Location:

**Romania**

SideBName: *Frontul Salvării Naționale (National Salvation Front)*

Startdate2: 22/12/1989

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3
Mali

SideBName: Mouvement Populaire de Libération de l'Azaouad (Popular Movement for the Liberation of Azawad)

Startdate2: 21/07/1990

Difference: (1) Language (Bamanankan vs. Tamashek, Arabic)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Blacks (Mande, Peul, Voltaic etc.) 'Monopoly', Whites (Tuareg & Arabs) 'Powerless' in 1990

Coding description:


2. SideA: Since 1968 (until March 1991) the government of Mali was in the hands of Moussa Traoré and his Union Démocratique du Peuple Malien (UDPM). So far, I could not determine the exact ethnic composition of the executive. Traore, who had extensive executive powers, was Bamana (or Bambara). It is known that Bamana have traditionally dominated Malian
politics (and thus the government) (e.g., Gutelius, 2007: 66; Humphreys & Mohamed, 2005: 267; Krings, 1995: 58, 60).

SideB: MPLA was composed of Tuareg and Arab nomads (e.g., Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/12/17; Humphreys & Mohamed, 2005: 255; Keita, 1998: 112).

3. SideA: Bamana spoke Bamanankan and were predominantly Sunni Muslims; SideB: Tuaregs spoke Tamashek (a 'macrolanguage) and Arabs Arabic (Hasanya). Both groups were predominantly Sunni Muslims.

Conflicts between Tuaregs, Arabs and Malian government have often been defined in racial terms (i.e., 'blacks' versus 'whites') (e.g., Hirsch, 2012; Humphreys & Mohamed, 2005: 281-282). It is known, however, that the rebels included a small number (precise number is unknown) Bella (or Ikelan) recruits, so-called 'Black Tuaregs' (Keita, 1998: 112).

4. The army was dominated by Bambara (e.g., Hirsch, 2012); yet, according to Keita, a number of Tuaregs served in the Malian army as well, both before and during the rebellion (1998: Endnotes 21 and 47). Thus, the conflict could have involved some intra-Tuareg fighting. However, I could not determine the proportion of Tuaregs in the Malian Army at the time of the conflict. Also, I have not found any information suggesting that Tuaregs serving in the army were directly involved in the confrontation with MPLA.

ID: 177

Location:

**Mali**

SideBName: *Front islamique arabe de l’Azaouad (Islamic Arab Front of Azawad)*

Startdate2: 04/10/1994

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Arabic)

Category: 2
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Blacks (Mande, Peul, Voltaic etc.) 'Monopoly', Whites (Tuareg & Arabs) 'Powerless' in 1994

Coding description:


2. SideA: In 1991 Traore was overthrown and Mali started transition to multiparty democracy. Since then Malian government increasingly became ethnically heterogeneous (e.g., Dunning & Harrison, 2010: 22; Minority Rights Group International, 2007; United States Department of State, 1999). This was also the case in the army. After the 'National Pact' (peace accord between the government and various rebel factions signed in April 1992), significant number of Tuaregs (as well as some Arabs) were gradually integrated into the national army, police and civil service (Keita, 1998). The first round of integration took place in April 1993: 150 fighters of the PLA, 120 of the MPA, 140 of the ARLA and 190 of the FIAA were integrated into the national army (Keita, 1998: Appendix B, Table 1) (note, however, that rebel integration proved difficult at the start with some factions braking the ceasefire and returning back to rebellion, see Poulton & Youssouf, 1998: 55-77).

The FPLA, ARLA and (as mentioned above, ID: 177, year 1990) MPA were Tuareg organizations (Lode, 1997: 414), while the FIAA was predominantly Arab (see below). By 1998, some 3000 Tuareg fighters were integrated into Malian security forces and civil service (Keita, 1998: 114). When the conflict broke out, the Malian army numbered only 6900, the Gendarmerie numbered about 1800 and the National Police about 1000 (International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1989: 134-135). Thus, at the time of the conflict between the government and the FIAA (late 1994), Tuaregs must have constituted substantial part of the national army.

SideB: the FIAA was a splinter group from the MPLA composed of Arabs (e.g., Krings, 1995: 61; Poulton & Youssouf, 1998: 57). It broke away from the ceasefire and confronted the government, as well as other Tuareg groups. So far, I could not determine whether any of the FIAA fighters remained on the government side (see above) and whether government-FIAA confrontation involved any intra-Arab fighting (in 1994).

ID: 177
Location:

*Mali*

SideBName: *Alliance démocratique du 23 Mai pour le changement – Ibrahim Bahanga faction (May 23 Democratic Alliance for Change – Ibrahim Bahanga faction)*

Startdate2: 31/08/2007

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 4

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data for 2007; 2005: Blacks (Mande, Peul, Voltaic etc.) 'Senior partner', Whites (Tuareg & Arabs) 'Junior partner' in 1994

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 178
Location:

*Niger*

SideBName: *Coordination de la résistance armée (Coordination of the Armed Resistance)*

Startdate2: 16/05/1994
Difference: (1) Language (Hausa, Zarma vs. Tamashek)

Category: 2
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Hausa 'Senior partner', Tuareg 'Junior partner', Dhjerma-Songhai 'Junior partner', Kanouri 'Junior partner' in 1994

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 179

Location:

Rwanda

SideBName: Front patriotique rwandais (Rwandan Patriotic Front)

Startdate2: 03/10/1990

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Hutu 'Monopoly', Tutsi 'Discriminated' in 1990

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 179
Location:

Rwanda

SideBName: Peuple en armes pour la liberation du Rwanda (Armed People for the Liberation of Rwanda)

Startdate2: 12/07/1996

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Tutsi 'Dominant', Hutu 'Discriminated' in 1996

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 179

Location:

Rwanda

SideBName: Peuple en armes pour la liberation du Rwanda (Armed People for the Liberation of Rwanda)

