

**DANGEROUS COMPANIONS:**

**COOPERATION BETWEEN STATES AND  
NONSTATE ARMED GROUPS (NAGs)**

*A Triadic Level Time-Series Dataset on Support of NAGs by States*

**CODEBOOK**  
**v. April 2015**

*Belgin San-Akca*  
*bakca@ku.edu.tr*

*Department of International Relations*  
*Koç University*  
*Istanbul, Turkey*

**This research is funded by Marie Curie International Reintegration Grant (Proposal Ref. No. FP7-268486 and Grant ID No. REA.P3(2010)D/3202).**

Research Team

**Coders**

Gizem Türkarıslan (Research Assistant)

Bariř Ari  
Efe Çoban  
Aytaç Denk  
Melissa Meek  
Ilayda Bilge Önder  
Burcu Saęıroęlu  
Paulina Schenk  
Burcu Yięiter

**Data Portal and Website**

Burak Demir (Research Assistant)

Ferit Demircioęlu  
Özge Nur Kamcı  
Suat Alper Orhan  
Halit Sezgin  
Irena Atnaguzina  
Elif Burcu Gundooędu

WHEN USING OR REFERRING TO THE DATA, CITE:

**San-Akca, Belgin. “Dangerous Companions: Cooperation between States and Nonstate Armed Groups (NAGs)” v.04/2015. nonstatearmedgroups.ku.edu.tr.**

**San-Akca, Belgin. “States in Disguise: Causes of External State Support for Rebel Groups.” New York: Oxford University Press. 2016.**

WHEN REFERRING TO THE CONCEPT OF NAGs, CITE:

**San-Akca, Belgin. “Supporting Non-State Armed Groups: A Resort to Illegality?” *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol.32, No.4 (August 2009), pp.589-613.**

## I. INTRODUCTION

*Dangerous Companions* is a project trying to realize two objectives with respect to the interactions between states and Non-State Armed Groups (NAGs, hereon). Building on a novel conceptualization of state and armed rebel groups relations, it engages in (1) collecting data on these relations and (2) building a continuously maintained data portal, which is accessible by public and includes information on individual profiles of NAGs and states they are allied with. *Dangerous Companions* Project (DCP) builds on the understanding that NAGs are not mere agents of states, simply serving to realize the objectives of states they subject themselves to. Obviously, when trying to provide support to an armed opposition group, a state goes through a decision-making process since it is a risky experiment to begin with. Nonetheless, states have historically used these alternative actors of international politics to pursue certain foreign policy goals, regardless of whether it proved to be a successful strategy or not. Yet, similar to states, the leaders and members of NAGs go through a decision-making process as well in deciding whether to receive external support from other states and which states provide the most effective grounds for extracting human and material resources to support the operations of these groups. In other words, the current conceptualization of state-NAGs relations goes beyond a simple treatment of these actors as a part of proxy wars conducted by major states in world politics. When it comes to motives of actors, states and NAGs, the theoretical framework is further developed in *States in Disguise* (San-Akca 2016) to capture the varieties of state-NAGs relations.

Each of these decision-making processes are referred as State Selection and Rebel Selection, respectively with the understanding that states might select the NAGs to provide support to, but it does not tell us the entire story about the ways NAGs select and extract resources from external states. For examples, Hamas received support from several

countries, such as Jordan, Syria and Iraq, which provided safe haven to the leaders and/or members of Hamas occasionally since 1993. On the other hand, Hamas had supporters in United States and United Kingdom, who managed to raise funds for the organization and transfer these funds to Hamas. These are two distinct processes referred by the framework developed under the current project. In the former, states are intentionally choosing to support Hamas. In the latter, states do not create channels with the goal of supporting the organization, but rather gets exploited due to the individual freedom and liberties intrinsically found in democracies. Though in either case, Hamas achieve acquiring resources, they are not necessarily the same, thus should be treated and coded separately.

NAGs refer to any armed opposition group that uses violent means to pursue certain political objectives. It is an overarching concept used to refer to ethnic and religious insurgents, revolutionary movements and terrorists. Insurgency, terrorism and revolution are various forms of violence NAGs resort to in realizing their objectives. Therefore, it is not useful for the purposes of the current project to refer to these groups with politically loaded concepts, such as revolutionaries or terrorists. It is commonly accepted now that NAGs acquire resources through various channels, such as Diaspora Support, charity organizations engaging in fund raising, smuggling of drugs and weapons, and engaging in illicit trade among the many others. The purpose of the current project is to examine the general patterns about the nature of states that NAGs most frequently conduct such activities to acquire these resources. Therefore, the current project stands in direct challenge to the post-9/11 assumption that the major problem behind terrorism and armed rebels in general, is ungoverned territories or weak states. Designated borders between states divide majority of the world's territory. So, it must be the case that more than 90% of the time, armed groups are operating within the borders of states, which claim monopoly of the legitimate use of violent means. *What kind of domestic and international*

*environment attracts armed groups to certain states when it comes to acquiring resources within their territories?*

The State-NAGs Cooperation Dataset (NAGs Dataset) collected for the current project is an attempt to operationalize external state support of Non-State Armed Groups (NAGs, hereon) that are engaged in a violent conflict against one or more governments within or outside the state(s) they live. The groups and the states they target are borrowed from the UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Database (v 4-2014a) (Gleditsch, Wallensteen et al. 2002, Pettersson & Wallensteen 2015). In total, there is information about 455 NAGs that have existed in the post-1945 period. The first version of the dataset (v.4/2015) covers the period between 1945 and 2010. Each case in the dataset is a triad that involves a NAG, a target – the country subject to the violence of the NAG-, and a supporter –the country that has provided one or more types of support, such as training camps, safe havens, arms and equipment, funds, and troops to the NAG. Detailed description of each variable is given in the table below. Next, case selection, each variable and corresponding coding rule have been explained in detail. A triad is listed for the entire period of a NAG’s activity if a state ends up supporting it for at least one year during the period it is active.

The other contribution of the current project is the public data portal site with information on each rebel group and states they allied with. Given that it is a challenging task to find and code information about state support, whether it is an intentional act on the part of a state or a case of rebels selecting them to extract resources from, the best one could do is to transparently share the sources and material used to collect and code such information. DCP data portal presents profiles of each NAG listing thousand of sources used to gather the required information. In addition, it provides data visualization by using maps and profiles for each group.

