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Abstract: In recent years peacekeeping activities have expanded in scope from the provision of blue helmet security to state-building. But what types of institutions reduce domestic conflict? Is expanded governance capacity the first essential step following civil wars, to reestablish order, stability, and security, as realists argue? Or instead should the process of building democratic institutions be the most important priority, thereby strengthening regime legitimacy and accountability, as idealists suggest? Or do we need both?

Part I of this study outlines the long-standing debate about these issues. Part II sets out the research design, the core concepts, and the sources of evidence. Measures of internal conflict are derived from the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP/PRIO) Armed Conflict Dataset 1946-2009. Part III examines the cross-national time-series evidence. The conclusion in Part IV summarizes the main findings and considers their implications.
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In recent decades the international community has expanded peace-keeping operations following both intra-state and civil wars. Interventions have broadened in scope well beyond the provision of blue-helmet security to cover complex challenges of overcoming human suffering and humanitarian crisis, economic destruction, social reconstruction, and securing agreement for new constitutional settlements. The expansion has been fuelled by widespread concern that societies deeply-divided by conflict and violence where old regimes have collapsed are breeding grounds for many global ills, including terrorism, organized crime and corruption, weapons proliferation, humanitarian emergencies, environmental degradation, genocides, and political extremism.

Nevertheless U.N. peace-building operations have had a checkered record of success. The outcome in the most positive cases has been durable peace-settlements and the establishment of legitimate governments, such as in Mozambique, El Salvador, and Croatia. Elsewhere peacekeeping has proved less effective and states have continued to struggle, exemplified by continuing conflict, lawlessness, and unrest in Somalia, a humanitarian crisis in Darfur and southern secession in Sudan, renewed violence over disputed presidential elections in Cote d'Ivoire, and marauding militia and instability in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Hewitt, Wilkenfeld and Gurr estimate that of the 39 outbreaks of armed conflict during the last decade, 31 were recurrences after violence had been dormant for at least a year. Like Pandora’s Box, the evil of war refuses to be contained.

When confronted with these challenges, two rival schools of thought are common within international relations and comparative politics – termed here the ‘realist’ and ‘idealist’ perspectives. Both share common normative goals but these differ sharply in their emphasis about the strategic priorities and sequential process of institution-building thought necessary to secure an enduring reduction in armed conflict within societies. Hence realists emphasize the critical role of starting post-war reconstruction processes with state-building as the first step, including strengthening the capacity of governing executives to maintain order and stability. Insurgency, political violence, and civil war are thought less likely under strong states. By contrast, idealists stress the importance of first establishing the institutional foundations of liberal democracy, and thus competitive elections, institutional checks and balances and the dispersal of power, limiting executive autonomy, on the grounds that inclusive democracies reinforce the legitimacy of the government and provide channels for expression which reduce the underlying causes of political grievances driving the use of armed conflict. Debate about these alternative priorities is not confined to academe, by any means; instead similar arguments also resonate among agencies and policymakers within the international community. Moreover these arguments are open to challenge if they ultimately involve a false dichotomy based on faulty reasoning, particularly if the most effective strategy is strengthening both democracy and governance simultaneously.

To throw new light on these issues, Part I of this study summarizes the theoretical arguments and points of contention in the debate. Part II developed the research design, operationalizes the concepts and measures of liberal democracy and governance capacity, and then selects indices to compare societies. The comparative framework examines global trends in 133 independent nation-states for two decades, from 1984 to 2004, where country-year is the unit of analysis. The dependent variable, measures of internal armed conflict, is derived from the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset 1946-2009. Part III examines the cross-national time-series (CNTS) evidence for the consequences of regimes for internal violence. The conclusion in Part IV summarizes the main findings and considers their implications.

I: Theoretical framework

Idealist claims: establish democratic legitimacy first

The role of formal institutions has long been central to the study of comparative politics, and it has experienced a recent revived of interest in developmental economics. But what types of institution-building should be prioritized in the immediate aftermath of civil wars? The idealist perspective emphasizing the role of democracy in reducing conflict is common in comparative politics and
democratic theory. It is essential to restore trust in any divided society following civil war, idealists argue, by first building regimes enjoying popular legitimacy based on the institutional foundations of representative democracy, exemplified by holding competitive multiparty elections, building power-sharing arrangements into constitutional settlements, strengthening legislatures and independent judiciary, expanding civil society, and decentralizing governance. Idealists claim that democratic institutions have the potential capacity to overcome many of the world’s ills, including reducing the causes of deep-rooted civil conflict, with indirect benefits for international security, as well as having positive consequences for human development.

The broadest idealists claim argues that the international community needs to be fully committed to democracy promotion and holding election even under the most challenging circumstances, such as in Sudan, Iraq and Afghanistan. As Michael McCaul argues: “As a system of government, democracy has clear advantages over other kinds of regimes. Democracies represent the will of the people and constrain the power of the state. They avoid the worst kinds of economic disasters, such as famine, and the political horrors, such as genocide, that occur in autocracies. On average, democracies also produce economic development just as well as other forms of government. Democracies also tend to provide for more stable government and more peaceful relations with other states compared to other regime types. Finally, most people in the world want democracy.”

Similar views are heard elsewhere, for example Siegle, Weinstein and Halperin claim that democratic regimes have overwhelming instrumental advantages for peace, as well as beneficial consequences for human development and welfare.

Idealists suggest several reasons why deeply-divided societies emerging from civil conflict should establish democratic regimes deriving authority from legitimate and credible elections held at an early stage in any peace-building process.

First, unless regimes are founded on competitive elections meeting international standards, as a minimum, then rulers will fail to be regarded as legitimate by citizens, thus fostering enduring grievances, suppressing but not mitigating the deeper causes of conflict. Democracies provide participatory outlets for the expression of discontent, reducing the need for extreme violence and coercion, and building trust.

Second, idealists argue that democratic political institutions reduce state repression. Repression involves a wide range of actions which states use against their own citizens, ranging from curtailments of fundamental freedoms and the imprisonment of dissidents to outright violence and even genocide. The ‘domestic peace’ argument by Christian Davenport suggests that, at minimum, this type of regime constrains governments from repressive acts against their own citizens and thus reduces the causes of home-grown conflict. Democracy curtails these acts through the mechanism of voice, since elected governments can be voted out of office, and through the mechanism of veto, since institutions check executive power. Repressive acts against citizens also violate democratic cultural norms and values, such as tolerance and compromise.

Thirdly, ‘state-building first’ is regarded as a flawed strategy for those holding democratic values because there is no long-term guarantee, and every reason to doubt, that regimes will eventually voluntarily loosen their grip on power to transition towards democracy. Democracy deferred may well prove to be democracy denied.

Moreover beyond the beneficial consequences for reducing the causes of internal conflict, idealists claim that there are important indirect benefits for inter-state relations. The well-known ‘democratic peace’ proposition maintains that democratic states have never, or rarely, fought each other. One of the most widely-quoted studies, by Bruce Russett, suggests that the spread of the democratic peace developed towards the end of the nineteenth century, and this pattern has been enduring since then: “There are no clear-cut cases of sovereign stable democracies waging war with each other in the modern international system.” The precise underlying mechanisms generating any democratic peace dividend remains difficult to establish, however, and alternative theories focus upon the importance of institutions, political culture, and globalization.
Establish power-sharing democracies first

The idealist perspective also contains scholars claiming that not all types of democracy encourage accommodation; theories based on ideas of ‘consociational’ or ‘consensus’ democracy, long championed by Arend Lijphart, emphasize that power-sharing arrangements are critical. Consociationalists argue that these constitutional settlements serve to dampen down armed conflicts in deeply-divided multi-ethnic societies and thereby produce a durable peace settlement, political stability, and the conditions under which sustainable democracy flourishes. According to Lijphart, democracies which endure in plural societies are characterized by multiple democratic checks and balances to insure that power is widely dispersed vertically and horizontally, typified by the adoption of proportional representation electoral systems, decentralized and devolved governance, and prime ministerial executives accountable to parliament.