Startdate2: 28/01/2009

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1
EPRcodes: No data for 2009; 2005: Tutsi 'Dominant', Hutu 'Powerless'

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 180

Location:

*Senegal*

SideBName: *Mouvement des forces démocratiques de Casamance (Movement of the Democratic Forces of the Casamance)*

Startdate2: 01/08/1990

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Jola-Fonyi)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 3

EPRcodes: Wolof 'Senior partner, Diola 'Junior Partner', Pulaar (Peul, Toucouleur) 'Junior partner', Serer 'Junior partner', Mandingue (and other eastern groups) 'Junior partner'

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 181

Location:

*Russia (Soviet Union)*
SideBName: Republic of Armenia

Startdate2: 01/08/1990

Difference: (1) Language (Russian vs. Armenian)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Russians 'Senior partner', Armenians 'Regional autonomy', Ukrainians 'Junior partner' in 1990

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 182

Location:

Russia (Soviet Union)

SideBName: Azerbaijani Popular Front

Startdate2: 19/01/1990

Difference: (1) Language (Russian vs. Azerbaijani) (2) Religion (Atheists, Christians vs. Muslims)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Russians 'Senior partner', Azerbaijanis 'Regional autonomy', Ukrainians 'Junior partner' in 1990

Coding description:
Trinidad and Tobago

SideBName: Jamaat al-Muslimeen (Muslim Society)

Startdate2: 30/07/1990

Difference: (1) Religion (Christians, Hindus vs. Muslims)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: East Indians 'Senior partner', Blacks 'Junior partner' in 1990

Coding description:

1. SideA: Trinidad and Tobago; SideB: Jamaat al-Muslimeen.

2. SideA: When the conflict started, the government was in the hands of the National Alliance for Reconstruction, NAR. In 1986 elections, the NAR won 33 out of 36 seats and formed the government. At the time of the elections, the NAR was ethnically heterogeneous (mainly Afro-Trinidadian and Indian) (e.g., Premdas, 2007: 159; Premdas & Ragoonath, 1998: 31). However, about one year later, most of the Indian segment left the NAR and formed opposition party – United National Congress (Premdas, 2007: 159; Premdas & Ragoonath, 1998: 35). This notwithstanding, Indians retained five ministerial posts (out of 22) (before the split, the number of Indians in the cabinet was even higher) (Premdas, 2007: 72). The rest were mainly Afro-Trinidadians. The prime minister, A. N. R. Robinson, was Afro-Trinidadian as well (Premdas & Ragoonath, 1998: 31).
The composition of the national army (in 1990) was as follows: Afro-Trinidadians 71.53%, Indians 9.84%, Chinese 0.13%, White 0.13%, Mixed 17.70%, other ethnic groups 0.20%, none stated 0.46% (Premdas, 2007: 60).

SideB: Jamaat al-Muslimeen were composed of 300-400 Afro-Trinidadian Muslim converts (leader Yasin Abu Bakr) (Collihan & Danopoulos, 1993: 441; Premdas, 2007: 128-129).

3. SideA: The government was heterogeneous in linguistic (English (official language), Tabagodian Creole English, Trinidadian Creole English, Hindustani Caribbean) and religious respect (according to WCD, Afro-Trinidadians were predominantly Christian (94%), Indians – 59% Hindus, 25% Christians and 15% Muslims).

SideB: So far, I could not establish with certainty the language the members of Jamaat al-Muslimeen spoke. However, given that they were Afro-Trinidadians (though Muslim converts), most likely, they were not linguistically distinct from the Afro-Trinidadians represented one the SideA. As mentioned above, Jamaat al-Muslimeen were entirely Muslim (note, that there was a small number of Muslims among Indians, and thus Muslims could have (though to a very low degree) been represented in the government and the army.

There were no racial differences between Afro-Trinidadians on the SideA and SideB.

4. So far, I have not found any information suggesting that the conflict involved fighting between members of the governmental forces or members of the Jamaat al-Muslimeen. It is known that the loyalty of the army was high during entire conflict and no members of the army defected to Jamaat al-Muslimeen (Collihan & Danopoulos, 1993: 445-446).
SideBName: *Front pour la restauration de l’unité et de la démocratie (Front for the Restoration of Unity and Democracy)*

Startdate2: 13/11/1991

Difference: (1) *Language (Somali vs. Afar)*

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *No data*

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Djibouti; SideB: *Front pour la restauration de l’unité et de la démocratie (FRUD)*.

2. SideA: At the time of the conflict, the government was in the hands of President Gouled Aptidon and his Rassemblement Populaire Pour le Progres, RPP (the only legal party in Djibouti at the time). As Yasin puts it, ‘Gouled has governed the territory as his personal fiefdom, with a few of his Issa cronies controlling the judiciary, the police, the civil service, the army and the economy’ (2010: 113). Gouled was member of Issa. RPP was dominated by Issa as well. The executive, in general, and the army was also dominated by Issas (Schraeder, 1993: 203).

However, formally, Afar people (see below) were not entirely excluded from the executive. The prime minister, as well as several members of the cabinet, were Afar. The national assembly included a significant number of Afar as well (ibid.: 208). However, their de facto power and the extent to which they represented Afar population remains rather questionable, as the prime minister – whose powers were very limited – was appointed by the president, who was, as mentioned above, the de facto ruler of the country, and the candidates to the Assembly were selected and approved by the Issa-dominated RPP, thus, ‘ensuring the selection of Afar candidates who potentially were more beholden to Gouled than to their own people’ (ibid.).

SideB: The FRUD leadership, foot-soldiers and support base were Afars (e.g., ibid.: 211-212).
3. SideA: Issa, a clan of Somali people, spoke Somali and were entirely Sunni Muslims; SideB: Afar spoke Afar and were entirely Sunni Muslims as well.

