

## APPENDIX A

### **Case Summaries and Sources**

In appendix A, all cases of extended-immediate deterrence between major powers are summarized for the period 1895–1985 (for their summary listing, see table 3.2). The headings for each case include the year(s) of its commencement and termination and the names under which these cases are most commonly referred to in the historical literature. Brief narrative summaries document all actions that are relevant for this study, that is, those that indicate military acts as operationalized in chapter 3. Each case summary is completed with the bibliographic references for the consulted sources. For those surveys that provide case summaries, such as Brecher and Wilkenfeld (1997), the numbers (#) refer to the case numbers rather than to the relevant pages. Sources used for the case summaries are listed at the end of the references.

The second section of this appendix identifies all other cases of general deterrence failure that did not escalate into immediate deterrence between major powers. The summary for each case includes the starting and ending years of its occurrence, its conventional historical name, major actors and outcome (also listed in table 3.1), and the bibliographic information used in its analysis from the relevant historical literature. The third section presents the cases of direct-immediate deterrence failure (see also table 3.3) between major powers, and the same information format is used as in the second section.

#### **1. Extended-Immediate Deterrence Cases (Summaries and Sources)**

1895–96 South African Crisis (Delagoa Bay and Jameson Raids)

The Transvaal (Boer Republic), Cape Colony, and Rhodesia were viewed as parts of the British Empire and as such were not allowed to

have independent foreign relations with other powers, although England did not interfere in their internal affairs. President Kruger of Transvaal, however, resisted British influence and encouraged close relations with Germany. In 1895, he finished the construction of the Delagoa Bay Railway and, by imposing high tariffs, made transportation from Cape Colony difficult and expensive. In June 1895, two German warships were dispatched to Delagoa Bay as a demonstration of support for Kruger's actions. When shippers from the Cape began to use the drifts (the fording-places) in order to avoid the high railway rates, Kruger retaliated by closing the drifts. After the British government had protested vigorously, ordering troops to South Africa, Kruger yielded to an ultimatum and the drifts were reopened (November 3).

Soon another crisis emerged. Dr. Jameson, an administrator in the Chartered Company, launched raids in Transvaal. On December 29, 1895, his forces crossed the frontier, but they were quickly defeated by the Transvaal forces on January 2, 1896. The British government had no prior knowledge of the Jameson Raid and later condemned the entire operation. Nevertheless, on January 2 the Kaiser sent a telegram to Kruger (the "Kruger telegram") with congratulations and assurances of German support for the independence of Transvaal. Moreover, Germany officially suggested an international conference to regulate the status of Transvaal, thus challenging the British claim to Transvaal as a part of the British Commonwealth. The German government also ordered troops to proceed to Delagoa Bay, but the Portuguese government refused to allow them to land in Portuguese West Africa (Angola). England sent a squadron to Delagoa Bay and a torpedo-flotilla to the Channel, while Russia and France refused to support the German action. Very soon Germany backed down. On February 13, in his Reichstag speech, German Chancellor Marschall announced that Germany had no wish to interfere in Transvaal, although he reiterated that South African unification would damage German economic interests. Several excuses and explanations were communicated to the British government as well.

*Source:* Langer 1951, 226–47; James 1976, 177–83, Grenville 1964, 98–107; Seton-Watson 1937, 575–79; Townsend 1966, 84–85; Brandenburg 1933, 80–89; Taylor 1954, 362–66.

#### 1897 Kiao-Chow (German Occupation)

By the end of 1895 Germany decided to claim rights to the Chinese port of Kiao-Chow, although the port was apparently leased to the

Russians. In the summer of 1896, a German squadron was sent to Chinese waters under the command of General Tirpitz. Before stationing in the harbor, Kaiser Wilhelm II raised the issue with the czar during his visit to St. Petersburg in August 1897. The czar gave only a general response, but did not object to German warships wintering there with the consent of Russian naval authorities. In October 1897 Germany notified the Russian admiral about the arrival of the German warships. As no prior consent had been requested, the Russian government protested.

In the meantime, two German Catholic missionaries were attacked and killed by a Chinese “gang” on November 1. The incident was used as a pretext for the seizure of Kiao-Chow. On November 7, the Kaiser ordered the German squadron to sail to the port, but on November 9 the Russians demanded that Germany look at some other location for its compensation from China. At the same time, the Russian admiral was ordered to enter the port if the German vessels reached it. Nevertheless, the German squadron occupied the port on November 14. The exchange of telegrams between Berlin and St. Petersburg intensified, and the czar was informed that Germany would not object if the Russians also took a Chinese port. The Russians quickly agreed and informed Germany about the renunciation of their claims over Kiao-Chow. The Russian squadron would anchor at Port Arthur in the meantime. After the Germans’ prompt approval on December 17, the Russian occupation of Port Arthur took place at the end of December. On January 2, Germany also recognized Manchuria, Chinese Turkestan, and the province of Pechili as part of the Russian sphere of interest in the Far East.

*Source:* Malozemoff 1958, 95–112; Langer 1951, 445–80; Morse and MacNair 1951, 424–27; Grenville 1964, 135–39; Townsend 1966, 186–89; Geiss 1976, 84–85; Taylor 1954, 372–77; Joseph 1928, 189–221, 264–314.

### 1897–98 Niger Dispute

In Central-West Africa, Britain and France disputed each other’s claims in the Upper Niger, and a settlement was sought through a Joint Niger Commission in Paris. Despite the Commission’s work, both powers sent expeditions into the disputed area in 1897. Although negotiations continued through the winter of 1897 and spring of 1898, the crisis became acute in February and March 1898 when the two powers seemed to be at the verge of war. On June 14, 1898, an agreement was

finally reached delimiting their respective spheres of influence from Senegal to the Nile region and clearing up the boundary questions between their possessions in this region.

*Source:* Grenville 1964, 121–24; Langer 1951, 550.

#### 1898–99 Anglo-Russian Crisis

In January 1898, British top-ranked cabinet members issued a number of statements warning that England was determined, even at the cost of war, to oppose any action by other powers that would jeopardize British commercial interests in China. The appearance of British ships at Port Arthur further heightened Anglo-Russian tensions. However, after the United States and Japan declined the British request to become involved in the dispute, the British government eventually accepted the compromise. In March 1898, the Chinese government leased Port Arthur and Talienwan to Russia, and Weihaiwei to Britain. The tensions yet continued, now over railway concessions in northern China, but an Anglo-Russian agreement was reached on April 29, 1899. Each party recognized the other side's sphere of interest in China; Russia recognized the British railway sphere in the Yangtze basin in return for the British promise not to interfere in the Russian sphere in Manchuria. The partition of China, triggered by the German seizure of Kiao-Chow, expanded when France obtained a lease on Kwangchowan in April 1898.

*Source:* Malozemoff 1958, 113–16; Langer 1951, 463–74.

#### 1898–99 Samoan Islands Dispute

The death of Samoan king Malietoa in August 1898 led to internal fighting between the Samoan factions. Supporting Malietoa's son against the rival Mataefe, who was backed by the Germans, British and American warships bombed Apua on March 15, 1899. As the German consulate was damaged during the bombings, Germany vehemently protested, threatening to break off diplomatic relations with England, but ultimately sought the partition of the Samoan islands. Salisbury's opposition to any partitioning gave way to the Kaiser's pressure, who sought the principal island Upolu as an outpost for his navy. On November 1, 1899, a treaty was concluded, granting the island of Tutuila to the United States, Upolu and Savari to Germany, and Tonga Islands, Savage Islands, and an area in Togoland to England, while Germany renounced its rights in Zanzibar.

*Source:* Gooch 1936–38, 1:212–17; Townsend 1966, 198–201;

Brandenburg 1933, 125–29; Langer 1951, 619–24; Grenville 1964, 274–77.

#### 1898–99 Fashoda

Despite the Grey Declaration (March 28, 1895) that any French advance in the Nile Valley would constitute “an unfriendly act” against England, France sent two missions, led by Louis Monteil, to reach the upper Nile (1894 and 1895). After both missions failed, the Marchand mission was sent out from the Congo region in February 1896. Soon after the Marchand mission had been dispatched, the British sent the Kitchener mission (April 1896), designed to reconquer Sudan and move toward Fashoda. The two missions, Marchand heading from the west and Kitchener moving from the north, were both involved in heavy fighting with the native populations on their way to Fashoda. Marchand succeeded in reaching the Nile at Fashoda on July 10, 1898. On September 19, 1898, Kitchener’s army also arrived at Fashoda, refusing to negotiate with Marchand and demanding French withdrawal.

In October 1898, the Russian foreign minister, Muraviev, visited Paris, but declined to give any Russian support to the French claims in Fashoda. The Germans also refused to give their support to France, due to the Anglo-German agreement of 1890 by which Germany recognized English rights to the Upper Nile in exchange for German acquisition of Heligoland. The British government demanded of France an unconditional withdrawal from Fashoda and dispatched several squadrons to Gibraltar and Alexandria to guard against the French Mediterranean fleet. With these extensive naval preparations in October, England seemed to be preparing for war. After the long deadlock, the French government made the first conciliatory move: on November 4 it ordered the evacuation of Fashoda. On March 21, 1899, a convention was signed: France agreed to renounce all its claims in the Nile basin, but was not required to recognize British claims in Egypt. In exchange England gave France a free hand in the Sahara and the interior of Western Sahara from the Atlantic to Lake Chad.