1.1. How is the NAGs Dataset placed next to other existing datasets on the issue of external state support?

There are several other existing datasets on non-state actors and third-party interventions. Cunningham, Gleditsch and Salehyan's Non-State Actor (NSA) (2009), is a dyadic dataset with information on each NSA's military strength and capacity, leadership characteristic, popular support and political linkages as well as external sponsorship. However, external state support is not broken into diverse types. We only know if there was explicit or implicit support by external states. Similarly, UCDP's External Support Data is another dyadic dataset which also codes external supporters that give support to a NAG in a given year from 1975 to 2010, also coding for different types of support and the type of the external supporter (Hogbladh et al. 2011). This data is limited in its temporal domain, which does not go beyond 1975. The total number of observations in the external support dataset is around 7900, whereas the total number of observations in the NAGs Dataset is around 17250. Furthermore, in either of these datasets, there is not information on the ideational characteristics of NAGs, such as ethnic and religious identity and political ideology they adhere to. Finally Regan and Aydin's data on external interventions into civil conflicts looks particularly at diplomatic third party interventions (2006). This dataset takes intrastate conflicts as one single unit and does not distinguish between different parties and non-state actors that are included in an intrastate conflict (Regan, Frank, Aydin 2009).

1.2. What is new about the DCP and NAGs Dataset?

NAGs Dataset differentiates between state and NAGs selection cases. Though it might be misleading to refer to interactions emerging at the end of both processes as state support or cooperation, to some extent it is justified since states turn out to be *de facto* supporters of rebels in the end of the rebel selection process. Since we do not have a way of

understanding the intentions of each state leader and bureaucrat about whether they really want to support or curb support for NAGs, if they found themselves selected by them, the healthiest way to go about coding such information is relying on observed realities. Even in the case of NAGs selection, states turn into facilitators of violent operations of NAGs despite their will to do so. Therefore, it is not indeed wrong to refer to both cases as state support, emerging either by a state's intended and unintended acts. Secondly, NAGs Dataset starts coding a NAG as soon as it declares a name regardless of whether it conducts violent operations to begin with, while the ACD takes the start of a NAG as the year in which at least one battle-related death occurs for the first time. This is despite the fact that sometimes NAGs might have existed long before they resort to violence. Another contribution of the current project is the detailed coding of group objectives and ideational characteristics.

Previously, Byman (2005b) took the initiative in classifying several paths armed opposition movements, specifically terrorists, end up acquiring resources from states. He refers to passive support of rebels by states under three conditions: "(1) the regime in question itself does not provide assistance but knowingly allows other actors in the country to aid a terrorist group, (2) the regime has the capacity to stop this assistance or has chosen not to develop this capacity, and (3) often passive support is given by political parties, wealthy merchants, or other actors in society that have no formal affiliation with the government" (Byman 2005b, 118). Except the last criterion, the first two are very difficult to determine in each case even if one puts enough time and resources to do so. It is very difficult to figure out whether "a government chooses not to develop capacity" to curb support of rebels within its territories. And, it is very difficult to know whether a regime or government "knowingly allows other actors in the country to aid" rebel groups.

Though appreciating the way to conceptualize passive support of terrorism, the ambitious data collection and coding project specified under DCP requires developing a standardized set of criteria that will make coding a large number of cases possible. Such criteria can be developed if we rely on what is observed rather than what is intended. Since the intentions do not always lead to observable outcomes. Rather than treating capacity as a selection criterion when coding cases, it is better to treat it as a variable. This way, it will be possible to detect whether NAGs or armed rebels select states with weak or low capacity to control their activities within the former's borders. Each variable is defined and explained in the following sections.

## 2. List of variables

<b>Variable Short Name</b>	<b>Variable Long Name &amp; Measurement</b>
TriadID	Triad identifier – Unique Triad Id Number for a given NAG, its target and supporter
DyadID	Dyad identifier – UCDP / PRIO Dyad Code
ConflictID	Conflict identifier – UCDP PRIO Conflict ID
Year	Year of observation
Yr_Active (not coded)	1- the year groups was formed, 2- the year in which at least one BRD (Battle-Related Death) is observed (Startdate1 in UCDP/PRIO), 3- the year in which at least 25 BRDs are observed (Startdate2 in UCDP/PRIO) 4- formation date & one BRD year are the same, 5- formation date, one BRD and 25 BRD year are the same year, 6- One BRD and 25 BRD year are the same.
Foundyr	Foundation year
Startdate1	the year in which at least one Battle-Related Death is observed in UCDP/PRIO
Startdate2	the year in which at least 25 BRDs are observed in UCDP/PRIO
Target	Target country name- abbreviation
TarNum_GW	Numeric Gleditsch and Ward ID of target country
TarNum_COW	Numeric COW ID of target country
NAG_name	Full Name of the NAG
NAGcode_1	Numeric code of the non-state armed group
NAGcode_2	Numeric UCDP/PRIO code of the NAG
Incomp	Incompatibility – UCDP/PRIO

<b>Variable Short Name</b>	<b>Variable Long Name &amp; Measurement</b>
Terr	Name of territory
NAGID 1-5	Identity of NAG (Numeric): 1- NOID, 2- Ethno-nationalist, 3- religious, 4- leftist, 5- other
NAGEth	Ethnic identity of the NAG (Name)
NAGRel	Religion the non-state actor belongs to (Name)
NAGLeft	Whether the NAG is a leftist revolutionary group (Binary)
NAGRight	Whether the NAG is a right-wing group (Binary) – fascist or conservative or other (specify)
NAGDem	Whether the NAG has democratic aspirations (Binary)
NAGAuth	Whether NAG aspires to establish an authoritarian regime
NAGDict	Whether NAG is supporting a dictatorial regime
NAGMil	Whether NAG is supporting a military regime
NAGTheo	Whether NAG aspires to establish a theocratic regime
NAGObj 1-6	Objective of the NAG (Numerical): 1- toppling an existing leadership, 2- change of regime type (transition from autocracy to democracy or the reverse regime change), 3- demands for autonomy, 4- secession/territorial demand, 5- demands for policy change, 6- Other – specify Each category is coded as separate binary variables. A group may have more than a single objective.
PolParDummy	Political party dummy – whether the group has a party wing
PartyName	Political party name
Supporter	Country providing support to a NAG – Abbreviation
SupNum_GW	Gleditsch and Ward country code of the supporter
SupNum_COW	COW country code of the supporter
StateSup (State Selection)	Binary variable of State Selection Cases of Support
S_Precision 1-10	Support precision 1- supporter state clear intention 2- reliable sources document support 3- support is highly suspected by reliable source 4- target state accuses supporter state without documentation.
S_SafeMem	Safe haven to members
S_SafeLead	Safe haven to leadership
S_Headquar	Headquarters
S_TrainCamp	Training camp
S_Training	Training
S_WeaponLog	Weapons and logistics aid