Consociational theory suggests that power-sharing democratic institutions are especially important for political stability following conflict in divided societies, mainly by restoring trust among community leaders, as well as increasing confidence in the responsiveness of elected officials among their followers, and thereby establishing conditions favoring sustainable peace.

Empirical studies have explored several aspects of this complex relationship. In previous work, I have subjected the consociational claims to rigorous scrutiny and demonstrated that states with power-sharing arrangements do display significantly greater progress in democratization than those with majoritarian institutions. Other have reported that peace-settlements involving power-sharing are more likely to endure.

Realist arguments: State-building first

Nevertheless despite much theorizing about the general effects of democracy and democratization on civil war, generating a substantial literature, the statistical relationship is not robust. Interpretation of the evidence is often sensitive to issues of measurement error and problems of validity, systematic biases in missing data, problems of endogeneity in complex pathways of causation, non-linear and skewed indices, and a partial set of cases. For all these reasons evidence remains inconclusive and idealist claims – especially the most general claims - have always proved controversial. Critics charge that power-sharing democracies can freeze group boundaries, heighten latent ethnic identities, hinder rebuilding the state in the early stages of recovery from violent internal conflict, and thereby fail to facilitate stability in multi-ethnic societies. Democratic institutions are also thought to have a limited impact on the risk of conflict recurrence in divided societies because they are remain vulnerable to poor economic growth, lingering disagreements about power-sharing arrangements, and continued opportunities for insurgencies to organize. The transition from absolute autocracy towards more open regimes and electoral democracies is regarded as a particularly dangerous period for multiethnic societies, when autocratic control is curtailed, providing greater opportunities for rebellion, but at the same time regimes have not yet consolidated the full panoply of democratic institutions ensuring feelings of political legitimacy.

The primary alternative theoretical viewpoint derives from the realist perspective, originating in the classic work of Samuel P. Huntington and recently back in vogue among diverse commentators exemplified by Robert Kaplan, Francis Fukuyama, Edward Mansfield and Jack Snyder. Realists regard political development as a sequential process. In this view, the first priority in the peace-building and reconstruction process following internal conflict is state-building designed to expand governance capacity and establish conditions of social cohesion, order and stability, national unity, the rule of law, and the exercise of effective authority. ‘State-building’ is understood as an essential pre-condition for subsequent industrialization and societal modernization so that, in the due course of time, nations eventually become ready to transition towards democracy, through the usual mechanisms of holding competitive elections, strengthening legislatures, and establishing independent checks and balances upon the executive. Effective development is understood as a series of strategic steps in a process where societies first need to build well-functioning states capable
of maintaining order and security, before they can subsequently expand processes of economic development. Only further down the road, once these preconditions are met, realists suggest, should societies seek to transition in the next stage to democratic regimes.

The intellectual roots of these ideas can be traced back to Samuel P. Huntington’s 1968 *Political Order in Changing Societies.* This accounts was seared by the experience of decolonization during the late-1950s and early-1960s, and the failure of the institutions of representative democracy to take firm root when transplanted into many newly independent developing societies, such as in many former British and French colonies in West and East Africa.

Earlier theories of modernization, put forward by leading scholars such as Lucian Pye, Edward Shils and Daniel Lerner, had assumed that the process of industrialization, the expansion of mass democracy, and the growth of the modern bureaucratic state could occur simultaneously in many developing societies. Yet if social mobilization outpaced the establishment of democratic institutions and processes of industrial growth, Huntington cautioned, this raised the risks of social disorder, insurgency movements, and fragile regimes. Thus he predicted that newly-independent post-colonial states would be destabilized by ‘premature’ increases in mass participation, typically by mobilizing new groups and holding elections early in any regime transition process.

In support, Huntington cited the history of growing political instability during the 1950s and 1960s, including a series of coups d’états experienced throughout Latin America, revolutionary violence, insurrection and guerrilla warfare in Indonesia, Thailand and the Philippines, and ethnic tensions or communal violence in Nigeria, Burundi and Sudan. What caused this violence and instability? Huntington blamed the rapid mobilization of new groups into politics coupled with the slow development of political institutions: “Social and economic change... extend political consciousness, multiply political demands, broaden political participation. These changes undermine traditional sources of political authority and traditional political institution.” The result, he believed, was anarchy. Instead, Huntington recommended that regimes should first establish the foundation of legitimate authority, social order, and rule of law, by modernizing authoritarianism, as exemplified by leaders such as Lee Kwan Yew in Singapore, Park Chung-Hee in Korea or Suharto in Indonesia. Once these foundations were stable, he argued, then countries would be ready for the expansion of mass participation and democracy.

Ideas of sequencing proved to be in temporary abeyance during the third wave era, especially following the fall of the Berlin wall, but contemporary debate about these notions revived again during the last decade, following experience of elections in post-Saddam Iraq and in Afghanistan. American commentators were frequently dismayed by continued conflict in these countries and problems of governance, exemplified by pervasive corruption and fraudulent practices reported under the Karsai administration, leading the Electoral Commission to discard one fifth of all ballots cast for the 2010 Afghan parliamentary elections. Following the March 2010 elections, Iraq also experienced fraught negotiations and extended delays in forming a new administration, including appointments in key security posts, which fuelled doubts about the process. Elsewhere some fragile transitions from autocracy faltered, notably in Gabon, Kenya, Niger, Sierra Leone, and Madagascar, as well as setbacks for electoral democracies in countries as diverse as Fiji, Thailand, and Venezuela. In Russia, improvements in human rights during the early-1990s were reversed under Putin’s leadership.

Troubled by these developments, ‘realist’ thinkers within international relations argued that enthusiasm for democracy promotion should be tempered by other considerations. Realists do not usually question normative claims about the importance of democracy and human rights; rather they suggest that the most effective strategy to achieve this long-term goal is indirect. Echoing Huntington, sequentialist theories suggest that countries afflicted with deep-rooted conflict need to first establish the foundations of a well-functioning state before rushing headlong into elections and democracy.
This perspective has been forcefully revived by diverse commentators; hence the journalist Robert Kaplan articulated many reasons for pessimism about democracy promotion, arguing that population increases, urbanization, and resource depletion were undermining fragile governments in West Africa and Asia.27 Fareed Zakaria expressed concern about the election of a new generation of autocrats, suppressing human rights in countries as diverse as Peru, Kazakhstan and the Philippines, establishing ‘illiberal democracies’.28

Reflecting upon the international community’s peace-building record in Haiti, Cambodia and Bosnia, Francis Fukuyama argued that important trade-offs exist between governance and democracy. In particular, state-building in multicultural societies often requires the authorities to use force to disarm militia and to establish legitimate control over national territorial borders. By contrast, liberal democracies constrain the power of the central authorities. If elections are held prior to the completion of this process, Fukuyama claims, then internal conflicts may be frozen, prolonging instability.29

Some scholars also argue that the creation of federal structures encourage a dynamic unraveling and break-up of the nation-state, in which accession to demands for increased autonomy fuels the flames which lead eventually towards instability, partition, and even outright succession.30

Similarly, Simon Chesterman analyzed the history of internationally-run transitional administrations, arguing that peace-builders had not devoted sufficient attention to the process of building sustainable institutions, such as the need for effective law-enforcement and a judicial system in Bosnia and Kosovo.31 Moreover Amy Chu claims that the pursuit of democracy and market reform in countries with predominant minorities is destabilizing, by encouraging ethnic conflict.32 Monica Toft argues that civil wars ending with military victories, where one side maintains control of the military and police, generate more durable order and stability. Rebel victories, in particular, provide conditions conducive to democratization. 33

In recent years, perhaps the most sustained challenge to the idealist thesis has been developed in a long series of publications by Edward Mansfield and Jack Snyder. 34 These scholars warn that instead of a peace dividend, democratizing states in the process of transition are far more susceptible to ethnic conflict, not less, through encouraging nationalist rhetoric in the pursuit of popular electoral support. In the process, Mansfield and Snyder have revived realist claims that the process of transition from autocracy increases, rather than reduces, the risks of interstate conflict.35 They argue that elections are particularly dangerous if held early in any transition process, before the mechanisms of political accountability, institutional checks and balances, and a democratic culture have had time to develop. In this context, they believe, politicians seeking to mobilize popular support through tribal and nationalistic appeals have an incentive to declare an aggressive war.

