

The Effects of Tangibility and Intangibility on Conflicts and Settlements

Author: Emily E. Barrett

Abstract:

This research studies the effect of levels of the tangibility and intangibility on the management of contentious issues between countries. It is theorized that due to the great impact high tangibility and intangibility has on a conflict individually that by having these two dimensions within the same conflict would cause them to have an impact on one another, therefore, enhancing and/or affecting each other's role within the contentious issue. It is also hypothesized that when a contentious issue occurs with both high tangibility and intangibility that it would increase the likelihood of armed conflicts or peaceful settlements. It is found that when these two dimensions are within the same contentious issue they do increase the probability of armed conflict but do not impact the result of the peaceful settlement.

Introduction

Territory has been researched and frequently cited as a primary source of contention, therefore it is important to understand the role of its underlying factors and how that contributes to territory's being contentious. Past research has examined the roles of geography, contiguity, levels of salience, state rivalries, etc., in order to broaden the understanding of what causes conflict and peace when territory is involved. All these factors play an important role, but an aspect that needs to be further understood is how the levels of tangible and intangible salience cause conflicts and settlements. As previous studies have argued, "different types of issues vary along two general dimensions of salience: the tangible importance of an issue, such as economic or strategic value, and the intangible importance of an issue, such as prestige or identity value" (Hensel et al. 2008, p.138). These underlying issues of territory have a great effect on the outcome of the conflict.

Past research has looked into how the levels of salience of these dimensions individually affect the outcome of the conflict (Hensel & Mitchell 2005). However, previous studies have not investigated how these two dimensions effect each other and how they affect the conflict's outcome. This has left several unanswered questions about territory and its underlying factors, such as:

- What is the effect of these two factors upon one another and how does that affect the outcome of the issue?
- Does the presence of one variable (i.e. intangible issues) affects the other (tangible issue) so that it is greater than just having two present at the same time?
- Does the role of intangible issues increase the number of tangible claims?

- Could intangible issues between two parties increase discord over tangible stakes and eventually make them infused with more intangible qualities?
- Within contentious issues what is the combination effect of tangibility and intangibility on conflict and settlements?

These questions are not answered by previous research and needs to be further explored in order to understand how and why territory is contentious.

I argue that when a contentious issue has combinations of both tangibility and intangibility is more likely to produce armed conflicts or peaceful agreements than issues lacking one or both of these dimensions. I developed this argument by reviewing the previous literature on territory, finding that the effect of levels of tangible and intangible has not been fully researched. Therefore, I will analyze these dimensions of territory and their effects on conflicts and settlements. In the research design I discuss the methods I will use. I found strong support for my argument that the different combinations of tangibility and intangibility have different affects on the outcome of the issue at hand.

Literature Review

To date, many scholars have found several factors and reasons for why war and conflict occurs in the world. The leading factor of contention within conflicts has been credited to territory. The role of territory is not a sufficient condition of war, but it does increase the chance of war and conflict dramatically (Vasquez and Henahan 2001, p.123). To explain why territory plays such a significant role in causing contention, conflicts and wars, many scholars have analyzed Militarized Interstate Dispute Data of the Correlates of War project, data on territorial claims and the Issue Correlates of War issue data. Previous research and studies of these data sets have furthered the overall understanding of the role of territory and contentious issues.

Militarized Interstate Dispute Data of the Correlates of War project

The Correlates of War project is the most basic source of data on territory (Vasquez 2009). This data set coded into the four types of category revisions: territory, policy, regime and other (Jones, Bremer, and Singer, 1996: p.178). The only recorded data comes from demands that are made with threats or the use of militarized force. This data set reveals the relationships between states, decisions and actors, allowing further explanation and information pertaining to territory.

The MID data set provides further analyses on territory, states, wars, and relationships that have developed over time. Paul R. Hensel (1996, p.2) empirically analyzes the effects territory has on conflicts. This research shows that territory has a strong influence on conflict behavior and increases the chances for conflicts to escalate to full-scale interstate war. Additionally, Paul Senese (1996, p.133) furthers investigates the escalation to war puzzle by examining how MIDs escalate and increase the gravity of an issue once the primary threshold of a conflict breaks. The results of Senese's research reveal that the role of contiguity and territory positively influence the likelihood of MIDs. Territory's influence upon the escalation to war, war and conflicts show territory plays an important role in both past and contemporary issues.

John Vasquez and Marie T. Henehan (2001, p. 126) examine the relationship between territory and war through the MID data set. Their research shows that territory has a higher chance of going to war and accounts for the majority of wars in comparison to policy's or regime disputes (Vasquez and Henehan 2001, p.127). Additionally, they found that regimes disputes are also prone to war and that they have a different behavioral profile than other disputes; therefore, they should not be combined with other disputes in a general non-territorial category (Vasquez and Henehan 2001, p.129). However, Sarah McLaughlin Mitchell and Brandon C. Prins (1999,

p.179) conclude that a large portion of Militarized Interstate Dispute involved other factors besides territory like fisheries, maritime boundaries, and resources of the sea are sources of contention. They further defined the sources of conflict and the role territory plays within them.

The role of democracies has also been examined through the MID data set. Steve Miller and Doug Gibler (2009) reexamine the interstate dispute behavior in democratic peace theory and the relationship between that concept and territory. They found through investigating the MID Correlates of War Data that democratic states resolve most of their threatening issues like territory before becoming a democratic state, therefore when they are a considered a democratic state they are less likely to be involved in disputes. Overall, these studies reveal the intricate and vital aspects of the role of territory within conflicts, states, decisions and democracies.

Data on Territorial Claims

Paul Huth (1996) collected the data on territorial claims, which further explores the relationship between territory and contentious issues. These data has been gathered from 1950 to 1990 and now has been extended back to 1919 (Huth and Allee, 2002). This data set breaks down the territorial disagreements between states and then codes them as strategic, economic, or ethnic questions; it is helpful when examining the predispositions of different types of territorial issues. Ultimately, the Huth data further explains what makes territorial issues more conflict prone.

Vasquez and Senese (2003) delve in to the relationship between disputes and the probability of war breaking out. This approach was previously criticized for underestimating the possible sampling bias found in the militarized interstate dispute (MID) data. Therefore, they developed a new unified territorial explanation for why certain factors influence the rise of militarized disputes (Vasquez and Senese 2003). They contend that territorial claims do increase

the probability of militarized disputes occurring and territorial MIDs increase the probability of war. Ultimately, their new territorial explanation shows no sampling bias with regard to territory in MID data. This research provides greater information on the role of territory and war breaking out. Again it shows that their relationship is both complex and very contentious.