<b>Variable Short Name</b>	<b>Variable Long Name &amp; Measurement</b>
S_FinAid	Financial aid
S_Transport	Transport of the military equipment, military advice
S_Troop	Troops
S_Other	Any other kind of intentional support
De facto Support (NAGs Selection)	Binary variable of <i>De facto</i> Support ( <i>NAGs Selection Cases</i> )
DS_Precision 1-9	De facto support precision 1- supporter state clear intention 2- reliable sources document support 3-support is highly suspected by reliable source 4- target state accuses supporter state without documentation.
DS_SafeMem	Safe haven to members
DS_SafeLead	Safe haven to leadership
DS_Headquar	Headquarters
DS_TrainCamp	Training camp
DS_Training	Training
DS_WeaponLog	Weapons and logistics aid
DS_FinAid	Financial aid
DS_Transport	Transport of the military equipment, military advice
DS_Other	Any other kind of support
DomSup	Domestic support dummy
DomSup P	1 – not much confident, 2- somehow confident, 3- confident
SupTermDummy	Support termination dummy
TargetPressure	Target country pressure
IntlComPressure	International community pressure
RegChTar	Regime change in the target country
RegChSup	Regime change in the supporting country
LeadChangeSup	Leadership change in the supporting country
GroupCeaseAct	Group ceased activity
GroupCeasefire	Group signed a ceasefire
GroupPol	Group turned into a political movement
Other term	Other termination – explain

### 3. CASES

#### Identifying the Targets

In order to identify the states that have been targets of non-state violence in the post-WWII period, I rely on the UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset v.4-2011, 1946-2010 (Gleditsch et al. 2002; Themnér and Wallensteen 2011).

#### Identifying the Groups

The groups included in the data set have to meet the criterion of “25-battle related deaths” according to the UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset (ACD). I use the same groups as in UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset v.4-2014a, 1946-2014 (Gleditsch, Wallensteen et al. 2002, Pettersson & Wallensteen 2015). The ACD identifies an opposition organization as following: “Any non-governmental group of people having announced a name for their group and using armed force to influence the outcome of the stated incompatibility”. Two types of incompatibility are identified by the Armed Conflict Dataset: 1- “incompatibility concerning government: type of political system, the replacement of the central government, or the change of its composition”; 2- “Incompatibility concerning territory: Incompatibility concerning the status of a territory, e.g. the change of the state in control of a certain territory (interstate conflict), secession or autonomy (internal conflict)” (Gleditsch, Wallensteen et al. 2002, Pettersson & Wallensteen 2015). As is described below, the NAGs Dataset has a further detailed coding of group objectives.

#### Identifying the Period

The temporal domain in the data set is identified as the “opportunity period”; the period during which a state has the opportunity to support a group. This basically stems from the fact that a group has to be active in order for a state to have an opportunity to support a group. Therefore, the year variable specifies the years during which a group is

active. In some cases, a group ceases activity for a while and then restarts its violence. As long as the group and the government it targets do not sign a settlement treaty and the dispute is not entirely resolved, these brief spells of ceasefire are treated as activity years. In other words, once a group resorts to violence, it is considered as actively targeting a state, thus the opportunity to support the group continues existing, unless there is a settlement or group ceases violence and converts into a political party. Concerning the information about conflict termination, this data set draws upon the UCDP Conflict Termination dataset (v.2010-1) (Kreutz 2010). The UCDP Conflict Termination dataset identifies 7 types of termination: Peace agreement, ceasefire agreement with conflict regulation, ceasefire agreement, victory, low activity, other, and joining alliance. As long as the conflict does not end with the first 4 types of outcome, the current data set does not consider a NAG terminated and codes external support until the group ceases.

UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset codes two different start years for a group. The first year (Startdate1) is coded when there is at least one battle-related death in a conflict. And a second start date (startdate2) is coded when there are at least twenty-five battle-related deaths in a conflict. The second start date is considered as the onset of a conflict within a given government-opposition group conflict. And, there might be multiple conflicts within a given government-opposition organization conflict. The current data codes the first year when a group is formed as the beginning of the activity period regardless violence is observed or not. This way, it is also possible to observe whether receiving external support prompts groups to resort to violence. Of course, this is attainable when the formation year is before the first year in which a minimum of one battle-related death is observed. See description of Yr\_Active variable below for a more detailed coding.

4. DEFINITION OF VARIABLES:

**TriadID:** Each row in the dataset represents a triad-year. A triad consists of a target, a supporter, and a NAG that resorts to violent means against a country (target) to achieve its political objectives. This number is constituted in the following way: target COW ID\*1,000,000+NAGcode\*1,000+potential supporter COWID. For example, in calculating the triadID number for Algeria (target), Armed Islamic Group (NAG), and France (supporter);

COW ID for Algeria: 615

NAGcode for the Armed Islamic Group: 2

COWID for France: 220

**Triadid = [(615\*1000000) + (2\*1000) + 220] = 615002220**

**DyadID:** A unique identifier generated by UCD/ PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset Dyadic

Codebook to identify each dyad of rebel group and its target state (Gleditsch,

Wallensteen et al. 2002, Petterson & Wallensteen 2015).

**ConflictID:** Conflict identifier from the UCDP/PRIO dataset.

**Year:** The year of observation. Each triad is listed for the period during which a NAG is active beginning from its formation year regardless there is violence in that year or not.

**Yr\_Active:** 1- the year groups was formed, 2- the year in which at least one BRD (Battle-Related Death) is observed (Startdate1 in UCDP/PRIO), 3- the year in which at least 25 BRDs are observed (Startdate2 in UCDP/PRIO), 4- formation date & one BRD year are the same, 5- formation date, one BRD and 25 BRD year are the same year, 6- One BRD and 25 BRD year are the same.