*Source:* Langer 1951, 537–70; Grenville 1964, 218–34; Schuman 1931, 164–67; Anderson 1966, 102–7; Gooch 1936–38, 1:94–105; Seton-Watson 1937, 579–81; Cooke 1973, 81–97; Taylor 1954, 380–83.

#### 1899–1900 Masampo Episode

Since 11,000 miles separate Vladivostok from Port Arthur, acquired by Russia in 1898, securing a port in southern Korea became an impor-

tant strategic goal for Russian diplomacy in the Far East. In 1899 the Russians approached the Korean government in a series of abortive attempts to obtain a concession of the land at Masampo. On March 16, 1900, a Russian squadron then arrived at Chemulpo, alarming both Korea and Japan. The Japanese navy was urgently mobilized, and a part of the army was also put on the highest alert, leading the Russians to retreat. While an agreement on the Russian lease of an uninhabited coaling station at Masampo was signed on March 30, it also obliged Russia never to demand the use of Masampo or surrounding areas for military purposes. After learning about the restrictive terms of the lease, which de facto reflected the Russian retreat, the Japanese accepted the favorable terms and subsequently halted their military preparations.

*Source:* Malozemoff 1958, 120–23; Langer 1951, 688–92; Morse and MacNair 1931, 506–7.

### 1901–3 Manchurian Evacuation

During the joint effort of major powers to suppress the Boxer Rebellion in China, Russia occupied Manchuria. As the Boxer Rebellion subsided, Russian troops were expected to withdraw from southern Manchuria. When their withdrawal was delayed, the Japanese sent the first sharp Note in March 1901. The Russians, convinced that war was inevitable, doubled their troops at the Manchurian border. The tensions temporarily subsided, only to reemerge after the Russians failed to carry out the terms of the Russo-Chinese agreement of 1902, which provided for the Manchurian evacuation. In August 1903, the czar dismissed Count Witte, marking the victory for the so-called Bezobrazov group in the Russian government, which favored Russian imperial designs in Manchuria and Korea. This cabinet reshuffling further hardened the Russian position in Manchuria. It was again challenged by the Japanese in their Note of April 1903, threatening to resort to force if the evacuation again failed. Russia swiftly rejected the renewed Japanese demands, thus giving the appearance of victory for Russian diplomacy. The following year the two powers found themselves in a new standoff, also compounded by the Korean issue, which ultimately culminated in war (see the case of Russo-Japanese War).

*Source:* Malozemoff 1958, 208, 227, 237–49; Langer 1951, 711–29; Takeuchi 1935, 132–41.

### 1902–3 Venezuelan Crisis

By 1902 Venezuela owed large debts to foreign investors, primarily British and German creditors, which were long overdue. Coupled with the damage claims by foreign companies and citizens who lost their property in Venezuela's frequent internal disorders, the debt problems prompted Britain and Germany to apply harsher pressures for financial settlements. After Venezuelan President Cipriano Castro had refused to respond to the ultimatum of December 7, British and German warships attacked the Venezuelan navy on December 9, 1902, and later also proclaimed a blockade of the Venezuelan coast on December 20. In the ongoing negotiations of January 1903, the blockading powers insisted their claims be paid first, while the U.S. representatives insisted on equal treatment of all nations with unsettled claims against Venezuela. As Germany and Britain refused to renounce their claims for priority treatment, President Roosevelt ordered the U.S. fleet into the eastern Caribbean. Uneasy with the rapid concentration of U.S. warships in the Caribbean waters, the British and German governments ended the blockade in February 1903 and agreed to U.S. arbitration of the debt issue.

*Source:* Healy 1988, 100–103; Townsend 1966, 206–7; Langley 1980, 24–26; Langley 1985, 20–22; Munro 1964, 66–77.

### 1904–5 Russo-Japanese War

In this war, Russia and Japan clashed seriously for the first time over their influence in Korea and Manchuria. After its decisive victory in the Sino-Japanese war for control of Korea in 1895, Japan emerged as a serious rival to Russia and other powers in the Far East. Russia intensified its forward policy of penetration with its Trans-Siberian Railway and the occupation of Manchuria. Concerned with the prospects for its hegemony in Korea, on February 8, 1904, Japan attacked Port Arthur, and two days later war was declared. The Russian forces were defeated in a series of Japanese attacks, and a treaty of peace was finally signed at Portsmouth on September 5, 1905. Russia ceded the northern part of Sakhalin to Japan, transferred its lease of the Liaotung Peninsula, and recognized the Japanese preponderance in Korea. In 1910 Japan formally annexed Korea. Other powers did not interfere militarily, although there was an incident between the Rus-

sian and British fleets (the Dogger Bank episode). This incident was quickly settled, however, as it was clarified that the Russian fleet opened fire upon British trawlers by mistake (supposing them to be Japanese destroyers). Notwithstanding this incident, Britain and other powers stood aside throughout the war.

*Source:* Kajima 1968, 130–52, 328–41; Morse and MacNair 1931, 512–16; MacNair and Lach 1955, 99–105; Nish 1977, 69–77; Beasley 1987, 78–84; Gooch 1936–38, 1:75–83; Monger 1963, 147–85; Takeuchi 1935, 142–59.

#### 1905–6 First Moroccan (Tangier) Crisis

Since the French occupation of oases (1900), there were a number of clashes between French troops and the native peoples at the Moroccan frontier. Concerned about the Anglo-French entente of 1904, German officials made several attempts to split the alliance. Morocco was ultimately chosen as a test of the strength of the Anglo-French alliance. The idea was to draw the French to Germany on a mistaken assumption that England would fail to support France on the Moroccan issue. German Chancellor von Bülow managed to persuade Wilhelm II to go on a trip to the Mediterranean with Morocco as the final destination. The Kaiser disliked the idea and attempted to avoid landing in Tangier. Nevertheless, his voyage developed into a serious crisis as he landed at Tangier on March 31, 1905. At the official ceremony and before the French diplomatic representatives, Wilhelm lent public support for Morocco as an independent state. The crisis involving Berlin, Paris, and London endured throughout the year, and occasionally the tensions were close to erupting into open warfare. The French viewed the German action as an intrusion on their sphere of influence, and the British gave them diplomatic support. Although the crisis caused the fall of Delcasse, the French got what they wanted at the Algeciras Conference of 1906, where they were entrusted with the border police and gained strong economic control over Morocco. The crisis was a complete fiasco for German diplomacy, as England and Russia declined to support Germany.

*Source:* Monger 1963, 186–235; Schuman 1931, 173–84; Townsend 1966, 309–21; Gooch 1936–38, 1:51–63, 129–39, 163–83, 245–53, 257–66; Gooch 1936–38, 2:12–20; Seton-Watson 1937, 602–7; Brandenburg 1933, 208–31, 244–56; Roberts 1928, 1:549–52; Cooke 1973, 118–36; Geiss 1976, 101–5; Taylor 1954, 428–33.



## 1908 Annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina

At the beginning of 1908, A. P. Izvolskii, the Russian foreign minister, attempted to forge a Russo-Austrian agreement on the Balkan issues. On September 15, Izvolskii and Alois Aehrenthal, the Austrian foreign minister, met at Buchlau, but made no written agreement. Aehrenthal reported that Izvolskii expressed his willingness to agree to the Austro-Hungarian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in return for Austrian support for the opening of the Straits to Russian warships. However, when Austria proclaimed the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina on October 6, the two statesmen offered very different interpretations of their talks at Buchlau. Most important, Izvolskii denied the truthfulness of Aehrenthal's report. Still without a free passage for its warships through the Straits, Russia protested diplomatically. Russia failed to gain support from London or Paris, as Britain and France opposed any change in the international regulation of the Straits. On the other hand, Germany was not pleased to discover the Austrian decision on annexation had been made without consulting Berlin, but still decided to back its ally. Diplomatic tensions continued until Germany sent a sharp Note to Russia on March 21, 1909, demanding a clear Russian acceptance of the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Without British or French support, the Russians yielded to the ultimatum and forced Serbia to recognize the annexation on March 31, 1909.

*Source:* Schmitt 1937, 19–48, 186–207; Albertini 1952, 190–300; Gooch 1936–38, 1:274–83, 331–34, 389–400; Gooch 1936–38, 2:46–54; Anderson 1966, 279–86; Marriott 1940, 421–32; Lowe and Dockrill 1972, 1:81–86; Seton-Watson 1937, 615–16; Brandenburg 1933, 300–335; Geiss 1976, 110–18; Taylor 1954, 451–56.

## 1911 Second Moroccan (Agadir) Crisis

In March 1911, the sultan of Morocco appealed to France to defend Fez, a Moroccan city, from native uprisings. In his communication with Paris on April 28, German Foreign Minister Kiderlen agreed only to a provisional occupation of Fez. On May 28 French forces occupied Fez, and an official statement came from the French government that the occupation was provisional. Suddenly, Germany decided to respond to the French advance in Morocco and on July 1, 1911, dispatched the gunboat *Panther* to the southern Moroccan port of

Agadir. On July 15 Germany demanded the whole of the French Congo in return for a French protectorate over Morocco. France refused to give up its colony and turned to Russia and England for support.

