

# Malawi



## 2016 Country Review

**COUNTRY WATCH**

<http://www.countrywatch.com>

# Table of Contents

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Chapter 1  | 1   |
| Country Overview                                 | 1   |
| Country Overview                                 | 2   |
| Key Data   | 3   |
| Malawi   | 4   |
| Africa   | 5   |
| Chapter 2  | 7   |
| Political Overview                               | 7   |
| History  | 8   |
| Political Conditions                             | 10  |
| Political Risk Index                             | 33  |
| Political Stability                              | 47  |
| Freedom Rankings                                 | 62  |
| Human Rights                                     | 74  |
| Government Functions                             | 76  |
| Government Structure                             | 77  |
| Principal Government Officials                   | 85  |
| Leader Biography                                 | 86  |
| Leader Biography                                 | 86  |
| Foreign Relations                                | 93  |
| National Security                                | 96  |
| Defense Forces                                   | 97  |
| Chapter 3  | 99  |
| Economic Overview                                | 99  |
| Economic Overview                                | 100 |
| Nominal GDP and Components                       | 103 |
| Population and GDP Per Capita                    | 104 |
| Real GDP and Inflation                           | 105 |
| Government Spending and Taxation                 | 106 |
| Money Supply, Interest Rates and Unemployment    | 107 |
| Foreign Trade and the Exchange Rate              | 108 |
| Data in US Dollars                               | 109 |
| Energy Consumption and Production Standard Units | 110 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Energy Consumption and Production QUADS | 111 |
| World Energy Price Summary              | 112 |
| CO2 Emissions                           | 113 |
| Agriculture Consumption and Production  | 114 |
| World Agriculture Pricing Summary       | 116 |
| Metals Consumption and Production       | 117 |
| World Metals Pricing Summary            | 119 |
| Economic Performance Index              | 120 |
| Chapter 4                               | 132 |
| Investment Overview                     | 132 |
| Foreign Investment Climate              | 133 |
| Foreign Investment Index                | 137 |
| Corruption Perceptions Index            | 150 |
| Competitiveness Ranking                 | 162 |
| Taxation                                | 171 |
| Stock Market                            | 172 |
| Partner Links                           | 172 |
| Chapter 5                               | 174 |
| Social Overview                         | 174 |
| People                                  | 175 |
| Human Development Index                 | 177 |
| Life Satisfaction Index                 | 181 |
| Happy Planet Index                      | 192 |
| Status of Women                         | 201 |
| Global Gender Gap Index                 | 203 |
| Culture and Arts                        | 213 |
| Etiquette                               | 213 |
| Travel Information                      | 214 |
| Diseases/Health Data                    | 223 |
| Chapter 6                               | 229 |
| Environmental Overview                  | 229 |
| Environmental Issues                    | 230 |
| Environmental Policy                    | 231 |
| Greenhouse Gas Ranking                  | 232 |
| Global Environmental Snapshot           | 243 |
| Global Environmental Concepts           | 254 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| International Environmental Agreements and Associations | 268 |
| Appendices  | 293 |
| Bibliography  | 294 |

# Chapter 1

## Country Overview

---

## Country Overview

### MALAWI

Malawi is a landlocked, southern African country. It became the British protectorate in 1891 and attained independence in 1964. After three decades of one-party rule under President Kamuzu Banda, the country held multiparty elections in 1994 under a provisional constitution that came into full effect the following year. With limited resources and a largely unskilled work force, Malawi's economy relies almost entirely on agriculture which makes it vulnerable to shocks such as adverse weather conditions and fluctuations in world commodity prices. The country remains one of the poorest and least developed in the world, and is highly dependent on donor support and economic assistance from international financial institutions.

## Key Data

| Key Data           |   |
|--------------------|---|
| <b>Region:</b>     | Africa  |
| <b>Population:</b> | 17715076  |
| <b>Climate:</b>    | Tropical, rainy season (November to May), dry season (May to November)          |
| <b>Languages:</b>  | English (official)<br>Chichewa (official)<br>other regional languages           |
| <b>Currency:</b>   | 1 Malawian kwacha (MK) = 100 tambala  |
| <b>Holiday:</b>    | Republic Day is 6 July (1966), Mother's Day is 17 October, Kamuzu Day is 14 May |
| <b>Area Total:</b> | 118480  |
| <b>Area Land:</b>  | 94080   |
| <b>Coast Line:</b> | 0   |

---

## Malawi

### Country Map





---

## Africa

### Regional Map

---



© MAGELLAN Geographics® Santa Barbara, CA (800) 929-4MAP



# **Chapter 2**

## **Political Overview**

---

## History

The precolonial Maravi Empire was a loosely organized society covering an expanse of territory that extended well beyond present-day Malawi and encompassed first the Chewa and later the Tumbuka and Tonga ethnic groups.

In the 16th century, the Portuguese reached the area, and some of the first written records of Malawi date back to that era.

Eighteenth century Arab writings have also contributed to the written history. The Yao from the north and the Ngoni made successful invasions during the 19th century, when the Yao became involved in the commercial slave trade, acting as agents for the coastal Arabs. In so doing, the group established domineering and predatory relationships over peoples of other ethnicities in southern Malawi - the Sena, Nyanja and Lomwe, in particular.

One important feature of the period prior to colonial intervention concerns the relative absence of cohesive sociopolitical entities in Malawi. The political structures of the Maravi Empire did not endure beyond the 17th century. Other ethnic groups similarly lacked large-scale centralized authorities. This is even true of the Ngoni and Yao, who entered the area and subjugated other groups during the nineteenth century. Some have attributed the subsequent ease of colonial imposition to this feature of precolonial Malawi.

The arrival of a Scottish missionary, David Livingstone, in 1859, followed by several other British missionaries and colonists, began a period of British influence. Scottish Presbyterian churches established missions in Malawi in the 1870s. One of their objectives was to end the slave trade that continued in Malawi as late as the end of the 19th century. In 1878, a number of traders, mostly from Glasgow, Scotland, formed the African Lakes Company to supply goods and services to the missionaries. Other traders and hunters followed suit.

In 1883, a consul of the British government was accredited to the "Kings and Chiefs of Central Africa," and in 1891, the territory was claimed as the British protectorate of Nyasaland, named after "nyasa," the Chichewa word for "lake." Early opposition to colonial domination was limited, and after short campaigns against the Yao, the colony was effectively pacified by 1896. In addition to high levels of activity by missionaries, the early colonial period was characterized by the

establishment of a small settler community in the southern areas of Nyasaland. These settlers subsequently became engaged in estate agriculture.

After the realization of colonial domination, the British established a system of direct rule that would endure until 1933. Initially, traditional rulers played little role in this scheme, but by 1912, a district-based system was developed that incorporated traditional rulers into the administrative structure. However, their status as agents of colonial power undermined their bases of legitimacy with local populations.

The first half of the century saw sporadic resistance to the British colonial rule. The high point of anti-colonial agitation came in 1915, when John Chilembwe, the mission-educated leader of the Providence Industrial Mission, launched a small yet unsuccessful campaign against the colonial state. Chilembwe and his followers were later executed.

The period from 1912 to 1930 witnessed the formation of native associations. Constituted primarily of educated elites, these organizations viewed themselves as intermediaries between the colonial state and the colonial government. In later years, they attempted to pressure the government on local-level developmental and social issues. Highly elitist in character and focused on relatively "apolitical" objectives, these organizations later coalesced to form the Nyasaland African Congress, or NAC, in 1944. The initial impetus for the organization was colonial plans to include Malawi in a federation with Northern and Southern Rhodesia. The federation was established in 1953 and met with a great deal of resistance from many sectors of Nyasa society. The late 1940s and 1950s were a period of rising disaffection from the African population, which experienced deteriorating social conditions and land alienation. In this context, the NAC became the primary vehicle for anti-colonial agitation.

The NAC, however, experienced numerous organizational and leadership weaknesses. This is one of the reasons younger leaders of the nationalist movement began to look toward Hastings Kamuzu Banda as an individual who might more effectively lead the nationalist struggle. Then in his late fifties, Banda had been overseas for four decades, during which time he earned a medical degree and established himself as an external supporter of nationalist causes. In 1958, Banda returned to Malawi expressly to lead the anti-colonial movement. A state of emergency was declared in 1959, and Banda was arrested for his political activism with the Malawi Congress Party, or MCP, an outgrowth of the NAC. He was released in 1960 to join the constitutional conference in London.

In 1961, following the constitutional talks, the MCP won a victory in elections to the new Legislative Council. A year later, it also gained an important role in the new Executive Council and ruled Nyasaland in all but name. At a second constitutional conference in 1962, the British government agreed to give Nyasaland self-governing status the following year.

In February 1963, Banda became prime minister, although the British still controlled Nyasaland's

financial, security and judicial systems. A new constitution took effect in May that provided virtually complete internal self-government, and on Dec. 31, 1963, the federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland was dissolved.

On July 6, 1964, independence was attained, and the new nation of Malawi joined the Commonwealth. Two years later, a new constitution was adopted, and Malawi became a republic with Banda as its first president.

*Note on History: In certain entries, open source content from the State Department Background Notes and Country Guides have been used. A full listing of sources is available in the Bibliography.*

---

## **Political Conditions**

By the time of independence, Hastings Kamuzu Banda had effectively emerged as the paramount actor within the state apparatus. The MCP, of which he was head, was the only effective political organization in the country. Moreover, owing to the circumstances of his return and capturing of the anti-federation and nationalist movements, material and symbolic political resources were concentrated in his hands.

In late 1964, further events would serve to entrench his dominant political status in the country. In September, four leading MCP officials and government ministers confronted Banda on a number of policy issues. The president did not take the confrontation lightly, stripping the outspoken ministers of their positions. In turn, three other ministers resigned, and anti-government protests broke out in various urban centers. In the ensuing political drama, Banda purged the ministers from the MCP and took steps to curtail the actions of his new political opponents. By October, fearing for their own security, five of the ministers sought refuge abroad. One minister, Henry Chipembere, successfully eluded Banda for months and in February 1965 organized a small anti-government force. While the force met initial success in Chipembere's home area of Mangochi, subsequent efforts to disrupt other areas failed. The force disbanded, and most of Chipembere's supporters were imprisoned. In the wake of these events, Banda banned all public political demonstrations and conducted a purge of MCP members in the northern region and Mangochi areas.

The 1964 cabinet crisis set the stage for further consolidation of power by Banda and indeed served as a harbinger of the leadership style that would govern Malawi for the next 30 years. Over the next decade, formal power was concentrated in Banda's hands, and a ruthless and effective dictatorship was put in place.

The new constitution granted Banda and the Malawi Congress Party a great amount of power in many areas of a modified British-styled government. As stipulated by the constitution, every five years party officials and tribal chiefs were to select the president. In 1970, however, the presidential procedure was eliminated, and the MCP appointed Banda to be president for life, in the context of a one-party state. Banda became the head of the lone party, the MCP, and all Malawians were obliged to be members.

Throughout Banda's rule, opposition was essentially nonexistent, due more to fear than satisfaction. Indeed, even elements of civil society suspected of disloyalty were banned. The most telling case was that of Jehovah's Witnesses who were persecuted by the paramilitary Malawi Young Pioneers in the early 1970s for failing to display Banda's picture in their churches. Over time, the Malawi Congress Party emerged as the dominant organization, blanketing nearly all aspects of Malawian social life and serving to further promote Banda's hegemony within the political system. Fawning and often highly orchestrated displays of adulation became characteristic features of Banda's Malawi.

Among the political elite, a mix of coercion, manipulation and patronage served to entrench Banda at the head of the state. Key elites received large estates for cultivation, providing a means of accumulating wealth and giving them an interest in the system over which Banda ruled. Frequent cabinet shifts precluded the emergence of any significant political opponents within his own circle of power. Suspected rivals were imprisoned, executed or assassinated. For example, of four individuals who served as secretary general of the MCP for more than two years between 1964 and 1983, only one escaped imprisonment or death at the hands of the regime. Banda also openly admitted he directed the sending of a letter bomb to one of his opponents abroad, Attati Mpakati, leader of the Socialist League.

In addition to allegations of a violent and authoritarian domestic policy, Banda's foreign policy was considered highly controversial. This was primarily due to his recognition of apartheid South Africa and an official visit in 1967, a time when the rest of black Africa sought to isolate the apartheid regime. Ironically, Banda also recognized the communist-backed government in Angola that was at odds with South African-backed forces. Until the early 1990s Banda's staunchly anti-socialist views kept him in good relations with Western countries as well as international financial institutions that provided aid.

Throughout the 1980s, opposition to Banda was voiced primarily by dissidents in exile. Also, several prominent international nongovernmental organizations - namely Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch - harshly criticized the Banda regime for human rights abuses. The first signs of significant internal opposition emerged in March 1992, when Roman Catholic bishops issued a pastoral letter raising a number of issues heretofore "off-limits" in Banda's Malawi. They included the lack of civil and political freedoms, growing disparity of wealth between the political elite and

suffering masses and human rights abuses by the regime. The Catholic statement initiated a period of open challenges to the regime. Precipitated by increasing unrest and escalating government violence, Western creditors suspended all but urgent humanitarian aid to Malawi. Soon afterward, activist organizations began to pressure the regime for political change. Central among these were the Livingstonia and Blantyre Synods of the Church of Central Africa Presbyterian as well as two previously underground political opposition groups, the Alliance for Democracy, or AFORD, and the United Democratic Front, or UDF. Together with the Catholic Church and other organizations, these groups formed a viable internal movement to work for democratic reforms.

Despite the banning of AFORD by Banda, the combinations of effective internal pressure by civic and political organizations, mass demonstrations and donor conditionality forced the hand of the Banda regime. In 1993, a referendum was held to decide the future of the one-party state. The referendum, monitored by United Nations representatives and other international bodies, strongly favored the creation of a multiparty state. Banda rejected demands for an immediate installation of an interim government. He did, however, agree to the establishment of a national council to oversee the transition to a multiparty system and the holding of free elections, as well as an amnesty for political exiles.

By 1994, a constitutional amendment was passed to allow for the registration of new parties; external agencies, most notably the United Nations, agreed to continue playing a supportive role during the transition. Although the months leading up to the election were marked by efforts of the regime to manipulate the electoral process, the pressure of opposition parties, civil society and international actors allowed for a relatively fair and transparent campaigning period. The run-up to elections was also punctuated by an army campaign to disarm the Malawi Young Pioneers, the regime's paramilitary force. Although successful, many feared members of the former paramilitary service escaped by fleeing to rebel bases in Mozambique.

In the May 16, 1994, National Assembly elections, three major parties won seats. The UDF won 84 seats, the MCP 55 and AFORD 36. Voting patterns tended to mirror regional lines with AFORD based in the north, the MCP taking the majority of districts in the central region and the UDF capturing the southern region. In the presidential elections held the same day, Bakili Muluzi, former cabinet minister and secretary general of the UDF, took 47.3 percent of the votes cast, defeating Banda and the AFORD candidate, Chakufwa Chihana. President Muluzi and Vice President Malewezi were inaugurated May 21, 1994.

By June of that year, Muluzi established a commission of inquiry to investigate the murders of four prominent politicians in 1983. Leading members of Banda's coterie, most notably John Tembo and Cecilia Kadzamira, were charged, arrested and tried. Banda, however, escaped in-person prosecution on grounds he was medically unfit to stand trial. Despite widespread popular perception that those on trial had committed the crimes, Banda and the others were found not guilty in December 1996. Weeks later, Banda publicly apologized for the pain and suffering he



might have caused Malawians during his rule. He retired from politics and died in 1997.

Since 1994, political life in the country has been typified by relative stability. Whether President Bakili Muluzi would assist Malawi in evolving to a vibrant, consolidated democracy remained an open question. While certain tendencies in the system bode well for further consolidation of democracy, other patterns suggest the possibility of instability and even authoritarian reversal. Despite Banda's departure and death, his legacy has continued to live on in present-day Malawi. Muluzi's UDF has increasingly displayed many of the same authoritarian tendencies reminiscent of the Banda regime it fought against. Corruption has become rampant while the economy has been faltering. Faced with growing social alienation and political agitation, the UDF government has increasingly turned to strong-arm tactics that further serve to undermine stability.

While key opposition and governing elites have repeatedly voiced their commitments to the democratic system, relations between the political parties have at times been marked by considerable tension. In early 1995, Chakufwa Chihana, the leader of the opposition Alliance for Democracy, or AFORD, party, acknowledged the new regime had made significant progress in establishing democracy and restoring stability to Malawi. Later in the year, AFORD and UDF signed a formal cooperation agreement, with Chihana being named second vice president of the country. By 1996, however, AFORD withdrew from the coalition on the grounds of alleged governmental corruption. This was followed by an opposition boycott of parliament, as both the MCP and AFORD alleged the new regime was abusing power. Highly contentious language came to typify political discourse, and violence became more frequent during party rallies. On the urging of civil society groups, a multiparty meeting was held in 1997, and Muluzi agreed to make significant changes to address the political situation. Despite the apparent rapprochement, serious conflict between the political parties has remained. By-elections for deceased or disqualified members of parliament, as well as the run-up to 1999 general elections, were marred by considerable political violence among local-level party supporters.

The former ruling party, the MCP, has remained the primary opposition to the UDF. However, the ability of the party to function and effectively challenge the UDF government has been limited. One of the primary reasons has been financial difficulty. In 1996, parliament passed the Press Reconstruction Act, which removed from the MCP the ownership of one of the largest economic conglomerates in the country, estimated to control between 12 percent and 30 percent of Malawi's GNP. The High Court ruled the legislation was "null and void" due to the lack of parliamentary quorum at the time of passage. However, the Supreme Court later overturned the decision. In addition, although the MCP was listed as one of the primary beneficiaries of Kamuzu Banda's estate, the former leader's will has been challenged in court. These financial constraints have limited the ability of the party to support its staff, pay rent and even hold national conventions.

Presidential and parliamentary elections were held in June 1999. Several highly contentious issues tainted both the conduct and outcome of the exercises. Many of these were associated with actions

by the government and the state-appointed electoral commission in particular. An early problem concerned President Muluzi's decision to replace members of the commission in August 1998, only eight months before the deadline for the polls. Later that year, parliament passed a general elections bill that empowered the commission to delineate additional constituencies, or voting districts, in the country. The subsequent recommendation by the commission for 70 new constituencies, 42 of them in UDF dominated areas, was met with considerable hostility by the opposition, civic groups and donors. Responding to the outcry, the governing regime in turn proposed only 17 new constituencies. While this resolved the initial dispute, further problems would plague the process.

Problems arose within the opposition when MCP presidential candidate Gwanda Chakuamba appointed the president of AFORD, Chakufwa Chihana, as his running mate for the upcoming presidential elections. The decision came as a surprise and insult to many supporters of the party who expected Chakuamba to choose MCP Vice President John Tembo. In opposition to the move, several members of the MCP did not attend the announcement of the alliance. The tension was put to rest when Tembo announced his support for the alliance with AFORD. However, the opposition received yet another setback when the head of the electoral commission, Justice William Hanjahanja, declared the joint MCP-AFORD ticket was illegal. After the opposition challenged the commission's ruling in court, the High Court reversed the decision and the two candidates were allowed to stand together.

Complaints about electoral commission partiality toward the UDF and mishandling of voter registration marred the electoral process from start to finish. Only a few months before the polling date, voter registration centers reported they lacked materials necessary to carry out the registration process. Registration clerks threatened to strike in April 1999 after not receiving pay. Opposition parties and civic groups accused the commission of failing to conduct its operations transparently and pointed to clear biases in the distribution of registration materials. Subsequent pressure by these actors as well as international donors forced the commission to postpone the original polling date by three weeks. In principle, this would allow the voter registration process to be completed. Shortly thereafter, Justice Hanjahanja resigned as head of the commission. Despite the polling date being extended, when registration centers were closed, more than 160,000 eligible voters in the north of the country, a region dominated by opposition supporters, had not yet registered.

The elections were held June 15 and, by most accounts, the polling proceeded without incident. Problems quickly followed the announcement that Muluzi and his UDF had won the elections. The opposition claimed that Muluzi, who won a majority of the votes cast but only a plurality of the electorate - represented by all registered voters - had been declared the winner illegally. The constitution of Malawi was itself vague on the issue of whether a majority or plurality of the electorate was needed to win the presidency. The Supreme Court subsequently ruled in favor of the government. The more central accusations by the opposition were those concerning the rigging of both the presidential and several parliamentary polls. They also alleged UDF officials had handed out money in a church to secure votes and that someone connected with the UDF had

been caught delivering ballots to a polling station.

In the immediate aftermath of the elections, violence erupted between supporters of the opposition and UDF supporters in the north of the country. Mosques and small businesses were raided and looted, and many people fled the area to avoid violence. The Muslim community was especially targeted - this presumably because of the president's Muslim convictions. Three people died and more than 50 were arrested in more than two weeks of violence and looting. While the violence subsided, political tension remained as the opposition announced it would not recognize the administration and would boycott parliament. Later, both MCP and AFORD opted to join parliamentary proceedings.

By mid-2000, the MCP had been disrupted by internal differences between party president Chakuamba and his vice, John Tembo. In distancing himself from Chakuamba and the alliance with AFORD, Tembo has moved closer to the UDF regime. Some have suggested he might even be named the second vice president of the country. While Chihana remains firmly entrenched in AFORD's northern base, the future of Chakuamba remains uncertain. Unlike Tembo, he is without access to substantial funds or a significant regional base of support.

By March 2001, a new force appeared on the Malawi political scene, the National Democratic Alliance, or NDA, led by former cabinet minister Brown Mpinganjira. By April 12, 2001, this new force was already spent as divisions rapidly started appearing within its ranks. At least three founding members of the NDA, Winston Sakwata, Ken Msonda and George Dilla, decamped from the executive of the party to join the ruling UDF. They accused NDA leader Brown Mpinganjira of not equitably sharing money donated to the organization by business people. The rapid rise and fall of the NDA was an important lesson to all opposition leaders. Until such time as they could function in a united fashion, putting personal agendas behind them, they would continue to play second fiddle to the UDF in elections.