ICOW Data

The ICOW data set further examines the relationship between contentious issues and territory. The ICOW data and the Huth data set are similar in that they both include disagreements that do not choose to the use of force or threats and are broader in both types of issues and their temporal domain (Vasquez 2009: Ch 10). The ICOW data set (Hensel 2001:90-94), starts with territorial disagreements, which includes Huth's data, and goes back to 1816 in order to be compatible with the Correlates of war data.

Through this data set many scholars investigate the role of territory and its underlying dimensions. Paul R. Hensel and Sarah McLaughlin Mitchell (2005) contend there are distinguishable differences between tangible and intangible issues and their effect on a given situation. Their research shows territorial claims with high intangible salience are significantly more likely to experience more militarized disputes and peaceful agreements, while tangible salience has a low impact on low level disputes and produce fewer agreements (Hensel & Mitchell 2005). Additionally, in other research Paul R. Hensel, Sarah McLaughlin Mitchell, Thomas E. Sowers II and Clayton L. Thyne (2008) further expound on this concept by conducting an issue-based approach in order to reveal that states are more likely to have both militarized and peaceful methods when an issue with high salience is at stake. They find that the type and level of salience varies and it is important to distinguish the difference between them because the techniques to resolve it will be different. Paul R. Hensel (1999) studies the origins of

enduring, militarized, interstate rivalry from an evolutionary perspective, which reveals that an evolutionary approach to studying rivalries and legacies of past events are important. By taking this type of approach it will allow for more general understanding of rivalry, conflict, and world politics. These studies offers a broader understanding of the concept of territory and its effect on contentious issues, states, wars and the escalation to war, but do not delve into further exploring the factors that cause territory to be contentious. Paul Hensel, Sarah McLaughlin Mitchell, Thomas E. Sowers II and Clayton L. Thyne (2008: p. 138) delve into this area of research by investigating the role tangibility and intangibility has upon a given situation but do not compare how the combination of different levels of tangible and intangible salience affect an issue. Overall, these studies provide both further evidence on how territory is the key to understanding war and peace. They expand upon the knowledge that territory issues are contentious by investigating how, what and why they are contentious.

Theory

Conceptual Definition of Tangibility and Intangibility

Territory plays a significant role in current and past conflicts. It has been cited as the primary source of conflict between states and most wars arise from territorial disputes. Territorial Militarized Interstate Disputes are more prone to fatalities, which shows that the state and people are more willing to sacrifice their lives over these issues (Senese 1996, p.133). Out of all the contentious issues states disagree on, territory has been argued to be the most salient and vital to states, and very difficult to settle peacefully (Vasquez and Henehan, 2001 p.123).

There are numerous factors, which contribute to the outcomes of conflict but in order to further understand territory's role within contentious issues it is important to know how its underlying dimensions affect the outcomes like armed conflict and peaceful agreement for an

issue. Armed conflicts are operationally defined as militarized disputes or the more severe form, which includes fatal militarized disputes and wars. A peaceful agreement is a settlement that ends by a conflict with either peaceful or violent means. Even though these terms are contradictory the fact that there was agreement made between the two states qualifies as a peaceful settlement.

An aspect of territory, which is key to understanding its full complexity, involves the concepts of tangibility and intangibility. It is important to investigate the relationships between tangibility and intangibility and these outcomes of conflict because it will broaden our understanding of territory and how it is contentious. These two dimensions of territory are able to classify the disputes that occur, in turn revealing motives, decisions and a better understanding of the states involved. There have been several illustrations and definitions of tangibility and intangibility. However, they do not paint a clear portrait of what are the exact limitations, expectations and perimeters of what these terms encompass. After carefully reviewing previous discussions of the definitions of tangibility and intangibility by James Rosenau, Richard Mansbach and John Vasquez, Paul Hensel, and Sarah Mitchell it is revealed that these concepts need further clarification and defining.

In James Rosenau article “Pre-Theories and Theories of Foreign Policy” (1966, p.187) he addresses the concepts tangibility and intangibility. Rosenau creates a definition that looks at a theoretical way of understanding them. As discussed in Rosenau’s article, “...The tangible-intangible scale of ends is operationalized in terms of whether the values involved can be photographed with a camera and that the tangibility means is measured by the extent to which money must be expended in order to acquire values” (1966, p.188). He goes on to give an illustration where the means are tangible but the ends are intangible. The concept he looks at is

education, which is intangible because the overall purpose of education is created through the teachers and process of educating. Additionally, nominations into office are another non-photographical example because it reflects the status of a person who is voted into the office. Rosenau provides the reader with a definition and an illustration of the term. However, the definition is too broad and not precise enough when indicating what is observable as tangible or intangible. It tries to encompass too much under these concepts making it unclear what issues and situations qualify as either tangible or intangible.

Richard Mansbach and John Vasquez build upon this explanation of tangibility and intangibility by looking at concrete, symbolic and transcendent stakes. In Mansbach and Vasquez's book "In Search of Theory" they discuss a significant aspect of the definition of these terms, which are the types of stakes under contention (1981, p.59). When tangible or intangible issues are being fought over different types of stakes are at risk. In the case that "actors contend for stakes in the belief that access to them will afford immediate value satisfaction" these are considered concrete stakes (1981, p.61). These stakes are both tangible and divisible and have a better ability to be settled because the value of it is inseparable from the object itself.

Symbolic stakes represent stakes of greater value in that their acquisition or loss is seen as an increasing the depravity of the loss of other stakes for which they stood for. Transcendent stakes are, "entirely abstract and nonspecific, and which concern beliefs, prescriptions, or norms about how people should live or behave" (1981, p.62). After examining these different types of stakes Mansbach and Vasquez discussed how these stakes values have the ability to change. For instance, a concrete stake can become infused with symbolic value, in turn transforming a once concrete stake into a symbolic stake. Mansbach and Vasquez expand on Rosenau's definition of

tangibility and intangibility by breaking down the concrete, symbolic and transcendent aspects of these dimensions and show how tangible objects can become intangible.

