

**Coding Manual for Territorial Claims Data
Issue Correlates of War (ICOW) Project**
Last updated 31 December 2013

Paul R. Hensel
Department of Political Science
University of North Texas
1155 Union Circle #305340
Denton, TX 76203-5017
phensel@unt.edu
<http://www.icow.org>

The latest version of this codebook, associated documentation, and officially released data may be downloaded from the ICOW web site at <<http://www.icow.org>>.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Introductory Notes | 1 |
| The ICOW General Codebook | 1 |
| Territorial Claims | 1 |
| Territorial Claim Salience | 1 |
| Territorial Claim Settlement Attempts | 2 |
| Sources and Coding Procedures | 2 |
| References | 2 |
| Revision History | 3 |
| Variables in the Dyadic Claim-Level Data File (TCCLAIM) | 4 |
| Variables in the Dyad-Year-Level Data File (TCDYADYR) | 8 |
| Variables in the Attempted Settlement Data Set (TCSETTLE) | 14 |
| Appendix: Sample Codesheets | 19 |
| ICOW Territorial Claim Coversheet | 19 |
| ICOW Dyadic Territorial Claim Codesheet | 20 |
| ICOW Attempted Settlement Codesheet | 21 |

Introductory Notes

The ICOW General Codebook

General data structure, coding rules, and coding procedures for the ICOW project (most of which are relevant both for this and for other ICOW data sets) are described in the ICOW general coding manual, which is also available on the ICOW web site (<http://www.icow.org>). This codebook focuses on the specific codesheets and variables for the ICOW territorial claims data set; coders and users of this data set must also read the general codebook to understand all coding rules relevant to this data set. General coding rules are only addressed here when there are important variants or additions beyond the material presented in the general codebook that are unique to territorial claims.

Territorial Claims

A territorial claim involves explicit contention between two or more states over the ownership of a piece of territory. Official representatives of the government of at least one state must lay explicit claim to territory being occupied, administered, or claimed by at least one other state. "Official representatives" include such individuals as a country's head of state, foreign minister, and other legitimate political or military officials who are speaking on behalf of the state's government and are authorized to make or state the government's foreign policy. Claims by individuals or organizations without the authority to speak on behalf of a state government are excluded, unless official state representatives support their claim through explicit statements.

An "explicit claim" must be a public statement by such an official representative, and must be phrased in unambiguous terms. That is, the official state representative making the claim must make clear that his or her government lays claim to specific territory that is presently occupied, administered, or claimed by one or more other specific states; vague or ambiguous statements are excluded. It is also important that this claim be made on behalf of the state making the claim, and indicate that this state desires control over the territory for itself. Claims made on behalf of third parties -- i.e., those in which the state making the claim argues that the current owner or occupier should not control the territory, and that the rightful owner should be a third party -- do not qualify. (Of course, if that third party makes a claim to the territory on its own behalf, then its claim would qualify). Furthermore, the claim should be opposed by the targeted state, because this is a data set of *contentious* issues; situations where two states work together to exchange small territories for mutual economic benefit do not qualify as claims.

As with all other ICOW data sets, it should be noted that this definition does not require any specific form of contention over the territorial claim. In particular, it does not require that one or both sides resort to militarized force over the claim. Similarly, it does not require that the adversaries negotiate over the claim, submit it to third party arbitration or adjudication, or even take any action whatsoever over the claim. Such actions over a claim are more properly the subject of systematic analysis using complete compilations of all territorial claims, rather than tools to be used for case selection.

Territorial Claim Salience

The salience of territory is measured through a number of specific indicators. Many of the indicators address general characteristics of the claimed territory, while others are more relative and hold different value for certain states than for others. General characteristics include the contents of the territory, such as its area, its population, and whether or not it is known or believed to include valuable resources, a strategic (military or economic) position, and one or both sides' ethnic or religious kinsmen. Relative characteristics include the territory's distance from each claimant, as well as whether or not it is seen by each participant as homeland territory or as a dependency. Each of these variables can be seen as contributing to the overall value or salience of the territory for the claimants, with territory generally being seen as more valuable in the presence of each of these indicators than in their absence.

Paul Hensel's March 2001 *International Studies Quarterly* article introduces a twelve-point salience index that draws from six of these indicators. This index was modified in Paul Hensel and Sara Mitchell's 2005 *GeoJournal* article and subsequent ICOW research, replacing the original indicator of mainland/offshore status with one indicating whether each claimant state had exercised sovereignty over the territory within the previous

two centuries. The mainland/offshore indicator is still included in the dataset, though, so interested scholars could still use it in their own research, and many other possible indices or measures could also be devised using the indicators that are included in the data set.

In this ICOW salience measure each of the six indicators contributes zero, one, or two points to the overall twelve-point index, depending on whether or not it is considered to be present for neither, one, or both countries in the dyad. For three indicators of the tangible salience of the territory -- a resource or strategic basis for the claim, as well as the presence of permanent settlements in the claimed territory -- either side could be expected to benefit from possession of the territory, so the indicator contributes either zero or two points to the index. For the remaining three indicators of the intangible salience of the territory -- claims to what is considered homeland rather than dependent territory, an ethnic/identity connection to the territory and its residents, and a history of exercising sovereignty over it -- each claimant state may have different uses in mind for the territory (as with Guatemalan claims to Belize before its independence, which Guatemala viewed as part of the Guatemalan homeland but Britain ruled as an overseas dependency); one point is contributed to the overall index for each state that qualifies.

Territorial Claim Settlement Attempts

To be included in the data set, settlement attempts during ongoing territorial claims must attempt to resolve part or all of the claim itself, or must at least attempt to manage the subject of the claim. As will be seen in the description of the attempted settlement data presented later in this codebook, this allows for four distinct types of settlement attempt: (1) functional, which involves attempts to manage the territory in question -- perhaps through the establishment of demilitarized zones or guarantees of free commerce or navigation through the territory -- but not to settle the ownership of the territory; (2) procedural, which involves discussion of future negotiations or procedures to settle the claim -- such as negotiations on submitting the claim to the World Court or to some other actor or body -- but not an attempt to settle the claim directly in the present talks; (3) attempts to settle the ownership of part but not all of the claimed territory, which if successful would be able to reduce the amount of claimed territory and perhaps move toward a more final settlement; and (4) attempts to settle the ownership of the entire claimed territory, which if successful would presumably be able to end the entire claim.

Each settlement attempt that meets any of these four descriptions is subjected to additional data collection. Variables to be collected cover the dates on which the attempt began and ended, the type of settlement attempt, and the effectiveness of the attempt. It must be noted that any attempt meeting one of these descriptions should be included in the data set, regardless of whether or not it led to agreement on a final treaty or agreement, or whether or not any resulting agreement is actually ratified or executed by the signatories. Such questions are more properly the subject of systematic analysis using complete compilations of all attempts to settle territorial claims, rather than tools to be used for case selection.