On a positive note, a small but active civil society has emerged in Malawi. Churches, the legal community, an active consumer association, an independent press and several other groups have confronted government abuses of power and brought important issues to greater public scrutiny. In addition, at the level of the state, some significant political pluralism has emerged. The judiciary has demonstrated it will challenge the governing party. This was evident in several cases concerning the conduct of elections as well as cases that have brought criminal charges against opposition members. The courts also have upheld the authority of the new office of ombudsman, which has been especially active in investigating cases of state employees dismissed on allegedly political grounds.

In state affairs, President Muluzi appeared firmly in control. Yet he was faced with several problems, the first of which related to spiraling levels of corruption in his administration. In October 1999, Muluzi denied charges he used public funds to pay for a lavish marriage ceremony

to his wife of 12 years. At the same time, he provided no information to his citizens as to where the funds came from. His denial came amid growing criticism accusing him of insensitivity in spending thousands of dollars on a private ceremony while the majority of Malawians are suffering. The opposition charged the government displayed hypocrisy by allegedly spending lavishly on the wedding while at the same time dispatching Finance Minister Cassim Chilumpha to Washington to plead with donor agencies and countries for debt relief.

In addition, UDF ministers were rumored to be engaging in corrupt practices, especially in dealings with international businesses seeking government contracts. To date, few cases have been effectively tried, much less brought to light by the Anti-Corruption Bureau.

In February 2001, however, President Muluzi had to embark on a cabinet reshuffle as some key ministers were implicated in a fresh round of corruption charges that prompted international donors to call on Muluzi to take action. This saw Finance Minister Chilumpha lose his cabinet post. Malawi ranks 45th on the list of the least-to-most-corrupt countries in the world ranked by Transparency International, a nongovernmental organization that monitors nation-state corruption. Commentators have also raised concerns about the concentration of economic power in the hands of the UDF elite and Muluzi in particular. A report by the Consumer Association of Malawi maintained in 1997 that the President controlled 60 percent of the sugar trade in the country. More recently, he has been accused of renting his personal properties to the state. The president was also suspected of having special access to funds from Libya. Close relations emerged between Muluzi and Colonel Muammar al-Qadhafi, with Muluzi making several trips to Libya in recent years.

In August 2001, it also became clear corruption could endanger Malawi's status as a Highly Indebted Poor Country, or HIPC. On Aug. 6, 2001, World Bank Resident Representative in Lilongwe Robert Liebenthal informed local media that any departure on International Monetary Fund- and World Bank-supported poverty initiatives would place Malawi's poor-country qualification in jeopardy. Liebenthal's comments followed great disquiet after the government failed to account for how it spent \$US14.7 million already received under HIPC debt relief. Allegations of corruption appeared at a most unfortunate time for the Muluzi Administration - when the economy seemed to be slowing down. Inflation in August 2001, for instance, shot up to 30 percent, causing further impoverishment. That certain government elites were engaged in corruption in a worsening economic climate resulted in popular anger as seen in various demonstrations against the government.

Until mid-2002, President Muluzi faced a political controversy revolving around his attempt to extend rule to an unconstitutional third term. Although Muluzi remained tight-lipped about amending the constitution to allow himself another term in office, senior UDF members did not and openly supported such a constitutional amendment. In August 2001, Muluzi and senior UDF members crisscrossed the country holding several public rallies. While Muluzi addressed the rallies on "developmental issues," his lieutenants sang a different tune. Uladi Mussa, a senior UDF

member, addressed one rally, saying Muluzi would stand for election again in 2004 because of public desire; as a result, the constitution would need to be changed. Meanwhile, Dumbo Lemani and Davis Kapito, two UDF aides, said their party did not have a natural replacement for Muluzi.

Opposition politicians pointed out that the campaign for a third term is accompanied by violence. A group within the ruling party's youth league, calling themselves Young Democrats unleashed a terror campaign against anyone perceived to oppose a third time in office. The group assaulted Muluzi's critics in the precincts of parliament and outside, according to police and opposition accounts. Scores more have been injured.

However, Muluzi's problems arose from neither Malawi's citizens nor the international community being able to accept authoritarian tendencies. In September 2001, an editorial in the independent daily *The Chronicle* exposed that the government has reverted to intercepting private mail and slammed what they termed "a state of dictatorship." In August 2001, Malawi's protestant churches issued a statement accusing the ruling party Youth League of being "terrorists" who harassed and intimidated Muluzi's opponents. The statement also called upon Malawians to oppose this "state-sanctioned terrorism." In context, Banda's dictatorship ended when churches called on people to oppose his rule. It was also clear that opposition parliamentarians unhappy with the pro-ruling party bias exhibited by Sam Mpasu, the speaker of parliament, was also going to take the matter further. This they did with the Southern African regional body of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Local efforts were assisted by international efforts.

In August 2001, Reporters Sans Frontieres, or RSF, sent a letter to President Muluzi protesting increasing repression against the independent press. According to the RSF, on August 14, 300 copies of the independent weekly *The People's Eye* were seized and burned by Young Democrats. That particular edition criticized Muluzi for seeking a third term in office. Malawi's economy being vulnerable to the dictates of the international donor community, their message to Muluzi not to pursue a third-term bid was difficult to wave off. After all, it was the international donor community that convinced Zambian President Chiluba from not going for a third presidential term. This placed President Muluzi in a difficult position, for if he pushed ahead with a third term, he risked serious domestic unrest and the ire of the international community.

By June 7, 2002, the parliament had rejected the proposed constitutional amendment to let President Muluzi run for a third term. Following the decision, President Muluzi, in a radio address, urged the divided country to reconcile political differences to work for "social economic gain." Opposition members as well as church and civic groups hailed the parliament's decision as a genuine reflection of Malawian's commitment to democracy.

In mid-2002, Malawi was in the grip of a major humanitarian crisis as famine and cholera outbreaks had plagued the country for several months. As much as 70 percent of the population was in danger of starvation, mainly in rural areas, and President Muluzi warned the famine could



last until 2003. He had declared a national state of emergency in February 2002. In April, IRIN had reported that almost 1000 people had died from cholera since November 2001. Widespread malnutrition and desperately inadequate medical facilities were exasperating the situation. Despite repeated calls to the international community for help, donor and aid agencies were slow in mobilizing any form of relief for Malawi, one of the world's poorest countries.

Several factors contributed to the current grim state of Malawi's affairs. After a two-year cycle of droughts followed by floods, important staple crops such as maize have become scarce. Floods also destroyed bridges, roads, and railroads by which food could be brought into Malawi. Hungry farmers were eating unripe maize, normally planted for future crops. Furthermore, the political crisis in Zimbabwe, which disrupted agricultural productivity, created a shortage of food affecting the entire southern African region.

Economic mismanagement by the government affected the ability by which the government can respond to the disaster. From October 2001 until April 2002, international donor agencies and countries withdrew aid from, or refused to release aid to, Malawi. USAID withheld aid due to Malawi's failure to privatize certain sectors as it had promised. The Danish government stopped aid over concerns of corruption. In April, the IMF withheld funds over Malawi's lack of transparency regarding how and where aid money is being spent. The Malawi government was also criticized for its shortsightedness in 2001 for selling off its surplus of food to Kenya.

In May 2002, the British Government responded to the crisis by granting a food aid package for cultivation of maize and other crops in the next winter season. Germany, Italy and the United States have followed suit in assisting the country in food relief and debt cancellation.

In early August 2002, senior government officials in Malawi were facing prosecution following allegations they sold grain reserves despite warnings of an imminent food crisis. At the time, it was estimated that at least three million of Malawi's 11 million people would starve in 2002.

Meanwhile, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in September 2002 approved an emergency loan of \$23m to Malawi to help the country buy food imports in anticipation of serious shortages later in the year. According to the IMF, starvation and malnutrition were already widespread in Malawi because of crop failures earlier in the year. The effects of the drought were made worse by the selling of the aforementioned grain surplus in 2001; the Malawi government alleged that the sale of the grain was advised by the IMF and the World Bank. However, the IMF denied the charges, and reportedly told Associated Press that it simply agreed with the recommendations of a Malawian Government study on food stocks. The IMF loan to Malawi was granted for the purpose of importing grain and other foodstuffs "to prevent large shortages expected" in late 2002. IMF Managing Director Horst Kohler called on donor countries to provide more aid for Malawi and other drought-stricken countries in the region.

By late November 2002, an AIDS epidemic in Malawi was contributing to the country's worst famine in living memory. It was estimated that more than one in seven of the 12 million people living in Malawi had the HIV virus. The disease wreaked havoc in towns and cities across the country and also had a devastating impact on many farming communities.

To make matters worse, severe floods in various parts of the country forced Malawi President Muluzi in mid-January 2003 to declare a "state of national disaster," and call for international assistance.

On the political front, in late January 2003, the Malawi government had backed down in its attempts to allow President Muluzi to stand for a third term in office. A bill to change the constitution was withdrawn from parliament in the face of strong opposition; a similar bill had been narrowly defeated in July 2002. Police reportedly had to intervene in parliament to prevent fights breaking out between rival MPs after the bill was withdrawn. The issue was dividing Malawians and police had to fire tear gas to disperse some 4,000 people protesting against the bill. President Muluzi even fired Commerce and Industry Minister Peter Kaleso because of his opposition to the 'third term' bill.

In early February 2003, the food crisis in Malawi was so severe that some of the worst-hit people had been reduced to eating grass. Aid agencies continued to worry that nearly a third of the population - about 3.3 million people - faced starvation in the coming months if relief funds dwindled and erratic weather did not bring much-needed rain in time for the harvest. In an attempt to help alleviate some of the suffering, the United Nations World Food Programme (WFP) distributed food to 3.6 million Malawians that month.

By late February, the Malawian government was again on the defensive over grain; this time, over a new decision to sell off 20 percent of its grain reserves. The country had already been under fire for selling some of its grain in 2000-2001. However, Chief Technical Advisor of Malawi's Ministry of Agriculture, Allard Malindi, claimed Malawi was being responsible in seeking to sell off the grain because the country was expecting a good harvest in three months' time.

On March 12, 2003, President Muluzi became the first leader in his country's history to testify before a court of law. He appeared before the Lilongwe Magistrate Courts as state witness in a case involving the main opposition Malawi Congress Party president. The document in which the allegedly forged signature appeared apparently outlined ways in which President Muluzi was planning to bribe opposition MPs to vote for a constitutional amendment in order to allow a sitting presidential a third term in office. By the end of that month, President Muluzi made a surprise announcement in a nationwide broadcast that he would not seek a further term in office. Instead, he told Malawians he was endorsing a cabinet proposal naming his economic planning minister as the governing UDF's candidate to be his successor.

Muluzi's chosen successor was considered a surprise choice -- an outsider -- by some observers. Bingu wa Mutharika, a 69-year-old professional economist, had several years' experience working for the World Bank, United Nations and regional bodies. He founded his own United Party (UP) under whose ticket he contested the 1999 second multi-party elections. He later dissolved the UP and joined the UDF where Muluzi appointed him deputy Reserve Bank of Malawi governor.

Just two days later, on April 2, 2003, President Muluzi sacked his entire cabinet. A brief statement from the president did not give any reason for the surprise decision but only said all matters requiring cabinet attention should be directed to his office until a new cabinet was appointed. Several ministers and UDF leaders accused President Muluzi of imposing wa Mutharika on the party and had allegedly threatened to quit soon after President Muluzi informed both the cabinet and the UDF National Executive Committee of his decision.

The new cabinet, announced April 10, 2003, included Chakufwa Chihana of the Alliance for Democracy party. Chihana was named the country's second vice-president and supported President Muluzi's failed attempt to stay in power for an unconstitutional third term in office. Some veteran politicians in the former cabinet, including the agriculture minister, Aleke Banda, were not re-appointed. Banda had openly declared that he wanted to succeed the president when he retired at the end of his official two five-year terms next year. Others who lost their jobs included Sports Minister and BBC reporter, Moses Dossi; former Justice Minister and Attorney General Henry Dama Phoya, and former deputy agriculture minister Samuel Kaphuka. According to BBC News, the new cabinet retained many figures who had pledged support to wa Mutharika.

In late April 2003, a conference of the main opposition Malawi Congress Party to choose a presidential candidate ended in chaos. Several people were injured while thousands of dollars worth of property was destroyed when violence erupted after vice president John Tembo was announced as the MCP candidate in next year's elections. The convention followed a bitter two-year feud between Tembo and Gwanda Chakuamba to take over the former ruling party from former president Banda. Tembo received 377 votes to Chakuamba's 275 votes.

On Feb. 23, 2004, Malawi President Bakili Muluzi again dissolved his entire 45-member cabinet for no apparent reason, simply issuing a statement that all official duties seeking cabinet attention should be directed to his office. The leader had been expected to dissolve his cabinet after the official dissolution of parliament on May 20, 2004. Political analysts said that President Muluzi's decision to dissolve the cabinet two months early was a strategic one, designed to include loyalists in a bid to generate funds for them to campaign for parliamentary seats ahead of the scheduled May 18 general elections. Analysts also said Muluzi would take the opportunity to rid his cabinet of people believed to be sympathetic to former senior UDF leaders who have since quit the ruling party to join opposition ranks in the midst of succession feud.

A court ruling, followed by an announcement by the electoral commission, suggested that Malawi's

---



presidential and parliamentary elections would be delayed until May 20, 2004. The decision was made in response to complaints by the opposition coalition that there were irregularities in the voters' roll and that the publication of the register was not in compliance with the constitution. According to the constitution, 21 days are mandated by law for the review of the roll, which was published only in early May.

Following the delayed election, which appeared to give victory to the governing United Democratic Front and its candidate, Bingu wa Mutharika, hundreds of protesters demonstrated in the streets. Mutharika, a former World Bank economist and minister of planning, had been selected by outgoing President Bakili Muluzi. He received 35.5 percent of the votes cast in the presidential race. John Tembo of the Malawi Congress Party garnered the second largest number of votes and 27.1 percent of the votes cast, while Gwanda Chakuamba of the Mgwiriziano coalition secured a third-place finish with 25.7 percent. Two other candidates, Brown Mpinganjira and Justin Malewezi respectively garnered less than 10 percent of the vote share. For his part, Chakuamba insisted he had won the election and said that he would not accept the result. In the parliamentary elections, the UDF took 74 seats, the MCP took 60 seats, Independents took 24 seats, the rest of the seats were distributed among other factions and interest groups.

Meanwhile, despite assertions by the Malawi Electoral Commission that the results were valid, international observers criticized the elections, charging that there were marked problems with the voters' roll as well as significant media bias. The political ramifications aside, free and fair elections are considered to be a necessary foundation in the country's ability to secure development aid. Such development aid is crucially important for poverty alleviation in Malawi, which is one of the world's poorest nations. Development aid is also vital to the fight against HIV/AIDS, which affects a quarter of the entire population.

In early 2005, President Bingu wa Mutharika announced he was resigning from the ruling United Democratic Front (UDF) over his government's anti-corruption policy. He subsequently sacked members of his cabinet and even replaced one cabinet member with his own former rival. He later intimated that his decisions had been somewhat influenced by the fact that former President Muluzi had been trying to govern from behind the scenes. Indeed, he even accused Muluzi of attempting to assassinate him. Whether or not these allegations were true, it seemed clear that the country was being thrust into political turmoil. He also announced that he would be founding his own Democratic Progressive Party.

In October 2005, members of parliament (MPs) in Malawi moved to impeach President Bingu wa Mutharika. Impeachment proceedings were advanced following accusations that the president used state funds improperly. More than one-third of the MPs signed the motion, thus introducing it for consideration. In order to actually pass the motion, however, a two-thirds majority would be needed. Loyalists of the president in parliament left the chamber in protest, hurling accusations that the president's detractors were in violation of parliamentary rules.

---

The move to impeach President Mutharika followed a previous attempt earlier in the year. Those proceedings took an unconventional turn when the parliamentary speaker collapsed and died. The president's precarious political position has worsened since his election in 2004 due to differences with the former ruling United Democratic Front (UDF), which had supported him in the election.

An independent legislator, Richard Msowoya, who was aligned with the government, requested that the court stop the parliament from moving forward with impeachment proceedings until a legal review could be undertaken. In response to the application, Justice Richard Chinangwa granted Msowoya an injunction, thus placing the impeachment process on hold. Subsequently, a constitutional court called a temporary halt to impeachment proceedings.

In April 2006, President Mutharika announced a reshuffle of his cabinet after he dismissed two senior ministers and a deputy minister. A statement was issued in this regard by the Office of the President and Cabinet. Mutharika also appointed three senior opposition parliamentarians to join his cabinet.

In mid-August 2006, President Mutharika called on Ishmael Wadi, the country's top prosecutor, to honorably resign after he [Wadi] dropped charges of corruption against former President Bakili Muluzi. The former president had been charged in June 2006. Only months earlier, Vice President Cassim Chilumpha, an ally of Muluzi, was arrested and charged with treason.

President Mutharika said that Wadi "has done the country more harm than he realizes" by dropping the charges against Muluzi. Indeed, the president noted that the move, which involved 42 counts of corruption, fraud and abuse, compromised the credibility of the justice system. A week earlier, the president suspended Gustav Kaliwo, who had been investigating the case.

Note: As noted above, in 2004, President Mutharika was selected by then-President Muluzi to succeed him. But several months later, President Mutharika resigned from the ruling party's membership on the grounds that there was much opposition to his anti-corruption agenda.

A year later, the political landscape was dominated by a budget showdown between President Mutharika and the parliament. At issue was the fact that opposition parliamentarians were refusing to discuss the budget unless their cohorts, who switched to join the president's party, were expelled. In this way, the budget, which had been introduced months earlier, remained unapproved. The situation laid bare the existing political conflict between the president and his opponents. As well, it spurred anxieties about the economic repercussions on international aid and payment for key state services.

Malawi was set to hold presidential and parliamentary elections on May 19, 2009. Contesting the elections were the ruling party of Malawi, the Democratic People's Party (DPP), which was

established in 2005 by incumbent President Bingu wa Mutharika following a dispute with Kakili Muluzi, the leader of the United Democratic Front (UDF). For his part, Muluzi served as the president from 1994 to 2004.

In October 2008, the DPP's national governing council nominated Mutharika as the party's candidate for the 2009 presidential election. At a UDF convention on April 24, 2008, Muluzi was chosen as that party's 2009 presidential candidate, despite questions about his eligibility due to term limits, as well as prevailing corruption charges against him.

On April 9, 2009, Muluzi aligned with the opposition Malawi Congress Party (MCP), led by John Tembo, after he [Muluzi] was disqualified as a presidential candidate by the electoral commission. The election body said that Muluzi was constitutionally barred from contesting the election since he had already served two terms in office as president. Muluzi was reported to be turning his support to Tembo for the presidential race. Muluzi and Tembo were hoping that their combined strength would propel them to victory.

Also contesting the election was James Nyodo, an independent candidate, who cast himself as the “young blood” on the political landscape. Nyodo said that he wished to oust the incumbent. In an election speech, he said, “To change our country, we must exercise our democracy and vote for new leadership.”

Meanwhile, Bingu wa Mutharika was hoping to capitalize on his record of economic reform, his fight against corruption, as well as his background as an economic technocrat who worked at the United Nations and led the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa. But by his own admission, he conceded that during his first term in office, he did not create as many jobs or young people as he would have liked. To that end, his 2009 election platform focused on job creation for young people.

More than a month later on May 19, 2009, Malawians went to polls to elect a new president and a new parliament. With the votes counted, it was clear that President Bingu wa Mutharika had won a landslide victory. One day after the votes were cast, a spokesperson for the Malawi Electoral Commission announced that with 93 percent of the votes counted, Mutharika had polled 2,730,630 votes against his main rival, Tembo, who had 1,270,053 votes. Other candidates, including Nyoda, were far behind. The remaining seven percent of the vote share was not expected to change the outcome of the election.

Several opposition candidates extended their congratulations to Mutharika on his re-election. Among them was Muluzi, who had backed Tembo in the race. Muluzi said, “I wish to congratulate Mutharika for his victory. This is politics and elections are over. We need to move forward.” He also promised to support Mutharika’s development programs.

Tembo’s MCP was not as quick to offer post-election reconciliation. Instead the MCP alleged that

the election outcome was flawed. Tembo said he would petition the election result in court. Indeed, Tembo wrote in a letter to the Malawi Electoral Commission: "MCP, therefore, rejects the results and will not accept the results if Mutharika and his DPP are declared winners in these elections." The MCP also alleged that the vehicles carrying ballot to counting centers were delivered in open envelopes. Observer missions, however, endorsed Malawi's elections as having taken place in a free, fair and well-managed manner.

Regardless of a potential legal controversy, President Mutharika's inauguration was set for May 22, 2009 in Blantyre.

On May 22, 2009, Malawian President Bingu wa Mutharika, who had just won a landslide victory in the presidential election, was sworn into office for a second term here. President Mutharika promised to continue his agenda of economic reform and anti-corruption during his second term. During his inaugural address, he said, "The election was won because the promises made in 2004 were fulfilled, especially fast economic growth." He continued, "Our government will continue with its development agenda." Mutharika also emphasized the anti-corruption drive saying, "My stand still the same. I shall continue to fight it because it is evil. It is an enemy to development, it robs the poor."

At the parliamentary level, the ruling Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) won a resounding 114 seats out of 192 which were contested in the elections. The other political parties -- mainly Malawi Congress Party (MCP) and the United Democratic Front (UDF) -- along with some independents won the remaining seats.

In June 2009, Malawi's president Bingu Wa Mutharika announced his new cabinet almost a month after being re-elected. See "Government Officials" for information about his selections.

In July 2009, the country's High Court dismissed a legal challenge issued by the opposition candidate, Tembo, regarding the results of the May presidential election.