Paul Hensel and Sarah Mitchell co-authored two articles pertaining to tangibility and intangibility of territory, “The Bones of Contention: Comparing Territorial, Maritime, and River Issues” (Hensel et al. 2008) and “Issues of Indivisibility” (2005). Hensel and Mitchell’s article “Issues of Indivisibility” discuss how issues may be more difficult to resolve depending on if it is a tangible or intangible issue. Within this article they do not provide definitions of these concepts but illustrations and previous discussions of them. In their article “The Bones of Contention: Comparing Territorial, Maritime, and River Issues” (2008, p. 120) they provide a detailed explanation of these terms by concluding that the tangible objectives would involve economic or strategic value, whereas intangible objectives involve prestige, influence or ideology. They go on to argue that intangible issues tend to be more difficult to resolve due to its indivisible qualities (Hensel and Mitchell 2005, p. 283). However, this explanation does not provide a clear black and white definition of the concept with clear limitations and guidelines to what these terms encompass. Ultimately, this definition provides examples to reference but not a clear and precise definition to what they mean.

In “The Bones of Contention: Comparing Territorial, Maritime, and River Issues” they explore how different contentious issues are managed and argue that different types of issues vary along two general dimensions of salience, tangible and intangible. As further explained in the article, “we classify issue types with relatively high values of either tangible or intangible salience (but not both) as having moderate salience overall. Examples include competing claims over maritime zones or cross border rivers (tangible), as well as over the treatment of minorities or communal groups (intangible). Finally, we consider issue types with relatively low values of

both tangible and intangible salience as having low salience overall. Examples include issues related to specific individuals or corporations” (Hensel and Mitchell et al. 2008, p. 122). They created this system by looking at what Laswell and Kaplan (1950), Maslow (1970), and Mansbach and Vasquez (1981, p.58) found to be the most important values of tangibility and intangibility. For the tangible values they categorized issues pertaining to security, survival and wealth, while intangible values would be culture/identity, equality/justice, independence, status/prestige/influence. These became the guidelines to how Hensel and Mitchell operationalized certain issues as being tangible or intangible. Nonetheless, one could view equality, which they classify as intangible, as a tangible value, because that concept can be measured by income distribution, human rights protests, voting privileges, etc, although justice is more obviously intangible. These illustrations provide important examples in understanding the terms. However, it does not provide a clear definition of the terms, so this definition is not complete, as some would like.

After reviewing these previous discussions on the definition of tangibility and intangibility I found that they encompass too much, which makes it hard to clearly define what qualifies as either tangible or intangible. To address this issue I created a more precise definition of tangibility and intangibility by building upon the previous literature: Tangibility is a visible object, which one is able to touch and photograph. Tangible objects are concrete objects such as terrain, natural resources, and trade routes. Intangibility is a value assigned to an object that is not visible and cannot be touched or photographed. They involve a certain set of values, beliefs or symbols that is assigned to an object, place or set of people. For instance, a piece of land can be just a tangible aspect of a country but a war can be fought on it, which makes it a historical landmark and indivisible. However, if you are able to remove the intangible qualities of this land

then you are able to create a divisible/concrete stake again. Stacie Goddard discusses this point of indivisible and intractable qualities of land in her article “Uncommon Ground: indivisible territory and the politics of legitimacy” (2005). Goddard defines an issue as indivisible “if actors represent the issue (such as territory) in ways that eliminate any possible division, and thus reduce the bargaining range to “0” (2005, p.2). She treats indivisibility as a social fact of the territory. Also, the way the territory appears indivisible is only by how actors legitimate their claims to territory during the bargaining process. Goddard discussion of indivisibility broadens my definition tangibility and intangibility by adding an explanation to the logic behind how intangible qualities are indivisible issues. The definitions I provide lay out the limitations and guidelines to what these terms include, which provides a clearer understanding of them.

Causal Relationship

When territory is at stake dimensions of tangibility and intangibility arise. However, the dimensions that take precedent within a situation depend on perspectives of the actors involved. The way the actors perceive and react to a situation affects what aspects of territory become prevalent (i.e. tangible or intangible), therefore it is the perceptions of a situation, which causes tangible or intangible issues to arise. For instance a family is celebrating Christmas and a family member forgets to buy everyone Christmas presents. In response one family member gets upset because they feel forgotten, one takes back their present to make the situation equal and one smashes their gift to show that they are angry. The way the rest of the family members reacted to the same situation brought out either the tangible and/or intangible qualities of the situation. Ultimately, the way each actor perceives a situation will cause either the tangible and/or intangible qualities to arise.

Another example was in 2010 when China and Japan had confrontation over rare earth elements (Bradsher p.1). A Chinese fishing vessel Captain was captured by Japan who would not release him. In response, China who maintains a monopoly over rare earth elements, which are a vital international commodity, stopped shipments to Japan. Japan in response returned the fishing Captain to China, but still had to wait a while for shipments of rare earth elements to resume. This situation exemplifies how actors perceive or react to a situation affects what aspects of territory become prevalent (i.e. tangible or intangible). In this case, the choices and reactions of China and Japan pertaining rare earth elements showed both the tangible and intangible aspects of it. Rare earth elements are a resource of Chinese territory, making them tangible. However, China's decision to stop shipment and use it as political leverage over Japan until they received what they wanted showed their intangible qualities. This shows how the perceptions of the actors involved in a situation is what causes the tangible or intangible qualities to become more prevalent.

This discussion of the causal relationship between tangibility and intangibility show that they have a very complex relationship. The dimensions of either tangibility or intangibility become more important due to the decisions and actions of the actors involved in the situation. In order, to further understand this complex relationship between these two variables I will analyze the combination of tangibility and intangibility (refer to Table 1). By analyzing the different combinations tangibility and intangibility it broadens the understanding of why conflicts and settlements occur. These four combinations exemplify the complexities of the causal relationship: issues with high tangibility and intangibility, high tangibility and low intangibility, low tangibility and high intangibility, low tangibility and intangibility.

Contentious issues with both high tangible and intangible salience focus both on indefinable and concrete factors. These situation's probable outcome is more armed conflicts or peaceful agreements because of the concrete and symbolic factors that are at stake for a country. For instance, say two states have a dispute over a piece of territory. The state wants to claim it for its natural resources and access to the sea. However, this piece of land for the state in an ancestral burial ground. This land is infused with both tangible and intangible salience and now has made this conflict much more contentious.

Issues with high tangible and low intangible salience focus more on concrete factors than symbolic or transcendent dimensions. The probable outcome is that less armed conflict and peaceful agreements will occur because tangible factors are easier to negotiate and reach compromises, since they are divisible factors. A situation that demonstrates these salient qualities is Egypt and its oil fields. This land does not have symbolic or transcendent qualities but it is very valuable for its resources.