When coding the activity periods of some NAGs, one issue is about the groups that capture the control of government for a brief period during their insurgency. For example, AFRC (Armed Forces Revolutionary Council) staged a coup against the

Sierra Leone government in 1997 and controlled the capital till ECOMOG (Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group) forces drove them out in 1998. In other words, they did not get acknowledgment of the international community. In such cases, the rebel group is not considered as representing the government. Rather its activity considered continuing in these periods even when they were in control of the government. Another case is the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia. Although Khmer Rouge started as a rebel group, it was in control of the Cambodian government between 1975 and 1979. It allied with the North Vietnamese government and there were not any regional and/or international efforts in order to remove them from power. In such cases, the rebel group is not considered as continuing its activity in the period they are in charge of the government.

**Foundyr:** The UCDP/PRIO dataset starts coding a group after at least 1 Battle-related death is observed. However, some groups existed long before a battle related death occurred. Therefore, this variable is coded separately.

**Startdate1:** Adopted directly from UCDP/PRIO dataset

**Startdate2:** Adopted from UCDP/PRIO dataset

**Target:** The country facing a threat from a NAG.

**TarNum\_GW:** Numeric Gleditsch and Ward ID of target country

**TarNum\_COW:** COW country code for target.

**NAG\_name:** Full name of the group.

**NAGcode\_1:** The numeric code of the NAG (ranges from 1 to 455). In the end, a list of groups, their codes in the dataset and the period of activity are listed. As long as the group did not sign an agreement with the government, we do not consider it terminated.

**NAGcode\_2:** Numeric UCDP/PRIO code of the NAG

**Incomp:** Incompatibility as coded by UCDP/PRIO ACD

**Terr:** Name of territory under dispute (from UCDP/PRIO)

**NAGID:** Identity of the NAG (Numeric):

- 1- NOID
- 2- Ethno-nationalist
- 3- Religious
- 4- Leftist
- 5- Other (specify)

These categories are not mutually exclusive. In many cases, it is possible to associate a NAG with multiple identities. The groups, such as the Palestinian Islamic Jihad and Hamas can be identified both as an ethnic and a religious-oriented group. The ideational identity of these groups has been recorded for both variables of ethnic and religious identity. If a group does not associate itself with any identity and/or ideology, such as the Cocoyes in Congo, then it is coded as not having any ideational identity. Although the group has aspirations to change the leadership, it does not make propaganda for a specific ethnic or religious group and/or political ideology. Rather, it aspires to be inclusive by bringing together multiple ethnic groups in Southern Congo.

Determining the ethnic, religious, or ideological aspirations of each group requires extensive analysis of the components of the ideational spectrum they identify themselves with. For example, Moro National Liberation Front (in contrast to Moro Islamic Liberation Front) does not aspire to found an Islamic state in Southern Philippines. Rather, it wants autonomy for areas populated by Moro Muslims. This group is coded as an ethno-nationalist group. Although Islam is a part of their identity, it is not the main driving force. In cases, there are multiple identities; the overwhelmingly emphasized one is coded

besides recording each components of a group's identity under the corresponding variables below. In order to attract international attention and support from major powers such as Soviet Union, China or the USA, some NAGs have claimed to follow a "communist" or as "democratic" ideology despite the fact that their actions clearly did not conform to either one of them. For example, the National Liberation Front in Algeria has been labeled with different ideologies over the course of its history; anti-colonial, nationalist and communist movement. In such cases, their discourse has been disregarded and their actions have been taken as a basis for coding.

**NAGeth:** the ethnic identity of the group. Ethnic identity is not only coded for ethno-nationalist movements, but for all movements. The Ethnic Power Relations Dataset (EPR) was used to code the ethnic identity of each group (Cederman et al. 2010). Lars-Erik Cederman; Brian Min; Andreas Wimmer's EPR dataset is hosted by the GROWup portal (<http://growup.ethz.ch/>) which matches each UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict data NAGs with corresponding ethnic groups in each target state. (Girardin et al. 2015) However; at the time of the coding of NAG dataset, ethnic identities of groups were not yet available. Therefore, each NAG's ethnic identity was coded according to EPR identities by the Dangerous Companions Project team. In cases where a group's ethnic identity was not clear, the identity of the group's leader was coded instead. For multiethnic NAGs whose composition included members with more than three different ethnic backgrounds, only the top three ethnicities found in their country of origin have been included.

**NAGrel:** the religious identity of the group. It does not necessarily mean that the group wants a religious regime or identifies itself openly with a religious affiliation. For example, PKK never uses religion as part of its identity, yet it is coded in accordance with the religious identity group members overwhelmingly belong to. The religion categories are coded according to the indicators of the World Religion Project (Maoz and Henderson

2013). If we can find the specific branch of a religion that the group identifies itself with (e.g. Sunni, Shia, Catholic, Orthodox etc.), we use such labels in coding. Otherwise, this variable is coded as broad religious identities (e.g. Muslim, Christian). The categories coded for religion can be found in the list below. Similar to the NAGeth variable, for multireligious NAGs whose composition included members with more than three different religious backgrounds, only the top three ethnicities found in their country of origin have been included.

**Table 1. World Religion Project Religion Categories coded for NAGs**

<b>Variable Label</b>	<b>Variable</b>
chrstprot	Christianity—Protestants—No. of Adherents
chrstcat	Christianity—Roman Catholics—No. of Adherents
chrstorth	Christianity—Eastern Orthodox—No. of Adherents
chrstang	Christianity—Anglican—No. of Adherents
chrstothr	Christianity—Others—No. of Adherents
chrstgen	Christianity—Total No. of Adherents
judorth	Judaism—Orthodox—No. of Adherents
jdcons	Judaism—Conservatives—No. of Adherents
judref	Judaism—Reform—No. of Adherents
judothr	Judaism--Others—No. of Adherents
judgen	Judaism—Total No. of Adherents
islmsun	Islam—Sunni—No. of Adherents
islmschi	Islam—Shi'a—No. of Adherents
islmiibd	Islam--Ibadhi—No. of Adherents
islmnat	Islam—Nation of Islam—No. of Adherents
islmalw	Islam—Alawite—No. of Adherents
islmahm	Islam—Ahmadiyya—No. of Adherents
islmothr	Islam--Other—No. of Adherents
islmggen	Islam—Total No. of Adherents
budmah	Buddhism—Mahayana—No. of Adherents
budthr	Buddhism—Theravada—No. of Adherents
budothr	Buddhism--Other—No. of Adherents
budgen	Buddhism—Total No. of Adherents
zorogen	Zoroastrian—Total No. of Adherents
hindgen	Hindu—Total No. of Adherents
sikhgen	Sikh—Total No. of Adherents
shntgen	Shinto—Total No. of Adherents

