# \section{Implications and Future Research}

## % Findings

In this article I sought to answer the question of why leaders begin territorial claims when they do. In many cases states have the potential to justify claims to desirable territory based on history, self-determination, and irridentism, and the location of previous borders, yet choose not to issue claims over them. In theory, leaders have an incentive to issue claims to any potentially valuable territory, as keeping these claims alive may make them easier to justify later. This suggests that they are either incapable of successfully pressuring their opponent into relinquishing their claim to the territory or do not wish to pay the costs of doing so.

Although existing studies demonstrate that a variety of dyadic factors and territorial attributes predict claim onset, they do not consider the question of timing. I proposed that states issue claims when there are changes in either the domestic or international environment that increase the opportunity or willingness of states to press their claims. These findings are robust to the inclusion of a large array of structural variables that predict the potential for claims to emerge between states, thus alleviating the problem associated with the inclusion of many dyads that are not at risk of claim onset.

The findings of my study are consistent with the idea that changes at the domestic level influence the timing of claim onset. The analysis of domestic variables produced three primary findings. First, changes in a state’s leader are associated with an increased probability of claim onset. Second, changes in the winning coalition have a similar effect. Third, changes in coalition have a larger effect than leadership changes since changes in the winning coalition generally produce larger changes in preferences than leadership changes.

I find limited support for the argument that changes at the international level influence claim onset. With respect to my initial expectations,

I find that claim onset was more likely during the quickly changing periods surrounding German and Italian unification and World War I.

This suggests that dyadic factors primary determine whether a claim could possibly emerge, but changes in this relationship do not have a large influence on the timing of claim onset.

## % Structural Model

Generally speaking, my results indicate that the structural factors that influence the potential for claims to arise have effects consistent with previous research. I find that factors that increase the probability that two states desire the same territory and factors that provide them with the opportunity to issue claims influence the onset of claims. One finding arises from the structural model that has generally not been explored by the literature. Prior research has not examined whether rivalry or a history of militarized competition influences the probability of claim onset (\citet{rasler2006 is an exception, although they do not test this argument explicitly. I find that rivals are much more likely to become involved in territorial claims. This finding has potential implications for theories connecting territorial claims, power politics, and rivalry (e.g., \citet{senese2008, vasquez2009}. Generally, previous work assumes that territorial claims increase the probability that states engage in power politics tactics which leads to the onset of rivalry. However, the results with respect to rivalry suggest that territorial claims are more likely to emerge between hostile states to begin with. Although territorial claims undoubtedly increase the probability of rivalry, it is worth reexamining the sequence of events that lead to claim onset and subsequent militarized disputes, as it is possible that these states are more prone to the use of power politics to begin with.

## % Diverse Pathways

Future research may also consider whether the structural and proximate causes of claims interact with each other. In this paper, I assume that the proximate causes of claim onset have an equal effect once all structural factors have been controlled for. However, it is possible that some proximate causes may only have an effect in the presence of specific structural conditions. For example, as noted above, states may be more likely to issue claims over economically or strategically valuable territory if they have a history of conflictual interactions with each other. Similarly, claims that are closely tied to identity politics may be more likely among states that have certain types of domestic regimes. Future research should work to uncover whether there are distinct pathways to different types of territorial claims and work to specify these more fully.

% However, it is possible that both the structural and proximate causes of claim onset differ depending on the type of territory contested.

% Consider when power dynamics matter: Wars of rivalry vs wars of inequality – Vasquez, dougs paper, david and goliath

% Implication: renewed claims – unpack finding on lagterrch