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RATIONALE

Understanding the causes and effects of proposals for different peaceful settlement methods in territorial disputes important, both for scholars of territorial conflict and for policymakers seeking limit the damages caused by contentions over land. This dataset was created with one purpose in mind: to measure the year-to-year peaceful settlement preferences of states involved in ongoing territorial disputes. We do not seek to measure the effectiveness of the methods recorded in terms of successful settlement attempts, nor do we only code settlement attempts that produce substantive cooperation on territorial issues. Rather, these data record observable indications that a particular state preferred one peaceful resolution of dispute method (PRD) to other methods, regardless of the preferences or actions of opponents. By generating these data for states involved in territorial disputes between 1945 and 2015, we hope to provide future researchers with a useful empirical basis upon which to test theories of state preferences in territorial conflict that is also fully compatible with the Issue Correlates of War (ICOW) project, the current primary dataset used by quantitative scholars of territorial and maritime disputes.

DEFINITIONS

1. **What is a territorial dispute?**
	1. A disagreement between two or more states over who holds title to a particular tract of land (Hensel 2013).
		1. “Title” refers to the factual and legal conditions that authorize the exercise of territorial sovereignty.
	2. Our core list of territorial disputes is taken from the Issue Correlates of War project’s provisional dataset (Frederick, Hensel, and Macaulay 2017, v. 1.01).
2. **What is a peaceful settlement proposal?**
	1. Any observable indication by formally authorized representatives of a state that said state prefers a particular peaceful settlement method in a particular year (Wiegand and Powell 2011).
	2. This includes:
		1. Years in which a state attempts, via authorized representatives, to initiate some peaceful settlement process, successfully or unsuccessfully.
		2. Years in which a state accedes to some peaceful settlement process initiated by an opponent.
		3. Years in which a state continues to participate in a peaceful settlement process initiated in a previous year.
		4. Years in which a peaceful settlement process settles a dispute.
3. **What isn’t a peaceful settlement proposal?**
	1. A year where a state does nothing to settle an ongoing dispute.
	2. A year in which a state only uses coercive measures (e.g. MIDs, war, occupation) to settle a dispute.
	3. A year in which a state merely reiterates its claim to a disputed territory but proposes no method for arriving at a settlement.
	4. A year in which some form of negotiations take place between opponents, possibly regarding issues in the disputed region, but the talks do not involve the question of sovereignty.
4. **What are the types of peaceful settlement proposals?**
	1. Bilateral negotiations
		1. A proposal to discuss a dispute with authorized representatives of an opponent in the absence of both external, third party mediators of any kind and legal settlement mechanisms.
	2. Non-binding third party methods
		1. A proposal to utilize a third party external to a dispute in order to facilitate settlement.
		2. Includes mediation, conciliation, inquiry, and good offices.
		3. The external third party may be either a state, an international organization, or an individual or group authorized by the disputants (e.g. the UN’s Secretary General can mediate).
		4. Does not include multilateral negotiations when all parties are claimants to the disputed territory, multilateral negotiations in which non-state actors are involved as claimants rather than mediators, and any proposal involving arbitration or adjudication (legal settlement mechanisms).
	3. Binding third party methods
		1. A proposal to utilize legal settlement methods: arbitration or adjudication.
			1. Arbitration: forms an *ad hoc* panel of judges to decide a single dispute by principles of international law and those authorized by the disputants.
			2. Adjudication: uses a permanent international court to adjudicate a dispute according to international law.

VARIABLES

**year**

The 4-digit calendar year in which an observation takes place.

**chal**

The 3-digit COW code connected to the state in a dyad that is considered to be the challenger. Challenger states are those that initiate territorial claims, thereby “challenging” the status quo. Data for challengers is taken from the ICOW dataset, version 1.1.

**tgt**

The 3-digit COW code connected to the state in a dyad that is considered to be the target. Target states prefer the territorial status quo at the initiation of a dispute by a challenger opponent. Data for challengers is taken from the ICOW dataset, version 1.1.

**name**

The full name of the observed territorial claim, as given by the ICOW project.

**PRD\_proposal**

The type of peaceful resolution of dispute method proposed in a given proposal.

**0**=No settlement activity proposed

**1**=Bilateral negotiations

**2**=Non-binding third party methods (mediation, conciliation, good offices, inquiry)

**3**=Arbitration

**4**=Adjudication

During years in which multiple settlement methods are proposed, the method with the highest level of formality is recorded. The level of formality is conveniently linked to the above coding: Adjudication (4) is the most formal, bilateral negotiations (1) is the least, and higher numeric codes indicate higher levels of formality.

**proposer**

The 3-digit COW code corresponding to the state being observed in a given year.

**negotiations**

A dichotomous variable equal to 1 if bilateral negotiations are proposed in a given year.

**nbtp**

A dichotomous variable equal to 1 if nonbinding third party methods are proposed in a given year.

**arbitration**

A dichotomous variable equal to 1 if arbitration is proposed in a given year.

**adjudication**

A dichotomous variable equal to 1 if adjudication is proposed in a given year.

**binding**

A dichotomous variable equal to 1 if either of the binding third party methods (adjudication or arbitration) is proposed in a given year.

**legalbinding**

A categorical variable equal to sett\_attempt, except that arbitration and adjudication are aggregated into one category, coded 3.

**region**

The region in which a claim takes place.

 **1**=the Americas

 **2**=Europe

 **3**=Africa

 **4**=Middle East

 **5**=Asia and Oceania

**duration**

Numeric variable equal to the number of years since the beginning of a claim or 1945, if the claim began prior to 1945.

**SQ**

A dichotomous variable equal to 1 if no settlement activity is proposed in a given year.

**post1944**

A dichotomous variable equal to 1 if a given claim began in 1945 or later and 0 if it began before 1945. This helps users worried about left censoring to drop out left censored claims.

**catyr**

This is a numeric variable transforming the calendar year (1945, 1946 etc.) into smaller values (0, 1, etc). Catyr is equal to 0 if year is equal to 1945, 1 if 1946, and so on. This was included to facilitate the use of the calendar year as an explanatory variable, particularly as nonlinear transformations of year may cause difficulties with some statistical packages.

**claimproposer**

The four-to-six digit panel identifier variable, with the first one-to-three digits being the ICOW claim number and the last three digits being the COW numeric code for the state being observed.

**claimdy**

The ICOW claim dyad within which a proposal is made. Included to facilitate merging with various ICOW datasets. This variable is included for ease of merging only. As the TPRD data is *not* dyadic, there are not multiple observations for states involved in different dyads within the same dispute.

**claim**

The ICOW claim code of the territorial dispute within which a proposal is made.

**dyad**

Dyadic, six-digit numeric variable consisting of the lesser of two COW country codes followed by the greater. Included to facilitate merging with various ICOW datasets, but note that the TPRD data is not dyadic (see note under “claimdy”).