Variable Label	Variable
bahgen	Baha'i—Total No. of Adherents
taogen	Taoism—Total No. of Adherents
jaingen	Confucianism—Total No. of Adherents
confgen	Jain—Total No. of Adherents
syncgen	Syncretic Religions- Total No. of Adherents
anmgen	Animist Religions—Total No. of Adherents
nonrelig	Non. Religious—Total No. of Adherents
othrgen	Other Religions—Total No. of Adherents

**NAGleft:** a dummy variable for whether a NAG is a leftist revolutionary group or not.

**NAGright:** if the NAG has fascist or conservative or other aspirations that we may relate to right-wing views. Ethno-nationalist NAGs with separatist aspirations have also been coded as having a right-wing ideology.

**NAGdemoc:** if a group claims that it has democratic aspirations, this variable is coded as “1”, and “0” otherwise. There is the problem that any group may argue that it will bring democracy. Usually any ethnic group that has aspirations for secessionism or control over government as their goals makes demands about further advancement of individual political rights and liberties. Indeed, such groups are usually ethnic minorities, such as Basque people who live in Spain or Kurdish people who live in Turkey. They emerge seeking further rights for minorities, which usually are granted if democracy level in a country increases. When we code this variable, we do not take into consideration such demands. Both PKK and ETA are not primarily looking for bringing democracy to the country they live in. Rather, they have other aspirations for their own ethnic communities. Examples of groups that try bringing democracy to a country include groups such as All Burma Students' Democratic Front. The primary motivation of ABSDF has been overthrowing the military regime in Burma and establishing a democratic rule.

**NAGauth:** If a group is fighting for a form of autocratic regime other than theocracy, dictatorship and military regimes, this variable is coded 1, 0 otherwise.

**NAGdict:** If a group is fighting for a dictatorial regime, this variable is coded as 1, otherwise 0.

**NAGmil:** If a group is fighting for a military regime, this variable is coded as 1, 0 otherwise. Most NAGs which carried out *coup d'états* fall under this category.

**NAGtheo:** If a group is fighting for a form of theocracy, this variable is coded 1, 0 otherwise. Most fundamentalist Islamist groups fall under this category.

**NAGobj:** the goals pursued by a NAG might be various and can change over time. UCDP PRIO Dataset codes the demands about government change and autonomy as forms of incompatibility over government and territory respectively. The objective of the group is recoded in a more detailed manner. A demand about the change of leadership is different than demand about change of regime type. By the same token PRIO data takes the stated incompatibility in the beginning of the conflict as if it continues until the end. It is known that various groups change their objective throughout the conflict duration and this in itself is a very important variable that needs to be captured.

- 1- toppling an existing leadership
- 2- change of regime type (transition from autocracy to democracy or the reverse regime change)
- 3- demands for autonomy
- 4- secession/territorial demand
- 5- demands for policy change
- 6- Other - specify

**PolParDummy:** a binary variable indicating whether there is a political party affiliated with the group in a given year. Affiliation is described as whether the party shares similar aspirations as the group and there is evidence that the party leaders communicate with militants.

**PartyName:** name of the political party affiliated with a NAG

**Supporter:** The state that supports the NAG in a given year.

**SupNum\_GW:** Numeric Gleditsch and Ward ID of supporter country.

**SupNum\_COW:** The COW country code of the supporter.

**State vs. De Facto Support:**

Support is an action that implies an intentional act on the part of an external actor. The post-9/11 debate about terrorism focused on weak states and how they turned into safe havens for various terrorist organizations. Yet, the event of weak states turning into safe havens for terrorists or other non-state armed groups does not qualify for “support of non-state violence.” State capacity should not be used as a coding criterion when deciding whether a form of support is provided or not. It should be treated as an independent variable to explain the influence of government’s capacity to control their borders on whether they end up as safe havens or sources of other forms of support for NAGs. As previously argued, the best way to code whether a NAG is able to acquire resources from other states is to focus on the observable outcomes rather than intentions since the latter is pretty hard to figure out. Therefore, the current coding protocol treats cases where there is clear evidence for states creating channels to abet certain groups and this evidence is confirmed by multiple reliable sources as incidents where states select the NAGs to provide support to. On the other hand, when there is not such evidence of state support and a rebel group is able to operate within the borders of a state, it is treated as an incident of NAGs selection or *de facto support*. Then, two criteria have been relied to code state support of NAGs:

- (1) Whether there was an observable indication that a given NAG was operating within the borders of other states; i.e. leaders finding safe havens. Fund raising, weapon smuggling etc.
- (2) If the government or leadership in a given state was knowingly creating channels to a NAG in question. For example, Egypt was knowingly letting Fedayeen to operate within its borders till the Suez Crisis, after which they extradited them from their territories.
- (3) In the absence of confirmable information that the government or leadership in a given state was providing support to rebels or creating channels to facilitate their activities, it is assumed to be *de facto* support, i.e. NAGs selecting the states from which to acquire resources to sustain their operations against their targets.

The following set of sources used in confirming state support and de facto support incidents:

- (1) News wires and press releases from credible sources, such as Agence France-Presse (AFP), the United Press International (UPI), Xinhua New Agency, Reuters, Aljazeera, CNN, BBC Monitoring etc.
- (2) Major newspapers, such as New York Times, the Washington Post, Independent, Guardian, Financial Times, The Globe and Mail etc.
- (3) Scholarly research articles, books, book chapters and research notes published in academic and indexed journals.