In July 2011, violent protests erupted in several cities in the southern African country of Malawi in protest of economic strife plaguing the country. There was at least one death reported and several injuries as a result of the clashes that broke out between the protesters and police. The epicenter of the violent eruptions appeared to be the commercial center of Blantyre in the capital city of Lilongwe where vandalism and looting were both reported, and where police used tear gas and rubber bullets to try to disperse the crowds.

At issue has been economic strife, manifest by fuel shortages and food shortages, with some demonstrators demanding that President Bingu wa Mutharika resign from office. Given the social and economic unrest taking shape in Malawi and out of concern for a lack of good governance, the United Kingdom moved to suspend aid to the southern African country.

Note that in August 2011, President Bingu Mutharika dissolved his cabinet; a month later in September 2011, he revealed a new government.

In January 2012, a number of women were attacked, beaten, and their clothing stripped from their bodies in the capital of Lilongwe and in the city of Blantyre. Their attackers were lashing out at the women for not wearing traditional garb.

Indeed, these attacks on women appeared to be driven by conservatives and hardliners who held ongoing allegiance to a now-defunct law that prevented females from wearing trousers (i.e. pants) or mini skirts and banned males from having long hair. The law, which was in existence during the rule of the country's former despotic leader, Hastings Banda, was set aside in 1994. Clearly, though, liberation for women on the matter of clothing remained a matter of great consternation for some factions of society in Malawi.

In response, hundreds of people took to the streets of cities in Malawi to protest attacks on the women. In an effort to register their discontent, many of the women participating in the protests defiantly wore either pants or mini skirts. As noted by several women at the demonstration, wearing pants and skirts in Malawi was a symbol of freedom in the aftermath of the era of one-party dictatorship. But in 2012, it could also be regarded as a basic human right to wear clothing of choice without being subject to violent attack. To that end, several attendees held up signs that simply read: "Real men don't bother women." The protests were also attended by outraged human rights activist, university professors and students, church leaders, members of parliament, and even Vice President Joyce Banda, who said "The reason why I'm here is because I'm in total disbelief that in the year 2012 women are being stripped naked."

For his part, Malawian President Bingu wa Mutharika said in a national radio broadcast that women had the right to wear what they want and called for the arrest of anyone harassing women. He was quoted as saying, "Women who want to wear trousers should do so, as you will be protected from thugs, vendors and terrorists."

Since mid-2011, Malawi had been dealing with violent protests, which erupted in response to the economic strife plaguing the country. Of particular concern has been the fuel shortages and food shortages, which have stressed the population, often driving protesters to the streets to demand that President Bingu wa Mutharika resign from office. The social and economic unrest escalated to the point that the United Kingdom moved to suspend aid to Malawi and out of concern for a lack of good governance. By September of 2011, President Bingu Mutharika attempted to quell dissatisfaction from the public and criticism from his opponents by forming a new government.

By March 2012, though, it was clear that this move had not squashed the sense of frustration felt by the people, and it certainly had not silenced the critics. The government's response to the unrest in Malawi was to enact a crackdown against anti-government voices. Human rights groups

drew attention to this trend by noting the surge of arrests and threats against journalists and activists, which had increased so acutely that many critics of the government in various fields had been forced to go into hiding.

The group, Human Rights Watch, drew particular attention to the case of John Kapito, the chairman of the Malawi Human Rights Commission and a prominent critic of the government's human rights record, who was arrested without a warrant on charges of possession of guns and seditious materials. Another case of note was the arrest of Atupele Muluzi, a prominent member of the opposition United Democratic Front (UDF) party and the son of former President Bakili Muluzi. The younger Muluzi was charged with inciting violence. Of particular concern was the president's directive that those who insulted the president would face prosecution and up to two years in prison.

Clearly, these collective actions demonstrated a slide in autocratic rule and repression in Malawi by President Bingu. As noted by Leslie Lefkow, deputy Africa director at Human Rights Watch, "Arresting government critics is just the latest sign of increasing repression in Malawi. President Mutharika should take urgent steps to end the harassment and arrests of people seen as opposing the government." Lefkow continued, "The Malawi government's increasing intolerance of any dissent should be strongly condemned by concerned governments."

It should be noted that as March 2012 was coming to a close, a conference of leading civil rights and religious leaders, as well as respected academics, convened under the umbrella organization, the Public Affairs Committee (PAC), to discuss the latest political developments in Malawi. At the conclusion of the meeting, the PAC urged President Mutharika to resolve the country's economic and political problems immediately. The PAC also demanded that the president either ratify his mandate in via a national referendum in 90 days, or, resign the presidency within 60 days.

For his part, President Mutharika dismissed the ultimatum and asserted that he had no intention of resigning from power. Instead, he said: "I want to inform the Malawi nation that Bingu will not step down until 2014; I would like to say that Bingu doesn't run away from work, Bingu doesn't desert responsibly even if the going gets tough." Then, directing his attention to the PAC, he defiantly declared in a message before the media: "You should make a clean copy of this (message) and give it to the Chairman of PAC and the Chairman of the civil society or whoever is supporting their calls. This is my answer to the memorandum that they (PAC) say they have written, I won't answer again!" As his supporters from the ruling Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) cheered, President Mutharika said: "This is my message, the message has gone to PAC, the message has gone to opposition, the DPP government will be there until 2014."

On April 6, 2012, it was announced that President Bingu wa Mutharika of Malawi had died of a heart attack. According to BBC News, a physician who treated Mutharika said the president was clinically dead the day before when he went into cardiac arrest and was rushed to the country's Kamuzu Central Hospital.



All eyes were on the question of succession in Malawi, which has seen political unrest in recent times and could be vulnerable to a power chasm. The expected successor to the presidency was supposed to be the vice president. But Vice President Joyce Banda had been embroiled in a very public imbroglio with the late President Mutharika for the past few years, ultimately leading to her being forced out of the ruling Democratic People's Party and the formation of her own People's Party in 2011. At the heart of the conflict was the ruling Democratic People's Party's decision to select President Mutharika's brother, Peter Mutharika, as the party's candidate to stand in the 2014 presidential election. It was a move that Banda opposed vociferously. To date, it was Peter Mutharika -- and not Banda -- who had acted as a "stand-in" for the president, as needed, during official occasions. Moreover, it was Peter Mutharika who was now internally viewed as the party's standard bearer into the future.

Still, with Bingu wa Mutharika now deceased, Vice President Banda's political prospects may have been revitalized. Certainly, Vice President Banda was hoping to step into the presidential shoes, despite her hostile relationship with the ruling party.

It should be noted that a Banda presidency might well be applauded by many citizens of the country who eschewed President Mutharika's recent slide into autocracy, as well as his economic mismanagement. Since 2011, Malawi has been dealing with violent protests, which erupted in response to the economic strife plaguing the country. Of particular concern has been the fuel and food shortages, which have stressed the population, escalating social unrest as protesters took to the streets to demand that President Mutharika resign from office. Although President Mutharika attempted to quell dissatisfaction from the public and criticism from his opponents by forming a new government, by March 2012, the sense of frustration felt by the people remained palpable. Indeed, protests were continuing. The government's response to the unrest in Malawi was to enact a crackdown against anti-government voices, thus sparking condemnation from human rights groups.

That background notwithstanding, Vice President Banda's eligibility for the presidency was a matter of debate since she was not appointed as acting president (due to the aforementioned feud with the late president). Accordingly, there were fears that the unorthodox scenario could spark a constitutional crisis.

Even with such anxieties prevailing, on April 7, 2012, Banda took the reins of power in the southern African country. The succession seemed to have been assured by provisions in the country's constitution that states the vice president takes over control of the country in the absence of the president. Thus, Banda declared: "The constitution prevails."

Having taken the oath of office, newly-inaugurated President Banda was met with resistance. Six government officials, including the ministers of information, health, local government, and youth, expressed opposition to Banda becoming president.

Still, it was Joyce Banda -- the women's rights advocate -- who took the oath of office and thanked her fellow citizens for remaining calm during this difficult time of transition. She also called for unity, saying: "I want all of us to move into the future with hope and with the spirit of oneness and unity. I just sincerely hope there will be no time for revenge, and I just hope that as a God-fearing nation we should allow God to move with us because if we don't move with God then we have failed."

In a somewhat related development, Peter Mutharika -- the younger brother of deceased President Mutharika -- was chosen officially to be the new leader of the country's ruling Democratic Progressive Party on April 15, 2012.

In the third week of May 2012, Malawi's new President Joyce Banda announced a Commission of Inquiry to investigate the circumstances leading the death of her predecessor -- President Bingu wa Mutharika. The commission would also be charged with looking into alleged attempts to circumvent the constitution by installing someone other than herself (then, the vice president) in the office of the president. In an address to parliament in the country's capital of Lilongwe, President Banda said: "I have decided to appoint a Commission of Inquiry to enquire into the death of our former president, late Ngwazi Professor Bingu wa Mutharika. Among other issues, the commission shall enquire into the date of death, the cause of death, medical attention available to our late president at the time of his death and the role and activities of various individuals during and in managing the transition."

At issue were the fears of a constitutional crisis that arose in Malawi following the sudden death of Mutharika a month prior. Although the constitution provided for power to be transferred to the vice president in such a scenario, then-Vice President Banda had not been immediately appointed as acting president due to a prevailing feud with the late president. That feud ultimately led to her being forced out of the ruling Democratic People's Party and the formation of her own People's Party in 2011. At the heart of the conflict was the ruling Democratic People's Party's decision to select President Mutharika's brother, Peter Mutharika, as the party's candidate to stand in the 2014 presidential election. It was a move that Banda opposed vociferously, but for the ruling party, it was Peter Mutharika who was internally viewed as the party's standard bearer into the future. Nevertheless, attempts by the Democratic People's Party to install Peter Mutharika as the new president ultimately ended in failure and it was Banda who, instead, took the oath of office.

Now, as the head of state, President Banda was trying to put the matter to rest by inaugurating this Commission of Inquiry. It should also be noted that in her address to parliament, President Banda made clear that her administration intended to improve frayed relations with donor countries, and that it would also repeal all oppressive legislation, including anti-gay legislation that put the former Mutharika leadership at odds with the West.

In mid-March 2013, 11 former government officials were arrested and charged with various



offenses including conspiracy to break the law, sedition, and perjury.

The 11 individuals were arrested following the publication of a report, which concluded that in the aftermath of the death of President Bingu wa Mutharika in April 2012, the cabal allegedly orchestrated a plot to prevent Joyce Banda -- the vice president at the time -- from assuming power as stipulated in the Constitution.

The report was commissioned by President Banda, who succeeded Mutharika as president, despite vociferous resistance from detractors -- including several government officials and cabinet minister. Those detractors argued that an ongoing feud between Banda and President Mutharika, along with the ruling Democratic People's Party's decision to select President Mutharika's brother, Peter Mutharika, as the party's leader, should disqualify Banda from becoming the new president. Nevertheless, it was Banda who ultimately took the oath of office.

After her inauguration into power in 2012, President Banda announced a Commission of Inquiry to investigate the circumstances leading the death of her predecessor -- President Bingu wa Mutharika, along with the attempts to circumvent the constitution by installing someone other than herself (then, the vice president) in the office of the president.

It should be noted that the late President Mutharika's younger brother, Peter Mutharika, was among the individuals arrested in Malawi in March 2013. Also among the group were former Information Minister Patricia Kaliati, former Youth Minister Symon Vuwa Kaunda, former Health Minister Jean Kalirani, former Presidential Affairs Minister Nicholas Dausi, former deputy Foreign Affairs and deputy Chief Secretary to the Government, Necton Mhura, Mutharika's Guard Commander Duncan Mwapasa, Economic Planning and Development Minister Goodall Gondwe, who had served as Mutharika Finance Minister, and Chief Secretary Bright Msaka, who also served as Chief Secretary in the former regime. In this way, the arrests constituted a sweeping indictment of leading political figures on the political landscape of Malawi, and suggested that President Banda continued to have a loyalty problem in her inner circle. A more positive interpretation for Banda, though, might be the fact that she now had a mandate of sorts to recalibrate her government with stalwarts.

On Oct. 10, 2013, President Joyce Banda of Malawi dissolved the country's cabinet. President Banda made the decision following her return from the United States where she was attending the General Assembly of the United Nations. The move to dissolve the cabinet appeared to be made in response to emerging reports of rampant fraud and corruption in the government. Of particular significance were the arrests of several government officials who were reported to have accumulated millions of dollars, with some of those funds discovered in their houses and cars. There were also suggestions that some of President Banda's own cabinet ministers were involved in the fraud and corruption scandal.

These revelations led to angry demands from both the political opposition parties and socio-economic organizations that President Banda either resign from office herself or fire key members of her administration, including the finance minister. Clearly, President Banda had decided that if she wished to hold onto her position as the president, her best option would be to dissolve the entire cabinet and start afresh. It was to be seen if her response would be enough to quiet the loud chorus of outrage across Malawi.

Presidential and parliamentary elections were set to be held in Malawi on May 20, 2014. At stake would be the presidency. Also at stake would be the composition of the unicameral National Assembly, which houses 193 seats and where members are popularly elected for five-year terms. (It should be noted that local elections would also be held on this day.)

The previous presidential election was held 2009 and won by the now-late Bingu wa Mutharika. In 2012, President Mutharika had died of a heart attack, prompting a political crisis over succession. The expected successor to the presidency was supposed to be the vice president. But Vice President Joyce Banda had been embroiled in a very public imbroglio with the president for several years, ultimately leading to her being forced out of the ruling Democratic People's Party (DPP) and forming her own People's Party in 2011. At the heart of the conflict was the ruling Democratic People's Party's decision to select President Mutharika's brother, Peter Mutharika, as the party's candidate to stand in the 2014 presidential election. It was a move that Banda opposed vociferously. Politically, it was Peter Mutharika -- and not Banda -- who had acted as a "stand-in" for the president, as needed, during official occasions. Moreover, it was Peter Mutharika who was internally viewed as the party's standard bearer into the future.

Still, with Bingu wa Mutharika now deceased, Vice President Banda's political prospects were revitalized. Certainly, Vice President Banda was hoping to step into the presidential shoes, despite her hostile relationship with the ruling party.

It should be noted that a Banda presidency was applauded by many citizens of the country who eschewed President Mutharika's slide into autocracy, as well as his economic mismanagement. From 2011, Malawi had been dealing with violent protests, which erupted in response to the economic strife plaguing the country. Of particular concern has been the fuel and food shortages, which have stressed the population, escalating social unrest as protesters took to the streets to demand that President Mutharika resign from office. Although President Mutharika attempted to quell dissatisfaction from the public and criticism from his opponents by forming a new government, by March 2012, the sense of frustration felt by the people remained palpable. Indeed, protests were continuing. The government's response to the unrest in Malawi was to enact a crackdown against anti-government voices, thus sparking condemnation from human rights groups.

That background notwithstanding, Banda's eligibility for the presidency was a matter of debate since she was not appointed as acting president (due to the aforementioned feud with the late

president). Accordingly, there were fears that the unorthodox scenario could spark a constitutional crisis. Nevertheless, in 2012, Banda took the reins of power in the southern African country and would be up for re-election in 2014. Her main opponent in 2014 would be Peter Mutharika of the ruling Democratic Progressive Party (DPP); however, there would be several other presidential contenders including Atupele Muluzi, the son of a former president.

It should be noted that the 2009 parliamentary elections were resoundingly won by the ruling Democratic Progressive Party (DPP). It was to be seen if the DPP would again see success at the polls in 2014. The other main political parties contesting the elections were the Malawi Congress Party (MCP) and the United Democratic Front (UDF). There were also some independents contesting the elections. The voting was set to be witnessed by an electoral observation mission from the European Union (EU).

On election day in May 2014, after a small portion of the votes had been tabulated, unofficial exit polls showed a small lead for Peter Mutharika and his Democratic Progressive Party (DPP). There was soon a chorus of claims that the elections were fraught with irregularities.

The claims of irregularities (and perhaps the signs that she would soon be defeated in the election contest) prompted President Joyce Banda -- a rival of Mutharika -- to declare the entire election "null and void" and declaring that fresh elections would be held in 90 days. At a news conference, Banda said, "In exercise of the powers conferred in section 88 (2) of the constitution, I hereby call for the nullification of all ongoing processes in relation to the 2014 tripartite elections, including announcement and counting of the results to cease forthwith."

Election officials admitted that there were serious election irregularities to be addressed; however, they also charged that the president did not have the authority to simply nullify elections. Meanwhile, supporters of Mutharika and the ruling party took to the streets to protest Banda's actions. Only days later, the high court of Malawi soon intervened and ruled that the presidential decree was unconstitutional; in this way, the court effectively blocked Banda's attempt to annul the general elections.

Realizing that her political cards may have been played, Banda soon announced that she would step down if the country's High Court validated the election result showing Mutharika and the DPP as the winners. In an interview with Reuters News, Banda said, "I have told the Malawi Electoral Council and related stakeholders that I will accept their decision, and the decision of the courts." She continued, "I will rest knowing that I tried to defend the rights of Malawians in a critical moment to ensure they have a leader elected in a fair and credible manner." It should be noted that while the initial phase of the Banda presidency was well-regarded, Banda's unpopular austerity measures and a spate of corruption allegations took a toll on her popularity in recent times, effectively revitalizing Mutharika's political prospects.

Ultimately, Malawi's High Court issued an injunction bringing an end to Banda's attempts to influence the election outcome. Then, by the close of May 2014, Malawi's electoral commission announced that Mutharika had won the presidential contest, securing 36.4 percent of the votes cast against Lazarus Chakwera, who won 27.8 percent, and outgoing President Banda who took 20.2 percent. At the parliamentary level, Mutharika's Democratic Progressive Party won the most seats. The electoral commission authorities also asserted that the elections had been free, fair, and credible.

The next elections would be held in 2019.

Editor's Note:

Malawi has increasingly been hailed as a model of economic development thanks to its annual growth of more than seven percent in recent years. It was clear that as of 2012 Malawi was now being faced with serious economic and socio-political challenges. Meanwhile, Joyce Banda made national history in April 2012 by becoming Malawi's first female leader and only the second female head of state in Africa. The Banda presidency was being applauded by many citizens of the country who eschewed the late President Mutharika's recent slide into autocracy, as well as his economic mismanagement. However, the 2013 arrests of government officials indicated that corruption continued to be a problem plaguing the country. It was to be seen how the new incoming Mutharika presidency (in power since 2014) would be received.

-- January 2015

*Written by Dr. Denise Youngblood Coleman, Editor in Chief and Executive Vice President, [www.countrywatch.com](http://www.countrywatch.com) See Bibliography for reference sources. Supplementary sources: New Encyclopedia Britannica; Malawi: The Politics of Despair; Where Silence Rules: The Suppression of Dissent in Malawi; Aspects of Central African History, Church, Law and Political Transition in Malawi 1992-1994; From Nyasaland to Malawi: Studies in Colonial History; Malawi at the Crossroads: Post-Colonial Political Economy.*

## Political Risk Index

### Political Risk Index

The **Political Risk Index** is a proprietary index measuring the level of risk posed to governments, corporations, and investors, based on a myriad of political and economic factors. The [Political Risk Index](#) is calculated using an established methodology by CountryWatch's Editor-in-Chief and is based on varied criteria\* including the following consideration: political stability, political representation, democratic accountability, freedom of expression, security and crime, risk of conflict, human development, jurisprudence and regulatory transparency, economic risk, foreign investment considerations, possibility of sovereign default, and corruption. Scores are assigned from 0-10 using the aforementioned criteria. A score of 0 marks the highest political risk, while a score of 10 marks the lowest political risk. Stated differently, countries with the lowest scores pose the greatest political risk. A score of 0 marks the most dire level of political risk and an ultimate nadir, while a score of 10 marks the lowest possible level of political risk, according to this proprietary index. Rarely will there be scores of 0 or 10 due to the reality that countries contain complex landscapes; as such, the index offers a range of possibilities ranging from lesser to greater risk.

| Country     | Assessment |
|-------------|------------|
| Afghanistan | 2          |
| Albania     | 4          |
| Algeria     | 6          |
| Andorra     | 9          |
| Angola      | 4          |

---

|                    |       |
|--------------------|-------|
| Antigua            | 8     |
| Argentina          | 4     |
| Armenia            | 4-5   |
| Australia          | 9.5   |
| Austria            | 9.5   |
| Azerbaijan         | 4     |
| Bahamas            | 8.5   |
| Bahrain            | 6     |
| Bangladesh         | 3.5   |
| Barbados           | 8.5-9 |
| Belarus            | 3     |
| Belgium            | 9     |
| Belize             | 8     |
| Benin              | 5     |
| Bhutan             | 5     |
| Bolivia            | 5     |
| Bosnia-Herzegovina | 4     |
| Botswana           | 7     |

---

---

|                          |     |
|--------------------------|-----|
| Brazil                   | 7   |
| Brunei                   | 7   |
| Bulgaria                 | 6   |
| Burkina Faso             | 4   |
| Burma (Myanmar)          | 4.5 |
| Burundi                  | 3   |
| Cambodia                 | 4   |
| Cameroon                 | 5   |
| Canada                   | 9.5 |
| Cape Verde               | 6   |
| Central African Republic | 3   |
| Chad                     | 4   |
| Chile                    | 9   |
| China                    | 7   |
| China: Hong Kong         | 8   |
| China: Taiwan            | 8   |
| Colombia                 | 7   |
| Comoros                  | 5   |

