Territoriality and Territorial Proximity as the Causes of International Conflicts

Julius Adinoyi

MA. Sociology (Disaster Management), MA International Conflict Management
Institute of Diplomacy and International Studies (IDIS), University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya

Abstract

This paper investigates with critical analysis that territoriality and territorial proximity more often than not, accounts for significant international conflicts. The author, in the first part, explains the emergence of international conflicts from territorial disputes, and further discusses the territorial issues in international conflict with the lens of the general premise surrounding the sovereignty of states –territoriality, and thus found that: the challenge to the Westphalia principle through the emergence of supra-regional entities –its operations usually embedded in quest for regional expansion are often achieved through benefits from strategic conflicts; and that supranational entities –its emergence are usually born out of conflict have created conflicts in the international realm. The last part placed critical emphasis on the analysis of how distance between States –considering from a realist perspective that the world is anarchical and that States view other States as potential threat to its national interest, have barred or fueled international conflict. The researcher argued that territorial propinquity have increased conflict due to the contingency from not only limited to geographically closer States but also from States that have been highly aided technologically in tele-military spaces and thus creating a borderless globe with equal opportunities and risks of conflict/crises/war. Therefore this paper strongly posits that territoriality and territorial proximity have directly or indirectly influenced the conflict spread toward the arena of global insecurity. This leaves the dot to recommending an affirmative reforms in the United Nation regarding the rightness of interventions and Ocean and Sea laws; and also since the territories with resources and its proximity to militarized spaces have greater correlation to international conflicts, thus the need for the demilitarization of such spaces that threaten or influence stability and conflicts respectively.

Keywords: Conflict, Dispute, Land, Resources, Security, **S**overeignty, Territoriality, Territory, War

1. Introduction

Territory is the space under the control or jurisdiction of an administrative entity –called State. There have been a challenge overtime on the issue of whom a space belongs to or whom is/should be the rightful occupiers of the space, and thus an more often than not, is the emergence of disputes over such space ownership or occupation. The elucidations in this paper asserts and reaffirms the existence of realism as embroiled in: the anarchical international systems and relations between and among entities in or out of a certain geographical space or territory; the dominance of states which in itself is identified with sovereignty and the issues of territory as an important element in sovereignty; the rationality of states in pursuits of their interest and maximization of objectives while acquiring many resources as possible, and the militarialization of territories for State's survival (Donnelly 2008).

Territoriality on an interpersonal perspective is the use or recognition of space in relation to the domain of area or possession occupancy (Beebe, et al. 2008). On the other hand, with focus on the larger group of people bounded with *commons*, territoriality is Statehood or assertion of the position that exercises the use of government politics and diplomacy over a certain geographical area (Fowler & Bunck 1995). And thus territoriality is seen as the organizing principles of international politics (Gerard 1993) as evidently initiated with international recognition in the *Westphalia Principle of 1648* (Hassan 2006).

However these have come over the years with challenge to statehood arising from the advancement of group *States* formations; or State's disintegration/breakaway; and out-rightly not forgetting the quest of certain States for domination or covertly and/or overtly seeking the share of the richness in other territories –*as evident in the era of colonialism and the neo-colonial/imperialist period*.

2. Territorial Disputes

With the concept of international conflict, territorial disputes is the disagreement between States over where their common homeland or colonial borders should be bounded or disputes by entities regarding the contestation of sovereignty rights over space. Such disputed boundary can be a small section of the territory or the entire length. Also there is the issue or territorial claims resulting to disputes between States, and in most cases not all are brought forward or reported at the International Court of Justice (ICJ) –only 7 out of the 129 territorial disputes have been resolved by the ICJ. Other legal efforts to resolve territorial disputes also involve negotiations and 3rd party mediation (Hassouna 1976) and this seems to be more effective than the use of the ICJ, this is because since 1953, about ninety seven territorial have been solved through the use of ICJ, mediation, arbitration, negotiation, bilateral and multilateral negotiations, and adjudication (Wiegand 2011).

Generally, territorial disputes may exit in any of following forms: *firstly*, a government(s) does not recognize the border line with its neighboring government(s), while the neighboring government(s) assumes the position that it holds unto the border agreement previously signed between the governments. Cases of this includes: Ecuador rejecting the boundary lines along its border with Peru since 1950s, and has claimed a large section of the Amazon Basin of Northern Peru on the basis of the Rio Protocol of 1942 (Krieg 1987). Venezuela and Guyana faced dispute over their territorial borders and in 1962 Venezuela officially rejected the 1899 British agreement over the border it has signed (Braveboy-Wagner 1984). China is also in dispute over its border with Russia and India since China rejected the agreement it has earlier signed in the 19th century (Day 1982). Also it is important to point to the fact that in many cases, it is either the government is challenging what the colonial government signed or arguing that the signed post-independence treaty over the border issue was never ratified by their government or both.