In coding state selection cases, **the emphasis was on whether a government directly provides assistance to facilitate violent conducts of a NAG.** In other words, when making decision about coding a case of support, some evidence was required with respect to the government or a political actor or organization that are formally affiliated

with the government providing support. The Revolutionary United Front (RUF) targeted Sierra Leone between 1991 and 2001. It received intentional and direct support from Liberia, Burkina Faso and Libya in the form of safe haven for members and leaders, funds, arms, logistics and troops. In coding state support for RUF, the following is an exemplary statement we adopted from a news source:

*“Nine years ago, the state's collapse, the poverty of its people and the eternal tussle for Sierra Leone's diamonds led to war. A cashiered army corporal named Foday Sankoh joined his vague notions of revolution with money and guns from Libya and Liberian warlord--now president--Charles Taylor to form the Revolutionary United Front. The RUF seized diamond fields, smuggled gemstones and became one of Africa's most thuggish militias” (Rupert 2000).*

*“In 1991, while still fighting in Liberia, Taylor helped launch the civil war in Sierra Leone by providing troops, training and supplies to Foday Sankoh, leader of the Revolutionary United Front. Richie was assigned to Sankoh's forces for their first incursion into Sierra Leone and has been fighting here ever since” (Douglas 2001).*

Another task when coding support is determining the time and duration of support. In some cases, it is easy to find out from the sources used for collecting data on a particular NAG. Yet, sometimes it proves challenging to code the time and duration of support. When an external support is mentioned in the sources but the period of support is not clear, the release date of the sources is used as an approximate date of support. All Tripura Tiger Force (ATTF) was an ethno-nationalist group fighting Indian state between 1992 and 2010 for an independent state for Tripuri people. The sources dated mostly in 2002, 2008 and 2010 pointed out that ATTF received support from Bangladesh and Pakistan. Thus, the support is coded as continuing from 2002 to 2010.

Furthermore, for each type of support coded, a precision level is determined. For the ATTF and Indian conflict, the above stated sources based the news on the accusations or allegations of the Indian government. Therefore, when coding, the lowest precision level was assigned to this particular group. Another example is Nicaraguan Democratic Force (FDN), which fought against the Sandinista regime between 1981 and 1990. Between 1981 and 1984, the support to FDN went with the approval of the US Congress (Cody 1984, Woodward 1984). Once the Congress stopped overt support channels from the US government to FDN, Reagan went covert about supporting the FDN, which resulted in the notorious and scandalous Iran-Contra Affair. It is a clear case of state support with a very high precision level. Indeed, the congressional reports indicate clearly that there was support during the specified period.

**Precision (S\_Precision & DS\_Precision):** In order to specify how confident the coder is that there is evidence of active support, the variable receives the following rating:

- 1 – The supporter outright stated its intention and/or type of support, and/or the support was officially documented by that state or another.
- 2 – A reliable journalist, scholar, or media outlet recorded the support and provides convincing evidence and there are other sources that confirm this information.
- 3 – Support is highly suspected by a reliable source (such as journalist, scholar, or media outlet), but cannot be confirmed by other sources.
- 4- One state accuses another state of supporting a group, but it cannot provide official documentation beyond allegations.

**SUPPORT TYPES:** State Selection Cases are denoted by “S” and NAGs Selection Cases are denoted by “DS” (De facto support)

For each rebel group, a table of direct citations including stories and news from reliable sources has been created by using Lexis-Nexis academic web program, Keesing’s

Archives, and published secondary sources, including political science journals, journals focusing on particular regions of the world, books and book chapters. Each coder received training and was given a sample NAG to code to. After inter-coder reliability is confirmed in the end of the sample group coding, they were assigned groups on a weekly basis. Regular meetings were held with the coders in order to respond to questions and concerns. In Lexis-Nexis Academic, a keyword search was done for each group for all available dates. Each coder was given a questionnaire, which is available in the end of this codebook, with directions and guidance about how to conduct research on online databases and sources to find and collect the required data. In order to determine the supporters and the type of support provided, the following keywords have been searched in the Lexis-Nexis categories “Major U.S. and World Publications,” “News Wire Services,” and “TV and Radio Broadcast Transcripts” with each group’s name: support, assistance, sponsor, safe haven, sanctuary, training camps, camps arms, weapons, funds, troops.

### **Coding Rules for State Support**

After a preliminary analysis and coding of 20% of the entire rebel groups and their supporters, the following rules are specified with respect to some ambiguous forms of support referred in the sources used for data coding:

1. If a state provides health services to a group’s members or leaders, it qualifies as providing safe haven for members or leaders.
2. In some instances, states become hosts to negotiations and meetings between a group’s leaders and the target government. This does not qualify as a form of support.
3. Some states host the headquarters of rebel groups. These headquarters organize propaganda and fundraising activities of a group and provide communication with

the militants at home. This is coded as a form of support under the name of headquarters or opening offices.

4. Some states host TV channels and radio stations operated by rebels and used to disseminate information about the group. This does not qualify as a form of support for the purposes of this project but can be the subject matter of another research project.
5. A state may provide one or more of the specified support types.
6. Some specific cases proved to be particularly complex. One such case was Palestinian militant groups finding safe havens in Lebanon. Lebanon was under the occupation of Syria and Israel between 1979 and 2005 and between 1982 and 2000, respectively. Prior to the initiation of civil war and Syrian occupation, Lebanon turned into a host for several Palestinian militant groups as well as Palestinian refugees mostly populating the South of the country. It is not clear how much Lebanese government could have resisted against the pressures of strong Arab states, such as Egypt and Syria, yet Cairo agreement turned it into a safe havens for several groups. Initially, it is coded as a state support case. Yet, later after foreign occupation, no support was coded for Lebanon and several groups, such as Palestinian Islamic Jihad, PFLP, and Fatah. Furthermore, Hezbollah emerged within Southern Lebanon as a response against the Israeli occupation. So, it was not necessarily a choice by Hezbollah to reside within Southern Lebanon. In other words, it was not like they could have emerged in Jordan or Egypt. Yet if Hezbollah sought support from external states, such as Iran and Syria, then it is coded as a clear case of state support by Iran and Syria.
7. In some cases, NAGs establish presence in a foreign country with the assistance of another rebel group targeting that foreign country. Maoist Communist Center of

India (MCC) had safe havens and training camps in Nepal. Nepalese government was not involved in this assistance; Maoist insurgents fighting against Nepal helped MCC to establish facilities inside Nepal. This is a selection on the part of MCC, thus coded as *de facto* support from Nepal to MCC against India.

