

**GLOBECO**  
**Understanding globalisation**

**WORLD HAPPINESS**

**2011 EDITION**

**THE FINANCIAL CRISIS IS NOT**  
**THE WHOLE STORY!**

**Translation: Hazel Duncan**  
**(e mail : [hazel.Duncan.fr@orange.fr](mailto:hazel.Duncan.fr@orange.fr))**

**[www.globeco.fr](http://www.globeco.fr)**

## **Summary**

### ❖ **Forward**

### ❖ **The new HDI : making headway towards the WHI?**

### ❖ **Introduction**

### ❖ **The World Happiness Index**

- Peace and security
- Freedom, democracy, human rights
- Standard of living
- Research, training, information, communication, culture

### ❖ **Classification per country**

- Peace and security
- Freedom, democracy, human rights
- Standard of living
- Research, training, information, communication, culture

## **Foreword**

1 – In order to read **GLOBECO**, it is necessary to understand a certain number of **terms** and **figures**, which can be consulted on my website [www.globeco.fr](http://www.globeco.fr) under the heading “Reading Globeco”.

**2** – Here is the 2011 edition of “world happiness.” This edition refers to statistics published essentially in **2009 or 2010, the last known year of statistics mainly being 2008, and more rarely, 2009.** A recapitulative chart in each chapter of this edition compares the last year of known statistics, in other words 2009’s, to the year of reference, 2000. We also compare 2005 to 2000 in order to review the situation every 5 years. The year 2006 does not figure in any chart quite simply because the second to last UNDP report missed this year out, the UNDP being our principle source of information up until now.

**3** – However, we do point out which is **the relevant year** for each indicator: this figures in parenthesis after each of the titles relating to each index. For example, as far as nuclear potential is concerned, the figure 2008 in parenthesis means that the relevant year for this statistic is 2008.

**4** – Certain statistics are subject each year to **rectifications**, and the figure sometimes only becomes definitive two or three years after it first appeared, which is quite understandable. This is one of the reasons why we prefer making 5 yearly comparisons, instead of from one year to the next.

**5** – Each year we encounter some difficulties related to the fact that the statistic sources can vary one year to the next; that was for instance the case concerning radio and television sets. The World Bank no longer publishes the figures relating to radio sets, now concentrating on the number of television sets per household, previously per 100 people. We have overcome this inconvenience by henceforth referring to the figures of the **International Telecommunication Union, which concentrates on Internet.** Another example is the number of copies of **newspapers**: here again, the World Bank defaults and we therefore henceforth give precedence to the data provided by the “**World Association of Newspapers**”!

Another difficulty has arisen these last few years: not only did the 2009 edition of the UNDP’s world report on human development provide much less dense statistic data than usual, but also the usual presentation of the 2010 edition was considerably altered, including the three elements comprising the HDI. Moreover, certain indexes only published by the UNDP, like the GDI (Gender-related Development Index) and the HPI have been totally abandoned. Whence the need to look for certain data from other sources, notably in the World Bank’s “**World Development Indexes**”, which gives rise to some problems with the linking of one source to another. It would therefore seem useful to review the statistic sources employed, in particularly when they are abnormally old. The following paragraphs synthesise remarks of this kind, to be made later, concerning each subject:

- As concerns world population, we have adopted data from the UN's "Population" department and for the GDP per capita we have taken statistics from the World Bank's "World development indicators".
- As for violent deaths and suicides, the latest available data calculated and published by the WHO dates from 2004. It is astonishing that such important elements are not taken into greater consideration.
- It is very difficult to make sense of the UNHCR series of statistics concerning refugee numbers. I have done my best to work out the reality and compare comparable data from year to year, but it is very difficult. It is true that this is no simple matter!
- The Chinese authorities' refusal to give figures for capital punishment in their country makes the global perception of the problem more complicated. One must hope that this problem is transitory!
- The fact that the UNDP no longer publishes the Gender-related Development Index (GDI) has obliged me to find another solution explained later. This decision taken by the UNDP is astonishing given that its last report strongly requested that male-female inequalities were given greater consideration. The same remark was made for the Human Poverty Index, (HPI), henceforth unpublished, while the UNDP's last report advocated that the HDI give different forms of poverty greater consideration.
- In 2010, the UNDP altered the indexes relating to global and national levels of education. This is a pity, since they seemed to me both interesting and important. I have overcome this inconvenience by going directly to the source, that is to say by using UNESCO's very complete statistics.
- The GINI coefficient, published by the World Bank, is a mystery: the statistics are old, particularly for France, (1995). Yet everyone assures me, including the INSEE, (French national institute of statistics and economic studies) that this index is calculated every year in our country. If this is true, how is it that the World Bank does not know about it?

- The World Bank's "Little Green Data Book" is very interesting but, once again, the statistics concerning access to water and sanitary systems are very old: 2006...
- The same applies to forested land area: I was given to understand that the FAO, (Food and Agriculture Organisation), would publish its figures in a report entitled, "The World Forest Situation". This report is published each year but its latest edition omits up-to-date figures.

Perhaps these modest remarks will contribute to improving things! In the meantime, for the present edition, the last known years for statistics are the following:

- 2 statistics, (violent deaths and suicides) concern 2004, (Source: WHO).
- 1 statistic, (world forested land surface), concerns 2005, (Source: FAO)
- 2 statistics, (access to water and proper sanitarian systems) concern 2006 (Source: Little green data book) ;
- 1 statistic with a coefficient of 2, (Research and Development), concerns 2007
- The GINI coefficient concerns the years 1995 to 2008
- 22 statistics concern 2008
- 10 statistics concern 2009.

## **THE NEW HDI, MAKING WAY TOWARDS GLOBECO'S WHI?**

As those familiar with GLOBECO know already, I have been a "fan" of the HDI since 1990 and read with great interest the world report on human development published each year since 1990 by the UNDP. It is even thanks to and based on these reports that I myself, in 2001, established the World Happiness Index, (WHI) which I calculate and regularly publish on internet, ([www.globeco.fr](http://www.globeco.fr)), my last publication, (World Happiness, 2009-2010 edition) being the ninth. **This is the tenth publication.**

To mark the occasion of its 20<sup>th</sup> edition, the last UNDP report proposed new orientations, which all have something in common: once these new orientations

are put into practice, the HDI will look like the brother of...GLOBECO's WHI! Indeed, I have noticed that these new orientations take the same direction as the GLOBECO studies:

- On page 3, the UNDP's report states, **“today we live in a better world than in 1990 and 1970”**. I am interested in this notion of a “better world”, since this is exactly the same objective that I ascribe to my world happiness index: **to discover, from objective data not prejudices, if year in year out the world is globally getting better or worse. That is why my index is evolutionary and not static.**
- This year the UNDP report proposes as an experiment, new notions aiming to improve the HDI and in particular the **inequalities in general, inequalities between men and women and multidimensional poverty**. As it happens, these three types of data have been included from the start in the world happiness index. Moreover, when one takes into account these new data and corrects the basic classification per country of the HDI, paying attention to the classifications undertaken for the three new fields, we reach more or less exactly my own classification.
- I understand, and moreover support, the UNDP's wish to continue improving the HDI by progressively incorporating data relating to sustainable development and freedom: the WHI has integrated all of this as well as another element whose importance is asserted on page 20 of the last report. It is the issue of security, which constitutes in its different forms, (war, peace, violent deaths, security of the individual and society, financial security...) quarter of my index, (10 indicators out of 40). I notice, as I did above, that some indicators relating to security are very old, as for example the rate of violent deaths: the last figures in this field from the WHO concern 2004. It is the same for suicide rates. Is it not possible, once more, to make an improvement in this field?
- I do take note that Amartya Sen quite rightly indicated that the HDI must not become a **“lumber room”**, which may be how he views my own index. He is right, but how can we take into consideration the new fields that the UNDP proposes to include in the HDI without broadening the field of data? Moreover, contrary to Amartya Sen's indications, one way

or another I think that it is advisable for the outcome to result in a **global measurement**, even if it were only “to act as a simple measurement, like the GDP”, as Amartya Sen himself proposed on page 20 of the last UNDP’s report.

- On the other hand, I do not really understand why the last report included the development of **the subjective measuring of happiness**. It is certainly very in vogue, but I consider that it is advisable to clearly separate the objective measuring of development, wellbeing and what I call **collective** happiness on the one hand, (the statistic aggregates method used both by the HDI and the WHI), and on the other, the **subjective measuring of individual happiness**. To my mind, what I call collective happiness, measured by the WHI, constitutes necessary but insufficient conditions for each individual to be happy or at least perceive himself as such. However, it is not because Sweden is at the top of my classification that all the Swedish are happy, not necessarily even happier than the French... These elements are explained in the article I published in April 2010 in the **Futuribles** review.
  
- All of this has strengthened me in my idea that GLOBECO’s WHI is highly significant and has encouraged me to keep on going even if I cannot rival an institution like the UNDP for whom about ten people work on the subject throughout the year, whereas I work alone for three or four months a year... In any case, here is the tenth edition, the one for 2011, in the hope that despite my advanced years, ten more years will follow!

## INTRODUCTION :

### MEASURING HAPPINESS, WHAT IS THE POINT?

(The elements in this introduction have been developed in an article, which I published for the 2010 April edition of the *Futuribles* review. This article is available in English on this same website).

**Happiness is no longer a new idea in either Europe or the world.** International organisations and the media are therefore increasingly interested in measuring happiness, which has given rise to numerous symposiums: the latest of these, organised particularly by **the OECD and the European Union**, first in Rome, then Istanbul and Brussels, have clearly posed the following questions: **Can happiness be measured? Is it profitable? What is the point?** The Franco-British Committee attempted to provide answers to these questions during a symposium, which took place in London on February 2<sup>nd</sup> last, and to which I had the honour of being invited in an official capacity as an expert on these questions.

Indeed, there are **two different ways** of broaching this problem:

- The first consists in trying to measure **individual happiness**; this is a difficult path to tread, indeed absurd according to Luc Ferry, as an individual's conception is so different from one country to another and one civilisation or religion to another. This is why the OECD experts and the European Union have prudently made do with recommending research in this field through surveys and microeconomic analyses. The so-called "**subjective**" method is to be used here.
- The second seems to us more like **a real request**: it concerns going further than the GDP, (Beyond the GDP!) to assess the ways in which different countries, and the world as a whole, procure a "**happy**" life for their inhabitants. This leaves us with finding a definition for a happy country and a happy world! We are concerned here with **collective happiness** and not individual happiness as we said before, and the measurement is taken using **statistic aggregates** in the continuation of what the UNDP has been doing for the last twenty years.

This is also what GLOBECO has been doing for nearly 10 years by firstly defining what constitutes a happy world and a happy country, which is not very difficult:

- **Who can deny that peace is preferable to war?**
- **Who can deny that freedom is preferable to dictatorship?**

- **Who can deny that a decent standard of living is preferable to poverty?**
- **Who can deny, in the words of Danton that, “After bread, education is the people’s first necessity?”**

**Using these four themes as a basis, for each of them we can look for a significant “inventory of fixtures” and evolutionary indicators for what we have called world happiness and happiness per country. This is in fact what the UNDP started doing in 1990 by defining 3 elements, (the GDP, life expectancy and level of education) as the basis of the Human Development Index, (HDI). Our World Happiness Index is complementary to and an extension of this, in so far as it does not only take 3 elements into account, but 40 for world happiness and 20 for a country’s happiness. In this way, the elements not taken into consideration by either the GDP or the HDI, that is to say everything to do with **peace, security, human rights, environment and culture**, are taken into account, which gives rise to better answers to the questions everyone is asking: **how is the world doing? Is it better or worse? How is my country doing? Is it better or worse? We are therefore concerned with an evolutionary index, not an index concerning a given point in time.****

The “2011 World Happiness edition” takes up the course of the preceding editions with the following plan:

- **We first calculate the evolution of world happiness in relation to the year 2000 while bearing in mind the evolution between 2000 and 2005.**
- **We establish the classification per country for the 60 countries retained.**

## **THE WORLD HAPPINESS INDEX**

The World Happiness Index is established using 40 statistic data, which are grouped around four headings:

- Peace and security
- Freedom, democracy, human rights
- Standard of living
- Intelligence, communication, culture

**Results that are higher than 100 mean an increase in world happiness and results lower than 100 mean a decrease in world happiness.**

In the recapitulative charts, we will henceforth concentrate on comparisons with the founding year 2000 as well as the years between 2000 and 2005 for one straightforward reason: evolution is generally slight from one year to the next, it is therefore preferable to make comparisons which allow us to see middle term evolution.

**A – Peace and Security**

**1 – Nuclear potential (2008, SIPRI)**

- We have retained as a first significant element for peace and security the number of attack and defence **nuclear weapon heads in working order** available to individual countries, which are officially, or unofficially members of the nuclear powers’ “club”. North Korea, previously mentioned in one of the editions of the SIPRI Yearbook, does not appear this year.
- The 2008 figures, published with many uncertain elements in the **2009 SIPRI Yearbook** are the following:

**Number of nuclear weapon heads**

United States	2702
Russia	4834
Great Britain	160
France	300

China	186
India	70
Pakistan	60
Israel	80
<b>Total</b>	<b>8392</b>

- The figures concerning the previous years are the following :

### Previous years' figures

<b>2000 (founding year)</b>	15 195
<b>2005</b>	12 100
<b>2006</b>	11 530
<b>2007</b>	10183
<b>2008</b>	8392

- The comparison between 2005 and 2000 (12100 / 15195) results in the figure **79,63** which is considered “positive” since it indicates that the situation has improved. We therefore retain the figure, **120,37** (100 + the difference between 100 et 79,63) for the comparison with the founding year.
- As for the comparison between 2008 and 2000, (8392 / 15195), it results in the figure 57,20 which is also positive in the same way, as it indicates an improvement in the situation. We therefore retain the figure **142,80** (100 + the difference between 100 et 57,20).

