Appendix 1: Short description of cases

Outcome: presence of a choice of conflict

P01 – Invasion of Panama (1989–90)
In December 1989 the USA invaded Panama as a result of a long chain of events. It was, in particular, the US desire to remove Noriega from power, a long-term US policy toward Latin America, that overshadowed the entire chain of events. Although they attempted more peaceful means at first, including staging a coup, Noriega managed to retain power and as a result became even more aggressive towards the USA (Strong, 2005: 184).

P02 – The Gulf War (1990)
Also known as 'Operation Desert Storm', the Gulf War was a response of the USA and 27 other countries to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990. The UN Security Council ordered Iraq to immediately and unconditionally withdraw all its military forces from Kuwait. It authorised member states cooperating with the Government of Kuwait to use any means necessary to uphold the Security Council's decision unless Iraq withdrew. Iraq did not comply, which led to the military operation, totalling over 800,000 military personnel from 36 countries (Human Rights Watch, 1991: 69).

P03 – War of Transnistria (1992)
Once the Soviet Union began to dismantle, three distinct movements for self-determination were present in Moldova. One was a self-determination movement for the Dniester area. However, the central government in Moldova ignored this movement, promoting Moldovan culture. Amidst a tense political situation that involved various levels of political harassment, the result was a self-proclaimed Dniester Republic. As hostilities escalated, spontaneous defence units sprang up, slowly coalescing into an organised army. Moldovan Government Forces consisted of volunteers, police

officers and hastily assembled National Army soldiers. Dniester also formed joint command forces but had many volunteers from Ukraine and Russia. The Russian 14th Army, which was the only army stationed in Moldova at the time of independence, partly participated on the side of Dniester. Although the exact involvement of the Russian 14th Army is unclear, members of Dniester's political elite often thanked Russia and the Russian 14th Army for their crucial role in sustaining the Republic during the war (Dailey, 1993: 18–23).

P04 – 'Operation Deliberate Force' (1995)
This was a bombing operation against a self-proclaimed state of Republika Srpska (or the Serb Republic), a Bosnian Serb entity established in January 1992. Air Forces from the USA, UK, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, Spain and Turkey participated in targeting Bosnian Serb forces, which was justified as a defence of humanitarian values in the face of 'undeniable Serb brutality against military prisoners and noncombatant civilians' (Owen, 2001: 63). The Serbs, however, were not willing to compromise, and launched counter-attacks whenever possible, including taking hostages.

P05 – NATO bombing of Yugoslavia (1999)
NATO conducted a 78-day bombing campaign against Yugoslavia in an effort to end Yugoslavia's crackdown on the Albanian insurgency in Kosovo. More specifically, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia failed to comply with NATO demands, which included an interim political settlement on the future of Kosovo, an end to the anti-insurgency campaign, deemed by NATO to be excessively and disproportionately carried out by the Serb Army and Special Police Forces in the region, and, most importantly, access by NATO forces to all of Yugoslavia (Wheatley, 1999: 478; Kaplan, 2004: 126). US, British and French forces under NATO command bombed Serbian targets throughout Yugoslavia, and Yugoslavia resisted for 78 days.

P06 – War in Afghanistan (2001–ongoing)
Following the September 11 attacks on the World Trade Center in New York, NATO and allied forces intervened in Afghanistan with two strategic objectives: first, to dismantle al-Qaeda and kill or capture Osama bin Laden, and second, to remove the Taliban from power (V.I., 2009: 166). The pretext to the invasion was that Osama bin Laden was hiding in Afghanistan. After the USA demanded that bin Laden be handed over, the Taliban regime declined to extradite him without evidence on his involvement in the September 11 attacks. The USA refused to negotiate

and launched a military operation in October of 2001, initially with the UK, but soon after followed by other allies. Although the Taliban were quickly driven out of power, their defeat (rather than acceptance of US conditions) and subsequent insurgency indicate a clear choice to resist, whether in power or not.

P07 – Iraq War (2003)

Iraq was named as being part of the 'axis of evil' in January 2002 by US President at the time, George W. Bush. This stemmed from the US claim that the Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) and sought domination of the Middle East, threatening US allies as well as oil supplies (Copson, 2003: 2). Asserting that Iraq had failed to comply with the WMD disarmament mandates, the Bush administration conducted a military operation without ever declaring war, with the primary goal stressed as being regime change. The operation included US allies such as the UK, Australia and Poland. Iraq briefly resisted before collapsing, suffering up to 10,800 casualties during the invasion phase (Conetta, 2003).

P08 – Russo–Georgian War (2008)

Abkhazia and South Ossetia are two breakaway territories of Georgia. On 7 August 2008, Georgia attacked South Ossetia, allegedly in response to attacks on its peacekeepers and villages, and because the Russian troops were moving into South Ossetia from Russia. However, on 9 August, Russian troops mounted a counter-offensive and forced Georgians to retreat. Russian troops continued to push into Georgia. Despite their poor morale and rapid defeat, Georgian troops fought back until a ceasefire was implemented (Gahrton, 2010: 177–9).

P09 – 'Operation Unified Protector' (2011)

Libya was undergoing a civil war when the UN Security Council gave an ultimatum to Gaddafi to end the violence. However, Gaddafi forces continued to advance to Benghazi in mid-March. Rebels pleaded for help, and the UN Security Council authorised the use of all necessary means to protect civilians and civilian-populated areas under threat of attack, as well as to secure the no-fly zone. On 19 March, an ad hoc coalition of states, including the US, UK and France, working through the NATO framework, attacked the Libyan government's targets – Gaddafi's forces (Ulfstein and Christiansen, 2013: 159–61).

Outcome: absence of a choice of conflict

These are the cases where a serious dispute involved a minor and a major power, but a minor power only displayed low levels of hostility, that is, only a threat to use force, or acquiescence. In other words, the minor power decided not to engage the major power. Brief violations of territorial waters or airspace are not included, as such violations lack data and might not be considered a serious challenge. For example, when Cuba shot down two US airplanes owned by the Brothers to the Rescue, it cannot be considered as a relevant case because the mission was not intended as a military or territorial challenge. Damaging, prolonged and more frequent violations against state property are included, as in the case of the Russo–Norwegian territorial dispute.