Far from generating peace, elections in divided societies and poorly consolidated democracies can trigger further violence, as exemplified by Kenya in 2008 and Cote d’Ivoire in 2011. Mansfield and Snyder emphasize that regime transitions from absolute autocracy to electoral democracy, or vice versa, heighten the risk of violence, although obviously any estimates are sensitive to timing and there are complex interaction effects in this relationship.36 Electoral competition for votes on the basis of heightened rhetoric and tribal appeals can heighten ethnic tensions, although the outcome is contingent upon a range of issues such as sequencing, timing, mechanics and administration.37 Attempts to replicate Mansfield and Snyder’s empirical evidence has raised several challenges, however; with the results heavily contingent upon measurement issues.38 The empirical evidence for realist claims therefore needs reexamining, including by comparing different types of regimes.

Equilibrium theory: do it all

Lastly it is also possible that the realist vs. idealist debate, while heated, is based on a false dichotomy, if conflict is reduced most effectively where the formal institutions of liberal democracy are strengthened simultaneously with governance capacity, in a balanced equilibrium. A number of
scholars assume that states need to ‘do it all’, -- building effective law and order as well as holding competitive elections, improving the quality of public administration as well as bolstering human rights -- rather than regarding these priorities as clear-cut alternatives. Hence Carothers suggests that the process of gradually strengthening democracy needs to accompany state-building initiatives, recognizing that both components are necessary for successful development. The idea that these institutions working together will strengthen stable and accountable states is common in the literature, and its popularity rests in part on the way that the idea of ‘governance’ is often so fuzzily defined and poorly conceptualized that it is sometimes equated automatically with ‘democracy’.

The most common and recognizable feature of representative democracy is holding competitive multiparty elections. These contests are now a standard component in negotiated settlements for divided societies emerging from conflict, as part of the international peace-building process. Yet this strategy may ultimately elect governments to fail, and thus have the capacity to spread long-term public disillusionment with electoral democracy, equilibrium theory suggests, in states where regime authorities lack the military, financial, or administrative capacity to improve the lives of their citizens. Many weak states have rulers who lack the ability to prevent bloodshed (as in the Democratic Republic of Congo), alleviate deep-rooted poverty (in Liberia), maintain security (as in Somalia), or protect citizens against the ravages of humanitarian or natural disasters (as in Haiti). It may thus be problematic to develop the institutions of representative democracy, which facilitate the expression and mobilization of citizens’ demands, where states lack basic governance capacity.

Yet it may be equally – or perhaps even more – inappropriate to expand state capacity, for example by strengthening the executive bureaucracy, bolstering tax collection agencies, or equipping the security forces, without first establishing the accountability mechanisms and safeguards over executive power provided by representative democratic institutions. Once installed securely in office, there is no guarantee whatever that rulers in strong autocratic states will necessarily subsequently relinquish power voluntarily. Indeed, there is every expectation that they will not, based on past experience.

Therefore equilibrium theory suggests that, rather than a false dichotomy, the challenge for the international community is to strike a careful and delicate balance between simultaneously strengthening both representative democracy and bureaucratic governance.

**Fig. 1: Regime typology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEMOCRACY</th>
<th>RESTRICTED VOICE AND ACCOUNTABILITY</th>
<th>INCLUSIVE VOICE AND ACCOUNTABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPANDED GOVERNANCE CAPACITY</strong></td>
<td>Bureaucratic autocracies (Mixed performance)</td>
<td>Bureaucratic democracies (Most effective performance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIMITED GOVERNANCE CAPACITY</strong></td>
<td>Patronage autocracies (Least effective performance)</td>
<td>Patronage democracies (Mixed performance)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 provides a typology illustrating equilibrium theory. This account suggests that conflict will be minimized under two conditions: first, in nation states where democratic institutions and procedures strengthen voice and accountability (depicted schematically on the horizontal axis), so that all citizens have the capacity to express their demands and to hold elected officials to account, and, secondly, in nation states where bureaucratic governance is strengthened (on the vertical axis), so that regime authorities have the capacity to implement policies, including maintaining security, raising public revenues, and managing the delivery of public goods and services.
II: CORE PROPOSITIONS AND RESEARCH DESIGN

Core propositions

The theories reviewed from the research literature suggest several empirically-testable alternative propositions. The core idealist claim is that democratic regimes have direct benefits for domestic peace, by reducing the grievances fuelling societal violence, fostering a sense of political legitimacy, and checking the excesses of state repression. Democracies are also believed to have indirect benefits for world peace, by decreasing the chances of inter-state war. The first testable proposition flowing from idealist theory is that, ceteris paribus:

(H#1) Countries which have built strong institutions of liberal democracy will be less vulnerable to internal violence and civil wars.

Moreover, a second proposition within the idealist perspective can also be identified, drawing upon the long tradition of consociational theory, namely:

(H#2) States with power-sharing institutional arrangements will be most effective at limiting domestic conflict.

Realists differ in many important regards, but they generally share the belief that the most effective and coherent strategy for peace-builders is to follow a step-by-step sequential process, where the first priority is state-building and establishing effective governance. Once the foundation of order and stability is established in any society then, it is hoped, this will be followed eventually by processes of societal development, market liberalization, and democratic elections. If this account is true, then it follows that, all other things being equal:

(H#3) States with strong and effective governance capacity will be less vulnerable to domestic violence and civil wars.

Lastly, equilibrium theory suggests that expanding either the demands of democracy or the supply of governance alone is likely to be insufficient; instead:

(H#4) The combination (or interaction effect) of both democracy and governance working in tandem will reduce the risks of civil war and outbreaks of internal violence.

Conceptualizing governance capacity

How should the core concepts be operationalized and measured to test these alternative propositions? Despite the popularity of the idea that governance capacity is important, most empirical studies analyzing conditions leading to the start and end of civil wars has examined the impact of democracy, not governance. The idea of ‘governance’ has become intellectually fashionable in recent years although it is a complex notion which is open to multiple meanings. There is a broad consensus that ‘governance’ is broader and more diffuse than simply ‘government’, but disciplines differ in their understanding of this term. The conceptualization adopted in this paper seeks to remain neutral about what goals states seek to achieve and thus avoid normative judgments about the most appropriate range, size, or scope of governance. The administrative capacity of the state is also treated as distinct from the effects of the state, which the research seeks to establish empirically.

