COUNTRIES AT RISK OF GENOCIDE AND POLITICIDE IN 2008

Prepared by Barbara Harff with Ted Robert Gurr **May 2008**

(1) HIGHEST RISK COUNTRIES: FOUR OR MORE RISK FACTORS PRESENT

Countries and Predisposing Factors: Cleavages	***Risk Factors***						***Possible Target Groups***
	Targets of State-led Discrimination	*Genocides, Politicides since 1950*	*Ethnically Polarized Elite*	*Exclusionary Ideology*	*Current Regime Type*	*2006 Trade Openness*	
Sudan: Separatism; unequal regional resource allocation; Islamist/secular	**Darfuri**	**Yes: 1956-72, 1983-2001, 2003-**	**Yes: Arabs dominate**	**Yes: Arab/ Islamist nationalism**	Partial autocracy	**Low**	Darfuri; Southerners; Nuba
Myanmar/Burma: Ethnic and tribal separatism; religious cleavages; pro-democracy vs autocracy	**Arakenese Chin, Shan Kachin Karen**	**Yes: 1978**	**Yes**	**Yes: Burman (junta) nationalism**	**Full autocracy**	Medium	Karen and other separatists; democratic opposition
Pakistan: Regional, ethnic, tribal autonomy; Islamist/secular	**Ahmadis Hindus**	**Yes: 1971, 1973-77**	No	Regime no; **Islamists yes**	**Full autocracy**	**Low**	Rebellious tribes; Ahmadis, Shi'i
Bhutan: Ethnic (Drukpas vs immigrant Nepalese)	**Lhotshampa (Nepalese)**	No	**Yes: Drukpas dominate**	**Yes: Bhutanese nationalism**	**Full autocracy**	Medium	Lhotshampas
China: Ethnic separatism; Muslim/Christian/secular cleavages	**Turkomen Tibetans Christians**	**Yes: 1950-51, 1959, 1956-75**	No	**Yes: Marxist**	**Full autocracy**	High	Turkomen, Uigher and Tibetan nationalists; Falun Gong; Christians
Iran: Ethnic autonomy; Islamist/secular	**Kurds Turkomen Baha'is**	**Yes: 1981-92**	No	**Yes: Islamic theocracy**	**Full autocracy**	High	Secularists; Baha'is; Kurds and other autonomists
Syria: Sectarian	**Kurds**	**Yes: 1981-82**	**Yes: Alawites dominate**	**Yes: Baathist**	**Full autocracy**	High	Regime opponents; Kurds

Note: Positive risk factors are in **bold.**

(2) MEDIUM RISK COUNTRIES (listed alphabetically): THREE RISK FACTORS PRESENT

Countries and Predisposing Factors: Cleavages	***Risk Factors***						***Possible Target Groups***
	Targets of State-led Discrimination	*Genocides, Politicides since 1950*	*Ethnically Polarized Elite*	*Exclusionary Ideology*	*Current Regime Type*	*2006 Trade Openness*	
Afghanistan: Ethnic, regional autonomist tendencies; unequal resource allocation; sectarian	None	**Yes: 1978-89**	**Yes: Pushtuns dominate**	No	**Transitional regime**	Medium	If US and NATO withdraw, civil war likely
Equatorial Guinea: Ethnic autonomist tendencies (mainland vs islands)	(Not surveyed by MAR project)	**Yes: 1969-79**	**Yes**	No	**Full autocracy**	High	Opponents of Obiang regime
Iraq: Separatism; tribal cleavages; Islamist/secular	None	**Yes: 1961-75, 1988-91**	**Yes: Shi'a dominate**	Regime no, **Islamists yes**	**Transitional regime**	High	If US withdraws, civil war likely
Israel, West Bank and Gaza: Palestinian nationalism; religious/secular	**Yes: Arab-Israelis Palestinians**	No	**Yes: Jews dominate**	**Yes: Zionist nationalism**	Democracy	High	Palestinians
Nigeria: Ethnic autonomist tendencies; North-South and Muslim-Christian cleavages	**Yes: Ogani, Ijaw**	**Yes: 1967-69**	No	Regime no, **Islamists yes**	Partial democracy	High	Ijaw, other Delta peoples; Christians in North
Rwanda: Ethnic	None	**Yes: 1963-64, 1994**	**Yes: Tutsis dominate**	No	Partial autocracy	**Low**	Supporters of exiled Hutu militants
Somalia: Separatism; clan and tribal rivalries; Islamist/secular	None	**Yes: 1988-91**	No	Clan leaders no, **Islamists yes**	No effective regime	**Low**	Clan rivals; Islamists
Sri Lanka: Ethnic; religious	**Yes: Tamils**	**Yes: 1989-90**	**Yes: Sinhalese favored**	No	Partial democracy	High	Tamils; Muslims
Uzbekistan: Secular/Islamist	**Yes: Islamists**	No	No	**Yes: Secular nationalism vs Islamists**	**Full autocracy**	Medium	Islamists
Zimbabwe: Ethnic, political opposition vs Mugabe's regime	**Yes: Europeans**	**Yes: 1983-87** (see note**)**	**Yes: Shona dominate**	No	Partial autocracy	High	Ndebele; Movement for Democratic Change

