Coding of US Presidential Discourse on Protection
Codebook

Authored by: Timo Kivimäki

Nature of the Data

This time series data is based on NVivo coding of all clauses in US Presidential Papers (Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States 1989-2012 (Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office)) with the word "protect" in any of its forms. Clauses are coded for their referent objects (who is being protected). Those clauses that deal with the protection of global civilians (=referent object is not US or allies, but people in other countries), coding is also done for the agent of protection and for the method of protection (protection by changing someone else's behaviour vs. protection by changing one's own behaviour). The data is stored in a numerical form in Stata format and for the sake of transparency the raw data on NVivo format is also included here.

Arguments that link the rules to their theoretical contexts can be found in

1. Kivimäki, Timo 2019a. The Failure to Protect. The Path to and Consequences of Humanitarian Interventionism. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

2. Kivimäki, Timo 2019b. "How Does Nationalist Selfishness Creep into Cosmopolitan Protection?" Global Responsibility to Protect 10, no. 1 (January 2019).

List of Variables

clauseid: A unique numeric ID identifying each coded cosmopolitan clause.

clause: Coded clause and when needed for the revelation of the referent object, agent and method of protection, also clauses before and after the coded clause. The clauses can also be found in their entire textual contexts from the NVivo files of this dataset.

month: Month. 198901 means January 1989.

biannualterm: Six-month period. 198901 refers to the first six months of year 1989.

year: Year.

agent: Main actor of protection, 1= US, 2= allies, 3=ad hoc actors, 4=bilateral agency, 5= representative agency.

ongus: Number of months, within the time period in question, of ongoing US protective military involvements in conflicts that take place in fragile states outside US alliances and start with intra-state violence. An involvement is protective, if the Presidential Papers of the US Presidents document has a sentence where someone outside the US and its alliances is the referent object to the word "protect". Military involvement is identified when the US is mentioned in the UCDP data as primary or secondary conflicting parties, or when the US has conducted deadly air strikes against a conflicting party without ground force presence in the country of the conflict. The latter stipulation adds 26 years of US military involvement to the UCDP data. The list of these military involvements and the argument for considering airborne involvements as military involvements can be found in Kivimäki, 2019a, Chapter 2.

ongallied: Number of months, within the time period in question, of ongoing protective military involvements (as defined above) by the US, UK or France.

newus: US protective military involvements (as defined above) that have started during the time period in question (in the case of biannual data the period is 6 months, in annual data it is one year, and in monthly data it is the specific month).

newallied: Allied (US, UK or France) protective military involvements that have started during the time period in question.

congrelect: The number of US congressional elections during the time period in question (in the case of biannual data the period is 6 months, in annual data it is one year). In monthly data the election discourse is coded not just for the November when elections are held, but also for four preceding months.

preselect; The number of US presidential elections during time period in question (in the case of biannual data the period is 6 months, in annual data it is one year). In monthly data the election discourse is coded not just for the November when elections are held, but also for four preceding months.

presreelect: The number of US presidential elections in which the sitting president participates as a candidate during time period in question (in the case of biannual data the

period is 6 months, in annual data it is one year). In monthly data the election discourse is coded not just for the November when elections are held, but also for four preceding months.

words: The total number of words in the Presidential Papers in the biannual term.

protect: The number of clauses with the word "protect" in all its forms in the biannual term. This number is not the sum of all protection clause codings as words "protect" were not coded from the index or table of content, and a clause where the word "protect" is repeated is coded only once if there is only one referent object. Furthermore, a clause with one word "protect" can be coded several times if it has several referent objects: "we protect allies and Iraq", for example has one coding as a clause in which allies are a referent object and one in which there is a cosmopolitan referent object.

bd_best: The number of global conflict fatalities according to UCDP data (Allansson & al 2017).

pwfatalities: number of fatalities of protection wars (see variable **ProtWar**) according to UCDP data (2017) in conflicts that UCDP data defines as intra-state or internationalized intra-state conflicts, and where New War State Fragility index (see Kivimäki 2019a, Chapter 2, Based on State Fragility Index, see, Marshall and Elzinga-Marshall 2017) is 6 or higher, and where the US, UK or France have an ongoing protective intervention (ongallied).