Secondly, in this case there is none existence of treaty(ies) or documented agreement over the disputed space by the governments. Case of this is the Indian Ocean maritime border dispute between Kenya and Somalia that has no signed documentation or treaty regarding ownership.

Thirdly, a country occupies the territory of another nation and fails to release or give up the territory. Cases includes: Israeli occupation of the Sinai –*an Egyptian territory* and the Golan Height –*Syrian territory* after the Six-Day-War of 1967. The British occupied the Suez Canal –*an Egyptian territory* after the end of Second World War. United States of America occupies and continues to operate its Military base and Guantanamo Bay Penitentiary from the Cuban territory.

Fourthly, government does not recognize the control of another country over the some portion of territory within the borders of that country. Afghanistan have been in conflict with Pakistan over Pakistani territory that inhabits the Pathan tribes likewise as the Pakistan challenges the Kashmir in the Indian territory, both challengers claiming the Pathans and Kashmiris respectively will succeed into their respective government if the Pathans and Kashmiris were giving the chance of referendum (Day 1982).

Fifthly, government(s) fails to recognize the power legitimacy of another country and thus invade or continually seek to annex part or all of the territory of that country or continually engage in hostile international relations to such a country and government(s) that opposes its claim. Cases of this are: annexation of Crimea by Russia from Ukraine; continual efforts of many government to see that Israel frees the Palestinians have been futile, thus questioning the independence of the State of Israel which includes Palestinian territory; similar case in Africa is the 1960 rejection of Mauritania independence by Morocco, Morocco's disagreement with other African States over the land of Western Sahara and the subsequent Morocco's exit from the African Union (AU) as the only African State that refuse to be a member of the AU with the claim that the AU recognized Western Sahara.

Most territorial disputes are persistent owing to the fact that the State challenger often finds it hard to withdraw or renounce their status of territorial claims. When such disputes are finally resolved, its either; firstly, the challenger occupies the territory with formal agreement with the government of the territory it has occupied; or secondly, where the challenger renounces his claim or agrees on settlement with the other government over its territory; or lastly, the challenger agrees to the ruling of a legal body, such as the ICJ or an international arbitration court rulings.

In further stressing the causes of international territorial conflicts that are in existence today, while it is important to note the colonial implications of Territoriality and/or the practice of arbitrarily drawing borders by former colonial powers, with no consideration of ethnic, religious, social, or linguistic identities, has created a legacy of troubles in many regions of the world; it is also important to stress a few technical mistakes (Guo 2012) that have resulted to territorial disputes namely:

Inappropriate topographical terms –*such as crest, range, and mouth*: those terms and its physical features varies over time due to geographical and hydrological changes. An example is the use of *watershed* range line of Dangrek as demarcations of Preah Vihear Temple ownership between Thailand and Cambodia in the colonial era created a problem of exact temple ownership identification since the use of the criteria watershed line was later abandoned and also over time the line once positioned the temple on the Thailand side and later on the Cambodian side. And this add-up to the uncertainty as both countries claim ownership rooted in their respective history.

Vague geographical features: the Sino-Russian boundary dispute at the Argun River is an illustration of this. The border was fixed on the median line of the main river channel in 1911, and after 1950s the river channel dried-up and a new main stream emerged which shifted the territory to the Russian side. This created a somewhat bilateral rift between Russia and China until the 2005 agreement that sealed a settlement for both countries.

Intricate human and cultural features: this stresses the claims by tribe or ethnic group over issues of occupancy owing to their history or similarity of their cultural feature, and thus would have otherwise want such features to be identified space-wise with the group, and in some cases the predominant such a group is to the other ethnic or tribal groups in the country will determine their quest to be autonomous as a group from the existing country that it is bounded. The Caucasus region fits this category as it has similar diverse culture in the regions of Abkhazia, Nagorno-Karabakh, and South Ossetia –and as such, a claim of the Southern Caucasus region

independence.

Inconsistent or contradictory statements: the Article 56 of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), for example, outlines parameters for the establishment of a country's Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), which extends 200 nautical miles from the country's coastline. This has created the possibility of overlapping claims in semi-enclosed seas. This ambiguity complicates defining the numerous claims in the East and South China Seas (UN 1982), -not forgetting the memorable March 1988 China´s massacre of the Vietnamese in Spratly islands (Henry 2012), and today, the Sea is still a disputed sea claims and creates one of the main sources of tensions hampering peaceful relations in East and Southeast Asia (Sheng-Ti Gau 2012).