Note: Positive risk factors are in **bold.**

(3) SOME LOWER RISK COUNTRIES: TWO RISK FACTORS PRESENT, RECENT INTERNAL WARS

Countries and Predisposing Factors: Cleavages	***Risk Factors***						***Possible Target Groups***
	Targets of State-led Discrimination	*Genocides, Politicides since 1950*	*Ethnically Polarized Elite*	*Exclusionary Ideology*	*Current Regime Type*	*2006 Trade Openness*	
Algeria: Secular/Islamist	None	**Yes: 1962**	No	**Yes: Secular nationalism vs Islamists**	Partial democracy	Medium	Islamists; Berbers
Angola: Ethnic separatism	**Yes: Cabindans**	**Yes: 1975-2001**	No	No	Partial autocracy	Very high	Cabindan separatists; UNITA supporters
Azerbaijan: Ethnic (Armenian) separatism	None	No	**Yes**	No	**Full autocracy**	High	Armenians
Bosnia: Separatism; ethnic/religious cleavages	None	**Yes: 1992-95**	**Yes**	No	**Transitional regime**	High	Muslim, Serb enclaves
Burundi: Ethnic	None	**Yes: 1965-73 1993, 1998**	**Yes**	No	Partial democracy	Medium	Supporters of Hutu militants
Cameroon: Ethnic autonomy sentiments	**Yes: People of Western Cameroon**	No	**Yes: Bulu and Beti dominate**	No	Partial autocracy	Medium	Westerners; Bamileke
Egypt: Secular/Islamist/ Christian; political opposition vs Mubarak regime	**Yes: Copts**	No	No	**Yes: Secular nationalism**	Partial autocracy	Medium	Copts; Islamists
Ethiopia: Separatism; ethnic/religious cleavages	No	**Yes: 1976-79**	**Yes: Tigreans dominate**	No	Partial democracy	Medium	Gambella; Oromo and Somali separatists
Nepal: Marxist vs. monarchist; class and regional economic disparities	No	No	No	Regime no, **Maoists yes**	Partial democracy	**Low**	Maoists; monarchists
DR Congo (Zaire): Ethnic autonomist tendencies	**Yes: Tutsis**	**Yes: 1964-65, 1977, 1999**	No	No	Partial democracy	High	Hutus, Tutsis of North Kivu

Other countries with two risk factors but no recent internal wars are Croatia, Indonesia, Libya, Laos, Lebanon, Mauritania, Serbia, Turkmenistan, Tunisia, Yemen, and Zambia.

General Note: This table is derived from analyses reported in Barbara Harff, "No Lessons Learned from the Holocaust? Assessing Risks of Genocide and Political Mass Murder since 1955," *American Political Science Review* 97, No. 1 (February 2003): 57-73. This study used data from all countries with internal wars and regime failures from 1955 to 2001. The presence of six risk factors, in various combinations, contributed to the occurrence of genocides or politicides during these cases. Subsequent analyses by the US government's Political Instability Task Force highlighted the significance of one other factor, the presence of state-led political or economic discrimination against specific minorities. When this variable was included, the magnitude of past conflict ("upheaval") was no longer significant.

New data for 2007 are used here to identify all countries that have two or more of the six risk factors in the revised model. The data are from the Political Instability Task Force and were updated by Monty G. Marshall of George Mason University for this analysis. The data on risk factors for all countries, along with the above article and a 2007 risk analysis, are posted at http://globalpolicy.gmu.edu/genocide/

Two changes have been made from previous risk assessments. First, we identified all countries with two or more of six risk factors, some of them not previously screened. This approach flags countries not usually regarded at risk , for example Bhutan, Equatorial Guinea, and Syria. Second, countries such as Cote d'Ivoire, Russia, and Turkey have been dropped from the 2007 list because they do not now have two or more current risk factors.

Variables Used in this Analysis:
State-led discrimination: State policies and practices deliberately restrict the economic and/or political rights of specific minority groups. Derived from current analyses by the Minorities at Risk project at the University of Maryland, website http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/mar/ Three groups are added to those flagged by the MAR project: Copts in Egypt, Kurds in Syria, and Arab Israelis in Israel.

Genocides and politicides since 1950: Two cases of mass atrocities are added here to those listed in genocide data set: in Zimbabwe, state-sponsored killings of tens of thousands of Ndbele in the mid-1980s because of their political opposition to the regime; and the systematic killings of Hutus, mostly refugees, in the eastern Congo under the cover of the Kabila-led revolutionary movement in 1996-97.

Ethnically polarized elite: The coded data distinguish between countries in which a majority ethnic group dominates the political system, and those in which a minority dominates. This table flags countries in which minority or majority domination of the elite is intensely contested.

Exclusionary ideology: The political elite, or a revolutionary challenger, holds a belief system that identifies some overriding purpose or principle that justifies efforts to restrict, persecute, or eliminate specific political, class, ethnic, or religious groups.

Current regime type: Full autocracies have a 2007 score of -6 or lower on the Polity scale, which ranges from -10 for full autocracies (such as North Korea and Saudi Arabia) to full democracies (such as Sweden and Canada). Such regimes have been most likely to perpetrate genocides and politicides; partial autocracies (scores of -5 to 0) are somewhat less at risk. Partial democracies have scores of +1 to +6, full democracies have scores of +7 to +10. Transitional regimes (Polity code of -66) in Iraq and Afghanistan also are categorized in this table as at risk of genocide because they are inherently unstable and susceptible to violent factional conflict and civil war. See the Polity IV website at http://www.systemicpeace.org

Trade openness 2006 (imports + exports as % of GNP, latest data available) signifies the extent of international engagement in a country. Risks have been highest in countries with the lowest openness scores, 45 or less. Medium scores are 46-70, high or very high are 70+.