4. So far, I have not found any information suggesting that the conflict, in 1991, involved any systematic intra-Issa or intra-Afar fighting.

ID: 184

Location:

Djibouti

SideBName: Front pour la restauration de l’unité et de la démocratie – Ahmed Dini faction

(Front for the Restoration of Unity and Democracy – Ahmed Dini faction)

Startdate2: 24/07/1999

Difference: (1) Language (Somali vs. Afar)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 185

Location:

Georgia
SideBName: National Guard and Mkhedrioni

Startdate2: 28/12/1991

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Georgians 'Dominant' in 1991

Coding description:


2. Both SideA and SideB were predominantly Georgians (e.g., Baev, 2003: 130-134).

3. Thus, no racial, linguistic or religious differences between parties to a conflict have been identified.

ID: 186

Location: Haiti

SideBName: Military faction (forces of Himmler Rebu and Guy Francois)

Startdate2: 08/04/1989

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Blacks 'Senior partner', Mulatto 'Junior partner' in 1989
Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 186

Location:

_Haiti_

SideBName: *Military faction (forces of Raol Cédras)*

Startdate2: 02/10/1991

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Blacks 'Senior partner', Mulatto 'Junior partner' in 1991*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 186

Location:

_Haiti_

SideBName: *Front pour la Liberación et la Reconstruction Nationales (National Front for the Liberation of Haiti), OP Lavalas (Chimères)*

Startdate2: 09/02/2004
Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Blacks 'Senior partner', Mulatto 'Junior partner' in 2004

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 187

Location: Sierra Leone

SideBName: Revolutionary United Front

Startdate2: 05/04/1991

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Limba 'Senior partner', Creole 'Junior partner', Temne 'Junior partner' in 1991

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 188

Location:
Turkey

SideBName: Revolutionary Left
Startdate2: 13/07/1991

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Turkish 'Monopoly' in 1991

Coding description:
[Currently unavailable]

ID: 188
Location:

Turkey

SideBName: Maoist Komünist Partisi (Maoist Communist Party)
Startdate2: 18/06/2005

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Turkish 'Monopoly' in 2005

Coding description:
[Currently unavailable]
ID: 189

Location:

Serbia (Yugoslavia)

SideBName: Republic of Slovenia

Startdate2: 28/06/1991

Difference: (1) Language (Serbian vs. Slovenian) (2) Religion (Orthodox Christians vs. Roman Catholics)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Serbs 'Senior partner', Slovenes 'Senior partner', Croats 'Senior partner', Bosniaks/Muslims 'Senior partners', Macedonians 'Senior partner', Montenegrins 'Senior partner' in 1991

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 190

Location:

Serbia (Yugoslavia)

SideBName: Croatian irregulars, Republic of Croatia

Startdate2: 27/07/1991
Difference: (1) Language (Serbian vs. Croatian) (2) Religion (Orthodox Christians vs. Roman Catholics)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Serbs 'Senior partner', Croats 'Senior partner', Slovenes 'Senior partner', Bosniaks/Muslims 'Senior partners', Macedonians 'Senior partner', Montenegrins 'Senior partner' in 1991

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 191

Location:

Algeria

SideBName: Takfir wa'l Hijra (Exile and Redemption)

Startdate2: 09/12/1991

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Arabs 'Dominant', Berbers 'Powerless' in 1991

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]
ID: 192

Location:

Angola

SideBName: Frente da libertação do enclave de Cabinda–Renovada (Front for the Liberation of the Enclave of Cabinda–Renewed)

Startdate2: 03/06/1991

Difference: (1) Language (Kimbundu, Portuguese vs. Kikongo)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Mbundu-Mestico 'Monopoly', Bakongo 'Powerless in 1991

Coding description:


2. SideA: See above (ID: 131, year 1975); SideB: The FLEC-R and FLEC-FAC represented Cabindan Bakongos (e.g., Porto, 2003; also Martin, 1977).


4. So far, I could not find any information suggesting that the conflict involved intra-Mestico, intra-Mbundu or intra-Bakongo fighting.

ID: 192

Location:
Angola

SideBName: Frente da libertação do enclave de Cabinda–Forças armadas de Cabinda (Front for the Liberation of the Enclave of Cabinda–Armed Forces of Cabinda), Frente da libertação do enclave de Cabinda–Renovada (Front for the Liberation of the Enclave of Cabinda–Renewed)

Startdate2: 01/01/1994

Difference: (1) Language (Kimbundu, Portuguese vs. Kikongo)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Mbundu-Mestico 'Monopoly', Bakongo 'Powerless in 1994

Coding description:

[This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of Angola and FLEC-R – see above]

ID: 192

Location:

Angola

SideBName: Frente da libertação do enclave de Cabinda–Forças armadas de Cabinda (Front for the Liberation of the Enclave of Cabinda–Armed Forces of Cabinda), Frente da libertação do enclave de Cabinda–Renovada (Front for the Liberation of the Enclave of Cabinda–Renewed)

Startdate2: 01/01/2002

Difference: (1) Language (Kimbundu, Portuguese vs. Kikongo)
Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Mbundu-Mestico 'Monopoly', Bakongo 'Powerless in 2002

Coding description:

[This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of Angola and FLEC-R and FLEC-FAC – see above]

ID: 192

Location:

Angola

SideBName: Frente da libertação do enclave de Cabinda–Forças armadas de Cabinda (Front for the Liberation of the Enclave of Cabinda–Armed Forces of Cabinda)

Startdate2: 01/01/2007

Difference: (1) Language (Kimbundu, Portuguese vs. Kikongo)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data for 2007; 2005: Mbundu-Mestico 'Monopoly', Bakongo 'Powerless'

Coding description:

[This conflict is a continuation of the previous conflict between Government of Angola and FLEC-R and FLEC-FAC – see above]

ID: 193
Location:

**Azerbaijan**

SideBName: *Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh*

Startdate2: 30/12/1991

Difference: (1) *Language (Azerbaijani vs. Armenian)* (2) *Religion (Muslims vs. Christians)*

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Azeri 'Dominant', Armenians 'Separatist autonomy' in 1991*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ID: 193

Location:

**Azerbaijan**

SideBName: *Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh*

Startdate2: 09/10/2005

Difference: (1) *Language (Azerbaijani vs. Armenian)* (2) *Religion (Muslims vs. Christians)*

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Azeri 'Dominant', Armenians 'Separatist autonomy' in 2005*
ID: 194

Location:

**Bosnia-Herzegovina**

SideBName: *Serbian irregulars, Serbian Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina*

Startdate2: 30/04/1992

Difference: *1) Language (Bosnian vs. Serbian) 2) Religion (Muslims vs. Christians)*

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Bosniaks/Muslims 'Senior partner', Serbs 'Separatist autonomy', Croats 'Junior partner' in 1992*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 195

Location:

**Croatia**

SideBName: *Serbian irregulars, Republika Srpska Krajina (Serbian Republic of Krajina)*

Startdate2: 17/05/1992
Difference: (1) Language (Croatian vs. Serbian) (2) Religion (Roman Catholics vs. Orthodox Christians)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Croats 'Monopoly', Serbs 'Powerless' in 1992

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

.................................................................

ID: 195

Location:

Croatia

SideBName: Republika Srpska Krajina (Serbian Republic of Krajina)

Startdate2: 01/05/1995

Difference: (1) Language (Croatian vs. Serbian) (2) Religion (Roman Catholics vs. Orthodox Christians)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Croats 'Monopoly', Serbs 'Discriminated' in 1995

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

.................................................................

ID: 196
Egypt

SideBName: al-Gama’a al-Islamiyya (Islamic Group)

Startdate2: 10/03/1993

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Arab Muslims 'Dominant' in 1993

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 197

Location:

Georgia

SideBName: Republic of Abkhazia

Startdate2: 18/08/1992

Difference: (1) Language (Georgian vs. Abkhaz)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Georgians 'Dominant', Abhazians 'Separatist autonomy' in 1992
Coding description:


2. SideA: Government of Georgia was predominantly Georgian; SideB: Republic of Abkhazia represented (and was composed of) Abkhazians (e.g., Baev, 2003: 137-141). Note that Abkhazians were supported by local Armenians and Russians (Krag & Funch, 1994: 36).

3. Georgians spoke Georgian and were predominantly Christians; SideB: Abkhazians spoke Abkhaz and followed Christianity and Islam (70% and 23% respectively).

4. So far, I have not found any information suggesting that the conflict involved systematic intra-Georgian or intra-Abkhazian fighting.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ID: 198

Location:

**Georgia**

SideBName: *Republic of South Ossetia*

Startdate2: 08/06/1992

Difference: *(1) Language (Georgian vs. Osetin)*

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Georgians 'Dominant', Ossetians (South) 'Separatist autonomy' in 1992

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Georgia; SideB: Republic of South Ossetia.

2. SideA: Government of Georgia was predominantly Georgian; SideB: Republic of South Ossetia represented (and was composed of) Ossetians (e.g., Baev, 2003: 134-137).
3. Georgians spoke Georgian and were predominantly Christians; SideB: Ossetians spoke Osetin and followed Christianity and Islam (55% and 40% respectively).

4. So far, I have not found any information suggesting that the conflict involved systematic intra-Georgian or intra-Ossetian fighting.

ID: 198

Location: Georgia

SideBName: Republic of South Ossetia

Startdate2: 19/08/2004

Difference: (1) Language (Georgian vs. Osetin)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Georgians 'Dominant', Ossetians (South) 'Separatist autonomy' in 2004

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]
Startdate1: 08/08/2008

Difference: (1) Language (Georgian vs. Osetin)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data for 2008; 2005: Georgians 'Dominant', Ossetians (South) 'Separatist autonomy'

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ID: 199

Location:

Moldova

SideBName: Pridnistrovs’ka Moldavs’ka Respublika (Dniestr Republic)

Startdate1: 17/03/1992

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 4

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Moldovans 'Dominant', Transnistrians 'Separatist autonomy', Russian speakers 'Powerless' in 1992

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
ID: 200

Location:

Tajikistan

SideBName: United Tajik Opposition

Startdate2: 10/05/1992

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Tajiks 'Senior partner', Uzbeks 'Junior partner' in 1992

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

..............................................................

ID: 201

Location:

Azerbaijan

SideBName: Military faction (forces of Suret Husseinov)

Startdate2: 06/06/1993

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1
EPRcodes: Azeri 'Dominant' in 1993

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 201
Location:

Azerbaijan

SideBName: Otryad Policija Osobogo Naznacenija (Special Police Brigade)

Startdate2: 17/03/1995
Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Azeri 'Dominant' in 1995

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 202
Location:

Bosnia-Herzegovina

SideBName: Autonomous Province of Western Bosnia
Startdate2: 05/10/1993

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 4

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Bosniaks/Muslims 'Senior partner', Croats 'Junior partner' in 1993

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 203

Location:

**Bosnia-Herzegovina**

SideBName: Croatian irregulars, Croatian Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina

Startdate2: 15/01/1993

Difference: (1) Language (Bosnian vs. Croatian) (2) Religion (Muslims vs. Christians)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Bosniaks/Muslims 'Senior partner', Croats 'Junior partner' in 1993

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 204
Location:

**Russia (Soviet Union)**

SideBName: *Parliamentary Forces*

Startdate2: 03/10/1993

Difference: *No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Russians 'Dominant' in 1993*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 205

Location:

**Mexico**

SideBName: *Ejército Zapatista de liberación nacional (Zapatista National Liberation Army)*