## 2 – Military expenditure (2008, SIPRI)

- **The SIPRI YEARBOOK** describes military expenditure each year in the world. We have chosen to retain the figures in **current** dollars and to compare them, as the SIPRI does each year, to the world GDP also calculated in current dollars, to obtain the percentage of military expenditure compared with the GDP. The figures over the previous years, issued from successive SIPRI reports, are the following:

### Military expenditure in current dollars corresponding to the GDP

	Military expenditure	In % of world GDP according to the SIPRI
2000 (founding year)	798	2,60
2005	1118	2,50
2008	1464	2,40

- The vast progress in military expenditure is much less fast than the GDP's: the correlation between 2005 and 2000, (2,50 / 2,60) results in the figure **96,15**, a "positive" figure since it concerns a favourable evolution; we have therefore retained the figure **103,85** (100 + the difference between 100 et 96,15).
- The comparison between 2008 et 2000 (2,40 / 2,60) results in the figure **92,30**, also a "positive" figure. That gives us the figure **107,70** (100 + the difference entre 100 et 92,30).

### 3 – Victims of major armed conflict (2008, SIPRI)

The SIPRI calculates each year the number of victims of major armed conflicts; the figures of the last few years, (SIPRI Yearbook 2009) are the following:

#### Number of victims of major armed conflicts

1999	69 300
2000	29 850
2001	17 700
2004	18300

2005	13530
2006	14200
2007	17700
2008	24500

- The **15 countries** concerned with major armed conflicts in 2008, (compared with 22 in 2000), are Burundi, Somalia, Sudan, Columbia, Peru, the United States, Afghanistan, India, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Iraq, Israel and Turkey.
- We have chosen the triennial method, (3M) as these figures may vary considerably from one year to the next in the case of violent and deadly conflict; this results in the following figures:

#### Number of victims with the 3M

<b>2000</b> (average 1999, 2000, 2001) base	38 333
<b>2005</b> (average 2004, 2005, 2006)	15 343
<b>2007</b> (average 2006, 2007, 2008)	18800

- The correlation between 2005 et 2000 (15343 / 38333) results in the figure de 40,03 which is “positive” since it concerns an improvement in the situation. This results in the figure **159,97** (100 + the difference between 100 et 40,03), a figure which we have retained. The comparison between 2007 et 2000 (18800 / 38333) results in the figure 49,04, also a “positive” figure, to finish with the figure **150,96** (100 + the difference between 100 et 49,04).

#### 4 – Corruption (2009, Transparency International)

- Transparency International publishes each year all figures relating to corruption; let us bear in mind that these figures and classifications in fact convey the **perception** of corruption of people in business who are in contact with different countries' administrations. It must be understood that the average we publish engages solely our own responsibility.
- We first calculated the average of the countries classified by Transparency International; the problem is that, **each year, the countries classified differ. In 2000, there were 99, in 2002, 102 and there are now about 180...** Making a comparison is therefore difficult and in order to remain rigorous, we prefer to take into consideration only the 60 countries included in our own classification per country. Let us remind ourselves that these 60 countries unite more than 90% of the world's population and global GDP.
- **The average of the 60 countries** over the last years is the following, given that the countries are classified from 10 to 1 according to their level of corruption. The least corrupt country amongst the 60 countries is Denmark with 9,3 points and the most corrupt country is the Republic of Myanmar, (Burma) with 1,4 points. For the most recent year concerned, 2009, we have used the last edition of the CPI (consumer price index 2010).

### Corruption

2000 (founding year)	5,01
2005	4,90
2007	4,89
2008	4,82
2009	4,80

- The evolution conveys the situation's deterioration since the year 2000: the correlation between 2005 and 2000 ( $4,90 / 5,01$ ) results in the figure **97,80**, a figure which we have retained to compare with the founding year.
- The comparison between 2009 et 2000 ( $4,80 / 5,01$ ) results in the figure **95,81** which we have retained.

## 5 – Violent deaths (2004, WHO)

- **The WHO** periodically publishes this data, which reviews all the causes of violent death, meaning non-natural deaths resulting from some sort of traumatism, from poisonings to suicides, while including road accidents, victims of natural and technological catastrophes, homicides and fires. **This is an interesting element as it gives us insight into the way each form of violence evolves in our society.**
- Unfortunately, the last figures, forgotten by the WHO, concern 2004 and we are therefore regrettably obliged, to make do with this data.
- The figures evolve as follows:

### Violent deaths

	<b>Absolute value</b>	<b>Per million</b>
2000 (founding year)	5 101 000	834
2001	5 103 000	824
2002	5 188 000	827
2004	5 784 000	900

- The situation is deteriorating particularly because of the great increase in the number of vehicles on the road in countries where road accidents are very frequent. The evolution in 2004 compared with 2000, (900 / 834) results in the figure, 107,91, a “negative” figure since it shows that the situation has deteriorated. We have therefore retained the figure **92,09** (100 minus the difference between 100 et 107,91), both for the comparison between 2004 and 2000 but also for the comparison between 2008 and 2000 until we receive the new statistics from the WHO.

## 6 – Refugees (2009, HCR)

- The HCR publishes each year a report on the number of refugees in the world. This report includes not only the refugees as such, but also asylum seekers and other people of whom the HCR is in charge. **The precise statistic category we have retained is “the total number of people concerned by the HCR’s scope of activities”**. In its second to last publication, the HCR explained that the increase noted in the number of refugees is the result of a finer perception of the realities and of adjustments in the statistics. In order to consider this evolution, we have retained the statistic modifications part, (+8 million people in the 2006 figures compared with 2005 according to the HCR statistic report), which led us to raise the 2000 and 2005 figures by 8 million.
- The first countries most concerned are, in decreasing order, Afghanistan, Iraq, Somalia, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Myanmar. The HCR’s up-to-date evolution in figures is the following:

### Refugees per 1000 inhabitants

	Millions (1)	World Population according to the UN (2)	Per 1000
2000	22 + 8 = 30	6115 million	4,91
2005	21 + 8 = 29	6512 million	4,45
2008	34,5	6750 million	5,11
2009	36,5	6830 million	5,34

- **The situation had improved in 2005 compared to 2000:** the comparison between 4,45 and 4,91 results in the figure 90,63 which is “positive” since it concerns an improvement in the situation. We have therefore retained the figure **109,37** for the comparison between 2005 and the founding year.
- On the other hand, we have witnessed the **situation’s deterioration** in 2009 as in 2008: the correlation between the 2009 and 2000 figures (5,34 / 4,91) results in the figure 108,76, a “negative” figure since it concerns a deterioration in the situation. We have therefore retained the figure 91,24 (100 minus the difference between 108,76 and 100), for the comparison with the founding year.

**7 – Victims of natural and technological catastrophes, (2009, Swiss Re): the financial crisis is not the whole story!**

- The reinsurer company **Swiss Re** in its review entitled “Sigma” publishes each year the number of victims of natural and technological catastrophes. We notice that 2008, like 2004, (tsunami) was a very bad year marked with the Sichuan earthquake and Nargis cyclone which particularly hit Burma, (nearly 100 000 victims in both cases). We note also the preponderant part natural catastrophes play, (more than 95%) in the total of victims.
- The figures are the following :

**Number of victims**

1999	63 806
2000	14 941
2001	36 035
2002	22 433
2003	43 043
<b>2004</b>	<b>242 446</b>
2005	97 018
2006	30 500
2007	21 500
<b>2008</b>	<b>240 500</b>
2009	15 000

- In order to overcome the random nature of these figures, we continue to use the triennial method, (3M) which results in the following:

**Number of victims with the 3M**

2000 (1999 - <b><u>2000</u></b> - 2001)	38 260
-----------------------------------------	--------

2005 (2004 – <b>2005</b> - 2006)	123 321
2007 (2006 - <b>2007</b> – 2008)	97 500
2008 (2007 – <b>2008</b> - 2009)	92333

- We have related these results to the world population which has given us the following number of victims per million inhabitants: (the year 2000 represents the triennial average 1999, 2000, 2001)

### Number of victims with the 3M / world population in millions

	Victims (1)	Population (2) according to the UN	(1) / (2)
2000 (base)	38260	6115	6,26
2005	123321	6512	18,94
2007	97500	6670	14,62
2008	92333	6750	13,68

- The situation has deteriorated appallingly because of both the 2004 tsunami and 2008 being a very bad year: the correlation between 2005 and 2000, (18,94 / 6,26) results in the figure 302,56, a “negative” figure since it concerns the situation’s deterioration. We have therefore retained the figure of “**minus 102,56**”, (100 minus the difference between 302,56 and 100).
- The correlation between 2008 and 2000, (13,68 / 6,26) results in the figure 218,53, also a “negative” figure which gives us the figure “minus 18,53”.
- **Next year we will have to integrate the consequences of the earthquake in Haiti, then the Japanese catastrophe. Yes, indeed, amongst the world’s misfortunes, the financial crisis is not the whole story!**

### 8 – Economic and financial security: the risk country (2009, COFACE)

- This element is published each year by **COFACE** under the heading “Risk Country”.
- **This criteria considers the difficulties related to a country’s economic and financial problems**, the Argentines and the Greeks for example have a very good idea of what that means. In fact, the risk country assesses the following elements per country:
  - Political and institutional weaknesses;
  - The vulnerability of the present situation;
  - The risk of a liquidity crisis in currency;
  - Excessive exterior debt;
  - The state’s financial vulnerability;
  - Weakness in the banking sector;
  - The way in which companies’ deliver payment
- **As in the past**, in order to ensure the comparison of comparable data, we will only consider the 60 countries, which we follow while bearing in mind that together these countries represent 90% of the world’s population and nearly 95% of global GDP. Obviously, the calculations were made again to include the alteration in the list of 60 countries. The average figures are the following, it being understood that the best risk countries have 7 points and the worst 1 point, following the COFACE’s own nomenclature in this area: (we take entire responsibility for the publishing of these averages)

### **Risk countries**

2000 (founding year)	4,53
2005	4,57
2007	4,55
2008	4,10
2009	4,18

- The comparison between 4,57 et 4,53 results in the figure **100,88** which we have retained for comparing 2005 to 2000.

- On the other hand, because of the crash, the situation has dramatically deteriorated since 2007: the comparison between 4,18 et 4,53 results in the figure **92,27** which we have retained for comparing 2009 to 2000.

### **9 and 10 – Living until the age of 65 (2008, World Bank)**

- The WHO does not regularly calculate life expectancy from birth and we are therefore obliged to choose another indicator just as significant; we have chosen the probability at birth of reaching the age of 65. **This indicator in fact reflects the effects of all the hazards, which can shatter women and men’s lives in their youth or prime of life.**
- According to the World Bank, the following figures concerning 2000, 2005, 2007 and 2008 appear as a percentage of world population:

#### **Probability at birth of reaching the age of 65**

2000 (founding year)	73,5 %
2005	71,0 %
2007	72,0 %
2008	72,5 %

- There is a significant deterioration between 2005 and 2000. The correlation between 71 and 73,5 results in the figure **96,60**, which we have retained. There is a slight recovery between 2005 and 2008, but the situation remains worse in 2008 than in 2000. The correlation between 72,5 et 73,5 results in the figure **98,64**, which we have retained.
- Considering the importance of this factor, we have given it a coefficient of 2; 96,60 has therefore become **193,20** and 98,64 has become **197,28**.

### **Summary: peace and security**

The second column of the following chart concerns 2009, which is to this day the last year of known statistics. However, the figures quoted can concern years preceding 2009, indicated in parenthesis following the title of each heading.

	<b>2005 / 2000</b>	<b>2009 / 2000</b>
	(2000 = 100)	(2000 = 100)
<b>1 – Nuclear potential</b>	120,37	142,80
<b>2 – Military expenditure</b>	103,85	107,70
<b>3 – Victims of conflicts</b>	159,97	150,96
<b>4 – Corruption</b>	97,80	95,81
<b>5 – Violent deaths</b>	92,09	92,09
<b>6 – Refugees</b>	109,37	91,24
<b>7 – Victims of catastrophes</b>	Minus 102,56	Minus 18,53
<b>8 – Risk countries</b>	100,88	92,27
<b>9 et 10 – Living until the age of 65 (coef 2)</b>	193,20	197,28
<b>Average</b>	<b>87,50</b>	<b>95,16</b>

**This result must be emphasised: despite the improvement in the figures concerning nuclear warheads and the number of victims of major armed conflicts, the situation has dramatically deteriorated, essentially because of the great number of victims of natural catastrophes in 2004 and 2008. This situation, alas, is likely to continue next year since the catastrophic consequences of the Haiti earthquake will have to be incorporated.**

### **B – Freedom, democracy and human rights**

**Regretfully, we have been obliged to abandon the indicator relating to child labour, which is impossible to follow from one year to the next given the absence of reliable statistics in this field. We will overcome this absence by doubling the coefficient for the level of education for the young, which ties in with this factor's fundamental importance. Similarly, we deplore that the UNDP no longer publishes the Gender-related Human Development Index**

which was a good indicator of a woman’s place in the world compared to a man’s. We will overcome this difficulty by doubling the coefficient of the percentage of women in parliament.

**1 - The percentage of countries where the inhabitants live in “freedom”. (2009, Freedom House)**

- **Freedom House**, an American “think tank” separates the world’s countries into three categories: those who live in “freedom”, “part freedom” or “without freedom”. The following figures which concern 194 countries have been taken from the 2010 edition of Freedom House published on the web.
- The evolution is the following as far as the percentage of inhabitants of living in “free” countries is concerned.

**Percentage of countries whose inhabitants live in freedom**

2000 (founding year)	44 %
2005	46 %
2007	47 %
2008	46 %
2009	46 %

- The situation improved between 2000 and 2005. The correlation between 46 and 44 results in the figure **104,55** which we have retained to compare 2005 to 2000. The situation has remained stable since and we will therefore adopt the same figure, **104,55** for the evolution between 2009 and 2000..

**2 – The average level of freedom in the world (2009, Freedom House)**

- **Freedom House** has allocated marks to each country for their average level of freedom concerning political rights and civil liberties with marks going from 1, (the worst) to 7, (the best).