The Russians gave a cool response explaining that Russian public opinion would not understand a war caused by a colonial dispute over distant territory such as Morocco. The British government, nervous about the possibility of a German base near Gibraltar, protested and inquired about German intentions in Morocco. On July 24, the German government informed London that Germany had no claim to Morocco and only wanted compensation in western Africa (i.e., the whole of the French Congo). France continued to stand firm and even threatened to send warships to Agadir, but this threat was later withdrawn. The Germans yielded in the end; on November 4 an agreement was signed by which Germany agreed to a French protectorate over Morocco. Germany obtained only two strips of territory in the French Congo with access to the coast and the Congo river, considered a worthless bargain for German diplomacy. France also acquired a narrow strip in the Cameroons, south of Lake Chad, and by the end of November, the German gunboat was recalled from Agadir.

*Source:* Gooch 1936–38, 2:69–81, 137–40, 216–26; Seton-Watson 1937, 622–25; Lowe and Dockrill 1972, 1:37–48; Brandenburg 1933, 370–86; Roberts 1928, 1:553–57; Geiss 1976, 132–37; Taylor 1954, 464–73.

### 1912 First Balkan War

A number of different territorial issues brought together three Balkan states—Bulgaria, Greece, and Serbia—fighting against Turkey in the First Balkan War (October 18, 1912–May 30, 1913). The interests of major powers were not consistent across all issues, but one territorial question was particularly polarizing and almost brought them to the brink of war. On September 29 Count Berchtold, the Austro-Hungarian foreign minister, made it clear that the monarchy would not tolerate the Serbian boundaries reaching the Adriatic Sea. In October, Austro-Hungarian troops were put in a state of readiness and massively concentrated along the borders of Serbia. After initial hesitancy, Germany agreed to join the claims of Austria-Hungary as its ally, while Russia strongly supported the Serbian claims. In November, the situation grew tense as Russia ordered troop mobilization. Austria subse-

quently strengthened its troops on the eastern frontiers in Galicia. Despite the heightened alertness and mobilization on both sides, the crisis was resolved peacefully after the Russians decided not to support its ally to the end. This shift in the Russian position left Serbia unprotected, forcing its troops to evacuate Durazzo, an Adriatic harbor, on May 5.

*Source:* Albertini 1952, 364–402; Helmreich 1938, 193–230, 288–90; Anderson 1966, 291–302; Gooch 1936–38, 2:95–105, 181–99, 324–41, 387–412; Seton-Watson 1937, 632–41; Lowe and Dockrill 1972, 1:107–10; Brandenburg 1933, 418–49; Geiss 1976, 140–42; Taylor 1954, 490–97.

#### 1914–18 World War I

After the Archduke Francis Ferdinand was assassinated in Sarajevo on June 28, 1914, Austro-Hungary sent an ultimatum to Serbia on July 23. As both Serbia and Austria ordered mobilization, Austria declared war on Serbia on July 28, and Belgrade was bombed the next day. On July 30 Russia ordered general mobilization, as it had previously demanded Austria not invade Serbia. The next day Germany sent a twelve-hour ultimatum to Russia to withdraw its troops from the German frontier, and on July 31 Germany declared war on Russia. Meanwhile, British and French concerns were centered on the German western frontier. On July 29, Germany offered a bargain to Britain: it would not take French or Belgian territory if Britain promised neutrality. Although Britain rejected the bargain, Germany also rejected the British request that Germany respect Belgian neutrality. A few hours before its declaration of war on Russia, Germany promised Britain not to attack France if Britain would guarantee French neutrality. On August 2, the British cabinet decided to protect France against German attack, and on the same day Germany invaded Luxembourg, demanding that Belgium provide free passage for German troops through Belgian territory. On August 3, Germany declared war on France, on the pretext of frontier violations. Germany also began the invasion of Belgium, and the next day Britain declared war on Germany.

*Source:* Schmitt 1930; Dedijer 1966; Bowsworth 1979, 377–417; Gooch 1936–38, 2:122–33, 269–86, 355–70, 434–47; Brandenburg 1933, 482–513; Geiss 1976, 163–72; Takeuchi 1935, 168–83; Taylor 1954, 511–31.

## 1920–23 Anglo-Russian Frictions in Central Asia

The Anglo-Russian clashes over their interests in the Near East did not abate with the fall of czarist Russia. In the years after the Bolshevik Revolution, there were recurring frictions concerning Persia (Iran) and Afghanistan. After Russian troops occupied the Persian province of Ghilan in October 1920, Persia signed a treaty with Russia on February 26, 1921, which made the evacuation of Russian troops contingent upon the withdrawal of British forces from northern Persia. Both powers began to retreat from their occupying areas, but the frictions reemerged regarding their interests in neighboring Afghanistan. After winning independence in 1919, the ascension of Amanullah to the throne of Afghanistan brought a major shift in Russo-Afghan relations. The Treaty of February 28, 1921 provided for friendly relations between Afghanistan and Soviet Russia, including Soviet military and technical assistance, which made London uneasy about the British position in the area. Namely, the British were deeply involved in Waziristan, the northwest frontier province of Afghanistan, which started with the Anglo-Afghan War of 1919. Since air bombings of Waziristan did not improve the British position, Curzon issued an ultimatum of May 2, 1923, alleging Russian hostile activities in Persia, Afghanistan, and India. The ultimatum also demanded compensations on a few minor issues, but most importantly it demanded retraction from the alleged anti-British activities. The Soviet reply met the British demands on a few issues, but denied any anti-British activities in Central Asia. In the meantime, the French occupation of the Ruhr and the deepening currency crisis in Germany turned London toward moderation vis-à-vis Russia, and both sides claimed a diplomatic victory concerning their interests in the Near East.

*Source:* Fischer 1951, 1:428–49; Adamec 1967, 142–66; Langer 1968, 1097.

## 1932 Shanghai Incident

On January 18, 1932, several Japanese residents were attacked by Chinese residents in Shanghai. This incident served as the pretext for Japan's naval reinforcement in Shanghai, accompanied by an ultimatum to China. The crisis escalated when Japan launched bombings of Chapei on January 29, immediately prompting the British, whose major commercial interests in China rested on Shanghai, to send a sharp Note to Japan. The British strengthened their naval forces in the

surrounding area and sent a warship with a battalion of infantry to Hong Kong. The United States also sided with Britain, joining its threats against Japan, but fighting between the Japanese and Chinese forces did not abate until a final armistice was reached on May 5. Under U.S. and British pressure, the Japanese troops finally left Shanghai by the end of May.

*Source:* Toshihiko [1962–63] 1984, 305–19; MacNair and Lach 1955, 313–22; Nish 1977, 182; Northedge 1967, 356–58; Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 316–17; Takeuchi 1935, 373–80; Medlicott 1968, 116–17.

### 1935–36 Italo-Ethiopian (Abyssinian) War

In December 1934, fighting broke out between Ethiopian and Italian troops at Walwal near the border between Ethiopia and Italian Somaliland. The fighting continued sporadically, and on August 29, 1935, the British Mediterranean Fleet was dispatched to the area. By the fall of 1935, however, Italy and Britain agreed to cancel their naval movements in the Mediterranean. Italy subsequently invaded Ethiopia on October 2, 1935, and the Ethiopian government appealed to the League of Nations. The League condemned the aggression and declared sanctions on Italy on October 7. France was alarmed that the sanctions would turn Italy away from the anti-German agreement signed by France, Britain, and Italy in April 1935. France succeeded in preventing the imposition of oil sanctions on Italy and designed a joint plan with Britain for the partition of Ethiopia. According to the Laval-Hoare plan, Italy would be granted a substantial piece of Ethiopian territory. The British media revealed the plan just before it was officially presented to the belligerent parties, and public condemnation led to Hoare's resignation as prime minister on December 18. The controversy over the plan also led to the fall of Laval's government in France on January 22, 1936. In the meantime, Italian forces defeated Ethiopian resistance, annexing the entire territory of Ethiopia on May 5, 1936.

*Source:* Lowe and Marzari 1975, 255–90; Mack Smith 1976, 59–81; Nere 1975, 173–84; Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 402–18; Northedge 1967, 406–25; Sontag 1971, 285–92; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #47.

### 1935–36 Outer Mongolian Frontier Dispute

After acquiring Manchuria and Jehol, an expansion into Mongolia was Japan's next goal. For this purpose, Japan tried to use Mongol

nationalism by emphasizing common religious ties, ignoring the fact that they belonged to very different Buddhist branches. Japan also hoped to tie Mongol national aspirations to its puppet state Manchukuo, hoping that the history of the Mongol-Manchu control over China in imperial times would turn away the Mongols from their ties with the Soviets and bring them closer to Japan and Manchukuo. These designs did not work, and eventually a series of clashes between Manchukuo's and the Outer Mongolian armies ensued from January 1935 through March 1936. In a number of incidents, Japanese troops would occasionally join the Manchukuo army in combat, which raised Soviet concerns as they had a "gentleman's" agreement with Outer Mongolia on November 27, 1934. Subsequently, Soviet troops returned to Outer Mongolia as clashes flared on the Manchukuo-Outer Mongolian border. At one point, Russian and Japanese forces were directly involved in minor clashes (Changlingtzu Incident) in March 1936. The Japanese eventually retreated from their anti-Soviet agitation in Outer Mongolia, only to have the hostilities renewed concerning a different issue in Manchuria (see the next case, the Amur River Incident).

*Source:* Ikuhiko [1962–63] 1976, 134–37; Beloff 1947, 1:246–48.