Sources and Coding Procedures

The general coding procedures for the territorial claims data set are the same as for any other ICOW data set, as described in the general codebook.

References

Paul R. Hensel (2001). "Contentious Issues and World Politics: Territorial Claims in the Americas, 1816-1992." *International Studies Quarterly* 45, 1 (March): 81-109.

Paul R. Hensel and Sara McLaughlin Mitchell (2005). "Issue Indivisibility and Territorial Claims." *GeoJournal* 64, 4 (December): 275-285.

Paul R. Hensel, Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, Thomas E. Sowers II, and Clayton L. Thyne (2008). "Bones of Contention: Comparing Territorial, Maritime, and River Issues." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52, 1 (February): 117-143.

Revision History

- 31 December 2013: Clarified the description of Resolved, Endviol, Chal, and Tgt.
- 8 February 2013: Updated this coding manual to reflect changes in the upcoming release of version 1.2 of the ICOW data:
 - Updated the sample codesheet at the end to reflect some improvements that have been made to the basic codesheet since the previous version of this codebook was released.
 - Added the variables Reslist (list of resources in claimed territory) and Stratdes (description of strategic value of territory).
 - Added clarifications to the description of the variables Pop (population of claimed territory), Resource (resources in claimed territory), Homechal/Hometgt (whether the claimed territory is considered homeland or dependent territory), and Contchal/Conttgt (contiguity of the claimed territory to the claimant states).
 - Revised coding of Resolved variable (coding ongoing claims as missing and splitting third party resolution into binding and non-binding third party activities).
 - Also made the table of contents clickable, to make this easier to use with iPads and similar devices.
- 13 May 2005: Added the Colonial variable (colonial legacies) to TCCLAIM and the HistChal and HistTgt variables (historical sovereignty over claimed territory) to TCDYADYR. Also updated the document to fix minor formatting and clarification issues.
- Prior revisions: Changes in previous versions of this codebook were not recorded.

Variables in the Dyadic Claim-Level Data File (TCCLAIM)

CLAIM: Number of Claim

Number: *An ICOW code number assigned to each claim to identify it (no substantive interpretation)*

Notes

- Leave this space on the codesheet blank until all candidate cases have been collected for the entire geographic region that you have been assigned.
- Where possible, ICOW claim numbers should correspond to the COW nation-state numbers in each geographic region or sub-region (e.g., all South American ICOW claims should fall between numbers 100-199, just like South American COW nation-states).
- Within each geographic region or sub-region, ICOW claim numbers should follow the general order of the COW interstate system codes for the primary dyad in each claim (see "DYAD," below). That is, a Colombia-Peru claim (100-135) should be listed before a Venezuela-Brazil claim (101-140). For claims involving a colonial power on at least one side, try to assign a claim number based on the COW code for the dependency rather than for the colonizer (so the Guyana-Suriname claim should be assigned a number based on states #110 Guyana and #115 Suriname rather than #200 UK and #210 Netherlands); see the project director for COW codes for entities that are not currently members of the COW interstate system.
- When assigning claim numbers, be sure to leave at least one unused number between each two claims, to allow for the addition of future claims if needed.

NAME: Name of Claim

Text: *Name of the territory or claim under dispute*

Notes

- If the claimed territory is not commonly referred to by a single name, choose the most important geographic feature or the most important city located in the claimed area -- i.e., something that will make it obvious which territory is being claimed.

DYADNUM: Number of Dyadic Claim

Number: *An ICOW code number assigned to identify each dyad involved in each claim*

Notes

- Dyadic claims all have a Dyadnum value of "1".
- Multilateral claims are divided into dyads in approximate chronological order, as well as can be determined. For overlapping periods in which multiple dyadic claims are active, order dyads by approximate order of importance within the claim (which dyad involves the largest portion of territory, or is the most active?).

CHAL: Challenger state in this dyadic claim

Number: *COW country code of the actor in this dyad making the initial claim*

Notes

- When one state owns or administers the entire territory in question, the other state is coded as the claim challenger, because it seeks to obtain territory that another state currently possesses.
- Where both states lay claim to the territory, the challenger refers to the state that is most active in pressing the claim, or if this can not be determined, the state that possesses or administers less of the territory in question at the start of the claim.

TGT: Target state in this dyadic claim

Number: *COW country code of state in this dyad targeted by the challenger*

Notes

- When one state owns or administers the entire territory in question, that state is coded as the claim target, because the other state (challenger) seeks to obtain territory that it currently possesses.
- Where both states lay claim to the territory, the target refers to the state that possesses or administers more of the territory in question at the start of the claim.

BEGCLAIM: Start Date of Dyadic Claim

Number: *The month and year that the claim began*

Notes

- This date takes the form YYYYMM, as in 181601, 194508, or 200012.

ENDCLAIM: End Date of Dyadic Claim

Number: *The month and year that the claim ended*

-9: *Claim coded as ongoing past the current end of the data set*

Notes

- This date takes the form YYYYMM, as in 181601, 194508, or 200012.

RESOLVED: Type of Resolution of Claim

-9: Ongoing *The claim is not resolved (as of the current end of the data set)*

1: Dropped by Challenger *The claim is simply dropped (the challenger simply stops pursuing it sometime during this year, and does not pursue it any further)*

2: Renounced by Challenger *The claim is renounced through an official statement by the leadership of the challenger (but not through any bilateral agreement with the adversary, or any third-party assistance)*

3: *(This value is no longer used; as of version 1.2 of the ICOW data, this value has been split into binding and non-binding third party activities, values 12 and 13 in the revised list)*

4: Bilateral *The disputants formally settle the claim in a bilateral treaty or agreement (including any bilateral agreement qualifying for inclusion in TCSETTLE)*

5: Independence *This dyadic claim is replaced by a new claim due to the independence of a former dependency (e.g., the dyadic Guatemala-Britain claim over Belize ends with Belize's independence, when it is replaced by a new dyadic claim between Guatemala and Belize)*

6: Actor Leaves System *This particular dyadic claim ends when either the challenger or target state leaves the COW interstate system (e.g., the Haiti-U.S. claim over Navassa Island ends when Haiti leaves the COW system in 1915, and a new dyadic claim between the same states begins when Haiti rejoins the system in 1934; a number of claims involving Austria-Hungary also end this way when the empire leaves the system in 1918, some of which restart when the relevant successor -- Austria or Hungary -- joins the system in 1918 or 1919). Note that if the actor leaves the system due to military action over this claim (e.g. an invasion to conquer the territory) it should be coded as ending through conquest/occupation.*

