

The Evolution and Causes of Territorial Peace in the Americas

Appendix 2

Appendix B. Individual Criteria for the Selection of Resistant Cases

In this section, we present a transparent account of the characteristics we considered when identifying the list of resistant territorial disputes we analyze in the main text.

Saliency: The Issue Correlates of War Project (Frederick et al 2017; cf. Hensel et al 2008) measures the saliency of a territorial dispute along a scale from 0-12. This variable's coding reflects six characteristics of the territory as they apply to each disputant in the dyad ($6*2=12$). These characteristics include whether the territory contains valuable resources, offers a strategic location, is population dense, is affiliated with one/more disputants' homeland, has ethnic kin of one/more disputant living in the territory, and one/more disputant has exercised sovereign rights over the territory in the past. Saliency is high when values are between 8 and 12. We use the latest version of the Issue Correlates of War Project (Frederick et al 2017) to identify the high saliency claims that appear in Table B1.

Table B1. Resistant Cases by Saliency, 1816-2001

<i>Challenger</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Claim</i>	<i>Duration</i>	<i>Saliency</i>
Chile	Argentina	Patagonia	1841-1903	10
Ecuador	Peru	Oriente-Mainas	1854-1945	10
Bolivia	Paraguay	Chaco Boreal	1878-1938	10
Bolivia	Chile	Antofagasta	1884 onwards	10
Peru	Chile	Tacna-Arica	1884-1929	10
United States	Mexico	Baja California/Sonora	1847-1865	9
Chile	Bolivia	Antofagasta	1848-1884	9
Chile	Peru	Tacna-Arica	1879-1929	9
Peru	Brazil	Acre	1839-1909	8
Peru	Colombia	Loreto	1839-1922	8
Argentina	UK	Falklands/Malvinas	1841 onwards	8
Venezuela	Colombia	Goajirá-Goainía	1841-1922	8
Paraguay	Brazil	Apa	1846-1874	8
Brazil	Bolivia	Acre	1848-1909	8
Peru	Bolivia	Acre	1848-1912	8
Guatemala	UK/Belize	Belize	1868-onwards	8
Ecuador	Peru	Cordillera del Cóndor	1947-1998	8

Legal Parity: Huth et al (2013) use a three-point scale to determine whether the challenger and the target involved in a territorial dispute each have a (i) strong legal claim, (ii) mixed legal claim, or (iii) weak legal claim. If one party possesses a strong legal claim while the other possesses a weak one, a legal advantage exists in favor of the stronger side. Table B2 lists the post-1945 territorial disputes in the Americas where no party had a legal advantage.

Table B2. Resistant Cases by Legal Parity, 1946-2001

<i>Challenger</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Claim</i>	<i>Duration</i>
Suriname	UK/Guyana	Corentyn	1840 onwards
Argentina	UK	Falklands/Malvinas	1841 onwards
Argentina	Chile	Beagle/Laguna del Desierto	1841-1998
Bolivia	Chile	Antofagasta	1884 onwards
Mexico	United States	El Chamizal	1895-1963
El Salvador	Honduras	Gulf of Fonseca	1899-1992
Honduras	United States	Swan Islands	1921-1972
Panama	United States	Canal Zone	1923-1979
Haiti	United States	Navassa Island	1935 onwards
Cuba	United States	Guantánamo Bay	1960 onwards
United States	Canada	Machias Seal Island	1971 onwards
Nicaragua	Colombia	San Andrés /Providencia	1979 onwards

Duration: A claim is resistant by duration if it persists for more than 75 years. We choose this threshold following the process established by Cronqvist and Berg-Scholsser (2009:76-79), which recommends establishing a threshold along the data distribution that divides it into two clusters of roughly equivalent process. Importantly, our analyses remain robust to any duration threshold between 52-92 years. Table B3 lists the territorial disputes in the Americas that qualify as “resistant” according to our standard of duration.

Table B3. Resistant Cases by Duration (more than 75 years), 1816-2001.