Situations with low tangible and high intangible salience focus more on indivisible factors than economic factors. The probable outcome is that it will produce more armed conflicts and peaceful agreements, due to the symbolic connection that actors have to a situation. The Kosovo War shows how low tangible and high intangible cause conflicts and settlements due to the indivisible qualities connected to the war. This was an ethnic war fought over control of territory and there was a large historical and emotional connection to the land by the actors involved.

Lastly, matters that have both low tangible and intangible salience do not have either indivisible factors or economic factors at risk. The probable outcome is that it would produce neither a high chance of armed conflict or peaceful agreements due to its lack of ability to incite

conflict. These types of situations would involve actors who have neither economic nor symbolic connection to a piece of territory at stake, therefore not increasing the probability of conflicts or settlements to occur. Overall, these relationships explore the intricacies the combination of tangibility and intangibility. It helps one understand the role they play within territory, conflicts and settlements. Therefore, after analyzing these relationships I developed the following hypotheses.

***Hypothesis 1:** Contentious issues with both high tangibility and intangibility are more likely to produce armed conflicts than issues with low levels on one or both dimensions, particularly for more severe forms of conflict.*

***Hypothesis 2:** Contentious issues with both high tangibility and intangibility are more likely to produce peaceful agreements than issues with low levels of one or both dimensions.*

Research Design

I test my argument by analyzing the territorial claims data from the Issue Correlates of War (ICOW) Project, which currently covers claims of territory in the Americas and Western Europe from 1816-1992 and considers a territorial claim a, “official representatives of at least one state make explicit statements claiming sovereignty over a piece of territory that is claimed or administered by another state” (Hensel, 2001, p. 90). The ICOW territorial claims do not have any private organizations or individuals that make reports on territory claims. Only when a government official representative makes a clear claim of sovereignty over a specific piece of territory then they considered it a claim. Additionally, the salience of an issue is considered the “degree of importance attached to that issue by the actors involved” (Diehl, 1992). In relation to territorial issues, salience is the importance level that is connected to the current territorial issue. The ICOW data set salience measure has two important advantages for my research, it allows for

comparison both within and across issues types, and both with militarized and peaceful attempts to manage or settle each issue is identified. This allows me to cross compare the effect of the level of salience has upon contentious issues. Therefore, I will define the variables I used for my research and discuss the results of data runs I conducted with them.

Dependent Variables

Militarized Interstate Dispute within a Year (ATTANYM)- According to the MID of COW data set, in order to determine the impact the level of salience has on armed conflicts the of militarized interstate dispute were taken into account. According to Jones, Singer, Bremer and (1996) for an event to be classified as a MID it must be a dispute between system member states that became militarized, involve multiple interstate members, and is a government authorized action. This variable is coded as 1 if there is at least one MID in a year and 0 otherwise.

Fatal Militarized Interstate Dispute within a Year (ATTANYF)- This variable indicates militarized interstate disputes with at least one fatality that occurred over an issue that year. This variable reveals the severity and occurrence of an MID within the data set.

A War Beginning within a Year (ATTANYW)- This variable describes when at least 1 war occurs within a year over an issue at stake. It represents the situations that have wars as a result of the conflict at hand and how many times it occurs within the given year.

Role of Organized Violence in End of Claim (ENDVIOL)- In order to characterize the type of settlement that occurred between two states the variable Endviol from the ICOW data set will be used. Endviol is characterized as 1, which is labeled violence represents claims that end due to an extensively large violent occurrence between the actors involved. 0, which is labeled None denotes claims that did not end through the violent means described in label 1. Lastly -9

represents claims that still ongoing and has not ended. Additionally, this variable does not included cases when the violence was not planned or conducted by non-official forces.

Claim ended through Peaceful Techniques (ENDPEACE)- This variable was created using the ICOW data set. Endpeace is characterized as either 1, which is represents if the claim was resolved or ended through a peaceful 3rd party or bilateral agreement and 0, which represents if the claim has not ended yet. This variable represents cases where peaceful measures are consider to be taken in order to end the conflict.

Independent Variables

Within my data analyses I will be using two measures of tangibility and intangibility: First I will use the ICOW data set salience measure and secondly I will use the subcomponents that make up tangibility and intangibility. The second measure of tangibility and intangibility is employed in order to obtain a more direct measure of these terms. Additionally, it will provide a further understanding on which components of tangibility and intangibility are the most important. However, I will not be using if a state has obtained sovereignty over territory as an intangible component in my analyses. The reason for this exclusion is that this variable was not as important in comparison to homeland and identity when analyzing intangibility.

In order to clarify how and what dimensions contribute to creating the ICOW salience measure, the ICOW project produced an index of salience for it. This index allows for a comparison of the components that create the salience measure. Six factors were used to create the territorial claim salience (Hensel and Mitchell et al. 2008). These factors can be broken down into being either tangible or intangible qualities. The tangible dimensions are if the territory posses a permanent population or not, valuable resources and if it is in an economically strategic location. The intangible components are if the territory has been claimed as homeland territory, a

state has obtained sovereignty over it during the past two centuries and if there was an ethnic or identity basis for the claim of territory. Each of these components are measured separately for the states involved in the claim and are assigned value on a zero to twelve scale (Hensel and Mitchell et al. 2008). The zero being that there is no vital characteristics for the states involved to twelve, where all of the six components exist for the states involved. However, due to the great similarities between the ICOW Salience measure and my combined measure I could not run them together because there was too much correlation between them.

High levels of Tangible & Intangible Salience (TANHINTH)- This variable was derived from the ICOW salience measure. However, it was not created by combining the components of tangibility and intangibility on a zero to twelve scale, like the ICOW salience measure does. It is created combining the tangible salience (SALTAN) and intangible salience (SALINT) variables on a zero to six scale. Additionally, it only considers a situation with high levels of tangible and intangible salience when the situation is equal to or above a three on the zero to six scale. Also, this variable adds 1 point for each salience indicator that is present for each country.

Tangible Salience Level (SALTAN)- For the tangible salience level variable 3 indicators were used: resources, strategic location, and populated area. These variables apply to both of the countries involved in the conflict. Lastly, 2 points are added for when each of these indicators are present within a conflict.

Intangible Salience Level (SALINT)- The intangible salience level variable was assigned to the countries involved differently from the tangible salience level variable. Since, this variable represents ideas and values that one state care about that the other doesn't it was assigned separately to the countries involved. 1 point was used for a country that assigns identity to the

territory, 1 point for when the territory is considered homeland, and 1 point for when the state has maintained historical sovereignty over the territory for the past two centuries.