7: Military Conquest/Occupation *This dyadic claim ends with the military occupation of the claimed territory by the challenger state (e.g., when Chile occupies the Bolivian territory around Antofagasta, the Chilean claim against Bolivia ends by military occupation) -- Note that this may lead to a reversal of the challenger-target distinction, as the former target becomes the challenger in a new claim seeking to regain its lost territory*

8: Dropped by Target *The target state simply stops its objections to the challenger's claims, without any formal agreement*

9: Renounced by Target *The target state explicitly renounces its objections to the challenger's claims, without any formal agreement*

10: Plebiscite *The claim ended because of a plebiscite in the disputed area, the results of which were accepted by both sides. Note that this only refers to plebiscites where the outcome is actually in doubt by both sides; plebiscites that are called to ratify an accepted and implemented treaty do not count in this regard, and the claim should be coded as ending with the treaty.*

11: Claim No Longer Relevant *The claim is no longer relevant because the territory has ceased to exist (e.g., for claims to islands that disappear beneath the waves) or is no longer in the possession of the target state (e.g., for claims to territory that is transferred from the target state to another state).*

12: Binding Third Party Decision *The claim ends through a legally binding third party decision (adjudication or arbitration).*

13: Non-binding Third Party Activity *The claim ends with the non-binding assistance of a third party (good offices, inquiry, conciliation, mediation, or multilateral negotiations).*

14: Peace Conference *The claim ends with the non-binding assistance of a multilateral peace conference that follows the end of a regional or global war, involving war participants and perhaps other interested parties attempts to adjust borders, as well as settling other postwar issues such as war guilt or reparations -- an example is the post-World War I Paris Peace Conference and its associated Treaty of Versailles.*

Notes

- This variable should be consistent with the "Claimend" variable from TCSETTLE. If the claim is considered settled through bilateral or third party means, then this coding should be reflected in one of the settlement attempts included in TCSETTLE (and if a settlement attempt is coded as ending the claim in TCSETTLE, then this should be reflected in the "Resolved" variable in TCCLAIM).

ENDVIOL: Role of Organized Violence in End of Claim

1: Violence *This claim ended due to the threat or use of large-scale organized violence between the claimant states over this claim*

0: None *The claim did not end in this way*

-9: *Claim coded as ongoing past the current end of the data set*

Notes

- "Violence" refers to the threat or use of large-scale organized violence -- this does not necessarily have to meet the COW definition of interstate war (1000 dead in sustained combat between regular forces.) It may occur through military action or occupation that involved fewer casualties, or even no casualties if one state backs down because of military threats to carry out large-scale violence or occupation of the claimed territory.

- Note that a value of 1 (violent ending) must be coded for any claim that is coded for the RESOLVED variable as ending through military conquest or occupation.

- A claim will be coded as ending through violence if a peaceful (bilateral or third party) settlement over the claim largely codifies the results of organized violence (e.g., when a subsequent treaty or peace conference confirms possession of the territory by the victor of the earlier fighting).

- Ending through violence also includes cases of unsuccessful violence/war, which are followed by one side dropping its claim (e.g., the Chincha Islands between Spain and Peru, where Spain's unsuccessful military adventure ended with the dropping of the claim).

- This variable is NOT meant to identify cases where the violence was not organized (e.g., riots or other non-official forces) or did not directly involve these two claimants or this territorial claim (e.g., when the U.S. occupied Haiti or the Dominican Republic, leading to the end of their claims against some additional party because the claimant left the international system). The purpose of this variable is to identify cases where the claim was resolved through violence between the claimant states in the dyad.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON CODESHEET

Actors

- Be sure to list all nation-state actors involved in the claim, along with their COW code numbers and the dates when they were in the COW interstate system.

Dyads

- Be sure to list all dyads involved in the claim on the coversheet.

- The "Dyadnum" headings refer to the ICOW code number for each dyad, which will be determined once all claim-level and dyad-year-level information has been collected for the claim.

Brief Description of Issue

- This should be a one-paragraph summary of the issue in question. For the territorial claims data set, this means a brief summary of which territory is under contention. If possible, this description should also give

some idea about events before (but leading up to) the claim, the circumstances under which the claim was first begun, and the original reasoning behind the claim.

- For example, the sample codesheet attached at the end of this codebook gives a brief description of the claimed territory (Aves Island), including the distance from the island to Venezuela and to several Caribbean islands (including the Dutch possessions that allowed a Dutch claim to an island so far from Europe), the historical discovery and usage of the island before the claim, and the Venezuelan reasoning in raising the claim when they did.
- Where multiple dyads exist for a claim to a given piece of territory, each dyad should have a separate one-paragraph entry in this section of the codesheet (with an italicized subheading "Dyad #1" and so on). This will allow easy determination of what has changed across the claim's various dyads, whether this means a different set of countries claiming the territory (perhaps due to the independence of a colony) or the original claimants resolving much but not all of their claim.

Brief Chronology of Claim

- This should be a one- or two-paragraph summary of major actions taken during the claim. For example, significant negotiations, third party awards, or major crises or wars should be mentioned here. This section should also briefly mention how, when, and (to the extent this can be determined) why the claim ended.
- When multiple dyads exist for a claim to a given piece of territory, each dyad should have a separate one- or two-paragraph entry in this section of the codesheet (with an italicized subheading "Dyad #1" and so on). This will allow easy determination of what happened during each dyadic claim, rather than forcing researchers to read through the entire claim chronology.
- Note that this brief chronology should be brief and should be in complete paragraph form, rather than event-by-event chronology form. The more detailed chronologies belong in the dyadic codesheets, rather than in these larger claim-level coversheets.

Coding Notes

- Details on the coding for the case, where relevant (explanations of why the case was coded as it was, particularly in controversial or unclear situations, with references where possible).

References

- List of sources consulted (provide full bibliographic citation for each source). Note that this is the only listing of references for the entire codesheet; in the original version of the codesheets, there was a space for references in the claim coversheet as well as each dyadic claim codesheet and each settlement attempt codesheet, but that led to confusion, duplication of sources in multiple places, and in some cases the failure to list a source anywhere.

Variables in the Dyad-Year-Level Data File (TCDYADYR)

CLAIM: Number of Claim (*See description under TCCLAIM data*)

DYADNUM: Number of Dyadic Claim (*See description under TCCLAIM data*)

CHAL: Challenger State (*See description under TCCLAIM data*)

TGT: Target State (*See description under TCCLAIM data*)

YEAR: Year of This Observation

- Because TCDYADYR is a dyad-year-level data set; this variable only appears in the computerized dyad-year version of the data set, not the hand-written dyad-level codesheet.