Startdate2: 01/01/1994

Difference: *(1) Language (Spanish vs. Heterogeneous (indigenous))*

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Mestizo 'Dominant', Indigenous peoples 'Powerless' in 1994*
ID: 205

Location:

Mexico

SideBName: Ejercito Popular Revolucionario (Popular Revolutionary Army)

Startdate2: 16/09/1996

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 2

EPRcodes: Mestizo 'Dominant', Indigenous peoples 'Regional autonomy' in 1996

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 206

Location:

Russia (Soviet Union)

SideBName: Chechen Republic of Ichkeria

Startdate2: 26/11/1994
Difference: (1) Language (Russian vs. Chechen) (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Russians 'Dominant', Chechens 'Separatist autonomy' in 1994

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 206

Location:

Russia (Soviet Union)

SideBName: Chechen Republic of Ichkeria

Startdate2: 18/07/1999

Difference: (1) Language (Russian vs. Chechen) (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Russians 'Dominant', Chechens 'Separatist autonomy' in 1999

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 207

Location:
**Yemen**

SideBName: *Democratic Republic of Yemen*

Startdate2: 28/04/1994

Difference: (2) *Religion (Shias vs. Sunnis)*

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 4

EPRcodes: *Northerners 'Senior partner', Southerners 'Senior partner' in 1994*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 209

Location:

**Pakistan**

SideBName: *Mohajir Qaumi Mahaz (Mohajir National Movement)*

Startdate2: 01/06/1990

Difference: (1) *Language (Heterogeneous vs. Urdu)*

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 3

EPRcodes: *Punjabi 'Senior partner', Mohajirs 'Discriminated', Pashtuns 'Junior partner', Sindhi 'Junior partner' in 1990*

Coding description:
ID: 209

Location:

**Pakistan**

SideBName: *Mohajir Qaumi Mahaz (Mohajir National Movement)*

Startdate2: 01/01/1995

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Urdu)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 3

EPRcodes: *Punjabi 'Senior partner', Mohajirs 'Discriminated', Pashtuns 'Junior partner', Sindhi 'Junior partner' in 1995*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ID: 209

Location:

**Pakistan**

SideBName: *Tehreek-e-Nafaz-e-Shariat-e-Mohammadi (Movement for the Enforcement of Islamic Laws)*

Startdate2: 15/07/2007
Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data for 2007; 2005: Punjabi 'Senior partner', Pashtuns 'Junior partner', Sindhi 'Junior partner'

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 212

Location:

Niger

SideBName: Front démocratique pour le renouveau (Democratic Front for Renewal)

Startdate2: 10/07/1995

Difference: (1) Language (Hausa, Zarma vs. Dazaga, Tedaga)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Djerma-Songhai 'Senior partner', Hausa 'Senior partner', Toubou 'Powerless', Kanouri 'Junior partner', Taureg 'Junior partner' in 1995

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 213
Location:

**Comoros**

SideBName: *Mouvement populaire anjouanais/Republic of Anjouan (Anjouan People’s Movement/Republic of Anjouan)*

Startdate2: 05/09/1997

Difference: *SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB*

Category: 4

Uncertainty: 4

EPRcodes: *No data*

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 214

Location:

**Congo**

SideBName: *Ninjas*

Startdate2: 11/11/1993

Difference: *(1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Laari)*

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1
EPRcodes: Nibolek (Bembe etc.) 'Senior partner', Lari/Bakongo 'Regional autonomy', Kouyou 'Junior partner', Vili 'Junior partner' in 1993

Coding description:


2. SideA: At the time of the conflict, Government of Congo was dominated by UPADS (Union Panafricaine pour la démocratie sociale) led by Pascal Lissouba, who was the president of the state between 1992 and 1997. The UPADS drew most of its support from Nibolek region (e.g., Bazenguissa-Ganga, 1998: 39). Nibolek is an acronym formed from the first syllables of the names of three regions – Niari, Bouenza and Lekoumou (ibid.: 38). These three regions were inhabited by Nzabi, Pounou, Teke (Bateke), Kongo, Bembe (Babembe) and Zambi peoples (Balancie & de La Grange, 1996: 409). Lissouba, as well as the so-called 'Gang of Four' (an advisory group for Lissouba serving in high-level posts throughout his term in office), were Bembe (e.g., Clark & Decalo, 2012: 195).

   It is known that Lissouba's control of the national army was weak (ibid.: 284; also Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/12/21); therefore, when the conflict broke out, Lissouba largely relied on militias. There were two militias loyal to Lissouba who fought the Ninjas: 1) 'Reserve Ministerielle', organized by Martin Mberi (Lissouba's minister of the interior) at the town of Aubeville (hence, the militia is also sometimes called 'Aubevillois'); 2) The Zoulous. The first one was composed of Bembe and the second of the youth from the three Nibolek regions (Clark & Decalo, 2012: 284).

   Thus, SideA was composed of ethnic groups from the Nibolek region, with Bembe being the dominant one.

SideB: Ninjas were militia led by Bernard Kolelas. Like Kolelas, most members of the Ninjas were Lari (United States Department of State, 2000; Clark & Decalo, 2012: 284).

3. SideA: Bembe spoke Beembe and were Christians and Animists (70% and 30% respectively), Nzabi spoke Njebi and were Christians and Animists (70% and 30%), Pounou spoke Punu and were Christians and Animists (55% and 45%), Teke spoke Teke languages
and were predominantly Christians, Kongo spoke Koongo and were predominantly Christians as well (So far, I could not identify the language and religion of Zambi).

SideB: Lari spoke Laari and were almost entirely Christians (99%).

4. So far, I have not found any information suggesting that the conflict involved intra-ethnic fighting.

........................................................................................................................................................................