**SafeMem:** Providing safe havens to members. A certain number of militants are present within the territories of a state or they establish some bases. Safe havens are defined as “geographical spaces where non-state armed groups members are able to establish organizational and operational base that allows them to engage in financing activities, developing a communications network for command and control, achieving access to weapons and developing logistics network to enable travel, the movement of money and weapons (Kittner 2007, p.308). Geographical spaces in which militants acquire operational space for training are coded separately as “training camps”. This does not annul the fact that training camps are also operational spaces. Mere refugee camps do not qualify as safe havens. There needs to be some proof that militants infiltrated into these camps and operate from these places.

Providing safe havens to members of a rebel group is different than providing training camps or access to existing camps. More often than not, the neighbors of a state that experiences civil war or ethnic conflict end up accepting refugees within their own borders. Opening the borders to refugees does not qualify for providing safe havens to an armed group that is fighting its target government unless the group is engaging in violent cross-border attacks. The members of the Karen National Union, which has been fighting Myanmar’s government for over five decades, frequently escape into neighboring Thailand. They occasionally organize armed attacks back into Myanmar.

The following statement illustrates the type of evidence used to determine whether a state provides safe havens to a group:

‘Thai television reported that Burma was preparing to attack Karen refugee camps inside Thailand. Mortars reportedly were fired at one camp across the border in the Teakaplaw region, forcing thousands of refugees to flee. The fighting comes two weeks after a Karen splinter group supported by government launched cross-border raids against three camps of refugees loyal to the Karen National Union inside Thailand. Two camps were burned to the ground and 8,000 refugees fled into the Thai jungle.’ (“Burmese army launches...” 1997)

The above statement indicates that the Karen National Union has safe havens in Thailand. Whether the support is provided intentionally by the state is discussed more generally in the beginning of this section when explaining active vs. passive support. In addition, multiple sources were used to determine whether the KNU members were engaging in cross-border attacks into Myanmar.

**SafeLead:** Providing sanctuary to leadership. Providing safe havens to leaders of a group is different than providing safe havens to its members. Group leaders end up living in other states due to reasons such as being expelled from their target countries or not feeling safe in the target countries anymore. Of the total years that rebels’ leaders spent in external safe havens, 35% were in democratic states, in contrast to the 65% spent in autocratic states. Despite that, democratic states might be preferred by rebels’ leaders due to the individual freedoms and liberties that make their arrest difficult. After the assassination of Indian president Rajiv Gandhi, the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) lost its support base and funding from India. As a result, they founded offices in Western European countries, such as Switzerland, France, and UKG, as well as USA

and Canada. There is clear evidence that the Sri Lankan government put pressure on these countries to stop the fund raising activities of the group and to return the group's leaders back to Sri Lanka. The United States banned the group and its fundraising activities in 1997 by passing an anti-terrorism law and declaring LTTE a terrorist organization. ("Tamil Tigers, from a rag-tag band..." 1997) The United Kingdom and Canada did not ban fundraising activities of the group until 2001. (Jayamaha 2000)

**Headquarters/Open Offices:** the group has a physical office which does not command the violent activities of the organization or headquarters to spread propaganda and raise funds, not necessarily directed towards violence. Usually, if a supporter country provides headquarters for a NAG or allows it to open offices within its territories, there is a high probability that the country provides safe haven to its leadership.

**TrainCamp:** Providing training camps. Providing rebels with training camps requires extra effort on the part of the supporters than providing safe havens. Training camps are expected to be equipped with military equipment to help the members of a group in organizing and implementing violent attacks against their targets. During the Syrian occupation of Lebanon from 1976 to 2005, various Palestinian groups were trained in Lebanese territories by the assistance of Syria. ("Qom meeting of fundamentalist groups..." 1996) For instance, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad members had trained in the camps in Lebanon. Although the headquarters of the group had been placed in Damascus since its foundation, the training camps are not in Syrian territories. In coding the support of PIJ by Syria, providing training camps is not coded among the support types but providing safe havens to leaders is coded among the types of support.

**Training:** In addition to training camps, some states provide training not necessarily within their own borders. This refers to temporary assignment of a state's security forces to train the militants.

**WeaponLog:** Providing weapons and logistics aid. This variable is coded if there is clear evidence that the arms originated from the supporting country. The evidence on whether a state provides arms to rebels is not easily attainable. Mere allegations by the target states are not enough to prove that a state provides arms to a rebel group. In the following narration directly cited from the source, it is clear that Libya's giving arms to IRA was not a mere allegation by the United Kingdom:

‘Histories of the IRA have identified Mr Murphy as an IRA weapons smuggler who helped to procure supplies by travelling to Libya using false passports. In the 1980s, Libya supplied the Provisional IRA with more than 100 tonnes of weaponry’. (Sharrock 2007)

**FinAid:** Fundraising is different than receiving money from the supporter state's government. While in some cases, such as Iran and Hezbollah, governments provide funds to a rebel group, in many others, the groups themselves manage to raise funds within the borders of another state, such as the Irish Republican Army (IRA) raising funds within the USA. When this is the case, the support is assumed to be *passive*, i.e. rebels select certain states as supporters without necessarily any intentional effort on the part of the supporter. It is possible to argue that the USA had the capacity to control the IRA's activities, in which case the support of the group would have been intentional. However, making this judgment requires a more extensive analysis of each case in the dataset, which is not an attainable goal within the time frame of a project. The specific type of support the IRA obtained from the US is also called ‘passive support’ by Byman (2005c). I coded it as *passive* support since the US government was not intentionally creating any channels to help the group.