#### 1937 Amur River Incident

Since the Amur River incident of June 1937, Soviet and Japanese troops were engaged in recurrent fighting on the Manchurian frontier. The Japanese had previously occupied Manchuria and established the puppet state of Manchukuo in 1931. As Soviet troops occupied several islands in the Amur River on June 21, 1937, the Japanese ordered troop concentrations in the area on June 24. After the Japanese bombed a Soviet gunboat, the Soviets quickly retreated by evacuating the islands on July 4.

*Source:* Ikuhiko [1962–63] 1976, 137–40; Beloff 1949, 2: 179–81; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #55.

#### 1938 Changkufeng

In July 1938 the Soviets attempted to occupy the Changkufeng area on the Soviet-Manchukuo border, and the Japanese retaliated. As the Soviets occupied Changkufeng, the hill near the frontiers between Manchuria, Korea, and the Soviet Union, on July 15 Japanese Ambassador Shigemitsu delivered an ultimatum demanding the withdrawal

of Soviet troops. The Soviets rejected the demand, and fighting between the Japanese and Soviet forces broke out in the frontier area on July 27. Despite major fighting between the two forces through August, the Japanese quickly retreated this time and withdrew their troops from the area.

*Source:* Ikuhiko [1962–63] 1976, 140–57; Beloff 1949, 2:191–92; MacNair and Lach 1955, 485; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #63.

### 1938 Italian Colonial Claims against France

When Italian Foreign Minister Ciano addressed the parliament on November 30, 1938, he was joined by a number of Fascist deputies calling for retribution over French control of Tunis, Corsica, Nice, and Djibuti. The anti-French campaign quickly turned into massive street demonstrations. France responded with naval maneuvers in the Mediterranean, while Italy sent military reinforcements into Libya. The crisis ended on March 31, when Mussolini dropped his colonial demands against France.

*Source:* Burgwyn 1997, 182–88; Mack Smith 1976, 134–36; Nere 1975, 233–34; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #66.

### 1938 Sudetenland Problem and Munich Crisis

The German occupation of Czechoslovakia proceeded in two successive stages. In May 1938 Germany intensified its support for the Sudetenland secessionist movement and ordered the movement of troops toward the Czech border on May 19. As Britain and France responded with threats of retaliation if the Germans had invaded Czechoslovakia, Hitler decided to retreat and announced that Germany did not have any aggressive aims against Czechoslovakia. The crisis was renewed in the fall of 1938 after German forces began to concentrate again near the Czech border. Meanwhile, Britain and France pressed the Czech government to concede the Sudetenland, as it was largely inhabited by a German minority. On September 12, Hitler announced the German demand for self-determination of the Sudetenland Germans, and the Czech government ordered mobilization. The Anglo-French plan of September 19 proposed a transfer of the part of Sudetenland that was populated by the German majority. Chamberlain also met Hitler on September 22 and 23, but this time Hitler sent an ultimatum for the territorial transfer of Sudetenland to be completed by October 1. Although France ordered a partial mobilization, the Four-Power

Agreement was reached on September 30 in Munich by which Czechoslovakia was required to accept the territorial transfer. Throughout the crisis the Soviets refused to give military support to Czechoslovakia, emphasizing that the Soviet-Czech Pact stipulated prior French action as a condition for the Soviet defense commitment. Germany further advanced by occupying Czechoslovakia and Memel. Although war was already felt in the air, neither power retaliated militarily against these German advancements.

*Source:* Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 463–85; Nere 1975, 221–35; Renouvin 1969, 110–16; Sontag 1971, 336–50; Northedge 1967, 504–15, 527–48; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #62, 64.

### 1939 Italy's Invasion of Albania

In his designs to extend to the Balkans, Mussolini ordered the landing of Italian troops in Albania, which took place on April 7, 1939. In the meantime, the Italian representative in London delivered Mussolini's assurances to Halifax that the occupation of Tirana was not designed to hurt British interests in neighboring Greece. Nevertheless, under pressure from the Greek government, the British were convinced that Mussolini was about to invade Corfu next, and the British Fleet was ordered to Malta on April 11. Halifax also secured the French promise to support England in case of war against Italy over Greece. The French fleet was subsequently ordered to the Mediterranean and reinforcements sent to Tunis and French Somaliland. The crisis ended after the Italians denied the "rumors" of Italian designs against Greece. Nevertheless, on April 13 both France and England announced their guarantee of the independence of Greece and Rumania.

*Source:* Lowe and Marzari 1975, 326–31; Burgwyn 1997, 188–91; Mack Smith 1976, 149–58; Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 489–90; Renouvin 1969, 145–46; Northedge 1967, 581–83; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #71.

### 1939 Nomonhan Incident

The Russo-Japanese conflict over their interests in the Far East again escalated in May 1939, when their troops clashed on the Mongolian-Manchukuo frontier. While the Japanese controlled Manchukuo, the Soviets were allied to Outer Mongolia under their 1936 Mutual Assistance Pact. The joint attack by Japanese and Manchukuo forces against Outer Mongolia on May 28 triggered a Soviet counterattack on



June 18. The fighting escalated into a full-scale war throughout the summer of 1939. As the Soviet-Mongolian forces defeated and drove the Japanese troops from the area, a cease-fire agreement was reached on September 15, 1939, leaving the permanent boundary demarcation for future negotiations.

*Source:* Ikuhiko [1962–63] 1976, 157–78; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #72.

#### 1939–45 World War II

Prior to the Polish crisis, Germany signed a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union on August 23, 1939, which cleared the way for the partition of Poland and the Baltic states. The pact alarmed Britain, and British diplomatic efforts failed to halt the German advance in Poland. On September 1, German forces invaded Poland. The following day Britain sent an ultimatum, but, as no response came from Hitler for negotiations, Britain declared war on Germany on September 3. The war involvement of the Soviet Union came only after the Germans launched a surprise attack on Russia on June 22, 1941. (For the Soviet and U.S. entries, see section 3—direct-immediate deterrence failures.)

*Source:* Thorne 1973; Nere 1975, 235–45; Sontag 1971, 357–81; Renouvin 1969, 144–66; Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 496–502; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #74.

#### 1945 Azerbaijan Issue

During World War II, Allied forces were stationed in Iran with the understanding that they would withdraw six months after an armistice agreement was reached with the Axis powers. On November 16, 1945, Iran's Democratic party organized a rebellion for the autonomy of Azerbaijan, a northern Iranian province in the Soviet occupation zone. The following day, the Iranian government sent troops to the province, but the stationed Soviet forces blocked them. On November 24, the United States sent a Note to the Soviet Union demanding the troops' withdrawal by January 1, 1946. There were several abortive attempts to negotiate the withdrawal of all foreign troops. While the U.S. troops withdrew in the meantime, the Soviet forces remained in Azerbaijan. On March 4 and 5, they were further reinforced and began to move across Iranian territory. On March 6 the United States protested against the Soviet troop movements, bringing the dispute before the UN Security Council. Finally, on March 24 the Soviets announced an

agreement with Iran for the withdrawal of their troops, which was subsequently completed by May 1946.

*Source:* Ulam 1974, 425–27; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #108; Butterworth 1976, #13; Tillema 1991, #12.1; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #5.

#### 1945–46 Levant

The Treaty of Versailles of 1919 granted France a mandate over Levant, comprising Lebanon and Syria, and formerly controlled by the Ottoman Empire. As World War II was approaching its final stage, an independence movement in Syria clashed with the French forces on May 8, 1945, and soon afterward Syria appealed to the United Nations for independence. The French reacted by landing battalions in Beirut on May 17, 1945. As the French troops proceeded toward Damascus, shelling the city in May 1945, the British reacted with an ultimatum, demanding the evacuation of French troops from Syrian cities. There was also an unresolved issue over the authority of British General Paget, who was in charge of Allied forces in the Middle East. Churchill still considered him the commander in the area, including Damascus, while de Gaulle argued Paget's functions ceased with the end of the war in Europe. Despite the continuing tensions between London and Paris, the French complied with the British ultimatum and evacuated their forces on June 3.

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #105; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #4.

#### 1946 Turkish Straits

In June 1945 the Soviets called for a revision of the 1936 Convention regulating the Straits of Dardanelles and Bosphorus. Their demand, which was repeated on August 7, 1946, included permission for Soviet naval and land bases in the Turkish Straits area, a free passage for non-Black Sea vessels through the Straits, and the return of two provinces on Turkey's Caucasian border. At the same time, Soviet troops began to concentrate in the Caucasus, which was accompanied by Soviet naval movements in the Black Sea. On August 20, the United States dispatched navy and armed forces to the area to back the Turkish rejection of the treaty revisions. After an exchange of U.S. and Soviet Notes, the Soviets eventually yielded in October and dropped previous demands for an international conference on the Straits.

*Source:* Donelan and Grieve 1973, 28–32; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #111; Butterworth 1976, #7.

#### 1948–49 Berlin Blockade

According to the 1945 Potsdam Agreement, Germany was divided into four zones, with the status of Germany's future remaining open until a final settlement. Berlin was also divided into four zones, but it was located within the Soviet zone of occupation in Germany. In 1946 and 1947 the policy of Western powers began to be aimed at the economic recovery of Germany, which brought them into disagreement with the Soviet Union. On several occasions, the Soviets repeated their demand for \$10 billion in German reparations, which hindered the U.S.-British attempt to unify Germany and strengthen its economy. In March 1948, the Soviets walked out of the conference with the Western powers, as their positions on Germany widely diverged. On April 1, 1948, the Soviets first began to interfere with Western traffic into Berlin by introducing a temporary restriction on their access to the city. Nevertheless, the West introduced currency reform in the western German zone and initiated a process of full economic recovery. On June 24, the Soviets retaliated and imposed a complete blockade on Western access to the city, while the Western powers, in turn, began the airlift of supplies to Berlin. After several months of acute tension, the Soviets officially lifted the blockade in May 1949. In subsequent months, two separate German states were formed with the West Berlin enclave within the territory of East Germany.