N01 – Georgian Civil War (1991)
Georgia sought to gain control over separatist South Ossetia and Abkhazia, which resulted in a civil war. Both South Ossetia and Abkhazia were backed by Russia, politically, but also militarily. Despite being in a civil war, Georgia recognised the threat coming from Russian involvement in the war, and sought to appease it by reaching an agreement. Even though there were other episodes of Russian intrusions into Georgian territory, some of those were not aimed at challenging Georgia, but rather Chechen militants operating from its territory. Thus, the Georgian Civil War illustrates the best case of Russian intervention against Georgia.

N02 – Dispute over Taiwan (1994)
Both China and Taiwan engaged in intimidation tactics, causing protests from the other side. Such tactics included seizure of fishing vessels, alerts and military exercises. However, at no point did Taiwan engage in hostilities with the Chinese military.

N03 – Syrian border fortification (1996)
Syria amassed troops near the border with Turkey after it accused Turkey of being behind the blasts that had rocked the country for a few weeks. In response to Syrian border fortification, the USA threatened to confront Syria militarily if Syria went to war with Turkey. In 2004, US forces in Iraq exchanged gunfire with Syrian border troops over the Iraq–Syria border. The USA subsequently reinforced the border, but Syria did not respond. Other incidents also occurred later, such as in 2008, when US helicopters and troops fired at several buildings five miles inside Syrian territory.

N04 – Russia and the CIS in Afghanistan (1996)
Once the Taliban came into power in Afghanistan, relations between CIS states and the Afghani government continued to be unstable at the border. The Taliban government supported Islamic militants who threatened to destabilise the former Soviet States. In June 2000, a clash occurred between Uzbekistan and Afghanistan. Uzbekistan launched airstrikes into Afghanistan, but Afghanistan did not offer any serious engagement.

N05 – 'Operation Uphold Democracy' (1994)
This case refers to the US plan to remove a military regime from power in Haiti in 1994. With the approval of the UN Security Council, the USA began planning for the operation in August 1994. However, when most of the force was airborne, Haitian officials agreed to restore democracy and allow the US troops to land. Shortly after, the military regime abdicated peacefully.

N06 – Spratly Islands I: Philippines and China (1995)
China has challenged its weaker neighbours over the disputed Spratly Islands by slow encroachment. Even though the dispute predates the end of the Cold War, in 1995 there were many incidents that caused protests from the other side. For example, on 13 May 1995, China and the Philippines engaged in a mutual 'show of force' in which Chinese vessels blocked a Philippine Navy vessel sailing toward the Spratly Islands. In subsequent years incidents continued, and the Philippines often made serious preparations for a war with China. However, apart from intimidation tactics and the arrests of fishermen, the Philippines did not engage the Chinese military.

N07 – Spratly Islands II: Vietnam and China (1994)
Like the Philippines, Vietnam faced Chinese pressure over the control of these crucial islands. There were several incidents that indicated that Vietnam would not challenge China militarily, despite strong verbal protests by the Vietnamese government. 1994 is the highlighted year because it involved several serious incidents between the two countries. One such occurred in May, whereby China engaged in a show of force by increasing its naval presence around the Spratly Islands. Two months later, two Chinese warships blockaded a Vietnamese oil rig. Vietnam did not militarily engage the Chinese Navy.

N08 – Russo–Latvian border dispute (1998)
From 1998 to 1999 Russia reinforced the border after the Latvian Prime Minister stated that Latvia was going to begin to unilaterally demarcate the contested border.

N09 – Russo–Estonian border dispute (1994)
After Estonia gained independence, it claimed ownership of a strip of land in the Pechory (Petseri) district of southeastern Estonia, according to the Russian Estonian Treaty of Tartu of 1920. However, Russia objected to this and in 1994 proceeded to demarcate the border according to the post-1940 border by installing new posts and bringing troops to the disputed area.

N10 – Chinese intrusions into Bhutan (2004)
China has consistently used a dual strategy toward Bhutan, offering both sticks and carrots. On one occasion in 2004, 200 Chinese troops entered Bhutan to work on construction projects. Bhutan declared that this intrusion was a violation of its territorial sovereignty, but it did not respond by force. India also protested Chinese actions in Bhutan.

N11 – Russo–Norwegian territorial dispute (2008)
As global energy demands grow, the Arctic's resources have increasingly become a focus of interstate tensions, such as between Russia and Norway, which lacked a clear delineation of territorial waters. Although this dispute predated 2008 and contained many Russian violations of Norwegian airspace as well as fishing grounds, it was in 2008 when Russia increased its naval presence in the disputed waters near Spitsbergen, which belongs to Norway.

Appendix 2: Coding of data

This appendix includes a list of interstate disputes, taken from the Correlates of War project, titled 'Militarized Interstate Disputes' (v.4.01). Only disputes coded with hostility level of dispute 3, 4 and 5 were looked at for the outcome of 'military challenge', each pertaining to display of force, use of force and war (in their respective order). Threat to use force and lower hostility levels cannot account for militarily challenging a state. Below are answers to a set of questions to which an answer of 'yes' or 'no' would indicate whether there was a presence or absence of a condition. Thus, if at least one question can be answered with a 'yes', a condition is coded with 1 (presence). A data table showing membership scores is provided below, while the truth table has been provided in Chapter 3 (see Table 3.3).