Components of Tangibility

Population (TCPOP)- This variable represents if the territorial claim either has a permanent population or not (i.e. if the territory is uninhabited). In turn, revealing if the territory has contains a big enough population to be considered a tangible attribute.

Resources (TCRESOURCE)- This variable indicates if the territory is believed to have possible vital resources (oil, rare earth elements, etc.) or not. It represents the possibility and known resources of the territory at stake.

Strategic Location (TCSTRATLOC)- This variable specifies territory that has economic, military or a strategic location or not. It shows the types of territory that is valuable for the location and what it is able to provide for the actors involved.

Components of Intangibility

Identity (TCIDENCHAL/ TCIDENTGT)- These variables denotes territory that is claimed as ethnic, religious or other types of identity as basis for the territorial claim by either challenger or the target state involved. This variable shows the territory that has been infused with very indivisible qualities.

Homeland (TCHOMECHAL/ TCHOMTGT)- These variables represents if the territory at stake has been claimed as homeland for either the challenger or the target state involved. Instead of being claimed as colonial or a dependent possession of the states involved.

Control Variables

These variables below were used as the control variables for the data set. They represent characteristics of the states involved should have in common. Therefore, the challenger and

target state sharing a border, the actors involved are democracies and the relative capabilities are of the stronger state variables were used to provide these guidelines within the data set.

Challenger & Target State share Border (TCCONTBOTH)- In order to gather information on the states land border in relation to the territory a contiguity variable was used. This variable is derived from the ICOW data set and is a combination the challenger and target state that share a land border with the territory in question. The challenger and the target state do not necessary share borders but it does share a land border with the territory being disputed over.

Democracy Scale (DEMAUT6)- In order to account for it the states involved are democratic or not the Demaut6 variable was used. This variable characterizes if a state is a democratic by rating it on a scale from 1 to 10, 1 being least democratic to 10 being the most. Therefore, this variable categorized if a state is democratic by receiving a 6 or above on the democratic-autocratic scale.

Relative Capabilities (RELCAPS)-In order to account for the relative capabilities for a state this variable was used. This variable defines the relative capabilities of the stronger side in the claim (whether is it the challenger or the target state).

Analysis and Discussion

As previously stated, my two hypothesis's claim that contentious issues with both high levels of tangible and intangible salience are more likely to produce conflicts and peaceful agreements than issues with low levels on one or both salience dimensions, particularly for more severe forms of conflict. When testing my hypothesis I had to run the ICOW Salience variable and four combination dummy variables of tangible-intangible separately because they were too highly correlated and they would cancel one another out. I will run a set of Chi-square tests, logistic regression, and calculate the predictive probabilities using clarify. I will be using a logit

model for my tests because my dependent variables are binary, (i.e. 0-1) (Tomz, Wittenberg, and King, 1999, 2003; King, Tomz, and Wittenberg, 2000).

Table 3, Models 1-3 represent the logit tests for hypothesis one. Table 3a, Model 1 reveals that when a claim has high levels of both tangible and intangible salience it increases the likelihood of at least one MID occurring. In Table 3b Model 1 the Chi-square shows the strong significance of this relationship and in turns does not falsify the concept that levels of high tangible and intangible salience increase the likelihood of MIDs¹. Additionally, when my combination variable of high tangible and intangible salience was set as the reference category it was shown to have a higher likelihood to produce a MID than the other combination variables.

Table 3a, Model 2 shows the frequency of one fatal MID occurring with high levels of tangible and intangible salience. This relationships shows to be significant and high levels of tangible and intangible salience increases the probability that fatal MIDs to occur. Additionally, in Table 3b, Model 2 the Chi-square validates that the level of high tangible and intangible salience is significantly related to one fatal MID occurring over claims. This result emphasizes the importance of high levels of both tangible and intangible salience ability to increase the likelihood of at least one fatal MID occurring

Table 3a, Model 3 shows the relationship between the frequency of at least one war occurring when high levels of tangible and intangible salience are present. According to the logit

¹ bivariate test that analyzes and compares tanhinh variable with claims that are not tanhinh. It shows that claims that have tanhinh are more likely to have a war than expected by chance.

model there is not a significant relationship between them. However, the Chi-square does show there is connection between these two variables, revealing a casual relationship.²

In Table 3a, Models 4 and 5 represent the logit models for my second hypothesis. In Table 3a, Model 4, it shows the relationship of the between the occurrence of claims ending in peaceful arrangements and high levels of tangible and intangible salience. This model shows that high levels of tangible and intangible salience neither increase nor decrease the probability of peaceful agreements occurring. This contradicts my original hypothesis and that other level of tangible and intangible salience does have an impact on peaceful agreements, like low levels of tangible and high levels of intangible salience.

Table 3a Model 5 displays the frequency of claims ending in violent means when levels of high tangible and intangible salience exist. Again my combination variable is not significant within the logit model. However, in Table 3b Model 5 the Chi-square shows that my combination is related to claims ending in violence.

Table 4a-4d presents the results of the combined components of tangibility and intangibility. Within in Table 4a, Models 1-5 looks at the results of highly populated and territorial identity basis for the target state and the dependent variables. The combination of highly populated and territorial identity is significantly related to increasing the probability of

² The logit in Table 3a is comparing and analyzing the impact of the variable high tangible and intangible salience with the reference category of low tangible and intangible salience. The logit model displays that there is no difference between the high tangible and intangible and the low tangible and intangible variable's likelihood to produce wars. In Table 2b the chi square test is a bivariate test that analyzes and compares tanhinh variable with claims that are not tanhinh. It shows that claims that have tanhinh are more likely to have a war than expected by chance.

fatal MIDs, wars and claims ending through violence. Additionally in Table 5, Models 1-5, which discusses the predicted probabilities of the variable it shows again to increase the likelihood of these events to occur. Table 5, Model 1 shows that combined component variable increases probability of several dependent variables. This is seen within fatal MIDs it increasing from .138 when the combined component is absent to .288 when it is present. This increase in probability is also seen in with wars going from .083 when absent to .257 when present. Lastly, this dramatic increase of probability is shown with claims ending through violence going from .095 level when the combined component is not present to .296 it is.

Table 4b shows the combined variable of territory being high in resources and is challenger state's homeland. In Table 4b, Models 1,2 and 5 shows that there is a significant relationship between this combined component and any MIDs, fatal MIDs, and claims ending through violence. The Chi-square also supports these results of a significant relationship. Additionally, the predicted probabilities in Table 5, Models 1, 2 and 5 show a dramatic increase in the probabilities of these events occurring when this combined component is present, going from .292 when it is absent to .576 when it is present for MIDs. Additionally, going from .127 when it is absent to .252 when it is present for fatal MIDS and going from .076 when it is absent to .275 when it is present for claims ending through violent means.