---

|                    |       |
|--------------------|-------|
| Congo DRC          | 3     |
| Congo RC           | 4     |
| Costa Rica         | 8     |
| Cote d'Ivoire      | 4.5   |
| Croatia            | 7     |
| Cuba               | 4-4.5 |
| Cyprus             | 5     |
| Czech Republic     | 8     |
| Denmark            | 9.5   |
| Djibouti           | 4.5   |
| Dominica           | 7     |
| Dominican Republic | 6     |
| East Timor         | 5     |
| Ecuador            | 6     |
| Egypt              | 5     |
| El Salvador        | 7     |
| Equatorial Guinea  | 4     |
| Eritrea            | 3     |



|                             |       |
|-----------------------------|-------|
| Estonia                     | 8     |
| Ethiopia                    | 4     |
| Fiji                        | 5     |
| Finland                     | 9     |
| Fr. Yugoslav Rep. Macedonia | 5     |
| France                      | 9     |
| Gabon                       | 5     |
| Gambia                      | 4     |
| Georgia                     | 5     |
| Germany                     | 9.5   |
| Ghana                       | 6     |
| Greece                      | 4.5-5 |
| Grenada                     | 8     |
| Guatemala                   | 6     |
| Guinea                      | 3.5   |
| Guinea-Bissau               | 3.5   |
| Guyana                      | 4.5   |
| Haiti                       | 3.5   |

|                    |       |
|--------------------|-------|
| Holy See (Vatican) | 9     |
| Honduras           | 4.5-5 |
| Hungary            | 7     |
| Iceland            | 8.5-9 |
| India              | 7.5-8 |
| Indonesia          | 6     |
| Iran               | 3.5-4 |
| Iraq               | 2.5-3 |
| Ireland            | 8-8.5 |
| Israel             | 8     |
| Italy              | 7.5   |
| Jamaica            | 6.5-7 |
| Japan              | 9     |
| Jordan             | 6.5   |
| Kazakhstan         | 6     |
| Kenya              | 5     |
| Kiribati           | 7     |
| Korea, North       | 1     |

---

|               |     |
|---------------|-----|
| Korea, South  | 8   |
| Kosovo        | 4   |
| Kuwait        | 7   |
| Kyrgyzstan    | 4.5 |
| Laos          | 4.5 |
| Latvia        | 7   |
| Lebanon       | 5.5 |
| Lesotho       | 6   |
| Liberia       | 3.5 |
| Libya         | 2   |
| Liechtenstein | 9   |
| Lithuania     | 7.5 |
| Luxembourg    | 9   |
| Madagascar    | 4   |
| Malawi        | 4   |
| Malaysia      | 8   |
| Maldives      | 4.5 |
| Mali          | 4   |

---

---

|                  |       |
|------------------|-------|
| Malta            | 8     |
| Marshall Islands | 6     |
| Mauritania       | 4.5-5 |
| Mauritius        | 7     |
| Mexico           | 6.5   |
| Micronesia       | 7     |
| Moldova          | 5     |
| Monaco           | 9     |
| Mongolia         | 5     |
| Montenegro       | 6     |
| Morocco          | 6.5   |
| Mozambique       | 4.5-5 |
| Namibia          | 6.5-7 |
| Nauru            | 6     |
| Nepal            | 4     |
| Netherlands      | 9.5   |
| New Zealand      | 9.5   |
| Nicaragua        | 5     |
|                  |       |

---

---

|                       |       |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Niger                 | 4     |
| Nigeria               | 4.5   |
| Norway                | 9.5   |
| Oman                  | 7     |
| Pakistan              | 3.5   |
| Palau                 | 7     |
| Panama                | 7.5   |
| Papua New Guinea      | 5     |
| Paraguay              | 6.5-7 |
| Peru                  | 7     |
| Philippines           | 6     |
| Poland                | 8     |
| Portugal              | 7.5   |
| Qatar                 | 7.5   |
| Romania               | 5.5   |
| Russia                | 5.5   |
| Rwanda                | 5     |
| Saint Kitts and Nevis | 8     |

---

---

|                              |     |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Saint Lucia                  | 8   |
| Saint Vincent and Grenadines | 8   |
| Samoa                        | 7   |
| San Marino                   | 9   |
| Sao Tome and Principe        | 5.5 |
| Saudi Arabia                 | 6   |
| Senegal                      | 6   |
| Serbia                       | 5   |
| Seychelles                   | 7   |
| Sierra Leone                 | 4.5 |
| Singapore                    | 9   |
| Slovak Republic (Slovakia)   | 8   |
| Slovenia                     | 8   |
| Solomon Islands              | 6   |
| Somalia                      | 2   |
| South Africa                 | 7   |
| Spain                        | 7.5 |
| Sri Lanka                    | 5   |

---

|                     |       |
|---------------------|-------|
| Sudan               | 3.5   |
| Suriname            | 5     |
| Swaziland           | 5     |
| Sweden              | 9.5   |
| Switzerland         | 9.5   |
| Syria               | 2     |
| Tajikistan          | 4.5   |
| Tanzania            | 6     |
| Thailand            | 6.5   |
| Togo                | 4.5   |
| Tonga               | 7     |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 8     |
| Tunisia             | 6     |
| Turkey              | 7     |
| Turkmenistan        | 4.5   |
| Tuvalu              | 7     |
| Uganda              | 6     |
| Ukraine             | 3.5-4 |

|                      |     |
|----------------------|-----|
| United Arab Emirates | 7   |
| United Kingdom       | 9   |
| United States        | 9.5 |
| Uruguay              | 8   |
| Uzbekistan           | 4   |
| Vanuatu              | 7   |
| Venezuela            | 4   |
| Vietnam              | 5   |
| Yemen                | 3   |
| Zambia               | 4.5 |
| Zimbabwe             | 3   |

#### \*Methodology

The [Political Risk Index](#) is calculated by CountryWatch's Editor-in-Chief and is based on the combined scoring of varied criteria as follows --

1. political stability (record of peaceful transitions of power, ability of government to stay in office and carry out policies as a result of productive executive-legislative relationship, perhaps with popular support vis a vis risk of government collapse)
2. political representation (right of suffrage, free and fair elections, multi-party participation, and influence of foreign powers)
3. democratic accountability (record of respect for political rights, human rights, and civil liberties, backed by constitutional protections)



4. freedom of expression (media freedom and freedom of expression, right to dissent or express political opposition, backed by constitutional protections)
5. security and crime (the degree to which a country has security mechanisms that ensures safety of citizens and ensures law and order, without resorting to extra-judicial measures)
6. risk of conflict (the presence of conflict; record of coups or civil disturbances; threat of war; threats posed by internal or external tensions; threat or record of terrorism or insurgencies)
7. human development (quality of life; access to education; socio-economic conditions; systemic concern for the status of women and children)
8. jurisprudence and regulatory transparency (the impartiality of the legal system, the degree of transparency within the regulatory system of a country and the durability of that structure)
9. economic conditions (economic stability, investment climate, degree of nationalization of industries, property rights, labor force development)
10. corruption ( the degree of corruption in a country and/or efforts by the government to address graft and other irregularities)

Editor's Note:

As of 2015, the current climate of upheaval internationally -- both politically and economically -- has affected the ratings for several countries across the world.

North Korea, [Afghanistan](#), [Somalia](#), and [Zimbabwe](#) -- retain their low rankings.

Several Middle Eastern and North African countries, such as [Tunisia](#), [Egypt](#), [Libya](#), [Syria](#), [Iraq](#) and [Yemen](#) were downgraded in recent years due to political instability occurring in the "season of unrest" sweeping the region since 2011 and continuing today. The worst downgrades affected [Syria](#) where civil war is at play, along with the rampage of terror being carried out by Islamist terrorists who have also seized control over part of Syrian territory. [Iraq](#) has been further downgraded due to the rampage of Islamist terrorists and their takeover of wide swaths of Iraqi territory. [Libya](#) has also been downgraded further due to its slippage into failed state status; at issue in [Libya](#) have been an ongoing power struggle between rival militias. [Yemen](#) continues to hold steady with a poor ranking due to continued unrest at the hands of Houthi rebels, secessionists, al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, and Islamic State. Its landscape has been further complicated by the fact that it is now the site of a proxy war between [Iran](#) and [Saudi](#)

[Arabia](#). Conversely, [Tunisia](#) and [Egypt](#) have seen slight upgrades as these countries stabilize.

In Africa, [Zimbabwe](#) continues to be one of the bleak spots of the world with the Mugabe regime effectively destroying the country's once vibrant economy, and miring [Zimbabwe](#) with an exceedingly high rate of inflation, debilitating unemployment, devolving public services, and critical food shortages; rampant crime and political oppression round out the landscape. [Somalia](#) also sports a poor ranking due to the continuing influence of the terror group, al-Shabab, which was not operating across the border in [Kenya](#). On the upside, [Nigeria](#), which was ineffectively dealing with the threat posed by the terror group, Boko Haram, was making some strides on the national security front with its new president at the helm. [Mali](#) was slightly upgraded due to its efforts to return to constitutional order following the 2012 coup and to neutralize the threat of separatists and Islamists. But the [Central African Republic](#) was downgraded due to the takeover of the government by Muslim Seleka rebels and a continued state of lawlessness in that country. [South Sudan](#) -- the world's newest nation state -- has not been officially included in this assessment; however, it can be unofficially assessed to be in the vicinity of "3" due to its manifold political and economic challenges. [Burkina Faso](#), [Burundi](#) and [Guinea](#) have been downgraded due to political unrest, with [Guinea](#) also having to deal with the burgeoning Ebola crisis.

In Europe, [Ukraine](#) was downgraded due to the unrest facing that country following its Maidan revolution that triggered a pro-Russian uprising in the eastern part of the country. [Russia](#) was also implicated in the Ukrainian crisis due to its intervention on behalf of pro-Russian separatists, as well as its annexation of the Ukrainian territory of Crimea. Strains on the infrastructure of southern and eastern European countries, such as [Serbia](#), [Croatia](#), and [Hungary](#), due to an influx of refugees was expected to pose social and economic challenges, and slight downgrades were made accordingly. So too, a corruption crisis for the Romanian prime minister has affected the ranking of that country. Meanwhile, the rankings for [Spain](#), [Portugal](#), [Ireland](#), and [Italy](#) were maintained due to debt woes and the concomitant effect on the euro zone. [Greece](#), another euro zone nation, was earlier downgraded due to its sovereign debt crisis; however, no further downgrade was added since the country was able to successfully forge a bailout rescue deal with creditor institutions. Cyprus' exposure to Greek banks yielded a downgrade in its case.

In Asia, [Nepal](#) was downgraded in response to continuous political instability and a constitutional crisis that prevails well after landmark elections were held. Both [India](#) and [China](#) retain their rankings; [India](#) holds a slightly higher ranking than [China](#) due to its record of democratic representation and accountability. Increasing violence and political instability in [Pakistan](#) resulted in a downgrade for this country's already low rating. Meanwhile, [Singapore](#) retained its strong rankings due to its continued effective stewardship of the economy and political stability.

In the Americas, ongoing political and economic woes, as well as crime and corruption have affected the rankings for [Mexico](#), [Guatemala](#), and [Brazil](#). [Argentina](#) was downgraded due to its default on debt following the failure of talks with bond holders. [Venezuela](#) was downgraded due to

its mix of market unfriendly policies and political oppression. For the moment, the [United States](#) maintains a strong ranking along with [Canada](#), and most of the English-speaking countries of the Caribbean; however, a renewed debt ceiling crisis could cause the [United States](#) to be downgraded in a future edition. Finally, a small but significant upgrade was attributed to [Cuba](#) due to its recent pro-business reforms and its normalization of ties with the United States.

Source:

Dr. Denise Youngblood Coleman, Editor in Chief, CountryWatch Inc. [www.countrywatch.com](http://www.countrywatch.com)

Updated:

2015

---

## Political Stability

### Political Stability

The **Political Stability Index** is a proprietary index measuring a country's level of stability, standard of good governance, record of constitutional order, respect for human rights, and overall strength of democracy. The [Political Stability Index](#) is calculated using an established methodology\* by CountryWatch's Editor-in-Chief and is based on a given country's record of peaceful transitions of power, ability of a government to stay in office and carry out its policies vis a vis risk credible risks of government collapse. Threats include coups, domestic violence and instability, terrorism, etc. This index measures the dynamic between the quality of a country's government and the threats that can compromise and undermine stability. Scores are assigned from 0-10 using the aforementioned criteria. A score of 0 marks the lowest level of political stability and an ultimate nadir, while a score of 10 marks the highest level of political stability possible, according to this proprietary index. Rarely will there be scores of 0 or 10 due to the reality that countries contain complex landscapes; as such, the index offers a range of possibilities ranging from lesser to greater stability.

| Country | Assessment |
|---------|------------|
|         |            |

|             |       |
|-------------|-------|
|             |       |
| Afghanistan | 2     |
| Albania     | 4.5-5 |
| Algeria     | 5     |
| Andorra     | 9.5   |
| Angola      | 4.5-5 |
| Antigua     | 8.5-9 |
| Argentina   | 7     |
| Armenia     | 5.5   |
| Australia   | 9.5   |
| Austria     | 9.5   |
| Azerbaijan  | 5     |
| Bahamas     | 9     |
| Bahrain     | 6     |
| Bangladesh  | 4.5   |
| Barbados    | 9     |
| Belarus     | 4     |
| Belgium     | 9     |
|             |       |

|                          |       |
|--------------------------|-------|
| Belize                   | 8     |
| Benin                    | 5     |
| Bhutan                   | 5     |
| Bolivia                  | 6     |
| Bosnia-Herzegovina       | 5     |
| Botswana                 | 8.5   |
| Brazil                   | 7     |
| Brunei                   | 8     |
| Bulgaria                 | 7.5   |
| Burkina Faso             | 4     |
| Burma (Myanmar)          | 4.5   |
| Burundi                  | 4     |
| Cambodia                 | 4.5-5 |
| Cameroon                 | 6     |
| Canada                   | 9.5   |
| Cape Verde               | 6     |
| Central African Republic | 3     |
| Chad                     | 4.5   |

---

|                    |     |
|--------------------|-----|
| Chile              | 9   |
| China              | 7   |
| China: Hong Kong   | 8   |
| China: Taiwan      | 8   |
| Colombia           | 7.5 |
| Comoros            | 5   |
| Congo DRC          | 3   |
| Congo RC           | 5   |
| Costa Rica         | 9.5 |
| Cote d'Ivoire      | 3.5 |
| Croatia            | 7.5 |
| Cuba               | 4.5 |
| Cyprus             | 8   |
| Czech Republic     | 8.5 |
| Denmark            | 9.5 |
| Djibouti           | 5   |
| Dominica           | 8.5 |
| Dominican Republic | 7   |

---

|                          |       |
|--------------------------|-------|
| East Timor               | 5     |
| Ecuador                  | 7     |
| Egypt                    | 4.5-5 |
| El Salvador              | 7.5-8 |
| Equatorial Guinea        | 4.5   |
| Eritrea                  | 4     |
| Estonia                  | 9     |
| Ethiopia                 | 4.5   |
| Fiji                     | 5     |
| Finland                  | 9     |
| Fr.YugoslavRep.Macedonia | 6.5   |
| France                   | 9     |
| Gabon                    | 5     |
| Gambia                   | 4.5   |
| Georgia                  | 5     |
| Germany                  | 9.5   |
| Ghana                    | 7     |
| Greece                   | 6     |



|                    |       |
|--------------------|-------|
| Grenada            | 8.5   |
| Guatemala          | 7     |
| Guinea             | 3.5-4 |
| Guinea-Bissau      | 4     |
| Guyana             | 6     |
| Haiti              | 3.5-4 |
| Holy See (Vatican) | 9.5   |
| Honduras           | 6     |
| Hungary            | 7.5   |
| Iceland            | 9     |
| India              | 8     |
| Indonesia          | 7     |
| Iran               | 3.5   |
| Iraq               | 2.5   |
| Ireland            | 9.5   |
| Israel             | 8     |
| Italy              | 8.5-9 |
| Jamaica            | 8     |

|               |       |
|---------------|-------|
| Japan         | 9     |
| Jordan        | 6     |
| Kazakhstan    | 6     |
| Kenya         | 5     |
| Kiribati      | 8     |
| Korea, North  | 2     |
| Korea, South  | 8.5   |
| Kosovo        | 5.5   |
| Kuwait        | 7     |
| Kyrgyzstan    | 5     |
| Laos          | 5     |
| Latvia        | 8.5   |
| Lebanon       | 5.5   |
| Lesotho       | 5     |
| Liberia       | 3.5-4 |
| Libya         | 2     |
| Liechtenstein | 9     |
| Lithuania     | 9     |

---

|                  |       |
|------------------|-------|
| Luxembourg       | 9.5   |
| Madagascar       | 4     |
| Malawi           | 5     |
| Malaysia         | 8     |
| Maldives         | 4.5-5 |
| Mali             | 4.5-5 |
| Malta            | 9     |
| Marshall Islands | 8     |
| Mauritania       | 6     |
| Mauritius        | 8     |
| Mexico           | 6.5-7 |
| Micronesia       | 8     |
| Moldova          | 5.5   |
| Monaco           | 9.5   |
| Mongolia         | 6.5-7 |
| Montenegro       | 8     |
| Morocco          | 7     |
| Mozambique       | 5     |

---

|                  |     |
|------------------|-----|
| Namibia          | 8.5 |
| Nauru            | 8   |
| Nepal            | 4.5 |
| Netherlands      | 9.5 |
| New Zealand      | 9.5 |
| Nicaragua        | 6   |
| Niger            | 4.5 |
| Nigeria          | 4.5 |
| Norway           | 9.5 |
| Oman             | 7   |
| Pakistan         | 3   |
| Palau            | 8   |
| Panama           | 8.5 |
| Papua New Guinea | 6   |
| Paraguay         | 8   |
| Peru             | 7.5 |
| Philippines      | 6   |
| Poland           | 9   |

|                              |     |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Portugal                     | 9   |
| Qatar                        | 7   |
| Romania                      | 7   |
| Russia                       | 6   |
| Rwanda                       | 5   |
| Saint Kitts and Nevis        | 9   |
| Saint Lucia                  | 9   |
| Saint Vincent and Grenadines | 9   |
| Samoa                        | 8   |
| San Marino                   | 9.5 |
| Sao Tome and Principe        | 7   |
| Saudi Arabia                 | 6   |
| Senegal                      | 7.5 |
| Serbia                       | 6.5 |
| Seychelles                   | 8   |
| Sierra Leone                 | 4.5 |
| Singapore                    | 9.5 |
| Slovak Republic (Slovakia)   | 8.5 |

---

|                     |       |
|---------------------|-------|
| Slovenia            | 9     |
| Solomon Islands     | 6.5-7 |
| Somalia             | 2     |
| South Africa        | 7.5   |
| Spain               | 9     |
| Sri Lanka           | 5     |
| Sudan               | 3     |
| Suriname            | 5     |
| Swaziland           | 5     |
| Sweden              | 9.5   |
| Switzerland         | 9.5   |
| Syria               | 2     |
| Tajikistan          | 4.5   |
| Tanzania            | 6     |
| Thailand            | 6     |
| Togo                | 5     |
| Tonga               | 7     |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 8     |

---

---

|                      |       |
|----------------------|-------|
| Tunisia              | 5     |
| Turkey               | 7.5   |
| Turkmenistan         | 5     |
| Tuvalu               | 8.5   |
| Uganda               | 6     |
| Ukraine              | 3.5-4 |
| United Arab Emirates | 7     |
| United Kingdom       | 9     |
| United States        | 9     |
| Uruguay              | 8.5   |
| Uzbekistan           | 4     |
| Vanuatu              | 8.5   |
| Venezuela            | 4.5-5 |
| Vietnam              | 4.5   |
| Yemen                | 2.5   |
| Zambia               | 5     |
| Zimbabwe             | 3     |



### \*Methodology

The Political Stability Index is calculated by CountryWatch's Editor-in-Chief and is based on the combined scoring of varied criteria as follows --

1. record of peaceful transitions of power ( free and fair elections; adherence to political accords)
2. record of democratic representation, presence of instruments of democracy; systemic accountability
3. respect for human rights; respect for civil rights
4. strength of the system of jurisprudence, adherence to constitutional order, and good governance
5. ability of a government to stay in office and carry out its policies vis a vis risk credible risks of government collapse (i.e. government stability versus a country being deemed "ungovernable")
6. threat of coups, insurgencies, and insurrection
7. level of unchecked crime and corruption
8. risk of terrorism and other threats to national security
9. relationship with regional powers and international community; record of bilateral or multilateral cooperation
10. degree of economic strife (i.e. economic and financial challenges)

### Editor's Note:

As of 2015, the current climate of upheaval internationally -- both politically and economically -- has affected the ratings for several countries across the world. The usual suspects -- North Korea, [Afghanistan](#), and [Somalia](#) -- retain their low rankings. The reclusive and ultra-dictatorial North Korean regime, which has terrified the world with its nuclear threats, has exhibited internal instability. Of note was a cut-throat purge of hundreds of high ranking officials deemed to be a threat to Kim Jung-un. Despite their attempts to recover from years of lawlessness, war, and warlordism, both [Afghanistan](#) and [Somalia](#) continue to be beset by terrorism and turmoil. In [Afghanistan](#), while international forces have seen success in the effort against the terror group, al-Qaida, the other Islamist extremist group, the Taliban, continues to carry out a vicious insurgency using terrorism. In [Somalia](#), while the government attempts to do the nation's business, the terror

group, al-Shabab continues to make its presence known not only in [Somalia](#), but across the border into [Kenya](#) with devastating results/ Also in this category is [Iraq](#), which continues to be rocked by horrific violence and terrorism at the hands of Islamic State, which has taken over wide swaths of Iraqi territory.

Syria, [Libya](#), and [Yemen](#) have been added to this unfortunate echelon of the world's most politically unstable countries. [Syria](#) has been mired by the twin hazards of 1. a civil war as rebels oppose the Assad regime; and 2. the rampage of terror being carried out by Islamic State, which also seized control over vast portions of Syrian territory. Meanwhile, the post-Qaddafi landscape of [Libya](#) has devolved into chaos as rival militias battle for control -- the elected government of the country notwithstanding. Rounding out this grim triad is [Yemen](#), which was dealing with a Houthi rebellion, secessionists in the south, as well as the threat of terrorism from al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula as well as Islamic State, while also being the site of a proxy war between Shi'a [Iran](#) and Sunni [Saudi Arabia](#).