HOMECHAL: Homeland / Colony Claim Dummy for Challenger State

HOMETGT: Homeland / Colony Claim Dummy for Target State

- 1: Homeland** *The claimed territory is administered or claimed as homeland territory of the state in question (i.e., it is not seen as a colony or dependency)*
- 0: Dependency** *The claim only involves territory that is part of the state's colony, possession, or other dependent territory (i.e., not part of the state's homeland)*

Notes

- The challenger and target may have different values for this variable. For example, Argentina claims the Falkland/Malvinas Islands as part of the Argentina homeland, while Great Britain administers the islands as a dependency.
- This variable may change in value across dyadic claims. For example, Guatemala claims Belize as Guatemalan homeland territory, which remains consistent. For the target in that claim, though, Great Britain administered Belize as a dependency -- but after Belizean independence, Belize became the target, at which point HOMETGT took on a different "homeland" value for the new Guatemala-Belize dyad than it had for the earlier Guatemala-Britain dyad.
- This should be easy to determine for most cases, where a territory is either seen as part of the national territory, or as part of a colony or dependency. For land empires (such as the Ottoman, Hapsburg, or Russian Empires), though, the distinction may not be obvious. In such cases the coder must determine whether the area is treated as an area that would be considered part of the core national territory (e.g. if large numbers of the empire's dominant ethnic group settle in the area and/or its inhabitants are given the same rights and privileges as citizens of the core national territory) or as a peripheral part of the empire that corresponds more closely to an overseas colony.

OFFSHORE: Offshore / Mainland Claim Dummy

- 1: Offshore** *The claim only involves one or more islands (NOT including claims to territory located on the primary territory of island countries, such as Cuba, Australia, or the four islands of Japan -- but offshore islands such as the Kuriles WOULD be treated as islands)*
- 0: Mainland** *The claim only involves mainland territory (including the primary territory of island countries)*

Notes

- This variable can change values across dyadic claims. For example, the U.S. claim to Cuba is coded as offshore when Spain was the claim target state, because the island of Cuba was located offshore from Spain. If the U.S. had persisted in claiming Cuba after Cuban independence, though, the claim would be coded as "mainland," because it involves the main territory of the target state; the Cuba-U.S. claim over Guantánamo Bay is coded as "mainland" for the same reason.

CONTCHAL: Contiguity of Claimed Territory to Challenger State

CONTTGT: Contiguity of Claimed Territory to Target State

- 0: Not Contiguous** (*the claimed territory does not meet any of the following criteria*)
- 1: Land/River** *The claimed territory directly adjoins the territory of the state in question, separated only*

by a land or river border

2: 1-12 miles *The claimed territory is separated from the state by only 1-12 miles of water*

3: 13-24 miles

4: 25-150 miles

5: 151-400 miles

Notes

- Note that this refers only to the distance between the claimed territory and the challenger/target state's homeland territory -- it does not include the distance to the nearest colonial territory or any other such dependency (so European actors are never contiguous to Latin American territory, regardless of their colonies in the region).
- Contiguity by water assumes that there is a direct water route between the claim and the state's homeland territory, with no other countries in between. Similarly, land contiguity assumes that there is a direct land border; distance across a third state's territory -- no matter how narrow -- do not count and must be coded as "not contiguous."
- For land empires (such as the Ottoman, Hapsburg, or Russian Empires), a claimed territory should be coded as contiguous if it touches (or has a direct water route to) the empire's main territory (the core territory of the empire that includes the capital, even if there are several other units of the same empire between this territory and the capital itself).

ENTIRECL: Does Claim Involve Entire Target State?

1: Yes *The challenger state refuses to recognize the independence and sovereignty of the other state, and seeks to annex the entire territory of the target.*

0: No *The challenger claims some limited portion of the target state's territory, rather than the entire target.*

Notes

- If the target state in the dyadic claim is a colonial power defending a dependency, then this variable should be coded as 0 ("no"), because the claim doesn't involve the entire target state.
- Note that this variable should then be coded as 1 ("yes") as soon as the dependency becomes independent and becomes the target state in the claim, although that would be the start of a new dyadic claim.

AREA: Area of the Claimed Territory

Number: *The area of the claimed territory, measured in square miles.*

-9: *Missing / could not be determined*

Notes

- If the area must be estimated, make clear in the coding notes what sources and reasoning led you to the estimate you used.
- Values lower than 1 square mile should be coded as 1.

POP: Population of the Claimed Territory

1: No Permanent Population *Claimed territory includes no permanent population*

2: Limited Population *Territory contains some towns or villages, but no major cities*

3: Heavily Populated *Territory contains one or more cities of 100,000+ population*

Notes

- Be sure to note on the codesheet the name of any city in the claimed territory that might possibly reach 100,000 population in the foreseeable future -- this can then be used later on to double-check population figures.
- Where possible, be sure to identify in the "coding notes" section any of these cities that reach 100,000 population, as well as the approximate year that this threshold is reached. One good source for determining this is Victor Showers' book *World Facts and Figures* (New York, NY: Wiley, 1979 -- currently available at UNT's library in remote storage, but the project director has xeroxed the relevant pages), which reports population estimates for cities at a number of different times over the past two centuries.
- Note that garrisons of military bases, or scientists at research stations, are not considered permanent

population of a territory.

RESOURCE: Resource Basis for Claim?

1: Yes *Economically valuable resources were known or believed to be included in the territory at the time of the claim*

0: No *No such resources were believed to be contained in the territory at that time*