- These marks for a world average have evolved as follows:

### Average level of freedom in the world

2000 founding year	3,47
2005	3,34
2007	3,23
2008	3,30
2009	3,32

- The situation deteriorated quite dramatically in 2005 compared with 2000; the correlation between 3,34 and 3,47 results in the figure **96,25**, which we have retained to compare 2005 with the founding year.
- As for the comparison between 2009 and the founding year, the correlation between 3,32 and 3,47 results in the figure **95,68** which we have retained.

### 3 – Freedom of the press (2009, Freedom House)

- **Freedom House** each year publishes the statistics relating to the percentage of countries in the world with free press at their disposal.
- The worst examples are North Korea, Tunisia, Iran, Belorussia, Equatorial Guinea, Uzbekistan, Cuba and in last position, Eritrea.
- The evolution has been as follows since the founding year 2000:

### Percentage of countries with free press at their disposal

2000 (founding year)	37 %
2005	39 %
2007	38 %

2008	37 %
2009	35 %

- The comparison between 2005 and 2000 (39 / 37) results in the figure **105,40** which we have retained.
- As for the relationship between 2009 with the founding year, the correlation between 35 and 37 results in the figure **94,59**, which we have retained.

#### **4 – The Death Penalty (2009, Amnesty International)**

- Each year **Amnesty International** publishes on the web very interesting and accessible documents concerning the death penalty in the world; the figures can double from one year to the next, which has lead us, as with the natural and technological catastrophes, to adopt the method of triennial averages.
- The number of executions is henceforth a “state secret” in China. Amnesty International therefore no longer includes China in its annual assessment of capital executions. We have added to the Amnesty figure for 2009, the 1 700 capital executions which, according to Amnesty International, at the very minimum to have taken place in China in **2008??** According to these data, the **minimum** number of capital executions has evolved over the last years as follows:

#### **Minimum number of capital executions**

1999	1831
2000	1457
2001	3048
2002	1526
2003	1146
2004	3797
2005	2148
2006	1591

2007	1252
2008	2390
2009	2414

- **With the triennial average (3M), the figures are the following:**

**Minimum number of capital executions with the M3**

<b>2000</b> (1999-2000-2001) (base)	2112
<b>2005</b> (2004 – 2005 – 2006)	2512
<b>2007</b> (2006 – 2007 – 2008)	1744
<b>2008</b> (2007 – 2008 – 2009)	2019

- The correlation between 2512 and 2112 results in the figure 118,94, a “negative” figure since it conveys a deterioration in the situation. We have retained the figure **81,06** (100 minus the difference between 118,94 and 100) for the comparison of 2005 to the year 2000.
- To compare 2008 with the founding year, the correlation between 2019 and 2112 results in the figure 95,60, a “positive” figure since it conveys an improvement in the situation. We have therefore retained the figure **104,40** (100 + the difference between 100 and 95,60).

**5 – 6 - Women’s rights: the percentage of parliamentary women (2008, UNDP) coefficient 2**

- As we said earlier, the UNDP no longer publishes the GHDI, which served as a “score-keeper” for women’s position compared to men’s in society. The UNDP’s new index is no doubt interesting in this field but data relating to the preceding years no longer exist. We have therefore been obliged to find another solution. The UNDP each year publishes the percentage of women in parliament in more than 160 countries. We have retained this very significant element for women’s true rights in the world.

- The evolution of the percentage of women in parliament compared to the total number of parliamentarians is the following:

### **Percentage of women in parliament**

2000 (founding year)	14 %
2005	15 %
2006	16 %
2007	17 %
2008	16 %

- The situation is slowly improving despite a regression in 2008 compared with 2007.
- The correlation between 2005 and 2000 (15 / 14) has resulted in the figure **107,14**, which we have retained.
- As for the comparison between 2008 and 2000 (16 / 14), it results in the figure **114,29** which we have retained to compare 2008 with the founding year.
- With the coefficient of 2, these figures become respectively **214,28** et **228,58**.

### **7 – Women’s rights: the levels of girls in education, both primary and secondary (2008, UNESCO)**

- No one would deny the importance of schooling for women which has always been and still is everywhere one of the conditions to economic, social and human development. Moreover, in most countries, this primary and secondary schooling is a **right**, which should be respected, for girls included.
- The **UNDP** had published each year since 1990, statistics relating to this field under the heading: “Gross levels of women’s schooling from primary to higher education as a percentage”. Such is not the case in the

last edition of the world report on human development. We will therefore use statistics from UNESO and, more precisely, “the gross levels of schooling in primary and secondary education”, for girls. The figures of recent years are the following:

**Levels of schooling for girls in primary and secondary education.**

2000 (founding year)	75 %
2005	81 %
2007	83 %
2008	83 %

- There is a constant improvement. Between 2000 and 2005, the improvement (81 / 75) is 8 % and we have therefore retained the figure **108,00** to compare 2005 to 2000.
- As concerns the comparison between 2008 and 2000 (83 / 75), the figure to retain is **110,67**.

**8 – Children’s rights: the Child Mortality Under 5 – CMU5 (2008, UNICEF)**

- Each year **UNICEF** publishes the rate of child mortality under 5 (CMU5) in the world.
- This rate’s evolution per 1000 births is the following :

**CMU 5**

2000 D (founding year)	81
2005	76

2007	68
2008	65

- The situation regularly improves: the correlation between 2005 and 2000 (76 / 81) results in 93,83, a “positive” figure since it conveys improvement in the situation. We have therefore retained the figure **106,17** (100 + the difference between 100 et 93,83).
- As for the correlation between 2008 and 2000 (65 / 81), it results in the figure 80,25 which, once made “positive” gives us **119,75** (100 + the difference between 100 et 80,25), the figure that we have retained to compare with our founding year.

### 9 - 10 – Youth rights : primary and secondary schooling for both girls and boys (2008, UNESCO)

- Each year **UNESCO** publishes the gross rate of primary and secondary schooling for the young in the world, (both boys and girls). We have granted this factor a **coefficient of 2**, its significance is acknowledged by everyone. In most countries, schooling is obligatory for primary education and increasingly so for the first years of secondary education.
- This rate has evolved as follows over the last years:

#### Rate of schooling for the young

2000 (founding year)	78 %
2005	83 %
2007	84 %
2008	85 %

- The evolution is noticeably favourable. The correlation of the average between 2005 and 2000, (83 / 78) results in the figure **106,41** which we have retained for primary and secondary education.

- As for the comparison between 2008 et 2000 (85 / 78), it results in the figure **108,97** which we have retained to compare the founding year as far as primary and secondary education are concerned.
- Taking the coefficient 2 into consideration, these figures become respectively **212,82 et 217,94**.

### **Summary: freedom, democracy, human rights**

	<b>2005 / 2000</b>	<b>2009 / 2000</b>
	(2000 = 100)	(2000 = 100)
<b>1 – Free countries</b>	104,55	104,55
<b>2 – Degree of freedom</b>	96,25	95,68
<b>3 – Freedom of press</b>	105,40	94,59
<b>4 – Death penalty</b>	81,06	104,40
<b>5 - 6 – Women in parliament (coef.2)</b>	214,28	228,58
<b>7 – Girls schooling</b>	108,00	110,67
<b>8 – CMU5</b>	106,17	119,75
<b>9 -10 – Youth schooling (coef.2)</b>	212,82	217,94
<b><u>Average</u></b>	<b><u>102,85</u></b>	<b><u>107,62</u></b>

**It is worth noting the contrast with the preceding chapter: the situation is improving here, slowly but surely, with the exception of the degree of freedom and, since 2005, for the freedom of the press and probably the death penalty given the Chinese' decision to hide these figures. The positive notes are the increase in parliamentarian women, schooling the young in general and girls in particular along with the decrease in child mortality in under fives.**

### **C – Standard of living**

## 1 – Gross Global Income per capita (2008, Banque Mondiale)

- As concerns the evolution of the gross global income per capita, the figures of the last years are the following:

### Gross Global Income per capita

<b>2000 (founding year)</b>	7410 dollars PPP (purchasing power parity)
<b>2005</b>	9424 //
<b>2007</b>	9947 //
<b>2008</b>	10415 //

- The correlation between 2005 and 2000 (9424 / 7410) results in the figure **127,18** which we have retained to compare 2005 with 2000.
- As for the correlation between 2008 and 2000 (10415 / 7410), it results in the figure **140,55** which we have retained.

## 2 – World income per capita: the disparities (2008, World Bank)

- The introduction of this element deserves an explanation: we cannot just make do with averages, **the too wide gap between the rich and the poor is a factor, which does not tie in with world happiness!**
- To calculate the disparities between the rich and poor, we compare the income per capita of sub-Saharan Africa with the world average.
- The evolution over the last few years has been the following:

### Average income per capita: the world gape (figures in dollars \_ PPP)

	Sub-Saharan Africa (1)	World (2)	(1)/ (2 = 100)
<b>2000 (base)</b>	1600	7410	21,59 %
<b>2005</b>	2004	9424	21,26 %
<b>2007</b>	1869	9947	18,79 %
<b>2008</b>	1949	10415	18,71 %

- Alas, the evolution is unfavourable, especially since 2005. The correlation between 21,26 et 21,59 results in the figure **98 ,47** which we have retained to compare 2005 with the founding year.
- As for the comparison between 2008 and the founding year, (18,71 / 21,59), it gives us the figure **86,66** which we have retained.

### **3 – Life expectancy from birth (2008, World Bank)**

- The world figures for life expectancy from birth these last years are the following according to the World Bank:

#### **Life expectancy from birth**

<b>2000 (founding year)</b>	66 years old
<b>2005</b>	68 //
<b>2007</b>	69 //
<b>2008</b>	69 //

- The evolution from 2005 compared with 2000 (68 / 66) results in the figure **103,03** which we have retained
- As for the correlation between 2008 and 2000 (69 / 66), it results in the figure **104,55**, which we have retained.

#### **4 – Life expectancy: the world gap (2008, World Bank)**

- The UNDP has stopped publishing its human poverty indicator. We have replaced it with a comparison between life expectancy in sub-Saharan Africa and the world average:

##### **Life expectancy: the world gap**

	<b>Sub-Saharan Africa (1)</b>	<b>World (2)</b>	<b>(1)/ (2 = 100)</b>
<b>2000 (founding)</b>	47	66	71,21 %
<b>2005</b>	47	68	69,12 //
<b>2007</b>	51	69	73,91 //
<b>2008</b>	52	69	75,36 //

- Curiously, the evolution is the exact opposite of the GDP per capita: the situation deteriorates between 2000 and 2005 and improves afterwards.
- The comparison between 69,12 and 71,21 results in the figure **97,07** which we have retained to compare 2005 with 2000.
- As for the comparison between 2008 and 2000, the correlation between 75,36 et 71,21 results in the figure **105,83** which we have retained.

#### **5 – The GINI coefficient (2008, UNDP)**

- The GINI coefficient measures the inequalities in interior revenue for each country. This coefficient is published each year by the UNDP and by the World Bank. We have chosen to consider only the **60 countries** in our classification per country. Indeed, the number of countries classified varies from one year to the next and we therefore run the risk of comparing the incomparable. Choosing to consider only these 60 countries overcomes this inconvenience.

- The average evolution of the GINI coefficient in these 60 countries has been the following over the last years according to the UNDP, given that the years in question can vary from one country to another and that they are often quite old:

### GINI Coefficient

<b>2000 (founding year)</b>	35,79
<b>2005</b>	37,01
<b>2007</b>	37,15
<b>2008</b>	37,17

- The tendency is towards an increase in internal inequalities, but it is slight. The correlation between 2005 and 2000 (37,01 / 35,79) results in the figure 103,41, a “negative” figure since it concerns a deterioration in the situation. That gives us the figure **96,59** (100 minus the difference between 103,41 et 100) which we have retained.
- As for the correlation between 2008 and 2000 (37,17 / 35,79), it results in the figure 103,86 which we also reverse. We have retained therefore the figure **96,14** to compare 2008 with the founding year.

### 6 – Suicides (2004, WHO)

- **The WHO** periodically publishes, but very late, the number of suicides in the world. The last available figures concern 2004. The evolution over the last years is the following for the number of suicides in relation to the world’s population:

#### Number of suicides / world population

	Suicides (1)	World population (2) Source : World Bank	(1)/(2)

<b>2000 (founding year)</b>	815 000	6057 million	134,56
<b>2001</b>	849 000	6148 //	138,09
<b>2002</b>	877 000	6225 //	140,88
<b>2004</b>	844 000	6389 //	132,10

- The evolution is irregular: the correlation between the 2004 figure and the one for the year 2000 (132,10 / 134,56) results in the figure 98,17, a “positive” figure since it conveys an improvement in the situation. That gives us the figure **101,83**. In the absence of more recent figures, we have retained this figure for the comparisons of both 2005 and 2007 with the founding year.

### 7 – The amount of CO2 in the atmosphere (2008, CDIAC data)

- **The amount of CO2 in the atmosphere** is a very important element since it is most likely to be an explanation for a major part of climate change.
- The **CDIAC** (Carbone dioxide information analysis centre data) publishes this element each year using daily observations taken from different sites on the planet. We have chosen the figures from the Station Jubay on the Antarctic South Pole whose average levels each year in PPM, (parts per million) are the following:

#### Amount of CO2 in the atmosphere

<b>2000 (founding year)</b>	367 PPM
<b>2005</b>	377 //
<b>2007</b>	381 //
<b>2008</b>	383

- The tendency is towards a slow but regular deterioration of the situation. The correlation between 2005 and 2000 (377 / 367) results in the figure 102,72 which is “negative” since it conveys a deterioration in the

situation. We have therefore retained the figure **97,28** for the comparison between 2005 et 2000.

- As for the comparison between 2008 and 2000 (383 / 367), it results in the figure 104,36, a “negative” figure in the same way. We have therefore retained the figure **95,64** for the comparison between 2008 and the founding year.