Table 4c looks at the combined variable of territory that is high in resources and is the identity basis for target state. In Table 4c, Models 3 and 4 show that this combined component significantly increases the chances of war and claims ending through violence. The Chi-square score further supports these results by also showing there is a significant relationship between the two variables. Additionally, the predicted probabilities in Table 5, Models 3 and 5 reveal that the

chances of war occurring increases from .097 to .322 and the chances of claims ending in peaceful arrangements increases .076 to .273 when the combined component is present.

Table 4d displays the relationship between the combined variable of territory being strategic location and the challenger's homeland. In Table 4d, Models 3-5 shows that there is a significant relationship between the combined variable and wars, claims ending in peace and claims ending in violence. Furthermore, the Chi-square reveals there is a significant relationship between these two variables. Also, Table 5, Models 3-5 the predicted probabilities shows that this combined variable increases the likelihood of the dependent variables occurring going from .064 to .174 for wars, .702 to .517 for claims ending in peace and .048 to .229 for claims ending in violence when the combined component is present.

Conclusion

This study sought to determine whether the combination of high tangibility and intangibility would produce more armed conflicts or peaceful agreements than other levels of salience. Answering this question has important implications for the study of territory and the role of salience. In relation to territory this study shows that tangibility and intangibility play a significant role in the outcome of contentious issues dealing with territory. Overall, it further expands the literature by defining tangible and intangible salience and broadens the understanding to why territory is contentious. Additionally, the components of tangible and intangible salience were broken down and compared to further the understanding what factors cause high levels of tangible and intangible salience. This research shows that high levels of both tangible and intangible salience are much more significant in producing armed conflicts than other levels.

Even though it was hypothesized that these high levels would also produce more peaceful agreements this study shows that it is not the case. This further explains the role levels of salience have upon one another showing that the level of salience helps determine the outcome of the contentious issue. Moreover, this study seeks to explain the relationship of combination of high tangibility and intangibility and the outcomes of contentious issues. In order to explain this relationship and outcomes of territorial issues several logistic and descriptive analysis models were conducted, incorporating the presence of the combination of both high tangibility and intangibility with armed conflicts and peaceful agreements and see if there was any significant relationships between these variables.

Ultimately, it was found that the combination of high tangibility and intangibility had no significant influence on whether a situation would end in a peaceful settlement. However, this result provides valuable findings by showing that contentious issues with such high levels of salience cause the situation to become more difficult to resolve. Unlike previous research, which shows that high levels of intangible salience increase the likelihood to produce peaceful agreements (Hensel & Mitchell 2005, p.283), this research shows that when both high levels of tangible and intangible levels are present tangible salience cancels out the likelihood that it would end in a peaceful agreement. However, the significant influence the high levels of salience has upon armed conflicts shows that the combination of these two factor do increase the likelihood of producing armed conflicts. This further expands upon what was known about level of salience and that the levels of salience do affect the outcome of the contentious issue.

Additionally, the combined components of tangibility and intangibility were explored, in order to provide another measure of salience for tangibility and intangibility. These results further elaborated on the relationship between the combined components and its ability to

produce conflicts and peaceful agreements. The results showed several different significant relationships between the combined components and increasing the chances of conflicts and settlements. Overall, the results of these variables further defined the relationship of what factors drive tangibility and intangibility to be so contentious.

In the end, these test results do not falsify the first part of my hypothesis. Even though there was no significant influence between high levels of salience and peaceful agreements, it did show another dimension of the relationship between salience and peaceful agreements. Previous works have explained the role of these saliences individually upon a contentious issue and territory. However, previous literature had not explored the role of combining tangibility and intangibility. This research shows that it is important to look at the combination of high tangibility and intangibility because it broadens the understanding of what role it plays with causing conflicts and settlements between states.

Table 1

Combinations of Levels of Tangibility and Intangibility	
<p>High Tangibility & High Intangibility Contentious issues with both high tangibility and intangibility focus both on indefinable and concrete factors. These situations probable outcome is more armed conflicts or peaceful agreements because of the concrete and symbolic factors that is at stake for a country. For instance, say two states have a dispute over a peace of territory. The one state wants to claim it for its natural resources and views it as its homeland territory. However, this piece of land for the other state in an ancestral burial ground and provides natural resources for it. This land is infused with both tangible and intangible qualities and now has made this conflict much more contentious.</p>	<p>High Tangibility and Low Intangibility Issues with high tangibility and low intangibility focuses more on concrete factors than symbolic or transcendent dimensions. The probable outcome is that less armed conflict and peaceful agreements will occur because tangible factors are easier to negotiate and reach comprises, since they are divisible factors. A Situation that demonstrates these salient qualities is Egypt and its oil fields. This land does not have symbolic or transcendent qualities but it is very valuable for its resources.</p>
<p>Low Tangibility & High Intangibility Situations with low tangibility and high intangibility focus more on indivisible factors than economic factors. The probable outcome is that it will produce more armed conflicts and peaceful agreements, due to the symbolic connection that actors have to a situation. The Kosovo War shows how low tangibility and high intangibility cause conflicts and settlements due to the indivisible qualities connected to the war. This was an ethnic war fought over control of territory and there was a large historical and emotional connection to the land by the actors involved.</p>	<p>Low Intangibility & Low Tangibility Matters that have both low tangibility and intangibility do not have either indivisible factors or economic factors at risk. The probable outcome is that it would produce neither a high chance of armed conflict or peaceful agreements due to its lack of ability to incite conflict. These types of situations would involve actors who have neither economic nor symbolic connection to a piece of territory at stake, therefore not increasing the probability of conflicts or settlements to occur.</p>

Table 2: Baseline Model

Independent & Control Variables	Model 1 Militarized Dispute within a Year	Model 2 Fatal Militarized Dispute within a Year	Model 3 War within a Year	Model 4 Claims Ending in Peaceful Arrangements	Model 5 Claims Ending Through Violence
ICOW Saliency	.22*** (.037)	.30*** (.076)	2.87*** (.004)	-.20 * (0.07)	.42*** (.134)
Territory Contiguity	-.04 (.107)	.41 (.27)	.39 (.69)	.48* (.23)	.99 (.540)
Level of Democracy	-.60** (.28)	-.94 (.73)	-1.06** (.28)	.20 (.47)	-.545* (.783)
Relative Capabilities	-2.6*** (.517)	-1.9 (1.09)	-0.49 (.62)	-3.06* (1.23)	-1.16 (1.75)
Constant	-2.7*** (.539)	-5.97 *** (1.20)	-2.26 (0.024)	3.19*** (1.29)	-6.64*** (2.17)
Pseudo R2	0.066	0.094	0.1249	0.072	0.239