Notes

- Be sure to note on the codesheet exactly which resource(s) are involved -- this will be used for the following variable, "Reslist." Note that there may be multiple resources in a single territory.
- Where possible, be sure to note when these resources are first discovered in the claimed territory (or first believed to be present) -- this will be important in constructing the dyad-year data set for claims to territory whose known (or believed) resource supply changes over the course of a claim.
- Where relevant, also note if and when these resources are discovered *not* to be present (e.g., oil was thought to be present in the territory, until drilling in 1962 revealed otherwise)..
- Examples of the types of resources that are relevant (some of them much more important in the 19th century than today), broken into rough categories:
 - Energy/Fuel: anthracite, coal, coke, lignite, natural gas, oil
 - Fertilizers: guano, nitrates, phosphate/phosphorus, potash
 - Food: fertile agricultural land, fish, salt, shellfish, spices, whaling
 - Industrial metals: aluminum, bauxite, chromium, cobalt, copper, iron ore, lead, manganese, nickel, sulfur, tin, titanium, tungsten, zinc
 - Precious metals: diamonds, gold, platinum, silver
 - Other resources: fresh water (including usage for irrigation or hydroelectric power generation as well as drinking), furs, radium, rubber, timber, uranium
 - This list is not definitive -- there may be other resources that are not listed here, but that state leaders considered valuable enough to be worth pursuing in the claim. If there are any questions about whether a particular resource should be included, please ask Paul Hensel.
- To be coded, a resource must be available (or thought to be available) in commercially exploitable quantities, that could meet at least part of a state's own needs and/or could be exported. Small fisheries or timber-quality forests, for example, should not be coded as creating a resource basis for a claim if they are only usable by local residents in nearby villages, but they should be coded if they could be used more widely within the state itself or if they could be exported. Similarly, evidence that the territory included farms or agricultural crops should not automatically lead to coding the presence of resources; it must be described as unusually fertile agricultural land, which would presumably produce enough for more of the state's needs or for export than just for local consumption.
- It is not necessary to find explicit evidence documenting that the leaders on one or both states listed these resources as a motivating factor behind their claim. Leaders who are aware that a territory contains oil, for example, will not necessarily make public statements that they wish to acquire/retain sovereignty of the territory because of its oil wealth. (Indeed, some leaders may go out of their way to emphasize historical or cultural connections to the territory when the resource wealth is even more important to them.) It is important, though, to find evidence that the territory was known/believed to contain these resources *at the time of the claim*; this can be established through contemporary news accounts, historical books or documents, or gazetteers or geographical dictionaries published while the claim was ongoing. (Paul Hensel has a number of gazetteers from the 19th century, dating as far back as 1807, to help with this; most libraries will presumably also have relevant materials.)

RESLIST: List of Resources in Claimed Territory

XXX: *Text field listed all resources believed to be in the claimed territory.*

Notes

- This should be a list of all resources that are relevant, as described above. Make sure that coding notes are added to the codesheet with as much detail as possible about the type, quality, or quantity of each resource.

STRATLOC: Does Claim Involve a Strategic Location?

1: Yes *The claim involved territory that was thought at the time to have strategic value*

0: No *The territory was not thought to be strategic at the time of the claim*

Notes

- "Strategic value" could include territory that is seen as valuable strategically in either a military or economic sense, and includes (but is not necessarily limited to) the following:

- Strategic military value:

- connection between two territories: the territory would offer a state the ability to connect two currently distinct territories that it already administers.

- security threat (defensive positions): the territory includes valuable defensive positions that can be used to detect and/or stop an attack by the opponent, or in other hands, to threaten or harass the opponent. This is particularly relevant when the territory is currently used, or has recently been used, as a staging point for overt or covert military operations by or against this opponent.

- mountain passes: the territory gives control over mountain passes, which can be an important military advantage.

- military base(s): the territory includes one or more military bases that could be used for military operations against this opponent or another potential enemy. Note that this also includes airbases, naval bases, or coaling or supply stations.

- Strategic economic value:

- access to the sea: the territory offers access to the sea; only relevant for otherwise landlocked states with no other route to the sea

- harbor/port: the territory offers at least one important harbor or port -- particularly if it is a warm water port (for states that otherwise do not have any ports that are not frozen in during winter), a deep water port, or a good anchorage in an area where there are not many.

- trade route: the territory includes access to, or control over, important international shipping lanes or trade routes; this includes straits and other maritime chokepoints.

- river navigation: the territory allows control over navigation of an important river.

- canal route: the territory contains a current or potential waterway that could be used to link two major bodies of water.

- railroad/transportation/communications hub: the territory is an important center for land transportation

- Be sure to indicate on the codesheet and in the coding notes what makes the territory strategically valuable.

STRATDES: Description of Strategic Value of Claimed Territory

XXX: *Text field summarizing all strategic benefits of the claimed territory.*

Notes

- This should be a list of any relevant strategic value of the territory, as described above. Make sure that coding notes are added to the codesheet with as much detail as possible.

IDENCHAL: Identity Issue for Challenger State?

IDENTGT: Identity Issue for Target State?

1: Yes *The claimed territory includes significant portions of ethnic, religious, linguistic, or other identity groups linked to the challenger/target state*

0: No *No identity-based connection to this territory for this state*

Notes

- Be sure to note on the codesheet which ethnic, religious, linguistic, or other identity group(s) are relevant. Also give any additional details such as approximate size of the affected population, and note when these identity issues are first appear in the claim and when they appear to end.

- "Significant portions" is difficult to quantify. Basically, this means that official representatives of this state explicitly refer to this identity group in discussing the claim, or at least that credible historical sources refer to an identity-based concern in the claim for this state.

- For territorial claims involving dependent territory of at least one of the claimants, rather than homeland territory for both sides, the coding of identity issues must be based on the colonizer rather than on the colony. For example, if Great Britain is involved in a claim in Africa or Asia, the identity variable must be based on whether or not the claimed territory includes significant portions of ethnic, religious, linguistic, or other identity groups linked to Great Britain (rather than to the British dependency that is being claimed). If the claim continues (or re-starts) after the dependency becomes independent, then the identity basis for the claim must be reevaluated based on that now-independent state.

HISTCHAL: Historical Sovereignty over Territory by Challenger State?

HISTTGT: Historical Sovereignty over Territory by Target State?

1: Yes *The challenger/target state has exercised sovereignty over the claimed territory for at least one of the previous 200 years*

0: No *The state has never exercised sovereignty over this territory in the previous 200 years*

Notes

- The purpose of these two variables is to help measure the intangible or psychological value of the claimed territory. The intuition behind these variables is that a territory has greater psychological value to a state that has exercised sovereignty over it (either currently or in the past) -- and whose residents have thus developed emotional attachments to the land, may have ancestral lands and properties in the area, and may even have buried relatives there -- than to a state that would like to control the territory but has never done so.
- Sovereignty: This variable indicates separately for each of the two claimant states whether it has exercised sovereignty over the territory. To be coded, there must have been an actual exercise of sovereignty, not just theoretical legal title to the land -- if the state in question (and its citizens) never really occupied or administered the land, there is little intangible tie to the territory that can be measured. Also, this should not be coded where neither side has actual sovereignty over the territory, as in wilderness territory that both sides' citizens may be exploring but that neither government really controls.
- Duration: This sovereignty must have lasted for at least one full year, and can not include temporary military occupations (unless the territory was administered with the clear understanding that it was being annexed).
- 200 years: Intangible attachments to territory can endure for long periods of time, but we can not allow an infinite time horizon. Some claims follow tenuous connections to long-defunct historical entities (such as the Biblical Israelites, Frankish or Slavic tribes, and so on). To keep it reasonable, this variable should only be coded with respect to sovereignty within the previous two hundred years before the observation in question.
- Former colonies: For colonial inheritance, the independent state should be considered to have possessed all lands that were possessed by its predecessor entity during the colonial era. For questions where multiple states emerge from a single colony or dependency, the coder must determine whether each state (challenger and/or target) represents the successor of an entity that exercised sovereignty over the territory for at least one full year during the time period covered by this variable; this should generally be based on internal administrative borders within the colony, at least to the extent that these correspond to the post-independence states.
- Entire territory?: To be coded as exercising historical sovereignty, the entity in question (or its historical predecessor) must have controlled *a significant portion* of the territory in question. There is no requirement that *all* of the territory must have been controlled, as many territories' borders shift over time, and requiring the entire territory could render coding almost impossible.
- Relationship to homeland variables?: This historical sovereignty variable should be coded for all types of territory that were ruled by a given state or entity, whether homeland territory or colonial/dependent territory. Even for dependent territories, we believe that there is greater intangible value for a colony that has been ruled by the state previously than for one that has not.
- The codesheet will leave a space to note the last year when each state is considered to have had sovereignty over the territory in question as described in this codebook.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON CODESHEET