Meanwhile, several Middle Eastern and North African countries, such as [Tunisia](#), [Egypt](#), and [Bahrain](#) were downgraded in recent years due to political instability occurring in the "season of unrest" sweeping the region since 2011 and continuing today. All three of these countries have stabilized in recent years and have been upgraded accordingly. In [Bahrain](#), the landscape had calmed. In [Egypt](#), the secular military-backed government has generated criticism for its crackdown on the Muslim Brotherhood; however, the country had ratified the presidency via democratic elections and were on track to hold parliamentary elections as the country moved along the path of democratization. Perhaps the most impressive story was coming out of [Tunisia](#) -- the country whose Jasmine Revolution sparked the entire Arab Spring -- and where after a few years of strife, a new progressive constitution was passed into law and a secular government had been elected to power. [Tunisia](#), [Egypt](#), and [Bahrain](#) have seen slight upgrades as these countries stabilize.

In Africa, the [Central African Republic](#) was downgraded the previous year due to the takeover of the government by Muslim Seleka rebels. Although the country has been trying to emerge from this crisis, the fact of the matter was that it was difficult to halt the precipitous decline into lawlessness in that country. [Zimbabwe](#) has maintained its consistently poor ranking due to the dictatorial regime of Mugabe, who continues to hold a tight grip on power, intimidates the opposition, squashes dissent, and oppresses the white farmer population of the country. Moving in a slightly improved direction is [Nigeria](#), which has sported abysmal ratings due to the government's fecklessness in dealing with the threat posed by the Islamist terror group, Boko Haram. Under its newly-elected government, there appears to be more of a concerted effort to make national security a priority action item. [Mali](#) was also slightly upgraded due to its efforts to return to constitutional order following the 2012 coup and to neutralize the threat of separatists and Islamists. Political instability has visited [Burkina Faso](#) and [Burundi](#) as the leaders of those countries attempted to side-step constitutional limits to hold onto power. In [Burundi](#), an attempted

coup ensued but quelled, and the president won a (questionable) new term in office; unrest has since punctuated the landscape. In [Burkina Faso](#), the political climate has turned stormy as a result of a successful coup that ended the rule of the president, and then a putsch against the transitional government. These two African countries have been downgraded as a result.

It should be noted that the African country of South [Sudan](#) -- the world's newest nation state -- has not been officially included in this assessment; however, it can be unofficially assessed to be in the vicinity of "3" due to its manifold political and economic challenges. [Guinea](#) has endured poor rankings throughout, but was slightly downgraded further over fears of social unrest and the Ebola health crisis.

In Europe, [Ukraine](#) was downgraded due to the unrest facing that country following its Maidan revolution that triggered a pro-Russian uprising in the eastern part of the country. [Russia](#) was also implicated in the Ukrainian crisis due to its intervention on behalf of pro-Russian separatists, as well as its annexation of the Ukrainian territory of Crimea. [Serbia](#) and [Albania](#) were slightly downgraded due to eruptions of unrest, while [Romania](#) was slightly downgraded on the basis of corruption charges against the prime minister. [Spain](#), [Portugal](#), [Ireland](#), and [Italy](#) were downgraded due to debt woes and the concomitant effect on the euro zone. [Greece](#), another euro zone nation, was downgraded the previous year due to its sovereign debt crisis; however, the country successfully forged a rescue deal with international creditors and stayed within the Euro zone. Greek voters rewarded the hitherto unknown upstart party at the polls for these efforts. As a result, [Greece](#) was actually upgraded slightly as it proved to the world that it could endure the political and economic storms. Meanwhile, [Germany](#), [France](#), [Switzerland](#), the [United Kingdom](#), the [Netherlands](#), and the Scandinavian countries continue to post impressive ranking consistent with these countries' strong records of democracy, freedom, and peaceful transfers of power.

In Asia, [Nepal](#) was downgraded in response to continuous political instability well after landmark elections that prevails today. [Cambodia](#) was very slightly downgraded due to post-election instability that has resulted in occasional flares of violence. Despite the "trifecta of tragedy" in [Japan](#) in 2011 -- the earthquake, the ensuing tsunami, and the resulting nuclear crisis -- and the appreciable destabilization of the economic and political terrain therein, this country has only slightly been downgraded. Japan's challenges have been assessed to be transient, the government remains accountable, and there is little risk of default. Both [India](#) and [China](#) retain their rankings; [India](#) holds a slightly higher ranking than [China](#) due to its record of democratic representation and accountability. Increasing violence and political instability in [Pakistan](#) resulted in a downgrade for this country's already low rating.

In the Americas, [Haiti](#) retained its downgraded status due to ongoing political and economic woes. [Mexico](#) was downgraded due to its alarming rate of crime. [Guatemala](#) was downgraded due to charges of corruption, the arrest of the president, and uncertainty over the outcome of elections. [Brazil](#) was downgraded due to the corruption charges erupting on the political landscape, the

stalling of the economy, and the increasingly loud calls for the impeachment of President Rousseff. [Argentina](#) was downgraded due to its default on debt following the failure of talks with bond holders. [Venezuela](#) was downgraded due to the fact that the country's post-Chavez government is every bit as autocratic and nationalistic, but even more inclined to oppress its political opponents. [Colombia](#) was upgraded slightly due to efforts aimed at securing a peace deal with the FARC insurgents. A small but significant upgrade was attributed to [Cuba](#) due to its recent pro-business reforms and its normalization of ties with the United States. Meanwhile, the [United States](#), [Canada](#), [Costa Rica](#), [Panama](#), and most of the English-speaking countries of the Caribbean retain their strong rankings due to their records of stability and peaceful transfers of power.

In the Pacific, [Fiji](#) was upgraded due to its return to constitutional order and democracy with the holding of the first elections in eight years.

In Oceania, [Maldives](#) has been slightly downgraded due to the government's continued and rather relentless persecution of the country's former pro-democracy leader - former President Nasheed.

Source:

Dr. Denise Youngblood Coleman, Editor in Chief, CountryWatch Inc. [www.countrywatch.com](http://www.countrywatch.com)

Updated:

2015

---

## Freedom Rankings

Freedom Rankings

### Freedom in the World

Editor's Note: This ranking by Freedom House quantifies political freedom and civil liberties into a single combined index on each sovereign country's level of freedom and liberty. The initials "PR"

and "CL" stand for Political Rights and Civil Liberties, respectively. The number 1 represents the most free countries and the number 7 represents the least free. Several countries fall in the continuum in between. The freedom ratings reflect an overall judgment based on survey results.

| Country              | PR  | CL | Freedom Status | Trend Arrow |
|----------------------|-----|----|----------------|-------------|
| Afghanistan          | 6 ? | 6  | Not Free       |             |
| Albania*             | 3   | 3  | Partly Free    |             |
| Algeria              | 6   | 5  | Not Free       |             |
| Andorra*             | 1   | 1  | Free           |             |
| Angola               | 6   | 5  | Not Free       |             |
| Antigua and Barbuda* | 3 ? | 2  | Free           |             |
| Argentina*           | 2   | 2  | Free           |             |
| Armenia              | 6   | 4  | Partly Free    |             |
| Australia*           | 1   | 1  | Free           |             |
| Austria*             | 1   | 1  | Free           |             |
| Azerbaijan           | 6   | 5  | Not Free       |             |
| Bahamas*             | 1   | 1  | Free           |             |
| Bahrain              | 6 ? | 5  | Not Free ?     |             |
| Bangladesh*          | 3 ? | 4  | Partly Free    |             |

|                     |     |   |             |   |
|---------------------|-----|---|-------------|---|
| Barbados*           | 1   | 1 | Free        |   |
| Belarus             | 7   | 6 | Not Free    |   |
| Belgium*            | 1   | 1 | Free        |   |
| Belize*             | 1   | 2 | Free        |   |
| Benin*              | 2   | 2 | Free        |   |
| Bhutan              | 4   | 5 | Partly Free |   |
| Bolivia*            | 3   | 3 | Partly Free |   |
| Bosnia-Herzegovina* | 4   | 3 | Partly Free |   |
| Botswana*           | 3 ? | 2 | Free        |   |
| Brazil*             | 2   | 2 | Free        |   |
| Brunei              | 6   | 5 | Not Free    |   |
| Bulgaria*           | 2   | 2 | Free        |   |
| Burkina Faso        | 5   | 3 | Partly Free |   |
| Burma               | 7   | 7 | Not Free    |   |
| Burundi*            | 4   | 5 | Partly Free | ↑ |
| Cambodia            | 6   | 5 | Not Free    | ↓ |
| Cameroon            | 6   | 6 | Not Free    |   |
| Canada*             | 1   | 1 | Free        |   |

|                          |     |   |             |   |
|--------------------------|-----|---|-------------|---|
| Cape Verde*              | 1   | 1 | Free        |   |
| Central African Republic | 5   | 5 | Partly Free |   |
| Chad                     | 7   | 6 | Not Free    |   |
| Chile*                   | 1   | 1 | Free        |   |
| China                    | 7   | 6 | Not Free    |   |
| Colombia*                | 3   | 4 | Partly Free |   |
| Comoros*                 | 3   | 4 | Partly Free |   |
| Congo (Brazzaville )     | 6   | 5 | Not Free    | ↓ |
| Congo (Kinshasa)         | 6   | 6 | Not Free    | ↓ |
| Costa Rica*              | 1   | 1 | Free        |   |
| Cote d'Ivoire            | 6   | 5 | Not Free    |   |
| Croatia*                 | 1 ? | 2 | Free        |   |
| Cuba                     | 7   | 6 | Not Free    |   |
| Cyprus*                  | 1   | 1 | Free        |   |
| Czech Republic*          | 1   | 1 | Free        |   |
| Denmark*                 | 1   | 1 | Free        |   |
| Djibouti                 | 5   | 5 | Partly Free |   |
| Dominica*                | 1   | 1 | Free        |   |
|                          |     |   |             |   |



|                     |   |     |             |   |
|---------------------|---|-----|-------------|---|
| Dominican Republic* | 2 | 2   | Free        | ↓ |
| East Timor*         | 3 | 4   | Partly Free |   |
| Ecuador*            | 3 | 3   | Partly Free |   |
| Egypt               | 6 | 5   | Not Free    |   |
| El Salvador*        | 2 | 3   | Free        |   |
| Equatorial Guinea   | 7 | 7   | Not Free    |   |
| Eritrea             | 7 | 7 ? | Not Free    |   |
| Estonia*            | 1 | 1   | Free        |   |
| Ethiopia            | 5 | 5   | Partly Free | ↓ |
| Fiji                | 6 | 4   | Partly Free |   |
| Finland*            | 1 | 1   | Free        |   |
| France*             | 1 | 1   | Free        |   |
| Gabon               | 6 | 5 ? | Not Free ?  |   |
| The Gambia          | 5 | 5 ? | Partly Free |   |
| Georgia             | 4 | 4   | Partly Free |   |
| Germany*            | 1 | 1   | Free        |   |
| Ghana*              | 1 | 2   | Free        |   |
| Greece*             | 1 | 2   | Free        |   |
|                     |   |     |             |   |

|                |     |     |             |   |
|----------------|-----|-----|-------------|---|
| Grenada*       | 1   | 2   | Free        |   |
| Guatemala*     | 4 ? | 4   | Partly Free |   |
| Guinea         | 7   | 6 ? | Not Free    |   |
| Guinea-Bissau* | 4   | 4   | Partly Free |   |
| Guyana*        | 2   | 3   | Free        |   |
| Haiti*         | 4   | 5   | Partly Free |   |
| Honduras       | 4 ? | 4 ? | Partly Free |   |
| Hungary*       | 1   | 1   | Free        |   |
| Iceland*       | 1   | 1   | Free        |   |
| India*         | 2   | 3   | Free        |   |
| Indonesia*     | 2   | 3   | Free        |   |
| Iran           | 6   | 6   | Not Free    | ↓ |
| Iraq           | 5 ? | 6   | Not Free    |   |
| Ireland*       | 1   | 1   | Free        |   |
| Israel*        | 1   | 2   | Free        |   |
| Italy*         | 1   | 2   | Free        |   |
| Jamaica*       | 2   | 3   | Free        |   |
| Japan*         | 1   | 2   | Free        |   |
|                |     |     |             |   |

|                |     |     |               |   |
|----------------|-----|-----|---------------|---|
| Jordan         | 6 ? | 5   | Not Free ?    |   |
| Kazakhstan     | 6   | 5   | Not Free      | ↓ |
| Kenya          | 4   | 4 ? | Partly Free   |   |
| Kiribati*      | 1   | 1   | Free          |   |
| Kosovo         | 5 ? | 4 ? | Partly Free ? |   |
| Kuwait         | 4   | 4   | Partly Free   |   |
| Kyrgyzstan     | 6 ? | 5 ? | Not Free ?    |   |
| Laos           | 7   | 6   | Not Free      |   |
| Latvia*        | 2   | 1   | Free          |   |
| Lebanon        | 5   | 3 ? | Partly Free   |   |
| Lesotho*       | 3 ? | 3   | Partly Free ? |   |
| Liberia*       | 3   | 4   | Partly Free   |   |
| Libya          | 7   | 7   | Not Free      |   |
| Liechtenstein* | 1   | 1   | Free          |   |
| Lithuania*     | 1   | 1   | Free          |   |
| Luxembourg*    | 1   | 1   | Free          |   |
| Macedonia*     | 3   | 3   | Partly Free   | ↑ |
| Madagascar     | 6 ? | 4 ? | Partly Free   |   |
|                |     |     |               |   |

|                   |     |     |             |   |
|-------------------|-----|-----|-------------|---|
| Malawi*           | 3 ? | 4   | Partly Free |   |
| Malaysia          | 4   | 4   | Partly Free |   |
| Maldives*         | 3 ? | 4   | Partly Free |   |
| Mali*             | 2   | 3   | Free        |   |
| Malta*            | 1   | 1   | Free        | ↓ |
| Marshall Islands* | 1   | 1   | Free        |   |
| Mauritania        | 6   | 5   | Not Free    |   |
| Mauritius*        | 1   | 2   | Free        |   |
| Mexico*           | 2   | 3   | Free        |   |
| Micronesia*       | 1   | 1   | Free        |   |
| Moldova*          | 3 ? | 4   | Partly Free |   |
| Monaco*           | 2   | 1   | Free        |   |
| Mongolia*         | 2   | 2   | Free        | ↑ |
| Montenegro*       | 3   | 2 ? | Free ?      |   |
| Morocco           | 5   | 4   | Partly Free | ↓ |
| Mozambique        | 4 ? | 3   | Partly Free |   |
| Namibia*          | 2   | 2   | Free        |   |
| Nauru*            | 1   | 1   | Free        |   |
|                   |     |     |             |   |

|                   |     |     |             |   |
|-------------------|-----|-----|-------------|---|
| Nepal             | 4   | 4   | Partly Free |   |
| Netherlands*      | 1   | 1   | Free        |   |
| New Zealand*      | 1   | 1   | Free        |   |
| Nicaragua*        | 4   | 4 ? | Partly Free |   |
| Niger             | 5 ? | 4   | Partly Free |   |
| Nigeria           | 5   | 4   | Partly Free | ↓ |
| North Korea       | 7   | 7   | Not Free    | ↓ |
| Norway*           | 1   | 1   | Free        |   |
| Oman              | 6   | 5   | Not Free    |   |
| Pakistan          | 4   | 5   | Partly Free |   |
| Palau*            | 1   | 1   | Free        |   |
| Panama*           | 1   | 2   | Free        |   |
| Papua New Guinea* | 4   | 3   | Partly Free |   |
| Paraguay*         | 3   | 3   | Partly Free |   |
| Peru*             | 2   | 3   | Free        |   |
| Philippines       | 4   | 3   | Partly Free | ↓ |
| Poland*           | 1   | 1   | Free        |   |
| Portugal*         | 1   | 1   | Free        |   |
|                   |     |     |             |   |

|                               |     |   |             |   |
|-------------------------------|-----|---|-------------|---|
| Qatar                         | 6   | 5 | Not Free    |   |
| Romania*                      | 2   | 2 | Free        |   |
| Russia                        | 6   | 5 | Not Free    | ↓ |
| Rwanda                        | 6   | 5 | Not Free    |   |
| Saint Kitts and Nevis*        | 1   | 1 | Free        |   |
| Saint Lucia*                  | 1   | 1 | Free        |   |
| Saint Vincent and Grenadines* | 2   | 1 | Free        |   |
| Samoa*                        | 2   | 2 | Free        |   |
| San Marino*                   | 1   | 1 | Free        |   |
| Sao Tome and Principe*        | 2   | 2 | Free        |   |
| Saudi Arabia                  | 7   | 6 | Not Free    |   |
| Senegal*                      | 3   | 3 | Partly Free |   |
| Serbia*                       | 2 ? | 2 | Free        |   |
| Seychelles*                   | 3   | 3 | Partly Free |   |
| Sierra Leone*                 | 3   | 3 | Partly Free |   |
| Singapore                     | 5   | 4 | Partly Free |   |
| Slovakia*                     | 1   | 1 | Free        | ↓ |
| Slovenia*                     | 1   | 1 | Free        |   |

|                 |     |     |             |   |
|-----------------|-----|-----|-------------|---|
| Solomon Islands | 4   | 3   | Partly Free |   |
| Somalia         | 7   | 7   | Not Free    |   |
| South Africa*   | 2   | 2   | Free        |   |
| South Korea*    | 1   | 2   | Free        |   |
| Spain*          | 1   | 1   | Free        |   |
| Sri Lanka*      | 4   | 4   | Partly Free |   |
| Sudan           | 7   | 7   | Not Free    |   |
| Suriname*       | 2   | 2   | Free        |   |
| Swaziland       | 7   | 5   | Not Free    |   |
| Sweden*         | 1   | 1   | Free        |   |
| Switzerland*    | 1   | 1   | Free        | ↓ |
| Syria           | 7   | 6   | Not Free    |   |
| Taiwan*         | 1 ? | 2 ? | Free        |   |
| Tajikistan      | 6   | 5   | Not Free    |   |
| Tanzania        | 4   | 3   | Partly Free |   |
| Thailand        | 5   | 4   | Partly Free |   |
| Togo            | 5   | 4 ? | Partly Free |   |
| Tonga           | 5   | 3   | Partly Free |   |

|                      |     |     |             |   |
|----------------------|-----|-----|-------------|---|
| Trinidad and Tobago* | 2   | 2   | Free        |   |
| Tunisia              | 7   | 5   | Not Free    |   |
| Turkey*              | 3   | 3   | Partly Free | ↓ |
| Turkmenistan         | 7   | 7   | Not Free    |   |
| Tuvalu*              | 1   | 1   | Free        |   |
| Uganda               | 5   | 4   | Partly Free |   |
| Ukraine*             | 3   | 2   | Free        |   |
| United Arab Emirates | 6   | 5   | Not Free    |   |
| United Kingdom*      | 1   | 1   | Free        |   |
| United States*       | 1   | 1   | Free        |   |
| Uruguay*             | 1   | 1   | Free        |   |
| Uzbekistan           | 7   | 7   | Not Free    |   |
| Vanuatu*             | 2   | 2   | Free        |   |
| Venezuela            | 5 ? | 4   | Partly Free |   |
| Vietnam              | 7   | 5   | Not Free    | ↓ |
| Yemen                | 6 ? | 5   | Not Free ?  |   |
| Zambia*              | 3   | 4 ? | Partly Free |   |
| Zimbabwe             | 6 ? | 6   | Not Free    |   |



Methodology:

PR and CL stand for political rights and civil liberties, respectively; 1 represents the most free and 7 the least free rating. The ratings reflect an overall judgment based on survey results.

? ? up or down indicates a change in political rights, civil liberties, or status since the last survey.

↑ ↓ up or down indicates a trend of positive or negative changes that took place but that were not sufficient to result in a change in political rights or civil liberties ratings of 1-7.

\* indicates a country's status as an electoral democracy.

Source:

This data is derived from the latest edition of Freedom House's Freedom in the World 2010 edition.

Available at URL: <http://www.freedomhouse.org>

Updated:

Reviewed in 2015

---

## Human Rights

### Human Rights in Malawi

#### **Overview**

The Republic of Malawi is a multiparty democracy. The government of Malawi works to respect the civil and human rights of its citizens; however, there are still areas where problems persist. The security forces are known to use arbitrary arrest and detention as well as excessive force with suspects, detainees, and protestors. Prison conditions are harsh and often life threatening. In 2004, some 180 out of 9,000 prisoners died while in custody. Overcrowding, lack of medical attention, unsanitary conditions, and HIV/AIDS were the known causes of these deaths. The government limits citizens' freedoms of speech, press, assembly, and workers' rights. Forced child labor and human trafficking are other areas of concern. The government is starting to take steps to punish known human rights violators. For example, stiff penalties are now levied against child traffickers.

The administration is also speaking out against corruption and police brutality.

**Human Development Index (HDI) Rank:**

See full listing of the Human Development Index located in the Social Overview of this report for this country's current rank.

**Human Poverty Index Rank:**

85th out of 103

**Gini Index:**

50.3

**Life Expectancy at Birth (years):**

43.45 years

**Unemployment Rate:**

N/A

**Population living on \$1 a day (%):**

41.7%

**Population living on \$2 a day (%):**

76.1%

**Population living beneath the Poverty Line (%):**

65.3%

**Internally Displaced People:**

N/A

Note-3,000 refugees are currently in Malawi

**Total Crime Rate (%):**

N/A

**Health Expenditure (% of GDP):**

Public: 4.0%

**% of GDP Spent on Education:**

6.0%

**Human Rights Conventions Party to:**

- International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide

- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
- Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
- Conventions on the Rights of the Child
- Convention relating to the Status of Refugees
- Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court

\*Human Development Index (HDI) is a composite index that measures the level of well-being in 177 nations in the world. It uses factors such as poverty, literacy, life-expectancy, education, gross domestic product, and purchasing power parity to assess the average achievements in each nation. It has been used in the United Nation's Human Development Report since 1993.

