

**Codebook for Territorial Claims Data
Issue Correlates of War (ICOW) Project**
Last updated 24 February 2005

Paul R. Hensel
Department of Political Science
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-2230
Phone: 850-644-7318
Fax: 850-644-1367

phensel@icow.org
<http://hensel.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	2
Territorial Claim Settlement Attempts	2
Sources and Coding Procedures	3
Dyadic Claim-Level Data File (TCCLAIM)	4
Dyad-Year-Level Data File (TCDYADYR)	9
Attempted Settlement Data File (TCSETTLE)	14
Appendix: Sample Codesheets	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 general ICOW codebook, 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, although many other possible indices or measures could also be devised. Each indicator 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 five indicators -- a resource, ethnic/religious, or strategic basis for the claim, the presence of permanent settlements in the claimed territory, or territory that is located on the mainland rather than on an offshore island -- 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 final indicator -- claims to what is considered homeland rather than dependent territory -- 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 considers the territory to be homeland rather than dependency in nature.

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.

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

A. 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.

B. 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.

C. 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?)

D. DYAD: Members of Dyad

Number: A 6-digit code identifying the dyadic claim participants

Notes

- This code takes the form AAABBB, where AAA is the smaller COW nation-state number of

the two dyad members and BBB is the larger.

- Note that the smaller COW number is used first in the "DYAD" code; unlike "CHAL" and "TGT," described below, this number has no theoretical meaning. This is important because it allows easy merging of data sets (e.g., to combine data on territorial claims with data on dyadic democracy or relative capabilities).

E. 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, "side A" 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

F. 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, side B refers to the state that possesses or administers more of the territory in question at the start of the claim.

G. 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.

H. 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.

I. RESOLVED: Type of Resolution of Claim

0: 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: Third Party** The claim ends with third-party assistance (including any type of third party assistance: inquiry, conciliation, mediation, adjudication, or arbitration).
- 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 claim 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 7/1915, and a new dyadic claim between the same states begins when Haiti rejoins the system 8/1934).
- 7: Military Occupation** This dyadic claim ends with the military occupation of the claimed territory by the challenger state, leading to a reversal of the challenger-target distinction (e.g., when Chile occupies the Bolivian territory around Antofagasta, the Chile-Bolivia claim ends by military occupation, and a Bolivia-Chile claim begins)
- 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).

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).

J. ENDSVIOL: Role of Organized Violence in End of Claim

- 1: Violence** This claim ended due to large-scale organized violence between the claimant states
- 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 large-scale organized violence -- which does not necessarily have to meet the COW definition of interstate war (1000 dead in sustained combat between regular forces...)
- This includes cases where a negotiated settlement is reached to end the violence/war and also ends the claim (e.g., the Chaco Boreal claim between Bolivia and Paraguay, where the final post-

war treaty also led to resolution of the entire claim)

- This includes cases of unsuccessful violence/war, 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 does NOT include cases where the violence was not organized (e.g., riots or non-official forces) or did not involve the two claimants in the dyad (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)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON CODESHEET

Actors

- Be sure to list all nation-state actors involved in the claim, along with their COW code numbers

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)

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

- A. **CLAIM: Number of Claim** (See description under TCCLAIM data)
- B. **DYADNUM: Number of Dyadic Claim** (See description under TCCLAIM data)
- C. **DYAD: Members of Dyad** (See description under TCCLAIM data)
- D. **CHAL: Challenger State** (See description under TCCLAIM data)
- E. **TGT: Target State** (See description under TCCLAIM data)

F. **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.

G. **HOMECHAL: Homeland / Colony Claim Dummy for Challenger State**

H. **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.

I. **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.

J. **CONTCHAL: Contiguity of Claimed Territory to Challenger State**

K. **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."

L. 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 --but this variable should be coded as 1 ("yes") as soon as the dependency becomes independent and becomes the target state in the claim

M. 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.

N. POP: Population of the Claimed Territory

- 1: No Permanent Population** Claimed territory includes no (or minimal -- less than 1000 residents) 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.