### **8 – Access to water and proper sanitation facilities, (2006, World Bank – Little green data book)**

- The World Bank publishes each year a very interesting work entitled, “**The little green data book**”, where a wealth of information relative to the world’s environment is given. We have used the information relative to the percentage of the world’s population, which has “access to a source of improved water” and “sanitation facilities”. The figures available in the successive editions concern 2000, 2002, 2004 and 2006. The latest edition of the work is dated 2010.
- The figures are the following:

#### **Access to water and proper sanitation facilities**

	Water	Sanitation	Average
<b>2000 (founding year)</b>	81 %	56 %	68,5 %
<b>2002</b>	82 //	54 //	68,0 //
<b>2004</b>	83 //	57 //	70,0 //
<b>2006</b>	86 //	60 //	73,0 //

- The correlation between 2004 et 2000 (70 / 68,5) gives us the figure **102,19** which we have retained.
- As for the comparison between 2006 and 2000 (73 / 68,5), it gives us the figure **106,57** which we have retained.

## 9 – Forests (2005, FAO)

- The last report made by the FAO on forests in the world, (The World Forest Situation 2009), a report made every two years, does not bear any new statistic elements compared with the preceding edition. We have therefore used the last figures available, which refer to the year 2005.
- The areas of forest per inhabitant have evolved in the following way between 2000 and 2005:

	<b>Forest area in thousands of hectares (1)</b>	<b>World population in millions (2)</b>	<b>(1) / (2)</b>
<b>2000 (founding year)</b>	3 988 610	6057	658,51
<b>2004</b>	3 959 138	6389	619,68
<b>2005</b>	3 952 025	6515	606,60

- The correlation between 2005 and 2000 (606,60 / 658,51) gives the figure **92,12** which we have retained to compare 2005 with the founding year, a figure which we have also retained to compare 2009 with 2000, since more recent figures do not exist.

## 10 – Air pollution (2006, The little green data book)

- In its “Little Green Data Book”, the World Bank publishes each year the **rate of damaging particulate matter**, which is suspended in the air in cities throughout the world of more than 100 000 inhabitants. The last figures published are the following for the world average:

### Air pollution in parts per calculated unit

<b>2000 D (founding year)</b>	50
-------------------------------	----

<b>2004</b>	54
<b>2006</b>	50

- The situation deteriorated in 2004 compared with the founding year. The correlation between 54 and 50 gives us the figure 108 which we inverse since it concerns a deterioration in the situation. We have therefore retained the figure **92**.
- As for 2006 compared with 2000, the situation has returned to its original state and we have therefore retained the figure **100** for the comparison with the founding year.

### **Summary: Standard of living**

	<b>2005 / 2000</b>	<b>2009 / 2000</b>
	(2000 = 100)	(2000 = 100)
<b>1 – World income per capita</b>	127,18	140,55
<b>2 – Disparities in income per cap.</b>	98,47	86,66
<b>3 – Life expectancy from birth</b>	103,03	104,55
<b>4 – Disparities in exp. from birth</b>	97,07	105,83
<b>5 - GINI coefficient</b>	96,59	96,14
<b>6 – Suicides</b>	101,83	101,83
<b>7 – CO2 levels</b>	97,28	95,64
<b>8- Water and sanitary facilities</b>	102,19	106,57
<b>9 – Forests</b>	92,12	92,12
<b>10 – Pollution in the air</b>	92,00	100,00
<b><u>Average</u></b>	<b><u>100,78</u></b>	<b><u>102,99</u></b>

**The tendency here is stagnation until 2005 and a slight improvement between 2000 and 2009. We should note the important increase in the world gap in terms of GDP per capita**

since 2005 and its decrease in terms of life expectancy from birth also since 2005.

## **D – Research, training, information, communication, culture**

We have stopped taking into consideration the number of television sets in the world for two reasons: firstly, the global figures are really too hard to believe, whatever the source may be; secondly, television is increasingly watched on internet and mobile phones, which leaves television sets with limited relevance. To overcome this “failure”, we have given a double coefficient to the chapter “research-development”, whose significance needs no explanation, as we have been doing from the start for the criteria of “Level of education”.

### **1 and 2 - Research – development (2007, French Observatory of Science and Technology)**

- We have used the works of the **French Observatory of Science and Technology**, which publishes every two years an interesting report entitled “Sciences and technologies – indicators”.
- The latest edition of this report dates from 2010 and gives the 2007 figure for world expenditure on research and development, which is 1113 billion Euros. Given the importance of this factor, we have granted it a coefficient of 2.
- The following chart lets us know the expenditure in Euros per inhabitant in the world.

#### **World expenditure on research and development**

(Coefficient 2)

	Expenditure (1)	Population (2)	(1) / (2)
--	-----------------	----------------	-----------

<b>2000 (founding year)</b>	708 billion	6115 billion	116
<b>2005</b>	852 //	6512 //	131
<b>2007</b>	1113 //	6670 //	167

- The progression between 2005 and 2000 (131 / 116) gives us the figure 112,93, **infact 225,86** with a coefficient of 2, a figure that we have withheld to compare 2005 with the founding year.
- As concerns the comparison between 2007 and 2000, the correlation between 167 and 116 results in the figure 143,97, in fact **287,94** with the coefficient 2.

### **3 and 4 – The levels of schooling in the world, primary, secondary and higher combined, boys and girls (2006, UNESCO).**

(Coef. 2)

- The UNDP no longer calculates the world's level of education in the same way as it did in previous years. We have therefore given greater importance to the levels of education published by UNESCO. We have reproduced here the “gross levels of schooling for primary and secondary teaching combined”, (first figures in the chart) and the gross levels of schooling for higher education, (the second figures in the chart). These elements have evolved as follows over the last years:

#### **Gross levels of world schooling in %**

<b><u>2000 (founding year)</u></b>	78 – 19; average: 48,5
<b><u>2005</u></b>	83 – 24; average: 53,5
<b><u>2007</u></b>	84 – 26 ; average: 55,0
<b><u>2008</u></b>	85 – 26 ; average : 55,5

- The evolution in 2005 compared to 2000 (53,5 / 48,5) results in the figure **110,31** which we have adopted.

- The comparison between 55,5 and 48,5 results in the figure **114,43** which we have adopted to compare 2008 with 2000.
- In order to take the fundamental importance of this factor into consideration, (“**After bread, education is the people’s first necessity**” said Danton), we have granted it a **coefficient 2**, which gives us the figure **220,62** to compare 2005 with 2000 and **228,86** to compare 2008 with 2000.

**5 - Levels of schooling in poor countries for girls and boys primary, secondary and higher combined: the evolution in sub-Saharan Africa (2008, UNESCO)**

- We refer to the same gross levels of schooling, but for sub-Saharan Africa, a symbol of poverty in every domain. It is not enough simply to emphasise the world averages: it is also necessary to see how the educational situation evolves in the poorest countries. The first figures in the chart concern the gross levels of schooling in “primary and secondary education together”; the second figures concern the gross levels of schooling in higher education.

**Gross levels of schooling: sub-Saharan Africa**

<b>2000 (base)</b>	56 – 4 ;average: 30,0
<b>2005</b>	66 – 6 ;average: 36,0
<b>2007</b>	68 – 6 ;average: 37,0
<b>2008</b>	71 – 6 ;average: 38,5

- **The situation is improving:** the correlation between 2005 and 2000 (36 / 30) results in the figure **120, 00** which we have retained.
- As for the comparison between 2008 and 2000, the founding year, the correlation between 38,5 and 30, results in the figure **128,33** which we have withheld.

**6 – The disparities in the levels of schooling, all levels combined, girls and boys (2008 – UNESCO)**

- The improvement in the poor countries’ situation, represented by sub-Saharan Africa, must be judged in relation to the following question: have they caught up compared to the world average? In order to find out, we have compared the respective evolution of the world’s situation and sub-Saharan Africa’s for the year 2000, referring once more to UNESCO’s figures above.
- The figures are the following:

**The disparities in levels of schooling**

	<b><u>Sub-Saharan Africa</u></b> <b><u>(1)</u></b>	<b><u>World (2)</u></b>	<b><u>(1) / (2 = 100)</u></b>
<b><u>2000 (founding year)</u></b>	30,0 %	48,5 %	61,86
<b><u>2005</u></b>	36,0 %	53,5 %	67,29
<b><u>2007</u></b>	36,5 %	55,0 %	66,36
<b><u>2008</u></b>	37,0 %	55,5 %	66,67

- **Poor countries are catching up:** the correlation between 2005 and 2000 (67,29 / 61,86) results in the figure **108,78** which we have retained to compare 2005 with 2000.
- As for the comparison between 2008 and 2000 (66,67 / 61,86), it results in the figure **107,78** which we have retained.

**7 – The number of copies of daily newspapers (2008, World Association of Newspapers)**

- The **World Association of Newspapers** publishes annually the number of daily newspapers for sale or free of charge per thousand

inhabitants in the world and per country each year: “**World Press Trends**”. The figures have evolved as follows over the last years:

**Number of copies for sale or free of charge daily**

	Number (1)	World Population (2)	(1) / (2) per 1000 people
<b>2000 (founding year)</b>	440 million	6115 million	71,95
<b>2005</b>	514 //	6512 //	78,93
<b>2007</b>	560 //	6670 //	85,74
<b>2008</b>	562 //	6750 //	82,96

- There is a regular improvement until at least 2008, if we refer to the figures and not the myths as the World Association of Newspapers constantly insists; in 2005, compared to 2000, the correlation between 78,93 and 71,95 results in the figure **109,70** which we have retained.
- The same method of calculation (82,96 / 71,95) results in the figure **115,30** which we have adopted to compare 2008 with the founding year.

**8 – Internet (2009, ITU)**

- **The ITU (International Telecommunication Union)** publishes each year very interesting elements in this field on its website. This year we have solely withheld the data concerning the percentage of internauts, since the use of internet presupposes a telephone. However, in order to take account of the beginnings of internet in 2000, we are using the average between the years 2000 and 2005 as our basic figure.
- Since the year 2000, the world percentages are the following:

### Percentage of internautes in the world

<b>2000</b>	6,50 %
<b>2005</b>	<b>15,90 %</b>
<b>Average 2000 – 2005 (base)</b>	<b>11,20 %</b>
<b>2007</b>	20,80 %
<b>2008</b>	23,80 %
<b>2009</b>	<b>27,10 %</b>

- There has been strong development: the correlation between 2005 and the founding year (15,90 / 11,20) results in the figure **141,96** which we have retained.
- As for the correlation between 2009 and 2000 (27,10 / 11,20), it results in the figure **241,96** which we have retained.

### 9 – The number of films (2009, Screen Digest)

- **Screen Digest**, a British review, periodically publishes the number of films produced in the world; the up-to-date figures of the last few years are the following:

#### Number of films

2000 (founding year)	3782
2005	4886
2006	5272
2007	5580
2008	5459
2009	5360

- 9 The evolution between 2005 and 2000 (4886 / 3782) results in the figure **129,19** which we have retained to compare with the founding year.

**10** As for the comparison between 2009 with 2000 (5360 / 3782), it results in the figure **141,72** which we have retained to compare 2009 with the founding year.

### **10 – International tourist travel (2008, WTO)**

**11 The World Tourism Organisation (WTO)** publishes and keeps up to date each year the number of international tourists; the gross figures over the last years are the following as a percentage compared to the world's population:

#### **International Tourism**

	<b>Figures (1)</b>	<b>Population (2)</b>	<b>(1) / (2)</b>
<b>2000 (founding year)</b>	687 million	6115 million	11,23 %
<b>2005</b>	808 //	6512 //	12,41 %
<b>2007</b>	898 //	6670 //	13,46 %
<b>2008</b>	913 //	6750 //	13,53 %

- The correlation between 2005 and 2000 (12,41 / 11,23) results in the figure **110,51** which we have adopted to compare 2005 with the founding year.
- As for the comparison between 2008 and 2000, the founding year (13,53 / 11,23), it results in the figure **120,48** which we have adopted.

#### **Summary :**

#### **Research, training, information, communication, culture**

	<b>2005 / 2000</b>	<b>2008 / 2000</b>
--	--------------------	--------------------

	(2000 = 100)	(2000 = 100)
<b>1 and 2 - Research – development</b>	225,86 (coef.2)	287,94 (coef.2)
<b>3 and 4 – Level of education</b>	220,62 (coef.2)	228,86 (coef.2)
<b>5 – Education in subs-Saharan Africa</b>	120,00	128,33
<b>6 – Disparities in education</b>	108,78	107,78
<b>7 – Newspapers</b>	109,70	115,30
<b>8 – Internet</b>	141,96	241,96
<b>9 – Films</b>	123,19	141,72
<b>10 – International Tourism</b>	110,51	120,48
<b>Average</b>	<b>116,06</b>	<b>137,24</b>

**The evolution is definitely positive here: all the statistics convey an improvement in the situation, in particularly concerning internet.**

-----

**Here is the global evolution for the four headings of the World Happiness Index compared to both last year and the founding year.**

	<b>2005 / 2000</b>	<b>2008 / 2000</b>
	(2000 = 100)	(2000 = 100)
<b>Peace and security</b>	<b>87,50</b>	<b>95,16</b>
<b>Freedom, democracy, human rights</b>	<b>102,85</b>	<b>107,62</b>
<b>Standard of living</b>	<b>100,78</b>	<b>102,99</b>
<b>Research, training, information,</b>	<b>116,06</b>	<b>137,24</b>

<b>communication, culture</b>		
<b>World Happiness</b>	<b><u>101,80</u></b>	<b><u>110,75</u></b>

## **CONCLUSION : LET US NOT DISPAIR ABOUT OUR PLANET!**

Obviously, bad news should not systematically be swept aside, but equally, sole emphasis should not be given to bad news alone. Here follows, for the years 2000 to 2009, what we should retain amongst the good and bad news.

### **1 – The 2 pieces of very bad of news: the crash is not the whole story!**

- **Firstly, the number of victims of natural catastrophes has been particularly high since the year 2000**, and alas, this will persist with the Haiti earthquake. A tsunami in 2004 in South-East Asia, Katrina in 2005, an earthquake in China and cyclones in Burma in 2008: the consequences are heavy; the financial crisis is therefore not our sole concern!
- **Secondly, inequality in the GDP per capita between rich and poor countries has soared, particularly since 2005**: we measure these inequalities by comparing the average GDP per capita in sub-Saharan Africa with the global GDP per capita. In 2000, the average GDP per capita in sub-Saharan Africa represented 21,59 % of the global GDP per capita. In 2005, this figure was 21,26 %, and in 2009, 18,71%. It is extremely bad news, which has provoked far too little commentary.