Data table showing membership scores

ID	Case name	Main antagonists	Date	FS	WOO	DC	RS	AB	OUT
P01	Invasion of Panama	Panama – USA	1989–1990	0	0	1	0	1	1
P02	The Gulf War	Iraq – USA	1990	0	0	1	1	1	1
P03	War of Transnistria	Moldova – Russia	1992	0	1	1	1	0	1
P04	Operation Deliberate Force	Serb Entity – USA	1995	1	0	1	1	1	1
P05	NATO bombing of Yugoslavia	Serbia – USA	1999	1	0	1	1	0	1
P06	War in Afghanistan	Afghanistan – USA	2001–?	0	0	1	0	1	1
P07	Iraq War	Iraq – USA	2003	1	0	1	1	1	1
P08	Russo-Georgian War	Georgia – Russia	2008	1	0	1	1	0	1
P09	Operation Unified Protector	Libya – USA	2011	0	0	1	0	1	1
N01	Georgian Civil War	Georgia – Russia	1991–1993	0	1	1	0	0	0
N02	Dispute over Taiwan	Taiwan – China	1994–?	1	0	0	1	0	0
N03	Syrian border fortification	Syria – USA	1996	0	0	0	1	0	0
N04	Russia and the CIS in Afghanistan	Afghanistan – Russia	1996–2001	0	1	1	0	1	0
N05	Operation Uphold Democracy	Haiti – USA	1994–1996	0	0	0	1	1	0
N06	Spratly Islands I	Philippines – China	1995–?	1	0	0	1	0	0
N07	Spratly Islands II	Vietnam – China	1994–?	0	0	0	1	0	0
N08	Russo-Latvian border dispute	Latvia – Russia	1998–1999	1	1	0	1	0	0
N09	Russo-Estonian border dispute	Estonia-Russia	1994	1	1	0	1	0	0
N10	Chinese intrusions into Bhutan	Bhutan – China	2004	1	0	0	1	0	0
N11	Russo-Norwegian territorial dispute	Norway – Russia	2008	1	0	0	1	0	0

Invasion of Panama (P01)

Foreign support (FS)

Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?
Brzezinski, when referring to the leadership of Panama at the time, stated that 'Manuel Noriega has already discovered he has no allies' (Brzezinski, 2007: 50). Although the CIA supported him until the mid-1980s, by 1989 he was more of a liability to the USA than an ally.

Window of opportunity (WOO)

Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a major power had an economic crisis?
Has a major power had social upheaval?
The USA's new economy began to grow, reaching a peak during the 1990s, to which some attributed US power as even greater than before (Ikenberry, 2008: 23). As a hegemon that maintained the only leading position in the world, there are hardly any problems that made the USA vulnerable or 'exploitable' (see, for example, Black, 2007).

Domestic crisis (DC)

Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?
According to Galván (2012: 186), Panama at the time was a country 'in social chaos, a stagnant economy, simmering discontent, and street protests.'

Regime stability (RS)

For a democracy, did the regime maintain the support of enough people to get re-elected, and certainly not get impeached or removed through a vote of no confidence?
For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime so as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?
Noriega was brutal against any potential opposition. For example, he ordered the torture and murder of Dr Spadafora. When the president of Panama at the time, Nicolas Barletta, attempted to inquire into the matter, Noriega forced him to resign. When he named Delvalle as the next puppet president, the new president attempted to relieve Noriega as director of the armed forces. Delvalle was also forced to resign. When Noriega orchestrated controversial elections in 1989, as a sign of desperation, he beat up opposition politicians on the street. Thus, it was

clear that the regime was very unstable given the increasing aggression (Galván, 2012: 189).

Anomalous beliefs (AB)
Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?
Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?
Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?
Noriega was ideologically neutral; however, due to involvement in violence and crime, he had a reputation of being violent. For example, at a young age, he raped a 13-year-old girl. His drunken behaviour was also one of his prominent features (Galván, 2012: 184–6).

The Gulf War (P02)

Foreign support (FS)
Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?
Although Iraq had some diplomatic support from states such as Libya and Sudan, no powerful ally was in support of Saddam. UN Security Council Resolution 678 was passed without a veto from permanent members. This is why Ruane and James (2012: 107) stated that Iraq had 'no allies' among major powers.

Window of opportunity (WOO)
Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a major power had an economic crisis?
Has a major power had social upheaval?
The USA's new economy began to grow, reaching a peak during the 1990s, to which some attributed US power as even greater than before (Ikenberry, 2008: 23). As a hegemon that maintained the only leading position in the world, there are hardly any problems that made the USA vulnerable or 'exploitable' (see, for example, Black, 2007).

Domestic crisis (DC)
Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?
Economic problems were such that they might have caused instability in the Ba'ath regime. Iraq had spent US$452.6 billion in a war against Iran. The basic needs of Iraq were not being met (Park, 2004: 53–9). Therefore, Saddam Hussein needed to act if he wanted to get Iraq out of possible trouble.

Regime stability (RS)

For a democracy, did the regime maintain the support of enough people to get re-elected, and certainly not get impeached or removed through a vote of no confidence?

For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?

According to Park (2004: 53–9), domestic political instability was a possible trajectory given the economic crisis. However, since the approach taken here was to look for a situation before the conflict, it was not the case that a serious political crisis broke out to challenge the Ba'ath regime; Saddam had purged his political opponents much earlier.

Anomalous beliefs (AB)

Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?

Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?

Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?

According to a psychological study of Saddam Hussein, he followed a developmental path vowing 'never again, never again shall I submit to superior force.' His own studies also shaped his worldview to hate foreigners. He was also known as a 'street thug' (Post and George, 2004: 211–15).

War of Transnistria (P03)

Foreign support (FS)

Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?

International support for Moldova depended on Western countries' relations with Russia, which is why the USA did not want to recognise Moldova before Russia (Olson et al, 1994: 223). Moreover, the OSCE only established a mission in Moldova in 1993 (Olson et al, 1994: 222). There was thus little help Moldova could have expected before the conflict.

Window of opportunity (WOO)

Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?

Has a major power had an economic crisis?

Has a major power had social upheaval?

In late 1991, just a few months before the conflict, the Russian state did not really exist – that is, according to Kuchins (2013: 31–2), the regime lacked a clear sense of what it was striving to create. The absence of a

coherent strategy led to disagreement over economic reforms, spawning a constitutional crisis that ended in violence in 1993. Political drama, lack of economic progress and social upheaval make it clear that Russia was severely constrained.

Domestic crisis (DC)

Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?