\*Human Poverty Index Ranking is based on certain indicators used to calculate the Human Poverty Index. Probability at birth of not surviving to age 40, adult literacy rate, population without sustainable access to an improved water source, and population below income poverty line are the indicators assessed in this measure.

\*The Gini Index measures inequality based on the distribution of family income or consumption. A value of 0 represents perfect equality (income being distributed equally), and a value of 100 perfect inequality (income all going to one individual).

\*The calculation of the total crime rate is the % of the total population which has been effected by property crime, robbery, sexual assault, assault, or bribery (corruption) related occurrences.

---

## **Government Functions**

Constitution --

The new constitution, which came into being in 1994 and was finalized in May 1995, provides for a multiparty democracy based on the United States model. It ends the formerly sweeping and absolute powers of the president, contains a Bill of Human Rights and protects the independent judiciary.

Executive Government --

The head of state is an executive president, who is elected every five years by direct universal suffrage. The president is also head of the cabinet.

#### Legislative Authority --

Legislative authority is vested in the unicameral National Assembly, whose approximately 193 members are elected by universal suffrage for five-year terms. The speaker is appointed from among the members of the Assembly; the president has the power to prolong or dissolve the body.

#### Judiciary --

The judiciary is composed of the Supreme Court of Appeal, the High Court and Magistrates' Courts. Traditional courts, used by previous governments to persecute political opponents, were abolished by the new constitution. The High Court has unlimited jurisdiction in civil and criminal matters and consists of the chief justice and five additional judges. The Supreme Court of Appeal hears appeals from the High Court. Subordinate courts include an industrial relations court, magistrate's courts and other courts as may be prescribed by parliament. There is also a Human Rights Commission, a Law Commission, a Judicial Services Commission and an ombudsman. The National Compensation Tribunal hears claims against the government.

#### Administration --

At the administrative level, the country is divided into 28 districts.

*Sources: New Encyclopedia Britannica; Malawi: Politics of Despair.*

---

## Government Structure

### **Names:**

*conventional long form:*

Republic of Malawi

*conventional short form:*

Malawi

*local long form:*

Dziko la Malawi

*local short form:*

Malawi

*former:*

British Central African Protectorate, Nyasaland Protectorate, Nyasaland

**Type:**

Multiparty, democratic republic

**Executive Branch:**

Chief of state and head of government:

President Arthur Peter MUTHARIKA (since 2014); the president is elected by popular vote for a five-year term (eligible for a second term).

See Note below for details on the death of President Bingu wa Mutharika; he was succeeded by Joyce Banda, as discussed in the Note below. Note that fresh elections took place in 2014 with a presidential shift from Banda towards Peter Mutharika, as discussed in the 2014 Elections Primer below. In summary, Mutharika won the presidency with 36.4 percent of the vote share over his competitors, Lazarus Chakwera with 27.8 percent, Joyce Banda with 20.2 percent, and Atupele Muluzi with 13.7 percent.

Cabinet:

Named by the president

Note:

On April 6, 2012, it was announced that President Bingu wa Mutharika of Malawi had died of a heart attack. According to BBC News, a physician who treated Mutharika said the president was clinically dead the day before when he went into cardiac arrest and was rushed to the country's Kamuzu Central Hospital.

All eyes were on the question of succession in Malawi, which has seen political unrest in recent times and could be vulnerable to a power chasm. The expected successor to the presidency was supposed to be the vice president. But Vice President Joyce Banda had been embroiled in a very public imbroglio with the late President Mutharika for the past few years, ultimately leading to her being forced out of the ruling Democratic People's Party and the formation of her own People's Party in 2011. At the heart of the conflict was the ruling Democratic People's Party's decision to

select President Mutharika's brother, Peter Mutharika, as the party's candidate to stand in the 2014 presidential election. It was a move that Banda opposed vociferously. To date, it was Peter Mutharika -- and not Banda -- who had acted as a "stand-in" for the president, as needed, during official occasions. Moreover, it was Peter Mutharika who was now internally viewed as the party's standard bearer into the future.

Still, with Bingu wa Mutharika now deceased, Vice President Banda's political prospects may have been revitalized. Certainly, Vice President Banda was hoping to step into the presidential shoes, despite her hostile relationship with the ruling party.

It should be noted that a Banda presidency might well be applauded by many citizens of the country who eschewed President Mutharika's recent slide into autocracy, as well as his economic mismanagement. Since 2011, Malawi has been dealing with violent protests, which erupted in response to the economic strife plaguing the country. Of particular concern has been the fuel and food shortages, which have stressed the population, escalating social unrest as protesters took to the streets to demand that President Mutharika resign from office. Although President Mutharika attempted to quell dissatisfaction from the public and criticism from his opponents by forming a new government, by March 2012, the sense of frustration felt by the people remained palpable. Indeed, protests were continuing. The government's response to the unrest in Malawi was to enact a crackdown against anti-government voices, thus sparking condemnation from human rights groups.

That background notwithstanding, Vice President Banda's eligibility for the presidency was a matter of debate since she was not appointed as acting president (due to the aforementioned feud with the late president). Accordingly, there were fears that the unorthodox scenario could spark a constitutional crisis.

Even with such anxieties prevailing, on April 7, 2012, Banda took the reins of power in the southern African country. The succession seemed to have been assured by provisions in the country's constitution that states the vice president takes over control of the country in the absence of the president. Thus, Banda declared: "The constitution prevails."

Even having taken the oath of office, though, newly-inaugurated President Banda was met with resistance. Six government officials, including the ministers of information, health, local government, and youth, expressed opposition to Banda becoming president.

Still, it was Joyce Banda -- the women's rights advocate -- who took the oath of office and thanked her fellow citizens for remaining calm during this difficult time of transition. She also called for unity, saying: "I want all of us to move into the future with hope and with the spirit of oneness and unity. I just sincerely hope there will be no time for revenge, and I just hope that as a God-fearing nation we should allow God to move with us because if we don't move with God then we have failed."

2014 Elections Primer:

(May 20, 2014)

Presidential and parliamentary elections were set to be held in Malawi on May 20, 2014. At stake would be the presidency. Also at stake would be the composition of the unicameral National Assembly, which houses 193 seats and where members are popularly elected for five-year terms. (It should be noted that local elections would also be held on this day.)

The previous presidential election was held 2009 and won by the now-late Bingu wa Mutharika. In 2012, President Mutharika had died of a heart attack, prompting a political crisis over succession. The expected successor to the presidency was supposed to be the vice president. But Vice President Joyce Banda had been embroiled in a very public imbroglio with the president for several years, ultimately leading to her being forced out of the ruling Democratic People's Party (DPP) and forming her own People's Party in 2011. At the heart of the conflict was the ruling Democratic People's Party's decision to select President Mutharika's brother, Peter Mutharika, as the party's candidate to stand in the 2014 presidential election. It was a move that Banda opposed vociferously. Politically, it was Peter Mutharika -- and not Banda -- who had acted as a "stand-in" for the president, as needed, during official occasions. Moreover, it was Peter Mutharika who was internally viewed as the party's standard bearer into the future.

Still, with Bingu wa Mutharika now deceased, Vice President Banda's political prospects were revitalized. Certainly, Vice President Banda was hoping to step into the presidential shoes, despite her hostile relationship with the ruling party.

It should be noted that a Banda presidency was applauded by many citizens of the country who eschewed President Mutharika's slide into autocracy, as well as his economic mismanagement. From 2011, Malawi had been dealing with violent protests, which erupted in response to the economic strife plaguing the country. Of particular concern has been the fuel and food shortages, which have stressed the population, escalating social unrest as protesters took to the streets to demand that President Mutharika resign from office. Although President Mutharika attempted to quell dissatisfaction from the public and criticism from his opponents by forming a new government, by March 2012, the sense of frustration felt by the people remained palpable. Indeed, protests were continuing. The government's response to the unrest in Malawi was to enact a crackdown against anti-government voices, thus sparking condemnation from human rights groups.

That background notwithstanding, Vice President Banda's eligibility for the presidency was a matter of debate since she was not appointed as acting president (due to the aforementioned feud with the late president). Accordingly, there were fears that the unorthodox scenario could spark a constitutional crisis. Nevertheless, in 2012, Banda took the reins of power in the southern African country and would be up for re-election in 2014. Her main opponent in 2014 would be Peter

Mutharika of the ruling Democratic Progressive Party (DPP); however, there would be several other presidential contenders including Atupele Muluzi, the son of a former president.

It should be noted that the 2009 parliamentary elections were resoundingly won by the ruling Democratic Progressive Party (DPP). It was to be seen if the DPP would again see success at the polls in 2014. The other main political parties contesting the elections were the Malawi Congress Party (MCP) and the United Democratic Front (UDF). There were also some independents contesting the elections. The voting was set to be witnessed by an electoral observation mission from the European Union (EU).

On election day in May 2014, after a small portion of the votes had been tabulated, unofficial exit polls showed a small lead for Peter Mutharika and his Democratic Progressive Party (DPP). There was soon a chorus of claims that the elections were fraught with irregularities.

The claims of irregularities (and perhaps the signs that she would soon be defeated in the election contest) prompted President Joyce Banda -- a rival of Mutharika -- to declare the entire election "null and void" and declaring that fresh elections would be held in 90 days. At a news conference, Banda said, "In exercise of the powers conferred in section 88 (2) of the constitution, I hereby call for the nullification of all ongoing processes in relation to the 2014 tripartite elections, including announcement and counting of the results to cease forthwith."

Election officials admitted that there were serious election irregularities to be addressed; however, they also charged that the president did not have the authority to simply nullify elections. Meanwhile, supporters of Mutharika and the ruling party took to the streets to protest Banda's actions. Only days later, the high court of Malawi soon intervened and ruled that the presidential decree was unconstitutional; in this way, the court effectively blocked Banda's attempt to annul the general elections.

Realizing that her political cards may have been played, Banda soon announced that she would step down if the country's High Court validated the election result showing Mutharika and the DPP as the winners. In an interview with Reuters News, Banda said, "I have told the Malawi Electoral Council and related stakeholders that I will accept their decision, and the decision of the courts." She continued, "I will rest knowing that I tried to defend the rights of Malawians in a critical moment to ensure they have a leader elected in a fair and credible manner." It should be noted that while the initial phase of the Banda presidency was well-regarded, Banda's unpopular austerity measures and a spate of corruption allegations took a toll on her popularity in recent times, effectively revitalizing Mutharika's political prospects.

Ultimately, Malawi's High Court issued an injunction bringing an end to Banda's attempts to influence the election outcome. Then, by the close of May 2014, Malawi's electoral commission announced that Mutharika had won the presidential contest, securing 36.4 percent of the votes



cast against Lazarus Chakwera, who won 27.8 percent, and outgoing President Banda who took 20.2 percent. At the parliamentary level, Mutharika's Democratic Progressive Party won the most seats. The electoral commission authorities also asserted that the elections had been free, fair, and credible.

**Legislative Branch:**

Unicameral National Assembly:

193 members; popularly elected for five-year terms; last elections held in 2014, as discussed in the primer below.

Primer on 2014 Elections:

(May 20, 2014)

Presidential and parliamentary elections were set to be held in Malawi on May 20, 2014. At stake would be the presidency. Also at stake would be the composition of the unicameral National Assembly, which houses 193 seats and where members are popularly elected for five-year terms. (It should be noted that local elections would also be held on this day.)

The previous presidential election was held 2009 and won by the now-late Bingu wa Mutharika. In 2012, President Mutharika had died of a heart attack, prompting a political crisis over succession. The expected successor to the presidency was supposed to be the vice president. But Vice President Joyce Banda had been embroiled in a very public imbroglio with the president for several years, ultimately leading to her being forced out of the ruling Democratic People's Party (DPP) and forming her own People's Party in 2011. At the heart of the conflict was the ruling Democratic People's Party's decision to select President Mutharika's brother, Peter Mutharika, as the party's candidate to stand in the 2014 presidential election. It was a move that Banda opposed vociferously. Politically, it was Peter Mutharika -- and not Banda -- who had acted as a "stand-in" for the president, as needed, during official occasions. Moreover, it was Peter Mutharika who was internally viewed as the party's standard bearer into the future.

Still, with Bingu wa Mutharika now deceased, Vice President Banda's political prospects were revitalized. Certainly, Vice President Banda was hoping to step into the presidential shoes, despite her hostile relationship with the ruling party.

It should be noted that a Banda presidency was applauded by many citizens of the country who eschewed President Mutharika's slide into autocracy, as well as his economic mismanagement. From 2011, Malawi had been dealing with violent protests, which erupted in response to the economic strife plaguing the country. Of particular concern has been the fuel and food shortages, which have stressed the population, escalating social unrest as protesters took to the streets to demand that President Mutharika resign from office. Although President Mutharika attempted to

quell dissatisfaction from the public and criticism from his opponents by forming a new government, by March 2012, the sense of frustration felt by the people remained palpable. Indeed, protests were continuing. The government's response to the unrest in Malawi was to enact a crackdown against anti-government voices, thus sparking condemnation from human rights groups.

That background notwithstanding, Vice President Banda's eligibility for the presidency was a matter of debate since she was not appointed as acting president (due to the aforementioned feud with the late president). Accordingly, there were fears that the unorthodox scenario could spark a constitutional crisis. Nevertheless, in 2012, Banda took the reins of power in the southern African country and would be up for re-election in 2014. Her main opponent in 2014 would be Peter Mutharika of the ruling Democratic Progressive Party (DPP); however, there would be several other presidential contenders including Atupele Muluzi, the son of a former president.

It should be noted that the 2009 parliamentary elections were resoundingly won by the ruling Democratic Progressive Party (DPP). It was to be seen if the DPP would again see success at the polls in 2014. The other main political parties contesting the elections were the Malawi Congress Party (MCP) and the United Democratic Front (UDF). There were also some independents contesting the elections. The voting was set to be witnessed by an electoral observation mission from the European Union (EU).

On election day in May 2014, after a small portion of the votes had been tabulated, unofficial exit polls showed a small lead for Peter Mutharika and his Democratic Progressive Party (DPP). There was soon a chorus of claims that the elections were fraught with irregularities.

The claims of irregularities (and perhaps the signs that she would soon be defeated in the election contest) prompted President Joyce Banda -- a rival of Mutharika -- to declare the entire election "null and void" and declaring that fresh elections would be held in 90 days. At a news conference, Banda said, "In exercise of the powers conferred in section 88 (2) of the constitution, I hereby call for the nullification of all ongoing processes in relation to the 2014 tripartite elections, including announcement and counting of the results to cease forthwith."

Election officials admitted that there were serious election irregularities to be addressed; however, they also charged that the president did not have the authority to simply nullify elections. Meanwhile, supporters of Mutharika and the ruling party took to the streets to protest Banda's actions. Only days later, the high court of Malawi soon intervened and ruled that the presidential decree was unconstitutional; in this way, the court effectively blocked Banda's attempt to annul the general elections.

Realizing that her political cards may have been played, Banda soon announced that she would step down if the country's High Court validated the election result showing Mutharika and the DPP as the winners. In an interview with Reuters News, Banda said, "I have told the Malawi Electoral

Council and related stakeholders that I will accept their decision, and the decision of the courts." She continued, "I will rest knowing that I tried to defend the rights of Malawians in a critical moment to ensure they have a leader elected in a fair and credible manner." It should be noted that while the initial phase of the Banda presidency was well-regarded, Banda's unpopular austerity measures and a spate of corruption allegations took a toll on her popularity in recent times, effectively revitalizing Mutharika's political prospects.

Ultimately, Malawi's High Court issued an injunction bringing an end to Banda's attempts to influence the election outcome. Then, by the close of May 2014, Malawi's electoral commission announced that Mutharika had won the presidential contest, securing 36.4 percent of the votes cast against Lazarus Chakwera, who won 27.8 percent, and outgoing President Banda who took 20.2 percent. At the parliamentary level, Mutharika's Democratic Progressive Party won the most seats. The electoral commission authorities also asserted that the elections had been free, fair, and credible.

**Judicial Branch:**

High Court; chief justice appointed by the president, other judges appointed on the advice of the Judicial Service Commission; Supreme Court of Appeal; Magistrates' Courts

**Constitution:**

May 18, 1995

**Legal System:**

Based on English common law and customary law; judicial review of legislative acts in the Supreme Court of Appeal; accepts compulsory ICJ jurisdiction, with reservations

**Administrative Divisions:**

28 districts; Balaka, Blantyre, Chikwawa, Chiradzulu, Chitipa, Dedza, Dowa, Karonga, Kasungu, Likoma, Lilongwe, Machinga (Kasupe), Mangochi, Mchinji, Mulanje, Mwanza, Mzimba, Neno, Ntcheu, Nkhata Bay, Nkhotakota, Nsanje, Ntchisi, Phalombe, Rumphi, Salima, Thyolo, Zomba

**Political Parties and Leaders:**

Alliance for Democracy or AFORD [Godfrey SHAWA]

Chipani Cha Fuko or CCP [Davis KATSONGA PHIRI]

Democratic Progressive Party or DPP [Peter MUTHARIKA]

Malawi Congress Party or MCP [Lazarus CHAKWERA]

People's Party or PP [Joyce BANDA]  
United Democratic Front or UDF [Atupele MULUZI]

**Suffrage:**

18 years of age; universal

---

## Principal Government Officials

### Leadership and Cabinet of Malawi

Pres. Arthur Peter MUTHARIKA

Vice Pres. Saulos CHILIMA

Min. of Agriculture, Irrigation, & Water Development Allan CHIYEMBEKEZA

Min. of Civil Service, Disaster Management, Public Events, & Statutory Corporations Saulos CHILIMA

Min. of Defense Arthur Peter MUTHARIKA

Min. of Disability & Elderly Affairs Rachel KACHAJE

Min. of Education, Science, & Technology Vincent Winstone GHAMBI

Min. of Finance & Economic Development Goodall Edward GONDWE

Min. of Foreign Affairs & Intl. Cooperation George CHAPONDA

Min. of Gender, Children, Disability, & Social Welfare Patricia KALIATI

Min. of Health Peter KUMPALUME

Min. of Home Affairs & Internal Security Jean KALILANI

Min. of Information, Tourism, & Civic Education Jappie MHANGO

Min. of Justice & Constitutional Affairs Samuel TEMBENU

Min. of Labor, Youth, & Manpower Development Henry MUSSA

Min. of Lands, Housing, & Urban Development Atupele MULUZI

Min. of Local Govt. & Rural Development Kondwani NANKHUMWA

Min. of Natural Resources, Energy, & Mining Bright MSAKA

Min. of Trade & Industry Joseph MWANAMVEKA

Min. of Transport & Public Works Francis KASAILA

Min. of Sports & Culture Grace Obama CHIUMIA

Attorney Gen. Alexious NAMPOTA

Governor, Reserve Bank Charles CHUKA

Ambassador to the US Necton Darlington MHURA

Permanent Representative to the UN, New York Brian Granthen BOWLER

-- as of 2015

---

## Leader Biography

### Leader Biography

#### Leader

#### Leadership of Malawi

##### Introduction

On April 6, 2012, it was announced that President Bingu wa Mutharika of Malawi had died of a heart attack. According to BBC News, a physician who treated Mutharika said the president was clinically dead the day before when he went into cardiac arrest and was rushed to the country's Kamuzu Central Hospital.

All eyes were on the question of succession in Malawi, which has seen political unrest in recent times and could be vulnerable to a power chasm. The expected successor to the presidency was supposed to be the vice president. But Vice President Joyce Banda had been embroiled in a very public imbroglio with the late President Mutharika for the past few years, ultimately leading to her being forced out of the ruling Democratic People's Party and the formation of her own People's Party in 2011. At the heart of the conflict was the ruling Democratic People's Party's decision to select President Mutharika's brother, Peter Mutharika, as the party's candidate to stand in the 2014 presidential election. It was a move that Banda opposed vociferously. To date, it was Peter Mutharika -- and not Banda -- who had acted as a "stand-in" for the president, as needed, during

official occasions. Moreover, it was Peter Mutharika who was now internally viewed as the party's standard bearer into the future.

Still, with Bingu wa Mutharika now deceased, Vice President Banda's political prospects may have been revitalized. Certainly, Vice President Banda was hoping to step into the presidential shoes, despite her hostile relationship with the ruling party.

It should be noted that a Banda presidency might well be applauded by many citizens of the country who eschewed President Mutharika's recent slide into autocracy, as well as his economic mismanagement. Since 2011, Malawi has been dealing with violent protests, which erupted in response to the economic strife plaguing the country. Of particular concern has been the fuel and food shortages, which have stressed the population, escalating social unrest as protesters took to the streets to demand that President Mutharika resign from office. Although President Mutharika attempted to quell dissatisfaction from the public and criticism from his opponents by forming a new government, by March 2012, the sense of frustration felt by the people remained palpable. Indeed, protests were continuing. The government's response to the unrest in Malawi was to enact a crackdown against anti-government voices, thus sparking condemnation from human rights groups.

That background notwithstanding, Vice President Banda's eligibility for the presidency was a matter of debate since she was not appointed as acting president (due to the aforementioned feud with the late president). Accordingly, there were fears that the unorthodox scenario could spark a constitutional crisis.

Even with such anxieties prevailing, on April 7, 2012, Banda took the reins of power in the southern African country. The succession seemed to have been assured by provisions in the country's constitution that states the vice president takes over control of the country in the absence of the president. Thus, Banda declared: "The constitution prevails."

Even having taken the oath of office, though, newly-inaugurated President Banda was met with resistance. Six government officials, including the ministers of information, health, local government, and youth, expressed opposition to Banda becoming president.

Still, it was Joyce Banda -- the women's rights advocate -- who took the oath of office and thanked her fellow citizens for remaining calm during this difficult time of transition. She also called for unity, saying: "I want all of us to move into the future with hope and with the spirit of oneness and unity. I just sincerely hope there will be no time for revenge, and I just hope that as a God-fearing nation we should allow God to move with us because if we don't move with God then we have failed."