O. RESOURCE: Resource Basis for Claim?

1: Yes The claim involved explicit contention over resources known or thought to be included in the territory

0: No No explicit reference to resources contained in the territory

Notes

- Be sure to note on the codesheet exactly which resource(s) are involved
- 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).
- To be coded, a resource must be available (or thought to be available) in commercially exploitable quantities, that could meet much 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.
- There must also be evidence that the government of at least one of the claimant states was aware of the resource and considered it a reason to pursue its claim. Simply finding a statement in a geographic reference book that certain resources are present in a territory is not sufficient to code a given claim as having a resource basis. If neither claimant state's government was aware of the resource or neither considered it important at the time.
- Paul Huth's *Standing Your Ground* offers a list of the type of resources that are relevant: oil, manganese, iron ore, lead, titanium, bauxite, sulfur, copper, nickel, chromium, cobalt, tin, tungsten, zinc, phosphate, gold, silver, uranium, diamonds, and fresh water -- as well as close proximity to rich fishing grounds or seabed minerals and deposits for islands. These types of resources all definitely qualify (particularly for the second half of the 20th century, the period covered by Huth's data collection at the time of that book).
- For earlier times, though, additional resources were considered quite valuable to states' economies. For example, furs, rubber, timber, and guano were all considered quite valuable in the 19th century. Such resources should also be coded, at least to the extent that state leaders considered them valuable enough to be worth pursuing in the claim -- but if there are any questions about a particular resource, please ask Paul Hensel.

P. 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:

- important defensive positions: the territory includes valuable defensive positions that can be used to detect and/or stop an attack by the opponent

- ongoing security threat: the territory is currently being used, or has recently been used, as a staging point for either overt or covert military operations against this opponent

- military base(s): the territory includes one or more military bases that could be used for military operations against this opponent

- communication/transportation lines: the territory includes control over important communication and/or transportation lines, which would weaken the country substantially or cut off portions of the country if it were to fall into the hands of the opponent

- Strategic economic value:

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

- warm water port: the territory offers at least one warm water port; only relevant for states that otherwise do not have any ports that are not frozen in during winter

- trade route: the territory includes access to, or control over, important international shipping lanes or trade routes

- economic trade expansion: the territory includes access to new major markets for the country's traders or businesses (typically relevant for colonial/dependency claims, where the dependency allows the colonial power preferred access to a large market)

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

Q. IDENCHAL: Identity Issue for Challenger State?

R. 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.

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

- Make separate lists of all disputes & wars directly related to the claim (most or all of which should be coded by COW as involving territorial issues), as well as those apparently not directly related to the claim itself)
- (This will allow us to check the current COW dispute data for missing militarized disputes, incorrect territorial-versus-other issue codings, etc.)

Territorial Changes between the Participants

- A list of all territorial changes related to the claim (with details, where relevant)
--this includes all situations where territory changed hands between the participants, whether by military occupation or by some type of agreement or third-party settlement
- (This will allow us to check the current COW territorial change data for missing cases)

Attempted Settlements

- Did the claimants ever attempt negotiations, sign treaties, turn to international legal means, etc., to help settle their claim?
- (This serves to identify cases for our attempted settlement data set; each such attempted settlement should receive a separate entry in the settlement-level data set TCSETTLE)

References

- List of sources consulted (provide full bibliographic citation for each source)

Variables in the Attempted Settlement Data Set (TCSETTLE)

- A. **CLAIM: Number of Claim** (See description under TCCLAIM data)
- B. **DYADNUM: Number of Dyadic Claim** (See description under TCCLAIM data)
- C. **DYAD: Members of Dyad** (See description under TCCLAIM data)
- D. **CHAL: Challenger State** (See description under TCCLAIM data)
- E. **TGT: Target State** (See description under TCCLAIM data)

F. **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

G. **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)

H. **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.)

I. **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 the other binding settlement attempts, 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.

J. 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?)

K-L-M-N-O-P-Q. 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

R. 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)

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

1: Yes The claimants sign a treaty or agreement as a result of the settlement attempt

0: No No agreement is signed as a result of the attempt

Notes

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

T. 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 actually be different from the original goal of the settlement attempt, as expressed in EXTENTSA; for example, a settlement attempt that originally attempts to settle the entire claim may only lead to a procedural treaty as the parties find that they can only agree to meet again or to submit their claim to some third party.

U. 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)

V. 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.

W-X. 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.

Y-Z. 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).

AA. 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

Initiator of Settlement Attempt

• Who proposed the settlement attempt? (this could be one of the participants, or it could be an outside actor)

--this isn't being entered into our computerized version data set, but it may prove to be useful to have around for future reference

--this isn't always easy to determine, especially for older settlement attempts that are covered only briefly in historical sources.