Coding Notes

- Details on the coding for the case, where relevant (explanations of why the case was coded as it was,

particularly in controversial or unclear situations, with references where possible).

- Note any time that claim characteristics change (e.g., initial discovery of resources, change in population category as a city reaches 100,000 residents, a reduction in claimed area as part of the claim is settled, or reversal of the challenger and target states due to a change in possession).

Brief Chronology

- When and how was the claim first made, and by which actor(s)?
- What significant events (if any) occurred during (or because of) the claim?
- Were there any dormant periods in the claim, and if so, how was the claim restarted?
- When do we consider the claim to have ended, and why?

Militarized Conflict between the Participants

- This section of the codesheet will allow us to check the current COW dispute data for missing militarized disputes, incorrect territorial-versus-other issue codings, and so on. Don't worry about filling this out while initially coding the case -- this is something that will be addressed later, as the project director codes MIDs for correspondence with specific territorial claims.

Territorial Changes between the Participants

- This section of the codesheet will allow us to check the current COW territorial change data for missing cases. Don't worry about filling this out while initially coding the case -- this is something that will be addressed later, as the project director codes COW territorial changes for correspondence with specific territorial claims.

References

- Be sure to list all referenced sources in the References list on the claim coversheet.

Variables in the Attempted Settlement Data Set (TCSETTLE)

CLAIM: Number of Claim *(See description under TCCLAIM data)*

DYADNUM: Number of Dyadic Claim *(See description under TCCLAIM data)*

CHAL: Challenger State *(See description under TCCLAIM data)*

TGT: Target State *(See description under TCCLAIM data)*

SETTNUM: Number of Attempted Settlement

Number: *An ICOW code number for this settlement attempt*

Notes

- These code numbers are chronological, so the first settlement attempt for a given claim should have the number 01.

BEGSETT: Start Date of Attempted Settlement

Number: *The month and year that the settlement attempt began*

Notes

- This date takes the form YYYYMM, as in 181601, 194508, or 200012.
- This is the date that the actual attempted settlement began, not the date on which it was first suggested; additional details such as the date it was suggested should go in the case's brief chronology (if it can be determined).

ENDSETT: End Date of Attempted Settlement

Number: *The month and year that the settlement ended*

-999: *attempted settlement remains ongoing*

Notes

- This date takes the form YYYYMM, as in 181601, 194508, or 200012.
- For cases ending in successful agreements: use the date of the agreement.
- For other cases: use the date that the settlement attempt stopped (negotiations were broken off, an arbitration decision was handed down but rejected, etc.).

TYPESETT: Type of Attempted Settlement

1: Bilateral Negotiations *(between the claimants, without any third-party assistance)*

2: Good Offices *(third party attempts to facilitate communication between claimants)*

3: Inquiry or Conciliation *(essentially fact-finding mission by third party)*

4: Mediation *(third party is allowed to make suggestions toward settlement)*

5: Arbitration *(claimants submit claim to ad hoc third party for binding decision)*

6: Adjudication *(claimants submit claim to established legal institution for binding decision)*

7: Other Third-Party Settlement Attempt *(describe on codesheet)*

8: Multilateral Negotiations *(third parties included as equal, interested participants, rather than as neutral parties attempting to facilitate a bilateral settlement between the claimants)*

9: Peace Conference *(after the end of a regional or global war, a peace conference of war participants and perhaps other interested parties attempts to adjust borders, as well as settling other postwar issues such as war guilt or reparations -- an example is the post-World War I Paris Peace Conference and its associated Treaty of Versailles. This is somewhat similar to binding settlement attempts such as arbitration, in that the claimants themselves become subject to the decision reached by the peace conference, but the defeated party from the war may not be treated as possessing equal rights during the process, and may not even have the ability to present its own case. This is distinct from, say, mediation because the conference itself makes the decision regarding the disposition of the issue; if the parties are required to reach their own agreement with outside assistance/pressure, then the settlement attempt involves mediation rather than a peace conference.)*

Notes

- See the above discussion of types of settlement attempts for more detail on each type.
- When one actor offers good offices as a way to facilitate arbitration or mediation, code the more involved settlement attempt (in this case, the arbitration or mediation), but make a note of the good offices on the codesheet. Similarly, if a third party becomes involved in the middle of a period of bilateral negotiations by offering good offices to keep the negotiations from ending, code the entire settlement attempt as involving good offices, and make a note on the codesheet.

TYPEACT: Type of Third Party Actor in Attempted Settlement

- 9: *None (Bilateral settlement attempt)*
- 0: *Claim participants' citizens, or private citizens not acting on behalf of any state government (see note below under ACTOR1)*
- 1: *Minor power(s) only, at least one of which is located in the same region as the claim*
- 2: *Minor power(s) in other region only (i.e., no major power, and no minor power(s) in same region as claim)*
- 3: *COW Major power(s) only, at least one of which is located in the same region as the claim*
- 4: *COW Major power(s) in other region only*
- 5: *Regional IGO (intergovernmental organization) in same region as claim*
- 6: *Regional NGO (non-governmental organization) in same region as claim*
- 7: *Regional IGO in other region*
- 8: *Regional NGO in other region*
- 9: *Global IGO (including the ICJ and similar organizations)*
- 10: *Global NGO (including the Vatican)*
- 11: *Individual (not officially representing any other governments or organizations)*
- 12: *Minor powers, at least one of which is from the same region as the claim; AND Major power(s), at least one of which is from same region as claim*
- 13: *Minor powers, at least one of which is from the same region as the claim; AND Major power(s) from other region(s) only*
- 14: *Minor power(s) from other region(s) but not from the same region as the claim; AND Major power(s), at least one of which is from same region as claim*
- 15: *Minor power(s) from other region(s) but not from the same region as the claim; AND Major power(s) from other region(s) only*

Notes

- "Region" refers to the traditional COW conception of regions, as given in the COW interstate system list (actors 1-199 = Americas, 200-399 = Europe, 400-599 = Africa, 600-699 = Middle East, 700-899 = Asia, and 900-999 = Oceania). Note that this means that (for example) North, Central, and South America and the Caribbean are all considered to be part of the same region.
- "Major power" status is taken from the latest version of the COW interstate system list.
- Note that there is only one TYPEACT variable, although there could potentially be as many as six different third party actors involved in the claim. Code TYPEACT with respect to all third parties, taken as a whole -- note that this variable allows for multiple third party actors.
- Record any details about the specific individual or organization involved on the codesheet, if possible (was this a foreign king? foreign minister? military or religious leader?)