Other territorial disputes that have been experienced includes Nagorno Karabakh *in Azerbaijan*, Serbian, Croatian and Bosniak territory in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbian part of *Croatia,* South Osetia, Abkhazia *in Georgia*, Dniestr in *Moldova*, Checnya *in Russia*, Basque *in Spain,* Northern Ireland *in United Kingdom*, Palestine *in Israel*, Kurdistan *in Iraq*, Kashmir, Punjab, Assam, Manipur, Tripura *in India*, East Timor, Acceh *in Indonesia*, Mon, Arakan, Kachin, Kaya *in Mynamar*, Bougainville *in Papua New Guinea,* Mindanao *in Phillipines*, Tamil *in Sri Lanka.*

3. Territorial challenge of Statehood and Invasions

Territorial supremacy and independence are the indispensable attributes of a State (Liszt 1904) while power is also an important element. An entity regarded as a State ought to have permanent population; occupies a clearly defined territory; exercise governance jurisdiction over its territory; and finally with the capability to fulfil international obligations of elements of international relations (Montevideo Convention 1933).

The Westphalia treaty established the 'territorial state' in terms of the frontiers of their territories, on land and sea. It also defined the conditions under which a State could acquire valid title to territory(ies) either by discovery, cessation, and annexation (Morgenthau 1993). Territoriality also implies the definition of the right of a State over its citizens whether they live within and outside its defined territory. It equally defines their rights over the territorial sea, the rights of diplomatic representation, and the sanctity of national governments. The laws regarding war and the obligations to treaty(ies) emanates from the treaty of 1648 (Morgenthau 1993), and more significantly, the 1948 treaty ended the reoccurring religious wars and brought out clearly the identity or recognition of territorial states as the basic unit in the international system.

The Westphalia principle brought to light the need to have a rethink towards the termination of a political theory of leadership in which all power is bestowed on a single individual or authority (Ray 1998), and thus this the emergence of State(s) bestowed with sovereignty. While it is important to place emphasis that there cannot be sovereignty without great emphasis on international border domains/lines, it is however important to stress that there are confusion of State and sovereignty related terms (Olson 1991) due to the ever changing and multiplicity of (Ray 1998) –international regimes and laws, and –State statuses under the United Nations structure.

The existence of international border lines narrow down to the very unitary internal territorial lines within that State, more often than not, the legal based statuses that demarcates boundaries conflicts with the ethnic, religious and national issues of make-up of the populace within such territory. Of particular example is in Africa where the socio-political issues predominates the driving factors. (Nzogola-Ntalaja 1987) In *regional,* linguistic terms and considerations, a region might refer to the geographical area or an administrative area beyond a territorial state. But overtime, the *regional* term have evolved due to the development of *supranational* organizations and the border implications of most modern regional arrangements and alignments, the *Westphalia principles'* border definition and interpretations have been ambiguous and contradictory (Anderson & O'Dowd 1999).

Regional boundaries have implications for governance which sometimes imply a reduction in or the abolition of border controls (Church & Reid 1999). Regional conglomerates may arise as a result of ideological unity or division (Paasi 1999). Trans-border transactions in terms of funding opportunities or differential in wages, prices and institutional norms may give rise to regional unity or disunity.

For instance, the abdication of the Tsar, the Bolshevik coup, the fall of the Berlin Wall, the end of the Soviet Union –each of these events gave rise to formative moments marked by a search for recognition, expressions of sovereignty and a desire to create a new order on the ruins of the old. (Lehti & Smith 1999) Focusing on territorial gain, after the fall of the Berlin wall, the Western Europe/USA quest for regional bloc and territorial expansion particularly towards the Eastern Europe/Former Soviet State cannot be ignored as evident in the continuous expansion European Union (EU) membership to the former Soviet States and increase of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) bases closer to the last Soviet State –*Russia* membership.

This has stirred conflict around the European States, as seen in Yugoslavia, Kosovo, Georgia war and the recognition of South Ossetia and Abkhazia as States by Russia. More recently is territoriality of Crimea in Ukraine. The Ukrainian territoriality was divided between lines of those supporting the Europe/USA economic alignment and those supportive of the continued Russian economic alignment, and this created a territorial crisis within the Western Ukraine south and Eastern Ukraine respectively. Also the territoriality over the Baltic Sea and the Black Sea has influenced structural conflicts over the European States.