<i>Challenger</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Claim</i>	<i>Dates</i>	<i>Years</i>
Argentina	Uruguay	Río de la Plata	1882-1973	92
Argentina	Bolivia	Puna de Atacama	1848-1941	94
Argentina	UK	Malvinas/Falklands	1841 onwards	161
Brazil	Colombia	Apaporis	1831-1928	98
Chile	Argentina	Palena – Continental Glaciers**	1903-1998	96
Ecuador	Peru	Oriente-Mainas	1854-1945	92
El Salvador	Honduras	Bosones	1899-1992	94
El Salvador	Honduras	Gulf of Fonseca**	1899-1992	94
Guatemala	UK/Belize	Belize*	1868 onwards	114
Surinam	France	Maroni	1849 onwards	127
Surinam	Guyana	Corentyn	1816 onwards	151
Uruguay	Brazil	Yaguarón	1882 onwards	120
Mexico	US	Rio Grande	1884-1972	89
Brazil	UK	Pirara	1838-1926	89
Venezuela	Brazil	Amazonas	1841-1928	88
Peru	Colombia	Loreto	1839-1922	84
Venezuela	UK	Patos Island	1859-1942	84
Colombia	US	Quitaeño	1890-1972	83
Venezuela	Colombia	Goajirá-Goainía	1841-1922	82
Argentina	Chile	Beagle Channel	1904-1985	82

*Disputes that involved a colonial power and were then transferred to a successor state are considered a single case (cf. Frederick et al 2017).

** These disputes appear as settled in our sources (Frederick et al 2017) although it could be argued that they remain active given protests that have arisen at the stage of delimitation. Our analysis is consistent with both interpretations.

Repeated Negotiations: Disputes might also be resistant if repeated settlement attempts fail to settle them. Using ICOW data (Frederick et al 2017), Table B4 identifies all resistant territorial disputes in the Americas that experienced ten or more bilateral negotiations.

Table B4. Resistant Cases by Bilateral Settlement Attempts (>9 only, 1816-2001

<i>Challenger</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Claim</i>	<i>Duration</i>	<i>Bilateral Attempts</i>
Argentina	UK	Malvinas/Falklands	1841 onwards	55
Bolivia	Chile	Antofagasta	1884 onwards	35
Bolivia	Paraguay	Chaco Borea	1878-1938	33
Guatemala	UK/Belize	Belize*	1868 onwards	28
Argentina	Chile	Beagle	1904-1985	22
UK	US	Alaska	1872-1903	20
Peru	Chile	Tacna-Arica	1884-1929	19
Venezuela	Colombia	Goajirá-Goainía	1841-1922	18
El Salvador	Honduras	Bosones	1899-1992	18
Ecuador	Peru	Oriente-Mainas	1854-1945	17
Colombia	Venezuela	Los Monjes	1951 onwards	16
Venezuela	Guyana	Essequibo	1966 onwards	16
Honduras	Guatemala	Rio Motagua	1899-1992	15
Chile	Bolivia	Antofagasta	1848-1884	15
Venezuela	UK	Essequibo	1841-1899	13
Nicaragua	Honduras	Teotecacinte	1912-1961	12
Chile	Argentina	Patagonia	1841-1903	12
Peru	Bolivia	Acre	1848-1912	12
Panama	US	Canal Zone	1923-1979	12
Peru	Colombia	Loreto	1839-1922	12
Argentina	Bolivia	Puna de Atacama	1848-1941	11
Ecuador	Colombia	Oriente	1854-1919	11
US	Russia	Alaska	1822-1867	11
Chile	Argentina	Palena	1903-1998	10
Ecuador	Peru	Cenepa	1947-1998	10
Argentina	Uruguay	River Plate	1882-1973	10
Peru	Brazil	Acre	1839-1909	10

* Disputes that involved a colonial power and were then transferred to a successor state are considered a single case (cf. Frederick et al 2017)

Historical militarization: Violence can be another indicator of a case's resistance. Table B5 therefore uses the ICOW data (Frederick et al 2017) to identify all territorial disputes with at least one militarized interstate dispute – that is, a threat, display, or use of force (Palmer et al 2016) – at some point during the dispute's history. In addition to the total number of MIDs that occur in the dispute's history, we also list both the maximum hostility level achieved and the maximum number of fatalities that occur in these MIDs (Frederick et al 2017).