*Source:* Ulam 1974, 452–55; George and Smoke 1974, 107–39; Betts 1987, 23–31; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #123; Butterworth 1976, #33; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #13.

#### 1950 Taiwan Strait

Mao Tse-tung's Communist forces assured a victory against Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist forces by 1949, leading to the establishment of the People's Republic of China. Defeated in the Chinese civil war, Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang retreated off the Chinese mainland and moved to Taiwan (Formosa) and a few other offshore islands such as Quemoy and Matsu. Having an ultimate goal to create a united China, Mao Tse-tung's forces shelled the islands held by the Kuomintang in October 1949. Convinced that a Chinese invasion of Taiwan was imminent, Truman ordered the Seventh Fleet to the Taiwan Strait in June.

The U.S. military and training assistance, as well its military presence in the area, helped the Nationalist forces launch a successful attack in early 1952. These developments also coincided with China's entry into the Korean War, prompting the Chinese to retreat from their bombing campaigns against the islands by June 1953.

*Source:* Donelan and Grieve 1973, 74–76; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #132; Tillema 1991, #16.6; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #21.

### 1950–53 Korean War

In a military attempt to reunify Korea, the North Korean forces crossed the 38th parallel dividing the two Koreas on June 25, 1950. On June 27, President Truman authorized U.S. forces to support South Korea and ordered the dispatch of the Seventh Fleet to the Formosa Straits. The fleet subsequently imposed a naval blockade, while the U.S. delegation brought the issue before the UN Security Council. As the Soviet delegation walked out before the vote, there was no veto against the Security Council decision to adopt the U.S.-sponsored resolution, demanding a North Korean withdrawal behind the 38th parallel. The resolution also established a UN combined force, headed by U.S. General MacArthur, to assist the South Korean army. In September, American and South Korean forces launched a counteroffensive, crossing the 38th parallel in October. When their forces began to approach the Manchurian border and the Yalu River, Chinese troops crossed the river to halt the U.S. advancement and assist the North Koreans. President Truman announced, in turn, that the United States would use force to defeat the Chinese troops, but the Chinese forces continued to push MacArthur's forces behind the parallel, and the war subsequently escalated. Soviet reaction to the U.S. crossing of the 38th parallel was to put its Far Eastern troops on alert. In the subsequent years of the Korean War, the Soviets neither used force nor issued military threats against U.S. actions, although Soviet weapons poured into the Chinese and North Korean armies. The war eventually ended with an agreement on July 27, 1953, which roughly reestablished the prewar boundaries.

*Source:* LaFeber 1993, 99–105; Schulzinger 1998, 225–30; George and Smoke 1974, 140–234; Betts 1987, 31–47; Ulam 1974, 425–27; Donelan and Grieve 1973, 28–32; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #132, 133, 140; Butterworth 1976, #67; Tillema 1991, #16.5; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #24.

## 1954–55 Chinese Offshore Islands

The PRC's Chou En-lai government continued Mao Tse-tung's policy of unification with the offshore islands held by the Nationalist government. On September 3, 1954, the PRC launched bombardments of Quemoy and Matsu, triggering the crisis for the United States. The Seventh Fleet was promptly ordered to the Taiwan Straits, and a defense pact between the United States and Taiwan was signed on December 2, 1954. Although the United States retracted from supporting the Taiwanese concerning their positions in the small Tachen islands, which the United States did not consider vital to their interests, Chou En-lai decided to concede on the major issue concerning Quemoy and Matsu. The PRC subsequently stopped bombing the islands and offered to negotiate with the United States on April 23, apparently indicating its recognition of an increasing U.S. commitment to Taiwan.

*Source:* George and Smoke 1974, 266–94; Betts 1987, 54–62; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #146; Butterworth 1976, #95; Berco-vitch and Jackson 1997, #36.

## 1956 Suez Canal

Following the Egyptian nationalization of the Suez Canal in July 1956, Britain and France decided to join Israel in a combined military attack against Egypt. At the end of October, the three countries invaded Egypt, but they failed to consult the United States. On November 5, the Soviets warned that they would bomb Paris and London unless the invasion stopped, and invited the United States for a superpower meeting. Within a month, Britain and France backed down, reaching a cease-fire agreement on November 6. On the same day, the United States responded by putting the Strategic Air Command on alert and signaled it would retaliate in the case of an attack on Paris or London. However, the Eisenhower administration essentially disagreed with the actions of Britain and France and firmly pressed them to withdraw, threatening economic sanctions against the allies if the invasion did not stop. After Britain and France had complied on November 6, Israel announced two days later that it would evacuate Sinai, which it did completely by March 12, 1957.

*Source:* Donelan and Grieve 1973, 123–29; LaFeber 1993, 184–89; Ulam 1974, 586–89; Betts 1987, 62–66; Brecher and Wilken-

feld 1997, #152; Butterworth 1976, #119, 120; Tillema 1991, #13.8; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #29, 47.

#### 1957 Turkish-Syrian Frontier Dispute

Since 1955 Syria, influenced by Egyptian President Nasser, began to shift toward the anti-Western Arab world. It signed a military alliance with Egypt and accepted Soviet military aid. In January 1957 the Eisenhower Doctrine was announced, promising American assistance, including troops, for the defense of any pro-Western Arab state against "international communism." When some minor border clashes erupted between Turkey and Syria in the summer of 1957, Turkey organized a series of meetings with its pro-Western Arab neighbors. On September 7 the United States repeated its commitment to the Eisenhower Doctrine, and Syria quickly responded that it did not intend to attack any Arab state. Soon the Soviets also warned Turkey against any attack on Syria, and Turkish Premier Menderes subsequently denied any aggressive intentions toward Syria. The United States, however, issued a warning that an attack on Turkey would trigger U.S. retaliation on Soviet territory. At the same time, the U.S. Sixth Fleet began maneuvers near the Syrian shores. Despite high tensions, the border dispute subsided by November 1957. Nonetheless, it did draw Syria even closer to Egypt, and the two states formed the United Arab Republic the following year.

*Source:* George and Smoke 1974, 332–37; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #159; Butterworth 1976, #108; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #40.

#### 1958 Quemoy-Matsu

In 1949 China claimed sovereignty over Taiwan (Formosa) and its two largest offshore islands—Quemoy and Matsu. Five years later (1954) China attempted to solve the issue militarily and bombed Quemoy. The United States replied that it would deploy the Seventh Fleet if invasion occurred, and the Chinese stopped the bombardment. As a result, the United States made a commitment to Taiwan by signing the Mutual Security Treaty. China resumed the bombardment of Quemoy on August 23, 1958, and reiterated its territorial claims. The Taiwanese forces fired back, and the United States sent the Seventh Fleet to the area on August 27. In September, the United States also issued a nuclear threat against the Chinese invasion of Quemoy. The Soviets

responded with a counterthreat against an attack on China, but quickly clarified that they would not provide military support for Chinese efforts to reunify with Taiwan. The Chinese discontinued the bombardment of Quemoy shortly thereafter. In October the U.S. government also indicated that it would not support an invasion of mainland China and agreed on ambassadorial talks with the Chinese.

*Source:* George and Smoke 1974, 363–89; Betts 1987, 62–79; Donelan and Grieve 1973, 151–54; Ulam 1974, 617–18; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #166; Butterworth 1976, #145; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #58.

#### 1958–59 Berlin Deadline

Once again Berlin became the focus of superpower tensions in two subsequent crises. In his speech of November 1958, Khrushchev called for an end to the occupation of Berlin. He also announced the Soviet intention to turn its control over East Berlin (including all access routes to West Berlin) to the East German government. On November 27 he sent a Note to the Western powers demanding the demilitarization of Berlin within six months. As this deadline note was perceived as an ultimatum, the United States immediately redeployed its aircraft carriers with nuclear weapons aboard in the Mediterranean. The marines were also put on alert for a rapid movement to West Berlin. On the same day, however, Khrushchev denied at a press conference that this Note constituted an ultimatum. In late 1958 NATO denied the Soviet right to renounce its obligations unilaterally and proposed a ministerial conference. On August 3, 1959, an interim agreement was reached to ban nuclear weapons and missiles in Berlin.

*Source:* George and Smoke 1974, 390–413; Betts 1987, 83–92; Donelan and Grieve 1973, 168–73; LaFeber 1993, 205–7; Noguee and Donaldson 1992, 138–44; Ulam 1974, 619–20; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #168; Butterworth 1976, #147.

#### 1961 Berlin Wall

The East German decision of 1961 to build a wall between East and West Berlin triggered another superpower crisis. The decision was apparently motivated by a concern over the increased flow of East German refugees to the western part of the city. As the wall was erected on August 17 and 18, the United States and other Western powers immediately protested. Led by the United States, the powers strengthened

their troops in the city, with 1,500 U.S. troops arriving on August 20. On August 24 the United States also warned that it would hold the Soviets responsible for any interference with Western access to West Berlin. Khrushchev finally signaled his intention to keep the city divided when he pronounced at the Party Congress of July 1961 that the Four Powers Statute was now considered invalid.