Transnistria declared independence from Moldova at the same time as Moldova declared independence from the USSR. Gagauzia also pushed for autonomy and formed its own defence forces. According to Roper (2001: 106–8), the Russian 14th Army was stationed in Transnistria and supplied the Transnistrian paramilitary force with weapons and ammunition. Boris Yeltsin placed the 14th Army under direct Russian control. The Russian Congress of People's Deputies passed a resolution in support of the population in Transnistria. The 14th Army also directly intervened on the side of Transnistria. Therefore, while facing Russia on the side of Transnistria, Moldova had to overcome serious obstacles to keep the country together.

Regime stability (RS)

For a democracy, did the regime maintain the support of enough people to get re-elected, and certainly not get impeached or removed through a vote of no confidence?
For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?

After the March 1990 parliamentary elections, the Popular Front was formed comprising 66 per cent of the seats. The government was composed almost entirely of ethnic Moldovans. Mircea Snegur was elected president by the Parliament, and faced a feeble opposition (Roper, 2001: 104–5). He enjoyed strong support within the regime before the conflict.

Anomalous beliefs (AB)

Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?
Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?
Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?

Snegur was a strong supporter of unification with Romania, but he did not advocate the extreme position of unifying the two states (Roper, 2001: 106). He was also initially opposed to military action, preferring

negotiations due to a fear of reprisals from Russia and the Ukraine (Olson et al, 1994: 488).

'Operation Deliberate Force' (P04)

Foreign support (FS)

Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?
Republika Srpska did not initially enjoy any international support from powerful states. However, Pouliot (2010: 163–80) indicates that Russia's orientation to the world changed considerably between 1993 and 1995 in response to NATO enlargements. Thus, by mid-1995, the Russians were already protesting over the bombing of Serb positions. Even if it was only diplomatic, such support is valid.

Window of opportunity (WOO)

Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a major power had an economic crisis?
Has a major power had social upheaval?
The USA's new economy began to grow, reaching a peak during the 1990s, to which some attributed US power as even greater than before (Ikenberry, 2008: 23). As a hegemon that maintained the only leading position in the world, there are hardly any problems that made the USA vulnerable or 'exploitable' (see, for example, Black, 2007).

Domestic crisis (DC)

Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?
Economic sanctions were put in place in 1994 to punish the Bosnian Serbs (Stedman, 1998). However, since Bosnia was embroiled in a civil war, the Bosnian Serbs' primary responsibility was to carry out the domestic war successfully.

Regime stability (RS)

For a democracy, did the regime maintain the support of enough people to get re-elected, and certainly not get impeached or removed through a vote of no confidence?
For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?

Although there were plans in early 1995 by Milošević to depose of Karadžić by infiltrating his security services, Karadžić acted early enough by reorganising his police (Doder and Branson, 1999: 208). Thus, he remained in a stable role before the conflict.

Anomalous beliefs (AB)
Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?
Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?
Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?
Karadžić was nationalistic and corrupt, and was running a smuggling system. He also became paranoid later during his presidency (Doder and Branson, 1999: 208). From a young age, he had an obsession with blood and violence. Some who met him noticed a deep-seated hostility (Sell, 2003: 159). Thus, Karadžić showed more anomalous beliefs than average political figures.

NATO bombing of Yugoslavia (P05)

Foreign support (FS)
Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?
Although Russia made it clear to the Milošević regime that it would not stand in NATO's way, there is evidence that the Russian involvement in the crisis did help Milošević bolster his position (Sell, 2003: 314). If anything, Russian refusal to acquiesce to a UN resolution to authorise NATO action played an essential part in the overall crisis.

Window of opportunity (WOO)
Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a major power had an economic crisis?
Has a major power had social upheaval?
The USA's new economy began to grow, reaching a peak during the 1990s, to which some attributed US power as even greater than before (Ikenberry, 2008: 23). As a hegemon that maintained the only leading position in the world, there are hardly any problems that made the USA vulnerable or 'exploitable' (see, for example, Black, 2007).

Domestic crisis (DC)
Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?

Serbia at the time was under economic sanctions, but a rebellion in Kosovo also made the future of sovereignty in Serbia uncertain, including that of Milošević's regime (Sell, 2003: 195).

Regime stability (RS)

For a democracy, did the regime maintain the support of enough people to get re-elected, and certainly not get impeached or removed through a vote of no confidence?

For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?

Before the conflict, Milošević solidified his power by engineering a nearly total fragmentation of the body politic. Of the 53 parties that fielded political candidates for the Parliament, more than half were run by his agents. He also had the support of the intellectuals and the media (Doder and Branson, 1999: 76).

Anomalous beliefs (AB)

Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?

Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?

Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?

There are some elements of anomalous beliefs in Milošević. While his wife was hardline Marxist, he appealed to charisma and used Serbian nationalism to boost his power. He often labelled his opponents as national traitors (Sell, 2003: 182). However, he also had a lighter side, amusing European delegates, for example. Even with his Yugoslav opponents, he kept a respectful attitude (Sell, 2003: 252). Among domestic parties, Milošević purged the 'hardliners', preferring to work with moderates, including a pro-European New Democracy (ND). At times, even the Pentagon flirted with Milošević as an ally (Brown, 1996: 125–30). Thus, it would be difficult to portray him as someone with strong elements of anomalous beliefs, despite some elements of such a disposition.

War in Afghanistan (P06)

Foreign support (FS)

Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?

Not only did Afghanistan under the Taliban have no foreign support of another major power, but it also had no international recognition apart from Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and the UAE (Loyn, 2009: 190).

Window of opportunity (WOO)

Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a major power had an economic crisis?
Has a major power had social upheaval?

The USA's new economy grew during the 1990s, and some attributed US power as even greater than before (Ikenberry, 2008: 23). As a hegemon that maintained the only leading position in the world, there are hardly any problems that made the USA vulnerable or 'exploitable' (see, for example, Black, 2007). There was not much change in the early 2000s.

Domestic crisis (DC)

Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?

The Taliban's hold on Afghanistan prior to US engagement was vulnerable. They had the worst drought not seen for many years, and the opposition was far more determined to continue the military fight against the Taliban (Loyn, 2009: 202).

Regime stability (RS)

For a democracy, did the regime maintain the support of enough people to get re-elected, and certainly not get impeached or removed through a vote of no confidence?
For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?