ID: 214

Location:

Congo

SideBName: Cobras, Cocoyes

Startdate2: 06/06/1997

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Mbochi)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Nibolek (Bembe etc.) 'Senior partner', Mbochi (proper) 'Powerless', Kouyou 'Junior partner', Lari/Bakongo 'Junior partner', Vili 'Junior partner' in 1997

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Congo; SideB: Cobras, Cocoyes. The initial phase of the conflict (June-July, 1997) was limited to the confrontation between Government and Cobras (Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2012/12/22).

The conflict involved several phases. In the initial phase, Lissouba's government (see above, ID: 214, year 1993) confronted Cobra militias led by Denis Sassou-Nguesso. Cobras successfully fought Lissouba's forces and eventually took over the control of Brazzaville. Sassou-Nguesso declared himself a president. In the second phase, the fighting continued
with the roles reversed. Now government dominated by Sassou-Nguesso (and Cobras) fought against Lissouba's militia, the Cocoyes. Cocoyes were composed of some former army units and militias of Reserve Ministerielle and The Zoulous (see above, ID:214, year 1993).

Note that, as the conflict evolved, the conflicting parties were joined by additional forces. In September 1997 Lissouba's militias were joined by Ninjas. In October 1997 Cobras were joined by Angolan and Chadian troops (ibid.).

2. SideA: See above (ID: 214, year 1993); SideB: Cobras were mainly composed of Mbochi (Clark & Decalo, 2012: 284).

3. SideA: See above (ID: 214, year 1993); SideB: Mbochi spoke Mbosi and were almost entirely Christians (94.5% according to WCD).

4. So far, I have not found any information suggesting that the initial stage of the conflict involved any intra-ethnic fighting.

..............................

ID: 214

Location:

Congo

SideBName: Ntsiloulous

Startdate2: 10/04/2002

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Lari)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Mbochi (proper) 'Senior partner', Lari/Bakongo 'Powerless', Kouyou 'Junior partner' 2002
ID: 216

Location:

**Guinea-Bissau**

SideBName: *Military Junta for the Consolidation of Democracy, Peace and Justice*

Startdate2: 07/06/1998

Difference: *SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB*

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Papel 'Senior partner', Balanta 'Junior partner', Manjaco 'Junior partner' in 1998*

ID: 217

Location:

**Lesotho**

SideBName: *Military faction*

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3
Uncertainty: 1
EPRcodes: No data
Coding description:
[Currently unavailable]

ID: 218
Location:

Serbia (Yugoslavia)

SideBName: Ushtria çlirimtare ë kosovës (Kosovo Liberation Army)

Startdate2: 06/03/1998

Difference: (1) Language (Serbian vs. Albanian (Gheg)) (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)

Category: 2
Uncertainty: 1
EPRcodes: Serbs 'Senior partner', Albanians 'Discriminated', Montenegrins 'Junior partner' in 1998
Coding description:
[Currently unavailable]

ID: 219
1. SideA: Government of Ethiopia; SideB: Oromo Liberation Front (OLF).

2. SideA: See above (ID: 70, year 1960); SideB: OLF was Oromo organization.

3. SideA: See above (ID: 70, year 1960); SideB: Oromo spoke Oromo (a 'macro-language') and were predominantly Muslims and Christians.

4. So far, I could not find any information suggesting that the conflict, in 1977, involved any intra-Amhara or intra-Oromo fighting.
Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 4

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Tigry 'Senior partner', Oroma 'Junior partner', Amhara 'Junior partner' in 1998

Coding description:

1. SideA: Government of Ethiopia; SideB: Oromo Liberation Front (OLF).


Oromos were significantly represented in the EPRDF-dominated government (see above, ID: 70, 1960). Four (out of 17) government ministers were Oromo. Oromos had 187 reserved seats in the parliament (Joireman & Szayna, 2000: 197). The president was Oromo as well (though his role was largely ceremonial).

However, the de facto power of the pro-government Oromos, as well as the extent to which they represented Oromo people remains unclear: 'The government has attempted to incorporate members of different ethnic groups into its political fold, but only insofar as they agree with the government platform and agenda. The Oromo provide an important illustration. Those Oromo affiliated with the pro-government faction, the OPDO, are represented in national and regional governments. Those in the anti-government faction (OLF members and supporters) are not represented in either chamber of the legislature and did not stand for election. We have no way of measuring support for the two Oromo factions. There are reports that at least some Oromo view the OPDO as "seriously compromised" due to its affiliation with the EPRDF' (ibid.: 199).

3. Thus, SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB.

4. So far, I could not find any reliable information on the patterns of confrontation between parties to a conflict.

ID: 220
Location:

Russia (Soviet Union)

SideBName: Wahhabi movement of the Buinaksk district

Startdate2: 02/09/1999

Difference: (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 4

EPRcodes: Russians 'Dominant' in 1999

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 221

Location:

Uzbekistan

SideBName: Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan

Startdate2: 30/03/1999

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Uzbeks 'Monopoly' in 1999
ID: 221

Location:

_Uzbekistan_

SideBName: _Jihad Islamic Group_

Startdate2: 30/03/2004

Difference: _No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified_

Category: 3

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: _Uzbeks 'Monopoly' in 2004_

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 222

Location:

_Central African Republic_

SideBName: _Military faction (forces of André Kolingba)_

Startdate2: 01/06/2001
Difference: (1) Language (Sara languages, Gbaya languages vs. Yakoma)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Sara 'Senior partner', Yakoma 'Junior partner', Baya 'Junior partner', Mbaka 'Junior partner' in 2001

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 222

Location:

Central African Republic

SideBName: Union des Forces démocratiques pour le rassemblement (Union of Democratic Forces for Unity)


Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Gula) (2) Religion (Christians, Ethnoreligionists vs. Muslims)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data for 2006; 2005: Baya 'Senior partner', Sara 'Junior partner', Mbaka 'Junior partner', Yakoma 'Junior partner'

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]
ID: 222

Location:

**Central African Republic**

SideBName: *Convention des patriotes pour la justice et la paix (Convention of Patriots for Justice and Peace)*