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

- Annotated list of sources consulted for each claim in the data set

APPENDIX I: SAMPLE CODESHEETS
ICOW Territorial Claim Coversheet

CLAIM (*Number of claim*): 110

NAME (*Name of claim*): Aves Island (Bird Island, Isla de Aves / de la Aves)

ACTORS (*States involved in claim*):

<u>COW Code</u>	<u>Name of Actor</u>	<u>COW Code</u>	<u>Name of Actor</u>
101	Venezuela	210	Netherlands

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	101 - 210	185403	186605	3 (3rd party)	0 (no)

Brief Description of Issue:

Dyad #1

This claim involves ownership of Aves Island, a small Caribbean island 350 miles off the Venezuelan coast, 125 miles west of Guadeloupe, 140 miles south of Saba, and approximately 150 miles west of Dominica (several sources list it as only 75 miles from Dominican offshore islands). It appears doubtful that Spain had discovered the island initially; a British ship visited the island in 1835 and inhabitants of Saba and St. Eustatius (in the Dutch West Indies) often visited it to gather turtles and birds' eggs. The claim's immediate origins date to 1854, when a U.S. ship landed at the island to load guano. When news of this landing reached Venezuela, the Venezuelan authorities began claiming the island and sent a naval ship to press the claim. The Netherlands opposed this Venezuelan claim, arguing that the island was a Dutch possession. (Ireland 1938: 246)

Potential Dyad #2

Following the 1865 arbitral award, the island faded into obscurity for many years. It was maintained as a Federal Dependency of Venezuela, but does not appear to have been a source of controversy. Aves Island began to reemerge as a contentious issue with the importance of islands under the Law of the Sea Convention, which allowed states to claim an exclusive economic zone around their island possessions. Venezuela declared an EEZ around the island in 1978 (including over 150,000 km² of area that is believed to include rich gas and hydrocarbon deposits), and established a military base on the island that same year. Nearby Caribbean states become concerned about the implications of this claimed EEZ, as it allowed distant Venezuela to claim waters much closer to their own shores than to Venezuela proper. Most relevant for this claim, Dominica claims that the island is part of a long submarine sandbank connected to the island of Dominica, while also arguing that it should be classified as a "rock" rather than an "island" (which would deny Venezuela the ability to claim an EEZ around it). (EFE 7/1/2001; Nicholas 7/9/2001)

Brief Chronology of Claim:

Dyad #1

Venezuela started claiming Aves Island and exercising sovereignty over the island in 1854. The Dutch protested these claims and activities, and send a warship to the island in 1856. Venezuela

and the Netherlands agreed in 1857 to submit the claim to Spanish Queen Isabella. Isabella studied the case from 1860-1865, and eventually awarded the island to Venezuela. Both sides accepted the award in May 1866. (Ireland 1938: 246-248)

Potential Dyad #2

It is not yet clear whether or not there is an explicit claim to Aves Island by any Caribbean states. Seven OECS states -- most notably Dominica and Antigua and Barbuda -- have called on Venezuela to abandon its claimed EEZ based on Aves Island. Several sources refer to Dominica's position as a "claim" to the island, but further details are not yet available. Venezuela continues to claim the island on the basis of longtime occupation and exercise of acts of sovereignty over the island, including scientific research and maintenance of a small military outpost.

The issue was discussed at the July 2001 CARICOM meeting in the Bahamas, with the members rejecting Venezuela's claims over the island and agreeing that any future discussions over it must be conducted in accordance with applicable principles of international law (most notably the 1982 UN Law of the Sea Convention). Venezuela continues to maintain its sovereignty over the island, and in July 2001 announced plans to expand its military outpost on the island. (BBC 7/8/2001, 7/11/2001; EFE 7/1/2001; Lloyd 7/9/2001; Marrder 7/5/2001; Rosenberg 7/6/2001)

Coding Notes:

- Although Ireland (1938: 246-8) discusses economic claims by U.S. businessmen regarding Aves island and its guano deposits in the 1850s, occasionally supported by U.S. government officials, there is no evidence that the U.S. government ever claimed Aves island as part of an explicit territorial claim. Gray (1949) gives much more detail on the U.S. role over the island.
- The potential second dyad described on this coversheet may or may not become a territorial claim, depending on the specific content of arguments by Dominica (or by other Caribbean states). It already qualifies as a maritime claim because of the disagreement over maritime zones, so it is being addressed by the ICOW maritime claims data set. For this case to qualify as a territorial claim, official representatives of Dominica or some other state must explicitly argue that Aves Island should be their country's island rather than Venezuela's; arguing that it is a rock rather than an island, or that Venezuela can not claim such an EEZ around the island/rock, is not sufficient for a territorial claim.
- A full dyadic codesheet has not yet been filled out for the potential Dominican claim to the island, but information is currently being collected on this case. If it is determined that this claim qualifies as territorial in nature, a new codesheet will be created, and this coversheet will be updated.
- According to the UN Secretary General's annual report on the Law of the Sea (1997: paragraph 74): "The Governments of Antigua and Barbuda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines have made objections regarding three maritime boundary treaties in the Caribbean Sea relating to the island of Aves between Venezuela, on the one side, and three other countries, on the other; the treaty with the United States of 28 March 1978, which entered into force on 24 November 1980; the treaty with the Netherlands of 31 March 1978, which entered into force on 15 December 1978; and the treaty with France of 17 July 1980, which entered into force on 28 January 1983. The objection to these delimitation treaties is based on the fact that Aves Island has been granted the legal status of an island as provided for in UNCLOS,

and therefore is recognized as having full capacity to generate a maritime jurisdiction. Antigua and Barbuda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines argue that, as recognized in both customary international law and as reflected in UNCLOS, rocks which cannot sustain human habitation or economic life of their own shall have no exclusive economic zone or continental shelf. They further recall that, under the Convention, artificial islands and structures which have been erected adjacent to Aves Island are not entitled to a territorial sea and their presence does not affect the delimitation of the territorial sea, the exclusive economic zone or the continental shelf." This does not appear to indicate a qualifying territorial claim, at least in 1997.

References

Associated Press (7/1/2001). "Chavez Reiterates Sovereignty over Bird Island." Obtained through Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe.

BBC News Service (7/8/2001). "Communique Issued at End of Annual CARICOM Summit." Monitored from CANA News Agency report. Obtained through Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe.

BBC News Service (7/11/2001). "Dominica to Pursue its Claim to Aves Island." Monitored from CANA News Agency report. Obtained through Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe.

EFE News Service (7/1/2001). "Chavez Reiterates Sovereignty over Bird Island." Obtained through Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe.

Gray, William H. (1949). "The Human Aspect of Aves Diplomacy: An Incident in the Relations between the United States and Venezuela." *The Americas* 6, 1 (July): 72-84.

Ireland, Gordon (1938). *Boundaries, Possessions, and Conflicts in South America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Marrder, Alberto Garcia (7/5/2001). "Caribbean Leaders Discuss Territorial Conflicts with Venezuela." EFE News Service. Obtained through Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe.

Nicholas, Lloyd (7/9/2001). "Territorial Disputes Dog Leaders." Inter Press Service. Obtained through Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe.

Rosenberg, Matthew J. (7/6/2001). "Mexican President Promises Caribbean Aid in Quiet Campaign for UN Seat." Associated Press. Obtained through Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe.

UN (10/20/1997). "Oceans and the Law of the Sea: Law of the Sea. Report of the Secretary General." Available online at <http://www.un.org/Depts/los/a_52_487.htm>.

Zuloaga, Guillermo (1955). "The Isla de Aves Story." *Geographical Review* 45, 2 (April): 172-180.

ICOW Dyadic Territorial Claim Codesheet

CLAIM (*Number of claim*): 110

NAME (*Name of claim*): Aves Island

DYADNUM (*Number of dyadic claim*): 1

CHAL - TGT (*Claim challenger and target*): 101 - 210 (Venezuela - Netherlands)

BEGCLAIM (*Beginning of dyadic claim*): 185403

ENDCLAIM (*End of dyadic claim*): 186605

RESOLVED (*Type of resolution of dyadic claim*): 3 (third party)

ENDVIOL (*Did claim end through large-scale violence?*): 0 (no)

HOMECHAL - HOMETGT (*Challenger, target homeland claim?*): 1, 0 (yes, no)

OFFSHORE (*Offshore claim?*): 1 (yes)

