

ICOW Data: Notable Changes to Data Set

Last updated 4 June 2007

Changes for Version 1.1

New data:

- Since version 1.0, we have added territorial claims in Western Europe; river claims in Western Europe and the Middle East; and maritime claims in all of Europe.
- We have also added the attempted settlement data for all available issues and regions, in addition to the aggregated claim-level and dyad-year-level data that was previously released.

New variables:

- We have added data on the individual salience indicators that are used to construct the ICOW salience index; a number of specific indicators (including some that are not currently used to calculate the official salience index) have been included for each of the three issue types.
- We have also added several breakdowns of salience that have appeared in recent papers. Following Hensel and Mitchell's 2005 *GeoJournal* article, we provide measures of both the tangible and intangible salience of each territorial claim. We also provide separate measures of salience for the claim challenger and the claim target.

Changes to variables:

- Salience: we have replaced the original salience index that was used in Hensel's 2001 *International Studies Quarterly* article with a revised salience index that was used in Hensel and Mitchell's 2005 *GeoJournal* article. The only difference is that the original indicator of whether a claimed territory is on the mainland or offshore has been replaced with an indicator of whether or not each claimant has exercised sovereignty over the territory within the past 200 years. This change means that the 12-point salience index now includes a 6-point range of possible tangible salience and a 6-point range of possible intangible salience. While the original variable name (Icowsal) now refers to the revised salience index, the earlier salience index is still included in this data set under the name Salold.
- We have updated the coding of several salience measures for some territorial claims (particularly the coding of valuable economic resources and strategic territory). These changes were made on the basis of new sources that were not available during the initial coding of these cases in the mid-late 1990s.
- Binding third party settlement attempts have been redefined as involving only arbitration or adjudication. Postwar peace conferences are now considered non-binding third party attempts rather than binding, because they do not involve the same type of agreement among the adversaries before the settlement attempt begins. This is only a change to the codebook, though, and did not affect any Western Hemisphere cases (this change is more important for the Western European cases, which include numerous settlement attempts at peace conferences). In fact, it was only recently -- after the Western European cases were first finished -- that peace conferences were added to the last of possible settlement attempts; this change has not affected any public releases of the ICOW data or any published articles using this data.

Changes to data:

- A few typos have been corrected.
- 8/4. Haro Channel: this case was renamed to "San Juan Islands," which is a more accurate description of the subject of the claim.
- 78/1. Gulf of Fonseca Islands: the challenger and target in this case were reversed. Although some sources published during the claim reported that neither side's rights were superior to the other's (in which case either side could convincingly be considered the challenger), further research makes clear

that Honduras largely occupied and administered the islands in question, and El Salvador was seeking recognition of its own rights.

Changes for Version 1.0

Version 1.0 is the first official release of the ICOW river claims and maritime claims data sets, so there are no changes to report for either of these data sets. The territorial claims data set has undergone some changes since Paul Hensel's 2001 *International Studies Quarterly* article that first used the data, though. Most of these changes were the result of new sources that were not available to us at the time of the original data collection (most notably the Historical New York Times online, which is much easier to search than the original printed NYT index and microfilm archives, as well as specialized maritime sources that were consulted to collect the ICOW maritime claims data set). This is a list of major changes (cases added or deleted, etc.), excluding small changes like moving a start or end date by a few years.

New cases added to list:

- 11. Wrangel Island: this case had been considered as a potential case previously, but it was not codable until new information was found (partly on the basis of the maritime claims data set, using sources on Arctic maritime claims).
- 30. Baja California - Sonora: this case was considered previously, but it was unclear whether there was an explicit claim by official U.S. government representatives. Additional sources cleared up this matter and allowed us to code it.
- 32. Ellesmere Island: this case was added following research using sources that were originally consulted for the maritime claims data set (although there is no maritime claim around Ellesmere Island).
- 34. Sverdrup Islands: this case was added following research that were originally consulted for the maritime claims data set (although there is no maritime claim around the Sverdrup Islands).
- 36. Hans Island: this case was added following research for the maritime claims data set.
- 38. Eastern Greenland: this case was originally planned for Northern/Western Europe, but it was moved to the Americas after the maritime claims data set (correctly) considered the Canada-Greenland maritime question to be part of the Americas.
- 57. Serranilla Bank - Bajo Nuevo: the 1980s Honduras-Colombia dyad for this case was added because of additional research using sources that were consulted for the maritime claims data set. Earlier and later claims involving Serranilla Bank as part of a larger Caribbean claim are still considered to be part of separate territorial claims.
- 78-dyad 2. Conejo Island: This is a new case that began in 2000, after the end of the data set reported in the ISQ article.
- 81. Cayo Sur - Media Luna: This is a new case that began in 1998, after the end of the data set reported in the ISQ article.
- 85. Nicaragua Canal: This case was considered before but was not coded due to insufficient information. Subsequent research using additional sources has confirmed that it does qualify.
- 131. Galápagos Islands: This case was considered before but was not coded due to insufficient information. Subsequent research using additional sources has confirmed that it does qualify.