Startdate2: 07/12/2009

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Runga) (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data for 2009; 2005: Baya 'Senior partner', Sara 'Junior partner', Mbaka 'Junior partner', Yakoma 'Junior partner'

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 223

Location:

**Macedonia**

SideBName: *Ushtria çlirimtare ë kombëtare (National Liberation Army)*

Startdate2: 01/05/2001

Difference: (1) Language (Macedonian vs. Albanian) (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)
Category: 1
Uncertainty: 3
EPRcodes: Macedonians ‘Senior partner’, Albanians ‘Junior partner’ in 2001
Coding description:
[Currently unavailable]

ID: 224
Location:

United States of America
SideBName: The Base
Startdate2: 11/09/2001
Difference: (1) Language (Arabic vs. English) (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)
Category: 1
Uncertainty: 3
EPRcodes: Whites ‘Dominant’ in 2001
Coding description:
[Currently unavailable]

ID: 225
Location:
**Cote d'Ivoire**

SideBName: Mouvement Patriotique de la Côte d’Ivoire (Patriotic Movement of Ivory Coast), Mouvement Populaire Ivorian du Grand Ouest (Ivorian Movement for the Greater West)

Startdate2: 19/09/2002

Difference: (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 4

EPRcodes: Kru 'Senior partner', Northerners (Mande and Voltaic/Gur) 'Discriminated', Baule (Akan) 'Junior partner', Other Akans 'Junior partner' in 2002

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 227

Location:

**India**

SideBName: All Bodo Student’s Union

Startdate2: 16/03/1989

Difference: Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Bodo) (2) Religion (Heterogeneous vs. Ethnoreligionists)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 227

Location: India

SideBName: National Democratic Front for Bodoland

Startdate2: 01/01/1993

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Bodo) (2) Religion (Heterogeneous vs. Christians)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 227

Location:

India

SideBName: National Democratic Front for Bodoland – Ranjan Daimary faction

Startdate2: 12/06/2009

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Bodo) (2) Religion (Heterogeneous vs. Christians)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1


Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 228


Location:

**Myanmar**

SideBName: *United Wa State Army*

Startdate2: *16/03/1997*

Difference: *(1) Language (Burmese vs. Wa)*

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: *Bamar (Barman) 'Dominant', Wa 'Regional autonomy' in 1997*

Coding description:


2. SideA: Government of Myanmar was dominated by Bamar (see above, ID: 23, year 1949); SideB: UWSA was composed of Wa people.

3. SideA: See above (ID: 23, year 1949); Wa spoke Wa and were predominantly Buddhists.

4. So far, I could not find any information confirming that the conflict involved any intra-Bamar or intra-Wa fighting.

..............................................................................................................................

ID: 248

Location:

**Thailand**

SideBName: *Patani insurgents*

Startdate2: *25/10/2003*
Difference: (1) Language (Thai vs. Malay (Pattani)) (2) Religion (Buddhists vs. Muslims)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Thai 'Dominant', Malay Muslims 'Regional autonomy' in 2003

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 249

Location:

Nigeria

SideBName: Ahlul Sunnah Jamaa (Followers of the Prophet)

Startdate2: 23/09/2004

Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 4

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Yoruba 'Senior partner', Hausa-Fulani and Muslim Middle Belt 'Junior partner', Igbo 'Junior partner' in 2004

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 250

280
Location:

Nigeria

SideBName: Niger Delta People's Volunteer Force
Startdate2: 05/06/2004
Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Ijo languages)
Category: 2
Uncertainty: 1
EPRcodes: Yoruba 'Senior partner', Ijaw 'Discriminated', Hausa-Fulani and Muslim Middle Belt 'Junior partner', Igbo 'Junior partner' in 2004
Coding description:
[Currently unavailable]

ID: 251
Location:

Israel

SideBName: Hezbollah (Party of God)
Startdate2: 10/07/1990
Difference: (1) Language (Hebrew vs. Arabic) (2) Religion (Jews vs. Muslims)
Category: 2
Uncertainty: 1
EPRcodes: Mizrahim (Jewish) 'Senior partner', Ashkenazim (Jewish) 'Senior partner'
Palestinian Arabs 'Discriminated', Izraeli Arabs 'Regional autonomy', Russians (Jewish)
'Junior partner' in 1990

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 251
Location:

Israel

SideBName: Hezbollah (Party of God)

Startdate2: 13/07/2006

Difference: (1) Language (Hebrew vs. Arabic) (2) Religion (Jews vs. Muslims)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data for 2006; 2005: Mizrahim (Jewish) 'Senior partner', Ashkenazim (Jewish)
'Senior partner' Palestinian Arabs 'Discriminated', Izraeli Arabs 'Regional autonomy',
Russians (Jewish) 'Junior partner'

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 253
Location:
Mauritania

SideBName: Frente popular de liberación de Saguia el Hamra y Rio de Oro (Popular Front for the Liberation of Saguia el Hamra and Rio de Oro)

Startdate2: 19/12/1975

Difference: No racial, linguistic or religious differences have been identified

Category: 4

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: White moors (Beydan) 'Senior partner', Haratins (Black Moors) 'Junior partner', Black Africans 'Junior partner' in 1975

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 254

Location:

Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire)

SideBName: Bundu dia Kongo (Kingdom of Kongo)

Startdate2: 01/02/2007

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Kongo)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: White moors (Beydan) 'Senior partner', Haratins (Black Moors) 'Junior partner', Black Africans 'Junior partner' in 1975
SideBName: Front de libération de l’Aïr et l’Azaouad (Air and Azawad Liberation Front)

Startdate2: 01/12/1991

Difference: (1) Language (Hausa, Zarma vs. Tamashek)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Hausa 'Senior partner', Tuareg 'Discriminated', Djerma-Songhai 'Junior partner' in 1991