*P<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Table 3a: Coefficient estimates of Severe Forms of Conflict and Peaceful Settlements

Independent & Control Variables	<u>Model 1</u> Militarized Dispute within a Year	<u>Model 2</u> Fatal Militarized Dispute within a Year	<u>Model 3</u> War within a Year	<u>Model 4</u> Claims Ending in Peaceful Arrangements	<u>Model 5</u> Claims Ending Through Violence
High Tangibility & Intangibility	1.47*** (.355)	2.2* (1.05)	-1.64 (1.06)	-.28 (.497)	17.1 (3823.8)

*P<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

High Tangibility & Low Intangibility	1.64*** (.365)	1.17 (1.23)	-1.39 (1.12)	-.106 (.569)	16.7 (3823.8)
Low Tangibility & High Intangibility	.076 (.404)	.85 (1.11)	-.973 (.59)	1.13* (.610)	15.4 (3823.8)
Territory Contiguity	.247** (.120)	.52 (.289)	.14 (.356)	.14 (.241)	1.3 (.679)
Democracy Level	-.46 (.280)	-.80 (.73)	-.602 (.697)	.094 (.476)	-.076 (.74)
Relative Capabilities	-2.76*** (.507)	-2.34* (1.06)	-1.13 (1.57)	-2.91** (1.21)	-.545 (1.68)
Constant	-2.5*** (.552)	-5.38*** (1.40)	.640 (1.47)	2.76** (1.18)	-20.1 (3823.8)
Pseudo R2	0.085	0.10	0.0508	0.076	0.250
Number of Cases	191	191	191	191	191

Table 3b: Coefficient estimates of Severe Forms of Conflict and Peaceful Settlements Chi-square

Independent & Control Variables	<u>Model 1</u> Militarized Dispute within a Year	<u>Model 2</u> Fatal Militarized Dispute within a Year	<u>Model 3</u> War within a Year	<u>Model 4</u> Claims Ending in Peaceful Arrangements	<u>Model 5</u> Claims Ending Through Violence
High Tangibility & Intangibility	Chi2(1)=6.54** Pr=0.011	Chi2(1)=12.3*** Pr=0.000	Chi2(1)=11.02*** Pr=0.001	Chi2(1) =1.0725 Pr = 0.300	Chi2(1)=19.68*** Pr = 0.000
High Tangibility & Low Intangibility	Chi2(1) =0.0188 Pr = 0.891	Chi2(1) =0.9321 Pr = 0.334	Chi2(1) =1.0568 Pr = 0.304	Chi2(1) =0.5936 Pr = 0.441	Chi2(1) =1.5591 Pr = 0.212
Low Tangibility & High Intangibility	Chi2(1) =0.0096 Pr = 0.922	Chi2(1) =0.5503 Pr = 0.458	Chi2(1) =0.3931 Pr = 0.531	Chi2(1) =7.9579 Pr = 0.005	Chi2(1) =2.5189 Pr = 0.112
Low Tangibility & Intangibility	Chi2(1)=9.4542** Pr = 0.002	Chi2(1)=7.3034** Pr = 0.007	Chi2(1)=6.4491** Pr = 0.011	Chi2(1) =0.9378 Pr = 0.333	Chi2(1)=7.2138** Pr = 0.007

*P<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Table 4a: Combined Components of Tangibility and Intangibility

Combined Components of Tangible Salience & Control Variables	Model 1 Militarized Dispute within a Year	Model 2 Fatal Militarized Dispute within a Year	Model 3 War within a Year	Model 4 Claims Ending in Peaceful Arrangements	Model 5 Claims Ending Through Violence
Highly Populated and Territorial Identity Basis for Target State	-.172 (.406)	.890* (.455)	1.32** (.500)	-.683 (.400)	1.38** (.491)
Constant	-.474** (.163)	-1.82*** (.229)	-2.41*** (.289)	.619*** (.177)	-2.27 (.291)
Chi-Square	Chi2(1) =0.1806 Pr = 0.671	Chi2(1) =4.0001* Pr = 0.045	Chi2(1) =7.7049** Pr = 0.006	Chi2(1) =2.9727 Pr = 0.085	Chi2(1) =8.8279** Pr = 0.003
Pseudo R2	0.0007	0.0210	0.0478	0.0128	0.0561
Number of Cases	191	191	191	191	191

*P<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Table 4b: Combined Components of Tangibility and Intangibility

Combined Components of Tangible Salience & Control Variables	Model 1 Military Dispute within a Year	Model 2 Fatal Military Dispute within a Year	Model 3 War within a Year	Model 4 Claims Ending in Peaceful Arrangements	Model 5 Claims Ending Through Violence
Territory is high in resources and is Challenger State Homeland	1.20*** (.328)	.806* (.402)	.418 (.480)	.030 (.351)	1.54*** (.474)
Constant	-.890*** (.190)	-1.92*** (.259)	-2.23*** (.291)	.480** (.185)	-2.53*** (.346)
Chi-Square	Chi2(1)=14.1132*** Pr = 0.000	Chi2(1)=4.1475* Pr = 0.042	Chi2(1) =0.7674 Pr=0.381	Chi2(1) =0.0074 Pr= 0.931	Chi2(1)=12.0332*** Pr = 0.001
Pseudo R2	0.0548	0.0231	0.0056	0.0000	0.0823
Number of Cases	191	191	191	191	191

*P<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

4c: Combined Components of Tangibility and Intangibility

Combined Components of Tangible Salienc & Control Variables	<u>Model 1</u> Militaryzied Dispute within a Year	<u>Model 2</u> Fatal Militaryzied Dispute within a Year	<u>Model 3</u> War within a Year	<u>Model 4</u> Claims Ending in Peaceful Arrangements	<u>Model 5</u> Claims Ending Through Violence
Territory is High in Resources and is Identity Basis for Target State	.374 (.577)	.910 (.636)	1.43* (.652)	-.020 (.593)	2.02*** (.615)
Constant	-.528*** (.155)	-1.72*** (.208)	-2.24*** (.255)	.490** (.163)	-2.18*** (.263)
Chi-Square	Chi2(1) =0.4248 Pr = 0.515	Chi2(1) =2.1687 Pr = 0.141	Chi2(1)=5.5740* Pr = 0.018	Chi2(1)=0.0012 Pr = 0.972	Chi2(1) = 13.9075 Pr = 0.000
Pseudo R2	0.0016	0.0108	0.0310	0.0000	0.0740
Number of Cases	191	191	191	191	191