These changes essentially deriving from regional groupings and alignments have resulted in 'border change' (Anderson & O'Dowd 1999). This is exemplary in the border changes of the former Soviet Union (Forsberg 1996); the reunification of East and West Germany; and the national conflicts in Canada-Quebec, Yugoslavia, Kashmir, and to some extent in Ethiopia. Globalization creates the most significant border changes through economic, political and social reforms, and such cases of border change are evidenced by the rise of supra-state or supranational region as exemplified by the European Union, African Union etc. (Anderson & Goodman 1995). These supra-states regions are to an extent in conformity to the Treaty of Westphalia. While also there are those border changes that have the capacity to devalue state borders in terms of emphasizing supranational or sub national entities, and this directly challenge to the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia. The supra-states region has already altered the conception of the Treaty of Westphalia in terms of state boundaries, due 'borderless' global economy created by transnational governance.

The use of force by the NATO and USA are acclaimed to be morally based on the need for humanitarian assistance (Chopra & Weiss 1992) which is based on pretense. After Kofi Annan has stressed the need to rethink the principle of territorial integrity in terms of the exclusive internal sovereignty of states (UN 1999), States are increasingly being held to have internal responsibilities, and a failure to uphold such responsibilities has led to external intervention on the grounds of the international community's 'responsibility to protect' (Annan 2012). In this case states that fail to control activities within their own territory relinquish aspects of their sovereignty and therefore permits worried nations to take any action deemed necessary for their self-defence (Carter et al.). And thus this permits the circumstance that questions the status of States regarded as sovereign which is suppose not to be interfered with (Elden 2006), While such interference should have been or should be multilateral, the USA and its Military oppressive allies have carried out many merciless –*increased death counts* interventions without the approval of the multilateral approval of the body –*UN* that should have authorize such, and in cases where approvals where sought and appended, it is rather the display of the undemocratic and draconian interest of those power states that make-up the United Nation Security Council.

Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya had failed to exercise one of the key definitions of sovereignty – effective political control within its territory by failing to prosecute criminals [1] living within its borders, and thus undermining sovereignty with the potential of spreading such weakened or damning sovereignty across territories (Elden 2006). While foreign intervention was permitted as a result of the failure of the State to exercise effective political control within its territory, this greatly undermines territorial integrity of all states in ensuring global stability as more often than not, the invaded State usually and continuously experiences conflicts cutting-across the boundaries of closer States.

The war on terror has impacts on the territorial integrity through its challenge to States' sovereignty and thus the advocacy of the argument that humanitarian interventions have created the nexus between territorial sovereignty and an international system vested with not only security but also interest seems scholarly logical. In real sense, the response on the ground in terms of the interventions in Afghan, Iraq and Syria, shows intervention(s) not to be anything but inhumane. The present crisis in the Middle East and Libya is an outcome of decades of internal conflict and foreign intervention that has long compromised its territorial integrity. The United States of America (USA) with its foreign policy objectives created the Mujahedeen and the al-Qaeda down to the emergence of ISIS all outside its own territory and thus fueling an anarchical situation that at various point in time have had a backlash to its own territory.

The justification for U.S invasion countries on the fact or claims that such States allowed terror groups/networks to use their territory holds no legal justification in the UN authority, as such terror groups cannot be understood as 'another State' or if described as 'armed bands, groups, irregulars, or mercenaries' whether they can be viewed as sent 'on behalf of a State' (Elden 2009). The abysmal dismal situation of situation in the Middle East today is as a result of interference of foreign nations meddling into the internal democracies of states, thus weakening the States and further enabling a generative and functional ambiance for terror groups to exploit. (Rubin 2007)

The sovereign spaces of nation-States and the nodal networks of international terrorism offer a fundamental challenge to the modern State-centred global geopolitics (Mustafa 2005). Territorial preservation is one key aspect of a State's territorial integrity (Agnew 2005), and the lack of territorial sovereignty is often a key characteristic of so-called failed States where effective monopoly over the internal means of violence is lost.

4. The supremacy of geographical propinquity
This part critically place emphasis on the analysis of how distance between States –*considering from a realist perspective that the world is anarchical and that States view other States as potential threat to its national interest*

---

[1] Definition of criminals varies, in most cases where interventions have been experienced, the state views those engaging in political violence and its foreign sponsors as the criminals or terrorists, while the outside foreign entities along with their supporters within the violent state view the government or some of those in leadership control as the criminal or terrorist.

have barred or fueled international conflict.