The Taliban faced two problems in order to have a stable regime. First, they were inexperienced, uneducated and thus incapable of governing a country. Second, the Taliban faced internal fissures. As Ahmed Rashid suggested, such fissures were growing more severe as paid fighters began to leave (Goodson, 2001: 125). The most problematic tension was between the Taliban and al-Qaeda over antagonising the USA (Laub, 2014). On the other hand, the Taliban did enjoy some domestic support. Yet, given the lack of experience in stable governance, the Taliban regime can be coded as unstable. Seeing it as stable would be more problematic.

Anomalous beliefs (AB)

Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?
Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?
Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?

According to Loyn (2009: 109), the Taliban were reckless, discounting the importance of foreign acceptance, or the UN, which attempted to

tell them what it meant to be a country. Their interpretation of Islam was shunned by most of the world. Thus, the Taliban regime was bent on strict ideology, that is, religious lines that made the regime rather inflexible. It makes sense to interpret the Taliban's worldviews as 'anomalous beliefs'.

Iraq War (P07)

Foreign support (FS)

Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?
Iraq had no formal allies among major powers. However, members of the UN Security Council disagreed on the use of force. In fact, most of the members wanted the inspections to continue (Bunn et al, 2006: 60). This could have restrained the USA.

Window of opportunity (WOO)

Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a major power had economic crisis?
Has a major power had social upheaval?
Herring (2013) restates that among the USA's weaknesses, none relate to another costly conflict, economic crisis or social upheaval. Instead, the USA's biggest weakness was its dependence on military bases and petroleum products. Thus, there were no serious impediments for the USA to act.

Domestic crisis (DC)

Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?
Herring (2013) states that Saddam Hussein had a domestic rebellion in the north and south to deal with.

Regime stability (RS)

For a democracy, did the regime maintain the support of enough people to get re-elected, and certainly not get impeached or removed through a vote of no confidence?
For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?
Ellen Lust (2013: 379) describes Saddam's Iraq under the Ba'ath Party as a major actor in regional politics due to an important requirement to be a major actor, a 'stable and competent Iraqi domestic state'. Jonathan

Schanzer (2005: 126) also confirms that prior to the war in the spring of 2003, 'Iraq could never have been characterized as a state with weak central authority'. Such authority stemmed, of course, from Saddam's iron fist.

Anomalous beliefs (AB)
Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?
Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?
Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?
According to a psychological study of Saddam Hussein, he followed a developmental path vowing 'never again, never again shall I submit to superior force.' His own studies also shaped his worldview to hate foreigners. He was also known as a 'street thug' (Post and George, 2004: 211–15).

Russo-Georgian War (P08)

Foreign support (FS)
Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?
Cherkasova (2010: 13) claims that the USA warned Georgia that it would be foolish to count on US support because policy indications were not strong enough. However, she also states that the USA gave significant military and diplomatic assistance to Georgia, and that such assistance could have signalled to Georgia that the USA was willing and ready to protect Georgia's interests, at least diplomatically (Cherkasova, 2010: 25). Comparing Georgia with the Ukraine, she signals that other factors had a role to play. This seems convincing. However, equipping, financing and advising the Georgians, even throughout the war, meant that Georgia could at least count on diplomatic support (Treisman, 2012: 325).

Window of opportunity (WOO)
Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a major power had an economic crisis?
Has a major power had social upheaval?
In 2008 the Russian economy was booming, with record-high oil prices. There were no notable weaknesses that Russia had that could be exploited (Mankoff, 2010: 10–11).

Domestic crisis (DC)
Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?

Has a minor power had social upheaval?
Georgia was losing its breakaway territories, and there was a build-up of military infrastructure on the ground in these territories. Thus, there was an unbearable feeling of 'creeping annexation', especially since Saakashvili campaigned that he would return Georgia's 'territorial integrity' (Cherkasova, 2010: 75).

Regime stability (RS)
For a democracy, did the regime maintain the support of enough people to get re-elected, and certainly not get impeached or removed through a vote of no confidence?
For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?
Most vocal protests and internal disagreements within the regime came after the war, especially in 2009. Before the conflict, the opposition did threaten to substantially change the system, but it was small and divided (Lansford, 2013: 519–21). Thus, the regime was still reasonably stable.

Anomalous beliefs (AB)
Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?
Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?
Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?
Saakashvili was, by some accounts, successful in rebuilding the Georgian state (Jones, 2013: 86). Although some said his attack on South Ossetia was foolish, he was successful in Achara (Jones, 2013: 52). Some described him as nationalist, impatient, head charging and uncompromising. Yet he was also charismatic and strongly opposed to corruption. There are no indications that he had a dark, problematic personality or a propensity for high risks.

'Operation Unified Protector' (P09)

Foreign support (FS)
Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?
Gaddafi had little international support, if any. He alienated most other regional leaders. His regime also did not have significant ties with other non-Western patrons, such as Russia and China (Duncan, 2013: 66).

Window of opportunity (WOO)

Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a major power had an economic crisis?
Has a major power had social upheaval?

Although the USA may have lost some of its monopoly of international leadership to China, that is, with the dispersion of global power and innovation, it continues to have the largest military and one of the most dynamic economies in the world. Thus, there are few, if any, indicators of weaknesses for the USA to act in Libya (see, for example, Kegley and Blanton, 2014).

Domestic crisis (DC)

Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?

What started as protests in the city of Benghazi soon became a civil war, fuelled by long-held tribal rivalries, chaotic governance and Islamic militancy. Thus, the situation was apparently very difficult (Inbar, 2013: 6).

Regime stability (RS)

For a democracy, did the regime maintain the support of enough people to get re-elected, and certainly not get impeached or removed through a vote of no confidence?
For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?

With a country embroiled in a civil war, Gaddafi's regime was also crumbling internally. Large swaths of his military defected, along with prominent diplomats, the interior minister and even his foreign minister (Inbar, 2013: 6).

Anomalous beliefs (AB)

Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?
Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?
Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?