Table B5. Resistant Claims That Were Militarized, *1816-2001

<i>Challenger</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Claim</i>	<i>Duration</i>	<i>MID</i>	<i>Hostility (maximum)</i>	<i>Fatalities (maximum)</i>
Argentina	Paraguay	Chaco Central	1846-1878	1	War	1000+
Argentina	UK	Malvinas	1841 on	4	War	1000+
Bolivia	Paraguay	Chaco Boreal	1878-1938	19	War	1000+
Chile	Bolivia	Antofagasta	1848-1884	5	War	1000+
Chile	Peru	Tacna-Arica	1879-1884	2	War	1000+
El Salvador	Honduras	Bolsones	1899-1992	2	War	1000+
Paraguay	Brazil	Apa	1846-1874	5	War	1000+
US	Mexico	Texas	1831-1848	2	War	1000+
US	Mexico	California/NM	1835-1848	2	War	1000+
US	Spain	Cuba	1848-1898	1	War	1000+
Spain	Peru	Islas Chinchu	1864-1866	2	War	501-999
US	Spain	Florida	1816-1821	1	Use of force	0
Ecuador	Peru	Oriente-Mainas	1854-1945	16	Use of force	501-999
Ecuador	Peru	Cordillera del C6ndor	1947-1998	13	Use of force	251-500
Peru	Colombia	Leticia	1932-1935	2	Use of force	101-250
Peru	Brazil	Acre	1839-1909	1	Use of force	26-100
Argentina	Chile	Beagle	1904-1985	19	Use of force	1-25
Guatemala	El Salvador	Cordillera Mte Cristo	1935-1938	1	Use of force	1-25
Honduras	Guatemala	Rio Motagua	1899-1992	2	Use of force	1-25
Peru	Colombia	Loreto	1839-1922	5	Use of force	1-25
Peru	Bolivia	Acre	1848-1912	3	Use of force	1-25
Argentina	Brazil	Misiones	1941-1895	1	Force display	0
Argentina	Bolivia	Puna de Atacama	1848-1941	1	Force display	0
Argentina	Uruguay	Rio de la Plata	1882-1973	3	Use of force	0
Bolivia	Chile	Antofagasta	1884 on	2	Use of force	0
Brazil	UK	Pirara	1838-1926	3	Use of force	0
Brazil	Bolivia	Acre	1848-1909	1	Use of force	0
Brazil	UK	I. Trinidad	1826-1896	1	Use of force	0
Chile	Argentina	Andes	1896-1904	1	Force display	0
Chile	Argentina	Patagonia	1841-1903	8	Use of force	0
Colombia	Venezuela	Los Monjes	1951 on	3	Use of force	0
Costa Rica	Panama	Sixaola/Coto	1920-1941	1	Use of force	0
Ecuador	Colombia	Oriente	1854-1919	1	Use of force	0
El Salvador	Honduras	Golfo Fonseca	1899-1992	1	Use of force	0
France	Brazil	Amapa	1826-1900	2	Use of force	0
Guatemala	UK/Belize	Belize**	1868 on	8	Use of force	0
Haiti	Dominican	R. Massacre	1894-1915	1	Force display	0
Nicaragua	Colombia	San Andres/ Pro.	1900 on	4	Use of force	0
Nicaragua	Honduras	Teotecacinte	1912-1961	2	Use of force	0
Nicaragua	Honduras	Cayo Sur	1998 on	1	Use of force	0
Paraguay	Brazil	Rio Paraguay	1874-1929	1	Use of force	0
Peru	Chile	Tacna-Arica	1884-1929	3	Use of force	0
Suriname	Guyana	Corentyn	1816 on	2	Use of force	0
UK	US	Alaska	1872-1903	2	Force display	0
US	UK	S.Croix- John	1816-1842	1	Use of force	0
US	Mexico	Mesilla Valley	1850-1854	1	Use of force	0
US	UK	Oregon	1816-1846	1	Force display	0
US	Haiti	St. Nicholas	1889-1915	1	Force display	0

Venezuela	Colombia	Goajirá-Goainía	1841-1922	1	Use of force	0
Venezuela	Netherlands	Bird-Aves	1854-1866	2	Use of force	0
Venezuela	UK/Guyana	Essequibo	1841 on	9	Use of force	0
Venezuela	UK	Patos	1859-1942	1	Use of force	0

* At least one MID during claim history.