The thesis of this perspective is of the notion that territorial proximity between States has the likelihood of such States becoming engaged in conflictual relations and that such international conflict will diffuse across national boundaries. Since conflict is inherent and never at an absolute zero stage at any point in time, proximate States have higher incident of transboundary crisis and war than more distant States. Literatures posits that proximity facilitates conflict due to the greater opportunities of States to interact and disagree on issues, and also with greater capacity to threaten each other or result to use of armed conflict to resolve their differences (Diehl 1985).

In contrast to territorial disputes, proximity perspectives focus on the fact that territory is a facilitation of conflicts (Diehl 1991) and if territory does not directly leads to conflict, they create the structure enabling risks and opportunities that causes conflict (Starr & Most 1978). Thus the strength and capabilities of States to engage in interstate conflict depends on the proximity of States and decreases on how further it's distance is to other States (Boulding 1962), other scholarly materials have drawn attention to the fact that the capacity of states to engage in conflicts reduces with distance (Gleditsch & Singer 1975), this is very evident in the World War 1 and World War 2 where domino theory was an effect of why the war spread across Europe and Asia.

However, the advent of technological advancement have questioned proximity to the extent that it is no longer justified to make reference to border or neighboring countries as the elements that elucidates proximity in the context of the contingence of conflicts. The world has become a global circus due to the transformational development in the areas of communication and transportation thus making interactions between entities/potential entities of conflict to be closer enough to interact and increase the opportunities for the other international relations entities to participate either through international media, which also have its effect of the de-escalation or escalation of conflict. This agrees with the scholarly notion that crises and terrorism are contagious and not border bounded due to the era of globalization, and that the security line between nations have been somewhat blurred as a result of this challenge (Smith , Goodal 1987, Patman 1999, T'hart et al. 1993).

The most important element of this technological advancement is tele-Military space advancement which includes the naval and aviation realm, and thus have created a closed the gap –to a greater extent –*especially countries with greater military capability,* on the notion that the capacity of States to engage in conflict decreases with distance. The modern day military technologies have made certain power State –*with their ever increasing military bases around the world* proximate to other States that are considered physically distant.

The issue of when bilateral conflict becomes multiparty international conflict has been a scholarly discuss with regards to territorial proximity as one of the important explanatory variable. An indication shows that proximity is directly and significantly correlated to the diffusion of international conflict (Siverson & Starr 1991, Siverson & Starr 1990, Starr & Most 1983, Starr & Most 1980, Starr & Most 1978, Starr & Most 1976).

The proximity to strategic geopolitical territory and to natural resources –*due to its scarcity* is an important factor. The changes of geopolitics closer to territories with the mix of political, economic and cultural motives have fueled conflicts on territorial claims evidently in the disputes of East and South China Seas. The powerful Chinas' proximity to other state is seen in its dispute with Japan and Korea among other nations of the South East Asia over the areas of the EEZ.

Also the increasing competitive scramble for natural resources is influenced by States' proximity to those territories that have natural resources. The continual demographic expansion have increased the demand for resources and such competition resulting into conflicts to reclaim occupied territories that are rich with natural resources. This is evident in the China- Japan dispute (TIA 2012) and also in the South China Sea with china and other nations –*over the need for water, energy and agricultural usage* (IWMI 2007), and in the Indian Ocean between Somalia and Kenya –*over the exploitation of energy*.

Scholarly literatures suggests that proximity to Sea/river water bodies fuels rift relationships with countries sharing such water bodies, particularly among countries upstream of the water course with the countries downstream of the water course (Furlong & Gleditsch 2003, Hegre et al. 2006) and the such conflict are usually not on the side of violent escalation or armed conflict rather it is usually a diplomatic hostility which is often resolved through mediation and negotiations. The issue of the River Nile conflict is an example of this, where Egypt is in conflict with Sudan and Ethiopia of the usage of the Nile waters. And also the Bangladeshi-Indian dispute over the quantity of Ganges water to be released for Bangladeshi utilization during the dry season, a dispute that began in 1951, when India decided to build the Farakka Barrage, and found a settlement with the signature of a 30-year water-sharing agreement in 1996 (Mancini 2013).

Also the sea proximate territories to may not only stir hostility among the territories that are bounded in the region but may greatly influence Power State to expand their control due to the strategic usage of such water body as military base or operation lines and resource transportation lines.

The East China sea, South China sea, Strait of Malacca, Bay of Bengal, and the Indian Ocean is of strategic interest to the USA which explains the US actions in close naval partnerships and military exercise –with Japan *in Okinawa for East China Sea*, –with the South Korea *in Jeju for East China Sea and in Yongsan for Sea of Japan*, –and with other West Pacific nations; and all these have influenced tensions between South Korea and

North Korea likewise among the nations surrounding the west pacific.