*Source:* Donelan and Grieve 1973, 168–73; Betts 1987, 92–109; Nogee and Donaldson 1992, 147–52; Ulam 1974, 654–56; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #185; Butterworth 1976, #181; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #74.

### 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis

As Cuba was the major Soviet ally in Central America, the Soviets provided the Cuban government with substantial military assistance. However, on October 16, 1962, the United States discovered that the Soviets had changed the “rules of engagement” and covertly begun to station nuclear missiles on the island. The U.S. response came on October 22 when President Kennedy announced that the missiles presented a threat to vital U.S. national interests and demanded their removal. He also announced that the United States would begin a naval blockade of the shipment of all offensive weapons to Cuba on October 24. His announcement also included the threat of retaliation against Soviet territory in the event of any attack from Cuba. Although the Soviets continued to deny the presence of their missiles in Cuba, Khrushchev finally disclaimed previous denials and promised to remove the missiles in a letter of October 26. In the meantime, a U.S. U-2 surveillance plane was shot down, and Khrushchev sent a second letter on October 27 with stricter conditions. In this letter, Khrushchev stated that the USSR would remove its missiles from Cuba in exchange for the removal of U.S. missiles from Turkey. Kennedy immediately replied with an acceptance of the proposal contained in Khrushchev’s first letter of October 26, which in the end constituted the terms of the final settlement. President Kennedy’s persistence finally induced the Soviets to remove their missiles, but the United States also promised not to invade Cuba.

*Source:* George and Smoke 1974, 447–99; Betts 1987, 109–23; Donelan and Grieve 1973, 233–37; LaFeber 1993, 225–29; Nogee and Donaldson 1992, 152–59; Schulzinger 1998, 266–69; Ulam 1974, 667–77; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #196; Butterworth 1976, #206; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #82.



### 1967 Six Day War

In an attempt to recoup the losses of the 1956 war with Israel, Egyptian President Nasser demanded the removal of UNEF from the Gaza Strip on May 18. As the closure of the Strait of Tiran was expected to be his next move, President Johnson ordered the Sixth Fleet to the area on May 22. On the same day, Nasser announced the blockade of Israeli shipping through the Strait. Meanwhile, both superpowers urged restraint by Israel and Egypt. Nevertheless, Israel launched an attack on Egyptian and Syrian forces on June 5. As Israeli forces advanced rapidly on both fronts, they defeated the Egyptian army in the Sinai on June 7 and held the Golan Heights by June 9. On June 10 Soviet Prime Minister Kosygin sent a hotline message to Johnson warning that the Soviets would take military actions if Israel did not stop its advance to Damascus. Johnson immediately replied with an assurance that Israel would stop, but he also ordered the Sixth Fleet to move to Syrian waters. By noon of June 10, a cease-fire went into effect. Israel gained a substantial advantage from its rapid military success, and the fleet stopped its eastward movement.

*Source:* Donelan and Grieve 1973, 269–73; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #222.

### 1970 Black September

Jordanian King Hussein faced a serious crisis when Palestinian guerrilla groups turned to violence in their demands for complete autonomy within Jordan. Fighting between Jordanian forces and Palestinian guerrillas broke out in early September 1970. To assure its influence in the region, Syria supported the Palestinian claims and invaded Jordan on September 19. In its support of Syria and concurrently with the Syrian attacks on Jordan, the Soviets issued several warnings against outside interventions. Nevertheless, on September 19 the United States undertook several military measures, including the placement of U.S. air forces in Germany on semialert and the deployment of the Sixth Fleet off the Lebanese and Syrian coasts. Despite its warnings against U.S. intervention, the Soviets also pressured Syria to withdraw from Jordan and called for a cease-fire. The cease-fire was soon implemented on September 29, thus ending the crisis for all involved parties.

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #238; Butterworth 1976, #285, 286.

## 1971 Bangladesh

After the Pakistani liberation from British colonial rule in 1947, the country was divided into West Pakistan and East Pakistan (Bangladesh), separated by a strip of Indian territory. A movement for East Bengali independence grew over time, and the declaration of Bangladesh's independence was finally scheduled for March 6, 1971. As the West Pakistani army preempted the announcement with an attack on the Dacca University and some newspaper offices on March 25, Bengali leaders declared independence on the following day. In the subsequent violent clashes, the West Pakistani army killed an estimated three million Bengali. Meanwhile, India became an active party in the dispute, and the Pakistani civil war developed into an Indo-Pakistani war after the Indian army crossed the border on November 21. India had already signed a Treaty of Friendship with the USSR and received substantial Soviet military assistance. The United States urged restraint on both sides, but it decided to move the Seventh Fleet into the Bay of Bengal on December 13 as a symbol of its support for Pakistan. The USSR also dispatched its naval vessels to the Bay of Bengal on December 15, in support of India. While Bangladesh succeeded in retaining its independence, the Indo-Pakistani disagreement was not officially resolved until 1974.

*Source:* Garthoff 1994, 299–322; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #242; Butterworth 1976, #291.

## 1973 Yom Kippur War

After Israel's decisive victory in the war of 1967, the UN passed a resolution calling on Israel to withdraw its forces from the occupied areas (Resolution 242). Israel refused to withdraw unless a secure peace treaty was guaranteed with the neighboring Arab countries. Egypt then decided to turn to a military option against Israel. Although Sadat, the new Egyptian president, initiated rapprochement with the United States, Soviet arms shipments continued to pour into the Arab world. Finally, Egypt and Syria launched a coordinated surprise attack against Israel on October 6, 1973, an important religious holiday for both Jews and Muslims (Yom Kippur and Ramadan, respectively). While the Egyptians had initial success in Sinai, the Syrian forces were suffering heavy losses in the Golan Heights.

As the war escalated, both superpowers ordered an airlift of military equipment to opposite sides in the “week of the airlift” (October

13–20). After Israel had succeeded in advancing in Sinai, on October 18 a dozen Arab countries decided to reduce their oil exports by 5 per cent each month until the Israelis withdrew to the 1967 prewar boundaries. Although the United States and USSR cosponsored the UN resolution mandating a cease-fire, an acute superpower crisis developed quickly. On October 24 Brezhnev sent a Note to Nixon with a warning that the Soviet Union might intervene unilaterally unless the Israelis halted their advance on the west bank of the Suez Canal. On the same day, the United States responded by putting the Strategic Air Command, with its nuclear capability, on worldwide high alert, while Nixon sent a firm reply to Moscow. At the same time, the U.S. government pressed Israel to halt its penetration into Egypt. The superpower crisis was quickly resolved with joint sponsorship of another UN resolution calling for a cease-fire on October 26. On November 11 all the parties signed an agreement for negotiating their troops' withdrawal and for the relief of the Egyptian Third Army, surrounded on the east bank of the Canal.

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #255; Butterworth 1976, #304, 305.

#### 1975 Angolan Civil War

After winning its independence from Portuguese colonial control in 1974, the new transitional regime in Angola faced serious internal strife. There were three movements with distinct ideological and regional roots, supported by different foreign patrons. The MPLA (Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola) had a Marxist orientation and support from the Soviet Union and Cuba; its popular base was in the north and urban areas. Its major opponent was the central FNLA (National Front for the Liberation of Angola), chiefly supported by the United States and Zaire. The third movement, UNITA (National Union for the Total Independence of Angola), was based in the south and helped by South Africa and Zambia. When major fighting broke out between all three movements in July 1975, outside patrons also intervened covertly or overtly on behalf of their protégé groups. Thus, the United States increased its covert aid to the FNLA and Zaire, while Zaire also sent forces into Angola in September. On their part, the Soviets airlifted planes and tanks into Angola and ordered naval maneuvers in Angolan waters, while Cuban troops arrived in October, fighting in support of the MPLA. Similarly, South African troops intervened on behalf of the UNITA and FNLA. The

deepening Soviet involvement and the overt Cuban intervention prompted the Ford administration to issue several private and public warnings against Cuban-Soviet involvement. The ongoing economic crisis following the Vietnam War and the refusal of Congress to continue its support for the U.S. covert aid to Zaire prompted the U.S. government to withdraw from the Angolan imbroglio. Consequently, the MPLA, which continued to receive Cuban and Soviet assistance, succeeded over other factions and formed a new government.

*Source:* Garthoff 1994, 556–93; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #260.

## **2. General Deterrence Failure Cases—No EID**

(Major-Minor Conflicts: Actors and Sources)

### **1895–96 French Annexation of Madagascar**

France vs. Madagascar

*Source:* Schuman 1931, 122–28; Roberts 1928, 1:377–90.

### **1895 Armenian Massacres**

United Kingdom vs. Turkey

*Source:* Langer 1951, 203–10; Grenville 1964, 24–53; Anderson 1966, 254–59; Marriott 1940, 395–404.

### **1895–96 Italo-Ethiopian War**

Italy vs. Ethiopia

*Source:* Lowe and Marzari, 65–67; Langer 1951, 271–81.

### **1899–1900 French Occupation of Tuat**

France vs. Morocco

*Source:* Cooke 1973, 98–106.

### **1899–1902 Boer War**

United Kingdom vs. Southern Africa

*Source:* Grenville 1964, 235–90; James 1976, 186–206; Langer 1951, 605–26; Gooch 1936–38, 1:217–30; Brandenburg 1933, 135–47; Taylor 1954, 387–90, 401–2.

### **1900 Russo-Afghan Frontier Dispute**

Russia vs. Afghanistan

*Source:* Langer 1951, 668–69.