** Disputes that involved a colonial power and were then transferred to a successor state are considered a single case (cf. Frederick et al 2017).

Combining Criteria: The above indicators produce a long list of possible resistant cases. We therefore use case overlap across the indicators to narrow the list. More specifically, the latter columns of Table B6 track whether (1) or not (0) each territorial dispute contained: high salience, legal parity (i.e., no legal advantage for any one party), a long duration, repeated bilateral settlement attempts, and militarization at some point. The final column in the table then sums these dichotomous indicators. A score of 3 is moderate, while scores of 4 and 5 are high and very high respectively. Twenty cases score 3 or higher, and we use these as the resistant cases throughout the analysis presented in the main text.

Table B6. Resistant Cases by All Criteria, 1816-2001

<i>Challenger</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Dispute</i>	<i>Salience</i>	<i>Legal Parity</i>	<i>Duration</i>	<i>Settle Attempts</i>	<i>M I D</i>	<i>Total</i>
Cuba	US	Guantánamo	0	0	0	0	0	0
France	Brazil	Amapa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Argentina	Brazil	Misiones	0	0	0	0	1	1
Argentina	Paraguay	Chaco Central	0	0	0	0	1	1
Brazil	Colombia	Apaporis	0	0	1	0	0	1
Brazil	UK	Pirara	0	0	1	0	1	2
Brazil	UK	I. Trinidad	0	0	0	0	1	1
Chile	Argentina	Andes	0	0	0	0	1	1
Chile	Peru	Tacna-Arica	0	0	0	0	1	1
Costa Rica	Panama	Sixaola/Coto	0	0	0	0	1	1
Haiti	Dom. Rep.	Río Massacre	0	0	0	0	1	1
Haiti	US	Navassa Island	0	1	0	0	0	1
Honduras	US	Swan Islands	0	1	0	0	0	1
Mexico	US	El Chamizal	0	1	0	0	0	1
Mexico	US	Rio Grande	0	0	1	0	0	1
Colombia	US	Quitasueño	0	0	1	0	0	1
Nicaragua	Honduras	Cayo Sur	0	0	0	0	1	1
Paraguay	Brazil	Rio Paraguay	0	0	0	0	1	1
Peru	Colombia	Leticia	0	0	0	0	1	1
Spain	Peru	Islas Chincha	0	0	0	0	1	1
Surinam	France	Maroni	0	0	1	0	0	1
US	Canada	Machias Island	0	1	0	0	0	1
US	Mexico	Mesilla Valley	0	0	0	0	1	1
US	Spain	Florida	0	0	0	0	1	1
Uruguay	Brazil	Yaguarón	0	0	1	0	0	1
US	Haiti	St. Nicholas	0	0	0	0	1	1

US	Mexico	Texas	0	0	0	0	1	1
US	Mexico	California/NM	0	0	0	0	1	1
US	Russia	Alaska	0	0	0	1	0	1
US	Spain	Cuba	0	0	0	0	1	1
US	UK	Oregon	0	0	0	0	1	1
Venezuela	Netherlands	Bird-Aves	0	0	0	0	1	1
Venezuela	UK	Patos	0	0	2	0	1	2
Venezuela	Brazil	Amazonas	0	0	1	0	0	1
Brazil	Bolivia	Acre	1	0	0	0	1	2
Chile	Argentina	Palena	0	0	1	1	0	2
Colombia	Venezuela	Los Monjes	0	0	0	1	1	2
Ecuador	Colombia	Oriente/A	0	0	0	1	1	2
Honduras	Guatemala	Rio Motagua	0	0	0	1	1	2
Nicaragua	Colombia	San Andrés	0	1	0	0	1	2
Nicaragua	Honduras	Teotecacinte	0	0	0	1	1	2
Panama	US	Canal Zone	0	1	0	1	0	2
Paraguay	Brazil	Apa	1	0	0	0	1	2
UK	US	Alaska	0	0	0	1	1	2
US	Mexico	Baja California	1	0	0	0	1	2
US	UK	S.Croix- John	0	0	0	1	1	2
Argentina	Bolivia	Puna de Atac	0	0	1	1	1	3
Argentina	Chile	Beagle	0	1	1	1	1	4
Argentina	Uruguay	River Plate	0	0	1	1	1	3
Bolivia	Paraguay	Chaco Boreal	1	0	0	1	1	3
Chile	Argentina	Patagonia	1	0	0	1	1	3
Chile	Bolivia	Antofagasta	1	0	0	1	1	3
Ecuador	Peru	Cenepa	1	0	0	1	1	3
El Salvador	Honduras	Gulf Fonseca	0	1	1	0	1	3
El Salvador	Honduras	Bosones	0	0	1	1	1	3
Peru	Bolivia	Acre	1	0	0	1	1	3
Peru	Brazil	Acre	1	0	0	1	1	3
Peru	Chile	Tacna-Arica	1	0	0	1	1	3
Peru	Colombia	Loreto	1	0	1	1	1	4
Surinam	UK/Guyana	Corentyn	0	1	1	0	1	3
Venezuela	Colombia	GoajiráGoainía	1	0	1	1	1	4
Venezuela	UK/Guyana	Essequibo	1	0	0	1	1	3
Ecuador	Peru	OrienteMainas	1	0	1	1	1	4
Guatemala	UK/Belize	Belize	1	0	1	1	1	4
Argentina	UK	Malvinas	1	1	1	1	1	5
Bolivia	Chile	Antofagasta	1	1	0	1	1	4