The Centro-Asian Ring and Middle East are not exclusive to this, as resource abundance proximity in the region have fueled conflicts due to interference of power States, also such conflicts usually emerged from countries that are neighbors; Iraqi-Kuwait war, the Iraqi-Iran war, Russia and USA conflict in Afghanistan, Israeli-Egypt conflict, Pakistan and India.

The proximity of China to the important port-transport significant South China Sea has aided and will continue to strengthen the Chinese quest for control over the sea. In 2009, 14 out of the 20 top container ports in the world are located in or around the South China Sea (U.S. Department of Transport, Bureau of Transportation Statistics).

Many conflicts seem to have elements of territorial conflict as exemplified in the case of Croats, Serb, and Muslims over the land of Yugoslavia, Golan Heights, Kashmir and Falkland (Malvinas) island. Systematic wars and conflicts involve territorial components usually among State neighbors with importance on geographical locations. The vast majority of conflicts involving interstates occur between proximate neighbors –*because neighbors interact more frequently than distant states*. The occurrence of interstate conflicts does not necessary indicate the presence of territorial disputes rather based on territorial proximity as closer neighbors are more likely to be concerned of the states that are closer (John 1993). Between 1862 and 1992, over half of all militarized disputes and one third of intense full-scale interstate wars began with at least two State neighbors.

And also not ruling out the State and non-state actors' asymmetric conflict, in order word the implications territories experiencing state-sponsored and international terrorism is significant to proximate territories. This is evident in the rise of terrorism in Africa as the Northern territorial region is close to areas of intense terrorism in the Middle East, and thus there is flow of weapons and combatant migrants is a challenge to the African continent from the Middle East to North African and down to the sub-Saharan Africa (Adinoyi 2014).

5. Conclusion

Territoriality and territorial proximity accounts for almost all the international conflicts that have been elucidated in this paper, especially in the Africa, Asian Continent. The Southeast Asian states have been in continual conflict over the ownership of the sea that is proximate to the region, and this have created an avenue for states –that wants to expand their territorial outreach to nations in the areas of exploitation –to influence the conflict either overtly or covertly –to secure their legitimate or illegitimate occupation of some part of territory(ies). The Middle East region is also an important region for international exploitation and thus experiences scramble for territorial power which unarguably affects the African continent due to territorial proximity. The African continent have experienced issues that are of great concern with territory particularly in the colonial era when her sovereignty was ceased and afterwards in the post 1960s where the implications of border division with the negligence of ethnic, tribal and religious lines still hunts her territorial existence or border demarcation.

This study thus recommends: the review of the UNCLOS law especially to address the issues of ambiguity of terms –*200 miles EEZ* that narrowly fits into the cramped sea of the East China Sea and South China Sea; that the UN Security Council be strengthened –*to democratically involve states respective to regional representation and inclusivity –to object and strongly enact and implement consequences to states that act unilaterally or bilaterally or multilaterally in interventions without the genuine/majority states' approval through the body of the UN* to uphold the integrity and territorial sovereignty of states; and finally, the de-militarialization of the world since the tele-military advancement closer to greater parts of the world have greatly correlated with the increased conflicts due to proxy exploitation of territories –*usually of its resources* and thus this will also decrease the continual advancement of supranational entities proximate to each other or proximate to territory(ies) that can cause conflict due to its strategic geo-location or resource richness.

References

Alan Day (1982) Border and Teritorial Dispute (London: Longman).

Anderson J., Goodman J., (1995) Regions, states and the European Union: Modernist reaction or Postmodern adaptation? *Rev Int Pol Econ*, 2: 600-631

Anderson, J., O'Dowd, L. (1999) Borders, Border Regions and Territoriality, Contradictory Meanings, Changing Significance. *Regional Studies*, 33: 593-604.

Beebe, S. A., Beebe, S. J., Redmond, M. V. (2008) Interpersonal Communication: Relating to Others, 5th Edition, Needham Heights (MA: Allyn and Bacon).