Gaddafi was described as compulsively disruptive, someone who had an incurable love of chaos. He seemed to have an internal struggle going on. Thus, he was eccentric and bizarre. Although perhaps successful in some ways, he managed to alienate himself. Taking all this into account, Kawczynski (2011) describes him as power-seeking and intensely vain. Thus, when others describe him as immature, impatient and inconsistent, it becomes difficult to see him as a credible political figure.

Georgian Civil War (N01)

Foreign support (FS)

Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?
The West had good relations with the Soviet Union and Russia during the collapse of the Soviet Union. The USA thus regarded Georgian independence and conflicts as an internal Soviet affair. The USA only recognised Georgia on 25 December 1991 (Lansford, 2013: 519). Therefore, there was no foreign support during Georgia's early years.

Window of opportunity (WOO)

Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a major power had economic crisis?
Has a major power had social upheaval?
In 1991 the Russian state did not really exist – that is, according to Kuchins (2013: 31–2), the regime lacked a clear sense of what it was striving to create. The absence of a coherent strategy led to disagreement over economic reforms, spawning a constitutional crisis that ended in violence in 1993. Political drama, lack of economic progress and social upheaval make it clear that Russia was severely constrained.

Domestic crisis (DC)

Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?
Separatist governments assumed control in all three breakaway regions of Georgia in the early 1990s. Thus, civil strife was raging as Georgia attempted to become independent (Lansford, 2013: 519).

Regime stability (RS)

For a democracy, did the regime maintain the support of enough people to get re-elected, and certainly not get impeached or removed through a vote of no confidence?
For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?
Gamsakhurdia was the first elected leader of Georgia, but even before his election he faced highly critical opponents. Prime Minister Tengiz Sigua and two other senior ministers resigned in August over Gamsakhurdia's controversial policies. The Georgian National Guard split into pro and anti-government factions. In December 1991 there was a coup d'état (Lansford, 2013: 519–20). Thus, the regime was very unstable.

Anomalous beliefs (AB)
Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?
Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?
Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?
Gamsakhurdia was very nationalist, and is often blamed for making the situation irreparable for Georgia's national minorities. He is also cited as being an authoritarian in disguise. However, he was also a good scholar (Waters, 2004: 49). As a borderline case, it is reasonable to code Gamsakhurdia's regime as 0, because he was still somewhat respected after his death.

Dispute over Taiwan (N02)

Foreign support (FS)
Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?
Taiwan historically had an intimate relationship with the USA, which existed as an 'informal alliance'. Such a relationship did not begin to cool until 2000 (Lee, 2010: 288).

Window of opportunity (WOO)
Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a major power had an economic crisis?
Has a major power had social upheaval?
I found no significant issues that would restrain China's ability to act in 1993, maybe with the exception of the peaceful but heavily manipulated leadership transition from Zhao Ziyang to Jiang Zemin as President of China. It was a very smooth year for China, during which it further privatised its economy and encouraged economic integration with the West.

Domestic crisis (DC)
Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?
There were only minor incidents that caused tensions with China. Overall, Taiwan was undergoing rapid economic growth. The situation was rather favourable (Ash et al, 2013: 104).

Regime stability (RS)
For a democracy, was there a powerful opposition keen to erase the democratic principles of the current regime?

For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?
Taiwan had a vibrant political system, and was considered the first stable democratic polity in the Chinese tradition (Ash et al, 2013: 4).

Anomalous beliefs (AB)
Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?
Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?
Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?
Taiwan had a vibrant political system, and was considered the first stable democratic polity in the Chinese tradition (Ash et al, 2013: 4).

Syrian border fortification (N03)

Foreign support (FS)
Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?
Hafez al-Assad enjoyed a strong alliance with Iran. He attempted to re-establish military support from Moscow, but this time, to no avail. Syria also had oscillating relations with the Gulf States, but overall, the alliance with Iran and PKK made Syria relatively isolated at the time (Maoz and Yaniv, 2013: 237).

Window of opportunity (WOO)
Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a major power had an economic crisis?
Has a major power had social upheaval?
The USA's new economy grew during the 1990s, and some attributed US power as even greater than before (Ikenberry, 2008: 23). As a hegemon that maintained the only leading position in the world, there are hardly any problems that made the USA vulnerable or 'exploitable' (see, for example, Black, 2007).

Domestic crisis (DC)
Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?
Syria had a strong dislike of the Turkish and Israeli military cooperation, as well as disagreements with Turkey over territory and the sharing of water from the Euphrates. Turkey also retaliated covertly against Syria due to its support of the PKK. It seems that Syria willingly created a difficult

situation to put pressure on Turkey (Tejel, 2008: 75). The situation was, therefore, redeemable.

Regime stability (RS)

For a democracy, was there a powerful opposition keen to erase the democratic principles of the current regime?

For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?

Hafez al-Assad kept a stable regime through repression and technological support. He had a consensus system based on clan solidarity that helped the system absorb tensions and protect the regime throughout his reign (Trombetta, 2014: 35). As such, he was able to protect his regime from both internal and external enemies. His regime was not always safe, but it was relatively stable.

Anomalous beliefs (AB)

Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?

Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?

Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?

Assad was brutal, but he only used force when necessary, keeping his ambitions in check. Some believe he even had impressive skills and patience (Pipes, 1991: 5). Therefore, Hafez al-Assad was a dictator, but he had a pragmatic attitude, and showed the ability to compromise (Trombetta, 2014: 35).

Russia and the CIS in Afghanistan (N04)

Foreign support (FS)

Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?

As already mentioned, not only did Afghanistan under the Taliban have no foreign support, apart from the frontier in Pakistan, it also had no international recognition apart from Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and the UAE (Loyn, 2009: 190).

Window of opportunity (WOO)

Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?

Has a major power had an economic crisis?

Has a major power had social upheaval?

By the summer of 1996, Russia was pulling back from a disastrous defeat in Chechnya, where 100,000 Russian citizens had lost their lives (Kuchins,

2013: 33). Chechnya's situation remained unresolved, making Russia inept to deal with its most important problems.

Domestic crisis (DC)

Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?

In 1996, the Taliban technically seized power in Kabul, but ethnic-based fighting did not cease. In 1996 and 1997 the front lines shifted back and forth, making the situation very unstable (Goodson, 2001: 78).