Cases deleted from list:

- 24. Los Algodones: the information that led to the original coding of this case was somewhat vague. Subsequent research revealed that the news source that was used had mis-reported information from a different source; once the original source was found, it was clear that there is no qualifying claim here.

Cases merged together:

A few cases that were previously considered to reflect distinct territorial claims have now been merged together as parts of the same claim because they involved overlapping territory. This change should have no effect on analyses using the data, though, because details of the claims themselves have not changed -- this just changes the way the cases are organized.

- 136. Acre-Purús, 138. Acre-Madre de Dios, 140. Acre-Abuná: all merged together into 136. Acre. Although sources like Ireland (1938) treated all three dyads as separate cases, they involved a lot of overlapping territory. At times, all three states claimed the same territory at the same time, and in other cases once territory changed hands in one dyad it became contested in another. All three cases really belong as part of the same larger Acre claim.
- 156. Puna de Atacama, 162. Los Andes: merged into 156. Puna de Atacama / Los Andes. Again, sources like Ireland (1938) treated the two dyads separately, but the entire territory in the Argentina-Chile "Los Andes" case became contested only when Argentina acquired it from Bolivia in the "Puna de Atacama" case. As a result, the two cases really belong together as part of the same case.

Major changes to existing cases:

- 68. Ranguana & Sapodilla (Zapotillo): new information became available, particularly once we realized that Sapodilla can also be spelled Sapodillo, Zapotillo, and Zapotilla (as well as referred to simply as "the cays/cayes" or "the Belize cays"). Both the Guatemala-Belize and Honduras-Belize dyadic claims were discovered to extend back to the year before Belizean independence, creating two new dyadic claims with Britain as the target (and introducing several new Guatemala/UK settlement attempts). The new spellings of the cays' names also helped us to discover several additional settlement attempts after Belize joined the COW system.
- 70. Mosquito Coast: The 1900-05 British/Nicaraguan dyadic claim has been deleted. By this time Britain was no longer claiming sovereignty (or the right of a protectorate) over the Mosquito Coast area, despite Nicaraguan and American allegations to the contrary, but was only seeking Nicaraguan guarantees regarding the treatment of the area and its residents.
--also, the Nicaraguan/Colombian dyadic claim has been added. There was not much information before (besides a mention of the Mosquito Coast in the 1928 treaty), which was not sufficient to code this as a claim after Nicaragua joined the COW system, but enough (brief) additional mentions of the claim have now been found to give us confidence that there was a qualifying dyadic claim here until the 1928 treaty.
--the name of this case has been changed to "Mosquito Coast," to reflect that this was the name used by the claimants through much of the claim (although "Mosquitia" was used in earlier times, and the area was also known as the "Mosquito Shore," "Mosquito Kingdom," "Mosquito Coast Protectorate" under British protection up to 1860, and as the "Mosquito Reservation" or "Mosquito Reserve" from 1860-1894).
- 84/1. Mangles (Corn) Islands: due to a typo, the first dyadic claim over these islands was listed in Table 1 of the ISQ article as a Nicaragua/USA claim. That dyadic claim was coded correctly as a Colombia/Nicaragua claim in the data used for that paper's analyses (and thus in the replication archive available on the web), though. The second dyadic claim was correctly listed as Nicaragua/USA in both the table and the data.
- 100. Goajirá-Guainía: this had previously been coded as ongoing in the late 1990s, but it has now been recoded as ending in 1922. Numerous news stories throughout the 1980s and 1990s refer to border demarcation negotiations / commissions / agreements and frequent cross-border incidents (which are often referred to as "border disputes"). It appears, though, that the problem is only the specific demarcation of a border line that is accepted by both sides; if the border were more clearly marked, it is implied, there would be no such incidents.