SideBName: Union des Forces de la résistance armée (Union of Forces of the Armed Resistance)
Startdate 2: 19/10/1997

Difference: (1) Language (Hausa, Zarma vs. Tamashak)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Djerma-Songhai 'Dominant', Tuareg 'Powerless' in 1997

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 255

Location:

*Niger*

SideBName: Mouvement des Nigériens pour la Justice (Niger Movement for Justice)

Startdate 2: 01/07/2007

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Tamashak)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data for 2009; 2005: Djerma-Songhai 'Senior partner', Hausa 'Junior Partner', Kanouri 'Junior Partner', Tuareg 'Powerless'

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]
ID: 257

Location:

Russia (Soviet Union)

SideBName: Caucasus Emirate


Difference: SideA included members of ethnic group constituting SideB

Category: 4

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data for 2007; 2005: Russians 'Senior partner', Chechens 'Regional autonomy'

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 258

Location:

India

SideBName: Dima Halam Daogah – Black Widow faction

Startdate2: 30/10/2008

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Dimasa)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ID: 259

Location:

India

SideBName: People’s United Liberation Front

Startdate2: 09/11/2008

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Meitei) (2) Religion (Heterogeneous vs. Muslims)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1


Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

....................................................................................................................

ID: 261

Location:

Ethiopia

SideBName: Somali Abo Liberation Front

Startdate2: 01/01/1977

Difference: (1) Language (Amharic vs. Oromo) (2) Religion (Christians vs. Muslims)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 2

EPRcodes: Amhara 'Dominant', Oroma 'Discriminated' in 1977

Coding description:


2. SideA: See above (ID: 70, year 1960); SideB: The SALF represented Oromo speaking Somali (Shongolo, 1996: 267)

3. SideA: See above (ID: 70, year 1960); SideB: Somali were predominantly Muslims.

4. So far, I could not find any reliable information on the patterns of confrontation between parties to a conflict.
ID: 262

Location:

_Ethiopia_

SideBName: Sidama Liberation Movement

Startdate2: 01/04/1983

Difference: (1) Language (Amharic vs. Sidamo)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 2

EPRcodes: Amhara 'Dominant' in 1983

Coding description:


2. SideA: See above (ID: 70, year 1960); SideB: The SLM was composed of Sidama.

3. SideA: See above (ID: 70, year 1960); SideB: Sidama spoke Sidamo and mainly followed Christianity and Islam (65% and 34% respectively).

4. So far, I could not find any reliable information on the patterns of confrontation between parties to the conflict.

ID: 263

Location:

_India_
SideBName: *Kuki National Front*

Startdate2: 13/07/1997

Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Thado) (2) Religion (Heterogeneous vs. Christians)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1


Coding description:


2. SideA: See above (ID: 29, 1948); SideB: while the KNF 'purportedly [stood] for protection of "Kuki people" including, for example, the Thadou, Paite, Vaiphei, Zou, Simte, Gangte, etc.' (Zou, 2012: 322), it was formed by members of Thadou, the largest Kuki-Chin tribe (2009: 9).

3. SideA: See above (ID: 29, 1948); SideB: Thadou spoke Thado and were predominantly Christians (71% according to WCD).

4. The KNF has experienced several splits and was involved in intra-Kuki-Chin fighting (e.g. Zou, 2012). Yet, I could not find any information supporting the fact that members of Thadou (or any other Kuki-Chin tribe) were fighting on the side of the government.

ID: 264
Location:

Myanmar

SideBName: Myanmar National Democratic Alliance Army

Startdate2: 29/08/2009

Difference: (1) Language (Burmese vs. Mandarin) (2) Religion (Buddhists vs. Confucianists)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: No data for 2009; 2005: Bamar (Barman) 'Dominant', Chinese 'Discriminated'

Coding description:


2. SideA: Government of Myanmar was dominated by Bamar (see above, ID: 23, year 1949); SideB: The MNDAA represented Kokang people, a subgroup of Han Chinese.

3. SideA: See above (ID: 23, year 1949); Kokang spoke Mandarin. According to WCD, Myanmar's Han Chinese were predominantly Confucianists.

4. So far, I could not find any information confirming that the conflict involved any intra-Bamar or intra-Kokang fighting.

ID: 265

Location:

Myanmar

SideBName: Lahu National Unity Party
Startdate2: 01/02/1973

Difference: (1) Language (Burmese vs. Lahu) (2) Religion (Buddhists vs. Christians,
Ethnoreligionists)

Category: 2

Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Bamar (Barman) 'Dominant', Wa 'Regional autonomy' in 1973

Coding description:


2. SideA: Government of Myanmar was dominated by Bamar (see above, ID: 23, 1949);
SideB: The LNUP represented Lahu people.

3. SideA: See above (ID: 23, year 1949); Lahu spoke Lahu and were predominantly Christians
and Animists.

4. So far, I could not find any information confirming that the conflict (in the initial stage)
involved any intra-Bamar or intra-Lahu fighting.

ID: 266

Location:

Tajikistan

SideBName: Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan

Startdate2: 19/09/2010

Difference: (1) Language (Tajiki vs. Heterogeneous)

Category: 1
Uncertainty: 1

EPRcodes: Unavailable for 2010; 2005: Tajiks 'Dominant', Kyrgyz 'Powerless', Russians 'Powerless', Tatars 'Powerless', Uzbeks 'Powerless'

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]

ID: 267

Location:

*Mauritania*

SideBName: al-Qaida Organization in the Islamic Maghreb

Startdate2: 17/09/2010

Difference: Difference: (1) Language (Heterogeneous vs. Heterogeneous)

Category: 1

Uncertainty: 2

EPRcodes: Unavailable for 2010; 2005: White moors (Beydan) 'Senior partner', Haratins (Black Moors) 'Junior partner', Black Africans 'Junior partner'

Coding description:

[Currently unavailable]
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