### **2 – The five pieces of bad news**

- Firstly, **violent deaths** have greatly increased between 2000 and 2004. This is particularly due to the increase in traffic in several

countries. Even though we do not dispose of more recent figures, we can presume that the evolution will continue in particular because of the increased number of vehicles on the road in emerging countries.

- Then, the number of **refugees**, which had decreased between 2000 and 2005, began to increase once more in 2005. Unfortunately, this tendency is likely to continue for some time given the turmoil in countries in North Africa and the Middle East.
- Moreover, the average for the *risk country* which represents greater or lesser **economic and financial security in the world** deteriorated by 10% between 2005 and 2008. These are the first effects of the crash, but it seems it reached its lowest point in 2008 since the situation has slightly recovered since 2009.
- Furthermore, two **environmental** indicators are in the red: they concern the accumulation of CO2 in the atmosphere and the forest surface area per inhabitant.
- Lastly, the **GINI** coefficient which measures the different countries' inequalities in interior revenue has slowly but surely deteriorated since the year 2000.

### **3 – The three subjects for concern**

- Firstly, the index of the perception of **corruption** has slowly but surely increased. That carries heavy threats for the future.
- **Then, the average level of freedom in the world and particularly freedom of the media** show worrying signs of stagnating, or even worsening. This is in some respects due to the consequences of measures taken in the fight against terrorism.
- **The Chinese government has ceased to publish the number of death penalties taking place in its country.** This is a subject of great concern, which reveals how much the Chinese government must progress!

#### **4 – The six pieces of good news, despite the crash!**

- **Firstly, the world happiness index has progressed by more than 10% between 2000 and 2009 and the global GDP per capita has increased by 40% during the same period.** It is true that the figures for 2009 are not all known yet, so we should avoid rejoicing. Next year we shall see what impact the crash has had on the WHI and the global GDP per capita.
- Moreover, **research and development** per inhabitant has increased by more than 40% since 2000.
- Furthermore, the **communication** sector has greatly progressed since the year 2000: this is evident in the number of copies of daily **newspapers**, despite a recent less favourable evolution, and in particularly the number of **internauts**.
- The same favourable evolution applies to the number of films: 3782 in 2000, 5360 in 2009 according to Screen Digest. However, there is a downwards tendency since 2007: to be followed!
- Similarly, **international tourist travel** per million inhabitants has greatly increased: + 20 % since the year 2000, despite geopolitical turmoil.
- Lastly, supplies in **drinking water** and access to **proper sanitarian facilities** has progressed by 6,5% since the year 2000. The latest figures date from 2006 so we must survey what is to come!

#### **5 – The five pieces of good news despite the crash!**

- The potential of operational **nuclear arms** has decreased from around 15 000 weapon heads in the year 2000, to around 8 400. Furthermore, it seems that the Americans and the Russians intend further reductions of this potential for mass destruction.

- The number of **major armed conflicts** has gone down from 22 to 15 since the year 2000, and the number of victims of these conflicts has been halved during the same period: let us hope that the decline continues!
- **The situation of women** has improved as far as political life is concerned: the proportion of parliamentary women has progressed, (15% better since 2000); the same applies to the progress in girls' primary and secondary schooling: 14% better since the year 2000.
- **The mortality rate of children under 5, (MRU5)** has notably decreased. 81 deaths in under 5s per 1000 births, 65 in 2008. It is still significant, particularly for developing countries where the rate is still often higher than 200. This improvement must expand!
- Last but not least, the **levels of education**, measured by UNESCO, are improving: the brut rate of primary, secondary and higher education has risen from 48,5 % to 55, 5 % since the year 2000. As for the disparities between rich and poor countries, measured by the mark sub-Saharan Africa scored in this field, they have fallen substantially, which is very good news: long may it last!

**The readers of GLOBECO know that we refuse to adopt the role of the prophet of doom. More than ever, we must assert that there is no point in despairing about the planet, unless we demonstrate that the world is deteriorating in every field, which is not, or at least not yet, the case: even if the world happiness index's progress is slight, (around 1% per year since the year 2000), the good news outweighs the bad. When we have all the figures for 2009, we will see what consequences the world's economic, social and financial crisis has had on the evolution of world's happiness.**

# WORLD HAPPINESS : CLASSEFIED PER COUNTRY

EDITION 2011

## GERMANY REACHES THE PODIUM!

For the last 7 years, GLOBECO has published the classification of 60 countries according to criteria used to define world happiness and happiness per country. Compared to the previous years, whose results can be consulted on [www.globeco.fr](http://www.globeco.fr), under the heading: “World Happiness”, we have affirmed or introduced some alterations obviously with an aim to improve the first versions of this considerable work. Let us state immediately that the global framework remains the same:

- **We have kept the four main headings**, which constitute the composing factors of the world happiness index: peace and security; freedom, democracy and human rights; the standard of living; intelligence, information, communication and culture.
  - Within these 4 main headings, we have generally kept the same columns as in the past, with the two major alterations introduced in the preceding versions: **the inclusion of violent deaths, that is to say, unnatural deaths and suicides. We can only hope that the WHO will regularly provide these elements.** This has brought further credibility to our classification.
  - We have also kept, probably definitively, the list of countries concerned so that it remains representative of the diversity of the present-day world: **the 60 countries classified incorporate around 90% of the world’s population and provide about 95% of global GDP.**
- I must reply to three criticisms which have often been made by readers or journalists:

- I have often been criticised for **not including any criteria for employment** in either the world happiness index or the classification per country. Alas, the reason for this deplorable absence is straightforward: reliable sources of statistics only exist for countries in the OECD. What's more, it is very complicated counting unemployment in many developing countries where underground economy plays a fundamental and often useful role. Furthermore, in OECD countries, showing levels of employment largely depends on the amount and duration of unemployment benefit; in the past in the United States and Great Britain, these sometimes-flattering figures have largely reflected the fact that these countries' unemployment benefits do not last for long... Lastly, in some countries like Holland, those people no longer capable of working are classified as "handicapped", which makes the unemployment figures fall.
  
- **Another request** for the classification of countries: we should introduce a **classification in order of the attractiveness of each country** which would, for example, privilege France, (a pleasant country by mutual agreement) over a country like Sweden, (a country where winter is very long and the days often very short)... The argument is understandable but once more very difficult to put into practice: France is certainly a pleasant country, at least for those who have the means to make the most of it, but how can one quantify the variety of our landscapes or the quality of our rural products? Furthermore, our classification has nothing to do with the Club Méditerranée (luxury French holiday company), and I do not see how we could decide that France was more or less "attractive" than Sweden or Canada. It would of course also be necessary to take the "economic" attractiveness of our country into consideration. Should different criteria be found to combine the number of foreign tourists in each country with foreign investment? Tricky, since it would be necessary to take account of the number of "interior" tourists, (attractiveness is also measurable by the number of people who prefer to spend their holidays in their own country) as well as the geographical size and / or the number of inhabitants in each country. It is natural that France, given its size and 65 million inhabitants, attracts more tourists than Switzerland, not to mention our numerous tourists who are simply passing through on their way to Spain or Italy... As for foreign investment, it is influenced by economic and financial criteria, which have little bearing on our criteria for world happiness!

- Lastly, I am often blamed for “measuring” world happiness and happiness per country according to “**western**” criteria. This criticism is at first glance quite accurate since I am indeed a westerner, but can one really consider that in the west alone peace is preferred to war, freedom to dictatorship, a decent standard of living to poverty and education to illiteracy? Moreover, my criteria draw their inspiration largely from the universal declaration of human rights and I do not see why, in the name of who know what diversity of civilisations, we should renounce this declaration, which still holds great significance. What’s more, the events taking place in certain Arab countries today seem to demonstrate its universality and permanence.

**Having said that, I repeat what I have asserted from the start: my classification reflects the situation of each country according to chosen criteria. In no way does it claim that the Swedish are all happy or more or less happy than the French just because Sweden is classified in a better position than France is. Individual happiness is too personal to be measured other than through opinion polls. On the other hand, this classification means that the countries in the best positions benefit from a good coefficient of “collective happiness”, that is to say favourable conditions for individual happiness to blossom.**

- However, if I must argue my point, I have noted that GLOBECO’s classification is very close to other established classifications, either through its use of the statistic aggregate’s method, or through the method of opinion polls: we will look at this later!
- **Therefore, let us move on, to our 4 headings!**

## **PEACE AND SECURITY**

We have maintained the COFACE’s “risk country” in our classification, which constitutes a criterion of economic and financial security. As indicated above, we have maintained the criteria of “violent deaths” and of “Living up until the age of 65” which has replaced “life expectancy in good health”, an element that the WHO only provides on an irregular basis.

The **5 criteria** retained under this hearing are the following:

- Major armed conflicts
- Violent deaths
- Corruption
- Economic and financial security
- Living until the age of 65

### **1 – Major armed conflicts (2008, SIPRI)**

- As with last year, we have retained the data provided annually by the SIPRI, which the GLOBECO readers know well: this concerns an organisation whose expertise is internationally acknowledged as the best in the world as far as peace and conflicts are concerned.
- Our classification, which concerns 2008, is founded on data relative to the number of victims of major armed conflicts, data that we have already used above. **10 countries** have been affected, according to the SIPRI, by this type of conflict and we classified them according to the number of victims compared with the number of inhabitants of the country concerned. It is worth noting that Russia is no longer in this category and that Pakistan figures there, as with last year.
- The classification of the 60 countries for 2008, figure in the chart’s first column, “peace and security”.

### **2 – Violent deaths (2004, WHO)**

- Violent deaths, according to the **WHO**, are unnatural deaths caused by traumatism: for example death in early childhood, road accidents, suicides, victims of natural catastrophes and homicides... **It is therefore a very important criterion for judging how secure a country is for its inhabitants.**
- Unfortunately, the WHO only publishes these data on an irregular basis, the last known year dating back to 2004; however, given their significance, we have incorporated them!
- We should note that the countries where violent deaths least occur are in **Western Europe**, (Holland, Great Britain, Germany...).
- The classification per country figures in the chart's second column, "peace and security".

### **3 – Corruption (2009, Transparency International)**

- We should explain **why** we classify corruption under this heading relating to peace and security: firstly, corruption introduces daily insecurity into everyone's lives and in particular is often accomplice of all the cheats who transgress laws and rules: where corruption is rife, criminals and the mafia are never far!
- **Transparency International** each year publishes very interesting data concerning the way in which businessmen assess civil servants' corruption in different countries; **it is the perception of corruption which we are concerned with here and we take entire responsibility for the publication of the classification in question.**
- The countries considered most corrupt are often noticeably the poorest countries, but not always: **Russia, Ukraine, Iran and Venezuela** also figure highly!
- The classification of the 60 countries figure in the "peace and security" chart's third column.

#### 4 – Economic and financial security (2009, COFACE)

- This element, called the “**risk country**” by the COFACE, measures different countries’ economic and financial security.
- The 60 countries’ classification, which has **altered considerably this year because of the crash**, figures in the “peace and security” chart’s fourth column.

#### 5 – Social and human security (2008, Banque Mondiale)

- **We are keeping the element: “percentage of likelihood in reaching the age of 65”** instead of “life expectancy in good health”, whose statistics the WHO very rarely publishes. The aim remains the same: to understand how a country’s inhabitants “resist” life’s difficulties, be they disease, road accidents, homicides, even armed conflict, and to include all forms of “stress” which have an impact on our life expectancy. **In a sense, this is a matter of social and human security:** we can consider that a country’s human and social situation is more favourable for its inhabitants when there is a greater likelihood of them reaching the age of 65.
- **Henceforth, the World Bank** publishes this type of data; the 60 countries’ classification for the last known year figures in the “peace and security” chart’s last column.

### PEACE AND SECURITY

<u>War and peace</u>	<u>Violent deaths</u>	<u>Corruption</u>	<u>Economic and financial security</u>	<u>Social and human security</u>
1 – Norway	1 – Holland	1 – Denmark	1 – Sweden	1 – Japan
- Australia	2 – UK	2 – Finland	Canada	Sweden
- Ireland	3 –Germany	3 – Sweden	Australia	Australia

- Sweden	4 – Sweden	4 – Canada	Switzerland	Switzerland
- Canada	5 – Spain	5 - Holland	Japan	5 – Israel
- Japan	6– Switzerland	6 – Australia	6 – Norway	Italy
-Switzerland	7 – Irland	7– Switzerland	Denmark	7 – Norway
- Holland	8 – Israel	8 – Norway	Holland	Spain
- Finland	- Italy	9 – Ireland	Finland	Holland
- Belgium	10 – Canada	10 – Austria	Germany	Ireland
- Austria	11 – Japan	11–Germany	France	11 – Canada
- Denmark	12 – Greece	12 –Japan	Austria	France
- France	13–Denmark	13– UK	Belgium	Austria
- Italy	14 – Australie	14 – Chilli	Czech Rep.	Greece
- UK	15 – Portugal	15–Belgium	South Korea	15 – Belgium
- Spain	16 – France	16–United States	United States	Germany
- Germany	17 – Norway	17 – France	Chilli	17 – UK
- Greece	18 – Belgium	18 – Israel	Burma	Finland
- South Korea	19 – Turkey	19–Spain	19 – Ireland	South Korea
- Portugal	20– Czech Rep.	20– Portugal	UK	20 – Cuba
- Czech Rep.	21 – Egypt	21–South Korea	Spain	United States
- Hungary	22–United States	22–Poland	Italy	Denmark
-Argentina	23 – Chilli	23– Hungary	Portugal	Portugal
- Poland	24 –Malaysia	24–Saudi Arabia	Israel	24 – Chilli
- Chilly	25 – Hungary	25–Czech Rep.	Poland	25–Czech Rep
-Baltic countries	26–South Korea	26 – South Africa	Brazil	26 – Tunisia
- Mexico	27 – Cuba	27–Burma	Thailand	Mexico
- Bulgaria	28– Argentina	28 – Turkey	S.Africa	28 – Malaysia
- Romania	29 – Austria	29 – Tunisia	China	Argentina
- Malaysia	30 – Tunisia	30 – Italy	India	Poland
- Brazil	31– Philippines	31 – Brazil	31 – Greece	31 – Vietnam
- Venezuela	32– Uzbekistan	32 – Cuba	Hungary	32 –Saudi Arabia
- Thailand	33 – Finland	33-Romania	Mexico	Algeria
-Saudi Ar.	34 – Poland	34 – China	Turkey	34 – China
- Ukraine	35 – Algeria	35–	Tunisia	35–Venezuela

		Colombia		
- China	36 – Vietnam	36 – Greece	Morocco	Turkey
- Tunisia	37 – Mexico	37 – Peru	Algeria	37– SriLanka
- Iran	38– Romania	38-Thailand	Saudi Arabia	38 – Peru
- Algeria	39 – Morocco	39–Morocco	Colombia	Morocco
- Indonesia	40 – Peru	40 – India	40 – Peru	Iran
- Vietnam	41 – China	41–SriLanka	Romania	41– Colombia
- Egypt	42 – Pakistan	42– Egypt	Philippines	Philippines
- Uzbekistan	43 – Brazil	43–Mexico	Egypt	Roumania
- South Africa	44 –Thailand	44 – Algeria	Vietnam	44– Hungary
- Morocco	45 – Ar.s.dite	45– Argentina	Senegal	45 – Egypt
- Russia	46 – Burma	46 – Senegal	Indonesia	Indonesia
- Bangladesh	47–Bangladesh	47– Indonesia	Russia	47 – Brazil
- Nigeria	48 – Ethiopia	48– Ethiopia	48- Argentina	48 -Thailand
- Congo DR	49 – Iran	49–Vietnam	Venezuela	Pakistan
- Ethiopia	50 – Senegal	50– Bangladesh	Bangladesh	50– Uzbekistan
51 – India	51 – India	51 – Nigeria	Sri Lanka	51– Bangladesh
52-UnitedStates	52–Venezuela	52– Philippines	Ethiopia	52 – Ukraine
53– Burma	53 – Nigeria	53 – Ukraine	53 – Ukraine	53 – India
54 – Peru	54 – Ukraine	54– Pakistan	Pakistan	54 – Russia
55– Philippines	55–South Africa	55 – Iran	Congo DR	55– Burma
56– Colombia	56 – Indonesia	56 – Russia	Iran	56 – Ethiopia
57 - Turkey	57– Colombia	57- CongoDR	Uzbekistan	57 – Senegal
58– Pakistan	58–Congo DR	58– Venezuela	Burma	58-Congo DR
59 – Israel	59 – Russia	59- Uzbekistan	Nigeria	59 – Nigeria
60– Sri Lanka	60 – Sri Lanka	60–Burma	Cuba	60 –S.Africa

## LIBERTY, DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS

The **5 criteria** retained in this field are the following:

- Democracy
- Freedom of the press
- Women's rights
- Children's rights
- The death penalty

### 1 – Democracy (2009, Freedom House)

- **Freedom House's** statistics mean we can classify different countries according to their level of democracy; it is no surprise to find **Uzbekistan, Burma, Saudi Arabia** and **China** competing for the lowest positions.
- The 60 countries' classification figures in the first column of the "freedom, democracy and human rights" chart.

### 2 – Freedom of press (2009, Freedom House)

- **Freedom House** also classifies different countries according to their lesser or greater freedom of press; in this field the worst positions are filled by **Burma, Cuba, Uzbekistan, Iran and Tunisia**.
- The 60 countries' classification figures in the second column of the "freedom, democracy and human rights" chart.

### 3 – Women's rights (2008, UNDP)

- Here, we once more classify the different countries according to data figuring in the UNDP's new index relating to inequalities between men and women in the world.

- The 60 countries' classification figures in the third column of the “freedom, democracy and human rights” chart.

#### 4 – Children’s rights (2008, UNICEF)

- The right to live is a child’s first right. We have therefore retained the MRU5, (mortality rate for under 5s) as it is published each year by UNICEF, to represent children.
- The 60 countries' classification figures in the fourth column of the “freedom, democracy and human rights” chart.

#### 5 – The death penalty (2009, Amnesty International)

- **Amnesty International** publishes each year very interesting documents about this problem’s evolution in the world; as with last year, our classification once more considers the different situations:
  - **The first 32 countries** are those where capital punishment is abolished by law for all crimes, whatever they may be, including war crimes;
  - **The 4 following countries** classified in 33<sup>rd</sup> place have abolished capital punishment for common law crimes, but reserve the right to apply it for “particularly odious” crimes or war crimes.
  - **The 8 countries** holding the 37<sup>th</sup> position do not oppose the death penalty by law, but no death sentence was either pronounced or took place in 2005.
  - **The countries to be found in 45<sup>th</sup> and then 49<sup>th</sup> position**, are those where death sentences were both pronounced and took place in 2006, their exact number being impossible to find out.
  - **Finally, sharing the last positions are the United States, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Iran and China who must share the**

**responsibility for the majority of capital punishments in the world in 2008.**

- The 60 countries' classification figures in the fifth column of the "freedom, democracy and human rights" chart.

**FREEDOM, DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS**

<u>Democracy</u>	<u>Freedom of the press</u>	<u>Women's rights</u>	<u>Children's rights</u>	<u>Death penalty</u>
1 – Norway	1 – Finland	1 – Holland	1 – Sweden	1 – S. Africa
Australia	Norway	2– Denmark	Finland	- Germany
Ireland	Sweden	3 – Sweden	3 – Norway	- Australia
Sweden	4– Denmark	4– Switzerland	Germany	- Austria
Canada	5 – Belgium	5 – Norway	Ireland	- Belgium
Chilli	6–Switzerland	6 – Belgium	France	- Uzbekistan
United States	7 –Holland	7 – Germany	Spain	- Canada
Switzerland	8 – Ireland	8 – Finland	Japan	- Columbia
Holland	9 – Portugal	9 – Italy	Italy	- Denmark
Finland	10-Germany	10 – France	Czech Rep	- Spain
Belgium	11–Czech Rep.	11 – Japan	Greece	- Finland
Austria	United States	12 – Spain	Portugal	- France
Denmark	13 – Canada	13 – Canada	Denmark	- Greece
France	UK	14– Australia	Austria	- Italy
UK	15 – Hungary	15 – Austria	15 – Switzerland	- Hungary
Spain	Japan	16 –Portugal	South Korea	- Ireland
Germany	Austria	South Korea	Holland	- Mexico
Portugal	18 – France	18 – Greece	Israel	- Norway
Czech Rep	Hungary	19 – Israel	Belgium	- Holland
Hungary	20 –Spain	20 – Poland	20 – Canada	- Poland
Poland	Poland	21 –Czech Rep.	Australia	- Portugal
22 –Japan	22 – Israel	22 – Ireland	UK	- Czech Rep.
Greece	Greece	23 – UK	Malaysia	- Romania
Israel	24 –S.Africa	24 – Hungary	Cuba	- UK
South Korea	South Korea	25–USA	25 – Hungary	- Sweden
Italy	Chilli	26 – China	Poland	- Suisse

27 – Argentina	27 – Italy	27 – Russia	27 United States	- Turkey
Sth.Africa	India	28 – Ukraine	28 – Chilli	- Ukraine
Romania	29 – Brazil	29 – Cuba	29 – Russia	- Venezuela
Brazil	Romania	30 – Romania	30 – Vietnam	- Philippines
31 – India	31 – Peru	31 – Malaysia	Romania	- Senegal
Indonesia	32–Philippines	32 – Chilli	Thailand	-Argentina
Ukraine	33 –Argentina	33 – Tunisia	33 – Sri Lanka	33 – Brazil
Peru	34 – Turkey	34 –Vietnam	34 –Argentina	- Chilli
Mexico	35-Indonesia	35-Argentina	Ukraine	- Israel
36 – Turkey	36 – Ukraine	36 –Venezuela	36 –Mexico	- Peru
Senegal	37 – Nigeria	37 – Mexico	37 –Venezuela	37 – Algeria
38 – Columbia	38–Bangladesh	38 – Thailand	38 – Columbia	- Morocco
Philippines	39 – Senegal	39 – Algeria	39 – Tunisia	-Burma
Bangladesh	40 – Thailand	40–Sri Lanka	Saudi Arabia	- Russia
41 – Sri Lanka	41 –Columbia	41 – Peru	China	- Sri Lanka
Malaysia	Egypt	42 – Turkey	42 – Brazil	- Tunisia
43 – Venezuela	Mexico	43 – Philippines	Turkey	-South Korea
Morocco	44 -Pakistan	44 – Brazil	44 – Egypt	RD Congo DC
Nigeria	45 – Algeria	45 – S. Africa	45 – Peru	45 – Cuba
Pakistan	4 6 –Malaysia	46 – Columbia	46 – Iran	India
Thailand	47 – Morocco	47 – Iran	Philippines	Indonesia
48 – Ethiopia	48 –Sri Lanka	48 – Ind.sie	48 – Morocco	Pakistan
49 – Egypt	49 – Venezuela	49 – Morocco	49– Uzbekistan	49 – Egypt
Russia	50 – Ethiopia	50 – Egypta	50 – Algeria	Vietnam
Algeria	51-CongoDR	51 – Pakistan	Indonesia	Japan
52 – Tunisia	52 – Russia	52 – Senegal	52– Bangladesh	Bangladesh
Iran	53 – Vietnam	53 – Bangladesh	53 –S. Africa	Ethiopia
Vietnam	54 – Saudi Arabia	54 – India	54 – India	Malaysia
Congo DR	55 – China	55 – Saudi Arabia	55– Pakistan	Thailand
56 – China	56 – Tunisia	56- RDCongo	56-Burma	56–United States
Cuba	57- Iran	<b>Missing</b>	57 – Senegal	57 – Nigeria
Saudi Arabia	58–Uzbekistan	Uzbekistan	58 - Ethiopia	58 – Saudi Arabia
59 – Uzbekistan	59 – Cuba	Nigeria	59 – Nigeria	59 – Iran
Burma	60- Burma	Ethiopia	60-CongoDR	60 – China
		Burma		

## **STANDARD OF LIVING**

We have kept the number of suicides per country, despite the year concerned (2004) being rather out of date; indeed, suicide does not carry the same meaning in every country, but it remains an important criterion to convey how much each of us appreciates his/her life.

The **5 criteria** retained in this field are the following:

- The GDP per capita
- The GINI coefficient
- Life expectancy from birth
- Suicides
- Pollution in the air

### **1 – Gross income per capita (2008, WDI, World Bank)**

- The gross income per capita is obviously an important aspect of our standard of living. We have chosen to classify the countries according to their gross revenue per capita in dollars and calculated according to the purchasing parity power, (PPP), the best-adapted method for calculating different countries' standards of living. Our source is henceforth the annual World Bank document entitled, "**World Development Indicators**", the exact Anglo-Saxon term being the "**gross national income**".
- The 60 countries' classification figures in the first column of the "Standard of Living" chart.

### **2 – The GINI coefficient (2008 and former years, alas often out-of-date UNDP)**

- **The GINI coefficient**, published by the UNDP each year, lets us classify countries according to the internal inequality of their incomes: the higher a country's "mark", the higher the inequalities in income in this country. Thus South American countries, in particularly **Brazil, Chilli and Columbia, like South Africa**, world champions in this field, have a GINI coefficient 60, whereas Denmark, the most equalitarian in the world according to the coefficient, is "marked" at around **25, France has 33, the United States has 41...**
- The 60 countries' classification figures in the second column of the "Standard of Living" chart. It is worth noting that **Saudi Arabia, Burma and Cuba** do not figure in the UNDP's 2007-2008 statistics in this domain and the last known years are quite old, which is a shame although quite understandable.

### 3 – Life expectancy (2008, UNDP)

- Data relating to life expectancy from birth are published each year by the UNDP and they give us the chance to salute **Japan who comes first** in this field, but also **Spain, Israel, France and Italy** figure among the top countries, all of which being developed countries situated around the Mediterranean's circumference.
- The 60 countries' classification figures in the third column of the "Standard of Living" chart.

### 4 – Suicides (2004, WHO)

- Thanks to the WHO, which published the 2004 figures (the last known year as we said above) in 2008, we can keep this very significant criterion in our index. The figures indicate that the **Ukraine, Sri Lanka and Russia** are the countries where suicide is most frequent and either Arab or Muslim countries are where the suicide rates are lowest. **We should also note Finland's very bad score coming 55<sup>th</sup>, Japan's, (54<sup>th</sup>) as well as the mediocre ratings of Sweden (37<sup>th</sup>) Norway, (38<sup>th</sup>) and France's (29<sup>th</sup>).**

- Each country is classified per number of suicides compared to its' overall population and they figure in the fourth column of the “Standard of Living” chart.

### 5 – Air purity (2006, The little green data book)

- We have kept this criterion, which measures the greater or lesser **purity of the air** in each of the classified countries' big cities. The most recent data concerns 2006.
- The 60 countries' classification figures in the last column of the “Standard of Living” chart.

### STANDARD OF LIVING

<u>GNP per capita in PPP</u>	<u>GINI</u>	<u>Life expectancy</u>	<u>Suicides</u>	<u>Air Purity</u>
1 – Norway	1 – Denmark	1 – Japan	1 – Egypt	1 – Venezuela
2–USA	2 – Japan	2–Switzerland	2 – Peru	2 – Sweden
3 – Holland	3 – Sweden	France	3– Philippines	3 – France
4–Switzerland	4–Czech Rep.	Italy	4 – Morocco	4 – Romania
5 – Canada	– Norway	5 – Sweden	5 – Greece	5 – Australia
6 – Sweden	6 – Finland	Norway	6 – Algeria	Norway
7 – Denmark	7 – Ukraine	Canada	- Tunisia	UK
8 – Austria	8 –Germany	Australia	8 – Turkey	8 – Ireland
9 – Australia	9– Austria	Spain	9 – Mexico	9 – Canada
10 – UK	10 – Ethiopia	Israel	10– Italy	Cuba
11–Germany	11 – Hungary	11– Holland	11 – Senegal	11 – Russia
12– Finland	12 – Holland	Finland	12 – Brazil	Finland
13 – Ireland	13Bangladesh	Germany	13–Spain	13 – Hungary
14– Belgium	14 – Pakistan	Ireland	14–Venezuela	Denmark
15 – Japan	15–S. Korea	Austria	15 – Israel	Germany
16 – France	16–Romania	Belgium	16 – Nigeria	16 –Czech Rep
17 –Spain	Egypt	Greece	17 – Portugal	Morocco
18 – Italy	18 – Canada	S. Korea	18 – Iran	S. Africa

19 – Greece	19 – France	19–Denmark	19Uzbekistan	Ukraine
20- S. Korea	20 – Belgium	Portugal	20 – UK	USA
21 – Israel	21Switzerland	Chilli	21-Malaisie	21 – Columbia
22SaudiArabia	22 – Ireland	Cuba	22-S.Arabia	Belgium
23-Czech Rep.	Greece	23 – Czech	23– Ethiopia	23 – Malaysia
24– Portugal	24 – Spain	24 – UK	24 –Holland	Philippins
25– Hungary	25 – Poland	Poland	25– Thailand	Portugal
26– Poland	26 – Australia	26–USA	26 – Cuba	Brazil
27 – Russia	27 – Algeria	Argentina	- Argentina	27–Switzerland
28–Argentina	28 – Italy	28 – Malaysia	28-Germany	28 – Italy
29– Malaysia	29– UK	Venezuela	29- Romania	29 – Japan
30– Romania	30 Uzbekistan	Vietnam	30– Columbia	Tunisia
31 -Mexico	31 – India	Sri Lanka	31 – Denmark	31– Israel
32 – Turkey	32– Indonesia	Hungary	32- USA	32 – Spain
33 – Chilli	33 –Vietnam	Tunisia	33 – Vietnam	33 – Austria
34– Venezuela	34 – Malaysia	34- Romania	34 – Chilli	34 –Holland
35 – Iran	35 – Iran	Peru	Australia	35 –S. Korea
36 – Brazil	36 – Portugal	China	36 – Canada	36 – Mexico
37– S.Africa	37 – Israel	Saudi Arabia	37 – Sweden	Greece
38– Columbia	Senegal	Columbia	38 – Norway	38 – Poland
39 – Peru	39 – Tunisia	39 – Brazil	39– Indonesia	39 – Turkey
40 – Algeria	USA	Turkey	40Switzerland	40 – Nigeria
41- Thailand	41 – Morocco	Philippines	41- Burma	41- CongoDR
42 – Tunisia	42–Sri Lanka	Algeria	42 – China	42 – Chilli
43 – Ukraine	43 – Turkey	43 – Mexico	43 - Austria	43 – Iran
44 – China	44 – China	Iran	44–CzechRep	44 – Peru
45 – Egypt	45 – Thailand	Indonesia	45-CongoDR	45 –Vietnam
46–SriLanka	46 – Nigeria	46 – Egypt	46 - Ireland	Uzbekista n
47– Morocco	47–Venezuela	47 – Thailand	47 – Pakistan	47- Burma
48 Philippines	48 – Russia	48 – Ukraine	48 – Poland	48 – India
49-Indonesia	49Philippines	Russia	49 – France	49 – Ethiopia
50 – India	50–Congo DR	Uzbekistan	50 – S. Africa	50 – Algeria
51 – Vietnam	51– Argentina	51 – Pakistan	51 – Belgium	Thailand
52-Uzbekistan	52 – Peru	52Bangladesh	52Bangladesh	52– China
53– Pakistan	53 – Mexico	53 – Morocco	53 – Hungary	Argentina
54 – Nigeria	54 – Chilli	India	54 – Japan	54 – Sri Lanka
55 – Senegal	55 – Brazil	55 - Burma	55 – Finland	55 – Indonesia
56–Bangladesh	56– S.Africa	56 – Senegal	56- S. Korea	56 – Senegal
57– Ethiopia	57- Columbia	57 – Ethiopia	57 – India	57 – S.Arabie
58- Congo DR	<b>Missing :</b>	58 –S. Africa	58 – Ukraine	58 – Egypt
<b>Missing</b>	Saudi Arabia	59 – Nigeria	59 – S. Lanka	59 – Pakistan

Cuba	Burma	Congo DR	60 – Russia	60 Bangladesh
Burma	Cuba			

## **RESEARCH, TRAINING, INFORMATION, COMMUNICATION, CULTURE**

We have kept the criterion, “research and development” whose importance needs no developing. The World Bank has only classified 55 countries in this field but that seemed to us a sufficient number for this indicator to be considered. However, for the reasons already mentioned, we have dispensed with the indicator for television sets. **The elements taken into account are therefore the following:**

- Research and development
- Training (coefficient 2)
- Newspapers
- Internet users

### **1 – Research and development (2008, WDI, World Bank)**

- In its’ WDI, the World Bank each year gives the percentage of financing for research and development compared to the GDP for each country.
- The classification of the countries accounted for, figures in the first column of the “Research, training, information, communication, culture” chart.

### **2 – 3 - Training (2008, UNESCO)**

- No one will be surprised that a **coefficient of 2** is accorded to education which is no doubt the single most important factor of every form of development. The UNDP no longer publishes the level of teaching per country and in the world as it used to. Drawing from UNESCO’s statistics, we have therefore chosen to focus on **levels of schooling in higher education**, an element that allows us to differentiate the levels of education from one country to another.

- **The very high positions of Cuba and South Korea are noticeable as is Germany’s absence from these statistics, which is difficult to comprehend.**
- The classification of the 60 countries in this domain figures in the second column of the “Research, training, information, communication, culture” chart.

#### **4 – Newspapers (2008, World Association of Newspapers)**

- The World Association of Newspapers, whose headquarters are in Paris, annually publishes very interesting information about the **number of copies of daily newspapers on sale and free of charge per inhabitant** both in the world and in each country.
- The classification of the 60 countries in this domain figures in the third column of the “Research, training, information, communication, culture” chart.

#### **5 – Internet users (2009, UIT)**

- We have only retained the number of internet users in each country since the use of internet presupposes the availability of a telephone and computer.
- The **International Telecommunication Union** publishes statistics in this domain each year, the figures of which we have reemployed here.
- The classification of the 60 countries figures in the last column of the “Research, training, information, communication, culture” chart.

**RESEARCH, TRAINING, INFORMATION,**  
**COMMUNICATION, CULTURE**

<b><u>R &amp; D</u></b>	<b><u>Training(coef 2)</u></b>	<b><u>Newspapers</u></b>	<b><u>Internet</u></b>
1 – Israel	1 – South Korea	1 – Switzerland	1 – Norway
2 – Sweden	2 – Cuba	2 – Norway	2 – Sweden
3 – Finland	3 – Finland	3 – Sweden	3 – Holland
South Korea	4 – Greece	4 – Finland	4 – Denmark
5 – Japan	5 – USA	5 – Japan	5 – UK
6 – Switzerland	6 – Denmark	6 – Austria	6 – Finland
7 – USA	7 – Australia	7 – South Korea	7 – South Korea
8 – Denmark	8 – Ukraine	8 – Denmark	8 – Switzerland
9 – German	9 – Norway	9 – Holland	9 – Canada
10 – Austria	10 – Venezuela	10 – UK	10 – Germany
11 – Australia	11 – Sweden	11 – Germany	11 – Japan
12 – France	12 – Spain	12 – Ireland	USA
13 – Canada	13 – Argentina	13 – Israel	13 – Belgium
14 – Belgium	14 – Italy	14 – USA	14 – Australia
15 – UK	Poland	15 – Canada	15 – Austria
16 – Holland	16 – Russia	16 – France	16 – France
17 – Norway	17 – Belgium	17 – Cuba	17 – Ireland
18 – Czech Rep.	Hungary	18 – Czech Rep	18 – Czech Rep.
19 – China	19 – Canada	19 – Belgium	19 – Israel
20 – Ireland	20 – Holland	20 – Italy	20 – Spain
21 – Spaine	21 – Portugal	21 – Spain	21 – Hungary
22 – Portugal	Israel	22 – Malaysia	22 – Poland
23 – Italy	Romania	23 – Australia	23 – Malaysia
24 – Russia	24 – Ireland	24 – Hungary	24 – Columbia
25 – Brazil	Japan	25 – Thailand	25 – Italy
Tunisia	26 – UK	26 – India	26 – Portugal
27 – Hungary	27 – Czech Rep.	27 – Greece	27 – Greece
28–SouthAfrica	28 – France	28 – Poland	28 – Chilli
29 – Ukraine	Austria	29–Saudi Arabia	Morocco
30 – India	30 – Chilli	30 – Venezuela	30 – Brazil
31 – Turkey	31 – Switzerland	31 – Romania	31 – Saudi Arabia
32 – Chilli	32 – Columbia	32 – Algeria	32 – Romania
Iran	33 – Brazil	33 – China	33 – Turkey
Pakistan	Peru	34 – Portugal	34 – Tunisia
35 – Morocco	35 – Tunisia	35 – Turkey	35 – Argentina
Malaysia	36 – Thailand	36 – Ukraine	36 – Peru
37 – Poland	Saudi Arabia	37 – Egypt	37 – Venezuela
38 – Romania	38 – Turkey	38 – Mexico	38 – Russia
39 – Argentina	Philippines	39 – Brazil	39 – China

40 – Greece	40 – Mexico	40 – Philippines	40 – Nigeria
Mexico	Algeria	41 – Vietnam	41 – Mexico
42 – Cuba	42 – Iran	42 – Chilli	42 – Vietnam
43 – Thailand	43 – Indonesia	43 – Pakistan	43 – Thailand
44 – Egypt	44 – Malaysia	44 – S.Africa	44 – Egypt
45 – Vietnam	45 – Egypt	45 – Argentina	45 – Uzbekistan
46 – Columbia	46 – China	46 – Tunisia	46 – Ukraine
47 – Ethiopia	47 – Uzbekistan	47 – Columbia	47 – Senegal
Sri Lanka	48 – India	48 – Sri Lanka	48 – Cuba
49 – Burma	49 – Burma	49 – Indonesia	49 – Algeria
50 – Peru	Morocco	50 – Iran	50 – Pakistan
51 – Philippines	51 – Ethiopia	51 – Senegal	51 – Iran
52 – Senegal	52 – Nigeria	52 – Morocco	52 – Philippines
53 – Algeria	53 – Bangladesh	53 – Bangladesh	53 – S. Africa
54 – Indonesia	54 – Congo DR	54 – Burma	54 – Sri Lanka
Saudi Arabia	55 – Senegal	55 – Nigeria	55 – Indonesia
<b><u>Missing</u></b>	56 - Pakistan	56– Ethiopia	56 – India
Congo DR	<b><u>Missing</u></b>	57 – Uzbekistan	57 – Ethiopia
Uzbekistan,	Germany	58 – DR Congo	58 – DR Congo
Bangladesh, Nigeria	S.Africa, Vietnam	<b><u>Missing :</u></b>	59 – Bangladesh
Venezuela	Sri Lanka	Russia, Peru	60 – Burma

### **SUMMARY CHART**

The chart entitled “Classification per Country- Summary”, classifies the 60 countries under each of the great headings according to the “marks” each country achieved per criterion. For example, Sweden’s 10 points for “peace and security” result from the addition of its 1 point for “major armed conflicts”, 4 points for “violent deaths”, 3 points for “corruption” and 1 points for both “economic and financial security” and “human security”.

### **CLASSIFICATION PER COUNTRY–SUMMARY CHART**

<u>Peace and security</u>	<u>Freedom, democracy, human rights</u>	<u>Standard of living</u>	<u>RTICC (1)</u>
1–Sweden 10	1 –Sweden 7	1 –Sweden 53	1 – Finland 19
2–Switzerland 16	2 – Norway 10	Norway //	South Korea //
3 –Holland 20	Denmark //	3 – Germany 71	3 – Sweden 29
4 – Australia 23	4 – Finland 14	Denmark //	4 – Denmark 32
5 – Japan 26	5 – Germany 22	5 – Canada 73	5 – Norway 38
6 – Canada 27	6 – Holland 25	6 – Australia 79	6 – USA 42
7 – Germany 36	7–Switzerland 27	7 – Holland 84	7 – Germany 50
8 – Norway 39	8 – Belgium 28	8 – Italy 86	8 – Australia 62
9 – Denmark 41	9 – Portugal 30	9 – UK 87	9 – Holland 68
10 – Ireland 43	10 – France 33	10 – France 89	10 – Japan 69
11 – France 51	11 – Austria 35	11 – Spain 91	11 – Canada 75
Spain //	Ireland //	12 – Cuba 92	Israel //
13 – UK 52	13 – Spain 37	13 – Greece 93	13–Switzerland 77
14 – Belgium 55	14 – Czech 38	14–Switzerland 94	14 – Belgium 80
15 – Austria 57	15 – Canada 48	15 – Finland 95	15 – UK 82
16 – Finland 59	16 – Australia 51	16 – Ireland 100	16 – Spain 86
17 – Italy 63	17 – UK 58	17 – Japan 101	17 – Austria 87
18 – Chilli 68	18 – Italy 62	18 – Austria 104	18 – Italy 96
19 – S. Korea 71	19 –Greece 66	19 – Israel 109	19 – Ireland 97
20 – Portugal 75	20 – Poland 67	20 – Czech 110	20 – France 100
21 – Czech 77	21 – Hungary 69	21 – Romania 112	21 –Greece 102
22 – Malaysia 86	22 – Japan 100	22 – USA 115	22 – Hungary 106
23 –Greece 91	23 – Israel 111	23 – Belgium 117	23 – Czech 108
24 – Poland 104	24 – S. Korea 114	24 – Portugal 119	24–Venezuela 109
25 – Israel 109	25 – Romania 116	25–Venezuela 124	25 – Cuba 111
26 – USA 116	26 – Chilli 118	26 – Hungary 130	26 – Poland 115
27 – Tunisia 117	27 – USA 120	27 –Malaysia 135	27 – Russia 118
28 – Hungary 124	28 – Argentina 121	28–S. Korea 137	28 – Portugal 124
29 – China 129	29 – Ukraine 140	29 – Tunisia 144	29 – Ukraine 127
30 – Cuba 133	30 – Mexico 146	30 – Poland 161	30 – Romania 143
Saudi Arabia //	31 – S. Africa 150	Turkey //	31 – Argentina 145
32 – Mexico 138	32 – Turkey 155	Morocco //	32 – Brazil 160
33 – Brazil 141	33–Philippines 160	33 – Algeria 162	33 – Chilli 162

34 – Algeria 143	34 – Columbia 164	Philippines //	34 – Malaysia 168
35–Morocco 148	35–Venezuela 166	35 – Brazil 165	35 – Turkey 175
36 – Egypt 149	36 – Brazil 175	36 – S. Arabia 166	Tunisia //
37 – Thailand 150	37 – Peru 181	Egypt //	37 – Colombia 181
Argentina //	38 – Senegal 185	38 – Peru 170	38 – China 183
39 – Romania 153	39 – Malaysia 187	39 – Ukraine 172	Thailand //
40 - Vietnam 157	40 – Russia 194	Mexico //	40 – S. Arabia 186
41 – S Africa 161	41 – Sri Lanka 199	41 – Iran 174	41 – Peru 190
42 – Turkey 170	42 – Thailand 200	42 – Columbia 179	42 – Mexico 199
43 – Indonesia 189	43 – Vietnam 208	43 – Chilli 182	43 – S. Africa 208
44 – Senegal 194	44 – Indonesia 209	44 – Argentina 183	India //
Venezuela //	45 – Cuba 210	45 – Vietnam 190	45–Morocco 213
46 –Uzbekistan 195	Uzbekistan //	46 – Russia 194	Vietnam //
47 – Iran 196	47 – India 211	Uzbekistan //	47 – Algeria 214
48–Bangladesh 197	48 – Tunisia 217	48 – Ethiopia 196	48 – Egypt 215
49 – Ethiopia 201	49 – Algeria 220	49 – Thailand 208	49 – Iran 217
50 – Peru 209	50–Morocco 224	50 – Nigeria 215	50–Philippines 219
51 – Russia 212	51–Bangladesh 230	Senegal //	51 – Pakistan 237
52 – Ukraine 213	52 – Egypt 233	China //	52 – Indonesia 244
53 – India 214	53 – China 236	53 – S. Africa 217	53–Uzbekistan 245
54 – Nigeria 217	54 – Pakistan 238	54 –Indonesia 218	54 – Sri Lanka 248
55–Philippines 219	55 – Nigeria 245	55 – Pakistan 224	55 – Nigeria 249
56 – Columbia 220	56 – Ethiopia 256	56 –Sri Lanka 229	56 – Senegal 260
57 – DR Congo 227	DR Congo //	57–Bangladesh 233	57 – Burma 261
58 – Sri Lanka 246	58 – Iran 262	58- Burma 238	58 – Ethiopia 262
59 – Pakistan 255	59–S.Arabia 264	59 – India 239	59–Bangladesh 272
60 – Burma 267	60 – Burma 265	60 –DR Congo 253	60 – DR Congo 280

(1) : Research, Training, Information, Communication, Culture

**It is worth noting that throughout the four different sections of the chart only Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Germany and Holland are systematically amongst the top 10 classified whereas only Burma, the DR Congo, Pakistan and Nigeria always fill the bottom 10 positions.**

### **GENERAL CLASSIFICATION – EDITION 2011**

The final classification is obviously calculated in the same way as the summary. For example, Sweden's first position with 99 points results from adding together its' 4 "marks" in the summary: 10 points for "peace and security", 7 points for "freedom, democracy, human rights", 53 points for "standard of living" and 29 points for "research, training, information, communication, culture".

### GENERAL CLASSIFICATION

<b>1 – SWEDEN</b>	<b>99</b>	31 – ARGENTINA	608
<b>2 – NORWAY</b>	<b>141</b>	32 – BRAZIL	641
<b>3 – DENMARK</b>	<b>155</b>	33 – UKRAINE	652
<b>4 – GERMANY</b>	<b>179</b>	34 – TUNISIA	653
<b>5 – FINLAND</b>	<b>187</b>	35 – MEXICO	655
<b>6 – HOLLAND</b>	<b>197</b>	36 – TURKEY	661
<b>7 – SWITZERLAND</b>	<b>214</b>	37 – RUSSIA	716
<b>8 – AUSTRALIA</b>	<b>215</b>	38 – SOUTH AFRICA	736
<b>9 – CANADA</b>	<b>223</b>	39 – ALGERIA	739
<b>10 – SPAIN</b>	<b>255</b>	40 – THAILAND	741
		41 – COLUMBIA	744
11 – FRANCE	273	42 – MOROCCO	746
12 – IRELAND	275	43 – SAUDI ARABIA	749
13 – UNITED KINGDOM	279	44 – PERU	750
14 – BELGIUM	280	45 – PHILIPPINES	760
15 – AUSTRIA	283	46 – CHINA	763
16 – JAPAN	296	EGYPT	//
17 – ITALY	307	48 – VIETNAM	768
18 – CZECH	333	49 – UZBEKISTAN	844
19 – SOUTH KOREA	341	50 – IRAN	849
20 – PORTUGAL	348		
21 – GREECE	352	<b>51 – SENEGAL</b>	<b>854</b>
22 – UNITED STATES	393	<b>52 – INDONESIA</b>	<b>860</b>
23 – ISRAEL	404	<b>53 – INDIA</b>	<b>872</b>
24 – HUNGARY	429	<b>54 – ETHIOPIA</b>	<b>915</b>
25 – POLAND	447	<b>55 – SRI LANKA</b>	<b>922</b>
26 – ROMANIA	524	<b>56 – NIGERIA</b>	<b>926</b>
27 – CHILLI	530	<b>57 – BANGLADESH</b>	<b>932</b>

28 – CUBA	546	58 – PAKISTAN	954
29 – MALAYSIA	576	59 – DR CONGO	1016
30 – VENEZUELA	593	60 – BURMA	1031

- **The countries who have improved their “score” since the 2008 edition, that is to say since the list of countries has become definitive, are the following, (bearing in mind that the Tour de France’s “green shirt method is the same one used here).**

- 1 – **Cuba** : minus 102 points
- 2 – **Germany** : minus 59 points
- 3 – **Venezuela** : minus 55 points
- 4 – **Peru** : minus 52 points
- 5 – **Ethiopia** : minus 50 points

**We should note Germany’s impressive jump to the podium coming just behind the 3 Vikings and henceforth positioned above Finland and Holland.**

- **Conversely, the countries whose “scores” have most deteriorated are the following:**

- 1 – **Sri Lanka** : + 77 points
- 2 – **United Kingdom** : + 73 points
- 3 – **Pakistan** : + 60 points
- 4 – **Columbia** : + 55 points
- 5 – **Ireland** : + 44 points

**We should note the United Kingdom’s and Ireland’s impressive fall, both unable to affirm their former good positions.**

- The comparison between this classification and last year’s is interesting, as well as with the classification of the gross national income per capita and the HDI for the 60 countries classified for of world happiness.

**GNI per capita in PPP (2008), HDI (2008), WHI Edition 2011**

**( Only the 60 countries classified for world happiness have been taken into consideration).**

<b><u>GNI per capita in PPP (2008)</u></b>	<b><u>HDI (2008)</u></b>	<b><u>WHI per country (edition 2011)</u></b>
1 – Norway	1 – Norway	1 – Sweden
2 – United States	2 – Australia	2 – Norway
3 – Holland	3 – United States	3 – Denmark
4 – Switzerland	4 – Ireland	4 – Germany
5 – Canada	5 – Holland	5 – Finland
6 – Sweden	6 – Canada	6 – Holland
7 – Denmark	7 – Sweden	7 – Switzerland
8 – Austria	8 – Germany	8 – Australia
9 – Australia	9 – Japan	9 – Canada
10 – United Kingdom	10 – Switzerland	10 – Spain

**These 3 charts demonstrate quite a large convergence between the three classifications: Norway, Sweden, Holland, Canada and Switzerland, these 5 countries are to be found in the top 10 in all three classifications. However, other countries that are classified in the top 10 in terms of GDP, are classified beyond the 10<sup>th</sup> position as far as world happiness is concerned. This concerns the United States, the United Kingdom and Austria. Conversely, Germany, Finland and Spain are in the top 10 in terms of world happiness without figuring in the top ten for their GDP.**

Let us now compare the top 10 from the 2011 edition with last year's classification:

**World happiness per country: 2009-2010 classification and 2011**

<b><u>Edition 2009 - 2010</u></b>	<b><u>Edition 2011</u></b>
1 – Sweden	1 – Sweden
2 – Norway	2 – Norway

3 – Denmark	3 – Denmark
4 – Holland	4 – Germany
5 – Finland	5 – Finland
6 – Canada	6 – Holland
7 – Australia	7 – Switzerland
8 – Germany	8 – Australia
9 – Switzerland	9 – Canada
10 – Ireland	10 – Spain

- **The three first positions are still held by Sweden, Norway and Denmark but the great novelty is Germany's recent improvement, which having entered the top 10 last year, has now settled in 4<sup>th</sup> place.** We should note that all the countries classified in the top 10 are either Northern countries, (Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland) to which we can add Holland, or Anglo-Saxon countries, (Canada, Australia) to which Germany, Switzerland and recently Spain have been added.
  
- **This edition's classification per country globally confirms the former data:**
  - The first positions are always taken by Northern European countries: **the victorious Vikings bag the first places.**
  - **The CEEC** affirm their favourable evolution: they all figure in the first half of the classification, including Romania.
  - The **Latin American countries** come between 27<sup>th</sup> position, (Chilli) and 44<sup>th</sup> position, (Peru).
  - **Japan** is only 16<sup>th</sup> and the **United States** only 22<sup>nd</sup>. The United States' position can be explained by it being a country at war whose income rates are very unequal and where the death penalty is practiced. Moreover, life expectancy from birth and the level of training is slight while the under 5 child mortality rate is high.
  - **Brazil** comes 32<sup>nd</sup>, **Russia** 37<sup>th</sup>, **China** 46<sup>th</sup> and **India** 53<sup>rd</sup>.
  - Amongst the North African and Middle Eastern countries, **Israel** is 23<sup>rd</sup>, **Tunisia** 34<sup>th</sup>, **Turkey** 36<sup>th</sup>, **Algeria** 39<sup>th</sup>, **Morocco** 42<sup>nd</sup>, **Saudi Arabia** 43<sup>rd</sup>, **Egypt** 46<sup>th</sup> and **Iran** 50<sup>th</sup>.
  - The last five positions are filled by **Nigeria, Bangladesh, Pakistan, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Burma ...**

- It is interesting to compare GLOBECO’s classification with classifications made by partisans of the opinion poll method. As we said earlier and as explained in the April 2010 edition of **Futuribles** already quoted, some researchers question thousands of people throughout the world asking them to position themselves on a scale of 1 to 10 to determine their personal happiness. The main researchers in this field are Mr. **Ruut Veenhoven** from Rotterdam University and Mr. **Adrian White** from Leicester University.
- The results are edifying: **amongst the top 10 countries classified by Mr. Veenhoven and Mr. White, we find almost the exact same countries as in GLOBECO’s top 10 classifications, (Sweden, Switzerland, Denmark, Canada, Finland). This therefore reveals how the two methods, GLOBECO’s and the opinion poll’s, far from contradicting one another, complement each other perfectly. It also reveals that the people (often, alas, the French) who claim Northern European countries as “impossible to live in” are simply demonstrating their arrogance... The following chart takes up the 3 classifications’ 10 first positions:**

<b><u>WHI (2009)</u></b>	<b><u>Adrian White (2006)</u></b>	<b><u>Ruut Veenhoven (2007)</u></b>
<b>1 – Sweden</b>	<b>1 – Denmark</b>	1 – Costa Rica
2 – Norway	<b>2 – Switzerland</b>	<b>2 – Denmark</b>
<b>3 – Denmark</b>	<b>3 – Austria</b>	3– Iceland
3 – Germany	4 – Iceland	<b>4 – Switzerland</b>
<b>5 – Finland</b>	5 – Bahamas	<b>5 - Canada</b>
6 – <b>Holland</b>	<b>6 – Finland</b>	6 – Norway
7– <b>Switzerland</b>	<b>7– Sweden</b>	<b>7 – Finland</b>
8 – Australia	8 – Butan	8 – Mexico
9 – <b>Canada</b>	9 – Brunei	<b>9 – Sweden</b>
10 – Spain	10 – <b>Canada</b>	10 – Panama

- **France retains its 11<sup>th</sup> position. We are 10<sup>th</sup> for peace and security, 6<sup>th</sup> for freedom, democracy and human rights, 10<sup>th</sup> for our standard of living and 14<sup>th</sup> for research, training,**

**information, communication and culture. When will we enter the top ten? The seats are heavily priced!**

- Lastly, we should note that another organisation, the **Legatum Institute**, also used the statistic aggregates method to establish a world prosperity classification. The Legatum classification for its last publication, (2011), is very close to GLOBECO's since the first ten countries are practically the same. The same applies to the **UNDP's** classification as far we understand it, taking into account the new criteria emphasised in the last edition of its report on human development. **We can draw two conclusions from these different works: firstly, the statistic aggregate method used by the UNDP, GLOBECO and the Legatum Institute, result in similar classifications notably highlighting Northern European countries and secondly, the subjective method used in particularly by Adrian White and Ruut Veenhoven confirm the classifications obtained by the statistic aggregates. It is therefore clear that these different works are far from contradictory but rather complement one another.**