Bueno de Mesquita., The war trap (New Haven: Yale University Press)

Carter, A. B., Deutch, J. M., & Zelikow, P. D., 'Catastrophic Terrorism: Elements of a National Policy', (Cambridge MA: Visions of Governance in the 21st Century). [Online] Available: www.ksg.harvard.edu/visions/publication/terrorism.htm (November 4, 2015)

Chef, Henry (2012) China´s massacre in Spratly islands real footage March 14 1988. [Online] Available: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vwaZdz-tITY (November 4, 2015)

Chopra, J. and Weiss (1992) 'Sovereignty In No Longer Sacrosanct: Codifying Humanitarian Intervention', *Ethics and International Affairs*. 6 (1):95–117

Church, A., Reid, P. (1999) Cross Border Co-operation, Institutionalization and Political Space across the English Channel. Regional Studies, 33: 640-55

Daud, Hassan (2006) The Rise of the Territorial State and The Treaty Of Westphalia, (Yearbook of New Zealand Jurisprudence Vol 9) p62-70

Elden, S. (2006) 'Contingent Sovereignty, Territorial Integrity and the Sanctity of Borders' *SAIS Review*. 26(1), 11-24.

Elden, S., (2009) Terror and Territory: The Spatial Extent of Sovereignty. (London, University of Minnesota Press) p153

Fowler, M. R., Bunck, J. M. (1995) Law, Power, and the Sovereign State (University Park, PA: Penn State Press).

Francesco, Mancini (2013) Uncertain Borders: Territorial Disputes in Asia. *Analysis* 180: June

Franzvon Liszt (1904) Das Volkerrecht: Systematisch Dargestellt. pp 65-66, 70-72.

Furlong, K., Gleditsch, N. P. (2003) The Boundary Dataset, Conflict Management and Peace Science, 20 (1), 93-117

Garnham, D. (1976) "Dyadic international war, 1816-1965: the role of power parity and geographical proximity." *Western Pol. Q*. 29: 231-242

Gleditsch, N. P., Singer, D. J. (1975) 'Distance and International War, 1816–1965', in Proceedings of the IPRA Conference, IPRA Studies in Peace Research, (Oslo: International Peace Research Association) pp 481–506

Goodal, B. (1987) Dictionary of Human Geography, (London: Penguin Books) p443

Harvey, Starr., & Benjamin, Most (1978) " A Return Journey: Richardson, 'Frontiers' and Wars in the 1946-1965 Era", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 22(3), 441-62

Harvey, Starr., Benjamin, Most (1976) "The Substance and Study of Conflict in International Relations Research", *International Study Quarterly* 20(4), 581-620.

Harvey, Starr., Benjamin, Most (1978) A Return Journey: Richardson, 'Frontiers' and Wars in the 1946-1965 Era, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 22(3), 441-62

Harvey, Starr., Benjamin, Most (1980) "Diffusion, Reinforcement, Geopolitics, and the Speed of War", *American Political Science Review*, 74(4), 932-46

Harvey, Starr., Benjamin, Most (1983) "The Forms and Process of War Diffusion" *Comparative Political Studies* 16(1), 92-117

Hassouna (1976) The League of Arab States and Regional Disputes; John Campbell, (ed)., Successful Negotiations (Princeton: Princeton University Press)

Hegre, H., Lacina, B. A., Owen, T., Furlong, K., Gleditsch, N. P. (2006) "Conflicts over Shared Rivers: Resource Wars or Fuzzy Boundaries?", *Political Geography* 25(4), 361-382

Heyman, J. M. (1999) Why Interdiction? Immigration Control at the United State – Mexico Borders. *Regional Studies*, 33: 619-30.

IWMI (2007) Comprehensive Assessment of Water Management in Agriculture, Water for Food, Water for Life: A Comprehensive Assessment of Water Management in Agriculture, (London, Earthscan and Colombo, International Water Management Institute).

Jack, Donnelly (2008) "The Ethics of Realism", in Christian Reus-Smit, Duncan Snidal (eds.), The Oxford Handbook of International Relations (Oxford University Press) p. 150

Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner (1984) The Venezuela-Guyana Border Dispute (Boulder: Westview Press).

John, Agnew. (2005) Sovereignty Regimes: Territoriality and State Authority in Contemporary World Politics. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 95(2), 437–461

Julius, Adinoyi (2014) The Challenge of Combating Terrorism: The influence of External Factor on Home Grown Terrorism in Africa. (University of Nairobi,), pp6-7. [Online] Available: https://www.academia.edu/11790357/the_challenge_of_combating_terrorism_influence_of_external_factors_on_home-grown_terrorism_in_africa (November 4, 2015)

Kenneth, E. Boulding (1962) Conflict and Defense: A General Theory. (New York, Harper and Brothers) p349

Kofi, Annan (2012) "Prevention, Promotion and Protection: Our Shared Responsibility" (Lund University, Sweden) [Online] Available: http://kofiannanfoundation.org/sites/default/files/Final%20Lund%20Speech.pdf (November 4, 2015)

Kratke, S., (1999) Regional Integration or Fragmentation? The German-Polish Border region in a New Europe. *Regional Studies*, 33: 631-641

Marko, Lehti., & David., J. Smith., Post-Cold War Identity Politics: Northern and Baltic Experiences (Taylor & Francis, 2005).