Variables related to the referent object of protection

irrelevant: The number of clauses within a biannual term, with the word "protect" in all its forms referring to protection that protects Americans and US institutions against non-external (for example, protection of American children against crime, decadence or tobacco and the like), non-life-threatening threats (protection of US tobacco farmers, economic protectionism, etc.) and unintentional threats to the US and Americans (pandemics, environmental degradation, securing of international traffic against technical dangers).

ecprot: Number of clauses within a time period in question (in the case of biannual data the period is 6 months, in annual data it is one year), with the word "protect" in all its forms referring to protection of US economic interests abroad. Subcategory of "irrelevant".

envprot: Number of clauses within a time period in question (monthly, biannual or annual), with the word "protect" in all its forms referring to protection of the environment.

natprot: Number of clauses within a time period in question (in the case of biannual data the period is 6 months, in annual data it is one year), with the word "protect" in all its forms referring to protection of Americans, US territory and borders, US political system, US bargaining leverage against violent potential enemies and security and national interests.

alliedprot: Number of clauses within time period in question (in the case of biannual data the period is 6 months, in annual data it is one year), with the word "protect" in all its forms referring to protection of members of the US alliances, their citizens, political systems, borders and territory, their bargaining leverage against violent potential enemies and security and national interests.

cosmoprot: Number of clauses within a time period in question (in the case of biannual data the period is 6 months, in annual data it is one year), with the word "protect" in all its forms referring to protection of people and institutions vital to people who are not citizens of the US or countries in US alliances. These clauses refer to cosmopolitan protection.

Variables related to the agent of cosmopolitan protection (coded only for clauses with cosmopolitan referent object)

usagency: Number of clauses a time period in question (monthly, biannual or annual), with the word "protect" (in all its forms) referring to cosmopolitan references (people or states outside US and its allies) and defining the United States as the actor of protection.

alliedagency: Number of clauses a time period in question (monthly, biannual or annual), with the word "protect" (in all its forms) referring to cosmopolitan references (people or states outside US and its allies) and defining the US alliance as the actor of protection.

adhocagency: Number of clauses a time period in question (monthly, biannual or annual), with the word "protect" (in all its forms) referring to cosmopolitan references (people or states outside US and its allies) and defining an ad hoc coalition as the actor of protection. An ad hoc agency is US-led coalition that does not represent or include the people who are being protected.

bilateralagency: Number of clauses a time period in question (monthly, biannual or annual), with the word "protect" (in all its forms) referring to cosmopolitan references (people or states outside US and its allies) and defining the United States together with the target of protection as the actor of protection. Here, bilateral cooperation between US/alliance/ad hoc coalition and the target country of protection does not subject the US-side to protection. Thus, bilateral agency exists, for example, when US and Iraq cooperate in protecting civilians in Iraq, but not in the US.

representativeagency: Number of clauses a time period in question (monthly, biannual or annual), with the word "protect" (in all its forms) referring to cosmopolitan references (people or states outside US and its allies) and defining a representative agent as the actor of protection. The actor of protection is representative when it is owned also by the targets of protection and when the targets are represented by it. For example, if protection is offered by the UN, which Iraq is a member of, the agency of protection of Iraq is representative. Representative agency does not necessarily need to be institutionalized. When the US negotiates rules with Russia regarding to the protection of Russians and Americans from accidental bilateral nuclear war, the agency of protection is representative. However, when the US and Russia protect Russians from nuclear accidents, agency is bilateral, as protection targets Russians only. When US and Russia negotiate global arrangements to protect the world from nuclear holocaust, the agency is ad hoc coalition, as the two countries do not represent the whole world.

Variables related to the method of protection (coded only for clauses with cosmopolitan referent object)

power: Number of clauses within a time period in question (in the case of biannual data the period is 6 months, in annual data it is one year, and in monthly data it is the specific month), with the word "protect" in all its forms referring to protection of cosmopolitan referent objects and defining the method of protection as power-centric.

A clause is power-biased if the means of protection:

1. prevents the acts of someone harming or threatening the people to be protected;
2. deters someone from harming or threatening the people to be protected;
3. rewards someone for not harming the people to be protected;
4. destroys or weakens someone who is harming or threatening the people to be protected.

It is not power-biased if protection is conducted:

1. by action that does not affect the threatening agent (power-neutral strategy: offering asylum etc.);
2. against non-intentional threat (power-neutral strategy: poverty, disease, etc.);
3. by means of self-restraint (power-negative strategy: protecting democracy by the leaders in an agreement that concerns the protector. Here agreements like the Helsinki Declaration signed by 35 nations in 1975 could be considered self-restraining, whilst democracy promotion in another country would be power biased as it deals with the behaviour of others).

