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Question
How does the type or nature of natural resources alter territorial conflict?

Theory
- **Resources**: The centrality of a natural resource to a territorial claim raises the salience of the claim as well as the inherent value of the territory under contention, increasing conflict.
- **Renewable vs Non-renewable**: Non-renewable resources are zero sum, encouraging conflict and making compromise difficult. Renewable resources need cooperation to prevent “tragedy of the commons,” states avoid destruction and overexploitation.
- **Resource type**: Energy, luxury goods increase conflict due to higher value and security concerns. Timber, food decrease conflict due to concerns of proper exploitation and to avoid destruction.

Hypotheses
- **H1 (resources)**: Claims with resources are more likely to experience armed conflict.
- **H2 (renewability)**: Claims with non-renewable resources are more likely to experience armed conflict than those with only renewable.
- **H3 (non-renewable resource types)**: Claims to territory with mineral, energy, and luxury resources are more likely to experience armed conflict.
- **H4 (renewable resource types)**: Claims to territory with timber, food production, and cash crops are less likely to experience armed conflict.

Research Design
- ICOW territorial claims (global, 1816-2001)
- DV: outbreak of MID over the issue in any given year (any MID, fatal MIDs only).
- Control for joint democracy, claim salience, recent conflict over claim, relative capabilities.

Logit Analysis: Probability of MID in given year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Any MID</th>
<th>Fatal MID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource(s)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.79)**</td>
<td>-0.05 (0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other salience</td>
<td>0.18 (0.02)***</td>
<td>0.33 (0.03)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent conflict</td>
<td>0.77 (0.04)***</td>
<td>0.49 (0.08)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenger cap.s</td>
<td>0.57 (0.11)***</td>
<td>0.53 (0.17)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint democracy</td>
<td>-0.51 (0.18)**</td>
<td>-0.71 (0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N: 13,166; X² = 635.8 (5 d.f., p&lt;.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 2: Renewability
- Only renewable -0.11 (0.99) | 0.07 (0.16)
- Only non-renewable 0.24 (0.10)** | -0.05 (0.19)
- Both 0.44 (0.10)*** | -0.54 (0.20)***
| N: 13,166; X² = 600.26 (7 d.f., p<.001) |

Model 3: Resource Types
- Mineral resources -0.18 (0.12) | -0.19 (0.19)
- Energy resources 0.29 (0.09)*** | -0.33 (0.16)**
- Luxury resources 0.09 (0.15) | 0.51 (0.19)**
- Timber -0.37 (0.16)*** | -0.72 (0.27)***
- Food production 0.05 (0.09) | -0.35 (0.18)***
- Cash crops -0.15 (0.09) | 0.51 (0.48)
| N: 13,127; X² = 680.12 (10 d.f., p<.001) |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Marginal Impact of Key Variables
- Claim includes any resource(s):
  - Yes: .055 any .015 fatal
  - No: .043 .016
- Renewability of resource(s):
  - Non-renew: .058 any .018 fatal
  - Renew: .041 .016
  - Both: .070 .010
- Specific resource types:
  - Non-renewable:
    - Mineral: .040 any .015 fatal
    - Energy: .063 .013
    - Luxury: .052 .030
  - Renewable:
    - Timber: .033 any .009 fatal
    - Food: .050 .013
    - Cash crops: .041 .030

Discussion
- **Renewability**: Non-renewable resources produce more MIDs than renewable; conflict escalation unaffected. States react to salience but are hesitant to damage potential gains from resources.
- **Resource Type**: Resources valued for security, military application produce more conflict (energy). Potentially overexploited resources see less conflict (timber).

Future Extensions:
- Does econ. development or era affect conflict propensity of certain resources?
- Resources and peaceful negotiations
- Different effects on initiation/escalation?
- Differences between specific resources in each category? (e.g. oil vs. coal?)