Unfortunately many indices of so-called ‘good governance’ mix all these elements together conceptually, including a long and ever-growing shopping list of qualities. The term ‘governance’ is often modified in recent usage by heavily value-laden but highly abstract terms of approval, notably the World Bank’s popular notion of ‘good governance’, as well as the use of terms such as the ‘quality of governance’. The measures of ‘good governance’ from the World Bank Institute are also heavily weighted towards outcomes, exemplified by indices for lack of corruption and political stability,
but they provide few insights into the particular institutional characteristics which generate certain outcomes. The ‘shopping-list’ approach is problematic and conceptually muddled, however, since the most appropriate role, functions, and scope of the state remain a matter of intense ideological debate, especially the degree of government intervention in economic markets. According to the well-known World Bank Institute indicators developed by Daniel Kaufmann and Aart Kraay, for example, the notion of ‘good governance’ emphasizes features central to capitalist economies, including respect for property rights. By contrast, Margaret Levi suggests that ‘effective’ governance maximizes social welfare, by protecting the population from violence, ensuring the honesty and competence of its bureaucracy, and enabling the infrastructure which makes possible the exchange of goods and services. Keynesian liberals envisage an expanded role for the state in the active management of the economy, including the provision of a range of social policies to protect the vulnerable in society.

Others have sought to gauge governance by measuring the extractive capacity of the state, such as the ratio of total tax revenues to GDP, when seeking to examine the incentives for rulers to capture resources. For example a comparison of post-communist countries developed an index of state capacity based on the quality of public goods provisions, taxation capacity, infrastructure reform, levels of corruption, property rights, and related measures.

In this study, however, the notion of governance capacity does not rest upon normative and ideological evaluations of the particular policies which regime authorities choose to adopt, or the scope and degree of state interventions. Instead the study focuses upon the managerial ability of the state to implement whatever public policies they seek to pursue. Governance by the state is understood to concern the capacity of regime authorities to perform functions essential for collective well-being. In practice, the concept of governance is multidimensional and it includes the capacity of the state to protect citizens living within its territory and to manage the delivery of public goods and services. This conceptualization closely follows Michael Mann’s argument, focusing upon the “institutional capacity of a central state…to penetrate its territories and logistically implement decisions.” There are two nested dimensions or components of governance capacity, focused on security and bureaucratic administration.

The broadest dimension concerns the capacity of regime authorities to protect the safety and security of citizens, including maintaining sovereignty within its territory against external threat, exercising a monopoly over the use of military force and maintaining social order. This understanding is consistent with the Weberian definition: “The state is a human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of force within its given territory.” The second dimension reflects the administrative capacity of the state to implement public policies and to manage the delivery of basic goods and services. Lack of administrative capacity is illustrated most vividly by poor states such as Haiti, Somalia and Cote d’Ivoire, where the central authorities are incapable of fulfilling core governance functions, such as raising revenues through regulatory tariffs and taxation, providing essential services such as emergency relief and basic healthcare, curbing criminal activities, and policing ‘no-go’ lawless areas. Building upon this understanding, we can distinguish between two types of administrative governance, including patronage and bureaucratic states.

Bureaucratic forms of governance exert control through instrumental forms of legal-rational authority, following the principles of impartiality, effectiveness, efficiency, transparency, and integrity. Legal-rational authority rests in the office, whether the holder is recruited through election or appointment, not the individual. Bureaucrats are responsive to elected authorities and yet somewhat autonomous from undue partisan pressures, with established mechanisms for recruitment and training based on formal qualifications and technical expertise. During the mid-to-late nineteenth century, industrialized nations came to reflect notions of Weberian rational bureaucracy. This has been seen as the ideal form of public administration for large, complex organizations in modern states. Bureaucracy has been regarded as instrumentally rational, reflecting the top-down command-and-control way to manage the delivery of organizational goals, just as the production line transformed
manufacturing industry. Bureaucratic rules and regulations, in particular, are designed to ensure that even lowly functionaries followed standardized procedures in each government department, so that all citizens received equitable treatment.

By contrast, in **patronage** states, leaders exert control primarily through the use of personal networks, delivering goods and services selectively to clientalistic groups of loyal supporters. Nepotism, favors, and corruption are commonplace ways of recruitment and promotion in patronage states, while legal, judicial, and administrative agencies are far from impartial and independent of political pressures. Patronage through the allocation of spoils helps rulers gain the loyalty and allegiance of the security forces, and thus maintain control of the general population through force. Patronage relationships emphasize personal connections between leaders and subjects, or patrons and clients, exemplified by monarchs, sultans, dictators, and emirs, where authority rests in the person rather than the office. Rulers gain compliance directly through their personal status, informal social ties, deference to traditional loyalties, and the allocation of material rewards, as well as indirectly through use of force and outright repression. Traditional forms of patronage were common in most states during the 18th and early 19th centuries.

**Measuring governance capacity**

Empirical estimates of governance capacity are difficult to operationalize, however, especially reliable indices useful for comparing trends worldwide and over time. The most detailed longitudinal study of the quality of bureaucratic governance, by Evans and Rauch, covers development since the early 1970s, but coverage is restricted to around three dozen countries. Similarly the World Bank’s Resource Allocation Index includes estimates about the contemporary quality of public administration, based on their annual Country Policy and Institutional Assessment exercise, but it is limited to 76 developing countries. The International Monetary Fund has also compiled general and central government revenues and outlays by function, based on standardized data from National Accounts. Nevertheless this data covers few developing countries and, in addition, it cannot be assumed that the size of the state, or high government revenues and expenditures, are indicative of bureaucratic capacity.

Typically, the capacity of the state to maintain security is usually operationalized more directly by the strength of military personnel, whether measured on a per capita basis, or as a proportion of the total labor force, or as a proportion of GDP or total government outlays. Nevertheless studies have found that these indicators are poorly, or even inversely, correlated with other measures of governance. Not surprisingly, military expenditure may in fact be a proxy for insecurity; states which experience external or internal threat are likely to boost spending on the armed forces. Another alternative indicator is government spending upon public order and safety (on a per capita basis, or as a proportion of total outlays), including expenditure upon the police and other law enforcement agencies. This measure is particularly important in lawless regions, where the state lacks the capacity to limit criminal activity, and standardized international data on government outlays for this function is compiled for some countries by the International Monetary Fund, derived from National Accounts. Yet reliable time-series data is unavailable in many countries, especially many developing societies. Spending on domestic security could also be expected to rise following a resurgence of criminal activity, exemplified by the Mexican government’s war on drug cartels.

To monitor governance capacity, this study therefore uses Political Risk Service’s Group (PRSG) International Country Risk Guide which provides estimates of the Quality of Governance. These measures provide reasonably comprehensive geographic and longitudinal coverage, estimated annually by expert surveys for 133 states worldwide from 1984-2004. Based on expert assessments, the PRSG’s Quality of Government index combines three components: (1) Bureaucratic Quality; (2) Corruption, and; (3) Law and Order.

(1) **Bureaucratic Quality** measures how far the country’s public sector is characterized by: (i) regular processes of meritocratic recruitment and career advancement, (ii) independence
from political pressures, and (iii) the ability to provide continuous administrative services during government changes.62

(2) Corruption in the regime is measured by actual or potential corruption from excessive patronage, nepotism and secret party funding, as well as demands for special payments or bribes in the financial transaction with public sector employees.

(3) Law and Order is assessed by the strength and impartiality of the legal system, including how far there is popular observance of the law or if the law is routinely ignored without sanction.

The capacity of the state to govern is conceptualized as higher where there are processes of bureaucratic decision-making in the public sector, where corruption is minimized, and where the legal system establishes basic conditions of rule of law. Conversely, weak governance capacity is measured by the absence of these conditions. The PRSG Quality of Governance items are summed and the results are transformed into a standardized 100-point scale. The scale is also dichotomized around the mean to classify regimes into either bureaucratic or patronage states.

Conceptualizing and Measuring Liberal Democracy

All states require the capacity to maintain security and to implement policy decisions. Only some regimes, however, are governed according to the principles of ‘representative democracy’. The complex notion of ‘democracy’ is open to multiple conceptualizations and the employment of many alternative modifiers, including ‘participatory’, ‘liberal’, ‘social’, ‘direct’ and ‘deliberative’ forms of democracy.63 Representative democracy is understood here, most simply, to mean the capacity of people to influence regime authorities within their nation-state.64

Following the Schumpeterian tradition, minimalist notions of democracy focus upon the provision of competitive elections. In this perspective, leaders in democratic regimes are recruited on the basis of free and fair multiparty elections which meet international standards of integrity. Nevertheless Schumpeter offers a relatively narrow definition which fails to take account of the many other institutions required to ensure democratic elections work effectively, including the provision of freedom of expression and respect for civil liberties, checks and balances among the core regime institutions, an independent judiciary and an effective legislature. Without these safeguards and many others, electoral manipulation and fraud can be widely practiced.65

Reflecting the long tradition of classical liberal theories, following Robert Dahl’s conception, liberal democracy is understood in this study to rest upon the principles of contestation, participation, and human rights.66 In practice, Dahl suggested that liberal democratic regimes (or ‘polyarchies’) can be identified by the presence of certain key political institutions: 1) elected officials; 2) free and fair elections; 3) inclusive suffrage; 4) the right to run for office; 5) freedom of expression; 6) alternative information; and 7) associational autonomy.67 Liberal democracies use competitive multiparty elections to fill offices for the national legislature and the chief executive. Competitive elections alone, even if conducted according to international standards of electoral integrity, are insufficient to establish liberal democratic states without freedom of expression, the availability of alternative sources of information (freedom of the media), and associational autonomy (freedom to organize parties, interest groups and social movements).

The standard indicators commonly used to measure and compare levels of liberal democracy include Polity IV’s scale of democracy-autocracy (from 1800-2007) and the Freedom House Gastil index of political rights and civil liberties (from 1972-date).68

The Freedom House index has been widely employed by many comparative scholars.69 The index monitors the existence of political rights in terms of electoral processes, political pluralism, and the functioning of government. Civil liberties and Political Rights are defined by expert assessments of each country, such as levels of freedom of speech and association, rule of law, and personal rights.
Each item is allocated a score from 0 to 4 and each is given equal weight when aggregated. The raw scores for each country are then converted into a seven-point scale of political rights and a seven-point scale for civil liberties, and in turn these are collapsed to categorize each regime worldwide as either ‘free’, ‘partly free’, or ‘not free’. As a result of this process, Freedom House estimate that in 2009 out of 193 nations, almost half or 89 (46%) could be classified as free while 58 nations could be classified as ‘partly free’. The emphasis on a wide range of civil liberties, rights, and freedoms means that this most closely reflects notions of liberal democracy. The index has the advantage of providing comprehensive coverage of nation-states and independent territories worldwide, as well as establishing a long time-series of observations conducted annually since 1972. The Gastil index is standardized to a 100-point scale for ease of interpretation in this study. The index is also dichotomized around the mean to classify regimes as either liberal democracies or autocracies.

Classifying power-sharing institutions

Consociational theory makes the important claim that power-sharing institutions in plural societies, in particular, are most conducive to the accommodation of minority interests, the promotion of trust and tolerance among communal leaders, and thus the reduction of inter-communal violence. Lijphart is far from alone in emphasizing the importance of decentralization for stability, peace-building and democratic consolidation in fragile multinational states. When comparing data from the Minorities at Risk project, Bermeo concludes that armed rebellions are three times more common among groups living in unitary than in federal states, while these groups also experience lower levels of discrimination and grievances. Stephan is also a strong proponent of this form of government, suggesting all stable contemporary multinational democracies are federal, including Switzerland, Canada, Belgium, Spain and India. Elsewhere, Gurr has also advocated power-sharing arrangements and group autonomy as a solution to deep-rooted ethnic conflict and civil wars. Hechter also suggests that plural states such as India and Nigeria would probably not have survived without some form of decentralized governance.

Power-sharing is a complex concept, however, open to a variety of arrangements. Some of the most important concern the use of proportional representation electoral systems (which provide the lowest vote thresholds and thus facilitate the representation of minorities in elected legislative office), and the use of federalism and decentralized unions, which facilitate cultural autonomy for regionally-concentrated groups, local decision-making, and vertical forms of power-sharing. Both of these factors are classified and included in the models as dummy variables. In addition, the fractional size of the largest party in the legislature is included, to measure the concentration of power for the governing party. It is important to emphasize that none of these factors are included in the definition and measurement which Freedom House uses to gauge the degree of liberal democracy. For example, clearly the existence of elections is critical to the quality of democracy, but Freedom House does not measure or assess the type of electoral system used in these contests. Thus these institutional arrangements are independent of the measure of liberal democracy.

Measuring political violence and armed domestic conflict

Measures of civil wars are derived from the UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset V4.0 that provides a comprehensive accounting of all forms of major armed conflicts in the world over the contemporary period: 1946-2007. UCDP defines conflict as: “a contested incompatibility that concerns government and/or territory where the use of armed force between two parties, of which at least one is the government of a state, results in at least 25 battle-related deaths.” The dataset identifies incidents of ‘internal armed conflict’, defined as that which occurs between the government of a state and one or more internal opposition group(s) without intervention from other states. The UCDP measure is coded one a 4-point ordinal scale depending upon the incidence and magnitude of conflict (depending upon the number of battle-related deaths): (0) no interstate conflict; (1) minor interstate armed conflict; (2) Interstate intermediate armed conflict; and (4) Interstate war.
In addition, the dataset recognizes several other types of conflict which can be compared with incidents of internal armed conflict, including *extrasystemic* armed conflict which occurs between a state and a non-state group outside its own territory; *interstate* armed conflict which occurs between two or more states, and finally *internationalized* internal armed conflict occurs between the government of a state and one or more internal opposition group(s) with intervention from other states.

To replicate standard approaches in the research literature, the dependent variables derived from this dataset are (i) FREQUENCY: the annual incidents of internal armed conflict, (ii) ONSET: the year which recorded the start of internal armed conflict (reaching the minimum threshold of 25 battle-related deaths, irrespective of magnitude) and (iii) ENDING: the year ending internal armed conflict (defined similarly). The onset and ending dates are clearly more difficult to estimate with precision in some cases than others, especially where some modest level of conflict and internal repression by the armed forces continues to rumble on, or where dissident activities are sporadic and intermittent (such as Basque violence), despite failing to reach the minimum threshold in particular years. Major armed coup d'états can also occur with arrests, detentions and the imposition of military law without a fatal shot being fired, as occurred in 2006 in Thailand. It is easier to identify a clear end date where there is a formal peace accord observed by rival factions following a long-standing civil war, such as that signed by government forces and Maoist rebels in 2006 in Nepal and monitored by the UN, or the 1998 ‘Good Friday’ Peace agreement in Northern Ireland. It is more difficult, and perhaps arbitrary, to attribute a start and end year for conflict when a single incident generates high casualties, such as the 2002 terrorist bombing in Bali. This process lets us identify the onset of 86 outbreaks of internal armed conflict from 1984-2004, and the end of 89 cases.

**Methods and controls**

The analysis relies on cross-sectional time-series (CSTS) panel data which consists of repeated observations in a series of fixed (non-sampled) units (contemporary nation states), where the units are of interest in themselves. The country-year is the basic unit of analysis, generating up to 2,631 observations across the whole period. This produces a large enough time-series to model the dynamics for each unit. Given limits on data availability, the analysis is limited to 133 contemporary nation states (excluding dependent territories and states which dissolved during this period). Descriptive statistics are examined and then binary logistic regression is used to measure the impact of the independent variables on the duration of internal armed conflict in each society with the full battery of multivariate controls.

Many previous studies have emphasized the role of economic development (measured here by logged per capita GDP in purchasing power parity and by rates of economic growth). Poor performance is thought to strengthen a sense of grievance, in particular if low rates of growth, youth unemployment, and enduring poverty foster popular discontent against the government. Rapid economic change is argued to intensify group competition for scarce resources, leading groups to support rebellion. Nevertheless there are potential problems of reverse causality in interpreting any correlation, since high levels of ethnic violence depress economic development (for example, by deterring foreign investment and destroying infrastructure).

Regional conflict among neighboring states is an obvious factor which can spill over national borders, exemplified in 1994 by the massive displacement of refugees and exiles in the Great Lakes region when Rwandans flooded into Tanzania, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Uganda and Burundi following the Rwandan Patriotic Front offensive, and where refugee camps developed into militarized bases for opposition forces. Another clear example concerns the Bosnian war and the effects on the surrounding Balkan states. For these reasons, this study controls for levels of regional conflict, as measured by the UCDP.

The well-known ‘resource curse’ has often been blamed for fuelling a sense of grievance among those excluded from the spoils, although the evidence has been questioned. The notion of a ‘resource curse’ has been most commonly applied to explaining why many countries apparently
blessed with abundant reserves of non-renewable mineral resources, such as Nigerian oil, the Democratic Republic of Congo’s gold, or Sierra Leone diamonds, in fact are commonly blighted with less transparency and probity, economic stability, economic diversification, social equality, and investment in human capital. In these conditions, the heightened danger of state capture and rent-seeking by ruling elites generate poorer prospects for the transition from autocracy and the consolidation of stable democracies. Lootable mineral resources, in particular, are thought to make a country particularly vulnerable to civil war, insurgency, and rebellion. Following Michael Ross, the role of natural resources is measured in this study by oil and gas rents per capita in constant dollars.81

High levels of ethnic fractionalization and communal polarization are also commonly regarded as some of the most critical factors capable of triggering inter-communal violence.82 The measurement of ethnicity remains a complex matter. Studies most often gauge the proportion of ethnic minorities within any population. This measure is not equivalent to polarization, however, and the geographic distribution of communities within society is also likely to prove important. Moreover all types of ethnic identities, such as those defined by race, tribe, language, religious faith, and nationalism, are not necessarily equivalent in terms of the capacity of communities to be mobilized into acts of hatred and violence. The distribution of each type of ethnicity also varies widely among global regions. Constructivist theory also suggests that endogeneity may be at work here; this view emphasizes that conflict can heighten latent ethnic identities, so that social cleavages based on language, religion, race or nationality should not be regarded as endogenous to the political system.83 In this study, societal levels of linguistic and religious ethnic fractionalization are derived from estimates provided by Alesina et al, the source providing the most comprehensive cross-national coverage.84 This proxy measure assumes that high levels of ethnic polarization are most likely to occur in the most fractionalized societies.

The size of any nation-state – both in terms of population and physical span – is also likely to increase the difficulties of maintain order and security. Larger countries which are also plural societies, such as Indonesia, India, Nigeria, and Russia, are potentially more vulnerable to ethnic groups demanding succession or autonomy, thus increasing the risks of violent rebellion.

Moreover the integration of states into the agencies of global governance is thought to help prevent conflict, because such states are more subject to international norms deterring the use of repressive acts against their own citizens. The predominant norms and values in the international community emphasize the belief that it is appropriate to use negotiation, bargaining and compromise to settle internal political disputes, rather than force.85 Thus national membership of regional organizations such as the EU, ASEAN, or NATO, and being closely engaged with the work of the IMF, World Bank and UN, should encourage less repressive regimes. The KOF annual index of Political Globalization is included in the models, measured by integration with international inter-governmental organizations, the number of embassies based in a country, and national engagement in UN peace missions.86

The historical legacy of colonial backgrounds is also thought to be important for internal conflict. Some studies suggest that countries with a British colonial past have a better track record of democratization and stability, through the administrative and cultural legacy which was established by Britain.87 Yet other studies have found that a French colonial background in Africa substantially reduces the risks of civil war, and it is suggested that the reason lies in the French military umbrella which provided de facto security guarantees in the region.88

III: Results and Analysis

Descriptive results

We can first look at the descriptive comparison of types of conflict (dichotomized to represent any instances of conflict, irrespective of the magnitude) across regime types, without any controls. As figure 1 and table 1 show, Patronage Autocracies display by far the highest levels of internal conflict,
as equilibrium theory predicted. The combination of lack of state capacity to maintain peace and security, coupled with high levels of grievance in autocratic states, seems to be a deadly combination. This type of regime also displays the highest frequency of inter-state and internationalized wars. Patronage democracies also prove to experience moderately high risk of domestic political violence, although not inter-state wars. Lastly bureaucratic democracies and bureaucratic autocracies are least prone to suffer from political violence, with both regimes displaying a similar profile.

**Fig 2: Mean conflict by types of regimes, 1984-2004**

![Fig 2: Mean conflict by types of regimes, 1984-2004](image)

Note: The mean levels of internal, interstate, and internationalized conflict experienced by type of regime, 1984-2004. Source: Calculated from the UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset

To examine these patterns in more detail, Figure 3 presents a scatterplot applying the regime classification to compare the countries experiencing internal armed conflict during 2004, irrespective of the magnitude of the violence. As illustrated, many outbreaks of internal conflict occur in the patronage autocracies, as expected, such as those in Russia, Sudan, Ethiopia, Haiti and Nigeria. Nevertheless democracies are obviously not safe from internal conflict can this also be observed in several of the patronage democracies, such as the Philippines and Indonesia, as well as in the bureaucratic democracies of India, Turkey, and Israel.

**Fig 3: Scatterplot of internal armed conflict by types of regimes**

![Fig 3: Scatterplot of internal armed conflict by types of regimes](image)

Note: The occurrence of internal conflict experienced by type of regime, 2004. Source: Calculated from the UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset.
Table 1 classifies the distribution of the different types of internal conflict occurring during 2004 by the four types of regime. Out of 37 states experiencing internal conflict, 9 were patronage autocracies, include four of the five cases classified as civil wars, defined in terms of the magnitude of fatalities. Therefore this type of regime is not just particularly prone to incidents of internal conflict, they are also subject to the most severe type of internal violence. In addition, in this year, four of the patronage democracies were also subject to intermediate armed conflict and less severe minor conflict.

Nevertheless before drawing any clear conclusions, any descriptive results must be treated extremely cautiously, since multiple complex factors contribute towards internal violence. Many of the bureaucratic democracies are also advanced industrialized economies. Many of the patronage autocracies are ethnically heterogeneous societies. The control variables incorporated into the multivariate models, selected for reasons which have already been discussed, are summarized in Table 2, including their mean and standard deviation. Their technical definition, measurement and data sources are specified in Appendix A.

Table 2 shows the preliminary results of successive models testing the core propositions using the logistic regression analysis where the frequency of occurrence of internal armed conflict in any state is the dependent variable. Subsequent analysis in further research will go on to explore the onset and cessation of violence, using lagged indices and alternative specifications taking advantage of the time-series. Models in this paper compare the impact of liberal democracy (model 1), governance capacity (model 2), and the interaction effect of democratic-governance (model 3). The models were double-checked to be free of problems of multicollinearity. Further tests for the robustness of these results were conducted in a series of additional models, not presented here as these did not substantially alter the key findings.