ACTOR1-ACTOR6: Third Party Actor(s) in Attempted Settlement

- Number:** *Code number for third party actor involved in settlement attempt*
- 0: *Claim participants (e.g., when the claimants appoint their own citizens to a tribunal to settle the claim. Citizens not acting on behalf of any government should be coded as 999, "private citizens.")*
- 9: *None (bilateral attempt, no third party involved)*

Notes

- Due to the difficulty of rating as many as six or more actors for the prominence or effectiveness of their efforts as third parties, the actors should be recorded in ascending order of COW nation-state code numbers. If there

are more than six actors, though, try to determine the six most active third parties in the settlement attempt to determine which six to include; if this is not possible, use the first six COW code numbers, but please leave a coding note indicating the other actors that were involved.

- Nation-state actors: use the COW project's nation-state code number.
- Non-state actors: see the ICOW list (available on the ICOW web site).
- If the specific actor is not listed in either the COW interstate system list or the ICOW non-state actor list, please type in the name or abbreviation of the actor(s) on the codesheet, and we can give them official code numbers later.

EXTENTSA: Extent of claim covered by settlement attempt

- 0: Functional** *The settlement attempt doesn't cover any of the territory in the claim, but rather covers the usage of the territory by one or both participants (e.g., negotiations over "treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation")*
- 1: Procedural** *The settlement attempt doesn't cover any of the territory in the claim, but rather covers procedures to be used in settling any (present or future) problems between the claimants (e.g., negotiations over submitting the claim to arbitration or adjudication would be coded as procedural, although the actual arbitral or adjudication process would be a later settlement attempt covering part or all of the claim)*
- 2: Part of Claim** *Part, but not all, of the claim is covered by the settlement attempt (i.e., they are trying to settle one portion of the overall disputed border)*
- 3: Entire Claim** *Entire claim is covered (i.e., they are trying to settle the entire length of the disputed border)*

Notes

- Note that the eventual agreement -- if any -- may be different from the original goal of the settlement attempt. For example, a settlement attempt that originally attempts to settle the entire claim may only lead to a procedural treaty, as the parties find themselves unable to settle the claim themselves and instead agree to meet again or to submit their claim to some third party.

AGREE: Did attempted settlement lead to an agreement by the claimants?

- 1: Yes** *The settlement attempt results in a treaty, agreement, or award*
- 0: No** *No treaty, agreement, or award results from the attempt*

Notes

- For settlement attempts involving third party decisions, "agreement" refers to the handing down of an arbitral or adjudicated award.

EXTENTAG: Extent of claim covered by agreement, if any

- 9: No agreement**
- 0: Functional**
- 1: Procedural**
- 2: Part of Claim**
- 3: Entire Claim**

Notes

- See the description of the values above (under EXTENTSA).
- Note that the eventual agreement -- if any -- may be different from the original goal of the settlement attempt. For example, a settlement attempt that originally attempts to settle the entire claim may only lead to a procedural treaty, as the parties find themselves unable to settle the claim themselves and instead agree to meet again or to submit their claim to some third party.

TERRCHAG: Did agreement call for exchange of territory?

- 9: No agreement**
- 1: Yes** *The agreement calls for the exchange of territory between the claimants (i.e., it must call for*

territory to be transferred after the agreement was signed -- agreements that simply recognize a past distribution of territory would not qualify).

- 0: No** *The agreement does not call for the exchange of territory (although it may recognize the status quo before the agreement, whether this status quo has existed for a long time or developed recently).*

Notes

- Note that for this variable to equal 1 (yes), the territory to be exchanged must have actually been occupied and administered by the side handing it over; if the agreement calls for the exchange of unexplored or unadministered territory, then this would be coded as 0 (no).

CONCESAG: Which side made more concessions in the agreement?

-9: No agreement

1: Major Challenger Concessions *The agreement involves major concessions by the challenger state, without comparable concessions by the target state. (e.g., challenger gives up its entire claim without receiving concessions from the target)*

2: Minor Challenger Concessions *The agreement involves some concessions by the challenger, although these concessions are not major (or if they are substantial, the target state also makes partially offsetting concessions of its own).*

3: Roughly Even Concessions *The agreement involves roughly equal concessions by both sides in the claim.*

4: Minor Target Concessions *The agreement involves some concessions by the target state, although these concessions are not major (or if they are substantial, the challenger also makes partially offsetting concessions of its own).*

5: Major Target Concessions *The agreement involves major concessions by the target state, without comparable concessions by the challenger. (e.g., target acquiesces to challenger's entire claim, without receiving concessions from the challenger)*

Notes

- In the case of third party arbitral or adjudicated awards, treat the award as if it had been negotiated directly between the claimants. An award that gives all of the disputed territory to the challenger would thus be coded as involving major target concessions.

RATCHAL / RATTGT: Did challenger/target ratify the agreement (if any)?

-9: No agreement

0: No *This state did not ratify the agreement*

1: Yes *This state ratified the agreement*

Notes

- Ratification must be completed within a reasonable time. If the agreement specifies a specific time frame (e.g., within one year of the treaty's signature), then ratification must be completed within that time frame to be coded. When no time frame is specified, the time frame for ratification should be five year from signature.
- If an agreement does not require formal ratification in one or both states' political systems, and the state in question attempted to comply with or carry out the terms of the agreement, then it should be coded as ratifying the agreement. The main purpose of this variable is to identify cases where ratification was not completed (indicating the failure of the attempted settlement), rather than to identify specific details of each state's political process.

COMPCHAL / COMPTGT: Did challenger/target implement or carry out the terms of the agreement (if any)?

-9: No agreement

0: No *This state did not implement/carry out the agreement*

1: Yes *This state implemented/carried out the agreement*

Notes

- Note that "compliance," "implementation," or "carrying out" refer to the claimants taking the required actions.