Table B7. Active Non-Resistant Cases, post-1945

<i>Challenger</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Dispute</i>	<i>Salience</i>	<i>Legal Parity</i>	<i>Duration</i>	<i>Settle Attempts</i>	<i>M I D</i>	<i>Settle</i>
Cuba	US	Guantánamo	0	0	0	0	0	-
Haiti	US	Navassa Island	0	1	0	0	0	-
Nicaragua	Honduras	Cayo Sur	0	0	0	0	1	-
US	Canada	Machias Is.	0	1	0	0	0	-

Uruguay	Brazil	Yaguarón	0	0	1	0	0	-
Colombia	Venezuela	Los Monjes	0	0	0	1	1	-
Honduras	Guatemala	Ranguana	0	0	0	0	0	-
Honduras	El Salvador	Conejo Island	0	0	0	0	0	-
Nicaragua	Honduras	Teotecacinte	0	0	0	1	1	1961
Mexico	US	El Chamizal	0	1	0	0	0	1963
Mexico	US	Rio Grande	0	0	0	0	0	1972
Honduras	US	Swan Islands	0	1	0	0	0	1972
Surinam	France	Maroni	0	0	1	0	0	1975
Panama	US	Canal Zone	0	1	0	1	0	1979
Colombia	Honduras	Serranilla	0	0	0	0	0	1986
Chile	Argentina	Palena	0	0	1	1	0	1998
Nicaragua	Colombia	San Andrés	0	1	0	0	1	2007

Appendices References

- Cronqvist, Lasse, and Dirk Berg-Schlosser. 2009. "Multi-Value QCA (mvQCA)." In *Configurational Comparative Methods*, eds. Benoit Rihoux and Charles Ragin. London: Sage, 69-86.
- Frederick, Bryan A., Paul R. Hensel, and Christopher Macaulay. 2017. "The Issue Correlates of War Territorial Claims Data, 1816–2001." *Journal of Peace Research*, Published online first: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343316676311>
- Hensel, Paul R., Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, Thomas E. Sowers, and Clayton L. Thyne. 2008. "Bones of Contention: Comparing Territorial, Maritime, and River Issues." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52 (1): 117-143.
- Huth, Paul, Sarah Croco, and Benjamin Appel. 2013. "Bringing Law to the Table: Legal Claims, Focal Points, and the Settlement of Territorial Disputes since 1945." *American Journal of Political Science* 57 (1): 90-103.
- Owsiak, Andrew P., Allison K. Cuttner, and Brent Buck. 2018. "The International Border Agreements Dataset." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 35(5):559-576.
- Palmer, Glenn, Vito D'Orazio, Michael Kenwick, and Matthew Lane. 2015. "The MID4 Dataset, 2002–2010: Procedures, Coding Rules and Description." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 32: 222-42.
- Stinnett, Douglas M., Jaroslav Tir, Philip Schafer, Paul F. Diehl, and Charles Gochman. 2002. "The Correlates of War Project Direct Contiguity Data, Version 3." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 19(2):58-66.