Regime stability (RS)

For a democracy, was there a powerful opposition keen to erase the democratic principles of the current regime?
For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?

Before consolidating their power, the Taliban were even more inexperienced, uneducated and thus incapable of governing a country. There were also doubts about the outcome of internal cohesion once the enemy was defeated (Goodson, 2001: 125). Thus, even though the Taliban did enjoy some domestic support, it could hardly be said that the Taliban established a properly functioning regime.

Anomalous beliefs (AB)

Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?
Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?
Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?

As already mentioned, the Taliban were reckless, discounting the importance of international acceptance, or the UN that attempted to tell them what it meant to be a country (Loyn, 2009: 109). Most of the world shunned their interpretation of Islam. Thus, perhaps the Taliban did not have anomalous beliefs, but their regime was bent on strict ideology, that is, religious lines that made the regime rather inflexible.

'Operation Uphold Democracy' (N05)

Foreign support (FS)

Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?

The actions of General Cedras isolated Haiti, and his government was only recognised by the Vatican (Whitney, 1996: 303–32).

Window of opportunity (WOO)

Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a major power had an economic crisis?
Has a major power had social upheaval?

The USA's new economy began to grow, reaching a peak during the 1990s, to which some attributed US power as even greater than before (Ikenberry, 2008: 23). As a hegemon that maintained the only leading position in the world, there are hardly any problems that made the USA vulnerable or 'exploitable' (see, for example, Black, 2007).

Domestic crisis (DC)

Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?

Despite attempts by foreign players to create a difficult situation for Cedras and to force him to step down, he and his ruling class were living a lavish lifestyle, even under sanctions (Gibbs and Duffy, 2012: 443). Thus, there was no significant domestic crisis.

Regime stability (RS)

For a democracy, was there a powerful opposition keen to erase the democratic principles of the current regime?
For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?

Cedras' regime of terror was quite effective at keeping opponents quiet, even using psychological tools. As Ballard (1998: 63) claims, the regime was quite resistant to diplomatic and economic pressures, perhaps because only a few select individuals performed administrative functions and were getting richer even during shortages.

Anomalous beliefs (AB)

Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?
Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?
Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?

General Cedras rejected every accord because he was called a criminal. Some called him a 'pompous prick'. Blatant lies about the situation in his country made him appear devious and unreliable abroad, angering even his own associates (Girard, 2004: 80). To add to this, he engaged in a reign of terror, executing children, raping women and killing priests, which has been labelled sheer sadism (Girard, 2004: 1). He was also engaged in

drug dealing and theft (Ballard, 1998: 122). Thus, such a violent character is far from rational.

Spratly Islands I (N06)

Foreign support (FS)

Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?
Although the Philippines closed down US bases on its territory in response to anti-US sentiment, the two countries remained allies, as stipulated in the US–Philippine Mutual Defense Treaty (Blackwill and Dibb, 2000: 4).

Window of opportunity (WOO)

Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a major power had an economic crisis?
Has a major power had social upheaval?
China was undergoing a smooth period. China was conducting military exercises off the coast of Taiwan, which brought some tensions with the USA. However, these were not too serious. Domestically, China was developing its impoverished regions and its situation looked stable (Benewick and Wingrove, 1999: 263–6).

Domestic crisis (DC)

Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?
Although economic reforms were underway, the majority of the population was still impoverished. Muslim separatists in the south also presented a threat. Nonetheless, these problems were given less attention as they were under control (Leifer, 2013: 30).

Regime stability (RS)

For a democracy, was there a powerful opposition keen to erase the democratic principles of the current regime?
For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?
Fidel Ramos was president. His presidency brought in more stability and economic growth to the Philippines. Armed forces accepted his civilian rule, and thus there was no threat to the regime (Bertrand, 2013: 84).

Anomalous beliefs (AB)
Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?
Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?
Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?
Although there are some indicators that Ramos wanted a constitutional change to stay in power, this was a rumour. He ruled under democratic and rational principles (Bertrand, 2013: 84).

Spratly Islands II (N07)

Foreign support (FS)
Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?
The traditional patron of Vietnam during the Cold War, Russia, withdrew its last military advisers in 1992. Attempts by Vietnam in 1994 to sign new security agreement were also fruitless (Donaldson et al, 2014: 343). The USA only lifted its trade embargo on Vietnam in 1994, a positive development, but far from reassuring. India and Indonesia have military ties with Vietnam, but these are more related to exchanges of personnel and servicing (Thayer, 1994: 71)

Window of opportunity (WOO)
Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a major power had an economic crisis?
Has a major power had social upheaval?
China faced no major issues in the 1993–94 period. The relationship with the USA was boosted with the most-favoured-nation trading status. Politically China was conservative, but this did not cause any turmoil (Benewick and Wingrove, 2000: 274).

Domestic crisis (DC)
Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?
Vietnam did not face any conflict or social upheaval except for small demonstrations in response to its socioeconomic situation, which Vietnam was slowly working to transform (Luong, 2003: 92).

Regime stability (RS)
For a democracy, was there a powerful opposition keen to erase the democratic principles of the current regime?

For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?

Vietnam already had a sophisticated regime to channel the concerns of the citizens to the authorities in a non-threatening manner, as well as establishing control over the different levels of society. As such, public demonstrations were not necessarily threatening. The Communist Party was well entrenched, loosening political restrictions in some areas (Luong, 2003: 33–5).

Anomalous beliefs (AB)

Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?
Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?
Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?

The General Secretary at the time, Đỗ Mười, ruled on consensus rather than autocracy. He published essays and seemed to be driven to achieve what he believed to be 'the true, the good and the beautiful' (Woodside, 1997: 67). There are no indications that he or the party ruled with anomalous beliefs.

Russo–Latvian border dispute (N08)

Foreign support (FS)

Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?

Latvia was an associate partner in the Western European Union. In 1994 it joined the Partnership for Peace programme. Even before its membership, Latvia worked with NATO forces. Bill Clinton visited Latvia in 1994, and gave a speech at the Monument of Freedom, an occasion that the Balts compared to President Kennedy's visit to Berlin during the Cold War. The USA was a crucial partner in getting the Russians to withdraw their troops from Latvia between 1991 and 1994. They also provided financial aid, guided reformation and have participated in the Peace Crops since 1992 (Pabriks and Purs, 2013: 138).

