

“Ethnic Power Sharing: Three Big Problems,” by Donald L. Horowitz

*Appendix*

(prepared with the research assistance of Asfia Tareen)

In order to obtain a count of countries that had experienced serious episodes of ethnic conflict between 1980 and 2010, several databases were consulted. Indicators from the following datasets were used:

*Minorities at Risk*

COMCON (values of 4, 5, or 6)

PROT (values of 4 or 5)

Indicators of highest levels of intercommunal conflict and protest

*Ethnic Power Relations*

ALL\_ONSET\_KO\_ETH\_FLAG (binary indicator, value of 1)

ALL\_ONSET\_DO\_ETH\_FLAG (binary indicator, value of 1)

Indicators of violent ethnic incidents or ongoing ethnic violence

*Ethnic Armed Conflict*

ETHNOWAR (binary indicator, value of 1)

Indicator of ethnic warfare

*Clash of Civilizations and Domestic Ethnopolitical Conflict*

INTENSITY80A

INTENSITY90A

Intensity scores of 3, the highest intensity level of violence in a decade

From these data, 78 countries of the 123 countries in the regions specified in the text were identified as having experienced serious ethnic conflict. To be included on this list, a country had to reach at least one of the relatively high threshold values indicated on any of the enumerated datasets. Despite the seriousness of the incidents that would be reflected by such inclusion, not all countries on the list could be said to be severely divided within the definition of that term provided in the text of the article. (Any country with a population under 500,000 was not included on the list.)

Each of these countries was then examined individually for power-sharing devices or practices at the center of power. Multiple sources were consulted: the Minorities at Risk Minority Group Assessments, the Minority Rights Group International's World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples country data, and an array of secondary sources, including news reports and scholarly articles on individual countries.

The existence of any single consociational or centripetal device or practice was sufficient to include a country on the list of power-sharing states. Regional devolution or federalism alone, however, without a corresponding power-sharing device at the center, such as a strong upper house to represent the regions or provinces, was insufficient to qualify a country for inclusion on the power-sharing list. The same is true for the mere existence of reserved seats for minority groups in the national legislature, unless accompanied by a power-sharing device or practice for such groups at the center. Also excluded was a power-sharing agreement where the combatants were not ethnically defined. A so-called warlords' peace agreement qualified for inclusion if the rebels were ethnically defined and if the agreement involved power-sharing devices or practices at the center, as most such agreements did.

Despite these exclusions, the criterion of only one power-sharing device or practice creates a bias toward inclusion. Even so, only about 20 countries qualified, and of these only about nine arrangements have been durable. That is, they lasted for five years or more.

One caveat: the use of the phrase "about nine" is meant to emphasize that this is a preliminary effort and is, therefore, fallible. It is possible that a country or countries practicing ethnic power sharing was or were missed. But such omissions, if they exist, will be rare. In any case, the exact

number is less important than the approximate number, which seems rather small. Relatively few states have succeeded in producing durable power-sharing; and the shaky, dubiously democratic, or stalemated condition of at least half of the nine cases that have survived for five years or more suggests that durable power sharing is hard to achieve.

---

**POWER-SHARING ARRANGEMENTS ADOPTED IN A UNIVERSE OF 78  
CONFLICTED COUNTRIES, 1980–2010\***

(n=20)

Angola, 1994	Iraq, 2005	Nigeria, 1999
Bosnia, 1995	Ivory Coast, 2003	Rwanda, 1993
Bulgaria, 1990	Kenya, 2010	Sudan, 2005
Burundi, 2005	Lebanon, 1989	Suriname, 1987
Djibouti, 1992	Liberia, 2003	Togo, 2006
Fiji, 1997	Macedonia, 2001	Yemen, 1990
Indonesia, 2002	Nepal, 2007	

\*This list consists of states that adopted one or more power-sharing institutions, arrangements, or practices at the central-government level in the period from 1980 through 2010. The universe from which it is drawn consists of the 78 states that experienced one or more episodes of serious ethnic conflict, based on indicators listed above. Those 78 states are, in turn, a subset of the 123 states with populations of 500,000 or more in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, and the Caribbean. Of these 20 states, only nine have had power-sharing arrangements that have endured for five years or more. The nine are listed in the *Journal of Democracy* article to which this is the appendix, at page 18, note 3.