Editor's Note:

Joyce Banda made national history in April 2012 by becoming Malawi's first female leader and only the second female head of state in Africa.

\*\*\*

### Recent Developments

In mid-March 2013, 11 former government officials were arrested and charged with various offenses including conspiracy to break the law, sedition, and perjury.

The 11 individuals were arrested following the publication of a report, which concluded that in the aftermath of the death of President Bingu wa Mutharika in April 2012, the cabal allegedly orchestrated a plot to prevent Joyce Banda -- the vice president at the time -- from assuming power as stipulated in the Constitution.

The report was commissioned by President Banda, who succeeded Mutharika as president, despite vociferous resistance from detractors -- including several government officials and cabinet minister. Those detractors argued that an ongoing feud between Banda and President Mutharika, along with the ruling Democratic People's Party's decision to select President Mutharika's brother, Peter Mutharika, as the party's leader, should disqualify Banda from becoming the new president. Nevertheless, it was Banda who ultimately took the oath of office.

After her inauguration into power in 2012, President Banda announced a Commission of Inquiry to investigate the circumstances leading the death of her predecessor -- President Bingu wa Mutharika, along with the attempts to circumvent the constitution by installing someone other than herself (then, the vice president) in the office of the president.

It should be noted that the late President Mutharika's younger brother, Peter Mutharika, was among the individuals arrested in Malawi in March 2013. Also among the group were former Information Minister Patricia Kaliati, former Youth Minister Symon Vuwa Kaunda, former Health Minister Jean Kalirani, former Presidential Affairs Minister Nicholas Dausi, former deputy Foreign Affairs and deputy Chief Secretary to the Government, Necton Mhura, Mutharika's Guard Commander Duncan Mwapasa, Economic Planning and Development Minister Goodall Gondwe, who had served as Mutharika Finance Minister, and Chief Secretary Bright Msaka, who also served as Chief Secretary in the former regime. In this way, the arrests constituted a sweeping indictment of leading political figures on the political landscape of Malawi, and suggested that President Banda continued to have a loyalty problem in her inner circle. A more positive interpretation for Banda, though, might be the fact that she now had a mandate of sorts to recalibrate her government with stalwarts.

\*\*\*

Cabinet changes --

On Oct. 10, 2013, President Joyce Banda of Malawi dissolved the country's cabinet. President Banda made the decision following her return from the United States where she was attending the General Assembly of the United Nations. The move to dissolve the cabinet appeared to be made in response to emerging reports of rampant fraud and corruption in the government. Of particular significance were the arrests of several government officials who were reported to have accumulated millions of dollars, with some of those funds discovered in their houses and cars. There were also suggestions that some of President Banda's own cabinet ministers were involved in the fraud and corruption scandal.



These revelations led to angry demands from both the political opposition parties and socio-economic organizations that President Banda either resign from office herself or fire key members of her administration, including the finance minister. Clearly, President Banda had decided that if she wished to hold onto her position as the president, her best option would be to dissolve the entire cabinet and start afresh. It was to be seen if her response would be enough to quiet the loud chorus of outrage across Malawi.

\*\*\*

Elections of 2014:

Presidential and parliamentary elections were set to be held in Malawi on May 20, 2014. At stake would be the presidency. Also at stake would be the composition of the unicameral National Assembly, which houses 193 seats and where members are popularly elected for five-year terms. (It should be noted that local elections would also be held on this day.)

The previous presidential election was held 2009 and won by the now-late Bingu wa Mutharika. In 2012, President Mutharika had died of a heart attack, prompting a political crisis over succession. The expected successor to the presidency was supposed to be the vice president. But Vice President Joyce Banda had been embroiled in a very public imbroglio with the president for several years, ultimately leading to her being forced out of the ruling Democratic People's Party (DPP) and forming her own People's Party in 2011. At the heart of the conflict was the ruling Democratic People's Party's decision to select President Mutharika's brother, Peter Mutharika, as the party's candidate to stand in the 2014 presidential election. It was a move that Banda opposed vociferously. Politically, it was Peter Mutharika -- and not Banda -- who had acted as a "stand-in" for the president, as needed, during official occasions. Moreover, it was Peter Mutharika who was internally viewed as the party's standard bearer into the future.

Still, with Bingu wa Mutharika now deceased, Vice President Banda's political prospects were revitalized. Certainly, Vice President Banda was hoping to step into the presidential shoes, despite her hostile relationship with the ruling party.

It should be noted that a Banda presidency was applauded by many citizens of the country who eschewed President Mutharika's slide into autocracy, as well as his economic mismanagement. From 2011, Malawi had been dealing with violent protests, which erupted in response to the economic strife plaguing the country. Of particular concern has been the fuel and food shortages, which have stressed the population, escalating social unrest as protesters took to the streets to demand that President Mutharika resign from office. Although President Mutharika attempted to quell dissatisfaction from the public and criticism from his opponents by forming a new government, by March 2012, the sense of frustration felt by the people remained palpable. Indeed, protests were continuing. The government's response to the unrest in Malawi was to enact a crackdown against anti-government voices, thus sparking condemnation from human rights groups.

That background notwithstanding, Vice President Banda's eligibility for the presidency was a matter of debate since she was not appointed as acting president (due to the aforementioned feud with the late president). Accordingly, there were fears that the unorthodox scenario could spark a constitutional crisis. Nevertheless, in 2012, Banda took the reins of power in the southern African country and would be up for re-election in 2014. Her main opponent in 2014 would be Peter Mutharika of the ruling Democratic Progressive Party (DPP); however, there would be several other presidential contenders including Atupele Muluzi, the son of a former president.

It should be noted that the 2009 parliamentary elections were resoundingly won by the ruling Democratic Progressive Party (DPP). It was to be seen if the DPP would again see success at the polls in 2014. The other main political parties contesting the elections were the Malawi Congress Party (MCP) and the United Democratic Front (UDF). There were also some independents contesting the elections. The voting was set to be witnessed by an electoral observation mission from the European Union (EU).

On election day in May 2014, after a small portion of the votes had been tabulated, unofficial exit polls showed a small lead for Peter Mutharika and his Democratic Progressive Party (DPP). There was soon a chorus of claims that the elections were fraught with irregularities.

The claims of irregularities (and perhaps the signs that she would soon be defeated in the election contest) prompted President Joyce Banda -- a rival of Mutharika -- to declare the entire election "null and void" and declaring that fresh elections would be held in 90 days. At a news conference, Banda said, "In exercise of the powers conferred in section 88 (2) of the constitution, I hereby call for the nullification of all ongoing processes in relation to the 2014 tripartite elections, including announcement and counting of the results to cease forthwith."

Election officials admitted that there were serious election irregularities to be addressed; however, they also charged that the president did not have the authority to simply nullify elections. Meanwhile, supporters of Mutharika and the ruling party took to the streets to protest Banda's actions. Only days later, the high court of Malawi soon intervened and ruled that the presidential decree was unconstitutional; in this way, the court effectively blocked Banda's attempt to annul the general elections.

Realizing that her political cards may have been played, Banda soon announced that she would step down if the country's High Court validated the election result showing Mutharika and the DPP as the winners. In an interview with Reuters News, Banda said, "I have told the Malawi Electoral Council and related stakeholders that I will accept their decision, and the decision of the courts." She continued, "I will rest knowing that I tried to defend the rights of Malawians in a critical moment to ensure they have a leader elected in a fair and credible manner." It should be noted that while the initial phase of the Banda presidency was well-regarded, Banda's unpopular austerity measures and a spate of corruption allegations took a toll on her popularity in recent times, effectively revitalizing Mutharika's political prospects.

Ultimately, Malawi's High Court issued an injunction bringing an end to Banda's attempts to influence the election outcome. Then, by the close of May 2014, Malawi's electoral commission announced that Mutharika had won the presidential contest, securing 36.4 percent of the votes cast against Lazarus Chakwera, who won 27.8 percent, and outgoing President Banda who took 20.2 percent. At the parliamentary level, Mutharika's Democratic Progressive Party won the most seats. The electoral commission authorities also asserted that the elections had been free, fair, and

credible.

---

## Foreign Relations

### General Relations

Among major nations, Malawi maintains diplomatic relations with China, Denmark, Egypt, Germany, the Republic of Korea, Israel, Kuwait, Taiwan, the United Kingdom and the United States. Malawian foreign policy has tended to be pro-Western, and relations with the United States are cordial. Malawi cooperates with the United Nations' initiatives to improve the stability of the region. The president has recently established close relations with Libya and its leader Muammar al-Qadhafi. Muluzi has visited Tripoli several times, and the Libyan government has provided significant amounts of aid. Some observers have argued the relationship has a lot to do with President Muluzi occupying an important post as chair of the Southern African Development Community (see below) and, together with chairs of other subregional blocs, is important in securing Qadhafi's objective - that of chair of the newly formed African Union.

### Regional Relations

#### South Africa

Due to its past relationship with apartheid-era South Africa, Malawi has had tense relations with neighboring countries. These have improved somewhat with South Africa's transition to majority government. Malawi has retained a good relationship with South Africa throughout the transition. Today, relations between South Africa and Malawi are sound, with trade being an important aspect. South Africa has continued development assistance to Malawi. In June 1998, Malawi's former President Bakili Muluzi, accompanied by a business delegation, made an official visit to Cape Town.

### Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Tanzania

Relations with Mozambique have been strained due to suspicion surrounding Malawi's possible involvement in the civil war in Mozambique. Conversely, documents indicated a plot between Mozambique and Zimbabwe in the 1980s to overthrow the Banda government in Malawi. Bilateral relations have improved recently with the repatriation of many refugees to Mozambique in 1994, as well as a joint agreement on defense, security and narcotics enforcement matters. Relations are improving with Zambia and Zimbabwe as well. In March and April 2001, communal conflict flared between inhabitants living along the banks of the River Songwe, which marks the common border between Tanzania and Malawi. On April 12, 2001, security personnel from both countries met and agreed to engage more patrols along the banks of the river to prevent further violence between the two communities.

### SADC and Central African Crisis

Malawi is a member of the Southern African Development Community, or SADC, and the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa. A watershed in Malawi's conduct of foreign affairs occurred on Aug. 14, 2001, at the SADC summit in Blantyre, when President Muluzi was chosen as chair of SADC. This immediately galvanized Malawi foreign policy-makers into action. On Aug. 19, Muluzi met with President Joseph Kabila of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, or DRC, to discuss the implementation of the Lusaka Peace Accords. A month later, on Sept. 27, 2001, Muluzi convened a meeting between presidents Kabila and Kagame of Rwanda in which both agreed with principles put forth by Muluzi to end the conflict in the DRC and withdrawal Rwandan troops. Also in September 2001, Muluzi embarked on a national dialogue among stakeholders inside Zimbabwe to end the political violence in that country.

### Africa Union

At its July 2-11, 2001, meeting in Lusaka, Zambia, the Organization of African Unity officially approved the transformation of OAU into the new African Union. Former foreign minister of Cote d'Ivoire, Amara Essy, was elected the first secretary-general of the Africa Union. U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan said, "This historic effort will require leadership, courage and willingness to depart from the ways of the past, if it is to do for Africa what the European Union has done for Europe." The goal of the Africa Union is to be a continental body that paves the way to a better life for all Africans. Where the OAU was criticized for its lack of action on economic and social fronts, the Africa Union is charged with development as its primary task. Following a model based on the European Union, the Africa Union is intended to bridge the economic gaps between African countries and thrust the continent onto the world economic stage as a single entity. The Africa Union Bill was a convergence of South African President Thabo Mbeki's African development plan and Plan Omega proposed by Senegalese President Abdoulaye Wade. It therefore adds to its economic mandate the political mandate that all of Africa seek democratic consolidation.

There are significant criticisms to the new Africa Union, though. Some fear that too much faith is being placed in a document that makes more sense in theory than in practice. The strongest criticism, however, is that the Africa Union's largest force has been Libyan President Muammar al-Qadhafi. The United States has made its objections to the Union clear, no doubt due to a lack of trust in Qadhafi's motives. Many African leaders backed the Union, even though they also demonstrated a lack of trust in Qadhafi. Even at the opening of the meeting, OAU leaders noted Qadhafi failed to even mention Africa's founding fathers, even though it was Ghana's Kwame Nkrumah who started pan-Africanism some 40 years ago. Indeed, Qadhafi has backed groups in his own country that are markedly anti-pan-Africanist. Other comments challenged the controversial role Libyan nationals often play in sub-Saharan African countries. Yet the most controversial position of Qadhafi no doubt was his statement: "We cannot be neutral here. We are here for the Africans, not the Europeans. We are here for the blacks, not for the whites." With Louis Farrakhan, leader of the U.S.-based Nation of Islam movement standing behind him, this statement was taken as an affront to increased Western relations as opposed to the Union's goal of increasing economic ties with wealthier countries.

### **Other Significant Relations**

Malawi has sound diplomatic, commercial and social ties with the United States. The U.S. mission enjoys access to and congenial relations with the government of Malawi, as well as with opposition parties, business and commercial organizations and representatives of other sectors of Malawian society.

In July 2002, Germany and Italy announced they were writing off close to US\$500,000 worth of Malawi's debts due to the devastating famine from which the country was suffering. The debt write-off was good news for the Malawi government, which has a troubled relationship with donors. Other western countries suspended development aid imposed in 2001, after reports that previous aid had not been used properly. Indeed, Germany and Italy warned that continued aid to Malawi depended on good governance. At the time, the IMF was withholding \$47m of the \$55m earmarked for Malawi due to concerns about possible corruption and poor management.

Then, in August 2002, the European Union (EU) asked the Malawi government to refund at least 8 million euros (US\$8 million). The EU alleged that the Malawi government had diverted the money from its intended use before Aug. 30, 2002.

The money was initially meant for a road construction project in Blantyre but, according to a joint EU/Malawi Government audit, the money was either used for other unapproved projects or was misappropriated. Several months prior, Denmark had halted aid to the impoverished nation blaming political intolerance and corruption.

*Written by Dr. Denise Youngblood Coleman, Editor in Chief at [www.countrywatch.com](http://www.countrywatch.com). See Bibliography for list of research sources. Supplementary sources: Lexis-Nexis, Africa Policy Information Center, BBC News, AllAfrica.com.*

---

## National Security

### External Threats

No nation poses an immediate threat to Malawi's national security. It is engaged in two minor territorial disputes with Tanzania, however. The countries disagree over the precise location of their Lake Nyasa border. They are also in dispute over the boundary that the Songwe River defines. The body of water's tendency to shift course somewhat undermines its utility as a borderline.

### Crime

Malawi has a generally low crime rate. Car jacking and residential break-ins are prevalent throughout the country, however. Petty theft is also a fairly common occurrence.

### Insurgencies

There are no insurgent movements operating inside or outside of Malawi that directly threaten its government or general population. Though autocratic rule characterized much its early history as a self-governing nation, the former British colony has enjoyed largely stable political conditions since receiving full independence in July 1964. The United States-educated medical doctor Hastings Kamuzu Banda became Malawi's first president in 1966. In 1971, he assumed the title for life. In June 1993, however, Malawi voted to adopt a democratic system. A year later, it held its first multi-party elections. Bakili Muluzi won the presidential election. He was re-elected to a second five-year term in 1999. Muluzi was constitutionally ineligible to participate in the May 2004 elections, which confirmed Bingu wa Mutharika as Malawi's second democratically-elected president.

## **Terrorism**

There is no specific threat of terrorism against Malawi, nor has it been a traditional target of terrorist violence. There have been several terrorist attacks in nearby Kenya and Tanzania though, including the coordinated bombings of U.S. embassies in Nairobi and Dar-Es-Salaam that occurred on Aug. 7, 1998, illuminating the potential danger of similar acts of violence throughout East Africa.

Malawi has been active in the global war on terrorism. In June 2005, they arrested five foreign nationals who are suspected members of the Al-Qaida network.

Malawi is party to five of the twelve international conventions and protocols pertaining to terrorism.

---

## **Defense Forces**

### **Military Data**

#### **Military Branches:**

Malawi Defense Forces: Army (includes Air Wing, Marine Unit)

#### **Eligible age to enter service:**

18 for voluntary

#### **Mandatory Service Terms:**

Initial engagement is 7 years for enlisted personnel and 10 years for officers

#### **Manpower in general population-fit for military service:**

males age 16-49: 2,132,909



females age 16-49: 2,043,925

**Manpower reaching eligible age annually:**

male: 183,683

femaie: 183,028

**Military Expenditures-Percent of GDP:**

0.93%

# **Chapter 3**

## **Economic Overview**

---

## Economic Overview

### *Overview*

Malawi is one of the poorest and least developed countries in the world. Agriculture is the mainstay of the economy, and major agricultural products for exports include tobacco, tea, sugar, and cotton. Heavy dependence on agricultural exports makes the economy vulnerable to shocks such as adverse weather conditions and fluctuations in world commodity prices. In addition, poor and inadequate infrastructure further hinders economic development. As such, Malawi remains highly dependent on donor support and economic assistance from international financial institutions.

Since mid-2004, Malawi's macroeconomic performance has improved under the IMF-supported PRGF (Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility) program. The country has made progress in achieving macroeconomic stabilization and attainment of the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative completion point in August 2006. Malawi's agriculture-based economy has weathered the global economic crisis relatively well, with good weather and the distribution of subsidized fertilizer contributing to robust growth and moderate inflation in 2008 and 2009. However, the fiscal stance loosened significantly in the run-up to the presidential elections in mid-2009, leading to a widening of the fiscal deficit. Moreover, Malawi's external position remains weak with a very low international reserves level. In recognizing the slippages in the previous year, the government adopted a more prudent fiscal stance in the 2010 budget by containing non-priority spending. But still, investment – which dropped 23 percent in 2009 – continued to decline in 2010. In August 2010, the government devalued the Malawi Kwacha by 10 percent after getting pressure from the IMF. The devaluation caused the fuel prices to rise by 28 percent in November 2010. At the end of 2011, Malawi President Bingu Mutharika said he would not give in to the IMF and others' demands to further devalue the country's currency. He argued that such a move would make Malawians poorer. Going into 2012, Malawi's economy was suffering from an acute shortage of foreign currency, an acute fuel shortage and very low income from the country's main foreign currency earner, tobacco. The country's development partners suspended budget support to the country, citing poor governance as a major reason. As a result of the suspension, President Mutharika adopted a Zero-Deficit Budget for the 2011/2012 financial year, a new concept where all recurrent expenditures are funded by local resources. On the positive side, the government predicted it will be saving US\$120 million a year once a Mozambican-originated railway line through Malawi is constructed and operational. On top of that, the government will be getting \$8 million a year from the Brazilian construction company building out the railway line for a period of three years, in addition to another \$8 million in corporate social services. Construction of the project was expected to add 5,000 jobs to the country.

By 2012, it was clear that Malawi's economy was driven to the brink of collapse after foreign aid dried up over concerns about the human rights record of President Bingu wa Mutharika. The country's international reserves had fallen to precariously low levels by early 2012. Then Mutharika died suddenly of a heart attack in April 2012 and Joyce Banda took over as the country's new president. Soon after taking office, Banda was working to win back the trust of donors. The new administration also quickly took steps to improve the economy by devaluing the kwacha, adopting a flexible exchange rate regime, and removing restrictions on foreign exchange transactions which had led to the growth of a parallel market in foreign exchange. At the same time, the authorities also adjusted the prices of petroleum products and adopted an automatic adjustment mechanism to ensure that these prices reflect their true import costs, thus removing burdensome subsidies on the budget. Malawi's development partners responded favorably to the new administration's economic policies and repeal of laws that were seen as infringing on human rights and freedoms.

In July 2012, the IMF approved a new \$156 million loan package to Malawi to support a program aimed at reviving economic growth and scaling up government social protection programs. The goal of the program is to help the country achieve low inflation, increasing international reserves, and reforms to expand financial services and improve the investment climate in order to promote sustained inclusive growth. In mid-August, Britain gave \$4.7 million to Malawi to help provide aid to the more than 1.6 million people faced food shortages. The number of people facing food shortages in Malawi had increased since 2011 to 1.63 million, which is 11 percent of the population, according to a report by the Malawi government and U.N. relief agencies, cited by Reuters. Britain's contribution took the total international aid for Malawi's new government to more than \$500 million as of mid-August 2012, according to Reuters. Overall, GDP growth in 2012 slowed following a contraction in the agricultural and manufacturing sectors, brought on by drought and a foreign exchange shortage. Growth in 2013 and 2014 was projected to rebound, according to the African Development Bank. In September 2013, Malawi made headlines when it said it planned to use the \$15 million in proceeds from selling its presidential jet to feed the more than 1 million people suffering chronic food shortages. Then, in October 2013, Malawi President Joyce Banda dissolved her cabinet following the arrest of 10 junior officials suspected of stealing state funds.

The scandal forced the government to shut down its payment system so that it could investigate what happened to a missing \$4 million that was keeping teachers, nurses and doctors from getting paid. Malawi's troubled economy had improved slightly in prior months with inflation easing slightly and earnings from its main export, tobacco, expected to double this year compared to last.

Investment has fallen continuously for several years and in 2013 amounted to just 13 percent of GDP. The cashgate scandal and the associated loss of most budget support from Malawi's development partners contributed to a sharp depreciation of the kwacha and a surge in inflation in the fourth quarter of 2013.

The annual rate of inflation had been declining gradually in recent months, but remained high at 22.6 percent in May 2014, according to the IMF.

In June 2014, Malawi's finance minister said the country's economy would likely grow faster for the year than previously expected – at about 6.5 percent compared to a previous estimate of 6.3 percent. He said that increased production in cash crops, like tobacco and tea, and the availability of foreign exchange were the main factors for the revision.

He also predicted that the higher growth would help inflation ease to 14.2 percent by the end of 2014, compared with 23.5 in 2013. Then, in July 2014, Malawi's central bank cut its benchmark lending rate by 250 basis points to 22.5 percent, saying that the outlook for inflation was favorable due to a relatively stable exchange rate for the kwacha currency.