**Transport:** Providing transport of the military equipment and military advice. If a state ends up being a transport point for a rebel group, it is coded separately from providing

arms and military supplies. Cambodia has for years become a *de facto* transport point for arms smuggling for many non-state armed groups in Asia. (Bonner 1998) Zaire was the major transport point for the weapons sent by the USA to UNITA, which was fighting the communist regime in Angola. (Lewis 1987)

**Troop:** In some cases, states allow their troops to fight on the side of the rebels against their targets. When civil wars or ethnic conflict crossed the borders of other states, there is a risk that the latter acts to protect its borders. This variable is not coded for passive support since it is impossible for a state to send its troops to help a NAG and do this passively? This leads to the accusations for providing troop support to rebels. Myanmar accused the Thai army multiple times of providing the KNU with troops during the counter-border operations of Myanmar's government into the Karen National Union camps in Thailand. The following illustrates type of statements and narratives used to code troop support:

*'Angola, allied to Sassou Nguesso's Cobra militia, staged a weekend attack along the border between its oil-producing Cabinda enclave and southwestern Congo, sending some 1,000 troops into Congo, according to diplomats.'*  
 ("Angolan tanks and troops enter..." 1997)

*"Following the 1979 establishment of the Islamic Republic and as a response to Israel's invasion of Lebanon in 1982, Iran organized, equipped, and trained Hezbollah. Tehran deployed 1,500 personnel from its Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corp (IRGC)—a semi-autonomous vanguard of Iran's military used to foment regional disorder and support terrorist organizations—to Lebanon."* (Wilner 2012, 19-20)

Only six percent of the binary support years involve states that provide troops to rebels. This is normal if we consider that troop support is a very risky strategy, since it means

directly engaging with the target of a rebel group. The purpose of supporting a group is to avoid direct confrontation with the adversary, besides trying to undermine the power of an adversary.

**Other:** any other kind of support not listed above.

**DomSup:** Whether there is a support basis from within the target or the supporter country.

**DomSup\_P:** The confidence by which we can claim domestic support from a NAG's target or supporter. The domestic support refers to support from among the people rather than the political leadership. 1 – not much confident, 2- somehow confident, 3- confident.

**SupTerm:** Why did the support end?

1. Pressures from the target of a given NAG
2. Pressures from the international community in general:  
other states (other than the target)
3. Regime change in the target country
4. Regime change in the supporting country
5. Leadership change in supporting country
6. Group ceased activity
7. Group signed a ceasefire
8. Group turned into a political movement
9. Other: describe

Support termination is coded as missing when there is no external state support for a NAG in a given year.

## References

- \_\_\_ (1997) "Angolan tanks and troops enter Congo's oil town Pointe Noir." *Deutsche Presse-Agentur*. October 15, 1997. Accessed on August 17, 2007.
- \_\_\_ (1997) "Burmese army launches offensive against Karen rebels." *International News section*. February 13, 1997. Accessed on August 21, 2008.
- \_\_\_ (1997) "Tamil Tigers, from a rag-tag band to a fighting force." *Associated Press Worldstream*. October 15, 1997. Accessed on August 20, 2008.
- \_\_\_ "UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset Codebook, v4 (2015)." Available at <http://new.prio.no/CSCW-Datasets/Data-on-Armed-Conflict/>. Last accessed on June 10, 2015.
- Barnett, Michael. (2002) "The Israeli Identity and the Peace Process: Re/creating the Un/thinkable " In *Identity and Foreign Policy in the Middle East*, eds. Shibley Telhami and Michael Barnett. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Bonner, Raymond. (1998) "Tamil Guerillas in Sri Lanka: Deadly and Armed to the Teeth". *New York Times*. March 7, 1998. Available at [www.nytimes.com](http://www.nytimes.com), accessed on August 15, 2008.
- Byman, Daniel. (2005) Passive Sponsors of Terrorism. *Survival* 47 (4): 117-144.
- Cederman, Lars-Erik; Brian Min; Andreas Wimmer. (2010) "Ethnic Power Relations dataset", <http://hdl.handle.net/1902.1/11796>, Harvard Dataverse, V1.
- Cunningham, David E., Kristian Skrede Gleditsch and Idean Salehyan. (2009) "It Takes Two: A Dyadic Analysis of Civil War Duration and Outcome", *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 53 (4): 570-597.
- Gleditsch, Nils Peter, Peter Wallensteen, Mikael Eriksson, Margareta Sollenberg, and Havard Strand. (2002) Armed Conflict 1946-2001: A new dataset. *Journal of Peace Research* 39 (5): 615-637.

- Högbladh, Stina, Therése Pettersson and Lotta Themnér. (2011) "External Support in Armed Conflict 1975–2009. Presenting new data" Paper presented at the 52nd Annual International Studies Association Convention, Montreal, Canada, 16-19 March, 2011.
- Jayamaha, Dilshika. (2000) "AP Photos COL101-102" the Associated Press Worldstream, December 11, 2000. Accessed on August 20, 2008.
- Kittner, Cristina C. Braffman. (2007) The Role of Terrorist Safe Havens in Islamist Terrorism. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 19 (3): 307-329.
- Kreutz, Joakim. (2010) How and When Armed Conflicts End: Introducing the UCDP Conflict Termination Dataset. *Journal of Peace Research* 47(2): 243-250.
- Lewis, Neil A. (1987) "Washington Talk: Working Profile; Chester Croker: Inside, making policy on Africa". June 9, 1987. Accessed on August 28, 2007.
- Cederman, Lars-Erik; Brian Min; Andreas Wimmer. (2010) "Ethnic Power Relations dataset", <http://hdl.handle.net/1902.1/11796>, Harvard Dataverse, V1.
- Luc Girardin, Philipp Hunziker, Lars-Erik Cederman, Nils-Christian Bormann, and Manuel Vogt. (2015) GROWup - Geographical Research On War, Unified Platform. ETH Zurich. Available at <http://growup.ethz.ch/>.
- Regan, Patrick M., Aysegul Aydin. (2006) "Diplomacy and Other Forms of Intervention in Civil War", *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50(5).
- Regan, P., Frank, R., Aydin, A. (2009) "Diplomatic interventions and civil war: A new dataset" *Journal of Peace Research* 46(1): 135-146.
- Sartori, G. (1969) Politics, Ideology, and Belief Systems. *American Political Science Review* 63: 398-411.
- Sharrock, David. (2007) "IRA baron charged - on tax". November 10, 2007. Weekend Australian. Accessed on July 24, 2008.

- Wendt, Alexander E. (1994) Collective Identity Formation and the International State.  
*American Political Science Review* 88: 384-396.
- Wilner, Alex S. (2012). "Apocalypse Soon? Deterring Nuclear Iran and its Terrorist  
Proxies." *Comparative Strategy* 31: 18-40.
- Zeev Maoz and Errol A. Henderson. (2013) "The World Religion Dataset, 1945-2010:  
Logic, Estimates, and Trends." *International Interactions*, 39: 265-291.