CONTCHAL - CONTTGT (*Challenger, target contiguous to claim?*): 5, 0 (151-400, none)

ENTIRECL (*Does claim involve entire target state?*): 0 (no)

AREA (*Area of the claimed territory*): 1 sq. mi

POP (*Population of claim*): 1 (minimal)

Cities: (none)

RESOURCE (*Resource basis?*): 1 (yes)

Resource(s): Guano

STRATLOC (*Strategic location?*): 0 (no)

Details: (none)

IDENCHAL (*Identity issue for challenger?*): 0 (no)

Group(s): (none)

IDENTGT (*Identity issue for target?*): 0 (no)

Group(s): (none)

Coding Notes:

- Resources: the immediate resource making headlines at the time of the claim was guano, which was plentiful on the island -- although Zuloaga (1955: 180) notes that there is no longer any trace of guano there. The importance of fishing around the island (particularly by Dutch citizens from nearby colonies, searching for sea turtle eggs when they were in season) was seen in the inclusion of specific language over fishing in the final treaty over the island, although this does not appear to have been a concern of any of the claimants during the claim itself, (see also Gray 1949: 72-73, Zuloaga 1955: 175)
- Aves lies some 230 km (143 miles) west of Dominica and 500 km (310 miles) north of the Venezuelan mainland (Zuloaga 1955: 175); Ireland (1938: 246) lists it as 350 miles from Venezuela.
- Aves Island is uninhabited, although it serves as the nesting ground for oceanic birds and sea turtles. (Zuloaga 1955: 175-177)
- Aves Island is away from major shipping lanes. (Zuloaga 1955: 175)

Brief Chronology of Claim:

March 1854: An American ship, the *John R. Dow*, landed at Aves Island to get guano. After hearing of the landings, Venezuela sent an armed schooner to investigate; it arrived on 12 December. (Ireland 1938: 246)

December 13, 1854: The Venezuelan and American captains signed a temporary accord allowing guano retrieval until the approval or disapproval of the Venezuelan government, and recognizing

Venezuelan sovereignty over the island. Venezuela later disavowed this arrangement. Though offering a 15 year concession, the government expelled the Americans on 12/30/1854. (Ireland 1938: 246)

The Americans applied to the U.S. government for damages from Venezuela on 1/15/1855. Venezuela opened up the island to foreign commerce on 7/28/1855, but refused the American Guano Company ships (who bought the contract from the original American captain Wallace); the AGC ships then went to Caracas where their award to use the island was restored on 9/29/1855. (Ireland 1938: 247)

In the Valencia convention of 1/14/1859, Venezuela paid off the American indemnification demand, and the U.S. agrees to desist from all further claims regarding Aves Island. (Ireland 1938: 247-248; Zuloaga 1955: 172)

December 1854?: The Dutch consul general at Caracas protested Venezuelan occupation of the island as a violation of Dutch sovereignty; he got no satisfactory reply. (Ireland 1938: 247)

March 1856: After not receiving any satisfactory reply, the Dutch government sent a warship to the island, demanding Venezuelan withdrawal and recognition of the Dutch right to Aves Island. (Ireland 1938: 247)

August 5, 1857: Venezuela and the Dutch agreed to take the ownership question to arbitration by a friendly party; Queen Isabella II of Spain was chosen. (Ireland 1938: 248)

1860: Both sides' claims were submitted to Queen Isabella. (Ireland 1938: 248)

June 30, 1865: Spanish Queen Isabella awarded the island to Venezuela, although Dutch subjects would continue to be allowed to fish there. Both sides accepted the award in May 1866. (Ireland 1938: 248; Zuloaga 1955: 172; Gray 1949: 73)

Militarized Conflict between the Participants:

- (1) *Conflict over territorial issues:* Dutch send warship, March 1856
- (2) *Conflict over other issues:* (none)

Territorial Changes between the Participants:

Venezuela receives Aves Island in 1865 arbitral award.