If an agreement fails for reasons beyond their control (e.g., both sides submit their cases to a third party but the third party refuses to hear them or dies before rendering an award), the claimants should still be coded as implementing the agreement.

- Compliance must be completed within a reasonable time. If the agreement specifies a specific time frame (e.g., within one year of the treaty's signature), then compliance must be completed within that time frame to be coded. When no time frame is specified, the time frame for compliance should be five years from signature.
- Compliance can always be withdrawn later, so any coding of compliance with a given agreement is necessarily an inexact decision that could be reversed. As a result, compliance should be coded based on a five-year period -- so a state that complies for less than five years should be coded as not complying with the agreement. An agreement that is meant to be carried out once (e.g., an agreement to submit cases to a third party arbitrator) should be coded based on whether or not the required action was carried out within the specified time frame (as described above).

CLAIMEND: Did attempted settlement lead to the end of the territorial claim?

-9: No agreement

0: No *The claim continued past the end of this settlement attempt*

1: Most of Claim *The agreement produced a division or settlement of the claimed territory that was followed by the end of explicit contention over most of the claim*

2: All of Claim *The agreement produced a division or settlement of the claimed territory that was followed by the end of explicit contention over all of the claim*

Notes

- "All" of the claim means the end of contention over the entire territory covered by the claim. When a settlement attempt is coded with this result, the claim should be coded as ending in the claim-level data (TCCLAIM).
- "Most" of the claim means the end of contention over most of the territory covered by the claim, although some of it remains ongoing. Examples include treaties or third party awards that resolve almost all of a claim but leave several islands or pockets of land unresolved (whether this oversight is intentional, with the goal of postponing the most controversial portion while resolving everything else, or because not enough information was available at the time of the treaty/award). When a settlement attempt is coded with this result, the full claim should not be coded as ending in the claim-level data (TCCLAIM), although the dyadic claim may be coded as ending and being replaced by a different dyadic claim focused on the remaining pockets being claimed, presumably with a much smaller claimed area and likely with different salience indicators.
- This variable may be complicated by territorial claims that appear to end following a treaty, only to be raised anew within several years (due to new information about the territory, new leadership in one or both former claimant states, or other factors). If explicit contention over most/all of the claim does indeed end following a treaty or award, this variable should be coded accordingly, even if a new claim between the same states begins within a year or two.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON CODESHEET

Brief Chronology of Settlement Attempt

- Who was involved in the settlement attempt, what they did, when, etc.
- Brief summary of the result of the settlement attempt (how did it end? summarize the agreement that was reached and any details on its ratification or implementation if possible, or explain the impasse that prevented agreement / ratification / implementation).

Coding Notes

- Details on the coding for the case, where relevant (explanations of why the case was coded as it was, particularly in controversial or unclear situations, with references where possible).

References

- Be sure to list all referenced sources in the References list on the claim coversheet.

**Appendix: Sample Codesheets
ICOW Territorial Claim Coversheet**

CLAIM (*Number of claim*):

NAME (*Name of claim*):

ACTORS (*States involved in claim*):

| <u>COW Code</u> | <u>Name of Actor</u> | <u>Years in COW System</u> |
|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------------|

DYADS: (*Dyads involved in claim*):

| <u>Dyadnum</u> | <u>Challenger - Target</u> | <u>Begdate</u> | <u>Enddate</u> | <u>Resolved</u> | <u>Endviol</u> |
|----------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 01 | | | | | |

Brief Description of Issue:

Brief Summary of Claim Management:

Coding Notes:

-

References:

ICOW Dyadic Territorial Claim Codesheet

CLAIM (*Number of claim*):

NAME (*Name of claim*):

DYADNUM (*Number of dyadic claim*):

CHAL - TGT (*Claim challenger and target*):

BEGCLAIM (*Beginning of dyadic claim*):

ENDCLAIM (*End of dyadic claim*):

RESOLVED (*Type of resolution of dyadic claim; see codebook for list*):

ENDVIOL (*Did claim end through large-scale violence? 0=no, 1=yes, -9=ongoing*):

HOMECHAL - HOMETGT (*Chal/target homeland claim? 1=home, 0=dependency*):

OFFSHORE (*Offshore claim? 1=offshore, 0=mainland*):

CONTCHAL - CONTTGT (*Chal/target contiguous to territory? see codebook*):

ENTIRECL (*Does claim involve entire target state? 1=yes, 0=no*):

AREA (*Area of the claimed territory, in square miles*):

POP (*Population of claim; see codebook*):

RESOURCE (*Resource basis? 1=yes, 0=no*):

STRATLOC (*Strategic location? 1=yes, 0=no*):

IDENCHAL (*Identity issue for chal.? 1=yes, 0=no*):

IDENTGT (*Identity issue for target? 1=yes, 0=no*):

HISTCHAL (*Historical sovereignty by chal.? 1/0*):

HISTTGT (*Historical sovereignty by target? 1/0*):

Cities:

Resource(s):

Nature:

Group(s):

Group(s):

When:

When:

Coding Notes:

- Challenger/target:
- Historical sovereignty:

Chronology of Claim:

Militarized Conflict over Claim:

MID# Year(s) Brief Descriptions

Territorial Changes between the Participants:

TC# Year Brief Description

ICOW Attempted Settlement Codesheet

CLAIM (*Number of claim*):

NAME (*Name of claim*):

DYADNUM (*Number of dyadic claim*):

CHAL - TGT (*Claim challenger and target*):

SETTNUM (*Number of attempted settlement*):

BEGSETT (*Beginning date of attempted settlement*):

ENDSETT (*End date of attempted settlement*):

TYPESETT (*Type of attempted settlement; see codebook for list*):

ACTOR1-ACTOR6 (*Third party actors, if any*):

TYPEACT (*Type of third party actor, if any; see codebook for list*):

EXTENTSA (*Extent of attempt; 0=functional, 1=procedural, 2=partial, 3=entire claim*):

AGREE (*Did attempt produce a treaty/agreement/decision? 1=yes, 0=no*):

EXTENTAG (*Extent of agreement; see ExtentSA, -9=no agreement*):

TERRCHAG (*Did agreement call for exchange of territory? 1=yes, 0=no, -9=N/A*):

CONCESAG (*Which side made more concessions in agreement? see codebook*):

RATCHAL, RATTGT (*Did chal/target ratify agreement? 1=yes, 0=no, -9=N/A*):

COMPCHAL, COMPTGT (*Did chal/target comply? 1=yes, 0=no, -9=N/A*):

CLAIMEND (*Did agreement end claim? 2=all, 1=most, 0=no, -9=N/A*):

Coding Notes:

Chronology of Settlement Attempt: