

AFGHANISTAN

Hazara (70007000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Hazaras
<i>SDM activity</i>	1960-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1960-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy for the entire period of separatist activity. According to Minahan (2016: 172), autonomy remained the dominant claim of the Hazara also after 2012, with only a minority seeking independence from Afghanistan. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minahan, James (2016). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Tajiks (70014000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1979-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Tajiks
<i>SDM activity</i>	1979-1992; 1996-2001
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1979-1992: autonomy claim] [1996-2001: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an end to the Tajik movement in 2001. There is no evidence that the separatist movement has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Uzbeks (70016000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1979-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Uzbeks
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>According to the SDM documentation, there has only been a relatively weak claim for autonomy in recent years by Jumbish-I-Milli, which advocates a federalist structure with autonomy for the northern provinces. No evidence could be found that this has changed since 2012 or that the movement has ended. The claim for autonomy is thus continued for the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p>	

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

ALBANIA

Greeks (33902000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1990-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Epirote Greeks
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-1992: autonomy claim] [1993-2012: irredentist claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a radicalization of the claim from regional autonomy within Albania to unification with Greece in the early 1990s. The claim for unification remains ongoing. We thus continue the coding of an irredentist claim also for the period 2013-2016. [2013-2017: irredentist claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

ALGERIA

Berbers (61502000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1962-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Berbers (Kabyles)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1963-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1963-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The ‘Mouvement pour l’Autodétermination de la Kabylie’ (MAK) wants a sovereign Kabyle state independent of Algeria. This still seemed to be the case in 2016 according to Minahan (2016: 197), who states that “many nationalists [...] seek separate independence for Kabylia.” However, the dominant self-determination group remains the Socialist Forces Front (FFS), which is also represented in the national parliament. The FFS is more moderate and continues to demands autonomy. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Mouvement pour l’Autodétermination de la Kabylie (2016). “Projet pour un Etat Kabyle P.E.K.” https://www.makabylie.org/index.php/projet-pour-un-etat-kabyle-p-e-k/ [June 29, 2017].</p> <p>Minahan, James (2016). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

ANGOLA

Bakongo (54001000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1975-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Bakongo
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2012
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>This Bakongo separatist claim is represented by the ‘Movimento para Auto-Determinacao de Bakongo’ (MAKO, founded 1990), the ‘Kimvuka Kia Lukuku Lua Kongo’ (KIMVUKA, founded in 1994), and the Angola Bakongo Community (CANGOBAK, founded in 1998), the three main organization associated with the Bakongo movement. According to Minority Rights Group International, MAKO was established to advocate “an independent Bakongo federation including Cabinda”. Since the KIMVUKA and the CANGOBAK also advocate “independence for the traditional territory of this ethnic group of northern Angola” (IRB 1998), we code independence as the dominant claim throughout. The SDM dataset codes an end to the Bakongo claim in 2012, ten years after the last evidence of Bakongo separatist activity (ten years inactivity rule). There is no evidence that the movement has reemerged between 2013 and 2017. [1990-2012: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>IRB - Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada (1998): “Update to Response to Information Request AGO29698.E of 15 July 1998 on the organization known as Kimvuka.” https://www.ecoi.net/local_link/168170/269300_en.html [July 4, 2017].</p> <p>Minority Rights Group International. <i>World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples</i>. http://minorityrights.org/minorities/bakongo-and-cabindans/ [July 4, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Cabindan Mayombe (54002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1975-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Cabindans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1975-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes the Cabindan self-determination movement as active in Angola from 1975 and as ongoing in 2012. The self-determination claim has not ended since, as clashes between FLEC and Angolan soldiers in 2016 illustrate (Reuters 2016). The main separatist organization has always been the Front for the Liberation of the Cabinda Enclave (FLEC), which split for some time into FLEC and FLEC-FAC. In August 1975, right after Angolan independence, the FLEC declared independence (Minahan 2002: 351). This claim seems to have been dominant throughout, with the Cabindan’s “refusal to renounce their goal of complete independence” (Minahan 2002: 353). Minorities at Risk confirms the claim for independence, as do many other sources (e.g. Human Rights Watch 2004, UNPO 2004). [1975-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Human Rights Watch (2004). “Angola: Between War and Peace in Cabinda.” https://www.hrw.org/legacy/background/africa/angola/2004/1204/cabinda122104.pdf [July 3, 2017].</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Reuters (2016). “Angolan rebels claim more casualties in oil-rich Cabinda.” http://www.reuters.com/article/us-angola-war-cabinda-idUSKCN10C2AN [July 3, 2017].</p>	

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization (UNPO) (2004). "Cabinda: Notes on a soon-to-be-forgotten war." <http://www.unpo.org/content/view/444/99/> [July 3, 2017].

ARGENTINA

Indigenous peoples (16002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Indigenous Peoples
<i>SDM activity</i>	1970-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>According to the SDM coding notes, the indigenous claim for increased self-determination is represented by several organizations: Coordinating Commission of Indigenous Institutions (CCIIRA), which later renamed the Indigenous Association of Argentina (AIRA), the Indigenous Federation of Chaco, the Indigenous Federation of Tucuman, and the Indigenous Federation of Neuquina (representing Mapuche Indians). According to Minorities at Risk, CCIIRA and AIRA primarily advocated indigenous land rights. This is confirmed by point 3 of the objectives of AIRA. Land rights is also the primary goal of the Chaco and the Mapuche, who demand autonomy in order to unite with their kin in neighboring Chile. Minority Rights Group International and Minahan (2002: 1185) also note that the Mapuche claim an “autonomous status”. Since we could not find evidence of a more extreme claim, we code autonomy throughout. The claim for autonomy continued after 2012 (see Guardian 2015). [1970-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Indigenous Association of Argentina (2017). “Objetivos.” http://www.aira.org.ar/objetivos [July 3, 2017].</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Minority Rights Group International. World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples. http://minorityrights.org/minorities/mapuche/ [July 3, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>The Guardian (2014). “Argentina indigenous chieftain leads fight to reclaim ancestral land.” September 15. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/jul/05/argentina-fight-reclaim-ancestral-land-indigenous-leader [July 3, 2017].</p>	

AUSTRALIA

Aborigines (90001000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Aborigines
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1945-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an aboriginal claim for increased autonomy within Australia for the entire period of separatist activity. This coding is based on various sources, among which also Minority Rights Group International, which in 2008 stated that “only a minority of Aborigines call for full political independence, most preferring regional autonomy with wide-spread powers”. There is no evidence that this claim has ended or has been altered in any way since the assessment of Minority Rights Group International in 2008, which is why we continue the code for autonomy. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minority Rights Group International. World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups. http://minorityrights.org/minorities/aborigines/ [July 4, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

AZERBAIJAN

Armenians (37304000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Armenians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-2012: irredentism claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for unification with Armenia from 1991 until 2012. This assessment is based on various sources, among which a relatively recent study by Caspersen (2012), who argues that the primary goal of the Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh is unification with Armenia. There is no evidence that this claim has ended or has been altered in any way since the assessment of Caspersen (2012). Tensions in the region have even increased (UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia, Aljazeera 2017) and the de-facto integration of Karabakh with Armenia has not changed (International Crisis Group 2017). We thus continue the coding of a claim for reunification with Armenia. [2013-2017: irredentism claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Aljazeera (2017). "Nagorno-Karabakh: Azerbaijan hits Armenia defence unit." May 16. http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2017/05/nagorno-karabakh-azerbaijan-hits-armenian-air-defence-170516104753249.html [July 4, 2017].</p> <p>Caspersen, Nina (2012). Unrecognized States. Cambridge: Polity Press.</p> <p>International Crisis Group (2017). Nagorno-Karabakh's Gathering War Clouds." Europe Report No.244.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) (2016). UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset v. 17.1. http://ucdp.uu.se/#/ [July 4, 2017].</p>	

Lezgins (37302000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Lezgins
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2004
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-2004: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an end to the separatist claim in 2004, ten years after the last evidence of Lezgin separatist activity (ten years inactivity rule). However, the SDM documentation also quotes an interview that took place in 2012, in which a leader of the main Lezgin organization (Sadval) states that they are working to revive the self-determination movement (BBC Monitoring). However, evidence that these plans have developed further could not be found. Hence no new period of separatist activity is coded.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>BBC Monitoring (2014). "Revival of Lezgi Ethnic Group Seen as Ruining "Human" Ties with Azeri."</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

BANGLADESH

Bengali Hindus (77101000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1972-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Hindus
<i>SDM activity</i>	1985-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1985-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for independence from 1985 until 2012. The evidence is clear in this case and the coding is based on numerous sources, with the most recent one being Latif (2013). We could not find evidence of significant separatist activity in the years 2013-2017. However, there is also no evidence that the movement has ended in those years or that the claim has been altered in any way. With Minorities at Risk coding non-zero protest scores in 2009 and with the recent assessment of Latif (2013), the threshold of ten years of inactivity has not been met. We thus continue to code an independence claim until 2017. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Latif, Asad-ul Iqbal (2013). "The Bengal Partition and Identity Politics: A Ghoti View." Peace and Security Review 5(10): 25-45.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Tribal-Buddhists (77103000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1972-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Chittagong Hills People
<i>SDM activity</i>	1972-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1972-1974: autonomy claim] [1975-1985: independence claim] [1986-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes autonomy as the dominant claim for the entire period of separatist activity, except the period from 1975 until 1985, when the movement radicalized and demanded independence. Since the signing of the peace agreement in 1997, according to which the Chittagong Hill Tracts should be granted autonomy, the Parbatya Chattagram Jana Sanghati Samiti (PCJSS), the main self-determination organization, has agitated for the full implementation of the accord. This has not changed in recent years, as clashes over land-rights protests in 2010 (Amnesty International 2010) and several recent reports and press releases on the webpage of the PCJSS illustrate. We thus continue the claim for autonomy. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Amnesty Australia. "Bangladesh: Investigate Army's Alleged Involvement in Human Rights Abuses in Chittagong Hill Tracts." http://www.amnesty.org.au/news/comments/22626/ [December 10, 2013].</p> <p>Parbatya Chattagram Jana Sanghati Samiti (2017). "Implementation of the CHT Accord." http://www.pcjss-cht.org/ [July 10, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

BELGIUM

Flemings (21101000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Flemish
<i>SDM activity</i>	1954-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1954-1991: autonomy claim] [1992- 2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a radicalization of the claim from autonomy to independence with the emergence of the Vlaams Blok/Vlaams Belang as the strongest Flemish nationalist party. Independence has also been the goal of the New Flemish Alliance (N-VA), which has emerged as the largest party in the Flemish Parliament in 2014. This claim has not been altered since, with the leadership of the N-VA reiterating its “plans to create a separate Flemish state” (Politico 2016). We thus continue to code a claim for Flemish independence, [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Politico (2016). “Flemish nationalists break cover on Belgium’s future.” January 23. http://www.politico.eu/article/flemish-nationalists-break-the-silence-on-belgiums-future-separatism-independence-bart-de-wever/ [July 10, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Germans (21103000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1973-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Germans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1970-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1970-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes autonomy as the dominant claim for the entire period of separatist activity. This coding is based on an assessment by Markusse (1999), who states that the ‘Partei der Deutschsprachigen Belgier (PDB)’ wants autonomy for Belgium’s German-speaking minority through an equal status for the German entity within the Belgian federal system and a separate electoral district. This goal has not changed since. The organization ‘Pro Deutschsprachige Gemeinschaft’ (ProDG), the successor of the PDB and the only organization claiming increased self-determination for the Germans in Belgium, also advocates autonomy within Belgium. This was illustrated in the 2014 election manifesto, where ProDG demanded an equal status for the German entity and the transfer of further competencies to the German-speaking community. We thus continue to code autonomy as the dominant claim for the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Markusse, Jan D. (1999). “German-speaking in Belgium and Italy: two different autonomy arrangements.” <i>Acta Universitatis Carolinae Geographica</i>, 34(1): 59-73.</p> <p>ProDG (2014). “Kurzwahlprogramm.” http://prodg.be/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Kurzwahlprogramm_2014.pdf [July 10, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Walloon (21102000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Walloons
<i>SDM activity</i>	1964-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1964-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>Regional autonomy is coded as the dominant claim for the entire period of separatist activity. This claim has neither been altered nor ended 2012. According to Baudewyns et al. (2015: 97), there is “no dominant regionalist party” in Wallonia, but the demand for autonomy within Belgium is clearly dominant. This is confirmed by the 2014 election manifestos and programs of the main actors, i.e. the ‘Fédéralistes Démocrates Francophones’ (FDF, now ‘Démocrate Fédéraliste Indépendant’ (DéFI)) or the Rassemblement Wallon (RW). We thus continue to code autonomy as the dominant claim. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Baudewyns, Pierre, Régis Dandoy, and Min Reuchamps (2015). “The success of the regionalist parties in the 2014 elections in Belgium.” <i>Regional & Federal Studies</i> 25(1): 91-102.</p> <p>Fédéralistes Démocrates Francophones (2014). “Manifeste.” http://defi.eu/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/manifeste_des__fdf_28-04-2013.pdf [July 10, 2017].</p> <p>Rassemblement Wallon (2014). “Programme du Rassemblement Wallon.” http://www.rassemblementwallon.sitew.be/Programme.F.htm#Programme.F [July 10, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). <i>Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set</i>.</p>	

BELIZE

Maya (80003000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1981-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Mayans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1995-2017 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The dominant claim among the Maya of Belize and the organizations representing their demands is cultural and political autonomy (Fox Tree 2010: 96). [1995-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Fox Tree Erich (2010). Global Linguistics, Mayan Languages, and the Cultivation of Autonomy. In: Blaser, M., De Costa, R., McGregor, D., & Coleman, W. D. (eds.), <i>Indigenous peoples and autonomy: Insights for a global age</i>. Vancouver: UBC Press, p. 80-106.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

BOLIVIA

Aymara (14505000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Quechua-Aymara
<i>SDM activity</i>	1952-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset combines the Aymara and Quechua and codes one self-determination movement (Quechua-Aymara). However, both groups can be considered separatist according to Minahan (2002: 1556-15567), and both from 1952 onwards, when the Quechua and Aymara in the mountains of Bolivia “took up arms against the Bolivian government and the mining companies in the first widespread uprising” (Minahan 2002: 1556). The Quechua-Aymara have been making claims for land rights and stronger environmental regulation until today (Minorities at Risk, Minority Rights Group International). No evidence could be found of majority claims that go beyond land rights and autonomy. [1952-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Minority Rights Group International. <i>World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples</i>. http://www.refworld.org/docid/4954ce15c.html [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). <i>Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set</i>.</p>	

Guaraní and other eastern indigenous groups (14506000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1952; 1982-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Lowland Indigenous
<i>SDM activity</i>	1982-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes the onset of the self-determination movement (‘Lowland Indigenous Peoples’) in 1982, with the establishment of the Confederación de Pueblos Indígenas del Oriente de Bolivia (CIDOB). Numerous sources state that land rights and territorial autonomy were the primary goals of the movement (Yashar 2005: 24, Prevost et al. 2013, Cooke 2013: 75). Evidence of a more extreme claim could not be found. The claim for autonomy has neither ended nor has it been altered in recent years, as the study by Tockman (2016) and a 2012 interview with a CIDOB leader show. We thus code autonomy as the dominant claim throughout. [1982-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Cooke, Erik (2013). “Uses of Autonomy: The Evolution of Multicultural Discourse in Bolivian Politics.” In: Eisenstadt, Todd A., and Moises Jaime Bailon Corres (eds.), <i>Latin America's multicultural movements: the struggle between communitarianism, autonomy, and human rights</i>, p. 67-87. Oxford: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Prevost, Gary, Carlos Oliva Campos, and Harry E. Vanden (2013) <i>Social Movements and Leftist Governments in Latin America: Confrontation Or Co-optation?</i> Zed Books Ltd.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). <i>Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set</i>.</p>	

- Tockman, Jason (2016). "Decentralization, socio-territoriality and the exercise of indigenous self-governance in Bolivia." *Third World Quarterly* 37(1): 153-171.
- Yashar, Deborah J. (2005). *Contesting Citizenship in Latin America: The Rise of Indigenous Movements and the Postliberal Challenge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Quechua (14503000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Quechua-Aymara
<i>SDM activity</i>	1952-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset combines the Aymara and Quechua and codes one self-determination movement (Quechua-Aymara). However, both groups can be considered separatist according to Minahan (2002: 1556-15567), and both from 1952 onwards, when the Quechua and Aymara in the mountains of Bolivia “took up arms against the Bolivian government and the mining companies in the first widespread uprising” (Minahan 2002: 1556). The Quechua-Aymara have been making claims for land rights and stronger environmental regulation until today (Minorities at Risk, Minority Rights Group International). No evidence could be found of majority claims that go beyond land rights and autonomy. [1952-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Minority Rights Group International. <i>World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples</i>. http://www.refworld.org/docid/4954ce15c.html [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). <i>Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set</i>.</p>	

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Croats (34603000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1992-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Bosnian Croats
<i>SDM activity</i>	1992-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1992-2000: irredentist claim][2001-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a switch from an irredentist claim to a claim for sub-state secession in 2000. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The claim for sub-state secession has continued to be dominant in the period 2013-2017, as illustrated by the demand for a Croatian entity by Dragan Čović, the leader of the Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ) of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Balkan Insight 2013). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Balkan Insight (2013). "HDZ Chief Takes up Bosnian Croat Grievances." http://www.balkaninsight.com/en/article/croatia-opposition-chief-bosnia-s-european-future-hinges-on-croats-equality [July 10, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Serbs (34602000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1992-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Bosnian Serbs
<i>SDM activity</i>	1992-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1992-2012: irredentist claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an irredentist claim for the entire period of separatist activity. This coding was continued until 2012, despite a 2011 announcement of Milorad Dodik, the Prime Minister of Republika Srpska, to organize a unilateral referendum on secession in 2018. These plans have since been mentioned repeatedly (Economist 2016). However, despite these plans, the unification with Serbia remains the ultimate goal according to the International Crisis Group (2011: 11). Hence, we continue to code an irredentist claim. [2013-2017: irredentist claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>International Crisis Group (2011). "Bosnia: What Does Republika Srpska Want?" <i>Europe Report N° 214</i>. http://www.crisisgroup.org/~media/Files/europe/balkans/bosnia-herzegovina/214%20Bosnia%20---%20What%20Does%20Republika%20SRPSKA%20Want [December 19, 2014].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>The Economist (2016). "A Referendum by Serbs threatens yet more trouble for Bosnia." September 27. https://www.economist.com/news/europe/21707877-banned-vote-separate-bosnian-serb-national-day-has-some-people-talking-war-referendum [July 10, 2017].</p>	

BOTSWANA

San (57111000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1966-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	San Bushmen
<i>SDM activity</i>	1995-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes the beginning of the San self-determination in 1995, when the San protested to regain their ancestral territory. According to Minorities at Risk, the San first and foremost “want access to their traditional lands”. Furthermore, they want their culture and language to be protected and promoted. The claim for land rights and autonomy is confirmed by other sources, such as Zips-Mairitsch (2009) or Cultural Survival (2002). This claim does not seem to have ended nor has it been altered since 2012 (Guardian 2014). [1995-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Cultural Survival (2002). “Foragers to First Peoples. The Kalahari san Today” https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/foragers-first-peoples-kalahari-san-today [July 10, 2017].</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>The Guardian (2014). “Botswana Bushmen: ‘If you deny us the right to hunt, you are killing us’” April 18. https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2014/apr/18/kalahari-bushmen-hunting-ban-prince-charles [July 10, 2017].</p> <p>Zips-Mairitsch, Manuela (2013). <i>Lost Lands? (Land) Rights of the San in Botswana and the legal concept of indigeneity in Africa</i>. Münster: LIT Verlag.</p>	

BRAZIL

Indigenous peoples (14003000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1978-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Indigenous Peoples
<i>SDM activity</i>	1970-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>According to Neves (2007: 105), the indigenous peoples in Brazil seek “official recognition of their lands” and reclaim “control of their territories and the natural resources within them”. This is confirmed by numerous other sources (e.g. Cultural Survival 2013, Minority Rights Group International) and has not changed in recent years, with several indigenous groups continuing to demand land rights (UNPO 2016). [1978-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Cultural Survival (2013). “Brazil’s indigenous peoples demand the demarcation of their territories.” https://www.culturalsurvival.org/news/brazils-indigenous-peoples-demand-demarcation-their-territories [July 10, 2017].</p> <p>Minority Rights Group International. <i>World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples</i>. http://minorityrights.org/minorities/yanomami/ [July 10, 2017].</p> <p>Neves, Lino Joao de Oliveira (2007). “The struggles for land demarcation by the indigenous peoples of Brazil.” In: Boaventura de Sousa Santos (eds.), <i>Another knowledge is possible: Beyond northern epistemologies</i>, p. 105-119. London: Verso.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization (UNPO) (2016). “Brazil: Munduruku Indigenous People Demand Land Rights.” December 14. http://unpo.org/article/19727 [July 10, 2017].</p>	

CAMEROON

Bamileke (47101000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Bamileke
<i>SDM activity</i>	1960-1971; 1992-2008
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>Bamileke demands for self-determination were already made prior to the independence of Cameroon. The main organization was the Union Bamileke that formed in 1948 and that demanded a united, independent Bamilekeland. This demand continued also after Cameroon gained independence (Minahan 2002: 264). The second period of activity started in 1992 when Bamileke groups, together with the English-speaking Anglophones of the two western provinces, demanded greater autonomy and a return to the pre-1972 federal system (Minahan 2002: 265). This demand is confirmed by Minorities at Risk. The SDM dataset codes an end to the movement in 2008, after ten years of inactivity. There is no evidence that the claim has reemerged since. [1960-1971: independence claim][1992-2008: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press. Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland. Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Northwestern Anglophones (Grassfielders) (47105000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1962-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Westerners
<i>SDM activity</i>	1980-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes one western, anglophone self-determination movement ('Westerners'), whereas EPR separates southwestern and northwestern Anglophones. Although there are important divisions between these two groups, they are united in their drive for separatism (Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada 2001). Hence, both the Southwestern Anglophones and the Northwestern Anglophones are coded separatist in EPR. The beginning of separatist activity was in 1980, when the Cameroon Action Movement (CAM), which demanded the return to the federal system that was abolished in 1972, was established (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 59). Autonomy was also the goal of the Anglophone Social Democratic Front (SDF), which was inaugurated in 1990, and the Cameroon Anglophone Movement (CAM), which initially also demanded the restoration of the federal system. However, in the mid-1990s, there seems to have been a radicalization of the claim, with an increasing number of representatives demanding outright independence for the English-speaking South-West Province. For example, Minorities at Risk mentions the Southern Cameroons National Council (SCNC), which was formed in 1994 and which, together with leaders of the Cameroon Anglophone Movement (CAM), in 1995 demanded at the United Nations the establishment of an independent republic of Southern Cameroons (Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada 2001). According to the BBC (2001), the separatist campaign had been "gathering momentum" in the late 1990s. However, it seems that overall, the claim for increased autonomy remained dominant (see Krieger 2008). This assessment is supported by Minorities at Risk, which in 2006 stated that the "major Anglophone demand is to return to the 1972 federal political structure, thereby obtaining substantial autonomy from the dominant Francophone political culture." The claim continued beyond 2012, as demonstrations in 2016 illustrate (New York Times 2017). [1980-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p>	

BBC (2001). "Cameroon's English speaking separatists." October 5.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/1581641.stm> [July 10, 2017].

Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada (2001). "Cameroon: The Cameroun Anglophone Movement (CAM) including membership, and treatment by authorities." <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3df4be2024.html> [July 10, 2017].

Krieger, Milton (2008). *Cameroon's Social Democratic Front: Its History and Prospects as an Opposition Political Party (1990-2011): Its History & Prospects as an Opposition Political Party (1990-2011)*. African Books Collective.

Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

New York Times (2017). "A Bilingual Cameroon Teeters After English Speakers Protest Treatment." February 9.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/09/world/africa/a-bilingual-cameroon-teeters-after-english-speakers-protest-treatment.html> [July 10, 2017].

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Southwestern Anglophones (Bakweri etc.) (47106000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1962-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Westerners
<i>SDM activity</i>	1980-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes one western, anglophone self-determination movement ('Westerners'), whereas EPR separates southwestern and northwestern Anglophones. Although there are important divisions between these two groups, they are united in their drive for separatism (Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada 2001). Hence, both the Southwestern Anglophones and the Northwestern Anglophones are coded separatist in EPR. The beginning of separatist activity was in 1980, when the Cameroon Action Movement (CAM), which demanded the return to the federal system that was abolished in 1972, was established (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 59). Autonomy was also the goal of the Anglophone Social Democratic Front (SDF) that was inaugurated in 1990 and the initial claim of the Cameroon Anglophone Movement (CAM), which also demanded the restoration of the federal system. However, in the mid-1990s, there seems to have been a radicalization of the claim, with an increasing number of representatives demanding outright independence for the English-speaking South-West Province. For example, Minorities at Risk mentions the Southern Cameroons National Council (SCNC) which was formed in 1994 and which, together with leaders of the Cameroon Anglophone Movement (CAM), in 1995 demanded at the United Nations the establishment of an independent republic of Southern Cameroons (Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada 2001). According to the BBC (2001), the separatist campaign had been "gathering momentum" in the late 1990s. However, it seems that overall, the claim for increased autonomy remained dominant (see Krieger 2008). This assessment is supported by Minorities at Risk, which in 2006 stated that the "major Anglophone demand is to return to the 1972 federal political structure, thereby obtaining substantial autonomy from the dominant Francophone political culture." The claim continued beyond 2012, as demonstrations in 2016 illustrate (New York Times 2017). [1980-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>BBC (2001). "Cameroon's English speaking separatists." October 5. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/1581641.stm [July 10, 2017].</p> <p>Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). <i>Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements</i>. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.</p> <p>Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada (2001). "Cameroon: The Cameroun Anglophone Movement (CAM) including membership, and treatment by authorities." http://www.refworld.org/docid/3df4be2024.html [July 10, 2017].</p>	

Krieger, Milton (2008). *Cameroon's Social Democratic Front: Its History and Prospects as an Opposition Political Party (1990-2011): Its History & Prospects as an Opposition Political Party (1990-2011)*. African Books Collective.

Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

New York Times (2017). "A Bilingual Cameroon Teeters After English Speakers Protest Treatment." February 9. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/09/world/africa/a-bilingual-cameroon-teeters-after-english-speakers-protest-treatment.html> [July 10, 2017].

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

CANADA

Aboriginal peoples (2004000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	n:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Cree; Dene; Haida; Innu; Inuit ; Iroquois
<i>SDM activity</i>	Cree: 1974-2012 (ongoing); Dene: 1975-2012 (ongoing); Haida: 1980-2012 (ongoing); Innu: 1977-2012 (ongoing); Inuit: 1963-1999; Iroquois: 1977-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	Iroquois: [1977-2012: independence claim]; other groups not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes six aboriginal movements in Canada (Cree, Dene, Haida, Innu, Inuit, Iroquois). The Inuit movement was the first to emerge in 1963. We thus code a claim from 1963 onwards. For each year, we identify the dominant claim among all active groups. For the period 1963 until 1974 (when the second movement made claims for self-determination), the aboriginal claim is equal to the claim of the Inuit, since it was the only active movement in those years. In 1963 several Inuit organizations demanded the division of the Northwest Territories and the creation of a self-governing Inuit homeland (Minahan 2002: 796). There were also some demands for an independent transpolar Inuit state, but the demands for autonomy within Canada was dominant and ended with the creation of the autonomous Inuit state of Nunavut in 1999. Autonomy is hence coded as the dominant claim in the period from 1963 until 1974. The Cree movement, which started in 1974, has predominantly made land claims. Claims for independence would only be made in the case of a secession of Quebec, in which case the Cree nation would be divided between two sovereign states (Minahan 2002: 496). The Dene made their first claims for increased self-determination one year later with the Dene Declaration of 1975 where they stated that the “Dene of the NWT insist upon the right to be regarded by ourselves and the world as a nation” and that they “seek independence and self-determination within Canada” (Papillon 2014: 41). This self-determination should take the form of a separate, Dene-controlled government within the Mackenzie Valley. The Innu self-determination started in 1977, when the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association (NMIA) was formed. The NMIA, later renamed Innu Nation (IN), advocates greater land rights and autonomy for their territory Nitassinan (Tanner 2011: 402). The Iroquois movement also started in 1977. It is the only aboriginal movement in Canada for which SDM has coded a claim (as part of the random sample). According to the SDM documentation, it is unclear whether the claim for independence or land rights and autonomy is dominant. In such cases, the SDM codebook instructs to code the more extreme claim, hence independence. Finally, the Haida first made claims for increase self-determination in 1980, when the Council of the Haida Nation was founded. As with the Iroquois, the claim is ambiguous. The Haida have been taking part in the Idle No More protests that started in 2012 and that want to promote – among other things – aboriginal land rights and sovereignty. However, the Council of the Haida Nation has also stated that it “shall strive for full independence, sovereignty and self-sufficiency of the Haida Nation” (Institute of Canadian and Aboriginal Studies 2013). Taking the claim of all aboriginal groups into account, the claim for land rights and autonomy is clearly dominant. The only two groups that also issued a claim for independence were the Haida and the Iroquois, but even these are ambiguous cases as there were also claims for land rights and autonomy within Canada. Furthermore, relying on population estimates by Minahan (2002), the Haida and Iroquois together only make up a little more than a quarter of population of the five separatist groups. We thus code an autonomy claim throughout. This claim has also continued after 2012, as the Idle No More protest illustrate (Huffington Post 2017). [1963-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Huffington Post (2017). “Idle No More Protests.” http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/news/idle-no-more-protest/ [July 10, 2017].</p> <p>Institute of Canadian and Aboriginal Studies (2013). “Community Profile – Haida.” https://arts.uottawa.ca/canada/en/community-profile-breanne-austin-haida [July 10, 2017].</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Papillon, Martin (2014). “Framing Self-Determination. The Politics of Indigenous Rights in Canada and the United States.” In: Turgeon, Luc, Martin Papillon, Jennifer Wallner and Stephen White (eds.), <i>Comparing Canada: Methods and Perspectives on Canadian Politics</i>, pp. 27-49. Vancouver: UBC Press.</p>	

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Tanner, Adrian (2011). "The Double Bind of Aboriginal Self-Determination." In: Scott, Colin (ed.), *Aboriginal Autonomy and Development in Northern Quebec and Labrador*, p. 396-416. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011.

French speakers (2002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Quebecois
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1945-1968: autonomy claim][1969-2012: independence claim]

The SDM dataset codes a switch in the claim from autonomy to independence in 1969 due to establishment of the Parti Québécois (PQ) in 1968, the major organization associated with the independentist view (Minorities at Risk Project). The PQ has continued to make claims for independence, again became the strongest party in the 2012 provincial elections but lost to the Liberal Party in 2014 (but still winning over 25% of the votes). The Liberal Party (PLQ) advocates federalist positions and rejects secession. Given the electoral victory of the federalist PLQ over the secessionist PQ, one could thus code the claim for autonomy as dominant. However, the SDM documentation argues that the PQ "remained the most important organization associated with the movement" and thus also codes an independence claim when the PQ was not the strongest party or not represented in government (1986 to 1994 and 2003 to 2012). We thus continue the claim for independence in the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: independence claim]

Sources

Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

CHAD

Arabs (48301000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Northerners
<i>SDM activity</i>	1966-1979
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes one umbrella group (Northerners) for all northern Muslims groups in Chad. For the period of separatist activity of the northern movement (1966-1979), EPR codes three sub-groups (Arabs, Muslim Sahel groups, Toubou). Since the main organization associated with the northern movement (FROLINAT) represented all three of these EPR groups, all of them are coded as separatist. There is no difference as regards the start and end date of the claim and the type of the claim. FROLINAT was established in 1966 with the goal to seek secession from Chad and to form an independent Islamic Republic of North Chad (San Akca 2016: 110). Many sources claim that the primary goal of the group was the control of the state (Nugent 2012: 100); a goal they reached in 1979. Leaving this claim aside, the goal was clearly secession. This is confirmed by Minahan (2002: 1391), who also states that “several Muslim leaders demanded the secession of the northern provinces and the establishment of an independent Islamic Republic of North Chad.” [1966-1979: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Nugent, Paul (2012) <i>Africa since Independence</i>. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). <i>Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set</i>.</p> <p>San-Akca, Belgin (2016). <i>States in Disguise: Causes of State Support for Rebel Groups</i>. Oxford: Oxford University Press.</p>	

Muslim Sahel groups (48302000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-1982
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Northerners
<i>SDM activity</i>	1966-1979
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes one umbrella group (Northerners) for all northern Muslims groups in Chad. For the period of separatist activity of the northern movement (1966-1979), EPR codes three sub-groups (Arabs, Muslim Sahel groups, Toubou). Since the main organization associated with the northern movement (FROLINAT) represented all three of these EPR groups, all of them are coded as separatist. There is no difference as regards the start and end date of the claim and the type of the claim. FROLINAT was established in 1966 with the goal to seek secession from Chad and to form an independent Islamic Republic of North Chad (San Akca 2016: 110). Many sources claim that the primary goal of the group was the control of the state (Nugent 2012: 100); a goal they reached in 1979. Leaving this claim aside, they goal was clearly secessionist. This is confirmed by Minahan (2002: 1391), who also states that “several Muslim leaders demanded the secession of the northern provinces and the establishment of an independent Islamic Republic of North Chad.” [1966-1979: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Nugent, Paul (2012) <i>Africa since Independence</i>. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.</p>	

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

San-Akca, Belgin (2016). *States in Disguise: Causes of State Support for Rebel Groups*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sara (48304000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Southerners
<i>SDM activity</i>	1980-2011
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset

The SDM dataset codes one umbrella group ('Southerners') for all Christian Southerners. Of the several sub-groups (e.g. Sara, Massa and Moundang in Mayo-Kebbi), EPR only codes the Sara, which are the majority of the Southerners. As with the Northerners, the Southerners were primarily interested in the control of the central government. However, there were also secessionist claims by the movement. Horowitz (2001: 278) mentions the proclamation of Sara secession in 1979. The same can be read in Mays (2002: 39), who writes that Wadal Kamougue, vice-president of the Transitional Government of National Unity, threatened to lead a secession during the second reconciliation conference in 1979. The claim de-radicalized later, but it is hard to identify the exact year. According to Minorities at Risk, demands for regional autonomy and a federal structure were included in the 2001 presidential platform of Yorongar. We thus code a switch from independence to autonomy in 2002, following the first of January rule. According to Soares and Otayek (2007: 88), "secessionist sentiments" increased again with the beginning of exploitation of oil fields in 2004, but there is no evidence that these sentiments turned into an organized claim. The SDM dataset codes an end to the movement in 2011, after ten years of inactivity. There is no evidence that the claim has reemerged since. [1980-2001: independence claim][2002-2011: autonomy claim]

Sources

Horowitz, Donald L. (2001). *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mays, Terry M. (2002). *Africa's First Peacekeeping Operation: The OAU in Chad, 1981-1982*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Soares, Benjamin, and René Otayek (2007). *Islam and Muslim politics in Africa*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Toubou (48306000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Northerners
<i>SDM activity</i>	1966-1979
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset

The SDM dataset codes one umbrella group (Northerners) for all northern Muslims groups in Chad. For the period of separatist activity of the northern movement (1966-1979), EPR codes three sub-groups (Arabs, Muslim Sahel groups, Toubou). Since the main organization associated with the northern movement (FROLINAT) represented all three of these EPR groups, all of them are coded as separatist. There is no difference as regards the start and end date of the claim and the type of the claim. FROLINAT was established in 1966 with the goal to seek secession from Chad and to form an independent Islamic Republic of North Chad (San Akca 2016: 110). Many sources claim that the primary goal of the group was the control of the state (Nugent 2012: 100); a goal they reached in 1979. Leaving this claim aside, they goal was clearly secessionist. This is confirmed by Minahan (2002: 1391), who also states that “several Muslim leaders demanded the secession of the northern provinces and the establishment of an independent Islamic Republic of North Chad.” [1966-1979: independence claim]

Sources

Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Nugent, Paul (2012) *Africa since Independence*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). *Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set*.

San-Akca, Belgin (2016). *States in Disguise: Causes of State Support for Rebel Groups*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CHILE

Mapuche (15502000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Mapuche (Araucanians)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1978-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>There are various Mapuche demands and a lack of agreement on the means to achieve these goals. According to Minorities at Risk, the most militant group ('All Lands Council'), demands a completely autonomous Mapuche region in a "bi-national" Chile. According to Minahan (2002: 1184), the claim for an independent Mapuche territory was supported by most Mapuche organizations in the early 1990s, which was also illustrated by a 1991 threat of a secessionist uprising in case a total of 600,000 acres of land taken from the Mapuche since 1881 were not returned. Secessionist claims were also made earlier, when the Mapuche People's Liberation Organization adopted a program aimed at eventual independence of Araucania (Minahan 2002: 1184). Minahan's (2002) assessment runs counter the information provided by Minorities at Risk, where it is stated that most Mapuche seek "land reform and political autonomy." Further evidence in this regard is provided by Hewitt and Cheetham (2000: 185) and a 1992 declaration in which Mapuche leaders "denied wanting to establish an independent state and reaffirmed their aims of cultural autonomy and territorial rights while remaining 'obligatory' Chilean citizens" (Minority Rights Group International). Finally, there are also groups that do not demand autonomy but only demand "formal recognition of their language, traditions, and cultures, including bilingual education" (Minorities at Risk Project). We could not identify which of the above claims is dominant among the Mapuche population. In such cases, the more extreme claim is coded, which is independence. The Mapuche claim has continued beyond 2012 (UNPO 2015). [1978-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). <i>Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements</i>. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Minority Rights Group International. <i>World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups</i>. http://minorityrights.org/minorities/mapuche-2/ [July 12, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization (UNPO) (2008). "Mapuche: Activists to Set Up Autonomous Self-Government." September 11. http://unpo.org/demo/article/18550 [July 12, 2017].</p>	

CHINA

Hui (71005000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1949-1963
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Hui (Dungans)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1953-1958
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1953-1958: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an end to the Hui movement in 1958. There is no evidence that the movement has reemerged since 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017 for the Hui, which EPR calls ‘Hui (proper)’ as of 1964.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Mongolians (71009000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1949-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	n:1/1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Southern Mongols; Eastern Mongols
<i>SDM activity</i>	Southern Mongols: 1945-1949, 1981-2012 (ongoing); Eastern Mongols: 1946
<i>SDM claim</i>	Southern Mongols: [1945-1949: irredentist claim] [1981-2012: autonomy claim]; Eastern Mongols: [1946: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes two Mongolian movements (Southern Mongols and Eastern Mongols). The two movements merged in 1946. 1946 is hence the only year in which both movements were active. However, since the Southern Mongol movement is more than twice as populous as the Eastern movement, we use the claim of the Southern movement (irredentism) for the EPR umbrella group in 1946. We thus code a first period of activity from 1945 until 1949 with a claim for irredentism. [1945-1949: irredentism]</p> <p>The SDM dataset codes a second period of separatist activity for the Southern Mongols from 1981 onwards, hence a 1:1 scenario. Autonomy is coded as the dominant claim for the entire period. This claim is continued for the period 2013-2017 due to the ongoing activity of the Southern Mongolia Human Rights Information Center (SMHRIC) and the Inner Mongolian People’s Party (IMPP). [1981-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Tibetans (71010000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1949-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Tibetans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-2012 (ongoing)

<i>SDM claim</i>	[1945-1988: independence claim] [1989-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a switch in the claim in 1989 when the Dalai Lama renounced the claim for independence and began advocating full internal autonomy (Minorities at Risk Project). Despite the presence of a strong movement for independence, the SDM dataset codes autonomy as the dominant claim as it regards the Dalai Lama as the most authoritative representation of the Tibetan self-determination movement. In order to be consistent with the SDM coding, we adopt this assumption and continue the claim for autonomy also for the period 2013-2017, as the Dalai Lama has reiterated his claim for autonomy (CNN 2016). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>CNN (2016). “Obama, Dalai Lama meet despite China's appeal.” February 21. http://edition.cnn.com/2014/02/20/world/asia/china-us-dalai-lama/index.html [July 12, 2017].</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Uyghur (71036000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1949-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Uyghurs
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1945-1949: independence claim; 1950-1967: autonomy claim; 1968-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes independence as the dominant claim as of 1968, due to the establishment of the East Turkestan People’s Revolutionary Party, one of the most important Uyghur organizations (Dillon 2004: 57-58) that together with other organizations demanded outright independence (Chung 2002; Hyer 2006; Reed & Raschke 2010: 37). We could not find evidence that the claim has ended or significantly changed in the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Chung, Chien-peng (2002). “China’s “War on Terror”: September 11 and Uighur Separatism.” <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 81(4): 8-12.</p> <p>Dillon, Michael (2004). <i>Xinjiang – China’s Muslim Far Northwest</i>. London: Routledge.</p> <p>Hyer, Eric (2006). “China’s Policy towards Uighur Nationalism.” <i>Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs</i> 26(1): 75-86.</p> <p>Reed, J. Todd, and Diana Raschke (2010). <i>The ETIM. China’s Islamic Militants and the Global Terrorist Threat</i>. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

COLOMBIA

Indigenous peoples (10003000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	n:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Cacarica; Cumbales, Paez, Guambiano, and Nasa
<i>SDM activity</i>	Cacarica: 2000-2012 (ongoing); Cumbales, Paez, Guambiano, and Nasa: 1980-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	Cacarica: [2000-2012: autonomy claim]; Cumbales, Paez, Guambiano, and Nasa: [1980-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes two indigenous self-determination movements in Colombia: An indigenous group in the Cacarica River Basin and the indigenous groups represented by the Indigenous Authorities of the Southwest movement (Cumbales, Paez, Guambiano, Nasa). EPR codes an indigenous umbrella group. However, since the two movements coded by the SDM dataset make up a significant part of the indigenous population in Colombia. The umbrella group can also be considered separatist. Since the SDM dataset codes an autonomy claim for both movements, autonomy is also coded as the dominant claim for the EPR umbrella group. No evidence could be found suggesting a change or an end of the claim since 2012. WOLA (2013) and PBI Colombia (2016) suggest that both movements remained active beyond 2012. [1980-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>PBI Colombia (2016). “Cacarica 2016.” https://pbicolombia.org/2016/09/21/cacarica-2016/ [July 14, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>WOLA (2013). “An Ongoing Search for Justice and Security in Colombia’s Afrodescendent Communities.” https://www.wola.org/analysis/an-ongoing-search-for-justice-and-security-in-colombias-afrodescendent-communities/ [July 14, 2017].</p>	

COMOROS

Nzwani Comorans (58101000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1975-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Anjouanese
<i>SDM activity</i>	1996-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>Independence has been the dominant claim throughout the movement's period of activity. This is supported by the fact that Anjouanese separatists unilaterally declared the independence of their island in August 1997 and the following independence referendum, in which 99.68% voted in favor of independence with a turnout of 94.79% (Dobler 2018: 160). [1996-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Dobler, Gregor (2018). Secessionism in Anjouan, Comoros. Internal Dynamics, External Decisions. In: de Vries, Lotje, Pierre Englebert, and Mareike Schomerus (eds.), <i>Secessionism in African Politics: Aspiration, Grievance, Performance, Disenchantment</i>. Palgrave Macmillan, p. 151-178.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

CONGO, DRC

Bakongo (49003000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Bakongo
<i>SDM activity</i>	1969-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1969-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for independence for the entire period of separatist activity. It hereby also relies on very recent sources, such as IRB (2011), Turner (2010), or Tull (2010). We could not find evidence that the claim has ended or significantly changed in the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>IRB - Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada (2011): "Democratic Republic of the Congo: Information on the Bundu dia Kongo (BDK) movement." http://www.refworld.org/docid/4db7c1382.html [July 14, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Tull, Denis M. (2010). "Troubled state-building in the DR Congo: the challenge from the margins." <i>The Journal of Modern African Studies</i> 48(4): 643-661.</p> <p>Turner, Thomas (2010). "Independence Day: Fifty Years after Lumumba Speech, DRC's Riches Still Not Benefiting her Children." https://www.carnegiecouncil.org/publications/ethics_online/0046 [July 14, 2017].</p>	

Luba Kasai (49005000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Luba
<i>SDM activity</i>	1960-1963
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes the Luba movement from 1960 until 1963, which are the years in which the Luba, led by Albert Kalonji, attempted to secede (Minorities at Risk Project). On 9 August 1960, the independence of the Republic of South Kasai was declared (Minahan 2002: 950). The bid for independence was abandoned by 1963. There is no evidence of a renewed claim in the period 2013-2017. [1960-1963: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Lunda-Yeke (49011000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-1965; 1998-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1

<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Katangans (Lunda and Yeke)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1960-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1960-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an independence claim for the entire period of separatist activity, due to several attempts of secession and the presence of numerous “outright secessionist organizations ever since the 1960s.” We continue this claim also for the period 2013-2017, as there is evidence of continued secessionist activity (BBC 2013, McGregor 2014). [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>BBC (2013). “Katanga: Fighting for DR Congo's cash cow to secede.” http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-23422038 [July 14, 2017].</p> <p>McGregor, Andrew (2014). “New Offensive Expected Against Mai Mai Militias in Mineral-Rich Katanga.” http://www.refworld.org/docid/534f99be4.html [July 14, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

CROATIA

Serbs (34402000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Croatian Serbs
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-1995: irredentist claim] [1996-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a switch from an irredentist claim to a claim for regional autonomy in 1996, due to the Croatian Serbs toning down their demands. According to Jacobs (2011), the demand for cultural autonomy and territorial autonomy has become dominant. There is no evidence that this claim has been altered or that it has ended in the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Jacobs, Frank (2011). "The Way We Were." <i>The New York Times</i>. http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/11/21/the-way-we-were/?_php=true&_type=blogs&_r=0 [August 18, 2014].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

CYPRUS

Turks (35202000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Turkish Cypriots
<i>SDM activity</i>	1961-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1961-2001: independence claim] [2002-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a switch from independence to autonomy as the dominant claim following a 2001 poll in which only 23% of Northern Cypriots opted for full-fledged independence, whereas 32% wanted a loose federation, and 8% integration within Cyprus (Minahan 2002). This claim has since remained dominant, as the Turkish Cypriot support (65%) for a federation in the 2004 referendum and the endorsement of the Annan Plan V by Turkish Cypriot elites in 2008 illustrate. There is no evidence that this claim has ended or that it has been significantly altered since 2008. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Czechs (31501000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1992
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Czechs
<i>SDM activity</i>	1992
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1992: independence claim]
The separatist claim ended with the dissolution of Czechoslovakia.	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Hungarians (31503000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1992
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Hungarians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-1992
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-1992: autonomy claim]
The movement is coded as terminated in Czechoslovakia in 1992 (see Hungarians under Slovakia for continuation of the claim).	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Slovaks (31502000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1992
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Slovaks
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-1948; 1963-1992
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1945-1948: autonomy claim] [1963-1991: autonomy claim] [1992: independence claim]
The separatist claim ended with the dissolution of Czechoslovakia.	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

DJIBOUTI

Afar (52202000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1977-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Afars
<i>SDM activity</i>	1977-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes the start of the Afar movement in 1975, due to the formation of the Afar Liberation Front (ALF). Since Djibouti did not become independent until 1977, the claim is only coded from 1977 onwards. According to Minority Rights Group International, “the ALF’s goal would be to establish an independent Islamic state for Afars.” The same information can also be found in Shehim and Searing (1980: 223), Minahan (2002: 44) and Schraeder (1993: 213). Over time, however, the calls for autonomy within Djibouti became more frequent. According to Schraeder (1993: 213), the Front for the Restoration of Unity and Democracy (FRUD), founded in 1991 as a secessionist organization, has repeatedly stated that it wanted to maintain the territorial integrity of Djibouti. FRUD has been described as “the main Afar rebel group” (Minorities at Risk). The most significant event regarding the Afar claim was the 1994 split of FRUD into two factions; a split which also reflects the division in the entire Afar community. On the one side is the faction led by Ougoureh Kefle Ahmed, which began negotiations with the government and signed a peace agreement in 1995. This faction has transformed into a conventional political party allied with the government. On the other side was the faction led by Ahmed Dini (FRUD-Dini) which continued fighting for an independent Afar state until a peace agreement was negotiated in December 2000 (Minorities at Risk). Information on the strength of the two factions is mixed. Minahan (2002: 45) states that the Afar community, weary of years of war, did not overwhelmingly support renewed Afar militancy. Banks et al. (1998: 263) on the other hand, argues that FRUD-Dini continued to enjoy support from the Afar grassroots groups, which viewed the consociational faction of FRUD with “little esteem.” A more objective indicator for the support of the two factions is the 1997 election, in which the coalition of which FRUD was part of won all 65 seats (FRUD won 11 seats). Hence, the moderate wing is thus considered dominant and autonomy coded as the dominant claim from 1995 onwards (first of January rule). Support for this coding is provided by Minorities at Risk, which states that the “main grievances of the Afars center on complete implementation of the 2001 peace accords, including decentralization in order to rule themselves.” According to SDM, the last evidence of Afar separatist activity was in 2006. In accordance with the ten years inactivity rule, the movement is thus coded as terminated in 2016. [1977-1994: independence claim][1995-2016: autonomy claim]</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>Banks, Arthur S., Alan J. Day, and Thomas C. Muller (1998). <i>Political Handbook of the World 1998</i>. Binghamton: CSA Publications.</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Minority Rights Group International. <i>World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples</i>. http://minorityrights.org/minorities/afar-2/ [July 14, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Schraeder, Peter. J. (1993). “Ethnic Politics in Djibouti: from ‘eye of the hurricane’ to ‘boiling cauldron.’” <i>African Affairs</i> 92(367): 203-221.</p> <p>Shehim, Kassim, and James Searing (1980). “Djibouti and the question of Afar nationalism.” <i>African Affairs</i> 79(315): 209-226.</p>	

ECUADOR

Indigenous highland peoples (Kichwa) (13003000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Highland Indigenous Peoples
<i>SDM activity</i>	1972-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes the start of the movement in 1972, when ECUARUNARI (Ecuador Runacunapac Riccharimui) was established. ECUARUNARI made claims for local autonomy (Yashar 2005: 108). In 1986 the Confederation of the Indigenous Nations of Ecuador (CONAIE), an umbrella indigenous organization representing both highland and lowland indigenous people of Ecuador, was established. CONAIE was the main indigenous organization in Ecuador and is also described as “one of the strongest indigenous organizations in Latin America” (Assies 2005: 166). The claim did not change with the emergence of CONAIE. As part of its 16-point program, CONAIE, like ECUARUNARI, advocates land restitution for indigenous peoples and bilingual education and furthermore envisages a national economy based on territorial autonomy (Minorities at Risk Project). With CONAIE still active as of today, we code an autonomy claim also for the period 2013-2017. [1972-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Assies, Willem (2005). “Two Steps Forward, one Step Back: Indigenous Peoples and Autonomies in Latin America.” In: Weller, Marc, and Stefan Wolff (eds.), <i>Autonomy, Self-governance and Conflict Resolution: Innovative Approaches to Institutional Design in Divided Societies</i>, p 156-185. London: Routledge.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Yashar, Deborah J. (2005). <i>Contesting Citizenship in Latin America</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p>	

Lowland peoples (Shuar, Achuar etc.) (13004000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Lowland Indigenous Peoples
<i>SDM activity</i>	1964-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>There were several organizations representing the lowland indigenous groups in Ecuador. We could not find evidence of a claim other than land rights and autonomy. The SDM dataset codes the start to the lowland indigenous movement in 1964, when the Shuar Federation was established. According to Rubenstein (2001), the Shuar Federation was established to protect indigenous land against incoming oil companies. With the Organization of the People of Pastaza (OPIP) and the Federation of the Indigenous Organization of Napo (FOIN), two new lowland indigenous organizations were formed in 1973. Both OPIP (Becker 2011: 7) and FOIN (Cultural Survival 1986) fought for land rights. In 1980, the Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of the Ecuadorian Amazon (CONFENAIE) was formed as an umbrella group for lowland indigenous organizations. Again, land rights were the central issue of CONFENAIE (Minorities at Risk Project). In 1986 the Confederation of the Indigenous Nations of Ecuador (CONAIE), an umbrella indigenous organization representing both highland and lowland indigenous people of Ecuador, was established. CONAIE was the main indigenous organization in Ecuador and is also described as “one of the strongest indigenous organizations in Latin America” (Assies 2005: 166). As part of its 16-point program, CONAIE advocates land restitution for indigenous peoples, bilingual education and furthermore envisages a national economy based on territorial autonomy (Minorities at Risk Project).</p>	

Risk Project). With CONAIE still active as of today, we code an autonomy claim also for the period 2013-2017. [1964-2017: autonomy claim]

Sources

Becker, Marc (2010). *Pachakutik: Indigenous movements and electoral politics in Ecuador*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Cultural Survival (1986). "Federation of Indian Organizations of Napo - FOIN."
<https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/federation-indian-organizations-napo-foin> [July 15, 2017]

Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Rubenstein, Steven (2001). "Colonialism, the Shuar Federation, and the Ecuadorian State." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 19: 263-293.

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

EL SALVADOR

Indigenous peoples (9202000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Indigenous Peoples
<i>SDM activity</i>	1959-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1959-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an autonomy claim throughout, based on assessments of Patrick (2004), Minorities at Risk, and Tilley (2005: 59), who argues that, while the indigenous claim is predominantly cultural, there are also claims to “autonomy or even sovereignty within their ancestral territories”. The ‘Asociacion Nacional de Indigenas de El Salvador’ (ANIS) and the National Coordinating Council of Salvadoran Indigenous Coordination Council (CCNIS) remain active, with no significant changes regarding their demands. We thus continue the claim for autonomy also for the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Patrick, Lyana (2004). “Indigenous Rights in El Salvador: Prospects for Change.” <i>Human Rights Review</i> 5(3): 92-102.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Tilley, Virginia (2005). <i>Seeing Indians: A Study of Race, Nation, and Power in El Salvador</i>. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.</p>	

ERITREA

Afar (53103000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1993-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Afars
<i>SDM activity</i>	1993-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>In Eritrea, Afar demands for self-determination are represented by the Afar Revolutionary Democratic Union (ARDUF) and its military wing, Ugugumo. According to the UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia, ARDUF is “said to be fighting for a federal or confederal Afar state”. The same is being written about Ugugumo (OECD 2010). Another Afar group, the Red Sea Afar Democratic Organization, also prefers secession as long as Eritrea remains undemocratic (Minorities at Risk). The secessionist claim of Eritrean Afars is compatible with the coding of the Afars in Ethiopia, who are also coded as seeking Afar independence. Afars in Djibouti are coded as altering their claim from independence to autonomy in 1995. However, the claim for reunification with their kin in Ethiopia and Eritrea also remained strong in Djibouti, making this coding also consistent with the coding of the Afars in Djibouti. [1993-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>OECD (2010). “The Afar rebellion: geopolitical motivations and control over land and resources.” https://www.oecd.org/countries/ethiopia/44652226.pdf [July 16, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP). <i>Conflict Encyclopedia</i>. http://www.ucdp.uu.se/gpdatabase/gpcountry.php?id=55&regionSelect=1-Northern_Africa# [November 24, 2013].</p>	

ESTONIA

Russians (36602000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Russians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2003
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-2003: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an end to the Russian movement in 2003, after ten years of inactivity. There is no evidence that an organized claim has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

ETHIOPIA

Afar (53001000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Afars
<i>SDM activity</i>	1975-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1975-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an independence claim throughout, as first the Afar Liberation Front (ALF) and later the Afar Revolutionary Democratic Unity Front (ARDUF) both had secessionist goals. According to the SDM documentation, ARDUF was involved in clashes against the Ethiopian-led TPLF in 2012. Since there is no evidence that ARDUF has ended or altered its claim since 2012, we code an independence claim also for the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Anuak (53012000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	2004-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Anuaks
<i>SDM activity</i>	1979-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1979-1989: autonomy claim] [1990-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy as of 1990, due to the Gambella People's Democratic Movement (GPDM) dropping its demand for independence in order to join the military coalition of the TPLF (Young 1979: 326). The claim for autonomy has remained dominant since. A relatively recent study by Tadesse (2009: 18) writes that the majority of Anuaks "wants to remain part of Ethiopia under a fair representative political system". We could not find evidence that this has changed significantly in the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Tadesse, Medhane (2009). The Impact of Local Conflict on Regional Security. <i>Institute for Security Studies, Pretoria, South Africa</i>.</p> <p>Young, John (1999). "Along Ethiopia's Western Frontier: Gambella and Benishangul in Transition." <i>The Journal of Modern African Studies</i> 37(2): 321-346.</p>	

Beni-Shugal-Gumez (53003000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1996-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Benishangul
<i>SDM activity</i>	1995-2012 (ongoing)

<i>SDM claim</i>	[1995-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an independence claim for the entire period of separatist activity. This claim was reiterated in 2012, when the Benishangul People's Liberation Movement (BPLM) urged its people "to continue their struggle with all means until we gain freedom and independence" (Ogaden News Agency 2012). Since there is no evidence of an end to that claim, we continue to code independence also for the period 2013-2016. In 2015, BPLM formed the Peoples' Alliance for Freedom and Democracy (PAFD) together with four other organizations from Ogaden, the Oromo, the Sidamo, and the Gambella (UNPO 2015). However, the goals of the new organization still seem relatively unclear at this moment as precise information could not be found yet. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>Ogaden News Agency (2012). "Benishangul People's Liberation Movement (BPLM) reject the agreement of Jafar Zarooqe and Wayane." September 1. http://www.ogadennet.com/?p=15589 [July 15, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization (UNPO) (2015). "Declaration of the Establishment of the Peoples' Alliance for Freedom and Democracy (PAFD)." http://unpo.org/downloads/1623.pdf [July 15, 2017].</p>	

Christian Eritreans (53010000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1952-1993
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Eritreans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1958-1993
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1958-1993: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset does not distinguish between Muslim and Christian Eritreans but only codes one single Eritrean self-determination movement. However, since both Muslim and Christian Eritreans participated in the secessionist movement from early on (Lobban 1972; Pool 1980), there are no different start dates for the two EPR groups as regards the separatist claim. A claim for independence is coded for both Muslim Eritreans and Christian Eritreans from 1958 until 1993. The claim of the Eritreans ended with the secession of Eritrea in 1993, hence no update is required.</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>Lobban, R. (1972). "Eritrean Liberation Front: A Close-Up View." <i>Munger Africana Library Notes</i> 2(13): 3-20.</p> <p>Pool, David (1980). "Revolutionary Crisis and Revolutionary Vanguard. The Emergence of the Eritrean People's Liberation Front." <i>Review of African Political Economy</i> 19: 33-47.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Muslim Eritreans (53011000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1952-1993
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Eritreans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1958-1993
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1958-1993: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset does not distinguish between Muslim and Christian Eritreans but only codes one single Eritrean self-determination movement. However, since both Muslim and Christian Eritreans participated in the secessionist movement from early on (Lobban 1972; Pool 1980), there are no different start dates for the two EPR</p>	

groups as regards the separatist claim. A claim for independence is coded for both Muslim Eritreans and Christian Eritreans from 1958 until 1993. The claim of the Eritreans ended with the secession of Eritrea in 1993, hence no update is required.

Sources

Lobban, R. (1972). "Eritrean Liberation Front: A Close-Up View." *Munger Africana Library Notes* 2(13): 3-20.

Pool, David (1980). "Revolutionary Crisis and Revolutionary Vanguard. The Emergence of the Eritrean People's Liberation Front." *Review of African Political Economy* 19: 33-47.

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Oroma (53006000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Oromos
<i>SDM activity</i>	1973-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1973-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for independence for the entire period of separatist activity. According to the SDM documentation, the Oromo Liberation Front (OLF) is the dominant representative of the Oromo. According to Minahan (2002), the OLF led a separatist campaign with the aim of establishing an independent Democratic Republic of Oromia. The Oromo claim has not ended since 2012, as large-scale demonstrations in 2015 and 2016 against the government's plan to incorporate parts of Oromiya into the capital Addis Ababa illustrate (Uppsala Conflict Data Program). Also, there is no evidence that OLF has altered its claim in the period 2013-2017. In 2015, the OLF formed the Peoples' Alliance for Freedom and Democracy (PAFD) together with four other organizations from the Ogaden, the Benshigul, the Sidamo, and the Gambella (UNPO 2015). However, the goals of the new organization still seem relatively unclear at this moment as precise information could not be found yet. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p>	
<h4>Sources</h4> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP). <i>Conflict Encyclopedia</i>. http://ucdp.uu.se/#/statebased/869 [July 15, 2017].</p> <p>Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization (UNPO) (2015). "Declaration of the Establishment of the Peoples' Alliance for Freedom and Democracy (PAFD)." http://unpo.org/downloads/1623.pdf [July 15, 2017].</p>	

Somali (Ogaden) (53008000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Western Somalis
<i>SDM activity</i>	1948-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1948-1981: irredentist claim] [1982-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an irredentist claim until 1981 and, after the Western Somali Liberation Front (WSLF) declared secession as their main goal, a claim for independence thereafter. In the 1980s, the Ogaden National Liberation Front (ONLF) became the leading Somali rebel organization. The ONLF is still considered secessionist (Freedom House 2015), which is why we continue the claim for independence. In 2015, the ONLF</p>	

formed the Peoples' Alliance for Freedom and Democracy (PAFD) together with four other organizations from the Oromo, the Benshigul, the Sidamo, and the Gambella (UNPO 2015). However, the goals of the new organization still seem relatively unclear at this moment as precise information could not be found yet. [2013-2017: independence claim]

Sources

Freedom House (2015). "Freedom in the World 2015 – Ethiopia."

<http://www.refworld.org/docid/5502f33f13.html> [July 15, 2017].

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization (UNPO) (2015). "Declaration of the Establishment of the Peoples' Alliance for Freedom and Democracy (PAFD)." <http://unpo.org/downloads/1623.pdf> [July 15, 2017].

Tigry (53009000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Tigreans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1975-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1975-1991: autonomy claim]
The SDM dataset codes an end to the Tigrean movement in 1991 with the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) taking over the government. There is no evidence that an organized claim has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.	
Sources	
Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

EQUATORIAL GUINEA

Bubi (22002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1968-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Bubis
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes the onset of separatist activity in 1989, when Bubi nationalists “stepped up demands for independence” for the island of Bioko, the homeland of the Bubis (Minahan 2002: 333). Minahan (2002) also mentions claims for autonomy in the subsequent years, but generally, independence seems to be the official goal of the Movimiento para la Auto-determinación de la Isla de Bioko (MAIB), the Movement for the Self-determination of Bioko Island. This is also confirmed in a recent article by Yates (2017: 75). [1989-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Yates, Douglas A. (2017). Oil Conflicts in the POstcolony. In: Omeje, Kenneth (ed.), <i>The Crises of Postcoloniality in Africa</i>, pp. 65-82. Dakar: CODESRIA.</p>	

FRANCE

Basques (22002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Basques
<i>SDM activity</i>	1963-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1963-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy throughout, as both Minahan (2002) and the Minorities at Risk Project state that political and cultural autonomy and the establishment of a separate Basque department (Iparralde) are the dominant claims among French Basques, whereas only a minority seeks an independent Basque state. We could not find evidence suggesting that the situation has changed since 2012. According to the SDM dataset, the last evidence of Basque separatism in France were the five bombings by Irrentzi in 2006. Irrentzi disappeared in October 2006. Following the ten years inactivity rule, we should code an end to the Basque claim in France in 2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Corsicans (22003000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1962-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Corsicans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1967-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1967-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an autonomy claim throughout, as first the Regional Front of Corsica (FRC) and later the Action for the Revival of Corsica (ARC) pursued regional autonomy for Corsica as their main goal (De la Calle and Fezi 2010: 399, Hossay 2004: 411). The militant Corsican National Liberation Front (FLNC) never had majority support and demilitarized in 2014. Also after 2012 “only a tiny minority of locals support independence” (New York Times 2014); autonomy hence remained the dominant claim. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>De la Calle, Luis, and Andre Fazi (2010). “Making Nationalists Out of Frenchmen? Substate Nationalism in Corsica.” <i>Nationalism and Ethnic Politics</i> 16(3-4): 397-419.</p> <p>Hossay, Patrick (2004). “Recognizing Corsica: The Drama of Recognition in Nationalist Mobilization.” <i>Ethnic and Racial studies</i> 27(3): 403-430.</p> <p>New York Times (2014). “Corsica’s Separatist Retreat.” August 4. https://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/05/opinion/corsicas-separatist-retreat.html [July 18, 2017]</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

GEORGIA

Abkhazians (37207000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Abkhaz
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-1992: autonomy claim; 1993-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a radicalization of the claim from regional autonomy to independence after the incursion of Georgian troops into Abkhazia in 1992. Abkhazia has been de-facto independent after it managed to force out the Georgian military from Abkhazia by the end of 1993 (Caspersen 2012: 12) and there is no evidence that the claim for independence ceased to be dominant after 2012. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Caspersen, Nina (2012). <i>Unrecognized States</i>. Cambridge: Polity Press.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Armenians (37202000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Armenians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy as this has been the claim of the two main vehicles (Javarkh and Virk) associated with the Armenian movement in Georgia (Wheatley 2004, Kanbolat and Gul 2008, Minority Rights Group International, Hewitt and Cheetham 2000: 28). The last evidence of separatist activity mentioned by the SDM dataset are mass demonstrations for autonomy within Georgia organized by Samtskhe-Javakheti activists in 2005 and 2006 (Minority Rights Group International). We thus code an end to the self-determination claim in 2016, following the ten years of inactivity rule. [2013-2016: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). <i>Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements</i>. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.</p> <p>Kanbolat, Hasan, and Nazmi Gul (2008). "The Geopolitics and Quest for Autonomy of the Armenians of Javakheti (Georgia) and Krasnodar (Russia) in the Caucasus." dspace.khazar.org/jspui/bitstream/123456789/86/1/Hasan%20Kanbolat.doc [May 7, 2014].</p> <p>Minority Rights Group International. <i>World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples</i>. http://minorityrights.org/minorities/armenians-2/ [July 18, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Wheatley, Jonathan (2004). "Obstacles Impending the Regional Integration of the Javakheti Region of Georgia." <i>ECMI Working Paper 22</i>. Flensburg: European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI).</p>	

Ossetians (South) (37206000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	South Ossetians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-2012: irredentist claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an irredentist claim throughout. This claim was renewed in 2015, when Leonid Tibilov, president of South Ossetia, announced plans to hold a referendum on joining Russia (Reuters 2015). We hence continue the irredentist claim for the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: irredentist claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Reuters (2015). "Georgia's breakaway South Ossetia seeks vote on joining Russia." http://www.reuters.com/article/us-russia-georgia-ossetia-idUSKCN0SE0W420151020 [July 19, 2017]</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

GHANA

Asante (Akan) (45201000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1957-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Ashanti, Brong, and Ahafo
<i>SDM activity</i>	1957-1964; 1980-2005
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>According to Minahan (2002: 190), Ashanti leaders pressed for separate independence in the 1956/1957 Ashanti secessionist crisis but finally settled for autonomy within an independent Ghana. However, following the arrest of Ashanti leaders, the closure of the Ashanti assembly and the banning of regional political parties, violent demonstrations for independence broke out in Ashanti cities. The claim for secession in the first period of self-determination activity is confirmed by various sources, among which Mwakikagile (2001: 145) who writes that there were “strong secessionist tendencies among the Ashanti who wanted to separate from the rest of Ghana and have their own independent state.” Allman (1993: 168) and Gocking (2005: 111) provide further evidence of a secessionist claim of the Ashanti in the period until 1964. For the second period of activity that started in 1980, the claim seems to have changed to autonomy within Ghana. Minahan (2002: 191) states that Ashanti demanded economic and cultural autonomy. The SDM dataset codes an end to the claim in 2005, after ten years of inactivity. No evidence could be found that the claim reemerged after 2012. [1957-1964: independence claim] [1980-2005: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Allman, Jean Marie (1993). <i>The Quills of the Porcupine: Asante nationalism in an emergent Ghana</i>. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.</p> <p>Gocking, Roger (2005). <i>The history of Ghana</i>. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group.</p> <p>Mwakikagile, Godfrey (2001). <i>Ethnic politics in Kenya and Nigeria</i>. Huntington: Nova Publishers.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Ewe (45202000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1957-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Ewes
<i>SDM activity</i>	1957-1987
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>Ewe nationalists campaigned for a united, independent Ewe state called Eweland already before Ghanaian independence. This demand became even stronger after Ghana won independence in 1957. The Greater Togo Movement sought to separate Trans-Volta from Ghana and unite it with the Ewes of Togo in a single state. Ewe secessionism again revived in the 1970s “with broad support for secession of the Ewe region from Ghana” (Minahan 2002: 593). According to the Minorities at Risk Project, there were Ewe threats of secession in the early 1970s. Furthermore, reunification of the Ewe of Ghana and Togo was also the goal of the Togoland Union, which later became the Togoland Congress Party (Brown 1980: 581f). [1957-1987: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Brown, David (1980). “Borderline Politics in Ghana: The National Liberation Movement of Western Togoland.” <i>The Journal of Modern African Studies</i> 18(4): 575-609.</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p>	

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

GUATEMALA

Maya (9002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Mayans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes the first evidence of organized separatist activity in 1991, when the Council of Mayan Organization of Guatemala (COMG) was established, an umbrella group of Mayan research institutions and cultural organizations that publicly advanced demands for Mayan self-determination and devolution. In 1994, the Coordination of Maya Peoples' Organizations of Guatemala (COPMAGUA) was formed out of 200 separate Maya organizations. COPMAGUA was the Mayan representative body in the peace negotiations that led to the end of the civil war and the peace accord of 1995. Lovell (2010: 168), calls COMPAGUA “the most important” Maya organization in Guatemala. COPMAGUA’s program evolved around loosely-defined terms ‘autonomy’, ‘self-determination’ and ‘participation’. These claim are confirmed by several other sources: The Minorities at Risk Project, for example, lists the “protection of and access to lands [...]; the right to teach, publish, and deal with the government in their own language [...]; greater political rights in their own community” as Mayan demands. Montejo (1997) also mentions political and cultural autonomy as the primary goals of COPMAGUA. The movement has continued to be active beyond 2012 and the claim for autonomy has remained dominant (see International Crisis Group 2013: 18). [1991-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>International Crisis Group (2013). “Totonicapán: Tension in Guatemala’s Indigenous Hinterland.” <i>Latin America Report N° 47</i>. http://www.crisisgroup.org/~media/Files/latin-america/Guatemala/047-totonicapan-tension-in-guatemalas-indigenous-hinterland.pdf [March 3, 2015].</p> <p>Lovell, George W. (2010). <i>A beauty that hurts: Life and death in Guatemala</i>. Austin: University of Texas Press.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Montejo, Victor D. (1997). “The Pan-Mayan Movement: Mayans at the Doorway of the New Millenium.” <i>Cultural Survival Quarterly</i> 21(2): 54-63: 28.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

HONDURAS

Garifuna (9110000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Black Karibs
<i>SDM activity</i>	1979-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The Minorities at Risk Project mentions four groups that represent Garifuna interests: The National Confederation for Autochthonous Peoples of Honduras (CONPAH), the ‘Organización Fraternal Negra Hondureña’ (OFRANEH), the Honduran Advisory Council for the Development of Autochthonous Ethnic Groups (CAHDEA), and the ‘Organización de Desarrollo Étnico Comunitario’ (ODECO). Their goals include the protection of Garifuna culture and language, the protection of civil rights and equal employment opportunities, but also land rights. According to the Minorities at Risk Project, CONPAH is particularly relevant in the struggle for land rights, while OFRANEH works to protect the Garifuna community’s capacity for self-determination through programs promoting their political, social, economic and cultural advancement. An example for their political claims is the non-violent defense of six Garifuna cooperatives against the central government in 2012, which planned to sell their territory to foreign investors. Minahan (2002: 654) also mentions “autonomy and self-determination” as Garifuna claims, which is why we code autonomy as the dominant claim throughout. [1979-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Indigenous peoples (Lenca, Maya-Chorti, Miskito, Tawahka/Sumu, Xicaque, Pech, Nahua) (9107000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1975-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Miskitos
<i>SDM activity</i>	1976-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset only codes the Miskitos as separatist. However, since they are by far the largest indigenous group in Honduras (approximately 50% according to Minority Rights Group International), we can adopt the claim of the Miskitos for the entire indigenous group. The SDM dataset codes the Miskitos separatist as of 1976, when the Miskito Asla Takanka (Unity of the Miskito, MASTA) was founded. According to Minorities at Risk, MASTA is the “primary organization representing the interests of the Miskito indigenous to the Honduran government”. In 1992, the National Coordinating Body of Autochthonous Peoples of Honduras (CONPAH) was founded. Indigenous claims are also represented by the ‘Consejo Cívico de Organizaciones Indígenas Populares’ (COPINH) and ‘Consejo Asesor Hondureño para el Desarrollo de las Étnicas Autóctona’s. According to Minorities at Risk Project, land rights have been at the center of the activities of these groups and the entire indigenous community in Honduras. That this claim has not changed in recent years as a 2015 demand by the Miskitos for better protection of their territory illustrates (Guardian 2015). [1976-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p>	

Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples*.

<http://minorityrights.org/minorities/lenca-miskitu-tawahka-pech-maya-chortis-and-xicaque/> [July 4, 2017].

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

The Guardian (2014). "Honduras Indians' land being seized by drug gangs and settlers, UN official says." November 10. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/nov/10/honduras-indians-land-seized-drug-gangs-settlers-un-official-says> [July 20, 2017].

INDIA

Assamese (non-SC/ST) (75001000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1947-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Assamese
<i>SDM activity</i>	1979-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1979-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an independence claim for the entire period of separatist activity given that the United Liberation Front of Assam (ULFA) has been demanding an independent state since its existence. The SDM dataset continues the claim for independence also beyond 2010, after one faction of ULFA gave up the claim for independence (UCDP). However, we could not find evidence suggesting that this faction has since emerged as the dominant representative of the Assam self-determination claim. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) (2016). <i>UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset v. 17.1</i>. http://ucdp.uu.se/#/actor/326 [July 20, 2017].</p>	

Bodo (75001000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1963-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Bodos
<i>SDM activity</i>	1967-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1967-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The claim for sub-state secession remains ongoing, as illustrated by a separatist attack in August 2016 that killed 13 people (New York Times 2016). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>New York Times (2016). “13 Killed in Separatist Attack in Northeastern India.” August 5. https://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/06/world/asia/india-assam-kokrajhar-attack.html [July 20, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Indigenous Tripuri (75007000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1947-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Tripuris
<i>SDM activity</i>	1949-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1949-1978: autonomy claim] [1979-2012: independence claim]

With the establishment of the Tripura National Volunteers (TNV) in 1978, the SDM dataset codes a switch from a claim for increased autonomy within India to one for independence. However, according to the SDM dataset, this coding is rather ambiguous as claims for autonomy have remained equally active and a dominant claim could not be identified. Independence is thus not necessarily coded because it is the dominant but only because it is the more extreme claim. We could not find evidence that either claim has become more dominant since 2012, which is why we continue to code independence. [2012-2017: independence claim]

Sources

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Kashmiri Muslims (75006000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1949-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Kashmiri Muslims
<i>SDM activity</i>	1947-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1947-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for independence throughout, but states that a case could also be made to code an irredentist claim as the movement is fractionalized with pro-Pakistani groups favoring accession to Pakistan and groups that want an independent Kashmir (e.g. the Jammu Kashmir Liberation Front). According to the SDM documentation, the latter groups enjoy more popular support (Staniland 2010, 2013), whereas the former are stronger militarily. We could not find any evidence suggesting that this situation has significantly changed. The violent protests in the Kashmir Valley in 2016/2017 show that the movement is still ongoing. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Staniland, P. (2013). “Kashmir since 2003: Counterinsurgency and the Paradox of “Normalcy.”” <i>Asian Survey</i> 53(5): 931–957.</p> <p>Staniland, P. S. (2010). <i>Explaining Cohesion, Fragmentation and Control in Insurgent Groups</i>. Boston, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.</p>	

Malyalam (non-SC/ST) (75009000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1947-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Keralans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1949-1956
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1949-1956: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1949 until 1956. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The SDM dataset codes an end to the separatist activity in 1956 with the establishment of the state of Kerala. The movement has not reemerged after 2012.</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Manipuri (75010000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1947-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Manipuri
<i>SDM activity</i>	1949-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1949-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for independence from 1949 until 2012. The movement remained ongoing after 2012, as attacks in 2014 (UCDP) and 2015 (Times of India 2015) killing 18 and 20 Indian soldiers prove. The United Liberation Front of Western South East Asia (UNLFW), a conglomerate of several separatist organizations among which also the United National Liberation Front (UNLF) of Manipur, claimed responsibility for the attacks (Times of India 2015). As regards the claim, we continue to code a claim for independence for the period 2013-2017, as UNLF chairman renewed this claim in a 2015 interview with the Telegraph (2015). [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>The Telegraph (2015). “We want Manipur's sovereignty’.” https://www.telegraphindia.com/1150727/jsp/northeast/story_33858.jsp [July 20, 2017].</p> <p>Times of India (2015). “UNLFW: The new name for terror in NE.” June 5. http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/UNLFW-The-new-name-for-terror-in-NE/articleshow/47547899.cms [July 20, 2017].</p> <p>Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) (2016). <i>UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset v. 17.1</i>. http://ucdp.uu.se/#/actor/6320 [July 20, 2017].</p>	

Mizo (75012000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1947-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Mizos
<i>SDM activity</i>	1947-1986
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1947-1953: independence claim][1954-1961: autonomy claim] [1962-1986: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an independence claim from 1947 until 1953 and from 1962 until 1986. For the period 1954 until 1961, sub-state secession is coded as the dominant claim. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The SDM dataset codes an end to the separatist activity in 1986 with the establishment of the state of Mizoram. The movement has not reemerged after 2012, hence no update is coded.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Naga (75014000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1947-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Nagas
<i>SDM activity</i>	1947-2012 (ongoing)

<i>SDM claim</i>	[1947-1975: independence claim][1976-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an independence claim from 1947 until 1975 and a claim for sub-state secession from 1976 until 2012. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The claim continued after 2012. In the context of the 2015 peace deal, the National Socialist Council of Nagaland (NSCN), the “main rebel group”, reiterated its demand for a greater Naga state (“Nagalim”) that also includes Naga-dominated areas of the three neighboring states of Manipur, Assam and Arunachal Pradesh (BBC 2015). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>BBC (2015). “Will India's peace deal with Naga rebels work?” http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-33769476 [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Punjabi-Sikhs (non-SC/ST)/(non-SC/ST/OBCs) (75017000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1947-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Sikhs
<i>SDM activity</i>	1947-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1947-1984: autonomy claim] [1985-1992: independence claim] [1993-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes sub-state secession as the dominant claim from 1947 until 1973. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. From 1993 onwards, the SDM dataset again codes a claim for regional autonomy within India as a majority of the Sikhs favored greater autonomy for the Punjab and parts of the Akali party making claims for the implementation of the 1973 resolution that demanded far-reaching autonomy (Van Dyk 2009: 978; Minorities at Risk Project). We continue to code a claim for autonomy for the period 2013-2016, as this has been the last claim for which SDM has found evidence. However, the Sikh movement seems to have been fading away in recent years and has lost “its popular support both in India and within the Diaspora community” (Dhillon 2007: 10). A more recent assessment by Ghosh (2013) comes to the same conclusion. The SDM dataset codes the movement as ongoing due to non-zero MAR protest scores for 1990-2006. In line with the ten years inactivity rule, however, the movement is coded as terminated in 2016. [2013-2016: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Dhillon, Simrat (2007). “The Sikh Diaspora and the Quest for Khalistan: A Search for Statehood or for Self-Preservation?” <i>IPCS Research Papers</i>. New Delhi: Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies. http://www.ipcs.org/pdf_file/issue/1787132181IPCS-ResearchPaper12-SimratDhillon.pdf [June 20, 2014].</p> <p>Ghosh, Palash (2013). “Khalistan: Almost 30 Years After Blue Star, Sikh Homeland Movement Fading.” <i>International Business Times</i>. June 13. http://www.ibtimes.com/khalistan-almost-three-decades-after-operation-blue-star-movement-sikh-homeland-fading-away-1304493 [June 20, 2014].</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Van Dyke, Virginia (2009). “The Khalistan Movement in Punjab, India, and the Post-Militancy Era: Structural Change and New Political Compulsions.” <i>Asian Survey</i> 49(6): 975-997.</p>	

Scheduled Tribes (75022000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1947-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	n:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Achiks (Garos); Gorkhas (Gurkhas); Hynniewtreps (Khasi-Jaintia); Jharkhandis; Kuki; Masas (Dimasas); Meghalayans; Mikirs (Karbi); Rabhas; Rajbangsis; Reang (Bru); Sikkimese
<i>SDM activity</i>	Achiks (Garos): 1992-2012 (ongoing); Gorkhas (Gurkhas): 1947-2012 (ongoing); Hynniewtreps (Khasi-Jaintia): 1992-2012 (ongoing); Jharkhandis: 1947-2000; Kuki: 1960-2012 (ongoing); Masas (Dimasas): 1980-2012 (ongoing); Meghalayans: 1947-1972; Mikirs (Karbi): 1947-2012 (ongoing); Rabhas: 1980-2012 (ongoing); Rajbangsis: 1991-2012 (ongoing); Reang (Bru): 1994-2012 (ongoing); Sikkimese: 1981-2004
<i>SDM claim</i>	Achiks (Garos): [1992-2012: autonomy claim]; Gorkhas (Gurkhas): [1947-2012: autonomy claim]; Hynniewtreps (Khasi-Jaintia): [1992-2012: autonomy claim]; Jharkhandis: [1947-2000: autonomy claim]; Kuki: [1960-2012: autonomy claim]; Masas (Dimasas): [1980-2012: autonomy claim]; Meghalayans: [1947-1972: autonomy claim]; Mikirs (Karbi): [1947-1979: autonomy claim; 1980-2012: autonomy claim]; Rabhas: [1980-2012: autonomy claim]; Rajbangsis: [1991-2012: autonomy claim]; Reang (Bru): [1994-2012: autonomy claim]; Sikkimese: [1981-2004: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes several movements that belong to the EPR group ‘Scheduled Tribes’. For almost all these groups, the SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession. In line with the coding instructions, this claim is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. This leaves the Sikkimese as the only group with a claim different than autonomy (independence claim). However, according to the SDM dataset, the Sikkimese population makes up less than 1% of the population belonging to the twelve separatist groups. We thus code an autonomy claim throughout and extend this code to 2017, as there is no evidence that would suggest that the claim has significantly changed or even ended in recent years. [1946-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Tamil (non-SC/ST/OBCs)/(non-SC/ST) (75019000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1947-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Tamils
<i>SDM activity</i>	1947-1963
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1947-1963: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an independence claim from 1947 until 1963. The movement is coded terminated in 1963, when the Dravida Progressive Federation (DMK) dropped its claim for an independent Tamil state (Chandra 2005: 238). The movement has not reemerged after 2012.</p> <p>Sources</p>	

Chandra, Kachan (2005). "Ethnic Parties and Democratic Stability." *Perspectives on Politics* 3(3): 235-252.

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Telugu (Non-SC/ST/OBCs)/(non-SC/ST) (75020000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1947-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Telugus
<i>SDM activity</i>	1950-1956
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1950-1956: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1950 until 1956. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The SDM dataset codes an end to the separatist activity in 1956, when the Telugu-speaking areas from Hyderabad were added to Andhra Pradesh, the Telugu state established in 1953. The movement has not reemerged after 2012.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

INDONESIA

Acehnese (85001000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1949-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Acehnese
<i>SDM activity</i>	1950-2005
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1950-1976: autonomy claim] [1977-2005: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an end to the Acehnese movement in 2005 when a peace deal granted far-reaching autonomy to Aceh and the Free Aceh Movement/Gerakan Aceh Merdeka surrendered its separatist intentions. There is no evidence that the separatist movement has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Amboinese (85002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1949-1966; 1999-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	South Moluccans (Ambonese)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1950; 1975-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1950, 1975-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for independence in both periods of activity. However, in the second period, this coding is rather ambiguous as there were also claims for autonomy (Minahan 2012: 10-11) and a dominant claim could not be identified. Independence is thus not necessarily coded because it is the dominant claim but only because it is the more extreme claim. This ambiguity has continued beyond 2012, as there have not been any major developments or shifts with regard to the claim. We thus continue the code for independence also for the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Balinese (85003000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1949-1966; 2015-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Balinese
<i>SDM activity</i>	1999-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1999-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>According to the SDM dataset, the Balinese have been claiming a special form of autonomy within Indonesia from 1999 onwards (Ramstedt 2009: 331). The demand for such an autonomy arrangement has been reiterated several times since. Recent evidence is provided by Erviani (2013), who reports that the Balinese “continue to</p>	

fight for special autonomy status for their province, following years of being ignored by the central government.” No evidence could be found that this claim has since ended or changed. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]

Sources

- Erviani, Ni Komang (2013). “Bali Fights for Special Autonomy Status.” *Jakarta Post*. February 5. <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2013/02/05/bali-fights-special-autonomy-status.html> [March 7, 2015].
- Ramstedt, Martin (2009). “Regional Autonomy and Its Discontents: The Case of Post-New Order Bali.” In: Coen J.G. Holztappel, and Martin Ramstedt (eds.), *Decentralization and Regional Autonomy in Indonesia. Implementation and Challenges*, pp. 329-379. Singapore: ISEAS Publishing.
- Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Bataks (85004000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1949-1966, 1999-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1/1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Indigenous Peoples
<i>SDM activity</i>	1988-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	SDM only codes claim for umbrella group
<p>Whereas EPR codes several indigenous groups separately (Bataks, Minangkabaus, Dayak, and Gorontalo), the SDM dataset codes an umbrella group ‘Indigenous Peoples’ that includes several separatist indigenous groups (except those that are separately coded by SDM, such as the Papuans). According to the SDM documentation, the Batak have been active in a struggle to retain their lands in the face of industrial deforestation from 1988 onwards, hence the start of Batak separatist activity is coded in 1988. The SDM dataset codes a claim for regional autonomy for the entire period of separatist activity of the umbrella group ‘Indigenous Peoples’, as all sources suggest an autonomy claim, whereas independence has never been brought up by any relevant organization (e.g., Moniaga 2004). Hence, autonomy is also coded for the Batak sub-group, particularly so since the Batak were the only indigenous group subsumed under the SDM group ‘Indigenous Peoples’ with separatist goals until 1999. Human Rights Watch (2002: 52) confirms the Batak claims for land rights. In 1999, the Community Alliance of Adat Nusantara (AMAN) was founded. AMAN is an indigenous umbrella organization that makes claims for indigenous land rights (Hadiz and Dhakidae 2005: 36) and continues to be active. [1988-2017: autonomy claim]</p>	
<h4>Sources</h4> <p>Hadiz, Vedi R., and Daniel Dhakidae (2005). <i>Social science and power in Indonesia</i>. Jakarta: Equinox Publishing.</p> <p>Moniaga, Sandra (2004). “Emerging Indigenous Peoples Movement in Indonesia.” <i>FOCUS</i> 36. http://www.hurights.or.jp/archives/focus/section2/2004/06/emerging-indigenous-peoples-movement-in-indonesia.html [August 19, 2014].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Dayak (85016000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1949-1966, 1999-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Indigenous Peoples
<i>SDM activity</i>	1999-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	SDM only codes claim for umbrella group

Whereas EPR codes several indigenous groups separately (Bataks, Minangkabaus, Dayak, and Gorontalo), the SDM dataset codes an umbrella group 'Indigenous Peoples' that includes several separatist indigenous groups (except those that are separately coded by SDM, such as the Papuans). The SDM dataset codes a claim for regional autonomy for the entire period of separatist activity of the umbrella group 'Indigenous Peoples', as all sources consulted suggest an autonomy claim, whereas independence has never been brought up by any relevant organization (Moniaga 2004). According to SDM2EPR, the individual separatist activity of the Dayak started in 1999 only, with the formation of the Community Alliance of Adat Nusantara (AMAN). AMAN is an indigenous umbrella organization that also makes claims for indigenous land rights (Hadiz and Dhakidae 2005: 36) and continues to be active. Based on Minahan (2002: 523) and Van Klinken (2007), SDM2EPR furthermore notes that there has been Dayak separatism already from 1919 until 1957, when the Dayak demanded a separate province and recognition of Great Dayak. A claim for autonomy is thus also coded from 1949 until 1957. [1949-1957: autonomy claim][1999-2017: autonomy claim]

Sources

Hadiz, Vedi R., and Daniel Dhakidae (2005). *Social science and power in Indonesia*. Jakarta: Equinox Publishing.

Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Moniaga, Sandra (2004). "Emerging Indigenous Peoples Movement in Indonesia." *FOCUS* 36. <http://www.hurights.or.jp/archives/focus/section2/2004/06/emerging-indigenous-peoples-movement-in-indonesia.html> [August 19, 2014].

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Van Klinken, Gerry (2007). "Ethnic fascism in Borneo". <http://www.insideindonesia.org/ethnic-fascism-in-borneo-2> [August 25, 2017].

East Timorese (85006000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1976-2001
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	East Timorese
<i>SDM activity</i>	1975-2002
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1975-2002: independence claim]
The claim ended with East Timorese independence in 2002.	
Sources	
Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Gorontalo (85007000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1949-1966
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1/1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Indigenous Peoples
<i>SDM activity</i>	1999-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	SDM only codes claim for umbrella group
Whereas EPR codes several indigenous groups separately (Bataks, Minangkabaus, Dayak, and Gorontalo), the SDM dataset codes an umbrella group 'Indigenous Peoples' that includes several separatist indigenous groups (except those that are separately coded by SDM, such as the Papuans). The SDM dataset codes a claim for regional autonomy for the entire period of separatist activity of the umbrella group 'Indigenous Peoples', as all sources consulted suggest an autonomy claim, whereas independence has never been brought up by any relevant	

organization (Moniaga 2004). According to SDM2EPR, the individual separatist activity of the Gorontalos started in 1999 only, with the formation of the Community Alliance of Adat Nusantara (AMAN). AMAN is an indigenous umbrella organization that also makes claims for indigenous land rights (Hadiz and Dhakidae 2005: 36) and continues to be active. [1999-2017: autonomy claim]

Sources

Hadiz, Vedi R., and Daniel Dhakidae (2005). *Social science and power in Indonesia*. Jakarta: Equinox Publishing.

Moniaga, Sandra (2004). "Emerging Indigenous Peoples Movement in Indonesia." *FOCUS* 36. <http://www.hurights.or.jp/archives/focus/section2/2004/06/emerging-indigenous-peoples-movement-in-indonesia.html> [August 19, 2014].

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Makassarese and Bugis (85010000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1949-1966; 2015-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	South Sulawesi
<i>SDM activity</i>	1950-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1950-2012: autonomy claim]
Despite calls for independence, the dominant claim has always been increased autonomy within Indonesia, according to the SDM dataset. As no evidence of a shift in the type of claim could be found, this coding is extended to the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]	
Sources	
Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Minangkabaus (85012000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1949-1966, 1999-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Indigenous Peoples
<i>SDM activity</i>	1988-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	SDM only codes claim for umbrella group
Whereas EPR codes several indigenous groups separately (Bataks, Minangkabaus, Dayak, and Gorontalos), the SDM dataset codes an umbrella group 'Indigenous Peoples' that includes several separatist indigenous groups (except those that are separately coded by SDM, such as the Papuans). The SDM dataset codes a claim for regional autonomy for the entire period of separatist activity of the umbrella group 'Indigenous Peoples', as all sources consulted suggest an autonomy claim, whereas independence has never been brought up by any relevant organization (Moniaga 2004). According to SDM2EPR, the individual separatist activity of the Minangkabaus started in 1999 only, with the formation of the Community Alliance of Adat Nusantara (AMAN). AMAN is an indigenous umbrella organization that also makes claims for indigenous land rights (Hadiz and Dhakidae 2005: 36) and continues to be active. [1999-2017: autonomy claim]	
Sources	
Hadiz, Vedi R., and Daniel Dhakidae (2005). <i>Social science and power in Indonesia</i> . Jakarta: Equinox Publishing.	

Moniaga, Sandra (2004). "Emerging Indigenous Peoples Movement in Indonesia." *FOCUS* 36.
<http://www.hurights.or.jp/archives/focus/section2/2004/06/emerging-indigenous-peoples-movement-in-indonesia.html> [August 19, 2014].

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Papuans (85013000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1964-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Papuans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1963-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1963-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an independence claim for the entire period of activity. This claim has remained dominant after 2012, as rallies in 2016 illustrated (The Guardian 2016). [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>The Guardian (2016). “West Papua: UN must supervise vote on independence, says coalition.” May 3. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/may/03/west-papua-un-must-supervise-vote-on-independence-says-coalition [July 27, 2017].</p> <p>The Guardian (2016). “Indonesia accused of arresting more than 1,000 in West Papua.” June 17. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jun/17/indonesia-accused-of-arresting-more-than-1000-in-west-papua [July 27, 2017].</p>	

IRAN

Arabs (63001000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Arabs (Arabistanis)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1979-1980; 1995-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes a first period of separatist activity in 1979-1980, with the establishment of the Arab Political Cultural Organization (APCO). In this period, the claim for autonomy was clearly dominant. According to Parsa (1989: 262), the Arabs demanded “autonomy, but not independence“. Regional autonomy was also the main demand of more than 100,000 demonstrators in Khorramshar in April 1979. The second period of separatist activity started in 1995. Again, the demand for autonomy seems to have been dominant. According to Korshidi et al. (2010: 274), Arabs in Iran “in the last hundred years have not pursued any serious efforts for independence” as their shared Shiite faith with the majority of Iranians made them prefer to live in the political context of Iran rather than seeking independence, particularly so since the eight Arab countries in the region are all majority Sunni. [1979-1980: autonomy claim][1995-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Khorshidi, Majid, Lee Yok Fee, and Fakhreddin Soltani (2010). “Ethnic Secessionism in Iran: Accusation or Fact.” <i>Journal of Politics and Law</i>: 269-276.</p> <p>Parsa, Misagh (1989). <i>Social Origins of the Iranian Revolution</i>. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). <i>Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set</i>.</p>	

Azeri (63004000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Azerbaijanis
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-1946; 1979-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The first period of separatist activity started in 1945, when the Azerbaijan Democratic Party (ADP), with Soviet support, declared the independence of Southern Azerbaijan as the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic. The newly established republic collapsed one year later, following the Soviet’s withdrawal that allowed the Iranian troops to take back Southern Azerbaijan and end the secessionist movement (Minahan 2002: 1769). The second period of separatist activity started after the fall of the Shah in 1979. However, the first ten years of this second period of activity are a little ambiguous and even the SDM documentation admits that there is only very limited evidence of separatist activity, particularly so between 1983 and the end of the 1980s. However, according to the SDM documentation, it is not fully clear whether organized separatist activity had fully ceased to exist and whether the interruption is shorter than ten years (see ten years inactivity rule in SDM data). One important Azeri organization in Iran was the Anjuman-i Azerbaijan which demanded in its manifesto the recognition of the national language and culture of Azerbaijan, the establishment of schools and mass media in Turkish language, and the right to use Azeri mother tongue in courts and other government offices. The organization also demanded a confederate relationship with Teheran (Shaffer: 455). Hence, a claim for autonomy seems to be dominant in these first years after the revolution. However, the picture changed with the relaxation of Soviet rule in the late 1980s, and ultimately with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the independence of Northern Azerbaijan as the Republic of Azerbaijan. In Southern Azerbaijan, three major groups emerged: One seeking unification with newly-independent Azerbaijan, one supporting the democratization of Iran and regional autonomy for Southern Azerbaijan within Iran, and one seeking independence for Southern Azerbaijan. Although the ban of political parties demanding the advancement of Azeri claims makes it difficult to assess the activities and strengths of</p>	

these groups, most sources suggest that autonomy within Iran remained the dominant claim. Minorities at Risk, for example, states that there are demands for independence and incorporation into Azerbaijan, but that “the dominant political grievance seems to be a wish for some decentralization of decision-making or limited autonomy.” This view is confirmed by Molavi (2003), who states that “the overwhelming majority of Iranian Azeris has displayed little interest in ethnic-inspired instability and virtually no interest in secession or unification with the Republic of Azerbaijan.” The establishment of autonomous zones for Azeris in Iran is also the goal of exile groups and dissidents, such as Mahmoud Ali Chehregani or the Azerbaijani United Islamic Front (Minorities at Risk). [1945-1946: independence claim][1979-2017: autonomy claim]

Sources

Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Molavi, Afshin (2003). “Iran’s Azeri Question: What Does Iran’s Largest Ethnic Minority Want?”
<http://www.eurasianet.org/departments/culture/articles/eav041503.shtml> [July 27, 2017].

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Shaffer, Brenda (2000). “The Formation of Azerbaijani Collective Identity in Iran.” *Nationalities Papers* 28(3): 449-477.

Baloch (63006000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1961-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Baluchis
<i>SDM activity</i>	1973-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>According to Minahan (2002: 258), the goal of the Baloch rebellion in 1973 was an independent Balochistan. The UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia provides more ambiguous information and states that there were not only claims for an independent Balochistan but also demands for a return to autonomy. As with the Baloch in Pakistan, it is not fully clear which of the two claims is dominant. In line with the coding rules of the SDM dataset, we code the more extreme claim during the rebellion. After the rebellion was crushed in 1977, there is only limited information on Baloch separatism in Iran, as the central government has not allowed Baloch political organizations to exist openly. Overall, the claim for autonomy seems to have emerged as the dominant one. In 1994, the Baloch National Council called for a special status for the Sistan-Balochistan region (Minahan 2002: 259). The Balochistan Peoples Party, an exile organization established in 2003 and based in Stockholm, also favors autonomy and demands a federal Iran as one of its main platform issues (Minorities at Risk Project). This is confirmed by UNPO (2008), where it is also stated that the Balochistan Peoples Party is “campaigning to achieve [...] sovereignty within a federal Democratic Republic of Iran based on parity of its constituent parts”. Furthermore, Gulam Mohammad Khanzai, an Iranian Baloch political expert, says that “the Baloch of Iran are not secessionist” (Taheri 2009: 157). Since 2004, there are also a number of militant organizations active in Balochistan (e.g. Jundallah), but it is unclear whether these organizations have separatist motives. [1973-1977: independence claim][1978-2017: autonomy claim]</p>	
Sources	
Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i> . Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.	
Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	
Taheri, Ahmad Reza (2009). <i>The Baloch in Post Islamic Revolution Iran: A Political Study (1979-2008)</i> .	
Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization (UNPO) (2008). “West Balochistan.” http://unpo.org/members/7922 [July 27, 2017].	
Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) (2016). <i>UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset v. 17.1</i> . http://ucdp.uu.se/#/conflict/325 [July 27, 2017].	

Kurds (63008000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Kurds
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes the beginning of Kurdish separatist activity in 1945, with the establishment of the Kurdish Democratic Party of Iran (KDPI). The Kurds declared independence in 1946 and established the Mahabad Republic under the leadership of the KDPI. The new republic was overthrown one year later by Iranian troops. After the collapse of the Mahabad Republic, the dominant claim seems to have been autonomy within Iran, as argued by numerous sources. Minorities at Risk, the UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia, and Minahan (2002: 1060) all state that the Iranian Kurds, mostly from bases in northern Iraq, have been campaigning for regional autonomy. Also, the KDPI defines self-determination for the Kurdish people “within the framework of Iran” as one of its objectives in its program (Van Bruinessen 1986: 17). Autonomy within Iran was or is also the goal of other Kurdish organizations, such as Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK) or the Parti Jiyani Azadi Kurdistan/The Free Life Party of Kurdistan (PJAK) (UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia). The Kurdish claim for autonomy has continued after 2012, as renewed clashes between KDPI and Iranian military in 2015 illustrate (UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia). [1945-1946: independence claim][1947-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) (2016). <i>UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset v. 17.1</i>. http://ucdp.uu.se/#/statebased/406 [July 27, 2017].</p> <p>Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) (2016). <i>UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset v. 17.1</i>. http://ucdp.uu.se/#/actor/261 [July 27, 2017].</p> <p>Van Bruinessen, Martin (1986). “The Kurds between Iran and Iraq.” <i>MERIP Middle East Report</i> 141(1): 14-27.</p>	

Turkmen (63010000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Turkmen
<i>SDM activity</i>	1979-1982; 2004-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes the start of the first period of Turkmen separatist activity in 1979 when the Turkmen rebelled against the new government and demanded “autonomy, official recognition of their language, and representation in local revolutionary councils dominated by Shi’i Muslims” (Minahan 2002: 1931). Minorities at Risk confirms this claim. The main representatives of the Turkmen claim in the second period of activity were the Turkemensahra Freedom Organization, the National Democratic Movement of Turkmenia (Turkmenlik), and Organization for Defense of the Rights of Turkmen People. As a result of Iran’s repressive system, there is only very little information on these organizations, their demands and strength. An exception is their signing of a declaration for a federal Iran in 2009 (UNPO 2009) or the 2005 manifesto by the Organization for Defense of the Rights of Turkmen People that also demanded a federal Iran (Congress of Iranian Nationalities for a Federal Iran). As there is no evidence of a termination of the movement since 2009 and since there have not been ten</p>	

years of inactivity, the claim is continued to be coded. [1979-1982: autonomy claim][2004-2017: autonomy claim]

Sources

Congress of Iranian Nationalities for a Federal Iran (2005). "Manifesto of the Congress of Iranian Nationalities." <http://www.navend.de/aktuell/pdf/2005-04-15/Manifest-Iran%20Engl.pdf> [July 28, 2017].

Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization (UNPO). "2009 Conference: Human Rights and the Question of Democratisation and Federalism in Iran." <http://unpo.org/article/11442> [July 28, 2017].

IRAQ

Kurds (64501000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Kurds
<i>SDM activity</i>	1946-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes the start of separatist activity in 1946 with the establishment of the Kurdistan Democratic Party (KDP). At its first congress, the KDP demanded autonomy for Iraqi Kurdistan (McDowall 2004: 242). The KDP has remained the dominant Kurdish party in Iraq. The Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK), established in 1975, later emerged as the second influential party in Iraqi Kurdistan. In 1991, Kurdistan became de-facto independent. Officially, however, federalism remained the dominant goal of the Kurdish leadership. In 1992, the Kurdistan National Assembly gave a unanimous commitment “to determine its fate and define its legal relationship with the central authority at this stage of history on the basis of a federation within a democratic parliamentary Iraq” (Bengio 2006: 178). Furthermore, the leaders of both the KDP and the PUK promoted the concept of a federal Iraq (Galbraith 2006: 270) and both PUK and KDP “have repeatedly denied any suggestions that their aim is to establish an independent Kurdistan” (Wanche 2006: 190). However, despite official demands for autonomy within a federal Iraq, the “longing for an independent state persists among Kurds, and many Kurds insist on independence as a distant possibility or long-term goal” (Wanche 2006: 190). This divergence between public opinion and the official position of the KDP and the PUK also continued after the US-led invasion and the overthrow of the Hussein regime in 2003. In 2004, a referendum movement collected 1,700,000 signatures demanding an independent Kurdistan (Galbraith 2005) and in an unofficial referendum in 2005, 98% of the voters voted in favor of independence (Rogg and Rimscha 2007: 833). While being aware that “an independent state is not a realistic option”, for the PUK and the KDP this referendum was “welcome insofar as it demonstrated to their partners in Baghdad what direction things could take if the federalism scheme fails” (Rogg and Rimscha 2007: 833). Far-reaching autonomy was also the Kurdish goal during the drafting of the permanent Iraqi Constitution in 2005, when the Kurdish leaders sought to consolidate Kurdistan’s autonomous institutions and powers within a federal Iraq. The powers of the federal government should be limited to foreign policy, defense, monetary policy, and customs (Galbraith 2006: 272). According to Ala Jabar (2013: 132), “the economic dependency of Kurdistan on Iraq has restrained Kurds from secession” and has made them demand federation with the rest of Iraq. Recently, in the context of the emergence of the Islamic State (IS), an independent Kurdistan seems to have become more obtainable. For the independence referendum planned to be held in September 2017, both the PUK and the KDP (and many other parties) recommended a ‘Yes’ vote. Despite the fact that independence has been the obvious long-term goal of a majority of the Kurds in Iraq, autonomy is coded as the dominant claim throughout. This is in line with the coding instructions of the SDM dataset that requires to code the official claim of the dominant organization(s), which is not necessarily the same as the claim favored by a majority of the population. The recent switch of KDP and PUK, which both support the independence referendum, would only be reflected as of 2018, following the first of January rule. [1946-2017: autonomy claim]</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>Ala Jabar, Mohammed (2013). “The Politics of Iraqi Kurdistan: Towards Federalism or Secession?” PhD Thesis University of Canberra. http://www.canberra.edu.au/researchrepository/file/3bee44d0-f162-8598-ad64-033aa44dd1e3/1/full_text.pdf [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Bengio, Ofra (2005). “Autonomy in Kurdistan in historical perspective.” In: Brendan O’Leary, John McGarry and Khaled Salih (eds.), <i>The Future of Kurdistan in Iraq</i>. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.</p> <p>Galbraith, Perter W. (2006). “Kurdistan in a federal Iraq.” In: Brendan O’Leary, John McGarry and Khaled Salih (eds.), <i>The Future of Kurdistan in Iraq</i>. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.</p> <p>McDowall, David (2004). <i>A Modern History of the Kurds</i>. Third Edition. London: I.B. Tauris.</p> <p>Rogg, Inga and Hans Rimscha (2007). “The Kurds as parties to and victims of conflicts in Iraq.” <i>International Review of the Red Cross</i> 89(868): 823-842.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Wanche, Sophia (2006). "Awaiting Liberation: Kurdish Perspectives on a Post-Saddam Iraq." In: Brendan O'Leary, John McGarry and Khaled Salih (eds.), *The Future of Kurdistan in Iraq*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Shi'a Arabs (64502000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Shiites
<i>SDM activity</i>	2005-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The beginning of separatist activity is coded in 2005, when the idea of a single Shiite federal entity (Visser 2007: 813) or a separate Shiite state (Sarhan and Knickmeyer 2005) was brought back on the agenda and found support among the hard-core electorate of the Islamic Supreme Council of Iraq (ISCI). The support for separatist ideas was rather small and it could not be identified which of the two claims was dominant. In line with the coding instructions, the more extreme claim is coded (independence). The movement remains ongoing and has accelerated with the rise of the Islamic State. According to Viser (2014), there are also more established political parties, such as the State of Law coalition of former PM Nuri al-Maliki and current PM Haydar al-Abadi, which have been linked to secessionist ideas. [2005-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Sarhan, Saad and Ellen Knickmeyer (2005). "Shiites Call for Own State in South." http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/08/11/AR2005081101791.html [July 28, 2017].</p> <p>Visser, Reidar (2014). "Will Iraq's Shiites Secede?" http://www.iraq-businessnews.com/2014/10/31/will-iraqs-shiites-secede/3/ [July 28, 2017].</p> <p>Visser, Reidar (2007). "Ethnicity, Federalism and the Idea of Sectarian Citizenship in Iraq: A Critique." <i>International Review of the Red Cross</i> 89(868): 809-822.</p>	

ISRAEL

Israeli Arabs (66601100)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1950-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1/1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Palestinians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1964-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes one Palestinian self-determination movement ('Palestinians'), whereas EPR distinguishes between Arabs in Israel proper ('Israeli Arabs', relevant from 1950-2017) and Palestinians in the West Bank and the Gaza strip ('Palestinian Arabs', relevant from 1967-2017). The SDM dataset codes the start of separatist activity in 1964, when the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) was formed. The goals of the PLO were first formulated in the anti-Zionist Palestinian National Covenant, which demanded the "the liberation of Palestine and "the elimination of Zionism in Palestine" (Article 15). It furthermore argued that "Palestine, with the boundaries it had during the British Mandate, is an indivisible territorial unit" (Article 2). An independent Palestinian state has remained the goal of the PLO and also of more radical actors such as Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ) (Becker 2014). [1964-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Becker, Jilian (2014). <i>The PLO: the rise and fall of the Palestine Liberation Organization</i>. London: AuthorHouse.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Palestinian Arabs (66601200)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1968-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Palestinians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1967-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes one Palestinian self-determination movement ('Palestinians'), whereas EPR distinguishes between Arabs in Israel proper ('Israeli Arabs', relevant from 1950-2017) and Palestinians in the West Bank and the Gaza strip ('Palestinian Arabs', relevant from 1967-2017). The SDM dataset codes the start of separatist activity in 1964, when the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) was formed. The goals of the PLO were first formulated in the anti-Zionist Palestinian National Covenant, which demanded the "the liberation of Palestine and "the elimination of Zionism in Palestine" (Article 15). It furthermore argued that "Palestine, with the boundaries it had during the British Mandate, is an indivisible territorial unit" (Article 2). An independent Palestinian state has remained the goal of the PLO and also of more radical actors such as Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ) (Becker 2014). Since Jordan and Egypt were still in control of the West Bank and the Gaza strip respectively (and 'Palestinian Arabs' are only coded from 1968 onwards), separatist activity is only coded from 1968 onwards. [1967-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Becker, Jilian (2014). <i>The PLO: the rise and fall of the Palestine Liberation Organization</i>. London: AuthorHouse.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

ITALY

Aostans (French speakers) (32505000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Valdaostans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1945-1947: independence claim][1948-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy for almost the entire period of activity. This coding is based on the claim of the Valdostan Union, which has been the strongest nationalist party. This has not changed since the end of SDM's coding period in 2012. In the Valdostan regional election of 2013, the Valdostan Union was again voted the strongest party with 33.5% of the votes. Together with Edelweiss and the Autonomist Federation, the party formed the regionalist Aosta Valley coalition that gained 47.9% of the votes (Nationalia 2013). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Nationalia (2013). "Centre-right autonomists win election in Aosta Valley." http://www.nationalia.info/new/9871/centre-right-autonomists-win-election-in-aosta-valley [July 31, 2017].</p>	

Friulians (32503000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Friuli
<i>SDM activity</i>	1948-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1948-1996: autonomy claim] [1997-2000: independence claim] [2001-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>With the defeat of the Lega Nord in the 1999 European election, the SDM dataset codes a de-radicalization of the claim from independence to devolution and regional autonomy (Ignazi 2008, Moreau 2011). Under its new leader, Matteo Salvini, the Lega shifted the attention away from self-determination and has predominantly focused on Italian nationalism, anti-immigration, and law and order (Albertazzi 2017). Federalism and autonomy have vanished completely from Salvini's rhetoric. However, the since it remains the official goal of the party, no termination of the movement is coded (yet) and the claim for autonomy is also coded for the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Albertazzi, Daniele (2017). "'No Federalism Please, We Are Leghisti!' The Lega Nord under Matteo Salvini." Paper Presented at the PSA Annual International Conference 2017, 10-12 April 2017, Glasgow.</p> <p>Ignazi, Piero (2008). <i>Partiti politici in Italia. Da Forza Italia al Partito Demoratico</i>. Bologna: Il Mulino.</p> <p>Moreau, Patrick (2011). "The Victorious Parties – Unity in Diversity?" In: Uwe Backes, and Patrick Moreau (eds.), <i>The Extreme Right in Europe: Current Trends and Perspectives</i>, 75-148. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

German speakers (Austrians) (32504000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	South Tyroleans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1945-1947: irredentist claim] [1948-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>Despite losing the absolute majority in the provincial election in 2013, the South Tyrol People's Party ('Südtiroler Volkspartei', SVP) has remained the dominant party in South Tyrol, with 45.7% of the votes. Since the SVP's primary goal remains the consolidation of autonomy within Italy (Südtiroler Volkspartei 2017), a claim for autonomy is also being coded for the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Südtiroler Volkspartei (2017). "Kernthema Autonomie." http://www.svp.eu/de/english/ [July 31, 2017].</p>	

Sardinians (32502000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Sardinians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1945-1979: autonomy claim; 1980-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a switch from autonomy to independence as the dominant claim in 1980. There is no evidence that the movement has ended or evidence that would suggest that the claim has changed since 2012. Fourteen Sardist parties took part in the 2014 regional election, winning a combined share of approximately 26% of the votes. With 4.7%, the secessionist Sardinian Action Party was again the strongest of the nationalist parties. Additional evidence for a coding of independence as the dominant goal are plans communicated in 2014 to hold an independence referendum. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

JAPAN

Ainu (74001000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1984-1996; 2013-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Ainu
<i>SDM activity</i>	1984-2012
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1984-2012: autonomy claim]
No update is required since the SDM dataset codes an end to the Ainu claim in 2012 after ten years of inactivity.	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Okinawans (74002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1972-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Okinawans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1972-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1972-2012: independence claim]
Although more people favor devolution, the SDM dataset codes a claim for independence since this is the only claim that is organized. This doesn't seem to have changed since 2012: The Guardian (2014) and the New York Times (2013) both call the nationalist Okinawa agitation an "independence movement". [2013-2017: independence claim]	
Sources New York Times (2013): "In Okinawa, Talk of Break From Japan Turns Serious." July 5. http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/06/world/asia/in-okinawa-talk-of-break-from-japan-turns-serious.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0 [July 31, 2017]. Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set. The Guardian (2014). "Okinawa independence movement seeks inspiration from Scotland." September 15. http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/sep/15/okinawa-independence-scotland-japan-us-military-base [July 31, 2017].	

KAZAKHSTAN

Russians (70503100)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-1994
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Russians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1992-1999
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1992-1994: autonomy claim][1995-1999: irredentist claim]
No update is required since EPR codes the 'Russians' as irrelevant from 1994 onwards.	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Russian-speakers (70503000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1995-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	n:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Russians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1992-1999
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1992-1994: autonomy claim][1995-1999: irredentist claim]
The SDM dataset codes one Russian self-determination movement ('Russians'), whereas EPR codes 'Russians' until 1994 and a group with additional Russian speakers called 'Russian speakers' from 1995 onwards. Since the Russians make up the predominant part of Russian-speakers in Kazakhstan (>85%), the SDM group 'Russians' is also matched with the EPR group 'Russian-speakers'. The SDM dataset codes an end to the movement in 1999. No evidence could be found suggesting that the claim has reemerged after the end of SDM's coding period in 2012.	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

KENYA

Mijikenda (50107000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1963-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Mombasa
<i>SDM activity</i>	1999-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>SDM codes a 'Mombasa' self-determination group that makes claims for the territory of the former Coast Province with the capital Mombasa. Since the Mijikenda make up the largest group in the former Coast Province (42%), are concentrated in the province, and are also the largest group associated with the Mijikenda movement, SDM2EPR matches them with the SDM movement 'Mombasa'. The SDM dataset codes a start to separatist activity in 1999, due to the formation of the Mombasa Republican Council (MRC). The MRC advocates the independence of coastal provinces from Kenya (Jamestown Foundation 2012, The Africa Report 2012). No evidence could be found suggesting that the claim has ended or that it has been altered after the end of SDM's coding period in 2012. [1999-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Jamestown Foundation (2012). "Kenya's Coast Province and the Mombasa Republican Council: Islamists, Separatists or Political Pawns?" http://www.refworld.org/docid/509918962.html [July 31, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>The Africa Report (2012). "Kenya's Mombasa Republican Council: The Coast Calls for Freedom." May 17. http://www.theafricareport.com/East-Horn-Africa/kenyas-mombasa-republican-council-the-coast-calls-for-freedom.html [July 31, 2017].</p>	

Somali (50108000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1963-2002; 2012-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Somalis
<i>SDM activity</i>	1963-1967
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes Somali separatist activity from 1961 until 1967, due to the Somalis of Kenya's Northern Frontier District (NFD) making calls for attachment to Somalia that later escalated into a four-year secessionist war lasting from 1963 to 1967 (Hewitt and Cheetham 2000: 275). The irredentist goal is confirmed by Botha (2016: 44), who states that the war was "a secessionist conflict in which ethnic Somalis in the NFD attempted to join with their fellow Somalis in a Greater Somalia. Further proof is the referendum in 1963, in which the Somalis were asked by a UN Commission if they would like the NFD to join Somalia or remain part of Kenya. A clear majority voted in favor of the former option (Hyndman and Wenona 2016: 36). No evidence could be found suggesting that the Somali claim has reemerged after the end of SDM's coding period in 2012. [1963-1967: irredentism claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Botha, Anneli (2016). Terrorism in Kenya and Uganda: Radicalization from a Political Socialization Perspective. Lanham: Lexington Books.</p> <p>Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). <i>Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements</i>. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, pp. 154, 274-275.</p>	

Hyndman, Jennifer, and Wenona Giles (2016). *Refugees in Extended Exile: Living on the Edge*. London: Routledge.

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

KOSOVO

Serbs (34702000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	2008-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Serbs
<i>SDM activity</i>	2008-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[2008-2012: irredentism claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an irredentist claim for the entire period of activity. The best indication for this coding is the 2012 North Kosovo referendum in which 99.74% of people rejected the Kosovar institutions, thereby indicating their preference to join Serbia (The Economist 2012). No evidence could be found suggesting that the claim has ended or been altered since 2012. [2013-2017: irredentist claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>The Economist. (2012). "Kosovo's Serbs. The Meaning of "No"." http://www.economist.com/blogs/easternapproaches/2012/02/kosovos-serbs [July 31, 2017].</p>	

KYRGYZSTAN

Uzbeks (70305000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Kyrgyz Uzbeks
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2000
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-2000: irredentist claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an end to the Uzbek movement for self-determination in 2000, following the ten years inactivity rule. No evidence could be found suggesting that the movement has reemerged since 2012.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

LAOS

Hmong (81201000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1953-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Hmong
<i>SDM activity</i>	1953-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1953-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for independence throughout. No evidence could be found suggesting that the movement has ended or that the claim has significantly altered since 2012. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

LIBYA

Toubou (62002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1970-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Toubou
<i>SDM activity</i>	2011-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>Toubou separatism in Libya emerged in 2011 when the Toubou Front for the Salvation of Libya (TFSL) no longer only aimed at securing basic rights of the Toubou population but actively started to pursue separatist goals. According to Martin and Weber (2012: 2), the TFSL leader Issa Abdel Majid has “threatened to work towards the creation of a separate state in the south”. Al-Jazeera also states that the TFSL brought up the possibility of an independent Toubou state. Idrissa and Decalo (2012) also describe the Toubou as an independence movement that wants reunification with its kin in Chad, Libya and Sudan. As with the Toubou in Niger, claims for secessionism can be seen as a mere bargaining strategy to extract concessions from the center (Carment 2012). Nevertheless, Toubou reunification in an independent state still is the dominant claim made by a formal organization. [2011-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Al Jazeera (2014). “Scores Killed in Libya Tribal Clashes.” http://www.aljazeera.com/news/africa/2012/03/201232901547564337.html [July 31, 2017].</p> <p>Carment, David (2012). “Ethnic Conflict in Libya: Toubou.” Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, Carleton University.</p> <p>Idrissa, Abdourahmane and Samuel Decalo (2012). <i>Historical Dictionary of Niger</i>. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.</p> <p>Martin, Philip and Christina Weber (2012). “Ethnic Conflict in Libya: Toubou.” http://www4.carleton.ca/cifp/app/serve.php/1394.pdf [July 31, 2017]</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

LITHUANIA

Poles (36802000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Lithuanian Poles
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy, as this is the demand of the Electoral Action of Poles in Lithuania, the most important party representing Polish interests in Lithuania. Other organizations are the Union of Lithuanian Poles, the Congress of Poles of Lithuania, the Lithuanian Polish Minority, and the Alliance of Lithuanian Citizens. All of these organizations have been consistently demanding greater autonomy; evidence of a claim for independence could not be found (Minorities at Risk). The Electoral Action of Poles in Lithuania continues to remain active in conventional politics and the claim for autonomy and cultural rights has not been altered after 2012. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

MACEDONIA

Albanians (34302000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Macedonian Albanians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>Although there have been demands by radicals to secede from Macedonia to unify with Kosovo and /or Albania (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 178), the claim for autonomy seems to be dominant. According to Bajrami (2009), a majority of Albanians favor regional autonomy. SDM hence codes an autonomy claim throughout and since there is no evidence suggesting that this has changed in recent years or that the claim has ended, autonomy is also coded for the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). <i>Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements</i>. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.</p>	

MALAYSIA

Dayaks (82002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1964-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Ibans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1963-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1963: independence claim; 1964-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an Iban claim for independence only in 1963, when the incorporation of Sarawak into Malaysia provoked a mobilization for secession. Ever since, the focus has been on cultural rights, autonomy, and land rights (Minorities at Risk Project). No radicalization or termination of the claim could be observed in the period 2013-2017, which is why the claim for regional autonomy is continued. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Kadazans (82004000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1964-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Kadazan
<i>SDM activity</i>	1963-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1963-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>Despite secessionist claims by more radical representatives, the SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy throughout. This coding is based on an assessment by Cheae (2002), who argues that secession does not appear to be the dominant claim among the political parties representing the Kadazan movement. This claim is also coded for the period 2013-2017, as the major Kadazan party, the Parti Bersatu Sabah (PBS), has continued to demand autonomy for Sabah. In 2015, the PBS has reiterated its goal of “fighting for Sabah’s full autonomy within the Federation of Malaysia” (Borneo Post 2015). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>The Borneo Post (2015). “PBS pursues full autonomy.” http://www.theborneopost.com/2015/09/27/pbs-pursues-full-autonomy/ [July 31, 2017].</p>	

MALI

Tuareg (43202000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Tuaregs
<i>SDM activity</i>	1962-1964; 1988-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The first period of separatist activity is coded due to the Tuareg rebellion from 1962-1964. This first Tuareg rebellion was predominantly caused by marginalization both under colonialism and in post-colonial Mali. But self-determination was also among the claims. Already prior to independence, there had been dreams of an independent Tuareg state (Azawad), comprised of territory in northern Mali, northern Niger, and southern Libya (Keita 1998: 108). The Minority Rights Group International also describes expectations during the colonial period among the Tuareg for an autonomous state (Azawad). These expectations carried into independent Mali. [1962-1964: independence claim]</p> <p>The second period of activity started in 1988, when the ‘Mouvement Populaire de Libération de l’Azawad’ (MPLA) was established. The MPLA was initially the first Tuareg organizations fighting the Malian government, but the Arab component of the movement soon broke away and created the ‘Front Islamique Arabe de l’Azaouad’ (FIAA) in 1990. Many splinter groups were formed during the early 1990s, such as the Front Populaire pour la Libération de l’Azaouad (FPLA) or the ‘Armée Révolutionnaire pour la Libération de l’Azaouad’ (ARLA) in 1991. In addition to the fractionalization of the Tuareg claim, the individual organizations also changed their claims over time. Lecocq (2010) provides an overview of all relevant movements and their claims. The UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia provides additional information on the individual claims: When the MPLA was still the only Tuareg self-determination organization, it demanded independence. However, when the MPLA changed its name to MPA (Mouvement Populaire de l’Azaouad) in early 1991 and signed the Tamanrasset accord in May 1991, it limited its aim to autonomy within Mali. The FIAA also signed the accord that granted northern Mali widespread autonomy. The accord was rejected by both FPLA and ARLA, which according to UCDP returned to the ideology of independence. Since UCDP described both movements as “much smaller groups” than MPA and FIAA, autonomy is coded as the dominant claim from 1992 onwards following the first of January rule. This coding is continued also for the relatively peaceful period between 1995 and 2007. The claim for autonomy in this period is also confirmed by Minorities at Risk. In 2007, conflict erupted again with the ‘Alliance démocratique du 23 Mai pour le changement - Ibrahim Bahanga faction’ (later the ‘Alliance Touareg Nord Mali pour le Changement (ATNMC)’) revolting against discrimination of Tuareg in the Malian military. According to Call (2012: 171), Banga “demanded greater autonomy (though not independence)”. The claim for autonomy is thus continued. In 2011, after the fall of Gaddafi in Libya, Tuareg fighters returning from Libya formed the National Movement for the Liberation of Azawad (MNLA), together with remnants from the ATNMC and a Tuareg organization called MNA. The goal of MNLA was the creation of an independent Azawad (UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia). In 2012, MNLA declared the independence of Azawad (BBC 2012). The second major group in the renewed insurgency was the Islamist Ansar Dine. According to UCDP and Cline (2013: 623), Ansar Dine favored the implementation of sharia law in the entire country and did not demand the creation of an independent Azawad. However, a short-lived agreement in 2012 between Ansar Dine and MNLA to create an independent Islamic state of Azawad and the fact that Ansar Dine created a de facto Islamic state in northern Mali after driving out MNLA (UCDP) would also suggest secessionist tendencies. In 2014, a regrouping of Tuareg organizations took place, with pro-national unity groups on one side (Platform) and the pro-independence groups on the other (‘Coordination des Mouvements de l’Azawad (CMA)’). [1988-1991: independence claim] [1992-2011: autonomy claim][2012-2017: independence claim]</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>BBC (2012). “Mali Tuareg Rebels Declare Independence in the North.” April 6. http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-17635437 [July 31, 2017].</p> <p>Call, Charles T. (2012). <i>Why peace fails: the causes and prevention of civil war recurrence</i>. Washington: Georgetown University Press.</p> <p>Cline, Lawrence E. (2013). “Nomads, Islamists, and soldiers: the struggles for Northern Mali.” <i>Studies in Conflict & Terrorism</i>, 36(8): 617-634.</p>	

Keita, Kalifa (1998). "Conflict and conflict resolution in the Sahel: The Tuareg insurgency in Mali." *Small Wars & Insurgencies*, 9(3): 102-128.

Lecocq, Baz (2010). *Disputed desert: decolonisation, competing nationalisms and Tuareg rebellions in Northern Mali*. Leiden: Brill.

Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples*.
<http://minorityrights.org/minorities/tuareg/> [July 31, 2017].

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) (2016). *UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset v. 17.1*.
<http://ucdp.uu.se/#/statebased/800> [July 31, 2017].

MAURITANIA

Black Africans (43503000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Kewris
<i>SDM activity</i>	1983-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes Kewri separatist activity as of 1983, with the establishment of the 'Forces de Libération Africaines de Mauritanie' (FLAM). According to Minahan (2002: 977), FLAM first advocated a separate state for the Kewris, "but later tuned down its rhetoric". However, evidence of a claim for secession could not be found in any other source. Both Kinne (2001: 602) and Diallo (1993: 46) describe FLAM as federalist organization. This is also in line with the 1996 split of FLAM as described in Minahan (2002: 978). The split resulted in two factions, with the larger faction favoring a federal system and the smaller faction advocating independence for the Kewri in a federation with Senegal (Minahan 2002: 978). As no evidence of a radicalization of the claim could be found since, a claim for autonomy is coded throughout. FLAM remains active, though mostly from neighboring Senegal. [1983-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Diallo, G. (1993). "Mauritania-the other apartheid?" <i>Current African Issues</i> 16, Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.</p> <p>Kinne, Lance (2001). "The benefits of exile: the case of FLAM." <i>The Journal of Modern African Studies</i>, 39(4): 597-621.</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Sahrawis (43504000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1977-1978
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	
<i>SDM activity</i>	1977-1979
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>Ever since 1974, independence has been the goal of POLISARIO, the major organization associated with the Saharawi movement (Hodges 1983: 53). In 1976, Saharawi rebel leaders declared independence and in negotiations, Sahrawi leaders have repeatedly demanded independence (Minahan 2002; Stephan & Mundy 2006). [1977-1978: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Hodges, Tony (1983). "The Origins of Saharawi Nationalism." <i>Third World Quarterly</i> 5(1): 28-57.</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Stephan, Maria, and Jacob Mundy (2006). "A Battlefield Transformed: From Guerilla Resistance to Mass Nonviolent Struggle in the Western Sahara." <i>Journal of Military and Strategic Studies</i> 8(3). http://jmss.org/jmss/index.php/jmss/article/viewFile/132/148 [July 31, 2017].</p>	

MEXICO

Maya (7002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Mayans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1987-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes Mayan separatist activity with the founding of the Indigenous Organization of the Highlands (ORIACH) in 1987. In 1994, the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN) emerged from the 1994 Chiapas uprising and has established itself as the most widely recognized pro-indigenous organization in Mexico. The Mayan have been demanding autonomy within Mexico for the entire period of separatist activity. According to Minorities at Risk, the Zapatistas demanded autonomy rights for all of Mexico's indigenous peoples and also declared de facto autonomy of 30 municipalities. This is confirmed by Minahan (2002: 1218), who also states that the Zapatista leaders demanded local autonomy in 1994. Stahler-Sholk (2007) and Cuninghame and Corona (1998) also describe the movement as seeking autonomy. Cuninghame and Corona (1998: 17) clearly state that it seeks "indigenous autonomy and self-determination within the confines of the Mexican national territory." The movement has remained active after 2012 and hence autonomy is also coded for the period 2013-2017. [1987-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Cuninghame, Patrick and Carolina B. Corona (1998). "A rainbow at midnight: Zapatistas and autonomy." <i>Capital & Class</i> 22(3): 12-22.</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Stahler-Sholk, Richard (2007). "Resisting neoliberal homogenization: The Zapatista autonomy movement." <i>Latin American Perspectives</i> 34(2): 48-63.</p>	

Other indigenous groups (7003000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	n:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Other Indigenous Peoples; Zapotecs
<i>SDM activity</i>	Other Indigenous Peoples: 1945-2012 (ongoing); Zapotecs: 1973-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes the Mayans, the Zapotecs, and an umbrella group called "Other Indigenous Peoples". The first two groups are coded separately by SDM because there was group-specific mobilization. However, until the respective date of mobilization, these two groups can be considered part of this umbrella indigenous group. Furthermore, since EPR only codes the Mayans separately and subsumes all other indigenous peoples under its umbrella group 'Other Indigenous Groups', SDM's 'Zapotecs' and 'Other Indigenous Peoples' together form the 'Other Indigenous Groups' group in EPR. There are numerous organizations representing the indigenous peoples in Mexico. Overall, the dominant claim is clearly autonomy within Mexico. According to Minorities at Risk, indigenous demands include "regional autonomy and self-determination for indigenous communities". The same demands are also listed for the Zapotecs. Minority Rights Group International confirms this and mentions the "creation of pluri-ethnic autonomous regions in areas of significant indigenous population" as an important goal of the indigenous communities. Indigenous groups such as the National Commission for the Development of Indigenous Peoples (CDI) or the Zapotec Worker-Peasant-Student Coalition of the Isthmus of Tehuantepec</p>	

(COCEI) are still actively demanding autonomy and land rights, hence the claim for autonomy is coded until 2017. [1945-2017: autonomy claim]

Sources

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples*.
<http://minorityrights.org/minorities/indigenous-peoples-4/> [July 31, 2017].

MOLDOVA

Gagauz (35904000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Gagauz
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-1992: independence claim; 1993-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>According to Minahan (2002: 634), extreme nationalists were outflanked in 1992 and the dominant claim was being moved to territorial autonomy within Moldova. The dominance of the claim for autonomy is confirmed by Katchanovski (2005: 85) and Hewitt and Cheetham (2000: 192). This does not seem to have changed after 2012, with Sander-Nielsen (2014) writing that “the Gagauz elites are not inclined to seek independence”. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). <i>Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements</i>. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.</p> <p>Katchanovski, Ivan (2005). “Small Nations but Great Differences: Political Orientations and Cultures of the Crimean Tatars and the Gagauz.” <i>Europe-Asia Studies</i> 57 (6): 877-894.</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Sander Nielsen, Ann Mette (2014). “Gagauzia: Another Obstacle on Moldova’s Path to Europe?” http://www.cipe.org/blog/2016/02/04/gagauzia-another-obstacle-on-moldovas-path-to-europe/#.WYsXf-ILdaQ [July 31, 2017]</p>	

MONTENEGRO

Bosniak/Muslims (34103000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	2006-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Sandzak Muslims
<i>SDM activity</i>	2006-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[2006-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an autonomy claim from 2006 onwards. Since this coding is mostly based on recent events or sources, such as Bošnjačka Stranka (2013), BKZ (2013), or Balkan Inside (2013), and since no evidence could be found that the claim has been significantly altered after 2012, this coding is continued for the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Balkan Inside. (2013). “New Bosniak Party in Montenegro Wants Autonomy for Sandzak.” http://www.balkaninside.com/new-bosniak-party-in-montenegro-wants-autonomy-for-sandzak/. [July 31, 2017].</p> <p>Bosniak Cultural Community (BKZ) (2013). <i>Report of Position of Bosniaks in Montenegro</i>. New York, NY: Rozaje.</p> <p>Bošnjačka Stranka (2013). “Ciljevi.” http://www.bscg.me/ciljevi/ [July 31, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). <i>Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set</i>.</p>	

MOROCCO

Sahrawis (60003000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1976-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Saharawis
<i>SDM activity</i>	1975-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1975-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for independence for the entire period of separatist activity. This claim has continued after 2012 with POLISARIO reiterating its claim for independence at various occasions (Africa News 2017, Reuters 2016). [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Africa News (2017). "Polisario Front insists Morocco must recognize Western Sahara's independence." http://www.africanews.com/2017/02/15/polisario-front-insists-morocco-must-recognize-western-sahara-s-independence/ [July 31, 2017].</p> <p>Reuters (2016). "Western Sahara independence movement at crossroads after Polisario chief's death:" http://www.reuters.com/article/us-morocco-westernsahara-polisario-idUSKCN0YP1QY [July 31, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

MYANMAR

Buddhist Arakanese (77502000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1948-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Buddhist Arakanese
<i>SDM activity</i>	1948-1980
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1948-1980: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an end to the Buddhist Arakanese movement in 1980. There is no evidence that the separatist movement has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Kachins (77505000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1948-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Kachins
<i>SDM activity</i>	1948-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1948-1989: independence claim] [1990-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a switch from independence to autonomy within Myanmar as the dominant claim in 1990. Also when fighting flared up once again in 2011/2012, the official claim of the KIA and KIO continued to be autonomy within Burma's federal state system and greater control of resources and territory (BBC 2013; Guardian 2013). According to Brenner (2017), the recent escalation of the war in Kachin has made independence again a preference for many Kachin. However, autonomy is continued to be coded as the dominant claim also for the period 2013-2017 for two reasons: First, greater autonomy within a federal union remains the official goal of the KIO. Second, the trend described by Brenner (2017) started only in 2017 and is hence too recent to be considered, as the 1st of January rule applies. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>BBC (2013). "Burma agrees preliminary deal with Kachin rebels." October 10, sec. Asia http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-24480495 [July 31, 2017].</p> <p>Brenner, David (2017). "Why Myanmar's ethnic minorities lose faith in federalism and peace." http://www.newmandala.org/myanmars-ethnic-minorities-lose-faith-federalism-peace/ [July 31, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>The Guardian (2013). "Kachin Rebels Cling to Last Stronghold amid Burmese Army's Deadly Barrage." January 25. http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/jan/25/kachin-rebels-face-onslaught-burma [July 31, 2017].</p>	

Karenni (Red Karens) (77512000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1948-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1

<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Karenni (Kayah)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1948-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1948-2005: independence claim] [2006-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a switch from an independence claim to a claim for autonomy within Myanmar. No evidence could be found suggesting that the claim has again radicalized in the period 2013-2017. During a meeting in November 2015, the “Karenni Constitution” was presented by the KNPP. According to the Myanmar Times (2015), “the document’s main focus is pushing for federalism and self-determination for ethnic people.” A continuation of the claim for autonomy within Myanmar hence seems justified. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>The Myanmar Times (2015). “KNPP-backed conference hits the road in Kayah.” http://www.mmmtimes.com/index.php/in-depth/17833-knpp-backed-conference-hits-the-road-in-kayah.html [July 31, 2017].</p>	

Kayin (Karens) (77506000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1948-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Karens
<i>SDM activity</i>	1948-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1948-1988: independence claim] [1989-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy from 1989 onwards, after the Karen National Union (KNU) and its armed branch, the Karen National Liberation Army (KNLA), had been fighting for independence for 40 years from 1948 until 1988. The claim for autonomy within a federalized Myanmar state has continued after 2012, as a recent official KNU document illustrates (KNU 2015: 9). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Karen National Union (2015). “Land Policy.” https://www.tni.org/files/article-downloads/knu_land_policy_eng.pdf [July 31, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Mons (77507000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1948-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Mons
<i>SDM activity</i>	1948-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1948-1958: independence claim] [1959-1974: autonomy claim] [1975-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes radicalization of the claim from autonomy to independence in 1975. Since no evidence could be found suggesting a de-radicalization or a termination of the claim in the period 2013-2017, the independence claim is continued. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Muslim Arakanese (77508000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1948-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Rohingyas (Arakanese)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1948-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1948-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for independence throughout. No evidence could be found suggesting that this has changed in recent years. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Shan (77509000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1948-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Shan
<i>SDM activity</i>	1948-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1948-1962: autonomy claim][1963-2012: independence claim]
<p>SDM codes a claim for independence from 1963 onwards. The coding of this claim continued also after the Shan movement split into different factions. No evidence could be found suggesting that the claim has de-radicalized in recent years. While the Shan State Army-South (SSA-South) has signed a ceasefire in 2015, fighting between the Shan State Army-North (SSA-North) and government troops has since intensified. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Wa (77510000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1948-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Wa
<i>SDM activity</i>	1972-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1972-1989: independence claim] [1990-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy as of 1990, after the United Wa State Party signed a ceasefire agreement with the military junta. No evidence of an escalation or a termination of that claim could be found. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Zomis (Chin) (77511000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1948-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Zomi (Chin)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1988-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1988-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy for the entire period of separatist activity, with the Chin National Army and the Chin National Front seeking to secure the self-determination of the Chin people and autonomy for a Chin state within a federated Union of Myanmar (Minorities at Risk Project). This demand has continued beyond 2012. In 2016, when the new leaders of the Chin National Front were elected at the party congress, the party repeated its goal of “building a federal union with democracy, equality and self-determination through political dialogue” (UNPO 2016). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization (2016). “Chin: New CNF Leadership Elected.” http://unpo.org/article/18918 [July 31, 2017].</p>	

NAMIBIA

Baster (56501000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1990-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Basters
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-1992: independence claim; 1993-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for independence only in the first three years of movement activity (1990-1992). After that, a moderation of the claim took place and autonomy has remained the dominant claim since. In 2012, a UNPO declaration reaffirmed the demand for autonomy and in 2013, the head of the traditional leadership body of the Basters expressed grievances regarding the government's refusal to grant the Basters the right to self-determination and the registration of Rehoboth as commercial land. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization (UNPO) (2015). "Rehoboth Basters." http://unpo.org/members/7881 [July 31, 2017].</p> <p>Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization (UNPO) (2012). "UNPO General Assembly Resolution on the Basters, 30 November 2012." http://www.rehobothbasters.org/reportdetails.php?id=755&cat=4 [July 31, 2017].</p>	

Basubia (56502000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1990-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	East Caprivians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes an umbrella group ('East Caprivians'), whereas EPR argues that there are different ethnic groups within the region with different political relevance. Of these groups, EPR codes two, the Mafwe and the Basubia. Since most sources simply speak of Caprivian mobilization for secession (see e.g. Minahan 2002) and the Caprivian movement claims to represent all Caprivians (Forrest 2000: 102), SDM2EPR matches the SDM movement 'East Caprivians' to both the Mafwe and the Basubia. Hence both groups are coded as separatist from 1990 onwards. Separatist activity started with the formation of the United Democratic Party (UDP) in 1989, while Namibia was still part of South Africa. The UDP advocated Caprivi secession (UDP 2005). Massó Guijarro (2013) also describes the establishment of an independent East Caprivian state as the primary goal of the movement. The Caprivi Liberation Army (CLA), which emerged in the mid-1990s and virtually disappeared in the early 2000s, is also described as a "secessionist movement" (Forrest 2004: 176). The UDP was banned in 2006, but exiled members continue to advocate secession. [1990-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Forrest, Joshua B. (2000). "Democracy and Development in Post-Independence Namibia." In: York Bradshaw and Stephen N. Ndegwa (eds.), <i>The Uncertain Promise of Southern Africa</i>, pp. 94-114. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.</p> <p>Forrest, Joshua (2004). <i>Subnationalism in Africa: Ethnicity, alliances, and politics</i>. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.</p>	

Massó Guijarro, E. (2013). “An Independent Caprivi: A Madness of the Few, a Partial Collective Yearning or a Realistic Possibility? Citizen Perspectives on Caprivian Secession. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 39(2): 337-352.

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

United Democratic Party (2005). “Caprivi Zipfel: The Controversial strip – Part I.”
<http://www.caprivifreedom.com/history.i?cmd=view&hid=23> [August 25, 2017].

Mafwe (56507000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1990-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	East Caprivians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset

The SDM dataset codes an umbrella group (‘East Caprivians’), whereas EPR argues that there are different ethnic groups within the region with different political relevance. Of these groups, EPR codes two, the Mafwe and the Basubia. Since most sources simply speak of Caprivian mobilization for secession (see e.g. Minahan 2002) and the Caprivian movement claims to represent all Caprivians (Forrest 2000: 102), SDM2EPR matches the SDM movement ‘East Caprivians’ to both the Mafwe and the Basubia. Hence both groups are coded as separatist from 1990 onwards. Separatist activity started with the formation of the United Democratic Party (UDP) in 1989, while Namibia was still part of South Africa. The UDP advocated Caprivi secession (UDP 2005). Massó Guijarro (2013) also describes the establishment of an independent East Caprivian state as the primary goal of the movement. The Caprivi Liberation Army (CLA), which emerged in the mid-1990s and virtually disappeared in the early 2000s, is also described as a “secessionist movement” (Forrest 2004: 176). The UDP was banned in 2006, but exiled members continue to advocate secession. [1990-2017: independence claim]

Sources

Forrest, Joshua B. (2000). "Democracy and Development in Post-Independence Namibia." In: York Bradshaw and Stephen N. Ndegwa (eds.), *The Uncertain Promise of Southern Africa*, pp. 94-114. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Forrest, Joshua (2004). *Subnationalism in Africa: Ethnicity, alliances, and politics*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Massó Guijarro, E. (2013). “An Independent Caprivi: A Madness of the Few, a Partial Collective Yearning or a Realistic Possibility? Citizen Perspectives on Caprivian Secession. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 39(2): 337-352.

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

United Democratic Party (2005). “Caprivi Zipfel: The Controversial strip – Part I.”
<http://www.caprivifreedom.com/history.i?cmd=view&hid=23> [August 25, 2017].

NEPAL

Adibasi Janajati (79002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	n:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Limbus; Other Adivasis/Janajatis; Rais
<i>SDM activity</i>	Limbus: 1986-2012 (ongoing); Other Adivasis/Janajatis: 1990-2012 (ongoing); Rais: 1992-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	Limbus: [1986-2012: autonomy claim]; Other Adivasis/Janajatis: [1992-2012: autonomy claim]; Rais: [1992-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes three Adivasi groups in Nepal: the Rais, the Limbus, and the ‘Other Adivasis/Janajatis’, which in combination are congruent with the EPR umbrella group ‘Adibasi Janajati’. The start of separatist activity for the latter is coded in 1986, which is the earliest evidence of separatist activity of one of the three groups in the SDM dataset. Since regional autonomy has been the dominant claim of all three groups in the SDM dataset, this claim is also coded for the EPR umbrella group. There is no evidence that this claim has ended or has been altered in any way since the assessment of Lawoti (2013: 200), which is why the code for autonomy is continued for the period 2013-2017. [1986-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Lawoti, Mahendra (2013). “Dynamics of Mobilization: Varied Trajectories of Dalit, Indigenous Nationalities and Madhesi Movements.” In: Mahendra Lawoti, and Susan Hangen (eds.), <i>Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict in Nepal. Ethnic Mobilization after 1990</i>, 193-225. Oxford: Routledge.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Madhesi (79005000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Madhesi (Terai People)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1951-1959; 1985-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1951-1959, 1985-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy throughout both periods of activity. According to Miklian (2012), there were talks about secession towards the end of the period covered by the SDM dataset. However, since these were minority views, autonomy is coded as the dominant claim until 2012. No evidence could be found that secession has gained majority support since. Following the introduction of the new constitution in 2015, Madhesi organizations reiterated their demand for increased autonomy and a larger province (Al Jazeera 2016; Nationalia 2015). Calls for secession have continued (Hindustan Times 2016), but seem to be made by a minority only. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Aljazeera (2016). “Nepal's ethnic Madhesi fight for dignity and equality” http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2016/03/nepal-ethnic-madhesi-fight-dignity-equality-tarai-160318100945995.html [July 31, 2017].</p> <p>Hindustan Times (2016). “‘Hrithik Roshan riots’ turned me from Nepali to Madhesi, says CK Raut.” http://www.hindustantimes.com/world/hrithik-roshan-riots-turned-me-from-nepali-to-madhesi-says-madhes-activist-ck-raut/story-RfRxOu0zKyPotJRvfb6qL.html [July 31, 2017].</p>	

Miklian, Jason (2012). "Nepal's Terai: Constructing an Ethnic Conflict."

<http://www.fredsforbundet.no/fredsiniativ/south-asia-peace-initiativ/2-sider/25-nepal-s-terai-constructing-an-ethnic-conflict.html> [July 31, 2017].

Nationalia (2015). "Disagreement over Terai autonomy remains after two months in Nepal."

<http://www.nationalia.info/new/10663/disagreement-over-terai-autonomy-remains-after-two-months-in-nepal> [July 31, 2017].

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

NEW ZEALAND

Maori (92001000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Maoris
<i>SDM activity</i>	1962-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes the start of Maori separatist activity in 1962, when the Maori Congress was established. Regional autonomy has been the dominant claim since. In 1975, Maori activists organized a land march, calling for the return of their lands and access to natural resources (Hewitt and Cheetham 2000: 185). According to Minorities at Risk, the essential concern of Maori are “the protection of Maori lands and the enforcement of land treaties.” A recent paper by Hill (2015) confirms that that the claim for land and autonomy continues to be the dominating issue. [1962-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). <i>Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements</i>. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.</p> <p>Hill, Richard S. (2016). New Zealand Maori: The quest for indigenous autonomy. <i>Ethnopolitics</i> 15(1): 144-165.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

NICARAGUA

Miskitos (9303000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Miskitos
<i>SDM activity</i>	1974-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>Miskito interests were represented by three organizations: The Alliance for the Progress of Miskitos and Sumus (ALPROMISU), Mascot, Rama, and Sandinista United (MISURASATA), and Yapti Masrika Nani - Descendants of Mother Earth (YATAMA). ALPROMISU was created in 1974 and demanded the recognition of Miskito communal land (Baracco 2011: 119). In 1979, ALPROMISU was replaced by MISURASATA. Over 80 percent Miskito, MISURASATA supported claims for indigenous communal land grants and the promotion of language and culture (Plan of Action 1981). MISURASATA also wanted to take over administrative functions in the governmental department established to govern the Atlantic coast (Baracco 2011: 126). These first years are coded with a claim for regional autonomy. In 1981, when the Sandinista government claimed to have discovered a CIA plot to create an independent Miskito state ("Red Christmas"), MISURASATA was banned and Miskito villages in the Coco river region were destroyed and its inhabitants resettled. The MISURASATA leadership and many of its followers fled to Honduras launching attacks with the ultimate goal to overthrow the Sandinista government (Sollis 1989: 507). The leadership of the movement soon split over the question of autonomy or independence, with the independence faction favoring the creation of an English-speaking state (Minahan 2002: 1265). The evidence for this period is indeed ambiguous regarding the dominant claim. Baracco (2011: 151) also mentions both autonomy and independence as goals of MISURASATA. In accordance with the codebook, the more extreme claim is coded from 1982 onwards (first of January rule). The ceasefire in 1985, the return of refugees, the release of MISURASATA prisoners and the replacement of Sandanista officials in the Atlantic region with Miskitos, seems to have led to a de-radicalization of the Miskito claim. According to Minorities at Risk, MISURASATA began negotiating for regional autonomy. An agreement was reached with the Statute of Autonomy for the Atlantic Coast Regions in 1987. In 1987, YATAMA was founded as a successor to MISURASATA. YATAMA "strives for further autonomy and protection of Indian cultural and land rights". Following the first of January rule, a claim for regional autonomy is coded from 1986 onwards. Lacking information that would suggest a more radical claim, this coding is continued. Claims for independence reemerged and were voiced most loudly in 2009, when the indigenous council of elders officially declared the secession of the Atlantic coast from Nicaragua (BBC 2009). However, this seems to be a minority only, with the majority of Miskitos still favoring autonomy (Rogers 2009). The claim for land rights and self-determination has continued beyond 2012 (New York Times 2016). [1974-1981: autonomy claim][1982-1985: independence claim][1986-2017: autonomy claim]</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>Baracco, Luciano (2011). "From Developmentalism to Autonomy: The Sandinista Revolution and the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua." In: Baracco, Luciano (ed.), <i>National integration and contested autonomy: the Caribbean coast of Nicaragua</i>, p. 117-146. New York: Algora Publishing.</p> <p>BBC (2009). "Nicaragua's Miskitos seek independence." http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/8181209.stm [August 5, 2017].</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>New York Times (2016). "Nicaragua Dispute Over Indigenous Land Erupts in Wave of Killings." https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/17/world/americas/nicaragua-dispute-over-indigenous-land-erupts-in-wave-of-killings.html [August 5, 2017].</p> <p>Rogers, Tim (2009). "Mosquito Coast Bites Nicaragua's Ortega." http://content.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1894376,00.html [August 5, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Sollis, Peter (1989). The Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua: Development and Autonomy. *Journal of Latin American Studies* 21(3): 481-520.

Sumus (9305000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Sumos (Mayangnas)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1974-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The start of Sumus separatist activity is coded in 1974 with the establishment of the Sumu Kalpapakna Wahaini Lani (SUKAWALA). SUKAWALA defends indigenous land rights and protests the lack of initiative and action on the titling of the Indigenous Sumu communities' territories. The organization furthermore demands recognition of the rights of use, administer, and manage the traditional lands and natural resources, by means of their boundary, demarcation and titling (Greer 2010). Further evidence supporting a claim for land rights and regional autonomy can be found in Greer (2014: 118) or Larson and Lewis-Mendoza (2012). [1974-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Greer, Nan M., Noe Coleman, and Linda Kosen (2010). "The Independent and Self-Determination Struggle for Land Tenture of Ancestral Lands by the Bawihka-Mayangna." <i>American Anthropology Association Annual Meeting</i>.</p> <p>Greer, Nan Marie (2014). "The Mayangna Resolve to save the rainforest, their homelands." In: Leonard, Liam and Sya B. Kedzior (eds.), <i>Occupy the earth: Global environmental movements</i>, p. 117-136. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.</p> <p>Larson, Anne and Jadder Lewis-Mendoza (2012). "Decentralisation and devolution in Nicaragua's North Atlantic autonomous region: Natural resources and indigenous peoples' rights." <i>International Journal of the Commons</i> 6(2): 179-199.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

NIGER

Toubou (43605000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Toubou
<i>SDM activity</i>	1994-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1994-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for independence throughout. No evidence could be found suggesting that the claim has since ended or that it has been changed significantly. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Tuareg (43606000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Tuaregs
<i>SDM activity</i>	1988-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1988-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy for the entire period of separatist activity. Since this coding is based on very recent sources, among which Taylor (2014: 11), and since no evidence could be found suggesting a change to that claim or the termination of the movement, autonomy is also coded as the dominant claim for the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Taylor, Christian (2014). “Unpacking Democratic Transitions: The Case of Niger.” http://www.democracylab.uwo.ca/Archives/2013__2014_country_research/niger/Niger%20Final%20Report.pdf [August 3, 2017].</p>	

NIGERIA

Hausa-Fulani and Muslim Middle Belt (47501000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Hausa and Fulani
<i>SDM activity</i>	1966; 1994-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1966: independence claim] [1994-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes two periods of separatist activity. The first one was the year 1966, when the Hausa-Fulani called for an independent Republic of Hausa (Minahan 2002: 716). The second period of activity started with the founding of the Arewa People's Congress (APC) in 1994. The SDM dataset codes independence as the dominant claim for the entire second period of activity, as the APC is described as secessionist by various sources (see e.g. Nwanesi 2008: 552; Adibe 2015). According to the SDM dataset, the last evidence of separatist activity was in 2006, which – according to the 10 years of inactivity rule – results in the movement to be coded as terminated in 2016. For the ten years between 2006 and 2016, the independence claim is continued. [2013-2016: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Adibe, Jideofor (2015). "Biafra and the new secessionist threat." https://www.dailytrust.com.ng/news/columns/biafra-and-the-new-secessionist-threat/117921.html [August 3, 2017].</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Nwanesi, Peter (2008). "Nigeria." In: DeRouen, Karl R., and Paul Bellamy (eds.), <i>International Security and the United States: An Encyclopedia</i>. Vol. 2., p. 542-555. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). <i>Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set</i>.</p>	

Igbo (47502000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Ibos (Biafrans)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1966-1970; 1999-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1966-1970: independence claim] [1999-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes two periods of separatist activity. In the first period (1966-1970) the dominant claim was clearly independence, with the Eastern Region Consultative Assembly voting to secede from Nigeria and Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu, the military governor of the Eastern Region, declaring the independence of Biafra on May 30, 1967 (Minahan 2002: 765). The second period of activity started with the founding of the Movement for the Actualization of the Sovereign State of Biafra (MASSOB) in 1999, which demands a "separate country for the Igbo people of south-eastern Nigeria" (BBC 2007). The secessionist movement has gained additional support since 2012, as demonstrations and violence in 2015 illustrate (International Crisis Group 2015). [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>BBC (2007). "Reopening Nigeria's civil war wounds." http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6657259.stm [August 4, 2017].</p> <p>International Crisis Group (2015). "Nigeria's Biafran Separatist Upsurge." http://blog.crisisgroup.org/africa/nigeria/2015/12/04/nigerias-biafran-separatist-upsurge/ [August 4,</p>	

2017].

Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Ijaw (47503000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Ijaw
<i>SDM activity</i>	1966; 1992-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1966: independence claim] [1992-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes two periods of separatist activity. The first one was the year 1966, when the independent Niger Delta People's Republic was proclaimed (Ikein et al. 2008: 265). The dominant claim in the second period of activity was autonomy within Nigeria, as represented by the influential Movement for the Survival of the Ijaw Ethnic Nationality (MOSIEN), the Chikoko Movement, and the Kaiama Declaration of 1998. Evidence about recent activities of MOSIEN or the Chikoko Movement are scarce. According to the SDM dataset, the last evidence of separatist activity was in 2006, which – according to the 10 years of inactivity rule – results in the movement to be coded as terminated in 2016. For the ten years between 2006 and 2016, the autonomy claim is continued. [2013-2016: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Ikein, Augustine, Diepreye Alamieyeseigha, and Steve Azaiki (2008). <i>Oil, Democracy, and the Promise of True Federalism in Nigeria</i>. Lanham: University Press of America.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Ogoni (47504000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Ogoni
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy from 1990 until 1999 and a claim for sub-state secession from 2000 until 2012. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The autonomy claim was reiterated in 2012, when the president of MOSOP, Goodluck Diigbo, proclaimed “self-determination or self-government of the Ogoni people within Nigeria” (Premium Times 2012). No evidence could be found suggesting that the autonomy claim has ended or has been altered significantly since 2012. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Premium Times (2012). “Nigeria not aware of Ogoni declaration, minister’s aide says.” http://www.premiumtimesng.com/news/93861-nigeria-not-aware-of-ogoni-declaration-ministers-aide-says.html [August 10, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Tiv (47505000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Tiv
<i>SDM activity</i>	1960-1976
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1960-1976: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an end to the Tiv movement in 1976. There is no evidence that the separatist movement has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Yoruba (47506000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Yorubas
<i>SDM activity</i>	1967-1977; 1994-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1967-1977: independence claim][1994-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes two periods of separatist activity. Independence was the dominant claim during the first period (Minahan 2002: 2082) and autonomy within Nigeria during the second (Human Rights Watch 2003: 5, Minahan 2002: 2083). As of 2012, the Odua People's Congress (OPC) was still active, notably to prevent Boko Haram from taking over Yorubaland (Channels TV 2012), but also to advocate a restructuring of the federation and "devolution of power" (Sowole 2015). Autonomy is thus continued to be coded as the dominant claim. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Channels TV (2012). "OPC Warns Boko Haram to Stay Away from Yorubaland." June 24. http://www.channelstv.com/home/2012/06/24/opc-warns-boko-haram-to-stay-away-from-yorubaland/ [August 4, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Sowole, James (2015). "Nigeria: Yoruba Leaders Advocate Constitutional Reforms to Address Separatist Agitation." http://allafrica.com/stories/201512090846.html [August 4, 2017].</p>	

PAKISTAN

Baluchis (77001000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1947-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Baluchis
<i>SDM activity</i>	1947-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1947-2012: independence claim]
<p>According to the SDM dataset, there have been claims for both autonomy within Pakistan and outright independence. In line with the codebook, the more extreme claim is coded throughout. According to Ahmad (2014) the independence movement has become increasingly popular in recent years. This is confirmed by Zurutuza (2015), who cites Balochistan analyst Malik Siraj Akbar, that “they want a free country, nor provincial autonomy”. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Ahmad, Mahvish (2014). “Home Front. The Changing Face of Balochistan’s Separatist Insurgency.” http://www.caravanmagazine.in/reportage/home-front?page=0,4 [August 4, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Zurutuza, Karlos (2015). “Understanding Pakistan’s Baloch Insurgency.” http://thediplomat.com/2015/06/cracking-pakistans-baloch-insurgency/ [August 4, 2017].</p>	

Bengali (77002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1947-1971
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Bengalis
<i>SDM activity</i>	1949-1971
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1949-1971: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy throughout. The official claim of the Awami League only changed to independence in 1971. But since the SDM dataset codes the situation on January 1st, the Bengali movement is coded as seeking regional autonomy throughout. The claim of the Bengali ended with the secession of Bangladesh in 1971, hence no update is required.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Pashtuns (77004000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1947-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Pashtuns (Pathans)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1947-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1947: independence claim] [1948-2012: autonomy claim]

The SDM dataset codes an independence claim in the first year of activity (1947) and an autonomy claim thereafter. The autonomy coding is substantiated by numerous sources (Ghufar 2009: 1098; Mushtaq 2009: 283; Khan 2003: 12-13, Minahan 2002: 1542, Minorities at Risk) and is also confirmed by a more recent study by Siddique (2014: 218), who argues that Pashtun demands “never went beyond calling for provincial autonomy within a federal Pakistan.” [2013-2017: autonomy claim]

Sources

Ghufar, Nasreen (2009). “Pushtun Ethnonationalism and the Taliban Insurgency in the North West Frontier Province of Pakistan.” *Asian Survey* 49(6): 1092-1114.

Khan, Adeel (2003). “Pashtun Ethnic Nationalism: From Separation to Integration.” *Asian Ethnicity* 4(1). <http://www.khyber.org/publications/pdf/ethniconationalism.pdf> [August 5, 2017].

Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Mushtaq, Muhammad (2009). “Managing Ethnic Diversity and Federalism in Pakistan.” *European Journal of Scientific Research* 33(2): 279-294.

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Siddique, Abubakar (2014). *The Pashtun Question: The Unresolved Key to the Future of Pakistan and Afghanistan*. London: Hurst & Company Limited.

Sindhi (77006000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1947-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Sindhis
<i>SDM activity</i>	1967-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1967-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy throughout, noting that there were also some radical minority groups (such as the Jeay Sindh Qaumi Mahaz and the Sindh National Party) that agitate for independence. The latter have not gained significantly more support in the period 2013-2017. This is also illustrated by the 2013 general election, where only the Sindh United Party and the Sindh Taraqqi Pasand Party gained votes. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p>	
<h4>Sources</h4> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

PANAMA

Choco (Embera-Wounan) (9505000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Embera-Wounaan
<i>SDM activity</i>	1968-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes a start to separatist activity with the establishment of the Embera-Wounaan Congress in 1968. According to Minorities at Risk, the Choco are mostly interested in the protection of their ancestral lands and have demanded more reserves to protect their traditional land from settlers. This demand has continued, as “Wounaan and Emberá communities [...] still seek official recognition of their collective lands” (Pittman 2012). [1968-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Pittman, Veronique (2012). “Indigenous Lands to Finally Receive Titles in Panama.” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/veronique-pittman/indigenous-lands-to-final_b_1595516.html [August 5, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Kuna (9504000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Kuna
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>According to Foss (2012: 5, 40, 54, 98) the Kuna started demanding territorial autonomy from 1925 onwards and have been doing so since. Minorities at Risk and Minority Rights Group International confirm the claim for land rights and increased autonomy within Panama. There is no evidence that this claim has ended or been altered in any way since the assessment of Foss (2012), which is why autonomy is coded as the dominant claim also for the period 2013-2017. [1946-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Foss, Sarah (2012). <i>Ahora todos somos Panameños: Kuna Identity and Panamanian Nationalism under the Torrijos Regime, 1968-1981</i>. Master thesis, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Minority Rights Group International. <i>World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples</i>. http://minorityrights.org/minorities/kuna/ [August 5, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Ngobe-Bugle (9503000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Ngobe-Bugle
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>According to the SDM dataset, separatist activity started in 1940 with the foundation of the Ngobe-Bugle Congress (Thorne 2004: 322). The Ngobe-Buglé movement has since been demanding autonomy and the protection of their land and culture (Minority Rights Group International). This is confirmed by Cansari and Gausset (2013: 8), who state that the “Ngäbe-Buglé movement is [...] about the autonomy of the Indigenous territory and the protection of Indigenous culture.” [1965-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Cansari, Rogelio and Quentin Gausset (2013). “Along the Road: The Ngäbe-Buglé Struggle to Protect Environmental Resources in Panama.” <i>The International Indigenous Policy Journal</i> 4(3): 1-15.</p> <p>Minority Rights Group International. <i>World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples</i>. http://minorityrights.org/minorities/guaymi-ngobe-bugle/ [August 5, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Bougainvilleans (91002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1975-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Bougainvilleans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1975-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1975-2012: independence claim]
<p>No evidence could be found suggesting a significant change in the type of claim in the period 2013-2017. The Autonomous Bougainville Government continues to demand the independence referendum scheduled to take place in 2019 (The Diplomat 2017, The Economist 2017). [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>The Diplomat (2017). “Will Bougainville Hold Its Independence Referendum?” https://thediplomat.com/2017/09/will-bougainville-hold-its-independence-referendum/ [December 12, 2017].</p> <p>The Economist (2017). Votes loom on the future of New Caledonia and Bougainville.” https://www.economist.com/news/asia/21720327-first-pacific-island-may-choose-stay-part-france-second-could-split-papua [December 12, 2017].</p>	

PARAGUAY

Tupi-Guaraní and other indigenous groups (15005000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Indigenous Peoples
<i>SDM activity</i>	1975-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>According to Minorities at Risk, the indigenous peoples of Paraguay seek “to establish a system of “autogestion”, in which the indigenous groups would represent their own interests and push their own demands”. Tierra Viva, according to the SDM dataset the most important indigenous organization in Paraguay, continues to be active (OHCHR 2016), which is why the coding of autonomy is continued. [1975-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (2016). “Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination discusses situation in Paraguay, South Africa and Ukraine with non-governmental organizations.” http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=20349 [August 5, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

PERU

Indigenous peoples of the Amazon (13505000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Lowland Indigenous Peoples
<i>SDM activity</i>	1980-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>According to Minorities at Risk, the major grievances of the lowland indigenous peoples are territorial autonomy and the protection from resource development that damages their local environment and communities. This is confirmed by Rénique (2007) and Cabitza (2012). The movement has remained active beyond 2012 (Collins 2016, Lööv and Da Silva 2017), without evidence of a radicalization of the claim. [1980-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Cabitza, Mattia (2012). “Peru’s Indigenous People: From García to Humala Their Battle Goes on.” <i>The Guardian</i>. June 5, sec. Global Development. http://www.theguardian.com/global-development/poverty-matters/2012/jun/05/peru-indigenous-people-garcia-humala [August 5, 2017].</p> <p>Collins, Dan (2016). “Amazonians call on leaders to heed link between land rights and climate change.” November 4. sec. Global Development. https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2016/nov/04/amazonians-call-on-leaders-to-heed-link-land-rights-and-climate-change-rainforest-lima-summit [August 5, 2017].</p> <p>Lööv, Jacob Balzani and Chantal Da Silva (2017). “Peru’s first autonomous Indigenous government wins major victory taking on oil companies.” May 4. http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/peru-indigenous-tribe-amazon-protect-land-oil-drilling-land-a7716321.html [August 5, 2017].</p> <p>Rénique, Gerardo (2007). “Against the Law of the Jungle: Peru’s Amazonian Uprising.” https://nacla.org/article/against-law-jungle-peru%E2%80%99s-amazonian-uprising [August 5, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Indigenous peoples of the Andes (13501000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	n:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Quechua-Aymara
<i>SDM activity</i>	2002-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset only codes the Quechuas and Aymaras. However, since they make up the dominant share of the indigenous peoples of the Andes, SDM2EPR matches them to the EPR group ‘Indigenous peoples of the Andes’. The SDM dataset pegs the beginning of separatist activity in 2002, with the establishment of the ‘Movimiento por la Autonomía Regional Quechua y Aymara’ (MARQA). MARQA demands regional autonomy (point 10: Autonomía Regional). Increased autonomy was also the goal of Hernán Fuentes, Puno’s regional president, when he demanded an autonomy referendum and unilaterally changed the region’s name into ‘Quechua and Aymara Autonomous Federal Region’ in early 2009 (Peruvian Times 2009). Fuentes demanded “more autonomy and greater decentralization from the central government in administrative, judicial, financial and legislative matters, and not a clean break from the rest of the country” (Peruvian Times 2008). Minority Rights Group International also mentions collective land rights as the major demand of indigenous organizations in Peru. The SDM dataset could not find clear-cut evidence of organized separatist activity beyond 2009 but codes the movement as ongoing based on the ten years of inactivity rule. An end of the claim would hence only be coded in 2019. [2002-2017: autonomy claim]</p>	

Sources

Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples*.
<http://www.minorityrights.org/1954/peru/aymara-and-highland-quechua.html> [August 5, 2017].

Movimiento por la Autonomia Regional Quechua y Aymara (MARQA) (2006). “MARQA por Puno.”
<http://www.infogob.com.pe/plangobierno/erm2006/200101011030B.DOC> [August 5, 2017].

Peruvian Times (2008). “Puno’s Regional President Pushes Referendums for more Independence from Peru’s Central Government.” May 7. <http://www.peruviantimes.com/07/punos-regional-president-pushes-referendums-for-more-independence-from-perus-central-government/359/> [August 5, 2017].

Peruvian Times (2009). “Puno Region Renamed “Quechua and Aymara Autonomous Federal Region.”
<http://www.peruviantimes.com/16/puno-region-renamed-%E2%80%9CQuecha-and-aymara-autonomous-federal-region%E2%80%9D-move-irritates-central-government-and-deemed-unconstitutional-by-legislators/1365/> [August 5, 2017].

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

PHILIPPINES

Indigenous (84002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1987-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	n:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Igorots (Cordillerans)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1984-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1984-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset only codes the Igorots (Cordillerans), who make up somewhat less than a third of the umbrella EPR group ('Indigenous'). Nevertheless, as with other indigenous groupings, SDM2EPR codes the entire EPR indigenous group as separatist. Based on Walter (2009) and Ferrer (2005: 122), regional autonomy is coded as the dominant claim of the Igorots throughout. The Cordillera Peoples Alliance (CPA) continues to be active and continues "its awareness, organizing, and advocacy towards future realization of genuine regional autonomy" (Cordillera Peoples Alliance 2014). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Cordillera Peoples Alliance (2014). "On the People's Cordillera Day and Genuine Regional Autonomy." https://cpaphils.wordpress.com/2014/07/12/on-the-peoples-cordillera-day-and-genuine-regional-autonomy/ [August 5, 2017].</p>	

Moro (84003000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Moros
<i>SDM activity</i>	1968-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1968-1976: independence claim] [1977-1998: autonomy claim] [1999-2010: independence claim] [2011-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an autonomy claim from 2011 onwards, after the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) dropped its independence claim (Teves 2010). No evidence could be found suggesting a renewed radicalization of the claim after 2012. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Teves, Oliver (2010). "Philippine Muslim Rebels Drop Independence Demand." <i>Associated Press</i>. September 23. https://web.archive.org/web/20110628201524/http://abcnews.go.com/International/wireStory?id=11707054 [August 5, 2017].</p>	

POLAND

Germans (29002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Silesians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes regional autonomy as the dominant claim of the Germans/Silesians in Poland. This claim is represented by the Silesian Autonomy Movement ('Ruch Autonomii Śląska' –RAS). RAS continued to be active and separatist beyond 2012 and won 7.2% of the votes and four seats in the Silesian local parliament in the local elections of 2014. This makes it the strongest representative of the Silesian self-determination movement. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

ROMANIA

Hungarians (36002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Magyars (Hungarians)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for regional autonomy for the entire period of separatist activity, with the Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania (DUHR), the primary representative of the Hungarian movement for self-determination in Romania, advocating the restoration of an autonomous Hungarian region within Romania (Bochsler and Szöcsik 2013, Deets and Stroschein 2005, Minorities at Risk). The DUHR continues to be active (6.9% of the votes in the 2016 Romanian legislative election) and continues to demand regional autonomy. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Bochsler, Daniel and Edina Szöcsik (2013). "The Forbidden Fruit of Federalism: Evidence from Romania and Slovakia." <i>West European Politics</i> 36(2): 426-446.</p> <p>Deets, Stephen and Sherrill Stroschein (2005). "Dilemmas of autonomy and liberal pluralism: examples involving Hungarians in Central Europe." <i>Nations and Nationalism</i> 11(2): 285-305.</p> <p>Romániai Magyar Demokrata Szövetség (2009). "Goals of the Program of the DAHR." http://archivum.rmdsz.ro/aboutus.php [August 5, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

RUSSIA

Abkhaz (36546000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1991
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Abkhaz
<i>SDM activity</i>	1977-1978; 1988-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1977-1978, 1988-1991: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession throughout both periods of separatist activity. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The movement is coded as terminated in Russia/USSR with the independence of Georgia in 1991 (see Abkhaz under Georgia for continuation of the Abkhaz claim).</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Adyghe (36540000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Adyghe
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-1992: autonomy claim; 1993-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1991 until 1992 and a claim for autonomy thereafter. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The Circassian Congress has continued to defend the sovereignty of the Adyghe Republic after 2012 and has continued to seek “autonomy as a united republic rather than outright separation from Russia” (Stratfor 2015). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Stratfor (2015). “A Caucasus Ethnic Group Raises Concerns in Moscow.” https://worldview.stratfor.com/analysis/caucasus-ethnic-group-raises-concerns-moscow [August 5, 2017].</p>	

Altai (36547000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Altaians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-2000
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-2000: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for regional autonomy from 1991 until 1992 and again from 1993 until 2000. In between, sub-state secession is coded as the dominant claim. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for</p>	

sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The SDM dataset codes an end to the Altai movement in 2000, following the ten-year rule. There is no evidence that the separatist movement has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.

Sources

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Armenians (36508000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Armenians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1966-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1966-1987: independence claim] [1988-1990: autonomy claim] [1991: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for independence from 1966 until 1987 and again in 1991. In between, sub-state secession is coded as the dominant claim. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the SDM dataset only codes an Armenian claim for increased self-determination in Georgia and Azerbaijan, but no longer in Russia. An Armenian claim in Russia has also not reemerged in the years 2013-2017.</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Avars (36523000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Avars
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2000
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-2000: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession for the entire period of separatist activity. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The SDM dataset codes an end to the Avar claim when the Avar's Shamil national movement disbanded in 2000. There is no evidence that the separatist movement has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Azerbaijanis (36509000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	2006-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1

<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Azerbaijanis
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989: autonomy claim; 1990-1991: independence claim]
The separatist claim ended with the independence of Azerbaijan in 1991.	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Balkars (36543000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Balkars
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-2012: autonomy claim]
The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1989 until 1991 and again from 1997 until 2012. In between, regional autonomy is coded as the dominant claim. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The last evidence of separatist activity, according to the SDM dataset, were protests in 2009 and 2013. No evidence of separatist activity beyond 2013 could be found. However, since there is also no evidence of a termination of the Balkar movement, the autonomy claim is continued for the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Bashkirs (36507000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Bashkir
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-2012: autonomy claim]
The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1989 until 1991 and a claim for autonomy thereafter. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. SDM also mentions news reports indicating that the movement for greater Bashkir autonomy has been consistently active up until 2013. No evidence of separatist activity beyond 2013 could be found. However, since there is also no evidence of termination of the movement, the autonomy claim is continued for the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Buryats (36532000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Buryats
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-1993: autonomy claim; 1994-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1990 until 1993 and a claim for autonomy thereafter. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The last evidence of separatist activity, according to the SDM dataset, were protests in 2008, after two of the three titular Buryat units lost their autonomous status as they were amalgated with Irkutsk and Chita Oblast respectively (Minority Rights Group International). No evidence of significant separatist activity beyond 2008 could be found. However, since there is also no evidence of termination of the Balkar movement, the autonomy claim is continued for the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minority Rights Group International. <i>World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups</i>. http://minorityrights.org/minorities/buryats/ [August 5, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Byelorussians (36504000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1991
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Belarussians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1987-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1987-1991: autonomy claim]
<p>The claim ended with the independence of Belarus in 1991.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Chechens (36516000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Chechens
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-1991: autonomy claim; 1992-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1989 until 1991 and a claim for independence thereafter. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The claim for independence has continued after 2012 (with one faction agitating for an independent Chechnya and the other faction working towards the establishment of an Islamic state encompassing the whole of the North Caucasus (UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia, BBC 2015). [2013-2017: independence claim]</p>	

Sources

BBC (2015). "Chechnya profile." <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-18188085> [August 7, 2017].

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) (2016). *UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset v. 17.1*. <http://ucdp.uu.se/#/actor/367> [August 7, 2017].

Chukchi (36548000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1992-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Chukots
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2001
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-1992: autonomy claim; 1993-2001: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1990 until 1992 and a claim for autonomy thereafter. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The SDM dataset codes an end to the movement in 2001, following the ten years of inactivity rule. There is no evidence that the separatist movement has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Chuvashes (36506000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Chuvash (Chavash)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-1991: autonomy claim; 1992-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1989 until 1991 and a claim for autonomy thereafter. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The Chuvash National Congress continues to be active. No evidence of radicalization of the claim could be found. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Cherkess (36544000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Cherkess

<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>According to the SDM dataset, the Cherkess claimed sub-state secession. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The claim for sub-state secession (resp. regional autonomy) has continued beyond 2012 as “activists become more organized and more outspoken in their calls for autonomy” (Stratfor 2015). Note: SDM2EPR codes this as an n:1 scenario, as the former version of EPR coded the umbrella group Circassians which included the Cherkess and the Abaza. With the 2017 update, EPR only codes the Cherkess, making this a 1:1 scenario. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Stratfor (2015). “A Caucasus Ethnic Group Raises Concerns in Moscow.” https://worldview.stratfor.com/analysis/caucasus-ethnic-group-raises-concerns-moscow [August 11, 2017].</p>	

Crimean Tatars (36549000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1991
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Crimean Tatars
<i>SDM activity</i>	1957-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1957-1991: autonomy claim]
<p>The movement is coded as terminated in Russia/USSR with the independence of Ukraine in 1991 (see Crimean Tatars under Ukraine for continuation of the claim).</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Estonians (36524000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1991
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Estonians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-1956; 1987-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1945-1956: independence claim] [1987-1989: autonomy claim; 1990-1991: independence claim]
<p>The claim ended with the independence of Estonia in 1991.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Finns (36550000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1991
-------------------------------	-----------

<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Ingrians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-2012: independence claim]
No update is required since EPR codes the Finns as irrelevant from 1992 onwards.	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Gagauz (36551000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1991
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Gagauz
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-1991: autonomy claim]
The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy from 1989 until 1990 and a claim for sub-state secession in 1991. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The movement is coded as terminated in Russia/USSR with the independence of Moldova in 1991 (see Gagauz under Moldova for continuation of the claim).	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Georgians (36510000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Georgians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1987-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1987-1989: autonomy claim; 1990-1991: independence claim]
The separatist claim ended with the independence of Georgia in 1991.	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Germans (36517000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Volga Germans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1964-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1964-2012: autonomy claim]

The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession for the entire period of separatist activity. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for regional autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The SDM dataset could not find evidence for self-determination activity beyond 2003 but, following the ten years of inactivity rule, still codes the movement as ongoing in 2012. The lack of such evidence continued beyond 2012, which is why the movement is coded terminated in 2013. Sub-state secession (resp. regional autonomy) is also coded as the dominant claim for the remaining year. [2013: autonomy claim]

Sources

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Ingush (36533000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Ingush
<i>SDM activity</i>	1970-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1970-2007: autonomy claim][2008-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1970 until 2007 and a claim for independence thereafter. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The radicalization of the claim started with the Islamic insurgency that demanded the establishment of an Islamic Caucasus Emirate. This claim was represented by local Ingush groups, such as the Ingush Islamic Jamaats. The death and capture of some of their leaders, increasing Russian counter-insurgency operations, and contestation from the more powerful Islamic State, weakened the Islamic movement in recent years and by September 2015, the “Caucasus Emirate was described to exist only as a small scattering of militants in Dagestan, missing both leadership or a functioning organization” (UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia). However, there is not any significant evidence of a reemerging Ingush claim for autonomy as it existed before the Islamic insurgency. Independence is thus continued to be coded as the dominant claim. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) (2016). <i>UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset v. 17.1</i>. http://ucdp.uu.se/#/actor/367 [August 10, 2017].</p>	

Kabardins (36528000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Kabards
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2002
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-2002: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1991 until 2002. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The SDM dataset codes an end to the Kabardin claim in 2002, based on the ten years of inactivity rule. There is no evidence that the separatist movement has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.</p>	
<p>Sources</p>	

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Kalmyks (36553000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Kalmyks
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2008
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-2008: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession in 1990/1991 and an autonomy claim from 1992 until 2008. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The SDM dataset codes an end to the Kalmyk claim in 2008, based on the ten years of inactivity rule. There is no evidence that the separatist movement has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Karachai (36554000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Karachais
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-2011
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-2011: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1989 until 2011. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The SDM dataset codes an end to the Karachai claim in 2011, based on the ten years of inactivity rule. There is no evidence that the separatist movement has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Karakalpaks (36555000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1991
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Karakalpaks
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-1991: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1989 until 1991. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The movement is coded as terminated in Russia/USSR with the independence of Uzbekistan in 1991 (see Karakalpaks under Uzbekistan for continuation of the claim).</p>	

Sources

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Karelians (36556000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Karelians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-2012: irredentist claim]
<p>The SDM dataset was unable to identify the dominant claim and hence coded the most radical claim (irredentism). The irredentist claim is represented by the Karelian Association and ProKarelia (Minority Rights Group International). Other organizations demand the partition of Karelia or greater autonomy within Russia (Minahan 2002: 932). Since no evidence could be found that one of the three claims has become dominant in the period 2013-2017, the most extreme claim is continued to be coded. [2013-2017: irredentist claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Minority Rights Group International. <i>World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples</i>. http://minorityrights.org/minorities/karelians/ [August 10, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Kazakhs (36512000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Kazakhs
<i>SDM activity</i>	1988-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1988-1991: autonomy claim]
<p>The separatist claim ended with the independence of Kazakhstan in 1991.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Khakass (36557000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Khakass
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-1991: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an autonomy claim in 1989/1990 and a claim for sub-state secession in 1991. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former</p>	

category does not exist in EPR. The SDM dataset codes an end to separatist activity in 1991. There is no evidence that the separatist movement has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.

Sources

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Kirghis (36522000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1991
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Kyrgyz
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-1991: autonomy claim]
The separatist claim ended with the independence of Kyrgyzstan in 1991.	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Komi (36537000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Komi
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-2012: autonomy claim]
The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession in 1990/1991 and a claim for autonomy thereafter. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. No evidence could be found suggesting that the movement has ended or that the claim has been altered significantly. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Komi-Permyaks (36558000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1991
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Komi-Permyaks
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-2012: autonomy claim]
The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1989 until 2005 and a claim for autonomy thereafter. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. No update is required since EPR codes the Komi-Permyaks as irrelevant from 1992 onwards.	

Sources

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Kumyks (36534000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Kumyks
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy from 1989 until 2012. No evidence of significant activity of the movement could be found in recent years. However, there is also no evidence that Tenglik (“Equality”), the nationalist organization, dissolved. The assessment of Minority Rights Group International, according to which “[s]ome Kumyks, particularly those associated with Tenglik, continue to advocate territorial autonomy” is recent enough not to be met by the ten years of inactivity rule. Hence, the most recent claim (regional autonomy) is continued for the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>Minority Rights Group International. <i>World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples</i>. http://minorityrights.org/minorities/kumyks/ [August 10, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Latvians (36521000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1991
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Latvians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-1953; 1986-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1945-1953: independence claim][1986-1988: independence claim][1989: autonomy claim][1990-1991: independence claim]
<p>The separatist claim ended with the independence of Latvia in 1991.</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Lezgins (36535000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Lezgins
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-1991: autonomy claim][1992-2012: independence claim]

The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession in 1990/1991 and a claim for independence thereafter. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. For the period 1992-2012, the SDM dataset was unable to identify the dominant claim and hence codes the most radical claim (independence). Since the movement remains active (BBC Monitoring 2012), but neither autonomy nor independence has emerged as the dominant claim, the coding of the more radical claim is continued for 2013-2017. [2013-2017: independence claim]

Sources

BBC Monitoring (2012). "Revival of Lezgi Ethnic Group Seen as Ruining "Human" Ties with Azeris." October 23.

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Lithuanians (36513000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1991
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Lithuanians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-1953; 1978-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1945-1953: independence claim][1978-1988: independence claim][1989: autonomy claim][1990-1991: independence claim]
The separatist claim ended with the independence of Lithuania in 1991.	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Mari (36529000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Mari
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-2000
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-2000: autonomy claim]
The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1989 until 1991 and a claim for autonomy from 1992 until 2000. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The SDM dataset codes an end to the Mari claim in 2000, based on the ten years of inactivity rule. There is no evidence that the separatist movement has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Moldovans (36514000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1991
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1

<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Moldovans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1969-1971; 1989-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1969-1971: irredentist claim][1989-1991: irredentist claim]
The separatist claim ended with the independence of Moldova in 1991.	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Mordva (36520000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Mordvins
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-1994
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-1990: autonomy claim][1991: autonomy claim] [1992-1994: autonomy claim]
The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession in 1991 and a claim for autonomy in 1989/1990 and 1992-1994. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The SDM dataset codes an end to the Mordvin claim in 1994 when the Mastorava Society disappeared. No evidence could be found suggesting that the claim has reemerged in the period 2013-2017.	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Nogai (36561000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Nogai
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-2012: autonomy claim]
The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1989 until 2012. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The demand for a separate republic was repeated in 2012 (BBC Monitoring Former Soviet Union 2012) and no evidence could be found suggesting that the movement has since ended or altered its claim. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]	
Sources BBC Monitoring Former Soviet Union (2012). "Programme Summary of Russian Ekho Moskvyy Radio News 1000 GMT 8 November 2012." November 8. <i>Lexis Nexis</i> [June 12, 2014]. Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Ossetes (36527000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
-------------------------------	-----------

<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	n:1/1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	North Ossetians; South Ossetians
<i>SDM activity</i>	North Ossetians: 1990-2005; South Ossetians: 1988-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	North Ossetians: 1990-2005: autonomy claim; South Ossetians: 1988-1991: autonomy claim
<p>During the USSR period, the SDM dataset distinguishes between North Ossetians (separatist from 1990-2005) and South Ossetians (1988-1991), hence a n:1 scenario. After the independence of Georgia in 1991, this is a 1:1 scenario. Taking the separatist activities of both the North Ossetians and South Ossetians into account, the Ossetes are coded as separatist from 1988 until 2005. No evidence could be found suggesting that the Ossetian claim has reemerged after 2012. Regarding the type of claim, both the North Ossetians (1990-1991) and South Ossetians (1991) claimed sub-state secession for a short period of time and autonomy in all other years of separatist activity. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. [1988-2005: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Pamir Tajiks (36563000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1991
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Pamiri Tajiks
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-1991: autonomy claim]
<p>The movement is coded as terminated in Russia/USSR with the independence of Tajikistan in 1991 (see Pamiri Tajiks under Tajikistan for continuation of the claim).</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Tajiks (36519000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1991
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Tajiks
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-1991: autonomy claim]
<p>The separatist claim ended with the independence of Tajikistan in 1991.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Tatars (36503000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
-------------------------------	-----------

<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Tatars
<i>SDM activity</i>	1988-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1988-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1988 until 1991 and a claim for autonomy thereafter. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The claim for regional autonomy has continued beyond 2012, as confirmed by recent sources (Stowe-Thurston 2016, Nizamova 2016). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Nizamova, Liliya R. (2016). "Ethnic Tatars in contention for recognition and autonomy: bilingualism and pluri-cultural education policies in Tatarstan." <i>Nationalities Papers</i> 44(1): 71-91.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Stowe-Thurston, Abigail (2016). "A State of the Union: Federation and Autonomy in Tatarstan." <i>Russian Studies Honors Projects</i>. Paper 1.</p>	

Turkmens (36525000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1991
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Turkmen
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-1991: autonomy claim]
<p>The separatist claim ended with the independence of Turkmenistan in 1991.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Tuvinsians (36539000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Tuvans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1989-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1989-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for regional autonomy from 1989 until 2012. This claim seems to have continued beyond 2012 (Jamestown Foundation 2016). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Jamestown Foundation (2016). "Ethnic Russians Sound Alarm About Declining Russian Presence in Tuva." http://www.refworld.org/docid/5748059a4.html [August 11, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Udmurt (36530000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Udmurts
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1990 until 1991 and a claim for autonomy thereafter. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The last evidence of Udmurt separatist activity mentioned by the SDM dataset is Minahan (2002: 1957). Since no significant evidence of continued separatist activity could be found since 2002, we code an end to the movement in 2012, based on the ten years of inactivity rule.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Ukrainians (36502000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Ukrainians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-1950; 1989-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1945-1950: independence claim][1989-1990: autonomy claim][1991: independence claim]
<p>The separatist claim ended with the independence of Ukraine in 1991.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Uzbeks (36505000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1991
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Uzbeks
<i>SDM activity</i>	1988-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1988-1991: autonomy claim]
<p>The separatist claim ended with the independence of Uzbekistan in 1991.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Yakuts (36536000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1

<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Yakuts (Sakhas)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for sub-state secession from 1990 until 1991 and a claim for autonomy thereafter. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is also coded as a claim for regional autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The most recent evidence of Yakut separatist activity are protests in 2012 (Stoyanova 2012), when the Yakut protested against mining activities and reiterated their demands “for collective rights to land and resources, recognition of cultural differences, and the acknowledgement of rights to self-determination.” No evidence could be found suggesting a termination of the movement. The autonomy claim is hence continued. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Stoyanova, Irina (2012). “Russia: Sakha Protest Mining Rush in Siberia.” <i>Minority Voices Newsroom</i>. June 29. http://www.minorityvoices.org/news.php/fr/1164/russia-sakha-protest-mining-rush-in-siberia [August 11, 2017].</p>	

SENEGAL

Diola (43305000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1960-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Casamancais
<i>SDM activity</i>	1982-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1982-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for independence for the entire period of separatist activity. From the 1990s onwards, after the movement has fragmented and the dominant claim could not be identified, independence is coded because it is the most radical claim. The MFDC declared a unilateral ceasefire in 2014 initiating negotiations between the government and the MFDC (BBC 2014). However, no evidence could be found suggesting that the goal of the separatist significantly changed. According to the Economist (2014), autonomy or independence were not part of the negotiations. As a consequence, the claim coded by the SDM dataset is continued for the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>BBC (2014). "Senegal's Casamance MFDC rebels declare a ceasefire." 30 April. http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-27221999 [August 30, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>The Economist (2014). Ceasefire in Casamance." 2 May. http://country.eiu.com/article.aspx?articleid=1961778980&Country=Senegal&topic=Politics&subtopic=_6 [August 30, 2017].</p>	

SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO

Albanians (34506000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2006
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Kosovar Albanians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1945-1991: autonomy claim][1992-2008: independence claim][2009-2012: irredentist claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a sub-state secession claim from 1945 until 1991. In line with the coding instructions, the claim for sub-state secession is coded as a claim for autonomy, as the former category does not exist in EPR. The independence claim from 1992 onwards is directly adapted from SDM. The movement is coded as terminated in Serbia and Montenegro in 2006 (see Albanians under Serbia for continuation of the claim).</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Bosniak/Muslims (34504000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2006
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	n:1/1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Bosniaks; Sandzak Muslims
<i>SDM activity</i>	Bosniaks: 1990-1992; Sandzak Muslims: 1990-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	Bosniaks: [1990-1992: independence claim]; Sandzak Muslims: [1990-1992: autonomy claim] [1993: irredentist claim] [1994-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes 'Bosniaks' and 'Sandzak Muslims'. SDM2EPR matches both groups to the EPR group 'Bosniak/Muslims'. The separatist claim of the 'Bosniaks' ended with the independence of Bosnia in 1992, whereas the claim of the 'Sandzak Muslims' continued (see also Bosniaks Muslims under Serbia from 2007 onwards). In the years 1990 until 1992, the independence claim of the SDM group 'Bosniaks' is coded since they were clearly the dominant share of the EPR group 'Bosniak/Muslims'. From 1993 onwards, after the independence of Bosnia, the claim of the SDM group 'Sandzak Muslims' is coded for the EPR group 'Bosniak/Muslims'. [1990-1992: independence claim] [1993: irredentist claim] [1994-2006: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Croats (34502000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2006
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Croats
<i>SDM activity</i>	1967-1972; 1989-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1967-1972: autonomy claim][1989-1991: independence claim]
The separatist claim ended with the independence of Croatia in 1991.	

Sources

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Hungarians (34511000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2006
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Hungarians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1992-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1992-2012: autonomy claim]
The movement is coded as terminated in Serbia and Montenegro in 2006 (see Hungarians under Serbia for continuation of the claim).	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Macedonians (34508000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1991
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Macedonians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-1991: independence claim]
The separatist claim ended with the independence of Macedonia in 1991.	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Montenegrians (34509000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2006
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Montenegrians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2006
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-2006: independence claim]
The separatist claim ended with the independence of Montenegro in 2006.	
Sources Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

Slovenes (34507000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1991
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Slovenes
<i>SDM activity</i>	1968-1972; 1986-1991
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1968-1972: autonomy claim][1986-1989: autonomy claim] [1990-1991: independence claim]
The separatist claim ended with the independence of Slovenia in 1991.	
Sources	
Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.	

SERBIA

Albanians (34006000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	2007-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Kosovar Albanians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1945-1991: autonomy claim][1992-2008: independence claim] [2009-2012: irredentist claim]
<p>After Kosovo's secession in 2008, the SDM dataset codes an irredentist claim for the remaining Albanian minority in Serbia from 2009 onwards. This claim has continued after 2012, as illustrated in March 2014, when the president of the Movement for Democratic Progress (PDP) argued that the Presevo Valley had always been part of Kosovo and that it had declared its wish to join Kosovo in an (unofficial) March 1992 referendum (Independent 2014; Novinite 2014; Civil War in Europe 2014). [2013-2017: irredentist claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Civil War in Europe (2014). "Les Albanais de la vallée du Presevo en Serbie demandent le rattachement au Kosovo." November 10. http://civilwarineurope.com/2014/11/10/les-albanais-de-la-vallee-du-presevo-en-serbie-demandent-le-rattachement-au-kosovo/ [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Independent (2014). "Serbian Minister Vulin: Albanians from Presevo Valley Threaten Serbia." March 18. http://www.independent.mk/articles/2801/Serbian+Minister+Vulin+Albanians+from+Presevo+Valley+Threaten+Serbia [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Novinite (2014). "South of Serbia Could Request to Join Kosovo." March 19. http://www.novinite.com/articles/159069/South+of+Serbia+Could+Request+to+Join+Kosovo [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Bosniak/Muslims (34004000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	2007-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Sandzak Muslims
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1990-1992: autonomy claim] [1993: irredentist claim] [1994-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy from 1994 onwards, after a memorandum issued by the Party of Democratic Action (SDA) demanded autonomy within Yugoslavia. The memorandum has remained the official platform of the Muslim National Council of Sandžak (MNVs, later Bosniak National Council (BNVS)). The demand has been reiterated with another declaration in 1999. Demands for autonomy have continued (Radio Free Europe 2010), although autonomy seems to have lost some of its appeal in recent years (Politico 2017). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Politico (2017). "At Balkan crossroads, anger at 'black sheep' image." August 9. http://www.politico.eu/article/serbia-sandzak-islam-caught-between-competing-worlds/ [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Radio Free Europe (2010). "Serbia's Sandzak Becomes Balkans' Latest Hot Spot." September 28. https://www.rferl.org/a/Serbias_Sandzak_Becomes_Balkans_Latest_Hot_Spot/2170477.html [August 25, 2017].</p>	

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Hungarians (34011000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	2007-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Hungarians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1992-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1992-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy for the entire period of separatist activity (which started in 1992 under Serbia and Montenegro). This claim has continued after 2012 and is represented by the Democratic Party of Vojvodina Hungarians and the Democratic Fellowship of Vojvodina Hungarians. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

SLOVAKIA

Hungarians (31702000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1993-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Hungarians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1993-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1993-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy from the independence of Slovakia until 2012. This claim has continued, with the Party of the Hungarian Community (MKP) continuing to be active (e.g. 2016 elections for national council) and continuing to advocate regional autonomy for the Hungarians. In 2014, the MKP presented a plan on a “self-governing arrangement based on collective minority rights of Hungarians in Slovakia and on greater economic independence of Southern Slovakia” (MKP 2015). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>MKP (2015). “The past and present of MKP in a nutshell.” http://www.mkp.sk/en/2015/01/01/the-past-and-present-of-mkp-in-a-nutshell/ [August 11, 2017]</p>	

SOUTH AFRICA

Afrikaners (56001000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Afrikaners
<i>SDM activity</i>	2000-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[2000-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>According to the SDM dataset, only a small fraction of the Afrikaner support independence organizations such as the Voortrekeers or the Boer National Warriors (Minorities at Risk). The majority demands “some form of cultural autonomy” and “territorial self-determination in a federal South Africa” (Minahan 2002: 50), as it is also advocated by the Group of 63 and the Freedom Front Plus (UNPO 2008). There have been no significant shifts regarding this situation in the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization UNPO (2008). “Afrikaners.” http://unpo.org/members/8148 [August 15, 2017].</p>	

Blacks (56005000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-1994
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	n:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	East Caprivians; Namibians; Ndebele; Zulus; Xhosa; Tswana
<i>SDM activity</i>	East Caprivians: 1989-1990; Namibians: 1959-1990; Ndebele: 1982-1986; Zulus: 1970-2007; Xhosa: 1963-1994; Tswana: 1973-1994
<i>SDM claim</i>	East Caprivians: [1989-1990: independence claim]; Namibians: [1959-1990: independence claim]; Ndebele: [1982-1986: independence claim]; Zulus: [1970-1990: autonomy claim] [1991-1994: independence claim] [1995-2007: autonomy claim]; Xhosa: [1963-1994: independence claim]; Tswana: [1973-1974: irredentist claim] [1975-1994: independence claim]
<p>Unlike EPR, the SDM dataset does not code an umbrella Blacks group during Apartheid but distinguishes between East Caprivians, Namibians, Ndebele, Zulus, Xhosa, and Tswana. In combination, these SDM groups make up around two thirds of the total population of the EPR group Blacks in South Africa. Hence, the EPR group Blacks is coded as separatist according to SDM2EPR. The start of separatist activity is pegged at 1959, which was the first year of separatist activity by an SDM group associated with the EPR group Blacks. The type of claim is matched according to the added size of the different SDM group (East Capr. (0.2% of the South African population), Namibians (3.28%), Ndebele (1.44%), Tswana (7.69%), Xhosa (17.3%), Zulus (22.11%)). Hence, for each year, the population share of all active SDM groups is added and the claim that is represented by the largest population share is coded for the EPR group ‘Blacks’. [1959-1969: independence claim][1970-1974: autonomy claim][1975-1994: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p>	

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

San (56005900)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1995-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Khoisans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1996-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1996-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes the 'Khoisans', which consist of two groups, the Khoi (formerly Hottentots) and the Sans. However, the SDM dataset codes the start of separatist activity due to the formation of a San self-determination organization (South African San Institute), which also remained active in subsequent years, the claim of the SDM group 'Khoisans' (regional autonomy from 1996 until 2012) can be adopted for the EPR group 'San'. Regional autonomy remained the dominant claim also after 2012, as recent publications (e.g. Le Fleur and Jansen 2013) or a recent statement in an interview by the Chief !Kora Danab Hennie van Wyk of the Xoraxoukhoe Khoisan Indigenous Peoples' Organization (Majavu 2013) illustrate. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Le Fleur, Andrew and Lesle Jansen (2013). "The Khoisan in Contemporary South Africa. Challenges of Recognition as an Indigenous People." Country Report Konrad Adenauer Stiftung. http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas_35255-1522-2-30.pdf?i30828123610 [August 15, 2017].</p> <p>Majavu, Anna (2013). "South Africa's First Nations Give Land Claims Consultation Thumbs Down." <i>The South African Civil Society Information Service</i>. February 26. http://sacsis.org.za/site/article/1585/stories.php?iKeyword=629 [August 15, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Tswana (56005400)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1995-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Tswana
<i>SDM activity</i>	1973-1994
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1973-1974: irredentist claim] [1975-1994: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an end to the Tswana claim in 1994, when Bophuthatswana was reincorporated into South Africa. No evidence could be found suggesting that the movement has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Xhosa (56005200)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1995-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1

<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Xhosa
<i>SDM activity</i>	1963-1994
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1963-1994: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an end to the Xhosa claim in 1994, when both Ciskei and Transkei were reincorporated into South Africa. No evidence could be found suggesting that the movement has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Zulus (56005100)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1995-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Zulus; Blacks
<i>SDM activity</i>	1970-2007
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1970-1990: autonomy claim] [1991-1994: independence claim] [1995-2007: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an end to the Zulu claim in 2007, based on the ten years of inactivity rule. There is no evidence that the separatist movement has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

SPAIN

Basques (23004000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Basques
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1945-2012: independence claim]
<p>According to the SDM dataset, the dominant claim is not fully clear as there have been claims for independence, autonomy, and also the incorporation of Navarra into the Basque Country. At the end, however, the SDM dataset codes independence as the dominant claim for the entire period of separatist activity. This is done for several reasons, among which the Basques' strong commitment to independence (Minorities at Risk), a proposal by the Basque government (Ibarretxe Plan) to create a semi-independent Basque state in confederation with the rest of Spain (Keating and Wilson 2009: 540), the initiative to hold a self-determination referendum in 2008, the Basque Nationalist Party's "pro-independence rhetoric" (Keating and Bray 2006), and the ETA and its political arm advocating independence. Since there have been no significant shifts with regard to the type of claim since 2012, the claim for independence is continued. If anything, the independence movement has gathered support in this period (The Guardian 2012): In the 2012 and 2016 regional elections, the newly formed pro-independence party coalition EH Bildu became the region's second biggest political group winning 24.7% and 21.1% of the votes. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Keating, Michael, and Alex Wilson (2009). "Renegotiating the State of Autonomies: Statute Reform and Multi-level Politics in Spain." <i>West European Politics</i> 32(3): 536-558.</p> <p>Keating, Michael, and Zoe Bray (2006). "Renegotiating Sovereignty: Basque Nationalism and the Rise and Fall of the Ibarretxe Plan." <i>Ethnopolitics</i> 5(4): 347-364.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>The Guardian (2012). "Pro-independence parties win Basque country elections in Spain." October 22. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/oct/21/pro-independence-basque-elections-spain [August 20, 2017].</p>	

Catalans (23002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Catalans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1975-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1975-2010: autonomy claim; 2011-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a radicalization of the claim from regional autonomy to independence in 2011. This is done as a significant part of CiU began to advocate independence and because several opinion polls since 2010 have shown that a relative majority of Catalans favors independence (Serrano 2013). Independence has remained popular in the period 2013-2017 and independence proponents received an additional boost in 2017, when the Catalan government vowed to declare independence if a majority of voters back it in a referendum (BBC 2017, Economist 2017). The independence claim is hence continued. [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p>	

BBC (2017). “Catalan independence: Plan for quick split from Spain after vote.”
<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-40496700> [August 20, 2017].

Economist (2017). “Catalonia plans an independence vote whether Spain lets it or not.” July 15.
<https://www.economist.com/news/europe/21724960-prime-minister-mariano-rajoy-says-vote-illegal-and-vows-block-it-catalonia-plans> [August 20, 2017].

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Galician (23003000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Galicians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1963-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1963-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>According to the SDM dataset, regional autonomy has been the dominant claim during the entire period of separatist activity. Regional autonomy has been the claim of the Galician People’s Union and the Socialists' Party of Galicia (Núñez 1997: 33) and was reiterated as the main goal in more recent discussion about a new autonomy statute (Keating & Wilson 2009: 543). No evidence of significant shifts could be found for the period 2013-2017, which is why autonomy is continued to be coded as the dominant claim. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Keating, Michael, and Alex Wilson (2009). “Renegotiating the State of Autonomies: Statute Reform and Multi-level Politics in Spain.” <i>West European Politics</i> 32(3): 536-558.</p> <p>Núñez, Xosé M. (1997). “National Reawakening within a Changing Society: The Galician Movement in Spain (1960-1997).” <i>Nationalism and Ethnic Politics</i> 3(2): 29-56.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

SRI LANKA

Moors (Muslims) (78002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1948-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Muslims
<i>SDM activity</i>	1981-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1981-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes separatist activity as of 1981, the year the Sri Lankan Muslim Congress (SLMC) was founded. The SLMC has campaigned for regional autonomy and a separate administrative entity for the Muslims in the southeast, which is why regional autonomy is coded as the dominant claim by the SDM dataset for the entire period of separatist activity. The SLMC remains active and continues to demand regional autonomy. Autonomy is thus continued to be coded for the period 2013-2017, despite the SLMC suffering a defeat in the 2015 elections (Colombo Telegraph 2015). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Colombo Telegraph (2015). “Devastating Defeat For Sri Lanka Muslim Congress.” September 14. https://www.colombotelegraph.com/index.php/devastating-defeat-for-sri-lanka-muslim-congress/ [August 20, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Sri Lankan Tamils (78004000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1948-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Tamils
<i>SDM activity</i>	1949-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1949-1976: autonomy claim] [1977-2002: independence claim] [2003-2005: autonomy claim] [2006-2011: independence claim] [2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a de-radicalization of the claim in 2011, after the Tamil National Alliance (TNA) dropped the demand for a separate independent homeland and refocused on regional autonomy (The Guardian 2011). A renewed radicalization could not be observed and autonomy is thus also coded as the dominant claim in 2013-2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>The Guardian (2011). “Sri Lankan Tamils drop demand for separate independent homeland.” 14 March. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/mar/14/tamils-drop-calls-for-separate-state [September 5].</p>	

SUDAN

Azande (62501000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1956-2011
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Southerners
<i>SDM activity</i>	1956-2012
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1956-1963: autonomy claim][1964-2011: independence claim] [2012: irredentist claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a separatist umbrella movement ('Southerners') which started separatist activity in 1950 (before Sudanese independence in 1956), when the Southern Liberation Party was formed. EPR does not code the South Sudanese as a single group, but codes a total of eight different groups that are associated with the Southern movement: Azande, Bari, Dinka, Latoka, Nuba, Nuer, Other Southern groups, Shilluk. Apart from the Nuba, all of these groups were involved in the southern separatist movement from the beginning. Hence, the Azande are coded as separatist from 1956 onwards. With the independence of South Sudan in 2011, separatist activities of the Azande came to an end. [1956-1963: autonomy claim][1964-2011: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Bari (62502000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1956-2011
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Southerners
<i>SDM activity</i>	1956-2012
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1956-1963: autonomy claim][1964-2011: independence claim] [2012: irredentist claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a separatist umbrella movement ('Southerners') which started separatist activity in 1950 (before Sudanese independence in 1956), when the Southern Liberation Party was formed. EPR does not code the South Sudanese as a single group, but codes a total of eight different groups: Azande, Bari, Dinka, Latoka, Nuba, Nuer, Other Southern groups, Shilluk. Apart from the Nuba, all of these groups were involved in the southern separatist movement from the beginning. Hence, the Bari are coded as separatist from 1956 onwards. With the independence of South Sudan in 2011, separatist activities of the Bari came to an end. [1956-1963: autonomy claim][1964-2011: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Beja (62503000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1956-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1/1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Easterners
<i>SDM activity</i>	1958-2012
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1958-2012: autonomy claim]

The SDM dataset codes an umbrella eastern self-determination movement ('Easterners') and codes a claim for regional autonomy for the entire period of separatist activity. EPR codes two groups which can be associated with the eastern separatist movement: the Beja and the Rashaida. Separatist activity of the Beja started in 1958 with the establishment of the Beja Congress (BC). Until the establishment of the Rashaida Free Lions in 1999, the Beja were the only eastern group with an organized separatist claim. There is hence a 1:1 scenario from 1958 until 1998 and the claim for regional autonomy as coded for the SDM group 'Easterners' can also be coded for the Beja. With the establishment of the Rashaida Free Lions in 1999, there is a 1:n scenario. However, the Bejas' claim for regional autonomy continued. A part of the National Democratic Alliance (NDA) since 1995, the BC continued to make claims for greater autonomy (Hewitt et al. 2008; International Crisis Group 2006). In 2005, the BC and the Rashaida Free Lions formed a (fragile) alliance and established the Eastern Front. According to the SDM documentation, the Eastern Front "demanded a Sudan with a federal structure reflecting the six regions – South, North, Central, West, East and Khartoum". Secessionist claims had become increasingly prevalent in the last years covered by the SDM dataset and in 2012, the Democratic Revolutionary Front for Eastern Sudan's Liberation was established. The organization calls for the secession of the Democratic Republic of Eastern Sudan (International Crisis Group 2013: 24). However, it seems that the claim for increased autonomy within Sudan remained dominant. A recent report by the Small Arms Survey (2015: 10), states that only "some people in the region are calling for secession". [1958-2017: autonomy claim]

Sources

Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheatham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

International Crisis Group (2013). "Sudan: Preserving Peace in the East." Africa Report N° 209.
<http://www.crisisgroup.org/~media/Files/africa/horn-of-africa/sudan/209-sudan-preserving-peace-in-the-east> [September 1, 2017].

International Crisis Group (2006). "Sudan: Saving Peace in the East." Africa Report N° 102.
<http://www.crisisgroup.org/~media/Files/africa/horn-of-africa/sudan/Sudan%20Saving%20Peace%20in%20the%20East> [September 1, 2017].

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Small Arms Survey (2015). Development Deferred: Eastern Sudan after the ESPA.
<http://www.smallarmssurveysudan.org/fileadmin/docs/working-papers/HSBA-WP36-Development-Deferred-Eastern-Sudan.pdf> [September 1, 2017].

Dinka (62504000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1956-2011
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Southerners
<i>SDM activity</i>	1956-2012
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1956-1963: autonomy claim][1964-2011: independence claim] [2012: irredentist claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a separatist umbrella movement ('Southerners') which started separatist activity in 1950 (before Sudanese independence in 1956), when the Southern Liberation Party was formed. EPR does not code the South Sudanese as a single group, but codes a total of eight different groups: Azande, Bari, Dinka, Latoka, Nuba, Nuer, Other Southern groups, Shilluk. Apart from the Nuba, all of these groups were involved in the southern separatist movement from the beginning. Hence, the Dinka are coded as separatist from 1956 onwards. EPR codes the Dinka only until 2011, when South Sudan gained independence. Hence, no update is coded. [1956-1963: autonomy claim][1964-2011: independence claim]</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Fur (62505000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1956-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Fur
<i>SDM activity</i>	1960-1966; 1986-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1960-1966: independence claim] [1986-2003: independence claim] [2004-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a switch from independence to autonomy as the dominant claim, when the Darfur Liberation Front changed its name to Sudan Liberation Movement/Army (SLM/A) and moderated its goal in 2004. With the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) also making claims for the federalization of Sudan, regional autonomy is coded as the dominant claim of the Fur separatist movement. Both JEM and the SLM/A remain active, but no evidence could be found suggesting a radicalization of their claim. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Latoka (62506000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1956-2011
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Southerners
<i>SDM activity</i>	1956-2012
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1956-1963: autonomy claim][1964-2011: independence claim] [2012: irredentist claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a separatist umbrella movement ('Southerners') which started separatist activity in 1950 (before Sudanese independence in 1956), when the Southern Liberation Party was formed. EPR does not code the South Sudanese as a single group, but codes a total of eight different groups: Azande, Bari, Dinka, Latoka, Nuba, Nuer, Other Southern groups, Shilluk. Apart from the Nuba, all of these groups were involved in the southern separatist movement from the beginning. Hence, the Latoka are coded as separatist from 1956 onwards. With the independence of South Sudan in 2011, separatist activities of the Latoka came to an end. [1956-1963: autonomy claim][1964-2011: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Nuba (62507000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1956-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Southerners
<i>SDM activity</i>	1956-2012
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1956-1963: autonomy claim][1964-2011: independence claim] [2012: irredentist claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a separatist umbrella movement ('Southerners') which started separatist activity in 1950 (before Sudanese independence in 1956), when the Southern Liberation Party was formed. EPR does not code the South Sudanese as a single group, but codes a total of eight different groups: Azande, Bari, Dinka, Latoka, Nuba, Nuer, Other Southern groups, Shilluk. Unlike all other seven groups, the Nuba were not involved in the southern separatist movement from the beginning. According to Gurr (2000: 318-319) and Marshall and Gurr (2003: 62),</p>	

the Nubas only mobilized for self-determination from 1985 onwards. Hence, the Nubas are only coded as separatist from 1985 onwards. A share of the Nuba (South Kordofan) remained with Sudan after the independence of South Sudan in 2011. According to the SDM dataset, they agitated for unification with South Sudan. This claim remains ongoing (Small Arms Survey 2013). [1985-2011: independence claim] [2012-2017: irredentist claim]

Sources

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Small Arms Survey (2013). "New war, old enemies: Conflict dynamics in South Kordofan."
<http://www.smallarmssurveysudan.org/fileadmin/docs/working-papers/HSBA-WP29-S.Kordofan.pdf>
 [September 1, 2016].

Nuer (62508000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1956-2011
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Southerners
<i>SDM activity</i>	1956-2012
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1956-1963: autonomy claim][1964-2011: independence claim] [2012: irredentist claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a separatist umbrella movement ('Southerners') which started separatist activity in 1950 (before Sudanese independence in 1956), when the Southern Liberation Party was formed. EPR does not code the South Sudanese as a single group, but codes a total of eight different groups: Azande, Bari, Dinka, Latoka, Nuba, Nuer, Other Southern groups, Shilluk. Apart from the Nuba, all of these groups were involved in the southern separatist movement from the beginning. Hence, the Nuer are coded as separatist from 1956 onwards. With the independence of South Sudan in 2011, separatist activities of the Nuer came to an end. [1956-1963: autonomy claim][1964-2011: independence claim]</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Other Southern groups (62511000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1956-2011
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Southerners
<i>SDM activity</i>	1956-2012
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1956-1963: autonomy claim][1964-2011: independence claim] [2012: irredentist claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a separatist umbrella movement ('Southerners') which started separatist activity in 1950 (before Sudanese independence in 1956), when the Southern Liberation Party was formed. EPR does not code the South Sudanese as a single group, but codes a total of eight different groups: Azande, Bari, Dinka, Latoka, Nuba, Nuer, Other Southern groups, Shilluk. Apart from the Nuba, all of these groups were involved in the southern separatist movement from the beginning. Hence, the Nuer are coded as separatist from 1956 onwards. EPR codes the 'Other Southern Groups' only until 2011, when South Sudan gained independence. Hence, no update is coded. [1956-1963: autonomy claim][1964-2011: independence claim]</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Rashaida (62516000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	2006-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Easterners
<i>SDM activity</i>	1958-2012
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1958-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an umbrella eastern self-determination movement ('Easterners') and codes a claim for regional autonomy for the entire period of separatist activity. EPR codes two groups which can be associated with the eastern separatist movement: the Beja and the Rashaida. Whereas separatist activity of the Beja started in 1958 with the establishment of the Beja Congress (BC), separatist activity of the Rashaida only started in 1999 with the establishment of the Rashaida Free Lions. The Rashaida Free Lions made claims for increased self-determination within Sudan (Assal 2013: 157-158). In 2005, the BC and the Rashaida Free Lions formed a (fragile) alliance and established the Eastern Front. According to the SDM documentation, the Eastern Front "demanded a Sudan with a federal structure reflecting the six regions – South, North, Central, West, East and Khartoum". Secessionist claims had become increasingly prevalent in the last years covered by the SDM dataset and in 2012, the Democratic Revolutionary Front for Eastern Sudan's Liberation was established. The organization calls for the secession of the Democratic Republic of Eastern Sudan (International Crisis Group 2013: 24). However, it seems that the claim for increased autonomy within Sudan remained dominant. A recent report by the Small Arms Survey (2015: 10), states that only "some people in the region are calling for secession". [1999 -2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). <i>Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements</i>. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.</p> <p>International Crisis Group (2013). "Sudan: Preserving Peace in the East." Africa Report N° 209. http://www.crisisgroup.org/~media/Files/africa/horn-of-africa/sudan/209-sudan-preserving-peace-in-the-east [September 1, 2017].</p> <p>International Crisis Group (2006). "Sudan: Saving Peace in the East." Africa Report N° 102. http://www.crisisgroup.org/~media/Files/africa/horn-of-africa/sudan/Sudan%20Saving%20Peace%20in%20the%20East [September 1, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Small Arms Survey (2015). Development Deferred: Eastern Sudan after the ESPA. http://www.smallarmssurveysudan.org/fileadmin/docs/working-papers/HSBA-WP36-Development-Deferred-Eastern-Sudan.pdf [September 1, 2017].</p>	

Shilluk (62513000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1956-2011
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Southerners
<i>SDM activity</i>	1956-2012
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1956-1963: autonomy claim][1964-2011: independence claim] [2012: irredentist claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a separatist umbrella movement ('Southerners') which started separatist activity in 1950 (before Sudanese independence in 1956), when the Southern Liberation Party was formed. EPR does not code the South Sudanese as a single group, but codes a total of eight different groups: Azande, Bari, Dinka, Latoka, Nuba, Nuer, Other Southern groups, Shilluk. Apart from the Nuba, all of these groups were involved in the southern separatist movement from the beginning. Hence, the Shilluk are coded as separatist from 1956 onwards. With the independence of South Sudan in 2011, separatist activities of the Shilluk came to an end. [1956-1963: autonomy claim][1964-2011: independence claim]</p>	

Sources

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

SURINAME

Indigenous Peoples (Arawaks and Caribs) (11504000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1975-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Indigenous Peoples
<i>SDM activity</i>	1976-2017
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>According to Haalboom (2009), there are three indigenous rights organizations in Suriname: The VIDs (Veriniging van Inheemse Doorpshoofden in Suriname or The Association of Indigenous Village Leaders in Suriname), the Organization of Indigenous Peoples in Suriname (OIS) 1 (formerly KANO) and the Organization of Indigenous Peoples in Suriname (OIS) 2. No evidence could be found suggesting that there were significant claims beyond autonomy and self-determination within the framework of the state of Suriname. According to Haalboom (2009), all three organizations focused on legal land rights and cultural claims and representation at regional and international levels. This is confirmed by Kambel (2002), who also states that the indigenous claim in Suriname was centered on demands that traditional authorities and village territories be legally recognized (Kambel 2002). [1976-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Haalboom, Bethany J. (2009). <i>Encounters with Conservation and Development in Suriname: How Indigenous Peoples Are Trying to Make Things “Right” through Scalar Politics, Identity Framing, and Hybrid Governance Arrangements</i>. PhD Dissertation, Duke University.</p> <p>Kambel, Ellen-Rose (2002). Resource conflicts, gender and indigenous rights in Suriname: Local, national and global perspectives. PhD Dissertation, University of Leiden.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

SYRIA

Alawi (65203000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Alawites (Alawi)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1946-1954
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1946-1953: independence claim; 1954: irredentist claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an end to Alawi separatist activity in 1954. No evidence could be found suggesting that the movement has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Druze (65201000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Druze
<i>SDM activity</i>	1946-1954
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1946-1954: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an end to Druze separatist activity in 1954. No evidence could be found suggesting that the movement has reemerged after 2012.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Kurds (65206000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Kurds
<i>SDM activity</i>	1957-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1957-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for regional autonomy throughout the group's separatist activity. This assessment is based on recent sources such as the International Crisis Group (2013) or Sinclair and Kajjo (2011) and has continued beyond 2012. In 2016, the Kurds reiterated their demand for a federal system and a self-run entity within Syria similar to the one established in 2003 in neighboring Iraq (Reuters 2016). Furthermore, the Syrian Democratic Forces, which were formed in 2015 and of which the Kurds make up around 40%, also fight for a secular, democratic and federal Syria. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p>	

- International Crisis Group (2013). "Syria's Kurds: A Struggle Within a Struggle."
<https://d2071andvip0wj.cloudfront.net/syrias-kurds-a-struggle-within-a-struggle.pdf> [September 1, 2017].
- Reuters (2016). "Syria's Kurds rebuked for seeking autonomous region." March 17.
<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-mideast-crisis-syria-federalism/syrias-kurds-rebuked-for-seeking-autonomous-region-idUSKCN0WJ1EP> [September 1, 2017].
- Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.
- Sinclair, Christian, and Sirwan Kajjo (2011). "The Evolution of Kurdish Politics in Syria." *Middle East Research and Information Project*. August 31. <http://www.merip.org/mero/mero083111> [September 1, 2017].

TAIWAN

Indigenous/Aboriginal Taiwanese (71301000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1996-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Indigenous Taiwanese
<i>SDM activity</i>	1988-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1988-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy for the entire period of separatist activity (Scott 2008, Minorities at Risk). MAR codes non-zero protest scores up until 2006 as the last evidence of separatist activity, which is why the movement is coded as terminated in 2016. No evidence of a radicalization of the claim could be found for the period 2013 until 2016. [2013-2016: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Scott, Simon (2008). "Indigenous Autonomy: Constructing a Place for Ethnic Minorities in Taiwan's Emerging Civic Society." <i>Paper prepared for the Fifth European Association of Taiwan Studies (EATS) Conference, Prague, Czech Republic, 18-20 April, 2008.</i> https://www.soas.ac.uk/taiwanstudies/eats/eats2008/file43169.pdf [August 20, 2017].</p>	

TAJIKISTAN

Uzbeks (70205000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Uzbeks
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-1998
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-1998: irredentist claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an end to Uzbek separatist activity in 1998. No evidence could be found suggesting that the movement has reemerged after 2012.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

TANZANIA

Shirazi (Zanzibar Africans) (51002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1964-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Zanzibaris
<i>SDM activity</i>	1964-2012
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes one Zanzibari self-determination movement, whereas EPR codes three groups on Zanzibar ('Shirazi (Zanzibar Africans)', 'Zanzibar Arabs', and 'Mainland Africans'), of which the 'Shirazi (Zanzibar Africans)' and the 'Zanzibar Arabs' can be associated with the self-determination movements (Minorities at Risk, Minahan (2002: 2085-2086)). Both groups are hence coded as separatist from 1964 onwards (when Zanzibar was united with Tanzania). Regarding the type of claim, Minahan (2002: 2088-2090) is unclear and mentions demands for both autonomy and independence. According to both Minorities at Risk and Minority Rights Group International, these diverging claims run along ethnic lines: Whereas "Arabs have been more fervent in their secessionist desire" the Shirazi tend to "favour enhanced autonomy" (Minority Rights Group International). Autonomy is hence coded as the dominant claim of the Shirazi. This claim has continued after 2012 (CSIS 2016). [1964-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Center for Strategic and International Studies (2016). "The Political Crisis in Zanzibar." https://www.csis.org/analysis/political-crisis-zanzibar [August 25, 2016].</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Minority Rights Group International. <i>World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples</i>. http://minorityrights.org/minorities/shirazi-and-arabs-of-zanzibar/ [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Zanzibar Arabs (51003000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1964-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Zanzibaris
<i>SDM activity</i>	1964-2012
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes one Zanzibar self-determination movement, whereas EPR codes three groups on Zanzibar ('Shirazi (Zanzibar Africans)', 'Zanzibar Arabs', and 'Mainland Africans'), of which the 'Shirazi (Zanzibar Africans)' and the 'Zanzibar Arabs' can be associated with the self-determination movements (Minorities at Risk, Minahan (2002: 2085-2086)). Both groups are hence coded as separatist from 1964 onwards (when Zanzibar was united with Tanzania). Regarding the type of claim, Minahan (2002: 2088-2090) is unclear and mentions demands for both autonomy and independence. According to both Minorities at Risk and Minority Rights Group International, these diverging claims run along ethnic lines: Whereas "Arabs have been more fervent in their secessionist desire" the Shirazi tend to "favour enhanced autonomy" (Minority Rights Group International). Independence is hence coded as the dominant claim of the Zanzibar Arabs. This claim has continued after 2012 (Reuters 2012). [1964-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p>	

Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples*.
<http://minorityrights.org/minorities/shirazi-and-arabs-of-zanzibar/> [August 25, 2017].

Reuters (2012). "Zanzibar separatist group leaders charged with inciting violence."
<http://www.reuters.com/article/us-tanzania-zanzibar-separatists/zanzibar-separatist-group-leaders-charged-with-inciting-violence-idUSBRE89L0XR20121022> [August 25, 2017].

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

THAILAND

Hill Tribes (80005000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1999-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Northern Hill Tribes
<i>SDM activity</i>	1997-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1997-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an autonomy claim for the entire period of separatist activity as the Hill Tribes seek equal civil rights and status through the granting of Thai citizenship, cultural autonomy, greater economic opportunities as well as their use of forests and land (Cross Cultural Foundation). For the period from 2013-2017, no evidence of a radicalization could be found. A claim for independence could not be found in connection with one of the following organizations: Tribal Assembly of Thailand, the Inter-Mountain Peoples Education and Culture, the Assembly of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of Thailand (AITT), the Karen Network for Culture and Environment (KNCE), the Hmong Association for Development in Thailand (MDT), and the Network of Indigenous Peoples in Thailand (NIPT). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Cross Cultural Foundation. "Shadow Report on Eliminating Racial Discrimination: Thailand." Submission to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD). http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/docs/ngos/CRDWThailand81.pdf [December 23, 2014].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Malay Muslims (80001000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Muslims (Malays or Pattani)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1947-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1947-1959: autonomy claim][1960-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes independence as the dominant claim from 1960 onwards, with the Islamic Liberation Front of Patani (BIPP), the Barisan Revolusi Nasional (BRN), and Patani United Liberation Organisation (PULO) all advocating Patani's independence. Independence has remained the dominant claim, as confirmed by a recent study by Lamey (2013). This does not seem to have changed in the period 2013 until 2017: According to Abuza (2017), PULO remains active, as are BRN and BIPP (see Chalermripinyorat 2015). [2013-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Abuza, Zachary (2017). "No End in Sight for Thailand's Deadly Southern Insurgency." July 18. http://thediplomat.com/2017/07/no-end-in-sight-for-thailands-deadly-southern-insurgency/ [August 20, 2017].</p> <p>Chalermripinyorat, Rungrawee (2015). "How to End Thailand's Southern Insurgency." May 12. http://thediplomat.com/2015/05/how-to-end-thailands-southern-insurgency/ [August 20, 2017].</p> <p>Lamey, Jay (2013). "Peace in Patani? The Prospect of a Settlement in Southern Thailand." <i>Stability: International Journal of Security and Development</i> 2(33).</p>	

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

TURKEY

Kurds (64001000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Kurds
<i>SDM activity</i>	1965-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The start of separatist activity is pegged at 1965, when the separatist Turkish Kurdistan Democratic Party was formed. Identifying the dominant claim of the party proved difficult. However, according to Barkey and Fuller (1998: 45), the party was closely affiliated with the Iraqi Kurdistan Democratic Party (KDP). The KDP, demanded “autonomy for Kurdistan, democracy for Iraq” and at first renounced the idea of an independent state, which only remained a long term strategic goal (Rogg and Rimscha 2007: 826). Lacking clear evidence of the claim of the Kurds in Turkey in this early period, the KDP claim is adopted. [1965-1974: autonomy claim]</p> <p>In 1974 the Kurdish Workers’ Party (PKK) was formed. According to Minorities at Risk, the PKK seeks “an independent Kurdistan and union with Kurds living in Iraq, Iran and Syria”. This was certainly the case at the beginning, as confirmed by Yavuz and Özcan (2006: 106), Kirişçi et al. (1997: 166), and Global Security (2016). [1975-1999: independence claim]</p> <p>After the arrest of its leader Abdullah Öcalan in 1999, PKK’s demands seemed to have moved away from Kurdish independence and mainly focused on gaining more political rights (Minorities at Risk). This is in line with evidence from Icduygu et al. (1999: 994), who mention several PKK statements that suggest that the movement changed its demands away from a separate Kurdish state towards a federal-type solution. Leezenberg (2016: 673) also states that the PKK moved “away from national independence to a form of autonomy within Turkey” in the post-1999 period. Apart from the PKK, there were several other Kurdish organization in Turkey: People’s Labor Party (HEP, active 1990-1993), Democracy Party (DEP, 1993-1994), People's Democracy Party (HADEP, 1994-2003), Democratic People's Party (DEHAP, 1997-2005), Democratic Society Movement (DTH, 2005), Democratic Society Party (DTP, 2005-2009), Peace and Democracy Party (BDP, 2008-2014), Democratic Regions Party (DBP, 2014-present), Peoples' Democratic Party (HDP, 2012-present). Within HADEP and its two predecessors, HEP and DEP, there was no consensus regarding the goal. Whereas hard-liners envisaged “a federation to be the ultimate end result”, moderates considered “cultural autonomy associated with significant state economic aid and recognition of the distinctiveness of Kurdish ethnicity and culture” sufficient (Barkey 1998: 131). Tuncer Bakirhan, the leader of DEHAP, in 2003 indicated that DEHAP is in favor of neither a federation nor a division (Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada 2004). The DTP in 2007 included the demand for autonomy in the six Kurdish provinces in the party program (Jenkins 2007). The BDP’s political objectives are described as “democratic autonomy”, whereby the BDP has “no intention of dividing the country with its calls for bilingualism and “democratic autonomy,” but rather seeks total decentralization” (CORI 2011). Since the PKK, which Icduygu et al. (1999: 994) describe as the “most important Kurdish movement in Turkey’s history”, demanded independence until 1999, independence is also coded as the dominant claim until 1999. With the PKK’s switch to regional autonomy and with a large share of most other parties also pursuing autonomy, autonomy is coded as the dominant claim from 2000 onwards. In 2010, the PKK reiterated the demand for autonomy and promised to lay down its arms if a significant degree of autonomy is granted (BBC 2010, PressTV 2010). In the 2015 elections (first election in June), the HDP won 13.12% of the votes and 80 seats in parliament, thereby passing the 10% election threshold. The HDP, which has regional autonomy in its program, hereby also benefited from the support of the pro-PKK electorate. Hence, regional autonomy is continued to be coded as the dominant claim (despite the renewed insurgency). [2000-2017: autonomy claim]</p>	
<p>Sources</p> <p>Barkey, Henri J. and Graham E. Fuller (2000). <i>Turkey's Kurdish question</i>. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.</p> <p>Barkey, Henri J. (1998). “The people's democracy party (hadep): the travails of a legal Kurdish party in Turkey.” <i>Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs</i> 18(1): 129-138.</p>	

- BBC (2010). "PKK 'would disarm for Kurdish rights in Turkey'." July 21. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-10707935> [August 20, 2017].
- Country of Origin Research Information CORI (2011). "Turkey: Peace and Democracy Party (BDP)." <http://www.refworld.org/docid/4d622c7a2.html> [August 20, 2017].
- Global Security (2016). "Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK)." <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/para/pkk.htm> [August 20, 2017].
- Icduygu, Ahmet, David Romano, and Ibrahim Sirkeci (1999). "The ethnic question in an environment of insecurity: the Kurds in Turkey." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22(6): 991-1010.
- Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada (2004). "Turkey: The situation and treatment of members, supporters and sympathizers of leftist parties, particularly the People's Democratic Party (HADEP) and Democratic People's Party (DEHAP)." <http://www.refworld.org/docid/42df61ad2f.html> [August 20, 2017].
- Jenkins, Garteh (2007). "DTP Calls For Autonomy Amid Continuing Tensions Following Recent PKK Attacks." *Eurasia Daily Monitor* 4(202).
- Kirişci, Kemal, Kemal Kirisci, and Gareth M. Winrow (1997). *The Kurdish question and Turkey: An example of a trans-state ethnic conflict*. London: Frank Class.
- Leezenberg, Michiel (2016). "The ambiguities of democratic autonomy: the Kurdish movement in Turkey and Rojava." *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 16(4): 671-690.
- Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- PressTV (2010). "PKK ready to swap arms for autonomy'." <https://web.archive.org/web/20100914220711/http://www.presstv.ir/detail/142279.html> [August 20, 2017].
- Rogg, Inga, and Hans Rimscha (2007). "The Kurds as parties to and victims of conflicts in Iraq." *International Review of the Red Cross* 89(868): 823-842.
- Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.
- Yavuz, Hakan M. and Nihat Ali Ozcan (2006). "The Kurdish question and Turkey's justice and development party." *Middle East Policy* 13(1): 102-119.

UGANDA

Baganda (50002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1962-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Baganda
<i>SDM activity</i>	1995-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>Separatist activity started with the foundation of the National Democratic Alliance in 1995. The organization demanded semi-autonomy for the Buganda kingdom, as does the Buganda Youth Movement, which was also formed in 1995. In 2003, the Baganda submitted a list of demands, including the demand for a federal system of government. During the 2004 presidential elections, “Baganda threatened to remove their political support of Museveni if he refused to grant Buganda administrative autonomy” (Minorities at Risk). Minahan (2002: 648) also describes regional autonomy as the Baganda’s “most pressing political issue”. Regional autonomy is hence coded as the dominant claim throughout. Since the last evidence of separatist activity mentioned by the SDM documentation was in 2006, the movement is coded as terminated in 2016, in line with the ten years of inactivity rule. [1995-2016: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

South-Westerners (Ankole, Banyoro, Toro, Banyarwanda) (50011000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1962-1989
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	n:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Batoro; Banyankole; Banyoro
<i>SDM activity</i>	Batoro: 1962-1972; Banyankole: 1962-1972, 1993-2012 (ongoing); Banyoro: 1962-1972, 1993-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes the Ankole (Banyankole), Banyoro, and the Toro (Batoro) as separate groups throughout, whereas EPR codes an umbrella group called South Westerners with four sub-groups (Ankole, Banyoro, Toro, Banyarwanda) until 1989 and with three sub-groups (Ankole, Banyoro, Toro) from 1990 onwards. Since the (non-separatist) Banyarwanda only make up one third of the South Westerners (until 1989), the South Westerners are coded separatist. The start of separatist activity is pegged at 1962 (Ugandan independence) and lasted until 1972. The second period started in 1993 and was ongoing in 2012 (for the claim in the second period, see comments under ‘South Westerners (Ankole, Banyoro, Toro)’). According to Minahan (2002), the Ankole are the largest of the three separatist groups and make up over 60% of their population. Before Ugandan independence, they demanded “autonomy or separate independence” (Minahan 2002: 132), but the Ankole finally accepted semi-federal status within an independent Uganda. However, Minahan (2002: 132) mentions “growing tensions and moves toward secession” in 1966, which made the Obote government put an end to Ankole autonomy. There was another “secessionist revolt” by the Ankole in 1972 after the overthrow of Obote (Minahan 2002: 132). The revolt was crushed by Idi Amin’s army, the Ankole leadership was decimated, murdered or disappeared and the separatist movement collapsed. Mwakikagile (2009: 95) also describes the Ankole as secessionist from 1966 onwards. The switch from accepting a semi-federal status within an independent Uganda to demanding secession, as just described in the case of the Ankole, could also be observed in the case of the Toros (Minahan 2002: 1912) and the Banyoro (Minahan 2002: 1429). Hence, autonomy is coded as the dominant claim from 1962 until 1966,</p>	

and independence from 1967 until the end of the first period of separatist activity in 1972. [1962-1966: autonomy claim][1967-1972: independence claim]

Sources

Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

South-Westerners (Ankole, Banyoro, Toro) (50011090)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1990-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	n:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Batoro; Banyankole; Banyoro
<i>SDM activity</i>	Batoro: 1962-1972; Banyankole: 1962-1972, 1993-2012 (ongoing); Banyoro: 1962-1972, 1993-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The SDM dataset codes the Ankole (Banyankole), Banyoro, and the Toro (Batoro) as separate groups throughout, whereas EPR codes an umbrella group called South Westerners with four sub-groups (Ankole, Banyoro, Toro, Banyarwanda) until 1989 and with three sub-groups (Ankole, Banyoro, Toro) from 1990 onwards. Since the (non-separatist) Banyarwanda only make up one third of the South Westerners (until 1989), the South Westerners are coded separatist. The start of separatist activity is pegged at 1962 (Ugandan independence) and lasted until 1972. The second period started in 1993 and was ongoing in 2012. Since the EPR group ‘South Westerners (Ankole, Banyoro, Toro)’ is only coded relevant from 1990 onwards, only the second period of separatist activity is considered here. This period started in 1993 (the SDM dataset only codes the Banyankole and Banyoro as separatist in this period), when the Nkore Cultural Trust (NCT) was formed to demand the restoration of the Ankole kingship (Tumushabe 2012). According to Minahan (2002), the Ankole are the largest of the three separatist groups and make up over 60% of their population. The Ankole demand became stronger when a 1993 law restored the former kingdoms of Buganda, Bunyoro-Kitara, Busoga and Toro but not the Ankole kingdom. The demand has continued after 2012 (Ninsiima and Basiime 2016; Magara 2014). Autonomy is coded as the dominant claim, since the restoration of the kingdom does not result in independence, as the examples of the other kingdoms have shown. [1993-2017: autonomy claim]</p>	
<h4>Sources</h4> <p>Magara, Darius (2014). “Ankole youth demand restoration of Ankole monarchy.” http://www.newvision.co.ug/new_vision/news/1303541/ankole-youth-demand-restoration-ankole-monarchy [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Mwakikagile, Godfrey (2009). <i>Uganda: The land and its people</i>. Dar es Salaam: New Africa Press.</p> <p>Ninsiima, Enid and Felix Basiime (2016). “Ankole prince unveiled as demand for king resumes.” http://www.monitor.co.ug/News/National/Ankole-prince-unveiled-demand-king-resumes-/688334-3015538-ks8w18z/index.html [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Tumushabe, Alfred (2012). “Ankole Monarchists’ Two Decade Battle for Restoration of Kingdom.” <i>Daily Monitor</i>. September 22. http://www.monitor.co.ug/SpecialReports/Ankole-monarchists--two-decade-battle-for-restoration-kingdom/-/688342/1513552/-/x7a7y6/-/index.html [August 25, 2017].</p>	

UKRAINE

Crimean Tatars (36905000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Crimean Tatars
<i>SDM activity</i>	1957-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for regional autonomy for the entire period of separatist activity in the Ukraine. This claim has continued after 2012, as the 2014 demand for “ethnic and territorial autonomy” by the Crimean Tatars’ assembly illustrates (Reuters 2014). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Reuters (2014). “Crimean Tatars' want autonomy after Russia's seizure of peninsula.” http://www.reuters.com/article/us-ukraine-crisis-crimea-tatars-idUSBREA2S09320140329 [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Hungarians (36907000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Hungarians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for regional autonomy for the entire period of separatist activity in the Ukraine. This claim was repeated in 2013 by the Cultural Association of Sub-Carpathian Hungarians (KMKSZ) and again in 2014 (Financial Times 2014). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Financial Times (2014). “Hungarian minority creates headache for Ukraine.” https://www.ft.com/content/419f99b2-0e22-3dae-8c64-f3e7ec6cead4 [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Romanians/Moldovans (36903000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Romanians
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2001
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-2001: autonomy claim]

The SDM dataset codes an end to the Romanian claim in 2001, based on the ten years of inactivity rule. There is no evidence that the separatist movement has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.

Sources

Sampanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

UNITED KINGDOM

Catholics In N. Ireland (20006000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Catholics in Northern Ireland
<i>SDM activity</i>	1948-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1948-2012: irredentist claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for irredentism for the entire period of separatist activity. This claim has continued after 2012. Sinn Féin, which came out as the strongest nationalist party in the 2016 and 2017 elections, demands a reunification referendum (The Guardian 2016). [2013-2017: irredentist claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>The Guardian (2017). “Sinn Féin calls for vote on Irish reunification if UK backs Brexit.” March 11. https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/mar/11/sinn-fein-irish-reunification-vote-brexiteu-referendum [August 25, 2017].</p>	

English (20001000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	English
<i>SDM activity</i>	1974-1981; 1998-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1974-1981: autonomy claim][1998-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy for both periods of separatist activity. This claim has continued after 2012 and has even gained more relevance in the context of Scotland’s 2014 independence referendum (e.g. The Economist 2014). [2103-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>The Economist (2014). “Devolution and Nationalism. Let England Shake.” September 27. http://www.economist.com/news/britain/21620243-scotlands-independence-referendum-has-opened-cracks-united-kingdom-let-england-shake [August 25, 2017].</p>	

Scots (20002000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Scots
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1945-1971: autonomy claim][1972-2012: independence claim]

The SDM dataset codes a claim for autonomy from 1945 until 1971 and then a claim for independence from 1972 onwards. The claim for independence has remained dominant since 2012, with an independence referendum in September 2014 (44.7 % in favor of independence) and with plans to hold a second such referendum in the context after the United Kingdom voted to leave the European Union (The Guardian 2017). [2013-2017: independence claim]

Sources

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

The Guardian (2017). “Scottish parliament votes for second independence referendum.” March 28.
<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2017/mar/28/scottish-parliament-votes-for-second-independence-referendum-nicola-sturgeon> [August 25, 2017].

Welsh (20005000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1964-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Welsh
<i>SDM activity</i>	1945-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1945-1999: independence claim][2000-2003: autonomy claim][2004-2012: independence claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a switch back to independence as the dominant claim in 2004, after Plaid Cymru adopted independence as its long-term objective, despite seeing devolution as the more realistic option in the short term. Independence remains the long term goal of Plaid Cymru (The Guardian 2012). [2013-2017: independence claim]</p>	
<h4>Sources</h4> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>The Guardian (2012). “Plaid Cymru leader: We can only prosper if we do things for ourselves.” September 12. https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2012/sep/12/plaid-cymru-leader-wales-prosper [August 25, 2017].</p>	

UNITED STATES

African Americans (203000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Africans
<i>SDM activity</i>	1968-1984
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>Separatist activity started with the foundation of the Republic of New Africa (RNA) in 1968. The RNA called for an independent black nation to be carved out of the states of Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, South Carolina and Mississippi (Brown University 2004). [1968-1984: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Brown University (2004). “Republic of New Africa.” http://cds.library.brown.edu/projects/FreedomNow/themes/blkpower/ [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

American Indians (205000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1946-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	n:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Cherokee; Dine (Navajo); Iroquois; Lakota (Sioux); Pueblos
<i>SDM activity</i>	Cherokee: 1948-2012 (ongoing); Dine (Navajo): 1977-2012 (ongoing); Iroquois: 1977-2012 (ongoing); Lakota (Sioux) : 1964-2012 (ongoing); Pueblos: 1945-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>Unlike EPR, which codes an indigenous umbrella group (American Indians), the SDM dataset codes five individual indigenous groups (Cherokee, Dine (Navajo), Iroquois, Lakota (Sioux), Pueblos). Since the five groups make up approximately 63% of the indigenous population, they are matched with the American Indians in EPR, which are hence coded as separatist from 1946 onwards. In 1946 and 1947, the Pueblo were the only separatist indigenous peoples. Their claim was represented by the All Indian Pueblo Council (AIPC, called All Pueblo Council APC before 1965), which pushed for land rights and later (in the 1980s and 1990s) also demanded “greater autonomy and the recognition of their historical sovereignty” (Minahan 2002: 1528). Walden (2011: 78), who also states that the Pueblos push for more self-determination with the United States, confirms this demand. In 1948, the first Cherokee organization with separatist goals was founded. According to Minahan (2002: 454), the Cherokees, which are the largest of the five separatist indigenous groups, claimed former tribal lands and demanded self- government. In 1964, a small number of Lakota (Sioux) occupied the island of Alcatraz, demanding its return to the Native people who once occupied it. The 1960s also saw the emergence of the radical Red Power Movement, which fought for land rights and greater self-determination (Josephy et al. 1999, Shreve 2012). The Red Power Movement included indigenous advocacy groups such as the American Indian Movement (AIM) and National Indian Youth Council (NIYC). The AIM, which was at the forefront of the Red Power Movement, also demanded “autonomy over tribal areas and the restoration of lands that they believed had been illegally seized” (Encyclopedia Britannica). Some sources describe a radicalization of the Indian movement in the 1970s and identify independence from the United States as the dominant claim (Toth 2012: 10). This assessment gets additional support by the Lakota Sioux Nation declaring independence in 1991, 2007, and 2012. However, the large majority of the sources mention autonomy and sovereignty within the United States as the movement’s primary goal. [1946-2017: autonomy claim]</p>	

Sources

Encyclopedia Britannica (2017). “American Indian Movement.” <https://www.britannica.com/topic/American-Indian-Movement> [September 1, 2017].

Josephy, Alvin M., Joane Nagel, and Troy R. Johnson (1999). *Red Power: The American Indians' Fight for Freedom*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

Shreve, Bradley G. (2012). *Red Power Rising: The National Indian Youth Council and the Origins of Native Activism*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Toth, Gyorgy Ferenc (2012). “Red Nations: The transatlantic relations of the American Indian radical sovereignty movement in the late Cold War.” *PhD Thesis University of Iowa*.

Walden, Robin S. (2011). *The Pueblo Confederation's Political Wing: The All Indian Pueblo Council, 1920–1975*. Master Thesis, University of New Mexico. <http://dspace.unm.edu/bitstream/handle/1928/12812/finaldraftsubmittedPDF.pdf?sequence=1> [August 25, 2017].

Latinos (202000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1966-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	n:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Chicanos
<i>SDM activity</i>	1969-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset

The SDM group Chicanos is matched with the EPR group Latinos, as about two thirds of all Latinos self-identify as American-Mexicans according to the 2010 census. Separatist activity is coded from 1969 onwards, when the Chicano Youth Liberation Conference was organized. The conference made the demand that most of the southwestern United States (i.e. Colorado, New Mexico, California, Arizona and parts of Texas) become the independent country of “Aztlán”. According to the SDM dataset, separatist activity was ongoing as of 2012, by organizations such as the ‘Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán’. This activity continued beyond 2012 and in 2016 the movement was renamed ‘Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán’. [1969-2017: independence claim]

Sources

Navarro, Armando (2015). *Mexicano and Latino politics and the quest for self-determination: What needs to be done*. London: Lexington Books.

Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.

UZBEKISTAN

Karakalpak (70401000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Karakalpaks
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for regional autonomy for the entire period of separatist activity. The claim for increased self-determination has certainly continued beyond 2012. In the context of the developments in Crimea and Eastern Ukraine, there has been increased activism with regard to an independence referendum in Karakalpakstan (Horák 2014). However, since this initiative “appeared to garner little local support” (International Crisis Group 2016), the more moderate claim for autonomy is continued. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Horák, Slavomir (2014). “Separatism in Uzbekistan? Karakalpakstan after Crimea.” http://www.css.ethz.ch/en/services/digital-library/articles/article.html/180362/pdf [August 25, 2016].</p> <p>International Crisis Group (2016). “Uzbekistan: In Transition.” <i>Crisis Group Europe and Central Asia Briefing No. 82</i>.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Tajiks (70404000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Uzbek Tajiks
<i>SDM activity</i>	1991-2002
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1991-2002: irredentist claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes an end to the Tajik claim in 2002, based on the ten years of inactivity rule. No evidence could be found that the movement has reemerged after 2012. Hence, no claim is coded for the years 2013-2017.</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

VENEZUELA

Indigenous Peoples (10103000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1973-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Indigenous Peoples
<i>SDM activity</i>	1972-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1972-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for regional autonomy for the entire period of separatist activity. This coding is backed by numerous sources and the official goals of the Consejo Nacional Indio de Venezuela (CONIVE), which advocates more political participation (proportional representation, ethnic quotas), land rights and protection of indigenous culture (Van Cott 2001). There continues to be no evidence of claims that go beyond autonomy, which is why regional autonomy is also coded as the dominant claim for the period 2013-2017. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>Van Cott, Donna L. (2001). "Explaining Ethnic Autonomy Regimes in Latin America." <i>Studies in Comparative International Development</i> 35(4): 30-58.</p>	

VIETNAM

Gia Rai (81610000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1976-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:n
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Montagnards
<i>SDM activity</i>	1975-1984; 2001-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1975-1984: independence claim][2001-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes the Montagnards as a self-determination group which was active in South Vietnam (1958-1975) and unified Vietnam (1976-1984, 2001-2012). The Montagnards include various highland indigenous peoples, among which also the Gia Rai. SDM2EPR matches the two movements and codes the Gia Rai in Vietnam as separatist, as they were also part of the separatist United Front for the Struggle of the Oppressed Races (FULRO). Regarding the type of claim, the SDM dataset codes autonomy as the dominant claim for the entire second period of separatist activity (2001-2012). This coding is based on a recent report by Human Rights Watch (2011), which states that the rebellion now is over issues of autonomy, greater cultural and religious freedom and land rights. No evidence could be found that the movement has since ended or altered its claims. [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Human Rights Watch (2011). Montagnard Christians in Vietnam. A Case Study in Religious Repression. http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/4d95751d2.pdf [August 25, 2017]</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

Khmer (81613000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1976-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Khmer Krom
<i>SDM activity</i>	1975-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	[1975-1984: irredentist claim][1985-2012: autonomy claim]
<p>The SDM dataset codes a claim for regional autonomy from 1985 onwards after the Front for the Struggle of the Oppressed Races (FULRO) disbanded and the Khmers Kampuchea-Krom Federation (KKF) emerged. Until today, the KKF has been demanding regional autonomy and a separate governing system for the Khmer Krom in southern Vietnam (The Cambodia Daily 2005, Minahan 2002: 996, Khmers Kampuchea-Krom Federation). [2013-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Khmers Kampuchea-Krom Federation. "About KKF." http://khmerkrom.org/about-us [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p> <p>The Cambodia Daily (2005): "Khmer Krom Federation Wants Right To Govern" August 11. http://www.cambodiadaily.com/archives/khmer-krom-federation-wants-right-to-govern-48863/ [August 25, 2017].</p>	

YEMEN

Southerners (67801000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1991-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	South Yemenis
<i>SDM activity</i>	1990-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>Right after unification, the main Southern party, the Yemeni Socialist Party (YSP), wanted a decentralized state that would grant considerable powers to its regional components. The demand for a more decentralized government in the early years of the unified Republic of Yemen is confirmed by Minahan (2002: 706), as is the fact that the Southerners changed their goal to independence in 1994. Secessionist fighting broke out on in May and southern leaders declared the independence of South Yemen. Since 1994, there have been claims for both independence and also more moderate demands for decentralization or federation (Brehony 2011: 202). It is unclear which of the two claims is dominant. In line with the SDM coding instruction, the more extreme claim is coded. Demands for secession and an independence referendum were reiterated in 2011 and 2012 (Reuters 2011, 2012) and also more recently (Middle East Eye 2017). [1990-1994: autonomy claim][1995-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Brehony, Noel (2011). <i>Yemen divided: The story of a failed state in South Arabia</i>. New York: IB Tauris.</p> <p>Middle East Eye (2017). "Yemen war: Demands for southern independence split coalition." http://www.middleeasteye.net/news/yemen-war-how-independence-calls-could-split-coalition-1812416955 [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Reuters (2012). "South Yemen separatists see new chance after Saleh's demise." http://www.reuters.com/article/us-yemen-south-separatism/south-yemen-separatists-see-new-chance-after-salehs-demise-idUSBRE89A14M20121011 [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Reuters (2011). "South Yemen politician wants referendum on secession." http://www.reuters.com/article/us-yemen-south-separatism/south-yemen-separatists-see-new-chance-after-salehs-demise-idUSBRE89A14M20121011 [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

ZAMBIA

Lozi (Barotse) (55103000)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1964-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Lozi (Barotse)
<i>SDM activity</i>	1988-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The Lozi began agitating for autonomy for the Western province (formerly known as Barotseland) in 1988. The demand for autonomy continued after the end of one-party rule in 1991. In 1992, the Barotse Patriotic Front demanded the return to the autonomous status of 1964 (Minahan 2002: 1119). The claim for autonomy in these early years is confirmed by Minorities at Risk. In July 1993, Lozi leaders for the first time threatened secession, if the autonomy agreement was not honored. Calls for secession have continued since. In 1996, the Barotse Patriotic Front (BPF) was formed with the aim of achieving independence for Barotseland. In 1997, the prime minister of Barotseland sent a petition to the United Nations Security Council and other supranational organizations, outlining the Lozi position on secession and in 1998, several Lozi leaders demanded a referendum on whether Barotseland should reclaim independence as a self-governing monarchy. The movement seems to be split between secessionists and moderates, who favor an autonomous province within a federal Zambia (Minahan 2002: 1120). Although Minorities at Risk state that secessionism is “only shared by a smaller number of Lozis, where many others do not see this stance as an advantageous one”, the main organizations and Lozi leaders seem to advocate the independence of Barotseland. Hence, independence is coded as the dominant claim from 1994 onwards, following the first of January rule. This demand has continued since and in 2012, the Barotseland royal household also demanded independence as the government has failed to honor the autonomy agreement of 1964 (BBC 2012). [1988-1993: autonomy claim][1994-2017: independence claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>BBC (2012). “Barotseland kingdom seeks to leave Zambia.” 29 March. http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-17546620 [August 25, 2017].</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set.</p>	

ZIMBABWE

Ndebele-Kalanga-(Tonga) (55201100)

<i>Relevance period (EPR)</i>	1980-2017
<i>SDM2EPR scenario</i>	1:1
<i>SDM group(s)</i>	Ndebele
<i>SDM activity</i>	1987-2012 (ongoing)
<i>SDM claim</i>	claim not coded by SDM dataset
<p>The Ndebele claim for self-determination was represented by several organizations, among which Vukani Mahlabezulu, Imbovane YaMahlabezulu, ZAPU 2000, Matabeleland Development Society, and the Mthwakazi People's Congress. While Vukani Mahlabezulu demands cultural autonomy, others, including ZAPU 2000, advocate a federal Ndebele state within Matabeleland (Minahan 2002: 1345). Claims for secession were made by the Mthwakazi People's Congress (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2009: 21, 189). However, the demand for regional autonomy seems to be dominant. According to Minorities at Risk, secessionism "seems limited to an old guard minority". The latest evidence of separatist activity mentioned by the SDM documentation was the 2012 establishment of the Mthwakazi Liberation Front (MLF). Hence, demands for self-determination are coded as ongoing. [1987-2017: autonomy claim]</p> <p>Sources</p> <p>Minahan, James (2002). <i>Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations</i>. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.</p> <p>Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.</p> <p>Sambanis, Nicholas, Micha Germann and Andreas Schädel (2017). <i>Self-Determination Movements (SDM) Data Set</i>.</p> <p>Ndlovu-Gatsheni, Sabelo J. (2009). <i>The Ndebele nation: Reflections on hegemony, memory and historiography</i>. Amsterdam: Rozenberg Publishers.</p>	