Attempted Settlements :

- (1) *Bilateral negotiations:* 1857 negotiations
- (2) *Third party assistance:* 1860-65 Spanish arbitration
- (3) *Treaties:* 1857 arbitration treaty, 1865 arbitral award

References:

Ireland, Gordon. (1938). *Boundaries, Possessions and Conflicts in South America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

ICOW Attempted Settlement Codesheet

CLAIM (*Number of claim*): 110

NAME (*Name of claim*): Aves Island

DYADNUM (*Number of dyadic claim*): 1

DYAD (*AAABBB*): 101-210

SETTNUM (*Number of attempted settlement*): 1

BEGSETT (*Beginning date of attempted settlement*): 185708

ENDSETT (*End date of attempted settlement*): 185708

TYPESETT (*Type of attempted settlement*): 1 (bilateral)

ACTOR (*Third party actor, if any*): -9 (none)

TYPEACT (*Type of third party actor, if any*): -9 (none)

EXTENTSA (*Extent of claim covered by settlement attempt*): 1 (procedural)

AGREE (*Did attempt produce a treaty / agreement / decision?*): 1 (yes)

EXTENTAG (*Extent of claim covered by agreement, if any*): 1 (procedural)

TERRCHAG (*Did agreement, if any, call for exchange of territory?*): 0 (no)

CONCESAG (*Which side made more concessions in agreement?*): 3 (even)

RATCHAL (*Did challenger ratify agreement?*): 1 (yes)

RATTGT (*Did target ratify agreement?*): 1 (yes)

COMPCHAL (*Did challenger comply with agreement?*): 1 (yes)

COMPTGT (*Did target comply with agreement?*): 1 (yes)

CLAIMEND (*Did agreement lead to end of territorial claim?*): 0 (no)

Brief Chronology of Settlement Attempt:

March 1856: After not receiving any satisfactory reply to their protests, the Dutch government sent a warship to the island, demanding Venezuelan withdrawal and recognition of the Dutch right to Aves Island. (Ireland 1938: 247)

August 5, 1857: Venezuela and the Dutch agree to take the ownership question to arbitration by a friendly party; Queen Isabella II of Spain was chosen. (Ireland 1938: 248)

Coding Notes:

- The start date of this settlement attempt was estimated as August 1857, the same month that that treaty was signed.

References:

Ireland, Gordon. (1938). *Boundaries, Possessions and Conflicts in South America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

ICOW Attempted Settlement Codesheet

CLAIM (*Number of claim*): 110

NAME (*Name of claim*): Aves Island

DYADNUM (*Number of dyadic claim*): 1

DYAD (*AAABBB*): 101-210

SETTNUM (*Number of attempted settlement*): 2

BEGSETT (*Beginning date of attempted settlement*): 186000

ENDSETT (*End date of attempted settlement*): 186506

TYPESETT (*Type of attempted settlement*): 5 (arbitration)

ACTOR (*Third party actor, if any*): 230 (Spain)

TYPEACT (*Type of third party actor, if any*): 2 (minor power/other region)

EXTENTSA (*Extent of claim covered by settlement attempt*): 3 (all)

AGREE (*Did attempt produce a treaty / agreement / decision?*): 1 (yes)

EXTENTAG (*Extent of claim covered by agreement, if any*): 3 (all)

TERRCHAG (*Did agreement, if any, call for exchange of territory?*): 0 (no)

CONCESAG (*Which side made more concessions in agreement?*): 4 (some target concessions)

RATCHAL (*Did challenger ratify agreement?*): 1 (yes)

RATTGT (*Did target ratify agreement?*): 1 (yes)

COMPCHAL (*Did challenger comply with agreement?*): 1 (yes)

COMPTGT (*Did target comply with agreement?*): 1 (yes)

CLAIMEND (*Did agreement lead to end of territorial claim?*): 1 (yes)

Brief Chronology of Settlement Attempt:

1860: Both sides' claims were submitted to Queen Isabella. (Ireland 1938: 248)

June 30, 1865: Spanish Queen Isabella awarded the island to Venezuela, although Dutch subjects would continue to be allowed to fish there. Both sides accepted the award in May 1866. (Ireland 1938: 248; Zuloaga 1955: 172; Gray 1949: 73)

Coding Notes:

- The beginning date of the settlement attempt is unclear.

References:

Gray, William H. (1949). "The Human Aspect of Aves Diplomacy: An Incident in the Relations between the United States and Venezuela." *The Americas* 6, 1 (July): 72-84.

Ireland, Gordon. (1938). *Boundaries, Possessions and Conflicts in South America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zuloaga, Guillermo (1955). "The Isla de Aves Story." *Geographical Review* 45, 2 (April): 172-180.