

# Democracy index 2012

## Democracy at a standstill

A report from The Economist Intelligence Unit





## The Economist Intelligence Unit's Index of Democracy 2012

### *Democracy at a standstill*

This is the fifth edition of the Economist Intelligence Unit's Democracy index. It reflects the situation at the end of 2012. In 2012 global democracy was at a standstill in the sense that there was neither significant progress nor regression in democracy in that year. Average regional scores in 2012 were very similar to scores in 2011.

The first edition of the index, published in *The Economist's The World* in 2007, measured the state of democracy in September 2006; the second edition covered the situation towards the end of 2008; the third as of November 2010 and the fourth at the end of 2011.

The index provides a snapshot of the state of democracy worldwide for 165 independent states and two territories—this covers almost the entire population of the world and the vast majority of the world's states (micro states are excluded). The Democracy index is based on five categories: electoral process and pluralism; civil liberties; the functioning of government; political participation; and political culture. Countries are placed within one of four types of regimes: full democracies; flawed democracies; hybrid regimes; and authoritarian regimes.

Free and fair elections and civil liberties are necessary conditions for democracy, but they are unlikely to be sufficient for a full and consolidated democracy if unaccompanied by transparent and at least minimally efficient government, sufficient political participation and a supportive democratic political culture. It is not easy to build a sturdy democracy. Even in long-established ones, democracy can corrode if not nurtured and protected.

### **Stagnation of democracy**

Key recent developments include:

- The unprecedented rise of movements for democratic change across the Arab world led many to expect a new wave of democratisation. But it has become apparent that democracy in the region remains a highly uncertain prospect.
- 2012 was characterised by sovereign debt crises and weak political leadership in the developed world.
- Popular confidence in political institutions continues to decline in many European countries.
- The US and the UK remain at the bottom end of the full democracy category. US democracy has been adversely affected by a deepening of the polarisation of the political scene and political brinkmanship and paralysis. The UK is beset by a deep institutional crisis.
- In eastern Europe democracy declined in 10 countries in 2012. Had it not been for the significant improvement in the score for Georgia, the regional average score for eastern Europe would have declined in 2012 compared with 2011.



- Rampant crime in some countries—in particular, violence and drug-trafficking—continues to have a negative impact on democracy in Latin America.

### **Erosion of democracy in Europe**

Global backsliding in democracy had been evident for some time and strengthened in the wake of the 2008–09 global economic crisis. Between 2006 and 2008 there was stagnation of democracy; between 2008 and 2010 there was regression across the world.

Following a regression in 2011, in western Europe in 2012 there was a stabilisation in democratic trends. In 2011 seven countries in western Europe suffered a decline in their democracy score; in 2012 none had a decline. The main reason for the earlier decline was the erosion of sovereignty and democratic accountability associated with the effects of and responses to the euro zone crisis (five of the countries that experienced a decline in their scores are members of the euro zone—Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain and Ireland). Most dramatically, in two countries (Greece and Italy) democratically elected leaders have been replaced by technocrats.

In 2013 harsh austerity and a new recession is testing the resilience of Europe’s political institutions.

### **Longer-term trends**

The global record in democratisation since the start of its so-called third wave in 1974, and acceleration after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, has been impressive. According to the Economist Intelligence Unit’s measure of democracy, one-half of the world’s population now lives in a democracy of some sort. However, in recent years there has been backsliding on previously attained progress in democratisation. The global financial crisis that started in 2008 accentuated some existing negative trends in political development.

A political malaise in east-central Europe has led to disappointment and questioning of the strength of the region’s democratic transition. Media freedoms have been eroded across Latin America and populist forces with dubious democratic credentials have come to the fore in a few countries in the region. In the developed West, a precipitous decline in political participation, weaknesses in the

**Table 1**

**Democracy index 2012, by regime type**

	No. of countries	% of countries	% of world population
Full democracies	25	15.0	11.3
Flawed democracies	54	32.3	37.2
Hybrid regimes	37	22.2	14.4
Authoritarian regimes	51	30.5	37.1

Note. “World” population refers to the total population of the 167 countries covered by the index. Since this excludes only micro states, this is nearly equal to the entire actual estimated world population.

Source: Economist Intelligence Unit.



functioning of government and security-related curbs on civil liberties are having a corrosive effect on some long-established democracies.

Although almost one-half of the world's countries can be considered to be democracies, in our index the number of "full democracies" is low, at only 25 countries; 54 countries are rated as "flawed democracies". Of the remaining 88 countries in our index, 51 are authoritarian and 37 are considered to be "hybrid regimes". As could be expected, the developed OECD countries dominate among full democracies, although there are two Latin American countries, one east European country and one African country, which suggests that the level of development is not a binding constraint. Only two Asian countries are represented: Japan and South Korea.

Slightly less than one-half of the world's population lives in a democracy of some sort, although only 11% reside in full democracies. Some 2.6bn people, more than one-third of the world's population, still lives under authoritarian rule (with a large share being, of course, in China).

**Table 2**  
**Democracy Index 2012**

Category scores							
Rank	Overall score	I Electoral process and pluralism	II Functioning of government	III Political participation	IV Political culture	V Civil liberties	
<b>Full democracies</b>							
Norway	1	9.93	10.00	9.64	10.00	10.00	10.00
Sweden	2	9.73	9.58	9.64	9.44	10.00	10.00
Iceland	3	9.65	10.00	9.64	8.89	10.00	9.71
Denmark	4	9.52	10.00	9.64	8.89	9.38	9.71
New Zealand	5	9.26	10.00	9.29	8.89	8.13	10.00
Australia	6	9.22	10.00	8.93	7.78	9.38	10.00
Switzerland	7	9.09	9.58	9.29	7.78	9.38	9.41
Canada	8	9.08	9.58	9.29	7.78	8.75	10.00
Finland	9	9.06	10.00	9.64	7.22	8.75	9.71
Netherlands	10	8.99	9.58	8.93	8.89	8.13	9.41
Luxembourg	11	8.88	10.00	9.29	6.67	8.75	9.71
Austria	12	8.62	9.58	8.21	7.78	8.13	9.41
Ireland	13	8.56	9.58	7.86	7.22	8.13	10.00
Germany	14	8.34	9.58	8.21	6.67	8.13	9.12
Malta	15	8.28	9.17	8.21	5.56	8.75	9.71
United Kingdom	16	8.21	9.58	7.50	6.11	8.75	9.12
Czech Republic	17	8.19	9.58	7.14	6.67	8.13	9.41
Uruguay	=18	8.17	10.00	8.93	4.44	7.50	10.00
Mauritius	=18	8.17	9.17	8.21	5.00	8.75	9.71



**Democracy Index 2012**  
Democracy at a standstill

**Table 2**  
**Democracy Index 2012**

Category scores							
	Rank	Overall score	I Electoral process and pluralism	II Functioning of government	III Political participation	IV Political culture	V Civil liberties
South Korea	20	8.13	9.17	8.21	7.22	7.50	8.53
United States of America	21	8.11	9.17	7.50	7.22	8.13	8.53
Costa Rica	22	8.10	9.58	8.21	6.11	6.88	9.71
Japan	23	8.08	9.17	8.21	6.11	7.50	9.41
Belgium	24	8.05	9.58	8.21	5.56	7.50	9.41
Spain	25	8.02	9.58	7.50	6.11	7.50	9.41
Flawed democracies							
Cape Verde	=26	7.92	9.17	7.86	7.22	6.25	9.12
Portugal	=26	7.92	9.58	6.43	6.67	7.50	9.41
France	=28	7.88	9.58	7.14	6.67	7.50	8.53
Slovenia	=28	7.88	9.58	7.50	7.22	6.25	8.82
Botswana	30	7.85	9.17	7.14	6.67	6.88	9.41
South Africa	31	7.79	8.75	8.21	7.22	6.25	8.53
Italy	32	7.74	9.58	6.43	6.67	7.50	8.53
Greece	33	7.65	9.58	5.71	6.67	6.88	9.41
Estonia	34	7.61	9.58	7.14	5.00	7.50	8.82
Taiwan	35	7.57	9.58	7.14	6.11	5.63	9.41
Chile	36	7.54	9.58	8.57	3.89	6.25	9.41
Israel	37	7.53	8.75	7.50	8.33	7.50	5.59
India	38	7.52	9.58	7.50	6.11	5.00	9.41
Jamaica	39	7.39	9.17	6.79	5.00	6.88	9.12
Slovakia	40	7.35	9.58	7.50	5.56	5.00	9.12
Cyprus	41	7.29	9.17	6.43	6.11	5.63	9.12
Lithuania	42	7.24	9.58	5.71	5.56	6.25	9.12
Timor-Leste	43	7.16	8.67	6.79	5.56	6.88	7.94
Poland	=44	7.12	9.58	6.43	6.11	4.38	9.12
Brazil	=44	7.12	9.58	7.50	5.00	4.38	9.12
Panama	46	7.08	9.58	6.43	5.56	5.00	8.82
Latvia	47	7.05	9.58	5.36	5.56	5.63	9.12
Trinidad and Tobago	48	6.99	9.58	7.14	5.00	5.00	8.24
Hungary	49	6.96	9.17	6.07	4.44	6.88	8.24
Croatia	50	6.93	9.17	6.07	5.56	5.63	8.24
Mexico	51	6.90	8.33	7.14	6.67	5.00	7.35



**Democracy Index 2012**  
Democracy at a standstill

**Table 2**  
**Democracy Index 2012**

	Rank	Overall score	Category scores				
			I Electoral process and pluralism	II Functioning of government	III Political participation	IV Political culture	V Civil liberties
Argentina	52	6.84	8.75	5.71	5.56	6.25	7.94
Indonesia	53	6.76	6.92	7.50	6.11	5.63	7.65
Bulgaria	54	6.72	9.17	5.71	6.11	4.38	8.24
Lesotho	55	6.66	8.25	5.71	6.67	5.63	7.06
Suriname	56	6.65	9.17	6.43	4.44	5.00	8.24
Colombia	57	6.63	9.17	7.50	3.89	3.75	8.82
Thailand	58	6.55	7.83	6.07	5.56	6.25	7.06
Romania	59	6.54	9.58	6.07	4.44	4.38	8.24
Dominican Republic	60	6.49	8.75	5.36	4.44	6.25	7.65
El Salvador	=61	6.47	9.17	6.07	3.89	5.00	8.24
Peru	=61	6.47	9.17	5.00	5.56	4.38	8.24
Hong Kong	63	6.42	4.75	6.07	5.00	6.88	9.41
Malaysia	64	6.41	6.50	7.86	5.56	6.25	5.88
Mongolia	65	6.35	8.33	5.71	4.44	5.00	8.24
Serbia	66	6.33	9.17	4.64	6.11	4.38	7.35
Moldova	=67	6.32	8.75	5.00	5.56	4.38	7.94
Papua New Guinea	=67	6.32	7.33	6.43	3.33	6.25	8.24
Philippines	69	6.30	8.33	5.36	5.56	3.13	9.12
Zambia	=70	6.26	7.92	5.36	4.44	6.25	7.35
Paraguay	=70	6.26	8.33	5.36	5.00	4.38	8.24
Namibia	72	6.24	5.67	5.00	6.67	5.63	8.24
Macedonia	73	6.16	7.75	4.64	6.11	4.38	7.94
Senegal	74	6.09	7.92	5.71	4.44	5.63	6.76
Malawi	75	6.08	7.00	5.71	5.56	6.25	5.88
Montenegro	=76	6.05	7.92	5.36	5.56	4.38	7.06
Guyana	=76	6.05	7.92	5.36	5.56	4.38	7.06
Ghana	78	6.02	8.33	5.00	5.00	5.00	6.76
Benin	79	6.00	7.33	6.43	4.44	5.63	6.18
Hybrid regimes							
Ukraine	80	5.91	7.92	4.64	5.56	4.38	7.06
Guatemala	=81	5.88	7.92	6.43	3.33	4.38	7.35
Singapore	=81	5.88	4.33	7.50	3.33	6.88	7.35
Tanzania	=81	5.88	7.42	4.64	6.11	5.63	5.59



**Democracy Index 2012**  
Democracy at a standstill

**Table 2**  
**Democracy Index 2012**

	Rank	Overall score	Category scores				
			I Electoral process and pluralism	II Functioning of government	III Political participation	IV Political culture	V Civil liberties
Bangladesh	84	5.86	7.42	5.43	5.00	4.38	7.06
Bolivia	=85	5.84	7.00	5.00	6.11	3.75	7.35
Honduras	=85	5.84	8.75	5.71	3.89	4.38	6.47
Ecuador	87	5.78	7.83	4.64	5.00	4.38	7.06
Turkey	88	5.76	7.92	6.79	5.00	5.00	4.12
Sri Lanka	89	5.75	6.17	5.36	4.44	6.88	5.88
Tunisia	=90	5.67	5.75	5.00	6.67	6.25	4.71
Albania	=90	5.67	7.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	7.35
Nicaragua	92	5.56	6.58	4.36	3.89	5.63	7.35
Georgia	93	5.53	8.25	3.21	5.00	5.00	6.18
Uganda	94	5.16	5.67	3.57	4.44	6.25	5.88
Libya	=95	5.15	4.33	5.71	3.89	6.25	5.59
Venezuela	=95	5.15	5.67	4.29	5.56	4.38	5.88
Mali	97	5.12	7.42	3.57	5.00	3.13	6.47
Bosnia and Hercegovina	98	5.11	6.92	2.93	3.33	5.00	7.35
Lebanon	99	5.05	5.67	1.79	7.22	5.00	5.59
Cambodia	100	4.96	5.67	6.07	3.33	5.63	4.12
Liberia	101	4.95	7.83	0.79	5.56	5.00	5.59
Mozambique	102	4.88	4.83	4.29	5.56	5.63	4.12
Palestine	103	4.80	5.17	2.86	7.78	4.38	3.82
Kenya	=104	4.71	3.92	4.29	4.44	5.63	5.29
Sierra Leone	=104	4.71	7.00	2.21	2.78	6.25	5.29
Kyrgyz Republic	106	4.69	6.58	2.21	5.00	4.38	5.29
Bhutan	107	4.65	6.67	5.36	3.33	4.38	3.53
Pakistan	108	4.57	5.58	5.36	2.22	4.38	5.29
Egypt	109	4.56	3.42	4.64	5.00	5.63	4.12
Mauritania	110	4.17	3.42	4.29	5.00	3.13	5.00
Nepal	=111	4.16	2.67	4.29	3.89	4.38	5.59
Niger	=111	4.16	7.50	1.14	2.78	4.38	5.00
Iraq	113	4.10	4.33	0.79	7.22	3.75	4.41
Armenia	114	4.09	4.33	3.21	3.89	3.13	5.88
Morocco	115	4.07	3.50	4.64	2.78	5.00	4.41
Haiti	116	3.96	5.17	2.21	2.22	3.75	6.47



**Democracy Index 2012**  
Democracy at a standstill

**Table 2**  
**Democracy Index 2012**

	Rank	Overall score	Category scores				
			I Electoral process and pluralism	II Functioning of government	III Political participation	IV Political culture	V Civil liberties
Authoritarian regimes							
Madagascar	117	3.93	2.17	2.14	5.00	5.63	4.71
Algeria	118	3.83	3.00	2.21	3.89	5.63	4.41
Kuwait	119	3.78	3.17	3.93	3.89	4.38	3.53
Nigeria	120	3.77	5.67	3.21	3.33	3.13	3.53
Jordan	121	3.76	3.17	3.93	4.44	3.75	3.53
Russia	122	3.74	3.92	2.86	5.00	2.50	4.41
Ethiopia	123	3.72	0.00	3.57	5.00	5.63	4.41
Fiji	124	3.67	0.42	2.86	3.89	5.00	6.18
Burundi	125	3.60	3.00	2.57	3.89	5.00	3.53
Gabon	126	3.56	2.58	2.21	3.89	5.00	4.12
Burkina Faso	=127	3.52	4.00	3.21	2.22	3.75	4.41
Cuba	=127	3.52	1.75	4.64	3.89	4.38	2.94
Comoros	=127	3.52	3.92	2.21	3.89	3.75	3.82
Togo	130	3.45	4.00	0.79	3.33	5.00	4.12
Cameroon	131	3.44	0.75	4.29	3.33	5.00	3.82
Rwanda	132	3.36	0.83	4.64	2.22	5.00	4.12
Angola	133	3.35	0.92	3.21	5.00	4.38	3.24
Gambia	134	3.31	2.17	3.93	2.22	5.00	3.24
Oman	135	3.26	0.00	3.93	3.89	4.38	4.12
Côte d'Ivoire	136	3.25	0.00	1.79	5.00	5.63	3.82
Swaziland	137	3.20	0.92	2.86	2.78	5.63	3.82
Qatar	138	3.18	0.00	3.93	2.22	5.63	4.12
Azerbaijan	139	3.15	2.17	1.79	3.33	3.75	4.71
Yemen	140	3.12	3.00	1.43	5.00	5.00	1.18
Belarus	141	3.04	1.75	2.86	3.89	4.38	2.35
China	142	3.00	0.00	4.64	3.89	5.00	1.47
Kazakhstan	143	2.95	0.50	2.14	3.33	4.38	4.41
Vietnam	=144	2.89	0.00	3.93	2.78	6.25	1.47
Congo (Brazzaville)	=144	2.89	1.25	2.86	3.33	3.75	3.24
Guinea	146	2.79	3.50	0.43	3.33	3.75	2.94
Djibouti	147	2.74	0.83	1.79	2.22	5.63	3.24
Zimbabwe	148	2.67	0.50	1.29	3.33	5.00	3.24



**Table 2**  
**Democracy Index 2012**

	Rank	Overall score	Category scores				
			I Electoral process and pluralism	II Functioning of government	III Political participation	IV Political culture	V Civil liberties
United Arab Emirates	149	2.58	0.00	3.57	1.11	5.00	3.24
Bahrain	150	2.53	1.25	2.50	2.78	4.38	1.76
Tajikistan	151	2.51	1.83	0.79	2.22	6.25	1.47
Afghanistan	152	2.48	2.50	0.79	2.78	2.50	3.82
Eritrea	153	2.40	0.00	2.86	1.11	6.88	1.18
Sudan	154	2.38	0.00	1.79	3.33	5.00	1.76
Myanmar	155	2.35	1.50	1.79	1.67	5.63	1.18
Laos	156	2.32	0.00	3.21	2.22	5.00	1.18
Central African Republic	157	1.99	1.75	1.07	1.67	2.50	2.94
Iran	158	1.98	0.00	2.86	2.78	2.50	1.76
Democratic Republic of Congo	159	1.92	1.75	0.71	2.22	3.13	1.76
Equatorial Guinea	160	1.83	0.00	0.79	2.22	4.38	1.76
Uzbekistan	=161	1.72	0.08	0.79	2.78	4.38	0.59
Turkmenistan	=161	1.72	0.00	0.79	2.22	5.00	0.59
Saudi Arabia	163	1.71	0.00	2.86	1.11	3.13	1.47
Syria	164	1.63	0.00	0.36	2.78	5.00	0.00
Chad	165	1.62	0.00	0.00	1.11	3.75	3.24
Guinea-Bissau	166	1.43	0.42	0.00	2.22	1.88	2.65
North Korea	167	1.08	0.00	2.50	1.67	1.25	0.00

Flawed democracies are concentrated in Latin America and eastern Europe, and to a lesser extent in Asia. Despite progress in Latin American democratisation in recent decades, many countries in the region have fragile democracies. Levels of political participation are generally low and democratic cultures are weak. There has also been significant backsliding in recent years in some areas such as media freedoms.

Much of eastern Europe illustrates the difference between formal and substantive democracy. The new EU members from the region have pretty much equal levels of political freedoms and civil liberties as the old developed EU, but lag significantly in political participation and political culture—a reflection of widespread popular disenchantment with the transition and weaknesses of democratic development. Only one country from the region, the Czech Republic, is rated a full democracy.

### Changes in 2012

The results of the Economist Intelligence Unit's (EIU) Democracy Index 2012 show that the democracy score declined in 2012 for 40 countries out of the 167 that are covered. The score increased in 54 countries and it stayed the same in 73. In most regions the average democracy score for 2012 is similar to the 2011



score. Libya experienced the biggest increase of any country in its democracy score in 2012.

The main exception is the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) where the average score increased by more than a point, from 3.62 to 3.73. Three MENA countries moved from authoritarian to hybrid regimes (Egypt, Libya, Morocco).

**Table 3**  
Democracy across the regions

	No. of countries	Democracy index average	Full democracies	Flawed democracies	Hybrid regimes	Authoritarian regimes
<b>North America</b>						
2012	2	8.59	2	0	0	0
2011	2	8.59	2	0	0	0
<b>Western Europe</b>						
2012	21	8.44	15	5	1	0
2011	21	8.40	15	5	1	0
<b>Eastern Europe</b>						
2012	28	5.51	1	14	6	7
2011	28	5.50	1	14	6	7
<b>Latin America &amp; the Caribbean</b>						
2012	24	6.36	2	14	7	1
2011	24	6.35	2	14	7	1
<b>Asia &amp; Australasia</b>						
2012	28	5.56	4	10	7	7
2011	28	5.51	4	10	7	7
<b>Middle East &amp; North Africa</b>						
2012	20	3.73	0	1	7	12
2011	20	3.62	0	1	4	15
<b>Sub-Saharan Africa</b>						
2012	44	4.33	1	10	9	24
2011	44	4.32	1	9	11	23
<b>Total</b>						
2012	167	5.52	25	54	37	51
2011	167	5.49	25	53	36	53

Source: Economist Intelligence Unit.

Eight countries had a change in regime type in 2012. In six there was an upgrade and two had a regression. Hong Kong, Malawi and Senegal improved from hybrid regimes to “flawed democracies. Libya, Morocco and Burundi moved from authoritarian to hybrid regimes. Mali and Sri Lanka regressed from flawed democracies to hybrid regimes.



### Decline in media freedoms

A noticeable decline in media freedoms, affecting all regions to some extent, has accelerated since 2008. This has affected mainly electronic media, which is often under state control or heavy state influence—although repression and infringements of the freedom of expression have also extended to the print media and, most recently, the Internet.

The reasons for this decline are complex and varied. Underlying negative trends were exacerbated by the 2008-09 global economic crisis. Many governments have felt increasingly vulnerable and threatened and have reacted by intensifying their efforts to control the media and impede free

expression. Increasing unemployment and job insecurity have fostered a climate of fear and self-censorship among journalists in many countries. The concentration of media ownership has tended to increase, which has had a negative impact on the diversity of views and the freedom of expression. Advanced nations have become more inward-looking and hence less interested and capable of monitoring and pressurising emerging market governments to ensure freedom of the press. In authoritarian regimes, which have often become stronger and more confident, state control and repression of any independent media is a given and has if anything tended to get worse, with increasing attacks on independent journalists.

**Table 4**  
Democracy Index 2006-2012

	2012	2011	2010	2008	2006
US	8.11	8.11	8.18	8.22	8.22
Canada	9.08	9.08	9.08	9.07	9.07
<b>average</b>	<b>8.59</b>	<b>8.59</b>	<b>8.63</b>	<b>8.64</b>	<b>8.64</b>
Austria	8.62	8.49	8.49	8.49	8.69
Belgium	8.05	8.05	8.05	8.16	8.15
Cyprus	7.29	7.29	7.29	7.70	7.60
Denmark	9.52	9.52	9.52	9.52	9.52
Finland	9.06	9.06	9.19	9.25	9.25
France	7.88	7.77	7.77	8.07	8.07
Germany	8.34	8.34	8.38	8.82	8.82
Greece	7.65	7.65	7.92	8.13	8.13
Iceland	9.65	9.65	9.65	9.65	9.71
Ireland	8.56	8.56	8.79	9.01	9.01
Italy	7.74	7.74	7.83	7.98	7.73
Luxembourg	8.88	8.88	8.88	9.10	9.10
Malta	8.28	8.28	8.28	8.39	8.39
Netherlands	8.99	8.99	8.99	9.53	9.66
Norway	9.93	9.80	9.80	9.68	9.55
Portugal	7.92	7.81	8.02	8.05	8.16



**Table 4**  
**Democracy Index 2006-2012**

	2012	2011	2010	2008	2006
Spain	8.02	8.02	8.16	8.45	8.34
Sweden	9.73	9.50	9.50	9.88	9.88
Switzerland	9.09	9.09	9.09	9.15	9.02
Turkey	5.76	5.73	5.73	5.69	5.70
UK	8.21	8.16	8.16	8.15	8.08
<b>average</b>	<b>8.44</b>	<b>8.40</b>	<b>8.45</b>	<b>8.61</b>	<b>8.60</b>
Albania	5.67	5.81	5.86	5.91	5.91
Armenia	4.09	4.09	4.09	4.09	4.15
Azerbaijan	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.19	3.31
Belarus	3.04	3.16	3.34	3.34	3.34
Bosnia and Herzegovina	5.11	5.24	5.32	5.70	5.78
Bulgaria	6.72	6.78	6.84	7.02	7.10
Croatia	6.93	6.73	6.81	7.04	7.04
Czech Rep	8.19	8.19	8.19	8.19	8.17
Estonia	7.61	7.61	7.68	7.68	7.74
Georgia	5.53	4.74	4.59	4.62	4.90
Hungary	6.96	7.04	7.21	7.44	7.53
Kazakhstan	2.95	3.24	3.30	3.45	3.62
Kyrgyz	4.69	4.34	4.31	4.05	4.08
Latvia	7.05	7.05	7.05	7.23	7.37
Lithuania	7.24	7.24	7.24	7.36	7.43
Macedonia	6.16	6.16	6.16	6.21	6.33
Moldova	6.32	6.32	6.33	6.50	6.50
Montenegro	6.05	6.15	6.27	6.43	6.57
Poland	7.12	7.12	7.05	7.30	7.30
Romania	6.54	6.54	6.60	7.06	7.06
Russia	3.74	3.92	4.26	4.48	5.02
Serbia	6.33	6.33	6.33	6.49	6.62
Slovakia	7.35	7.35	7.35	7.33	7.40
Slovenia	7.88	7.76	7.69	7.96	7.96
Tajikistan	2.51	2.51	2.51	2.45	2.45
Turkmenistan	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.83
Ukraine	5.91	5.94	6.30	6.94	6.94
Uzbekistan	1.72	1.74	1.74	1.74	1.85
<b>average</b>	<b>5.51</b>	<b>5.50</b>	<b>5.55</b>	<b>5.67</b>	<b>5.76</b>



**Table 4**  
**Democracy Index 2006-2012**

	2012	2011	2010	2008	2006
Argentina	6.84	6.84	6.84	6.63	6.63
Bolivia	5.84	5.84	5.92	6.15	5.98
Brazil	7.12	7.12	7.12	7.38	7.38
Chile	7.54	7.54	7.67	7.89	7.89
Colombia	6.63	6.63	6.55	6.54	6.40
Costa Rica	8.10	8.10	8.04	8.04	8.04
Cuba	3.52	3.52	3.52	3.52	3.52
Dom Rep	6.49	6.20	6.20	6.20	6.13
Ecuador	5.78	5.72	5.77	5.64	5.64
El Salvador	6.47	6.47	6.47	6.40	6.22
Guatemala	5.88	5.88	6.05	6.07	6.07
Guyana	6.05	6.05	6.05	6.12	6.15
Haiti	3.96	4.00	4.00	4.19	4.19
Honduras	5.84	5.84	5.76	6.18	6.25
Jamaica	7.39	7.13	7.21	7.21	7.34
Mexico	6.90	6.93	6.93	6.78	6.67
Nicaragua	5.56	5.56	5.73	6.07	5.68
Panama	7.08	7.08	7.15	7.35	7.35
Paraguay	6.26	6.40	6.40	6.40	6.16
Peru	6.47	6.59	6.40	6.31	6.11
Suriname	6.65	6.65	6.65	6.58	6.52
Trinidad and Tobago	6.99	7.16	7.16	7.21	7.18
Uruguay	8.17	8.17	8.10	8.08	7.96
Venezuela	5.15	5.08	5.18	5.34	5.42
<b>average</b>	<b>6.36</b>	<b>6.35</b>	<b>6.37</b>	<b>6.43</b>	<b>6.37</b>
Afghanistan	2.48	2.48	2.48	3.02	3.06
Australia	9.22	9.22	9.22	9.09	9.09
Bangladesh	5.86	5.86	5.87	5.52	6.11
Bhutan	4.65	4.57	4.68	4.30	2.62
Cambodia	4.96	4.87	4.87	4.87	4.77
China	3.00	3.14	3.14	3.04	2.97
Fiji	3.67	3.67	3.62	5.11	5.66
Hong Kong	6.42	5.92	5.92	5.85	6.03
India	7.52	7.30	7.28	7.80	7.68
Indonesia	6.76	6.53	6.53	6.34	6.41



**Democracy Index 2012**  
Democracy at a standstill

**Table 4**  
**Democracy Index 2006-2012**

	2012	2011	2010	2008	2006
Japan	8.08	8.08	8.08	8.25	8.15
Laos	2.32	2.10	2.10	2.10	2.10
Malaysia	6.41	6.19	6.19	6.36	5.98
Mongolia	6.35	6.23	6.36	6.60	6.60
Myanmar	2.35	1.77	1.77	1.77	1.77
Nepal	4.16	4.24	4.24	4.05	3.42
New Zealand	9.26	9.26	9.26	9.19	9.01
North Korea	1.08	1.08	1.08	0.86	1.03
Pakistan	4.57	4.55	4.55	4.46	3.92
Papua N G	6.32	6.32	6.54	6.54	6.54
Philippines	6.30	6.12	6.12	6.12	6.48
Singapore	5.88	5.89	5.89	5.89	5.89
South Korea	8.13	8.06	8.11	8.01	7.88
Sri Lanka	5.75	6.58	6.64	6.61	6.58
Taiwan	7.57	7.46	7.52	7.82	7.82
Thailand	6.55	6.55	6.55	6.81	5.67
Timor Leste	7.16	7.22	7.22	7.22	6.41
Vietnam	2.89	2.96	2.94	2.53	2.75
<b>average</b>	<b>5.56</b>	<b>5.51</b>	<b>5.53</b>	<b>5.58</b>	<b>5.44</b>
Algeria	3.83	3.44	3.44	3.32	3.17
Bahrain	2.53	2.92	3.49	3.38	3.53
Egypt	4.56	3.95	3.07	3.89	3.90
Iran	1.98	1.98	1.94	2.83	2.93
Iraq	4.10	4.03	4.00	4.00	4.01
Israel	7.53	7.53	7.48	7.48	7.28
Jordan	3.76	3.89	3.74	3.93	3.92
Kuwait	3.78	3.74	3.88	3.39	3.09
Lebanon	5.05	5.32	5.82	5.62	5.82
Libya	5.15	3.55	1.94	2.00	1.84
Morocco	4.07	3.83	3.79	3.88	3.90
Oman	3.26	3.26	2.86	2.98	2.77
Palestine	4.80	4.97	5.44	5.83	6.01
Qatar	3.18	3.18	3.09	2.92	2.78
Saudi	1.71	1.77	1.84	1.90	1.92



**Table 4**  
**Democracy Index 2006-2012**

	2012	2011	2010	2008	2006
Sudan	2.38	2.38	2.42	2.81	2.90
Syria	1.63	1.99	2.31	2.18	2.36
Tunisia	5.67	5.53	2.79	2.96	3.06
UAE	2.58	2.58	2.52	2.60	2.42
Yemen	3.12	2.57	2.64	2.95	2.98
<b>average</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>3.53</b>
Angola	3.35	3.32	3.32	3.35	2.41
Benin	6.00	6.06	6.17	6.06	6.16
Botswana	7.85	7.63	7.63	7.47	7.60
Burkina Faso	3.52	3.59	3.59	3.60	3.72
Burundi	3.60	4.01	4.01	4.51	4.51
Cameroon	3.44	3.41	3.41	3.46	3.27
Cape Verde	7.92	7.92	7.94	7.81	7.43
Central Africa	1.99	1.82	1.82	1.86	1.61
Chad	1.62	1.62	1.52	1.52	1.65
Comoros	3.52	3.52	3.41	3.58	3.90
Congo (Brazzaville)	2.89	2.89	2.89	2.94	3.19
Congo DRC	1.92	2.15	2.15	2.28	2.76
Côte d'Ivoire	3.25	3.08	3.02	3.27	3.38
Djibouti	2.74	2.68	2.20	2.37	2.37
Equatorial Guinea	1.83	1.77	1.84	2.19	2.09
Eritrea	2.40	2.34	2.31	2.31	2.31
Ethiopia	3.72	3.79	3.68	4.52	4.72
Gabon	3.56	3.48	3.29	3.00	2.72
Gambia	3.31	3.38	3.38	4.19	4.39
Ghana	6.02	6.02	6.02	5.35	5.35
Guinea	2.79	2.79	2.79	2.09	2.02
Guinea-Bissau	1.43	1.99	1.99	1.99	2.00
Kenya	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.79	5.08
Lesotho	6.66	6.33	6.02	6.29	6.48
Liberia	4.95	5.07	5.07	5.25	5.22
Madagascar	3.93	3.93	3.94	5.57	5.82
Malawi	6.08	5.84	5.84	5.13	4.97
Mali	5.12	6.36	6.01	5.87	5.99
Mauritania	4.17	4.17	3.86	3.91	3.12



**Table 4**  
**Democracy Index 2006-2012**

	2012	2011	2010	2008	2006
Mauritius	8.17	8.04	8.04	8.04	8.04
Mozambique	4.88	4.90	4.90	5.49	5.28
Namibia	6.24	6.24	6.23	6.48	6.54
Niger	4.16	4.16	3.38	3.41	3.54
Nigeria	3.77	3.83	3.47	3.53	3.52
Rwanda	3.36	3.25	3.25	3.71	3.82
Senegal	6.09	5.51	5.27	5.37	5.37
Sierra Leone	4.71	4.51	4.51	4.11	3.57
South Africa	7.79	7.79	7.79	7.91	7.91
Swaziland	3.20	3.26	2.90	3.04	2.93
Tanzania	5.88	5.64	5.64	5.28	5.18
Togo	3.45	3.45	3.45	2.43	1.75
Uganda	5.16	5.13	5.05	5.03	5.14
Zambia	6.26	6.19	5.68	5.25	5.25
Zimbabwe	2.67	2.68	2.64	2.53	2.62
<i>average</i>	<i>4.32</i>	<i>4.32</i>	<i>4.23</i>	<i>4.28</i>	<i>4.24</i>
<i>World average</i>	<i>5.52</i>	<i>5.49</i>	<i>5.46</i>	<i>5.55</i>	<i>5.62</i>

### **A new wave of democratisation?**

Following a period of global stagnation and decline in democracy, will the Arab spring political upheavals result in a new wave of democratisation? Although the degree of vulnerability of authoritarian regimes differs significantly, the developments in MENA underline the possibilities for political change. Authoritarian regimes in MENA and elsewhere share similar characteristics, to a lesser or greater degree: human rights abuses and absence of basic freedoms; rampant corruption and nepotism; small elites control the bulk of the nation's assets; and governance and social provision are poor. Economic hardships in the form of stagnant or falling incomes, high unemployment and rising inflation have affected many countries. Some authoritarian regimes have young and restless populations. Long-serving, geriatric leaders are another common feature. In Egypt Hosni Mubarak had been in office for 29 years; former Tunisian President Zine El Abidine Ben Al was in power for 23 years. Elsewhere in MENA, Ali Abdullah Saleh had ruled Yemen since 1978, while Libya's Muammar al-Gaddafi had been in power for more than four decades.

In other regions such as the CIS, several autocrats have been in power for two decades or more. Zimbabwe's Robert Mugabe has been in power for more than three decades, while the Castro brothers have held sway in Cuba for more than half a century. The longer ageing autocrats hang on to power, the



more out-of-touch and corrupt their regimes tend to become, and the more of an anachronism and an affront they become to their peoples.

The extent of economic dynamism varies sharply across authoritarian states. Oil wealth is a double-edged sword. Some of the energy-rich states have been able to buy off the population and pre-empt unrest. On the other hand, minerals-based development magnifies all kinds of institutional pathologies, which can in turn provoke unrest. In terms of the level of development, countries must not be rich enough to be able to buy off restive populations, but they need to be rich enough to have a middle class, widespread internet access and sufficient numbers of educated young people who are able and willing to form the vanguard of a political revolution.

Why did the Arab uprisings occur after a long period in which authoritarian governments appeared to have been successfully consolidating their control? The interplay of a number of factors may provide an explanation: electoral fraud; succession crises; economic distress; increasing corruption; and neighbourhood effects.

An attempt by an authoritarian ruler to extend his rule or ensure that a hand-picked successor, usually an offspring, takes power is a catalyst for protest. Stealing elections has often galvanised opposition (for example, in Egypt or during the CIS “colour revolutions” in the middle of the previous decade). The blatant fraud in the parliamentary elections in Egypt held in November and December 2010 outraged and helped mobilise protesters, as did Mr Mubarak’s plan to install his son Gamal as the country’s next ruler. Cumulative effects can be important. Years of corruption and repression mean that with each passing year popular dissatisfaction with the regime increases. Neighbourhood demonstration effects have played a strong role in anti-regime protests; without Tunisia there would have been no Egypt. Finally, domestic political opposition is emboldened when external opposition or ambivalence towards ruling elites replaces previous support. An increased international focus constrains autocrats’ room for manoeuvre.

Most authoritarian leaders have a large security apparatus at their disposal to suppress dissent and can mobilise supporters to counter challenges to their regime. Many do not fear international opprobrium if they crack down. These factors may be enough to ward off regime change, at least in the short term, and a number of MENA authoritarian regimes have resorted to brutal repression to remain in power.

### **Democracy: from retreat to renewal**

During the 1970s and 1980s more than 30 countries shifted from authoritarian to democratic political systems. In recent years, the post-1970s wave of democratisation has slowed or been reversed. In some respects the trend was made worse by the post-2008 economic crisis. There has been a decline in some aspects of governance, political participation and media freedoms, and a clear deterioration in attitudes associated with, or that are conducive to, democracy in many countries. Many governments have felt increasingly vulnerable and threatened and have reacted by intensifying their efforts to control the media and impede free expression.



We expect that political upheavals will indeed affect other authoritarian regimes. These may not all be successful and not all may necessarily take the form of mass popular uprisings. The outlook for democratic transition is, however, uncertain. As has been the case in recent years, major reversals in democratisation have taken place before. For example, a democratisation wave after the second world war ended with more than 20 countries subsequently sliding back to authoritarianism. That sort of rollback has not occurred recently. Democracy as a value retains strong universal appeal worldwide. Despite setbacks and overall stagnation, surveys show that most people in most places still want democracy. Trends such as globalisation, increasing education and expanding middle classes tend to favour the organic development of democracy.

As the recent experience in MENA has also illustrated, democratisation in hitherto authoritarian states does not of course mean a transition to fully-fledged, consolidated democracies. Democracy means more than holding elections; it requires the development of a range of supportive institutions and attitudes. Such a transformation takes a very long time.

### **Democracy and economic crisis**

Although economic crises can serve to undermine authoritarianism, there are also a number of ways in which democracy has been adversely affected by the economic and financial crisis. There has been a decline in some aspects of governance, political participation and media freedoms, and a clear deterioration in attitudes associated with, or conducive to, democracy in many countries, including in Europe.

Nations with a weak democratic tradition are by default vulnerable to setbacks. Many non-consolidated democracies are fragile and socioeconomic stress has led to backsliding on democracy in many countries. The underlying shallowness of democratic cultures—as revealed by disturbingly low scores for many countries in our index for political participation and political culture—has come to the fore.

The impact of the economic and financial crisis on political trends has been most marked in Europe, both east and west. Extremist political forces in Europe have not profited from the economic crisis as much as might have been feared, but populism and anti-immigrant sentiment has nevertheless been on the rise. Economic crises can threaten democracy, usually with a lag, through increased social unrest. So far, social unrest related to the financial and economic crisis has affected a limited number of countries.

Opinion polls show that confidence in public institutions in western Europe—already low before 2008 in many countries—has declined further since the onset of the crisis. Less than one fifth of west Europeans trust political parties and only about one third trust their governments and parliaments. Levels of public trust are exceptionally low in the eastern Europe-12 (the 10 new EU member states and EU candidate countries Croatia and Macedonia). Less than 10% of people in this subregion trust political parties and less than one fifth trust their governments and their parliaments.



## Regional patterns

### Western Europe

Six out of the top ten countries in our index are in western Europe (significantly only one, Finland, is in the euro zone). However, there has been a significant erosion in democracy in the region in recent years. Prior to the stabilisation in 2012 the underlying trend for some time had been one of deterioration. A total of 15 countries out of 21 experienced a decline in their overall score in 2010 compared with 2008, in large part related to the various effects of the economic crisis. Three countries (Greece, Italy and France) dropped out of the category of full democracies between 2008 and 2010; Portugal joined them in 2011. Seven countries had a decline in their score in 2011; none had an increase.

The main reason for the decline in democracy scores in 2011 in the region was the erosion in sovereignty and democratic accountability associated with the effects of and responses to the euro zone crisis (five of seven countries that experienced a decline in their scores--Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain and Ireland). Most dramatically, in two countries (Greece and Italy) democratically elected politicians were replaced by technocrats at the head of governments.

Policy in some countries is no longer being set by national legislatures and elected politicians, but is effectively set by official creditors, the European Central Bank, the European Commission and the IMF. The severity of austerity measures has tended to weaken social cohesion and diminish further trust in public institutions, which had already been declining since the 2008-09 economic crisis.

In many Western democracies, lack of public participation in the political process is a cause for concern, leading to a so-called democratic deficit. In Germany, for example, membership of the major parties is in decline and election turnout is decreasing at all levels. The UK's political participation score is among the worst in the developed world.

### Crisis of institutions in the UK

In 2012 the BBC became the latest in a long line of UK institutions, including parliament, the police and the church, to be wracked by crisis. From "cash for questions" to parliamentary expenses, Stephen Lawrence to Hillsborough, dodgy derivatives and Libor-fixing to payment protection scams, phone-hacking to cover-ups, the establishment has become beset by scandal. Aptly, the Oxford Dictionaries UK named "omnishambles" as its word of the year in 2012. The crisis afflicting Britain's institutions is widely acknowledged, but what has caused this seemingly unstoppable breakdown of authority and

trust? The decline began decades ago, but accelerated in the 1990s after the end of the Cold War.

#### Something rotten in the UK

The BBC director general, George Entwistle, resigned in November 2012, two months after taking office. This happened after the BBC's flagship current affairs programme, Newsnight, without checking its facts, broadcast an allegation on November 2nd that "a leading Conservative" was a paedophile in an investigation about child abuse in North Wales. The incident occurred after the BBC had been criticised for earlier dropping a Newsnight report into child abuse allegations against the late BBC TV presenter Jimmy Savile. Mr Entwistle was followed out of the BBC by other top executives. The BBC's Jonathan



Dimbleby, a veteran broadcaster, described the corporation as “a rudderless ship heading towards the rocks”.

### **The collapse of trust**

Trust in government, parliament and politicians is at an all-time low. The UK scores poorly in the Economist Intelligence Unit’s Democracy Index in large part because of the low levels of trust that people have in parliament, politicians, political parties and the political system as a whole. According to the *British Social Attitudes* report published in 2012, fewer than one in ten (9%) trust British politicians “a great deal” or “quite a lot”; only 15% trust parliament a great deal or quite a lot; and only 17% trust British governments in general a great deal or quite a lot. Levels of trust have fallen over the past quarter of a century. The percentage of people saying they trust governments “just about always” or “most of the time” has fallen from 40% in 1986 to 16% in 2009, following the scandal involving the expenses of members of parliament (MPs), before rising slightly to 22% in 2011.

Just before the Labour Party came to power in 1997, party leader Tony Blair observed that “so low is popular esteem for politicians and the system we operate that there is now little authority for us to use”. In its manifesto, “New Labour” pledged to rebuild the “bond of trust between government and the people” through a programme of constitutional reform. After 12 years in power, however, the Labour Party had to swallow its words. The party that had pilloried the previous Conservative government for “sleaze” over the “cash for questions” affair of 1994 (which led to the Nolan Committee review of standards in public life) was itself caught up in its own sleazy scandals—over MPs’ expenses—and popular distrust of politicians, parties and parliament deepened.

In 2010 the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition of David Cameron and Nick Clegg came to power, again promising to restore trust in government by promoting constitutional reform. In their election manifesto, the Conservatives referred to people being

“detached from the political process, devoid of trust in the political classes and disillusioned with our system of government”. The Lib Dems described the political system as “rotten” in their 2010 manifesto. Two years later, support for the coalition has fallen sharply and the trust deficit has risen further.

Other institutions and professions, from the police to the church and doctors to bankers, have also had their fair share of scandals in recent decades and experienced a decline in public trust. The police force has been dogged by accusations of racism, sexism and corruption, and some of its ranks have been exposed as mendacious and venal during the course of the Stephen Lawrence, Hillsborough and Leveson inquiries. The motives and ethics of the medical profession are no longer considered to be beyond question in the wake of scandals over organ-stripping, “superbug” outbreaks and waiting lists. The financial sector has become everybody’s favourite *bête noire* since the 2008 global financial crisis. The Church of England has been rocked by endless controversy and conflict, over issues such as women priests and gay marriage.

### **Existential crisis**

The UK’s institutions have been gradually weakening over many decades, as the traditions and values that they once espoused and the habit of deference towards authority have become outmoded. The process of institutional decline has accelerated since the 1990s and the end of the Cold War. This appears counter-intuitive because the defeat of the communist model was widely trumpeted at the time as a triumph for the Western way of life. However, with the end of the Cold War, the old certainties that had conferred legitimacy on state institutions were swept away. The problem of political and institutional legitimacy afflicting the UK and other Western societies in recent decades stems from the absence of a usable ideology that could replicate the Cold War anti-communist model.

The erosion of institutional authority in recent decades is also closely linked to the discrediting of the state. During the 1980s the Thatcherites waged



a campaign against the ideology and institutions of the left, as embodied in the post-war welfare state. The collapse of the Soviet bloc was the final nail in the coffin of the left and its statist ideology. However, the discrediting of the state also brought unexpected problems for the right. Having dismantled the welfare state, the question became what would replace it? It was one thing to attack the state as inefficient, and another thing altogether to find new solutions to the problems which gave rise to it in the first place. The absence of a coherent elite consensus has resulted in endless conflicts between different sections of the establishment.

The decline of institutions and state legitimacy that began in the 1990s has accelerated since the onset of the global economic crisis in 2008. The collapse of Lehman Brothers and other behemoths of the banking system raised broader questions about the efficacy of the Western political and economic model. The sovereign debt crisis which continues to plague the euro zone, and which has brought

several European states to the brink of bankruptcy, has further undermined the authority of states and political elites.

The problem lies in a society-wide lack of strongly held beliefs and values that could inspire people and capture their allegiance. The same problem afflicts just about every UK institution. There are now few politicians of stature who can command our respect. Comparing them with the post-war generation of Clement Attlee, Hugh Gaitskill, Harold Wilson, Denis Healey, Winston Churchill, Harold Macmillan, Anthony Eden and Edward Heath, they look like political pygmies, lacking substance and authority. Those post-war political leaders appeared authoritative and trustworthy because they were the embodiment of distinctive political ideologies and represented a well-defined social constituency. Their authority had deep political roots in society. Today, by contrast, none of the main political parties espouses a distinctive political philosophy or represents a clear social constituency.

## Eastern Europe

Eastern Europe has performed poorly in our democracy index in recent years. In 2012 in ten countries out of the 28 the democracy score declined. In 2011 12 countries in the region experienced declines in their scores. This followed a large decline in the average score for the region between 2008 and 2010, when 19 countries recorded a decline in their democracy scores.

Authoritarian trends have become entrenched in most members of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). But the setbacks to democracy are by no means limited to that subregion. Democracy is also being eroded across east-central Europe. A common explanation for the emergence of political difficulties in this subregion is that the EU accession process had previously held together the fractious party-political systems of these countries, as mainstream parties united behind the reforms that were needed to gain EU membership. But once accession was achieved, and politics reverted to “natural” antagonistic patterns, the underlying fragility of east-central European political systems was exposed.

There are a number of possible reasons for this fragility. Most important is that although democratic forms are in place in the region, much of the substance of democracy, including a political culture based on trust, is absent. This is manifested in low levels of political participation beyond voting (and even turnout at elections is low in many countries), and very low levels of public confidence in



institutions. A key underlying factor is that transition has resulted in a large stratum of discontented voters who feel that they have lost out. Another problem in the region is that party politics is fragmented, primarily reflecting the shallow roots of many parties and low voter identification with parties.

### *Attitudes to democracy*

The 2008-09 global economic crisis had a disproportionately negative impact on eastern Europe compared with other emerging markets, such as developing Asia and Latin America. It also seems to have reinforced a pre-existing mood of disappointment with the experience and results of the transition to democracy and market economies. A number of post-crisis surveys and reports point to a further decline in life satisfaction, support for markets and democracy and trust in institutions.

Some negative trends have recently got worse. Hungary is perhaps the prime example among the EU's new member states in the region. Since winning a two thirds parliamentary majority in the 2010 election, the centre-right Fidesz party has systematically been taking over the country's previously independent institutions: the presidency, the state audit office, the media council and even the central bank are now all run by party placemen. Electoral reforms have undermined the opposition and smaller parties.

Although the formal trappings of democracy remain in place, today's Russia has been called a "managed" (or "stage managed") democracy. All the main decisions are made by a small group of insiders. The Duma is now little more than a rubber-stamp parliament; regional governors are appointed directly; the main media are state-controlled; civil society organisations have come under pressure; and the state has increased its hold over the economy.

The announcement in September 2011 that the prime minister, Vladimir Putin, would seek to return to the presidency (a post that he occupied in 2000-08) was a retrograde and cynical step. It marked a decisive step in Russia's long-running slide towards outright authoritarianism. The decision made a mockery of the institution of the presidency and the electoral process. It exposed the Medvedev presidency as a charade used by Mr Putin to stay in power.

The protest movement in Russia that gathered pace after the 2011 flawed parliamentary poll has lost momentum. Yet although the threat to his rule is limited, Mr Putin appears unwilling to tolerate opposition, and in 2012 he backed a series of repressive measures. This includes controversial laws on treason, protests, foreign-funded non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and censorship. The trial and sentencing of three members of Pussy Riot, a female punk group, to two years in jail for hooliganism and inciting religious hatred, after they conducted an anti-Putin "punk prayer" at a Moscow cathedral, is another example of the increased trend towards authoritarianism. Weak institutions mean that Mr Putin's decision to return to the presidency marks a transformation of his rule into a highly personalistic regime. Mr Putin is now legally eligible for two six-year terms, possibly ruling until 2024—almost a quarter of a century after he first became president, in 2000—at which point he will be 71 years old. If he stays in power that long, he will have held the country's top job for longer than Leonid Brezhnev, who led the Soviet Union for 18 years. Only Stalin was in power for a



longer period. The longer a leader is in office, the more out of touch with the public he becomes, and the more likely to commit serious errors of judgment.

In Ukraine the democratic gains of the Orange Revolution are being undermined, including the conduct of elections, media freedoms and treatment of the opposition. Few are convinced that the sentencing of former prime minister Yuliya Tymoshenko to seven years in jail is not an example of gross abuse of the judicial system for political ends.

Ms Tymoshenko was convicted under a communist-era law that criminalised actions hurting the country even if the individual did not profit. She was found guilty of exceeding her authority in 2009 by agreeing to a big hike in the cost of gas imported from Russia, ending a dispute that saw Russia briefly cut off supplies to western Europe (which are transported through Ukraine).

### The CIS and MENA

There are a number of similarities between the authoritarian regimes in the CIS and in MENA. There is rampant corruption, small elites control the bulk of their nations' assets, institutions have been corroded by the effects of minerals-based development (the Belarusian regime depends on Russian subsidies), and governance and social provision are poor. The Arab world has a young and restless population; in the CIS, this applies to some Central Asian countries, especially Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. However, there are also differences, which reduce the chances of CIS authoritarian regimes being subjected to similar challenges. Growth in real GDP per head in the CIS has been far faster over the past decade than in MENA. Although unemployment tends to be under-reported in much of the CIS, rates are generally lower

than in the MENA countries suffering from unrest. In most CIS states, the incidence of absolute poverty and the degree of income disparities also tend to be lower.

Many CIS countries are poor, and the median income per head in the CIS is much lower than the median income per head in MENA. However, some energy-rich CIS states have been able to buy off the population and pre-empt potential unrest by using some of their energy revenue to boost state salaries and benefits. The greatest risk to existing rulers and elite structures may be the issue of succession. Both the Kazakh president, Nursultan Nazarbayev, and the Uzbek president, Islam Karimov, are more than 70 years old and have been in power for more than two decades. No clear successors have been lined up, which increases the potential for intra-elite in-fighting, and possibly public unrest when the incumbent dies or becomes incapacitated.

### Asia and Australasia

The wide disparities in democratic development across Asia are captured in the results of our democracy index. The picture is exemplified by the Korean peninsula: South Korea is a full democracy, ranked 20th. By contrast, North Korea props up the global listings, coming last of the 167 countries covered by the index.

Although parts of the region—from North Korea and Laos, to Vietnam and China—are still entrenched authoritarian regimes, the past couple of decades have seen the spread of democracy in the region overall. Over the past decade, some 20 Asian countries have held elections, and many have undergone peaceful transitions in government. Despite its problems, India remains the world's most



populous democracy. Yet even in the democratic countries, there are often significant problems in the functioning of political systems.

Democratic political cultures in Asia are often underdeveloped and shallow, even in the countries that have democratised. In only nine countries in the region do we rate elections as being both free and fair. Even in parts of the region that are not authoritarian there is often pressure on the independent media. In many countries, Asian Barometer polls show that more citizens believe that the nations' recent democratic transitions had brought no improvement to their lives than believe that the changes have been positive.

### **Latin America**

There was little change in this region between 2010 and 2012. In most countries free and fair elections are now well established. The recent evidence from surveys on attitudes towards democracy is mixed. In some countries, surveys indicate a slow shift in public attitudes on many issues in a direction that is conducive to democracy. However, a recent report (UNDP 2011) found that the sustainability of democracy in Latin America is being endangered by the concentration of power, the world's most pronounced social and economic inequalities, and mounting insecurity and violence.

While most Latin American countries (14 out of 24) fall within the flawed democracy category, there is wide diversity across the region. For example, Uruguay is a full democracy with an index score of 8.17 (out of 10) and a global ranking of 18th, while Cuba, an authoritarian regime, ranks 127th.

Although the region was adversely affected by the 2008–09 recession—with the US-dependent Central American and Caribbean subregions hit particularly badly—most countries avoided social unrest and a rolling back of democracy. However, a key issue that is undermining democracy in much of the region is an upsurge in violent crime, linked in large part with the drug trade. The corrupting influence of organised crime and its ability to undermine the effectiveness of the security forces and the judicial authorities are a serious problem.

Electoral democracy, for the most part, is firmly entrenched in Latin America, but media freedoms have been eroded in recent years in several countries. Aside from Cuba (the only state in the region without any independent media), Venezuela has been the worst offender. The failure to uphold press freedom in some countries in the region in part reflects inadequate oversight bodies—a symptom of broader institutional weaknesses in Latin America. The executive remains very strong in many countries, the legislature is comparatively weak in many cases and most judiciaries suffer from some degree of politicisation.

### **The Middle East and North Africa**

Despite the pro-democracy upheavals in the region and improvement in the region's average democracy score, the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) remains the most repressive region in the world—12 out of 20 countries in the region are still categorised as authoritarian. Only in Tunisia, Libya, Egypt and Yemen has there been any significant progress in democratisation. Elsewhere there has even been regression in reaction to popular protests—most notably in Syria, but also in Bahrain and Lebanon.



Two years after the outbreak of the regime-changing revolutions, the region remains unstable. The recent war in Mali and the hostage crisis in Algeria illustrated the region's extreme political and security risks.

In Syria, the two-year-old civil war between forces loyal to President Assad's regime and the opposition has so far cost more than 60,000 lives. In Lebanon, the Syrian conflict has strengthened sectarian clashes between factions in support of and opposed to the Assad regime.

Enormous oil rents are the means by which many governments in the region have entrenched autocratic rule. Rulers can finance far-reaching patronage networks and security apparatuses. Oil revenue removes the need to levy taxes, thereby reducing accountability. Civil society is very weak throughout most of the region.

### **Sub-Saharan Africa**

Elections have become a normal occurrence in Sub-Saharan Africa. Since the late 1990s the number of coups has fallen sharply, whereas the number of elections has increased. However, many elections are still rigged. Progress in democracy in the region has been slow and uneven, but nevertheless continues. The number of elections held annually in recent years has increased; since 2000 between 15 and 20 elections have been held each year. Although the holding of elections has become commonplace, not all ballots pass the test of being "free and fair" and many have been charades held by regimes clinging on to power.

The number of successful coups averaged about 20 per decade in 1960-2000. The number dropped to just six in the 2000s. Although coups have become more infrequent, conflict, failed governments and human-rights abuses remain widespread.

Only one state in the region (of the 44 assessed) remains a full democracy: the Indian Ocean island of Mauritius, which has maintained a strong democratic tradition since the country gained independence in 1968. The region has several flawed democracies, including South Africa, Benin, Cape Verde, Botswana, Namibia, Lesotho, Ghana, Malawi and Zambia. There are nine hybrid regimes and authoritarian regimes (24; over one-half of the total) continue to predominate. In 2012 Malawi and Senegal improved from hybrid regimes to flawed democracies. Burundi moved from an authoritarian to a hybrid regime. Mali regressed from a flawed democracy to a hybrid regime.

## **Defining and measuring democracy**

There is no consensus on how to measure democracy, definitions of democracy are contested and there is an ongoing lively debate on the subject. The issue is not only of academic interest. For example, although democracy-promotion is high on the list of US foreign policy priorities, there is no consensus within the US government on what constitutes a democracy. As one observer recently put it, "the world's only superpower is rhetorically and militarily promoting a political system that remains undefined--and it is staking its credibility and treasure on that pursuit" (Horowitz, 2006, p 114).

Although the terms freedom and democracy are often used interchangeably, the two are not



synonymous. Democracy can be seen as a set of practices and principles that institutionalise and thus ultimately protect freedom. Even if a consensus on precise definitions has proved elusive, most observers today would agree that, at a minimum, the fundamental features of a democracy include government based on majority rule and the consent of the governed, the existence of free and fair elections, the protection of minority rights and respect for basic human rights. Democracy presupposes equality before the law, due process and political pluralism. A question arises whether reference to these basic features is sufficient for a satisfactory concept of democracy. As discussed below, there is a question of how far the definition may need to be widened.

Some insist that democracy is necessarily a dichotomous concept—a state is either democratic or not. But most measures now appear to adhere to a continuous concept, with the possibility of varying degrees of democracy. At present, the best-known measure is produced by the US-based Freedom House organisation. The average of their indexes, on a 1 to 7 scale, of political freedom (based on 10 indicators) and of civil liberties (based on 15 indicators) is often taken to be a measure of democracy.

The index is available for all countries, and stretches back to the early 1970s. It has been used heavily in empirical investigations of the relationship between democracy and various economic and social variables. The so-called Polity Project provides, for a smaller number of countries, measures of democracy and regime types, based on rather minimalist definitions, stretching back to the 19th century. These have also been used in empirical work.

Freedom House also measures a narrower concept, that of “electoral democracy”. Democracies in this minimal sense share at least one common, essential characteristic. Positions of political power are filled through regular, free, and fair elections between competing parties, and it is possible for an incumbent government to be turned out of office through elections. Freedom House criteria for an electoral democracy include:

- 1) A competitive, multiparty political system
- 2) Universal adult suffrage
- 3) Regularly contested elections conducted on the basis of secret ballots, reasonable ballot security and the absence of massive voter fraud
- 4) Significant public access of major political parties to the electorate through the media and through generally open political campaigning

The Freedom House definition of political freedom is somewhat (though not much) more demanding than its criteria for electoral democracy—that is, it classifies more countries as electoral democracies than as “free” (some “partly free” countries are also categorised as “electoral democracies”). At the end of 2007, 121 out of 193 states were classified as “electoral democracies”; of these, on a more stringent criterion, 90 states were classified as “free”. The Freedom House political freedom measure covers the electoral process and political pluralism and, to a lesser extent the functioning of government and a few aspects of participation.

A key difference in measures is between “thin”, or minimalist, and “thick”, or wider concepts of democracy (Coppedge, 2005). The thin concepts correspond closely to an immensely influential



academic definition of democracy, that of Dahl's concept of polyarchy (Dahl, 1970). Polyarchy has eight components, or institutional requirements: almost all adult citizens have the right to vote; almost all adult citizens are eligible for public office; political leaders have the right to compete for votes; elections are free and fair; all citizens are free to form and join political parties and other organisations; all citizens are free to express themselves on all political issues; diverse sources of information about politics exist and are protected by law; and government policies depend on votes and other expressions of preference.

The Freedom House electoral democracy measure is a thin concept. Their measure of democracy based on political rights and civil liberties is "thicker" than the measure of "electoral democracy". Other definitions of democracy have broadened to include aspects of society and political culture in democratic societies.

### **The Economist Intelligence Unit measure**

The Economist Intelligence Unit's index is based on the view that measures of democracy that reflect the state of political freedoms and civil liberties are not "thick" enough. They do not encompass sufficiently or at all some features that determine how substantive democracy is or its quality. Freedom is an essential component of democracy, but not sufficient. In existing measures, the elements of political participation and functioning of government are taken into account only in a marginal and formal way.

The Economist Intelligence Unit's democracy index is based on five categories: electoral process and pluralism; civil liberties; the functioning of government; political participation; and political culture. The five categories are inter-related and form a coherent conceptual whole. The condition of having free and fair competitive elections, and satisfying related aspects of political freedom, is clearly the sine quo none of all definitions.

All modern definitions, except the most minimalist, also consider civil liberties to be a vital component of what is often called "liberal democracy". The principle of the protection of basic human rights is widely accepted. It is embodied in constitutions throughout the world as well as in the UN Charter and international agreements such as the Helsinki Final Act (the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe). Basic human rights include the freedom of speech, expression and the press; freedom of religion; freedom of assembly and association; and the right to due judicial process. All democracies are systems in which citizens freely make political decisions by majority rule. But rule by the majority is not necessarily democratic. In a democracy majority rule must be combined with guarantees of individual human rights and the rights of minorities.

Most measures also include aspects of the minimum quality of functioning of government. If democratically-based decisions cannot or are not implemented then the concept of democracy is not very meaningful or it becomes an empty shell.

Democracy is more than the sum of its institutions. A democratic political culture is also crucial for the legitimacy, smooth functioning and ultimately the sustainability of democracy. A culture of passivity and apathy, an obedient and docile citizenry, are not consistent with democracy. The



electoral process periodically divides the population into winners and losers. A successful democratic political culture implies that the losing parties and their supporters accept the judgment of the voters, and allow for the peaceful transfer of power.

Participation is also a necessary component, as apathy and abstention are enemies of democracy. Even measures that focus predominantly on the processes of representative, liberal democracy include (although inadequately or insufficiently) some aspects of participation. In a democracy, government is only one element in a social fabric of many and varied institutions, political organisations, and associations. Citizens cannot be required to take part in the political process, and they are free to express their dissatisfaction by not participating. However, a healthy democracy requires the active, freely chosen participation of citizens in public life. Democracies flourish when citizens are willing to participate in public debate, elect representatives and join political parties. Without this broad, sustaining participation, democracy begins to wither and become the preserve of small, select groups.

At the same time, even our “thicker”, more inclusive and wider measure of democracy does not include other aspects--which some authors argue are also crucial components of democracy--such as levels of economic and social well being. Thus our Index respects the dominant tradition that holds that a variety of social and economic outcomes can be consistent with political democracy, which is a separate concept.

## Methodology

The Economist Intelligence Unit’s index of democracy, on a 0 to 10 scale, is based on the ratings for 60 indicators grouped in five categories: electoral process and pluralism; civil liberties; the functioning of government; political participation; and political culture. Each category has a rating on a 0 to 10 scale, and the overall index of democracy is the simple average of the five category indexes.

The category indexes are based on the sum of the indicator scores in the category, converted to a 0 to 10 scale. Adjustments to the category scores are made if countries do not score a 1 in the following critical areas for democracy:

1. whether national elections are free and fair
2. the security of voters
3. the influence of foreign powers on government
4. the capability of the civil service to implement policies.

If the scores for the first three questions are 0 (or 0.5), one point (0.5 point) is deducted from the index in the relevant category (either the electoral process and pluralism or the functioning of government). If the score for 4 is 0, one point is deducted from the functioning of government category index.

The index values are used to place countries within one of four types of regimes:

1. Full democracies--scores of 8-10
2. Flawed democracies--score of 6 to 7.9
3. Hybrid regimes--scores of 4 to 5.9



4 Authoritarian regimes--scores below 4

Threshold points for regime types depend on overall scores that are rounded to one decimal point.

**Full democracies:** Countries in which not only basic political freedoms and civil liberties are respected, but these will also tend to be underpinned by a political culture conducive to the flourishing of democracy. The functioning of government is satisfactory. Media are independent and diverse. There is an effective system of checks and balances. The judiciary is independent and judicial decisions are enforced. There are only limited problems in the functioning of democracies.

**Flawed democracies:** These countries also have free and fair elections and even if there are problems (such as infringements on media freedom), basic civil liberties will be respected. However, there are significant weaknesses in other aspects of democracy, including problems in governance, an underdeveloped political culture and low levels of political participation.

**Hybrid regimes:** Elections have substantial irregularities that often prevent them from being both free and fair. Government pressure on opposition parties and candidates may be common. Serious weaknesses are more prevalent than in flawed democracies--in political culture, functioning of government and political participation. Corruption tends to be widespread and the rule of law is weak. Civil society is weak. Typically there is harassment of and pressure on journalists, and the judiciary is not independent.

**Authoritarian regimes:** In these states state political pluralism is absent or heavily circumscribed. Many countries in this category are outright dictatorships. Some formal institutions of democracy may exist, but these have little substance. Elections, if they do occur, are not free and fair. There is disregard for abuses and infringements of civil liberties. Media are typically state-owned or controlled by groups connected to the ruling regime. There is repression of criticism of the government and pervasive censorship. There is no independent judiciary.

### The scoring system

We use a combination of a dichotomous and a three-point scoring system for the 60 indicators. A dichotomous 1-0 scoring system (1 for a yes and 0 for a no answer) is not without problems, but it has several distinct advantages over more refined scoring scales (such as the often-used 1-5 or 1-7). For many indicators, the possibility of a 0.5 score is introduced, to capture 'grey areas' where a simple yes (1) or no (0) is problematic, with guidelines as to when that should be used. Thus for many indicators there is a three-point scoring system, which represents a compromise between simple dichotomous scoring and the use of finer scales.

The problems of 1-5 or 1-7 scoring scales are numerous. For most indicators under such a system, it is extremely difficult to define meaningful and comparable criteria or guidelines for each score. This can lead to arbitrary, spurious and non-comparable scorings. For example, a score of 2 for one country may be scored a 3 in another and so on. Or one expert might score an indicator for a particular country in a different way to another expert. This contravenes a basic principle of measurement, that of so-



called reliability—the degree to which a measurement procedure produces the same measurements every time, regardless of who is performing it. Two- and three-point systems do not guarantee reliability, but make it more likely.

Second, comparability between indicator scores and aggregation into a multi-dimensional index appears more valid with a two or three-point scale for each indicator (the dimensions being aggregated are similar across indicators). By contrast, with a 1-5 system, the scores are more likely to mean different things across the indicators (for example a 2 for one indicator may be more comparable to a 3 or 4 for another indicator, rather than a 2 for that indicator). The problems of a 1-5 or 1-7 system are magnified when attempting to extend the index to many regions and countries.

## **Features of the Economist Intelligence Unit index**

### *Public opinion surveys*

A crucial, differentiating aspect of our measure is that in addition to experts' assessments we use, where available, public opinion surveys—mainly the World Values Survey. Indicators based on the surveys predominate heavily in the political participation and political culture categories, and a few are used in the civil liberties and functioning of government categories.

In addition to the World Values Survey, other sources that can be leveraged include the Eurobarometer surveys, Gallup polls, Asian Barometer, Latin American Barometer, Afrobarometer and national surveys. In the case of countries for which survey results are missing, survey results for similar countries and expert assessment are used to fill in gaps.

### *Participation and voter turnout*

After increasing for many decades, there has been a trend of decreasing voter turnout in most established democracies since the 1960s. Low turnout may be due to disenchantment, but it can also be a sign of contentment. Many, however, see low turnout as undesirable, and there is much debate over the factors that affect turnout and how to increase it.

A high turnout is generally seen as evidence of the legitimacy of the current system. Contrary to widespread belief, there is in fact a close correlation between turnout and overall measures of democracy—that is, developed, consolidated democracies have, with very few exceptions, higher turnout (generally above 70%) than less established democracies.

### *The legislative and executive branches*

The appropriate balance between these is much-disputed in political theory. In our model the clear predominance of the legislature is rated positively as there is a very strong correlation between legislative dominance and measures of overall democracy.

## **The model**

### **I Electoral process and pluralism**

1. Are elections for the national legislature and head of government free?

Consider whether elections are competitive in that electors are free to vote and are offered a range



of choices.

1: Essentially unrestricted conditions for the presentation of candidates (for example, no bans on major parties)

0.5: There are some restrictions on the electoral process

0: A single-party system or major impediments exist (for example, bans on a major party or candidate)

2. Are elections for the national legislature and head of government fair?

1: No major irregularities in the voting process

0.5: Significant irregularities occur (intimidation, fraud), but do not affect significantly the overall outcome

0: Major irregularities occur and affect the outcome

Score 0 if score for question 1 is 0.

3. Are municipal elections both free and fair?

1: Are free and fair

0.5: Are free but not fair

0: Are neither free nor fair

4. Is there universal suffrage for all adults?

Bar generally accepted exclusions (for example, non-nationals; criminals; members of armed forces in some countries)

1: Yes

0: No

5. Can citizens cast their vote free of significant threats to their security from state or non-state bodies?

1: Yes

0: No

6. Do laws provide for broadly equal campaigning opportunities?

1: Yes

0.5: Yes formally, but in practice opportunities are limited for some candidates

0: No

7. Is the process of financing political parties transparent and generally accepted?

1: Yes

0.5: Not fully transparent

0: No

8. Following elections, are the constitutional mechanisms for the orderly transfer of power from one government to another clear, established and accepted?

1: All three criteria are fulfilled

0.5: Two of the three criteria are fulfilled

0: Only one or none of the criteria is satisfied



9. Are citizens free to form political parties that are independent of the government?  
1: Yes  
0.5: There are some restrictions  
0: No
10. Do opposition parties have a realistic prospect of achieving government?  
1: Yes  
0.5: There is a dominant two-party system in which other political forces never have any effective chance of taking part in national government  
0: No
11. Is potential access to public office open to all citizens?  
1: Yes  
0.5: Formally unrestricted, but in practice restricted for some groups, or for citizens from some parts of the country  
0: No
12. Are citizens free to form political and civic organisations, free of state interference and surveillance?  
1: Yes  
0.5: Officially free, but subject to some restrictions or interference  
0: No

## **II Functioning of government**

13. Do freely elected representatives determine government policy?  
1: Yes  
0.5: Exercise some meaningful influence  
0: No
14. Is the legislature the supreme political body, with a clear supremacy over other branches of government?  
1: Yes  
0: No
15. Is there an effective system of checks and balances on the exercise of government authority?  
1: Yes  
0.5: Yes, but there are some serious flaws  
0: No
16. Government is free of undue influence by the military or the security services  
1: Yes  
0.5: Influence is low, but the defence minister is not a civilian. If the current risk of a military coup is extremely low, but the country has a recent history of military rule or coups  
0: No



17. Foreign powers and organisations do not determine important government functions or policies
- 1: Yes
  - 0.5: Some features of a protectorate
  - 0: No (significant presence of foreign troops; important decisions taken by foreign power; country is a protectorate)
18. Special economic, religious or other powerful domestic groups do not exercise significant political power, parallel to democratic institutions?
- 1: Yes
  - 0.5: Exercise some meaningful influence
  - 0: No
19. Are sufficient mechanisms and institutions in place for assuring government accountability to the electorate in between elections?
- 1: Yes
  - 0.5: Yes, but serious flaws exist
  - 0: No
20. Does the government's authority extend over the full territory of the country?
- 1: Yes
  - 0: No
21. Is the functioning of government open and transparent, with sufficient public access to information?
- 1: Yes
  - 0.5: Yes, but serious flaws exist
  - 0: No
22. How pervasive is corruption?
- 1: Corruption is not a major problem
  - 0.5: Corruption is a significant issue
  - 0: Pervasive corruption exists
23. Is the civil service willing and capable of implementing government policy?
- 1: Yes
  - 0.5: Yes, but serious flaws exist
  - 0: No
24. Popular perceptions of the extent to which they have free choice and control over their lives
- 1: High
  - 0.5: Moderate
  - 0: Low
- If available, from World Values Survey
- % of people who think that they have a great deal of choice/control
- 1 if more than 70%



0.5 if 50-70%

0 if less than 50%

25. Public confidence in government

1: High

0.5: Moderate

0: Low

If available, from World Values Survey, Gallup polls, Eurobarometer, Latinobarometer

% of people who have a "great deal" or "quite a lot" of confidence in government

1 if more than 40%

0.5 if 25-40%

0 if less than 25%

26. Public confidence in political parties

1: High

0.5: Moderate

0: Low

If available, from World Values Survey

% of people who have a "great deal" or "quite a lot" of confidence

1 if more than 40%

0.5 if 25-40%

0 if less than 25%

### III Political participation

27. Voter participation/turn-out for national elections.

(average turnout in parliamentary elections since 2000. Turnout as proportion of population of voting age).

1 if consistently above 70%

0.5 if between 50% and 70%

0 if below 50%

If voting is obligatory, score 0. Score 0 if scores for questions 1 or 2 is 0.

28. Do ethnic, religious and other minorities have a reasonable degree of autonomy and voice in the political process?

1: Yes

0.5: Yes, but serious flaws exist

0: No

29. Women in parliament

% of members of parliament who are women

1 if more than 20% of seats

0.5 if 10-20%

0 if less than 10%



30. Extent of political participation. Membership of political parties and political non-governmental organisations.

Score 1 if over 7% of population for either

Score 0.5 if 4% to 7%

Score 0 if under 4%.

If participation is forced, score 0.

31. Citizens' engagement with politics

1: High

0.5: Moderate

0: Low

If available, from World Values Survey

% of people who are very or somewhat interested in politics

1 if over 60%

0.5 if 40% to 60%

0 if less than 40%

32. The preparedness of population to take part in lawful demonstrations.

1: High

0.5: Moderate

0: Low

If available, from World Values Survey

% of people who have taken part in or would consider attending lawful demonstrations

1 if over 40%

0.5 if 30% to 40%

0 if less than 30%

33. Adult literacy

1 if over 90%

0.5 if 70% to 90%

0 if less than 70%

34. Extent to which adult population shows an interest in and follows politics in the news.

1: High

0.5: Moderate

0: Low

If available, from World Values Survey

% of population that follows politics in the news media (print, TV or radio) every day

1 if over 50%

0.5 if 30% to 50%

0 if less than 30%

35. The authorities make a serious effort to promote political participation.

1: Yes



0.5: Some attempts

0: No

Consider the role of the education system, and other promotional efforts Consider measures to facilitate voting by members of the diaspora.

If participation is forced, score 0.

#### **IV Democratic political culture**

36. Is there a sufficient degree of societal consensus and cohesion to underpin a stable, functioning democracy?

1: Yes

0.5: Yes, but some serious doubts and risks

0: No

37. Perceptions of leadership; proportion of the population that desires a strong leader who bypasses parliament and elections.

1: Low

0.5: Moderate

0: High

If available, from World Values Survey

% of people who think it would be good or fairly good to have a strong leader who does not bother with parliament and elections

1 if less than 30%

0.5 if 30% to 50%

0 if more than 50%

38. Perceptions of military rule; proportion of the population that would prefer military

1: Low

0.5: Moderate

0: High

If available, from World Values Survey

% of people who think it would be very or fairly good to have army rule

1 if less than 10%

0.5 if 10% to 30%

0 if more than 30%

39. Perceptions of rule by experts or technocratic government; proportion of the population that would prefer rule by experts or technocrats.

1: Low

0.5: Moderate

0: High

If available, from World Values Survey

% of people who think it would be very or fairly good to have experts, not government, make decisions



for the country

- 1 if less than 50%
- 0.5 if 50% to 70%
- 0 if more than 70%

40. Perception of democracy and public order; proportion of the population that believes that democracies are not good at maintaining public order.

- 1: Low
- 0.5: Moderate
- 0: High

If available, from World Values Survey

% of people who disagree with the view that democracies are not good at maintaining order

- 1 if more than 70%
- 0.5 if 50% to 70%
- 0 if less than 50%

Alternatively, % of people who think that punishing criminals is an essential characteristic of democracy

- 1 if more than 80%
- 0.5 if 60% to 80%
- 0 if less than 60%

41. Perception of democracy and the economic system; proportion of the population that believes that democracy benefits economic performance

If available, from World Values Survey

% of people who disagree with the view that the economic system runs badly in democracies

- 1 if more than 80%
- 0.5 if 60% to 80%
- 0 if less than 60%

42. Degree of popular support for democracy

- 1: High
- 0.5: Moderate
- 0: Low

If available, from World Values Survey

% of people who agree or strongly agree that democracy is better than any other form of government

- 1 if more than 90%
- 0.5 if 75% to 90%
- 0 if less than 75%

43. There is a strong tradition of the separation of church and state

- 1: Yes
- 0.5: Some residual influence of church on state
- 0: No



## **V Civil liberties**

44. Is there a free electronic media?

1: Yes

0.5: Pluralistic, but state-controlled media are heavily favoured. One or two private owners dominate the media

0: No

45. Is there a free print media?

1: Yes

0.5: Pluralistic, but state-controlled media are heavily favoured. There is high degree of concentration of private ownership of national newspapers

0: No

46. Is there freedom of expression and protest (bar only generally accepted restrictions such as banning advocacy of violence)?

1: Yes

0.5: Minority view points are subject to some official harassment. Libel laws restrict heavily scope for free expression

0: No

47. Is media coverage robust? Is there open and free discussion of public issues, with a reasonable diversity of opinions?

1: Yes

0.5: There is formal freedom, but high degree of conformity of opinion, including through self-censorship, or discouragement of minority or marginal views

0: No

48. Are there political restrictions on access to the Internet?

1: No

0.5: Some moderate restrictions

0: Yes

49. Are citizens free to form professional organisations and trade unions?

1: Yes

0.5: Officially free, but subject to some restrictions

0: No

50. Do institutions provide citizens with the opportunity to successfully petition government to redress grievances?

1: Yes

0.5: Some opportunities

0: No

51. The use of torture by the state

1: Torture is not used

0: Torture is used



52. The degree to which the judiciary is independent of government influence.

Consider the views of international legal and judicial watchdogs. Have the courts ever issued an important judgement against the government, or a senior government official?

1: High

0.5: Moderate

0: Low

53. The degree of religious tolerance and freedom of religious expression.

Are all religions permitted to operate freely, or are some restricted? Is the right to worship permitted both publicly and privately? Do some religious groups feel intimidated by others, even if the law requires equality and protection?

1: High

0.5: Moderate

0: Low

54. The degree to which citizens are treated equally under the law.

Consider whether favoured members of groups are spared prosecution under the law.

1: High

0.5: Moderate

0: Low

55. Do citizens enjoy basic security?

1: Yes

0.5: Crime is so pervasive as to endanger security for large segments

0: No

56. Extent to which private property rights protected and private business is free from undue government influence

1: High

0.5: Moderate

0: Low

57. Extent to which citizens enjoy personal freedoms

Consider gender equality, right to travel, choice of work and study.

1: High

0.5: Moderate

0: Low

58. Popular perceptions on human rights protection; proportion of the population that think that basic human rights are well-protected.

1: High

0.5: Moderate

0: Low

If available, from World Values Survey:

% of people who think that human rights are respected in their country



1 if more than 70%

0.5 if 50% to 70%

0 if less than 50%

59. There is no significant discrimination on the basis of people's race, colour or creed.

1: Yes

0.5: Yes, but some significant exceptions

0: No

60. Extent to which the government invokes new risks and threats as an excuse for curbing civil liberties

1: Low

0.5: Moderate

0: High

## References

- Acemoglu, Daron, Simon Johnson, James A. Robinson, and Pierre Yared, (2005), "Income and Democracy", NBER Working Paper No. 11205, March.
- Anastasakis, Othon (2011), "Greek democracy at gunpoint", *European Voice*, 10.11.2011
- Butter, David (2011), "Whatever happened to Arab Revolutions?" MENA Regional Overview, Economist Intelligence Unit, September.
- Coppedge, Michael, (2005), "Defining and measuring democracy", Working paper, International Political Science Association, April.
- Dahl, Robert A, (1970), "Polyarchy", New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Diamond, Larry, (2008), "The Democratic Rollback", *Foreign Affairs*, March-April.
- Diamond, Larry (2011), "Democracy's Third Wave Today" *Current History* November.
- Freedom House, various, [www.freedomhouse.org](http://www.freedomhouse.org).
- Hoey, Joan, (2011), "A tale of two Europes: the impact of the crisis on attitudes and values", *Economies in Transition Regional Overview*, Economist Intelligence Unit, September.
- Horowitz, Irving Louis, (2006), "The struggle for democracy", *National Interest*, spring.
- ILO, *World of Work Report 2010: From one crisis to the next?*, Nov 2010
- Kekic, Laza (2006), "A pause in democracy's march", *The World in 2007*, Economist.
- Reporters without borders, *World Press Freedom Index 2010*
- Rigobon, Roberto and Dani Rodrik, (2005), "Rule of law, democracy, openness, and income: estimating the interrelationships", *Economics of Transition*, Volume 13 (3).
- Thaker, Pratibha (2010), "Democracy in Sub-Saharan Africa", *Sub-Saharan Africa Regional Overview*, Economist Intelligence Unit, December.
- UN (2010), *Human Development Report*.
- UN Development Programme (UNDP) and the Organisation of American States (2011), "Our Democracy in Latin America"



# Access analysis on over 200 countries worldwide with the Economist Intelligence Unit

The analysis and content in our reports is derived from our extensive economic, financial, political and business risk analysis of over 203 countries worldwide.

You may gain access to this information by signing up, free of charge, at [www.eiu.com](http://www.eiu.com).

Click on the country name to go straight to the latest analysis of that country:

## G8 Countries

- Canada
- Germany
- Japan
- United Kingdom
- France
- Italy
- Russia
- United States of America

## BRIC Countries

- Brazil
- Russia
- India
- China

## CIVETS Countries

- Colombia
- Vietnam
- Turkey
- Indonesia
- Egypt
- South Africa

Or [view the list of all the countries](#).

Further reports are available from Economist Intelligence Unit and can be downloaded at [www.eiu.com](http://www.eiu.com).

## Should you wish to speak to a sales representative please telephone us:

Americas: +1 212 698 9717

Asia: +852 2585 3888

Europe, Middle East & Africa: +44 (0)20 7576 8181



# Media Enquiries for the Economist Intelligence Unit

## Europe, Middle East & Africa

### Grayling London

Tommy Allez

Tel: +44 (0)20 7592 7926

Felicity McKane

Tel: +44 (0)20 7932 1833

Mobile: +44 (0) 7808 643 021

Liam Jacklin

Tel: +44 (0)207 932 1838

Mobile: +44 (0)783 432 8661

[allgraylingukeiu@grayling.com](mailto:allgraylingukeiu@grayling.com)

## Americas

### Grayling New York

Ravi Sunnak

Tel: + 1 (646) 359-2173

Kevin Maloney

Tel: + 1 (646) 284-9417

[allgraylingukeiu@grayling.com](mailto:allgraylingukeiu@grayling.com)

## Asia Pacific (excluding China)

### The Consultancy

Tom Engel

Tel: +852 3114 6337 / +852 9577 7106

[tengel@consultancy-pr.com.hk](mailto:tengel@consultancy-pr.com.hk)

Ian Fok

Tel: +852 3114 6335 / +852 9348 4484

[ifok@consultancy-pr.com.hk](mailto:ifok@consultancy-pr.com.hk)

Rhonda Taylor

Tel: +852 3114 6335

[rtaylor@consultancy-pr.com.hk](mailto:rtaylor@consultancy-pr.com.hk)

## China

### Grayling Shanghai

Harriet Gaywood

Tel: +86 21 5239 7719 / 7729 ext. 101

[allgraylingukeiu@grayling.com](mailto:allgraylingukeiu@grayling.com)



# Access analysis and forecasting of major industries with the Economist Intelligence Unit

**I**n addition to the extensive country coverage the Economist Intelligence Unit provides each month industry and commodities information is also available.

The key industry sectors we cover are listed below with links to more information on each of them.

## **Automotive**

Analysis and five-year forecast for the automotive industry throughout the world providing detail on a country by country basis

## **Commodities**

This service offers analysis for 25 leading commodities. It delivers price forecasts for the next two years with forecasts of factors influencing prices such as production, consumption and stock levels. Analysis and forecasts are split by the two main commodity types: “Industrial raw materials” and “Food, feedstuffs and beverages”.

## **Consumer goods**

Analysis and five-year forecast for the consumer goods and retail industry throughout the world providing detail on a country by country basis

## **Energy**

Analysis and five-year forecast for the energy industries throughout the world providing detail on a country by country basis

## **Financial services**

Analysis and five-year forecast for the financial services industry throughout the world providing detail on a country by country basis

## **Healthcare**

Analysis and five-year forecast for the healthcare industry throughout the world providing detail on a country by country basis

## **Technology**

Analysis and five-year forecast for the technology industry throughout the world providing detail on a country by country basis

While every effort has been taken to verify the accuracy of this information, The Economist Intelligence Unit Ltd. cannot accept any responsibility or liability for reliance by any person on this report or any of the information, opinions or conclusions set out in this report.

LONDON

20 Cabot Square

London

E14 4QW

United Kingdom

Tel: (44.20) 7576 8000

Fax: (44.20) 7576 8500

E-mail: london@eiu.com

NEW YORK

750 Third Avenue

5th Floor

New York, NY 10017

United States

Tel: (1.212) 554 0600

Fax: (1.212) 586 1181/2

E-mail: newyork@eiu.com

HONG KONG

6001, Central Plaza

18 Harbour Road

Wanchai

Hong Kong

Tel: (852) 2585 3888

Fax: (852) 2802 7638

E-mail: hongkong@eiu.com

GENEVA

Rue de l'Athénée 32

1206 Geneva

Switzerland

Tel: (41) 22 566 2470

Fax: (41) 22 346 93 47

E-mail: geneva@eiu.com