1900 Russian Intervention in Manchuria

Russia vs. Manchuria

*Source:* Romanov [1928] 1952, 173–247; Malozemoff 1958, 134–44; Langer 1951, 695–99, 711–17, 781–82; Morse and Mac-Nair 1951, 486–87.

1903 Persian Gulf Naval Demonstration

United Kingdom vs. Iran

*Source:* Grenville 1964, 370–71; Lowe and Dockrill 1972, 1:60–62.

1903 Panama Independence

United States vs. Colombia

*Source:* Munro 1964, 49–64; Healy 1988, 83–92; Langley 1980, 30–38; Langley 1985, 23–26; Schulzinger 1998, 24–27.

1903 Dominican Turmoils

United States vs. Dominican Republic

*Source:* Healy 1988, 113–16; Langley 1985, 27–33.

1903–4 British Invasion of Tibet

United Kingdom vs. Tibet

*Source:* Grenville 1964, 371–75; Lowe and Dockrill 1972, 1:59–63; Monger 1963, 115–16, 140–41.

1906 Akaba Affair

United Kingdom vs. Turkey (Palestine/Egypt)

*Source:* Monger 1963, 296–97.

1906–8 French Occupation of Sahara and Mauretania

France vs. Algeria/Morocco

*Source:* Cooke 1973, 137–45.

1906–9 Cuban Revolution

United States vs. Cuba

*Source:* Munro 1964, 125–36; Healy 1988, 126–33; Langley 1980, 38–43; Langley 1985, 33–43.

1909–12 Russian Invasion of Northern Persia

Russia vs. Iran

*Source:* Gooch 1936–38, 2:302–4.

1910–12 Nicaraguan Revolution

United States vs. Nicaragua

*Source:* Munro 1964, 204–16; Healy 1988, 152–60; Langley 1980, 49–58; Langley 1985, 676; Schulzinger 1998, 45–48.

1911 Honduran Revolution

United States vs. Honduras

*Source:* Munro 1964, 225–30.

1911–12 Tripoli War

Italy vs. Turkey (Libya)

*Source:* Askew 1942, 23–81; Lowe and Marzari, 114–24; Bosworth 1979, 165–81, 192–95; Albertini 1952, 340–52; Gooch 1936–38, 1:429–38; Gooch 1936–38, 2:140–45; Anderson 1966, 287–91; Monger 1963, 438–43; Brandenburg 1933, 386–93.

1911–14 Occupation of the Dominican Republic

United States vs. Dominican Republic

*Source:* Munro 1964, 257–95; Healy 1988, 192–97; Langley 1985, 117–19; Schulzinger 1998, 49.

1912 “Negro Revolt” in Cuba

United States vs. Cuba

*Source:* Healy 1988, 214–15; Munro 1964, 477–80; Langley 1980, 64–66; Langley 1985, 49–50.

1912 Italian Occupation of Dodecanese

Italy vs. Turkey

*Source:* Askew 1942, 189–215; Bosworth 1979, 184–95; Albertini 1952, 357–63; Gooch 1936–38, 2:238–43, 305–11, 373–81.

1912 Constantinople Issue (First Balkan War)

Russia vs. Bulgaria

*Source:* Langer 1968, 801.

1913 Albanian Boundaries Issue (Second Balkan War)

Italy, Austro-Hungary vs. Greece

*Source:* Helmreich 1938, 418–42; Brandenburg 1933, 449–53; Geiss 1976, 150–52; Taylor 1954, 497–500.

1913–14 Mexican Revolution

United States vs. Mexico

*Source:* Healy 1988, 171–73; Lowe and Dockrill 1972, 1:102–6; Langley 1985, 77–100; Schulzinger 1998, 51–60.

1914 American Intervention in Haiti

United States vs. Haiti

*Source:* Munro 1964, 351–56; Healy 1988, 187–92; Langley 1980, 68–77; Langley 1985, 122–32; Schulzinger 1998, 49–50.

1919 Smyrna

Italy vs. Greece

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #7.

1919–21 Cilician War

France vs. Turkey

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #11.

1920 French Colonization of Syria

France vs. Syria

*Source:* Priestley 1938, 379–84; Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 128–31; Northedge 1967, 126–33; Roberts 1928, 2:591–98; Priestley 1938, 369–87.

1921 Panama–Costa Rica Border Dispute

United States vs. Panama

*Source:* Langley 1985, 175; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #19.

1921 Reparations Problem

France, United Kingdom vs. Germany

*Source:* Nere 1975, 33–38; Schuman 1931, 253–68; Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 42–43; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #20.

1922 Chanak Affair

United Kingdom vs. Turkey

*Source:* Northedge 1967, 150–53; Medlicott 1968, 41–42; Lowe and Dockrill 1972, 2:370–74; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #26.

1922–32 Italian Recolonization of Libya

Italy vs. Libya

*Source:* Cassels 1970, 289–93; Macartney and Cremona [1938] 1970, 70–71, 279–81; Mack Smith 1976, 36–41.

1923 Corfu Crisis

Italy vs. Greece

*Source:* Cassels 1970, 91–126; Lowe and Marzari 1975, 194–200; Burgwyn 1997, 23–24; Mack Smith 1976, 59–60; Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 92–93; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #28.

1923–24 Honduran Revolution

United States vs. Honduras

*Source:* Munro 1974, 126–42; Langley 1980, 108–10; Langley 1985, 177–80.

1923–25 Ruhr Occupation

France vs. Germany

*Source:* Nere 1975, 47–56; Schuman 1931, 282–99; Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 51–59; Sontag 1971, 111–18; Marks 1976, 45–54; Northedge 1967, 179–96; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #27.

1924 British Ultimatum to Egypt

United Kingdom vs. Egypt

*Source:* Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 136–37.

1924 Mosul Land Dispute

United Kingdom vs. Turkey (Iraq)

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #31.

1925–26 Riffians Rebellion

France (Spain) vs. Morocco

*Source:* Priestley 1938, 351–52.

1925 Shanghai Incident

United Kingdom vs. China

*Source:* Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 317; MacNair and Lach 1955, 219–20; Northedge 1967, 292–95.



1925–27 Second American Intervention in Nicaragua

United States vs. Nicaragua

*Source:* Munro 1974, 187–254; Ellis 1968, 252–61; Langley 1980, 116–25; Langley 1985, 181–203.

1927–28 Shantung

Japan vs. China

*Source:* Iriye 1990, 146–47, 195–205; Nish 1977, 156–60; Beasley 1987, 184–88; Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 252; Takeuchi 1935, 247–61; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #35.

1928 Sinai Ultimatum

United Kingdom vs. Egypt

*Source:* Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 235–38.

1929 Chinese Eastern Railway

USSR vs. China

*Source:* Fischer 1951, 2:734–38; Beloff 1949, 1:70–75; Sontag 1971, 357–58; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #38.

1929–34 American Withdrawal from Haiti

United States vs. Haiti

*Source:* Munro 1974, 309–41; Ellis 1968, 274–75; Langley 1980, 134–36.

1931–32 Manchurian War (Mukden Incident)

Japan vs. China

*Source:* Toshihiko [1962–63] 1984, 241–305; Iriye [1962–63] 1984, 233–35; MacNair and Lach 1955, 297–337; Nish 1977, 175–83; Beasley 1987, 188–94; Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 313–21; Renouvin 1969, 38–45; Sontag 1971, 242–45; Takeuchi 1935, 337–73, 380–415; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #39.

1932–33 Jehol Campaign

Japan vs. China

*Source:* Toshihiko [1962–63] 1983, 11–59; MacNair and Lach 1955, 417–20; Nish 1977, 193–94; Beasley 1987, 199–200; Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 321–32; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #43.

1933–34 “Sergeants’ Revolt” in Cuba

United States vs. Cuba

*Source:* Langley 1980, 138–46; Smith 1950, chap. 10.

1934 Italo-Albanian Frictions (Durazzo Naval  
Demonstration)

Italy vs. Albania

*Source:* Macartney and Cremona [1938] 1970, 114–18.

1934 Dolfuss Affair (Nazi Putsch in Austria)

Italy vs. Austria

*Source:* Lowe and Marzari 1975, 232–39; Burgwyn 1997, 95–98; Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 388–91; Renouvin 1969, 52–60; Sontag 1971, 281–82; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #45.

1934 Wal Wal

Italy vs. Ethiopia

*Source:* See bibliographic references for the Italo-Ethiopian War (EID case).

1936–39 Spanish Civil War

Italy, Germany vs. Spain

*Source:* Burgwyn 1997, 147–51; Mack Smith 1976, 99–106; Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 431–43; Renouvin 1969, 87–96; Sontag 1971, 299–304; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #54.

1937–38 Alexendretta Crisis

France vs. Turkey (Syria)

*Source:* Langer 1968, 1088; Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 298–99; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #53.

1937–41 Sino-Japanese War

Japan vs. China

*Source:* Nish 1977, 218–34; MacNair and Lach 1955, 441–45; Beasley 1987, 203; Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 332–38; Renouvin 1969, 96–103; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #56.

1938 Anschluss

Germany vs. Austria

*Source:* Renouvin 1969, 103–10; Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 451–57; Sontag 1971, 332–35; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #60.

1939 Italy's Invasion of Albania

Italy vs. Albania

(See also above as an EID: Italy—Greece—United Kingdom, France)

*Source:* Lowe and Marzari 1975, 326–31; Burgwyn 1997, 188–91; Mack Smith 1976, 149–58; Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 489–90; Renouvin 1969, 145–46; Northedge 1967, 581–83; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #71.