*P<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

4d: Combined Components of Tangibility and Intangibility

Combined Components of Tangible Salience & Control Variables	Model 1 Militarized Dispute within a Year	Model 2 Fatal Militarized Dispute within a Year	Model 3 War within a Year	Model 4 Claims Ending in Peaceful Arrangements	Model 5 Claims Ending Through Violence
Territory has a Strategic Location and is Challenger's Homeland	.074 (.299)	.736 (.401)	1.20** (.507)	-.802** (.321)	1.87*** (.577)
Constant	-.536** (.204)	-2.02*** (.307)	-2.78*** (.420)	.878*** (.228)	-3.09*** (.511)
Chi-Square	Chi2(1) =0.0614 Pr = 0.804	Chi2(1) =3.4489 Pr = 0.063	Chi2(1)=6.1050** Pr = 0.013	Chi2(1)=6.3439** Pr = 0.012	Chi2(1)=12.8879*** Pr = 0.000
Pseudo R2	0.0002	0.0204	0.0469	0.0280	0.1034
Number of Cases	191	191	191	191	191

*P<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Table 5: Predicated Probabilities 1816-1992 of Combined Components of Tangibility and Intangibility

Combined Components of Tangibility and Intangibility	Variable Value	Model 1 Militarized Dispute within a Year	Model 2 Fatal Militarized Dispute within a Year	Model 3 War within a Year	Model 4 Claims Ending in Peaceful Arrangements	Model 5 Claims Ending Through Violence
Highly Populated and Territorial Identity Basis for Target State	0	X	.138 (.094-.199)	.083 (.047-.131)	X	.095 (.055-.157)
	1	X	.288 (.154-.451)	.257 (.128-.421)	X	.296 (.152-.463)
Territory is high in resources and is Challenger State Homeland	0	.292 (.223-.373)	.127 (.078-.185)	X	X	.076 (.037-.135)
	1	.576 (.455-.705)	.252 (.151-.389)	X	X	.275 (.160-.402)
Territory is High in Resources and is Identity Basis for Target State	0	X	X	.097 (.059-.148)	X	.076 (.039-.131)
	1	X	X	.322 (.119-.584)	X	.273 (.164-.412)
Territory has a Strategic Location and is Challenger's Homeland	0	X	X	.064 (.028-.122)	.702 (.592-.794)	.048 (.017-.112)
	1	X	X	.174 (.099-.265)	.517 (.408-.620)	.229 (.146-.331)

X = non-significant coefficient

Numbers in () are confidence intervals 95%

Bibliography

- Bradsher, K., 2010. "Amid Tension, China Blocks Vital Exports to Japan." *New York Times*.
- Diehl, P.F., 1992. "What are they fighting for? The importance of issues in international conflict research." *Journal of Peace Research* 29: 333-334
- Fearon J.D., 1995. "Rationalist explanations for War." *International Organization* 49: 379-414.
- Hensel P.R., Mitchell S., Sowers T.E., and Thyne C.L., 2008. "Bones of Contention 2008: Comparing Territorial, Maritime, and River Issues" *Journal of Conflict Resolutions* 52:117-143
- Hensel P.R., 1999. "An Evolutionary Approach to the Study of Interstate Rivalry." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 17, 2 (Fall): 179-206.
- (1996) "Charting a course to conflict: territorial issues and militarized interstate disputes 1816-1992." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 15:43-73
- (2001) "Contentious issues and world politics: territorial claims in the Americas, 1816-1992." *International Studies Quarterly* 45: 81-109
- (2000) "Territory: theory and evidence on geography and conflict." In: Vasquez J.A (ed.), *What Do We Know about War?* Rowman and Littlefield, MD.
- Hensel P.R. and Mitchell S 2005. "Issue Indivisibility and Territorial Claims." *GeoJournal* 64:275-85
- Holsti K.J., 1991. "Peace and War: Armed Conflicts and International Order, 1648-1989." Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Huth P.K. and Allee T., 2002. "The Democratic Peace and Territorial Conflict in the Twentieth Century." *New York Cambridge University Press*.
- Huth P.K., 1996: *Standing Your Ground: Territorial Disputes and International Conflict*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

- Keohane R.O. and Nye J.S., 1977. "Power and Interdependence." *Little, Brown, Boston*.
- Jones D., Bremer S. and Singer J., 1996. "Militarized Interstate Disputes, 1816-1992: Rationale, Coding Rules and Empirical Patterns." *Conflict Management and Peace Science*
- Laurd E., 1970. "The International Regulation of Frontier Disputes." Praeger, New York.
- Mansbach R. and Vasquez J., 1981: *In Search of Theory: A New Paradigm for Global Politics*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Miller S.V and Gibler D. M., 2009. *Democracies, Territory and Negotiated Compromises*.
- Mitchell S.M and Prins B.C., 1999. "Beyond territorial contiguity: issues at stake in democratic militarized interstate dispute." *International Studies Quarterly* **43**: 169-183
- Laurd E., 1970. *The International Regulation of Frontier Disputes*. Praeger, New York.
- Randle R., 1987. *Issues in the History of International Relations*. Praeger, New York.
- Rosenau, J., 1996. "Pre-Theories and Theories of Foreign Policy." In Vasquez J.A (ed.), *Classics of International Relations, third edition*. Prentice Hall, NJ.
- Senese P.D. and Vasquez J.A., 2003. "A unified explanation of territorial conflict: testing the impact of sampling bias, 1919-1992." *International Studies Quarterly* **47**:275-298
- Senese P.D., 1996. "Geographical proximity and issue salience: their effect on the escalation of militarized interstate conflict." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* **15**:133-161
- Tomz M., Wittenberg J., and King G., 1999 (2001, 2003). CLARIFY: Software for interpreting and presenting statistical results. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Dept. of Government. June 1. <http://gking.harvard.edu/>.
- Vasquez J., 2009. *War Puzzle Revisited* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. Print.
- Vasquez J.A. and Henehan M.T., 2001. "Territorial disputes and the probability of war, 1816-1992." *Journal of Peace Research* **38**:123-138