Michael, Sheng-Ti Gau, (2012) 'The U-Shaped Line and a Categorization of the Ocean Disputes in the South China Sea', *Ocean Development & International Law* 43(1), 57-69.

Montevideo Convention (1933) "Article I of the Montevideo Convention" in Convention on the Rights and Duties of States (Montevideo Convention), Dec. 26, 1933, 165 L.N.T.S. 19, 28 AM. J. INT'L L. (Supp.) 75 (1934).

Morgenthau, H. J. (1993) Politics among Nations. Revised Edition. (New York: McGraw-Hill Inc,). p254

Mustafa, D. (2005) The Terrible Geographicalness of Terrorism: Reflections of the Hazards Geographer. Antipode. 37(1), 7292

Nzogola-Ntalaja G., (1987) Revolution and Counter Revolution in Africa. (London: Zed Books). pp42-66

Olson, W. C., (1991) The Theory and Practice of International Relations. 8th Edition. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall) p120

Paasi, A., (1999) Boundaries as Social Practice and Discourse: The Finnish Russian Border. *Regional Studies*, 33: 669-680

Patman, R (1999) "Introduction: Security in a Post-Cold War Context", in: Patman, Robert (ed.): Security in a Post-Cold War World. (London: Macmillan Press Ltd)

Paul, Diehl (1985) Contiguity and Military Escalation in Major Power Rivalries, 1816-1980. *Journal of Politics* 47(4), 1203-11

Paul, Diehl (1991) Geography and War: A Review and Assessment of the Empirical Literature. *International Interactions* 17(1) 11-27

Perkmann, M. (1999) Building governance institutions across European Borders. *Regional Studies*, 33: 657-667.

Peter, Wellesteen., (1981) Incompatibility, Confrontation, and War, *Journal of Peace Research* 18(1), 57-90

Randolph, Siverson., Harvey, Starr (1990) Opportunity, Willingness and the Diffusion of War", American political Science Review 84(1), 47-64

Randolph, Siverson., Harvey, Starr (1991) The Diffusion of War, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press)

Ray, J. L., (1998) Global Politics, 7th Edition. (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company). pp161–4

Rongxing Guo (2012) Territorial Disputes and Conflict Management (London and New York, Routledge) pp. 9-23.

Rubin, B. R. (2007) 'Saving Afghanistan', (Foreign Affairs)

Ruggie, John, Gerard (1993) "Territoriality and beyond: problematizing modernity in international relations." *International organization*, 47(1), 139-174

Smith, P., Transnational Security Threats and State Survival: A Role for the Military. Parameters, 30(3)

Stuart., & Bremer (1992) Dangerous Dyads, *Journal of Conflict resolution* 36: (2) 309-41

T'hart, P., Rosenthal, U. & Kouzmin., A. (1993) "Crisis Decision Mak-ing: The Centralization Thesis Revisited", Administration & Society, 25(1)

TIA (2012) Territorial disputes hamper exploration and production of resources in the East China Sea. Today In Energy. [Online] Available: http://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.cfm?id=8270 (November 4, 2015)

Tuomas Forsberg., (1996) Beyond Sovereignty, Within Territoriality: Mapping the Space of Late-Modern (Geo) Politics. *Cooperation and Conflict* December, 31: 355-386

U.S. Department of Transport, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, [Online] Available: www.rita.dot.gov (November 4, 2015)

UN (1982) United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982. [Online] Available: http://www.un.org/depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/unclos_e.pdf (November 4, 2015)

UN (1999) 'Secretary-General Presents His Annual Report To General Assembly | Meetings Coverage And Press Releases' (SG/SM/7136, GA/9596) [Online] Available: http://www.un.org/press/en/1999/19990920.sgsm7136.html (November 4, 2015)

Vasquez, John A. (1993) *The War Puzzle*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), p134

Wiegand, K., (2011) Enduring Territorial Disputes: Strategies of Bargaining, Coercive Diplomacy, and Settlement (Athens, GA, University of Georgia Press) p. 2.

William Krieg., (1987) Ecuadorian-Peruvian Rivalry in the upper Amazon, (Bethesda, MD: William Krieg)