Variables related to the definition of a conflict as a new war or as a protection war

usinterv: The United States intervenes in the conflict. The value of this dummy variable is 1, whenever UCDP conflict data (Allansson et al. 2017) defines the United States as a secondary party to the conflict (sidea2nd, sideb2nd) or if the US participates in the conflict with fatal air attacks. The latter category of conflict participation is not included in the UCDP data on conflict sides, but when using data for the investigation of new wars or protection wars, the definitions of the theory will require the including as conflict intervention, interventions that take place without troops stationed on the ground. The difference of war participation between UCDP data and this data is listed in the variable **intervchange** and the difference is derived from the theory in Chapter 2 of (Kivimäki 2019a). The value of this variable is 0, where the US is not a conflicting party as defined above.

frainterv: France intervenes in the conflict. The value of this dummy variable is 1, whenever UCDP conflict data (Allansson et al. 2017) defines France as a secondary party to the conflict (sidea2nd or sideb2nd) or if France participates in the conflict with fatal air attacks. The value of this variable is 0, where France is not a conflicting party as defined above.

ukinterv: The United Kingdom intervenes in the conflict. The value of this dummy variable is 1, whenever UCDP conflict data (Allansson et al. 2017) defines The United Kingdom as a secondary party to the conflict (sidea2nd, sideb2nd) or if the UK participates in the conflict with fatal air attacks. The value of this variable is 0, where the UK is not a conflicting party as defined above.

russinterv: Russia intervenes in the conflict. The value of this dummy variable is 1, whenever UCDP conflict data (Allansson et al. 2017) defines Russia as a secondary party to the conflict (sidea2nd or sideb2nd) or if Russia participates in the conflict with fatal air attacks. The value of this variable is 0, where Russia is not a conflicting party as defined above.

prcinterv: China intervenes in the conflict. The value of this dummy variable is 1, whenever UCDP conflict data (Allansson et al. 2017) defines China as a secondary party to the conflict (sidea2nd or sideb2nd) or if China participates in the conflict with fatal air attacks. The value of this variable is 0, where China is not a conflicting party as defined above.

intervchange: difference of rulings on conflict participation in this data and the UCDP data. The value of this variable is 0, when such difference does not exist, and 1 when this data claims intervention and UCDP data does not.

mostfragilelocation: This variable identifies from the UCDP **battlelocation** data the one that is most fragile, measured by **newwarfragility**.

newwarfragility: This variable is based on those elements of the State Fragility Index (Marshall, M.G. and Elzinga-Marshall, G. 2017) the correspond to the definition of state fragility in the theory of new wars, and that are not related to conflicts (to avoid tautology when correlated with conflict indicators). Variation is from 0 to 19, and the selection of elements is derived from the theory in Chapter 2 of (Kivimäki 2019a).

nwfragdummy: This variable defines if a conflict takes place in conditions of state fragility that theorists of new wars consider to prevail at the onset and during new wars. It is 1, when **newwarfragility** is 6 or above, and 0 if **newwarfragility** is below 6. The threshold of the new war condition of state fragility is derived from the theory in Chapter 2 of (Kivimäki 2019a).

newwar: This is a variable that defines whether a conflict is a New War. A conflict is a new war, iff

It takes in a country (**mostfragilelocation**) that is defined as fragile (**nwfragdummy=1**).

It is not intervened by big powers (**usinterv, frainterv, ukinterv, russinterv** and **prcinterv is 0).**

 protwar: This is a variable that defines whether a conflict is a New War. A conflict is a new war, iff

It takes in a country (**mostfragilelocation**) that is defined as fragile (**nwfragdummy=1**).

It is intervened by a big power (**usinterv, frainterv, ukinterv, russinterv** or **prcinterv is 1).**

All other variables are from the UCDP data
(http://www.pcr.uu.se/digitalAssets/167/a_167198-f_codebook_ucdp_prio-armed-conflict-dataset-v4_2013.pdf).

Acknowledgements

For help with the development of the nodes and testing the unambiguity of the coding rules, the author of this dataset is grateful to Riccardo Boscherini, Thomas Brewis, Maddy Holley and Astrid Vikström.

References

Allansson, M., Melander, E. and Themnér, L. 2017. Organized violence, 1989–2016. *Journal of Peace Research*, **54**(4), 536–50.

Kivimäki, Timo 2019a. The Failure to Protect. The Path to and Consequences of Humanitarian Interventionism. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Marshall, M.G. and Elzinga-Marshall, G. (2017). Global Report 2017: Conflict, Governance, and State Fragility, Vienna: Center for Systematic Peace.