The final comparison of the results across the three models is presented in Table 2. Idealist theory provides a series of reasons why liberal democracy is expected to be associated with the accommodation of grievances and checks on the powers of the executive, nevertheless by itself the strength of liberal democracy is not significantly related to the degree of internal armed conflict in a society. This confirms the descriptive results already examined. Overall the results provide no support to the first hypothesis that countries which have built strong institutions of liberal democracy will be less vulnerable to internal violence and civil wars.

Nevertheless, consociational theory predicts (H#2) that the type of power-sharing institutions in any regime is most important for reducing societal conflict, not simply liberal democracy alone. The results of the analysis do lend consistent support to this claim. Across all the models, federal states and decentralized unions, countries with proportional electoral systems for the lower house of national parliaments, and those with more competitive party competition, were characterized by significantly less societal conflict. Thus the second proposition, suggesting that power-sharing constitutions serve to depress minority grievances and thus reduce the causes of internal conflict, is supported by these findings, even though the strength of liberal democracy per se is not significant.

What of state-building? Overall the proposition arising from the realist perspective (H#3) receives support from the analysis; societal violence and civil wars are minimized in states characterized by strong administrative capacity in the public sector, low corruption in the regime, and effective law and order through the strength and impartiality of the legal system.

In addition, providing limited support for equilibrium theory, the effect of the combination of democratic-governance was also to reduce violence significantly, although the effect was slightly less strong than that for governance capacity alone.
The impact of the control variables also need to be examined. Levels of economic development were not consistently associated with levels of conflict across all the models although a stronger economic performance was significantly correlated with lower conflict. Thus problems of economic growth seem likely to encourage popular discontent, such as a sudden economic crisis and downturn in income which can spill over into domestic violence, although absolute levels of poverty appear less important. The role of regional conflict served to increase internal instability to a modest degree, although not significantly in all models. The type of ethnic fractionalization also proved to matter; as expected, multilingual societies were more prone to internal violence, while those with high levels of religious fractionalization had significantly less conflict. Other scholars have reported similar findings, although the precise reasons for these contrasts are not clear, and further robustness checks are required before having confidence in the findings. The remaining control variables behave mostly as expected; violence-prone societies tend to be larger physically and more populous, to be less well integrated into political forms of global governance, moreover both a British and French colonial legacy were associated with greater violence. Overall each of the models explains a considerable degree of variance in societal violence (measured by the Nagelkerke $R^2$).

Conclusions and discussion

In conclusion, the evidence presented here provides some preliminary support for the realist perspective; according to the results of the analysis, even after controlling for many factors, regimes with strong governance capacity appear less vulnerable to the threat of armed internal conflict. The reason is that states such as China and Singapore, which have developed bureaucratic forms of administration in the public services, which have exerted control over corruption, and which have used the legal system to maintain law and order, have the capacity to maintain security and reduce threats arising through internal violence and insurgency movements. Bureaucratic regimes have greater capacity to deliver effective public goods and services, and thus reduce some of the underlying causes of grievance. The security forces and courts also provide an efficient way to control dissident factions and groups prepared to use violence.

Counter to this argument, however, the pattern is complex since there is evidence that power-sharing institutions also help to reduce incidents of internal conflict, including the role of federalism and more proportional electoral systems. Thus although general idealist claims about the instrumental consequences of all types of liberal democracies for peace receive no support from the evidence scrutinized here, it appears that the results of the analysis support consociational arguments. Moreover there is also some support for equilibrium theory: when liberal democracy is combined with governance capacity, this also proves positive in reducing the risks of armed internal violence.

Nevertheless, certain important qualifications to these preliminary results should be borne in mind. First, this study remains work in progress and further research is required in subsequent studies using time-series analysis with lagged effects to examine the effects of democratic governance on the onset and ending of civil wars. Logistic regression remains a limited technique for analysis and it is subject to problems common in any panel dataset. Panel models are often highly sensitive to measurement and specification issues. Logistic regression estimates assume that errors are independent, normally distributed, and with constant variance. Panel data violates these assumptions and raises potential problems of heteroscedasticity, autocorrelation, robustness, and missing data. In addition, to be useful for policymakers, and to deepen our theories, additional indices should be incorporated into the analysis to understand the type of governance institutions which contribute towards lower levels of conflict. Fourthly, many other checks need to be introduced into the analysis to see whether the results remain robust using additional controls and incorporating alternative indices allowing broader cross-national coverage. The use of the ICRG quality of governance index, in particular, limits the range of countries under comparison so alternative measures need to be considered. Lastly similar models need to be extended to look at other instrumental consequences thought to arise from democratic governance, including the impact upon economic prosperity, social inequality, and human welfare.
### Table 1: Distribution of Internal Armed Conflict by type of regime, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No internal conflict</th>
<th>Internal minor armed conflict</th>
<th>Internal intermediate armed conflict</th>
<th>Internal war</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patronage autocracy</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patronage democracy</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic autocracy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic democracy</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The occurrence of internal conflict experienced by type of regime, 2004.

**Source:** Calculated from the UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset.
### Table 2 Means and description of core variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internalwar</td>
<td>Internal war (0/1) UCDP</td>
<td>3761</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.1407</td>
<td>.34771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DemoGov</td>
<td>Democratic governance (FH*ICRG)</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>99.96</td>
<td>38.7945</td>
<td>29.52883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHstand</td>
<td>FH Liberal Democracy standardized scale 100 pts (Freedom House)</td>
<td>3717</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>61.066</td>
<td>29.1789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRG_qog</td>
<td>Governance capacity (ICRG)</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>56.24</td>
<td>22.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP_Constant</td>
<td>Logged GDP in PPP (Constant $ international) WB</td>
<td>3098</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>55218</td>
<td>7747.86</td>
<td>8483.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wdi_gro</td>
<td>GDP Growth (%)</td>
<td>3186</td>
<td>-51.03</td>
<td>106.28</td>
<td>3.2155</td>
<td>6.57904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regac</td>
<td>Sum of all armed conflicts of regional states</td>
<td>2946</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15.92</td>
<td>11.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oil_gas_rentPOP</td>
<td>Oil_gas rent per capita in constant 2000 dollars</td>
<td>3332</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>25112.61</td>
<td>366.2303</td>
<td>1480.60471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frac_lan</td>
<td>Linguistic fractionalization (Alesina 2002)</td>
<td>3408</td>
<td>.0021</td>
<td>.9227</td>
<td>.391075</td>
<td>.2845684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frac_rel</td>
<td>Religious fractionalization (Alesina 2002)</td>
<td>3581</td>
<td>.0023</td>
<td>.8603</td>
<td>.436650</td>
<td>.2359901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PolGlob</td>
<td>Political Globalization (KOF 2008)</td>
<td>2359</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>50.46</td>
<td>25.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area_KM</td>
<td>Area in Square Kilometers (Banks)</td>
<td>3475</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29800</td>
<td>2428.94</td>
<td>5358.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logpop</td>
<td>Logged population (Banks)</td>
<td>3474</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.634</td>
<td>.9619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britcol</td>
<td>Previous British colony/not (from CIA World Factbook)</td>
<td>3754</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.3303</td>
<td>.47039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FrenchCol</td>
<td>Previous French colony/not</td>
<td>3812</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.1522</td>
<td>.35921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedtype</td>
<td>Type of unitary (0)-federal (1) state (Norris 2008)</td>
<td>3601</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.7270</td>
<td>.44555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ht_partsz</td>
<td>Size of Largest Party in Legislature (in fractions)</td>
<td>3320</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.4944</td>
<td>.31840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>PR (1)/ other (1) electoral system (Norris 2008)</td>
<td>3761</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.4685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 2: Impact of democratic governance on internal armed conflict**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Regimes</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal democracy</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.003 N/s</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.003 N/s</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.003 N/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.006 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal democracy * governance capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.007 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Power-Sharing Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal state (0/1)</td>
<td>-.584</td>
<td>.194 ***</td>
<td>-.678</td>
<td>.263 **</td>
<td>-.549</td>
<td>.257 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest party size</td>
<td>-.558</td>
<td>.207 **</td>
<td>-.785</td>
<td>.309 **</td>
<td>-.747</td>
<td>.296 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Controls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Log GDP/Capita</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000 N/s</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000 ***</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000 N/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.012 ***</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.018 *</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.018 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional conflict</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.006 ***</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.009 N/s</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.009 N/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources (Oil/gas)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000 N/s</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.000 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic fractionalization</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.239 ***</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.318 ***</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.310 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious fractionalization</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>.355 ***</td>
<td>-.344</td>
<td>.518 ***</td>
<td>-.368</td>
<td>.504 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log population size</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.174 ***</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.240 ***</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.234 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area size</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000 ***</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Globalization</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.005 ***</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.006 ***</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.006 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British colonial legacy</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>.175 ***</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.252 ***</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.241 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French colonial legacy</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.186 ***</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.250 ***</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.250 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constant: -11.2, -10.0, -9.55
N. observations: 2,631, 1,683, 1,691
% Correctly predicted: 87.6, 90.0, 83.7
Nagelkerke R²: .415, .510, .490