1939 German Annexation of Czechoslovakia

Germany vs. Czechoslovakia

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #68 (for more sources, see the EID case of Sudetenland Problem).

1939 Memel Annexation

Germany vs. Lithuania

*Source:* Sontag 1971, 356–57; Gathorne-Hardy 1950, 486; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #69.

1939 Soviet Occupation of the Baltics

USSR vs. Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #75.

1940 Russo-Finnish War

USSR vs. Finland

*Source:* Ulam 1974, 289–95; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #76.

1948–51 Soviet-Yugoslav Rift

USSR vs. Yugoslavia

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #131; Butterworth 1976, #39.

1950–51 Chinese Invasion of Tibet

China vs. Tibet

*Source:* Donelan and Grieve 1973, 79–82; Butterworth 1976, #68; Tillema 1991, #16.7; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #25.

1951–52 Canal Zone

United Kingdom vs. Egypt

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #136; Butterworth 1976, #75; Tillema 1991, #13.6.

1952 Macao

China vs. Portugal

*Source:* Tillema 1991, #16.8; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #31.

1953 East Berlin Uprising

USSR vs. East Germany

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #141; Butterworth 1976, #85; Tillema 1991, #5.2.

1954 U.S. Intervention in Guatemala

United States vs. Guatemala

*Source:* Donelan and Grieve 1973, 94–98; LaFeber 1993, 159–61; Schulzinger 1998, 243–45; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #144; Butterworth 1976, #83, 84; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #37.

1955 Nicaragua–Costa Rican Dispute

United States vs. Nicaragua

*Source:* Butterworth 1976, #99; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #39.

1956 Polish October

USSR vs. Poland

*Source:* Noguee and Donaldson 1992, 248–51; Ulam 1974, 590–94; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #154; Butterworth 1976, #117.

1956 Hungarian Intervention

USSR vs. Hungary

*Source:* George and Smoke 1974, 295–308; Donelan and Grieve 1973, 130–34; Ulam 1974, 594–99; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #155; Butterworth 1976, #118; Tillema 1991, #5.5; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #48.

1957 Jordanian Civil War

United States, United Kingdom vs. Jordan

*Source:* Donelan and Grieve 1973, 138–42; LaFeber 1993, 201–2; George and Smoke 1974, 329–32; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #157; Butterworth 1976, #116.

1958 Lebanon Upheaval

United States vs. Lebanon

*Source:* George and Smoke 1974, 338–55; Betts 1987, 66–68; Donelan and Grieve 1973, 135–38; LaFeber 1993, 201–2; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #165; Butterworth 1976, #130, 131; Tillema 1991, #13.14; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #57.

1958–61 Tunisian Military Bases and Bizerta Conflict

France vs. Tunisia

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #158, 184; Butterworth 1976, #132, 133, 190; Tillema 1991, #11.8; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #55, 61, 75.

1959–60 Sino-Nepalese Border Dispute

China vs. Nepal

*Source:* Butterworth 1976, #156; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #64.

1958–62 Sino-Indian War

China vs. India

*Source:* Donelan and Grieve 1973, 155–59; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #171, 194; Butterworth 1976, #91, 199; Tillema 1991, #17.10, 17.12; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #66, 84.

1961 Bay of Pigs

United States vs. Cuba

*Source:* Donelan and Grieve 1973, 174–78; LaFeber 1993, 216–18; Schulzinger 1998, 262–64; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #181; Butterworth 1976, #178; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #72.

1961–62 Laos

United States vs. Laos/Thailand

*Source:* Donelan and Grieve 1973, 106–11; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #180, 193; Butterworth 1976, #139, 140, 141; Tillema 1991, #18.15; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #60.

1962 Taiwan Strait

China vs. Taiwan

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #192; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #79.

1962 Yemeni Civil War (1962–current)

United States vs. Yemen

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #195.

1963–65 Borneo

United Kingdom vs. Indonesia

*Source:* Butterworth 1976, #212; Tillema 1991, #18.22;  
Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #77.

1964 Panama Canal

United States vs. Panama

*Source:* Donelan and Grieve 1973, 249–53; Brecher and  
Wilkenfeld 1997, #206; Butterworth 1976, #234, 235; Tillema  
1991, #3.7; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #91.

1964 Military Putsch in Gabon

France vs. Gabon

*Source:* Tillema 1991, #7.7; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997,  
#93.

1964–66 Yemeni Civil War (1962–current)

United Kingdom vs. North Yemen

*Source:* Butterworth 1976, #216; Tillema 1991, #14.6;  
Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #83.

1964 Gulf of Tonkin (Vietnam War 1964–75)

United States vs. Vietnam

*Source:* Donelan and Grieve 1973, 99–105; LaFeber 1993,  
237–43; Schulzinger 1998, 270–75; Brecher and Wilkenfeld  
1997, #210; Butterworth 1976, #194, 195; Tillema 1991,  
#18.15; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #69.

1964 Congo

United States vs. Congo

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #211.

1965 Indo-Pakistani War (1945–65)

China vs. India

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #216; Butterworth  
1976, #241; Tillema 1991, #17.14.

1965 Dominican Intervention

United States vs. Dominican Republic

*Source:* Donelan and Grieve 1973, 254–58; LaFeber 1993, 246–49; Schulzinger 1998, 278–79; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #215; Butterworth 1976, #250, 251, 252; Tillema 1991, #2.5; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #104.

1968 *Pueblo* Seizure

United States vs. North Korea

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #224; Butterworth 1976, #271; Tillema 1991, #16.11; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #105.

1968 Prague Spring

USSR vs. Czechoslovakia

*Source:* Donelan and Grieve 1973, 274–79; Noguee and Donaldson 1992, 262–72; Ulam 1974, 738–46; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #227; Butterworth 1976, #274, 275; Tillema 1991, #5.9; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #120.

1969–72 First Chadian Civil War

France vs. Chad

*Source:* Tillema 1991, #7.10; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #109.

1970 Invasion of Cambodia (Vietnam War)

United States vs. Cambodia

*Source:* LaFeber 1993, 265–66; Schulzinger 1998, 292–95; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #237; Butterworth 1976, #110; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #126.

1975 *Mayaguez* Crisis

United States vs. Cambodia

*Source:* LaFeber 1993, 283–84; Schulzinger 1998, 311–12; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #259; Butterworth 1976, #287; Tillema 1991, #18.15; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #153.

1978 Shaba

France vs. Zaire

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #292; Tillema 1991, #7.14; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #177.

1978–79 Sino-Vietnam War

China vs. Vietnam

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #298; Tillema 1991, #18.29; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #182.

1978–82 Second Chadian Civil War

France vs. Chad

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #304; Tillema 1991, #7.13; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #175.

1979 Yemeni Civil War (1962–current)

United States vs. Yemen

*Source:* Garthoff 1994, 719–26.

1979 Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan (1979–89)

USSR vs. Afghanistan

*Source:* Garthoff 1994, 977–1093; Noguee and Donaldson 1992, 319–22; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #303; Tillema 1991, #15.4; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #180.

1979 Soviet Threat to Pakistan

USSR vs. Pakistan

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #306; Tillema 1991, #15.4.

1979–81 U.S. Hostages in Iran

United States vs. Iran

*Source:* Schulzinger 1998, 328–31; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #309; Tillema 1991, #12.10; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #188.

1980 Espiritu Santo Secessionist Fighting

United Kingdom, France vs. Vanuatu

*Source:* Tillema 1991, #20.2; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #192.

1980–81 The Solidarity Movement in Poland

USSR vs. Poland

*Source:* Noguee and Donaldson 1992, 333–37; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #315.



1981 Gulf of Syrte

United States vs. Libya

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #330; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #196.

1982 Falklands (Malvinas) War

United Kingdom vs. Argentina

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #336; Tillema 1991, #4.13; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #201.

1983 Contras

United States vs. Nicaragua

*Source:* LaFeber 1993, 314–16; Schulzinger 1998, 337–42; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #190.

1983 U.S. Invasion of Grenada

United States vs. Grenada

*Source:* LaFeber 1993, 312; Schulzinger 1998, 339–41; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #343; Tillema 1991, #2.8; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #215.

1983–84 Third Chadian Civil War (1983–current)

France vs. Chad

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #342; Tillema 1991, #7.18; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #203.

1983–84 Sino-Vietnamese Clashes

China vs. Vietnam

*Source:* Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #352; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #211, 218.

### 3. Direct-Immediate Deterrence Cases

(Major-Major Direct Conflicts: Actors and Sources)

1936 Remilitarization of Rhineland

Germany vs. France

*Source:* Nere 1975, 184–92; Renouvin 1969, 78–86; Sontag 1971, 292–94; Northedge 1967, 426–34; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #51.

1941 World War II (Barbarossa)

Germany vs. USSR

*Source:* Beloff 1949, 2:355–84; Ulam 1974, 297–313; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #85.

1941 World War II (Pearl Harbor)

Japan vs. United States

*Source:* Schulzinger 1998, 178–82; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #88.

1969 Sino-Soviet Border Dispute (Ussuri River)

China vs. USSR

*Source:* Garthoff 1994, 228–42; Betts 1987, 79–81; Noguee and Donaldson 1992, 260–62; Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997, #231; Butterworth 1976, #170; Tillema 1991, #16.15; Bercovitch and Jackson 1997, #86.