Window of opportunity (WOO)

Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a major power had an economic crisis?
Has a major power had social upheaval?

By the summer of 1996, Russia was pulling back from a disastrous defeat in Chechnya, where 100,000 Russian citizens had lost their lives (Kuchins, 2013: 33). Chechnya's situation remained unresolved, making Russia inept

at dealing with its most important problems. By 1998 the situation in Chechnya was still problematic. In addition, in August 1998, there was a financial collapse (Kuchins, 2013: 34).

Domestic crisis (DC)

Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?

The government (not the regime) was unstable, and there were some negative economic consequences due to tensions with Russia. Language rights and citizenship policies were causing friction, but the situation was not causing any serious harm (*The Europa World Year Book 2004*: 2578).

Regime stability (RS)

For a democracy, was there a powerful opposition keen to erase the democratic principles of the current regime?
For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?

In 1998 the Minister of the Economy was dismissed. The ruling coalition, fearing a collapse, began to disintegrate. Although indicative of an unstable regime, the ruling party requested that a vote of no confidence be conducted to test personal integrity (*The Europa World Year Book 2004*: 2578).

Anomalous beliefs (AB)

Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?
Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?
Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?

Krasts' government was open to challenges and cared about personal integrity. There is nothing to indicate anomalous beliefs (*The Europa World Year Book 2004*: 2578).

Russo–Estonian border dispute (N09)

Foreign support (FS)

Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?

Similar to Latvia, Estonia was an associate partner in the Western European Union. In 1994 it joined the Partnership for Peace programme. The USA was a crucial partner in getting Russians to withdraw their troops from Estonia between 1991 and 1994. They also provided financial aid, guided

reformation and have participated in the Peace Crops since 1992 (Pabriks and Purs, 2013: 138).

Window of opportunity (WOO)

Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a major power had an economic crisis?
Has a major power had social upheaval?

Yeltsin attempted to provide a new constitution to solve conflicts between the centre and the regions over the distribution of power. However, Chechnya did not acquiesce to the maintenance of the federal order. In December 1994, Yeltsin decided to use force to deal with Chechnya (Kuchins, 2013: 33). An executive-legislative standoff in late 1993 that almost resulted in a civil war was also an event affecting Russia's image.

Domestic crisis (DC)

Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?

While the years before 1994 were still somewhat uncertain for Estonia, from 1994, Estonia began to consolidate its independence, reflected in the intensification of its security debates. Although Estonia was still rebuilding its economy, the period was bearable (Aalto, 2013: 66).

Regime stability (RS)

For a democracy, was there a powerful opposition keen to erase the democratic principles of the current regime?
For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?

In November 1994 Mart Laar's government was ousted from power due to the 'rubles scandal'. However, this occurred later in the year and did not threaten Laar's political career. Thus, the regime was very stable (Aalto, 2013: 160).

Anomalous beliefs (AB)

Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?
Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?
Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?

As mentioned, Mart Laar's government was accused of a 'rubles scandal', which related to the clandestine sale of 2.3 billion rubles for US$1.9 million. However, such an action does not amount to anomalous beliefs (Aalto, 2013: 160).

Chinese intrusions into Bhutan (N10)

Foreign support (FS)

Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?
India is responsible for Bhutanese security. It supports Bhutan in the training and modernisation of its army, among other things. India is also the principal donor for Bhutan for its economic development. India has also been vocal against Chinese intrusions into Bhutan (Sharma et al, 2011: 190).

Window of opportunity (WOO)

Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a major power had an economic crisis?
Has a major power had social upheaval?
China had tolerable problems such as quarrels over energy resources with its neighbours, as well as a territorial dispute over the Spratly Islands. The price hike of crude oil did not help Chinese difficulties either, but the economy grew overall, and there are no indications that China was 'tied down' (Wu, 2014: 224).

Domestic crisis (DC)

Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?
Bhutan slowly developed hydropower and sought to develop its prosperity via decentralisation and democratisation. Apart from a threat perception coming from China, there are no signs of domestic crisis (Sharma et al, 2011: 187).

Regime stability (RS)

For a democracy, was there a powerful opposition keen to erase the democratic principles of the current regime?
For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?
The King of Bhutan himself helped in the transition of the country to a democracy, and there are thus no signs of an unstable regime (Sharma et al, 2011: 1–31).

Anomalous beliefs (AB)

Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?
Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?

Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?
The King of Bhutan seems to be rational, developing a democratic society, keeping repression low and working not to antagonise any of his neighbours. He even developed a 'gross happiness index' (Sharma et al, 2011: 187).

Russo–Norwegian territorial dispute (N11)

Foreign support (FS)
Did a minor power expect any form of foreign support prior to the conflict?
Norway was one of NATO's original founding member states. Foreign support is a thus a given.

Window of opportunity (WOO)
Is a major power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a major power had an economic crisis?
Has a major power had social upheaval?
In 2008 the Russian economy was booming, with record-high oil prices. There were no notable weaknesses that Russia had that could have been exploited (Mankoff, 2010: 10–11).

Domestic crisis (DC)
Is a minor power involved in another costly conflict?
Has a minor power had a devastating economic crisis?
Has a minor power had social upheaval?
Norway is perhaps one of the most prosperous countries in the world, far from having any domestic crisis (see, for example, OECD, 2008).

Regime stability (RS)
For a democracy, was there a powerful opposition keen to erase the democratic principles of the current regime?
For an authoritarian regime, were key aides and security services united in supporting the regime as to avoid a coup d'état, revolution or other removal from power?
Norway is an old and stable democracy, by many accounts (Strom and Narud, 2006: 523).

Anomalous beliefs (AB)
Was the regime overly ideological or zealous?
Was the regime engaged in criminal activities?
Was the leading figure mentally ill or abusing substances?

The long-standing practice of democratic principles makes it extremely difficult to have anomalous beliefs in Norway (see, for example, Strom and Narud, 2006).

References: see the References section of the book for full details of references in Appendices 1 and 2.