Note: Binary logistic regression. See Appendix A for the description of all variables.
Appendix A: Description of the variables and data sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description and source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Democracy index</td>
<td>The Gastil index, the 7-point scale used by Freedom House, measuring political rights and civil liberties annually since 1972. The index is standardized to a 100-point scale. Freedom in the World <a href="http://www.Freedomhouse.com">www.Freedomhouse.com</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance Capacity</td>
<td>Political Risk Service’s Group (PRSG) International Country Risk Guide estimates of the Quality of Governance. Based on expert assessments, the PRSG’s Quality of Government index combines three components: (1) Bureaucratic Quality; (2) Corruption, and; (3) Law and Order. The index is standardized to a 100 point scale. Source: The Quality of Government Dataset, the QOG Institute, University of Goteborg May 2010 release.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic-Governance</td>
<td>The liberal democracy and the governance capacity index are multiplied and standardized to a 100 point scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal armed conflict</td>
<td>‘Internal armed conflict’ is defined as that which occurs between the government of a state and one or more internal opposition group(s) without intervention from other states. The UCDP measure is coded one a 4-point ordinal scale depending upon the incidence and magnitude of conflict (depending upon the number of battle-related deaths): (0) no interstate conflict; (1) minor interstate armed conflict; (2) Interstate intermediate armed conflict; and (4) Interstate war. The measure is recoded into a binary dummy (0/1) variable indicating the incidence of internal armed conflict above the minimum threshold irrespective of magnitude. Source: UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset V4.0 1946-2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td>Per Capita GDP measured in constant international $ in Purchasing Power Parity. Various years. Source: The World Bank: World Development Indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>Annual percentage growth rate of GDP at market prices based on constant local prices. Source: The World Bank: World Development Indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area size</td>
<td>Area of the nation-state in kilometers Source: Banks CNTS dataset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources</td>
<td>Natural resources are operationalized as oil and gas rents per capita. This represents the total annual value of a country’s oil and gas production, minus the extraction costs in each country, divided by its population to normalize the value of the rents, measured from 1960 to 2002 in constant 2000 US dollars. Source: Michael Ross (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-linguistic fractionalization</td>
<td>The share of languages spoken as ‘mother tongues’ in each country, generally derived from national census data, as reported in the Encyclopedia Britannica 2001. The fractionalization index is computed as one minus the Herfindahl index of ethnolinguistic group share, reflecting the probability that two randomly selected individuals from a population belonged to different groups. Alesina, Devleeschauwer, Easterly, Kurlat and Wacziarg 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious fractionalization</td>
<td>The share of the population adhering to different religions in each country, as reported in the Encyclopedia Britannica 2001 and related sources. The fractionalization index is computed as one minus the Herfindahl index of ethnoreligious group share, reflecting the probability that two randomly selected individuals from a population belonged to different groups. Alesina, Devleeschauwer, Easterly, Kurlat and Wacziarg 2003.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Population size** | The estimates total population per state (thousands).  
*World Bank World Development Indicators.* |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **BritCol**         | The past colonial history of countries was classified into those which shared a British colonial background (1), and all others (0).  
*CIA The World Factbook*  
[www.cia.gov](http://www.cia.gov) |
| **FrenchCol**       | The past colonial history of countries was classified into those which shared a French colonial background (1), and all others (0).  
*CIA The World Factbook*  
[www.cia.gov](http://www.cia.gov) |
| **Political Globalization index** | The KOF Index of Political Globalization, 1970-2005. The 100-point index is constructed from a comprehensive range of two dozen variables, designed to gauge three dimensions: social globalization (the spread of personal contact, information flows, and cultural proximity); economic globalization (the actual long-distance flows of goods, investment capital, and commercial services, as well as restrictions through import barriers, taxes and tariffs); and political globalization (measured by integration with international inter-governmental organizations, the number of embassies based in a country, and national engagement in UN peace missions). The latter is included in this study.  
*KOF Index of Political Globalization*  
| **PR Electoral systems** | The type of electoral systems used for the lower house of the national parliament. *Majoritarian formulas* include First-Past-the-Post, Second Ballot, the Block vote, the Single Non-Transferable Vote, and the Alternative Vote. *Proportional formulas* are defined to include Party List as well as the Single Transferable Vote systems. *Combined* (or ‘mixed’) formulas use both majoritarian and proportional ballots for election to the same body. Countries using proportional formulas are coded into a dummy variable (1/0).  
*International IDEA. Handbook of Electoral System design, 2nd ed. 2005.*  
*Norris. 2008. Driving Democracy* |
| **Federal state**   | Federal states (coded 1) are either federations or decentralized unions. Federations are defined as compound polities where the directly elected constituent units possess independent powers in the exercise of their legislative, fiscal and administrative responsibilities. Decentralized unions are those where constituent units of government work through the common organs of government although constitutionally-protected subunits of government have some functional autonomy. All states which are not either federations or decentralized unions are coded as unitary states (coded 0).  


5 These three states scored highest on the State Fragility Index 2009; see Monty G. Marshall and Benjamin R. Cole *State Fragility Index and Matrix 2009* University of Maryland: Center for Systemic Peace. [http://www.systemicpeace.org/SFImatrix2009c.pdf](http://www.systemicpeace.org/SFImatrix2009c.pdf)


60 Data is available from International Monetary Fund. Government Finance Statistics. Table 7: Outlays by Function: General and Central Government. http://www2.imfstatistics.org/GFS/


64 This study is limited to comparing governance within nation-states, but governance is not necessarily confined to this level, by any means. A useful definition has been offered by Keohane and Nye: “By governance we mean the processes and institutions, both formal and informal, that guide and restrain the collective activities of a group. Government is the subset that acts with authority and creates formal obligations. Governance need not necessarily be conducted exclusively by governments. Private firms, associations of firms, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and associations of all NGOs engage in it; sometimes without governance authority.” Robert Keohane and Joseph S. Nye. Eds. 2000. Governance in a Globalized World. Washington DC: Brookings Institution.


77 For all technical details see the Uppsala Conflict Data Program www.ucdp.uu.se. The ECDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset Codebook Version 4-2010.