In January 2015, Malawi's president said the country would likely miss its 5.8 percent economic growth forecast after weeks of heavy rain killed scores of people and washed away the country's staple crop, according to Reuters.

"Preliminary assessment shows that the damage caused by the flood disaster to the economy is estimated at 23.9 billion kwacha (\$54 million), excluding the cost of the relief program currently underway," he was quoted by Reuters as saying.

He added that \$81 million was needed to address the needs of the 638,000 people affected by the floods. In May 2015, Thomson Reuters Foundation reported that childhood nutrition costs Malawi's economy nearly \$600 million, 10 percent of its GDP, annually because of increased healthcare expenses and low workforce productivity, according to a joint U.N.-government study.

### ***Economic Performance***

Despite the global economic crisis, Malawi's economic growth has been robust from 2007 to 2010. Favorable weather conditions and the government subsidies for fertilizer have contributed to the good performance.

According to CountryWatch estimated calculations for 2014:

Real GDP growth rate was: 4.8 percent

The fiscal deficit/surplus as percent of GDP (%) was: -2.5 percent

Inflation was measured at: 9.3 percent

*Updated in 2015*

*\*Please note that the figures in our Economic Performance section are estimates or forecasts based on IMF-based data that are formulated using CountryWatch models of analysis.*

*Supplementary Sources: Xinhua News Agency, International Monetary Fund, African Development Bank and Reuters*

## Nominal GDP and Components

| Nominal GDP and Components                 |         |          |          |          |          |
|--|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
|  | 2011    | 2012     | 2013     | 2014     | 2015     |
| Nominal GDP (LCU billions)                 | 880.853 | 1,056.33 | 1,415.18 | 1,809.22 | 3,187.06 |
| Nominal GDP Growth Rate (%)                | 8.423   | 19.921   | 33.971   | 27.844   | 76.156   |
| Consumption (LCU billions)                 | 633.695 | 796.569  | 1,043.39 | 1,403.58 | 2,366.25 |
| Government Expenditure (LCU billions)      | 203.052 | 236.470  | 329.165  | 314.577  | 530.336  |
| Gross Capital Formation (LCU billions)     | 134.724 | 178.751  | 225.802  | 278.073  | 428.085  |
| Exports of Goods & Services (LCU billions) | 260.286 | 393.505  | 673.019  | 828.385  | 1,092.80 |
| Imports of Goods & Services (LCU billions) | 350.904 | 548.963  | 856.192  | 1,015.39 | 1,230.41 |

---



---

**Population and GDP Per Capita**

| Population and GDP Per Capita      |           |           |           |            |            |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|
|                                    | 2011      | 2012      | 2013      | 2014       | 2015       |
| Population, total (million)        | 16.166    | 16.632    | 17.111    | 17.604     | 18.111     |
| Population growth (%)              | 2.876     | 2.883     | 2.880     | 2.881      | 2.880      |
| Nominal GDP per Capita (LCU 1000s) | 54,488.00 | 63,512.03 | 82,706.06 | 102,773.27 | 175,973.44 |

## Real GDP and Inflation

| Real GDP and Inflation                                  |         |         |         |         |          |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
|   | 2011    | 2012    | 2013    | 2014    | 2015     |
| Real Gross Domestic Product<br>(LCU billions 2005 base) | 772.163 | 787.033 | 828.276 | 875.962 | 1,293.65 |
| Real GDP Growth Rate (%)                                | -4.9551 | 1.926   | 5.240   | 5.757   | 47.683   |
| GDP Deflator (2005=100.0)                               | 114.076 | 134.217 | 170.859 | 206.541 | 246.362  |
| Inflation, GDP Deflator (%)                             | 14.076  | 17.656  | 27.301  | 20.884  | 19.280   |



## Government Spending and Taxation

| Government Spending and Taxation                    |          |          |           |          |           |
|---|----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
|   | 2011     | 2012     | 2013      | 2014     | 2015      |
| Government Fiscal Budget (billions)                 | 296.678  | 399.460  | 595.805   | 654.471  | 880.396   |
| Fiscal Budget Growth Rate (percentage)              | 3.775    | 34.644   | 49.153    | 9.847    | 34.520    |
| National Tax Rate Net of Transfers (%)              | 28.652   | 35.394   | 34.309    | 31.213   | 21.921    |
| Government Revenues Net of Transfers (LCU billions) | 252.382  | 373.882  | 485.538   | 564.705  | 698.624   |
| Government Surplus(-) Deficit(+) (LCU billions)     | -44.2960 | -25.5780 | -110.2670 | -89.7660 | -181.7720 |
| Government Surplus(+) Deficit(-) (%GDP)             | -5.0288  | -2.4214  | -7.7917   | -4.9616  | -5.7034   |

## Money Supply, Interest Rates and Unemployment

| Money Supply, Interest Rates and Unemployment |         |         |         |         |          |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
|   | 2011    | 2012    | 2013    | 2014    | 2015     |
| Money and Quasi-Money (M2)<br>(LCU billions)  | 314.331 | 386.436 | 521.963 | 616.153 | 1,085.39 |
| Money Supply Growth Rate<br>(%)               | 35.657  | 22.939  | 35.071  | 18.045  | 76.156   |
| Lending Interest Rate (%)                     | 23.750  | 32.330  | 46.011  | 44.290  | 17.331   |
| Unemployment Rate (%)                         | 5.966   | 6.422   | 6.400   | 6.367   | 5.811    |

## Foreign Trade and the Exchange Rate

| Foreign Trade and the Exchange Rate             |          |          |          |          |         |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|
|   | 2011     | 2012     | 2013     | 2014     | 2015    |
| Official Exchange Rate (LCU/\$US)               | 110.327  | 176.615  | 260.527  | 298.798  | 498.913 |
| Trade Balance NIPA (\$US billions)              | -0.8214  | -0.8802  | -0.7031  | -0.6259  | -0.2758 |
| Trade Balance % of GDP                          | -10.2875 | -14.7168 | -12.9434 | -10.3364 | -4.3179 |
| Total Foreign Exchange Reserves (\$US billions) | 0.2170   | 0.2446   | 0.4286   | 0.6179   | 0.2638  |

---

**Data in US Dollars**

| Data in US Dollars          |       |       |       |       |       |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|                             | 2011  | 2012  | 2013  | 2014  | 2015  |
| Nominal GDP (\$US billions) | 7.984 | 5.981 | 5.432 | 6.055 | 6.388 |
| Exports (\$US billions)     | 2.359 | 2.228 | 2.583 | 2.772 | 2.190 |
| Imports (\$US billions)     | 3.181 | 3.108 | 3.286 | 3.398 | 2.466 |

## Energy Consumption and Production Standard Units

| Energy Consumption and Production Standard Units |         |         |         |         |          |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
|  | 2011    | 2012    | 2013    | 2014    | 2015     |
| Petroleum Consumption (TBPD)                     | 6.059   | 6.059   | 6.000   | 5.973   | 6.224    |
| Petroleum Production (TBPD)                      | 0.2000  | 0.1986  | 0.1994  | 0.1955  | 0.1990   |
| Petroleum Net Exports (TBPD)                     | -5.8593 | -5.8607 | -5.8006 | -5.7777 | -6.0248  |
| Natural Gas Consumption (bcf)                    | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000   |
| Natural Gas Production (bcf)                     | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000   |
| Natural Gas Net Exports (bcf)                    | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000   |
| Coal Consumption (1000s st)                      | 59.525  | 59.525  | 72.576  | 77.406  | 80.537   |
| Coal Production (1000s st)                       | 58.388  | 56.077  | 66.701  | 70.122  | 70.215   |
| Coal Net Exports (1000s st)                      | -1.1367 | -3.4477 | -5.8746 | -7.2844 | -10.3218 |
| Nuclear Production (bil kwh)                     | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000   |
| Hydroelectric Production (bil kwh)               | 1.809   | 1.900   | 1.985   | 2.069   | 2.163    |
| Renewables Production (bil kwh)                  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000   |

## Energy Consumption and Production QUADS

| Energy Consumption and Production QUADS |         |         |         |         |         |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|   | 2011    | 2012    | 2013    | 2014    | 2015    |
| Petroleum Consumption (Quads)           | 0.0129  | 0.0129  | 0.0128  | 0.0128  | 0.0133  |
| Petroleum Production (Quads)            | 0.0004  | 0.0004  | 0.0004  | 0.0004  | 0.0003  |
| Petroleum Net Exports (Quads)           | -0.0125 | -0.0125 | -0.0124 | -0.0123 | -0.0129 |
| Natural Gas Consumption (Quads)         | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  |
| Natural Gas Production (Quads)          | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  |
| Natural Gas Net Exports (Quads)         | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  |
| Coal Consumption (Quads)                | 0.0012  | 0.0012  | 0.0015  | 0.0015  | 0.0016  |
| Coal Production (Quads)                 | 0.0012  | 0.0012  | 0.0014  | 0.0014  | 0.0013  |
| Coal Net Exports (Quads)                | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | -0.0001 | -0.0003 |
| Nuclear Production (Quads)              | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  |
| Hydroelectric Production (Quads)        | 0.0181  | 0.0190  | 0.0199  | 0.0207  | 0.0216  |
| Renewables Production (Quads)           | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  |

---

---

## World Energy Price Summary

| World Energy Price Summary       |         |        |        |        |        |
|----------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|                                  | 2011    | 2012   | 2013   | 2014   | 2015   |
| Petroleum-WTI (\$/bbl)           | 95.054  | 94.159 | 97.943 | 93.112 | 48.709 |
| Natural Gas-Henry Hub (\$/mmbtu) | 3.999   | 2.752  | 3.729  | 4.369  | 2.614  |
| Coal Thermal-Australian (\$/mt)  | 121.448 | 96.364 | 84.562 | 70.130 | 57.511 |

---

**CO2 Emissions**

| CO2 Emissions                 |        |        |        |        |        |
|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|                               | 2011   | 2012   | 2013   | 2014   | 2015   |
| Petroleum Based (mm mt C)     | 0.2891 | 0.2891 | 0.2862 | 0.2849 | 0.2969 |
| Natural Gas Based (mm mt C)   | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Coal Based (mm mt C)          | 0.0341 | 0.0341 | 0.0416 | 0.0444 | 0.0462 |
| Total CO2 Emissions (mm mt C) | 0.3232 | 0.3232 | 0.3278 | 0.3293 | 0.3431 |



## Agriculture Consumption and Production

| Agriculture Consumption and Production        |          |          |          |          |           |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
|   | 2011     | 2012     | 2013     | 2014     | 2015      |
| Corn Total Consumption (1000 metric tons)     | 3,347.95 | 3,603.31 | 3,698.52 | 4,023.35 | 4,001.64  |
| Corn Production (1000 metric tons)            | 3,692.29 | 3,607.69 | 3,625.04 | 3,989.10 | 3,717.87  |
| Corn Net Exports (1000 metric tons)           | 344.339  | 4.388    | -73.4868 | -34.2491 | -283.7715 |
| Soybeans Total Consumption (1000 metric tons) | 70.714   | 105.198  | 98.241   | 94.594   | 91.353    |
| Soybeans Production (1000 metric tons)        | 75.764   | 106.399  | 111.298  | 108.220  | 101.956   |
| Soybeans Net Exports (1000 metric tons)       | 5.050    | 1.201    | 13.057   | 13.626   | 10.603    |
| Rice Total Consumption (1000 metric tons)     | 117.782  | 110.168  | 125.162  | 131.002  | 127.037   |
| Rice Production (1000 metric tons)            | 117.812  | 110.962  | 125.101  | 130.949  | 128.056   |

|   | <b>2011</b> | <b>2012</b> | <b>2013</b> | <b>2014</b> | <b>2015</b> |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Rice Net Exports<br>(1000 metric tons)            | 0.0303      | 0.7942      | -0.0610     | -0.0532     | 1.020       |
| Coffee Total<br>Consumption (metric<br>tons)      | 3,158.00    | 4,550.00    | 4,811.00    | 5,451.08    | 5,540.49    |
| Coffee Production<br>(metric tons)                | 3,884.90    | 5,494.93    | 5,580.85    | 6,258.90    | 5,999.92    |
| Coffee Net Exports<br>(metric tons)               | 726.901     | 944.931     | 769.846     | 807.823     | 459.432     |
| Cocoa Beans Total<br>Consumption (metric<br>tons) | 0.0000      | 0.0000      | 0.0000      | 0.0000      | 0.0000      |
| Cocoa Beans<br>Production (metric<br>tons)        | 0.0000      | 0.0000      | 0.0000      | 0.0000      | 0.0000      |
| Cocoa Beans Net<br>Exports (metric tons)          | 0.0000      | 0.0000      | 0.0000      | 0.0000      | 0.0000      |
| Wheat Total<br>Consumption (1000<br>metric tons)  | 151.637     | 140.743     | 192.269     | 198.348     | 179.861     |
| Wheat Production<br>(1000 metric tons)            | 1.846       | 1.966       | 1.781       | 1.906       | 1.644       |
| Wheat Net Exports<br>(1000 metric tons)           | -149.7911   | -138.7766   | -190.4878   | -196.4418   | -178.2169   |

---



---

## World Agriculture Pricing Summary

| World Agriculture Pricing Summary            |         |         |         |         |         |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|  | 2011    | 2012    | 2013    | 2014    | 2015    |
| Corn Pricing Summary<br>(\$/metric ton)      | 291.684 | 298.417 | 259.389 | 192.881 | 169.750 |
| Soybeans Pricing Summary<br>(\$/metric ton)  | 540.667 | 591.417 | 538.417 | 491.771 | 390.417 |
| Rice Pricing Summary (\$/metric<br>ton)      | 458.558 | 525.071 | 473.989 | 425.148 | 386.033 |
| Coffee Pricing Summary<br>(\$/kilogram)      | 5.976   | 4.111   | 3.076   | 4.424   | 3.526   |
| Cocoa Beans Pricing Summary<br>(\$/kilogram) | 2.980   | 2.392   | 2.439   | 3.062   | 3.135   |
| Wheat Pricing Summary<br>(\$/metric ton)     | 316.264 | 313.242 | 312.248 | 284.895 | 203.177 |

## Metals Consumption and Production

| Metals Consumption and Production |         |         |          |          |          |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|
|                                   | 2011    | 2012    | 2013     | 2014     | 2015     |
| Copper Consumption (1000 mt)      | 9.531   | 9.459   | 39.700   | 11.190   | 10.554   |
| Copper Production (1000 mt)       | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000   | 0.0000   | 0.0000   |
| Copper Net Exports (1000 mt)      | -9.5310 | -9.4590 | -39.7000 | -11.1900 | -10.5540 |
| Zinc Consumption (1000 mt)        | 0.0988  | 0.0988  | 0.0988   | 0.0988   | 0.0988   |
| Zinc Production (1000 mt)         | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000   | 0.0000   | 0.0000   |
| Zinc Exports (1000 mt)            | -0.0988 | -0.0988 | -0.0988  | -0.0988  | -0.0988  |
| Lead Consumption (1000 mt)        | 1.074   | 1.074   | 1.074    | 1.074    | 1.074    |
| Lead Production (1000 mt)         | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000   | 0.0000   | 0.0000   |
| Lead Exports (1000 mt)            | -1.0744 | -1.0744 | -1.0744  | -1.0744  | -1.0744  |
| Tin Consumption (1000 mt)         | 0.0340  | 0.0280  | 0.2600   | 0.1073   | 0.1073   |
| Tin Production (1000 mt)          | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000   | 0.0000   | 0.0000   |
| Tin Exports (1000 mt)             | -0.0340 | -0.0280 | -0.2600  | -0.1073  | -0.1073  |
| Nickel Consumption (1000 mt)      | 0.0100  | 0.1160  | 0.0630   | 0.0630   | 0.0630   |

---

|                             | <b>2011</b> | <b>2012</b> | <b>2013</b> | <b>2014</b> | <b>2015</b> |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Nickel Production (1000 mt) | 0.0000      | 0.0000      | 0.0000      | 0.0000      | 0.0000      |
| Nickel Exports (1000 mt)    | -0.0100     | -0.1160     | -0.0630     | -0.0630     | -0.0630     |
| Gold Consumption (kg)       | 16.670      | 17.188      | 17.753      | 18.943      | 18.142      |
| Gold Production (kg)        | 8.356       | 8.616       | 8.899       | 9.496       | 9.164       |
| Gold Exports (kg)           | -8.3138     | -8.5723     | -8.8540     | -9.4479     | -8.9782     |
| Silver Consumption (mt)     | 15.400      | 15.400      | 15.400      | 15.400      | 15.400      |
| Silver Production (mt)      | 48.202      | 50.577      | 51.394      | 53.187      | 48.880      |
| Silver Exports (mt)         | 32.802      | 35.177      | 35.994      | 37.787      | 33.480      |

---



---

**World Metals Pricing Summary**

| World Metals Pricing Summary |           |           |           |           |           |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|                              | 2011      | 2012      | 2013      | 2014      | 2015      |
| Copper (\$/mt)               | 8,828.19  | 7,962.35  | 7,332.10  | 6,863.40  | 5,510.46  |
| Zinc (\$/mt)                 | 2,193.90  | 1,950.41  | 1,910.26  | 2,160.97  | 1,931.68  |
| Tin (\$/mt)                  | 26,053.68 | 21,125.99 | 22,282.80 | 21,898.87 | 16,066.63 |
| Lead (\$/mt)                 | 2,400.81  | 2,064.64  | 2,139.79  | 2,095.46  | 1,787.82  |
| Nickel (\$/mt)               | 22,910.36 | 17,547.55 | 15,031.80 | 16,893.38 | 11,862.64 |
| Gold (\$/oz)                 | 1,569.21  | 1,669.52  | 1,411.46  | 1,265.58  | 1,160.66  |
| Silver (\$/oz)               | 35.224    | 31.137    | 23.850    | 19.071    | 15.721    |

## Economic Performance Index

### Economic Performance Index

The Economic Performance rankings are calculated by CountryWatch's editorial team, and are based on criteria including sustained economic growth, monetary stability, current account deficits, budget surplus, unemployment and structural imbalances. Scores are assessed from 0 to 100 using this aforementioned criteria as well as CountryWatch's proprietary economic research data and models.

|                       | Bank<br>stability<br>risk | Monetary/<br>Currency<br>stability | Government<br>Finances | Empl./<br>Unempl. | Econ.GNP<br>growth or<br>decline/<br>forecast |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|---|
|                       | 0 - 100                   | 0 - 100                            | 0 - 100                | 0 - 100           | %   |
| <b>North Americas</b> |                           |                                    |                        |                   |   |
| Canada                | 92                        | 69                                 | 35                     | 38                | 3.14%   |
| United States         | 94                        | 76                                 | 4                      | 29                | 3.01%   |
| <b>Western Europe</b> |                           |                                    |                        |                   |   |
| Austria               | 90                        | 27                                 | 30                     | 63                | 1.33%   |
| Belgium               | 88                        | 27                                 | 19                     | 23                | 1.15%   |
| Cyprus                | 81                        | 91                                 | 16                     | 80                | -0.69%  |
| Denmark               | 97                        | 70                                 | 45                     | 78                | 1.20%   |
| Finland               | 89                        | 27                                 | 41                     | 33                | 1.25%   |

|                                       |    |    |    |    |        |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|--------|
| France                                | 87 | 27 | 18 | 27 | 1.52%  |
| Germany                               | 86 | 27 | 22 | 21 | 1.25%  |
| Greece                                | 79 | 27 | 5  | 24 | -2.00% |
| Iceland                               | 90 | 17 | 2  | 34 | -3.04% |
| Italy                                 | 85 | 27 | 37 | 24 | 0.84%  |
| Ireland                               | 92 | 27 | 11 | 10 | -1.55% |
| Luxembourg                            | 99 | 27 | 28 | 66 | 2.08%  |
| Malta                                 | 77 | 27 | 41 | 51 | 0.54%  |
| Netherlands                           | 91 | 27 | 26 | 74 | 1.30%  |
| Norway                                | 98 | 44 | 10 | 76 | 1.08%  |
| Portugal                              | 77 | 27 | 13 | 20 | 0.29%  |
| Spain                                 | 83 | 27 | 9  | 3  | -0.41% |
| Sweden                                | 94 | 72 | 54 | 32 | 1.23%  |
| Switzerland                           | 97 | 86 | 55 | 77 | 1.53%  |
| United Kingdom                        | 85 | 12 | 9  | 37 | 1.34%  |
| <b>Central and<br/>Eastern Europe</b> |    |    |    |    |        |
| Albania                               | 44 | 60 | 33 | 6  | 2.30%  |
| Armenia                               | 45 | 59 | 49 | 30 | 1.80%  |



|                        |    |     |    |     |        |
|------------------------|----|-----|----|-----|--------|
| Azerbaijan             | 56 | 4   | 84 | 99  | 2.68%  |
| Belarus                | 59 | 21  | 83 | 98  | 2.41%  |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 34 | 68  | 69 | N/A | 0.50%  |
| Bulgaria               | 58 | 75  | 88 | 49  | 0.20%  |
| Croatia                | 69 | 68  | 94 | 9   | 0.18%  |
| Czech Republic         | 80 | 89  | 29 | 70  | 1.67%  |
| Estonia                | 72 | 90  | 66 | 92  | 0.80%  |
| Georgia                | 36 | 60  | 53 | 56  | 2.00%  |
| Hungary                | 70 | 66  | 26 | 54  | -0.16% |
| Latvia                 | 67 | 100 | 65 | 44  | -3.97% |
| Lithuania              | 65 | 91  | 87 | 79  | -1.65% |
| Macedonia (FYR)        | 53 | 69  | 56 | 2   | 2.03%  |
| Moldova                | 23 | 36  | 81 | 67  | 2.50%  |
| Poland                 | 74 | 74  | 38 | 12  | 2.72%  |
| Romania                | 62 | 56  | 70 | 62  | 0.75%  |
| Russia                 | 73 | 18  | 90 | 8   | 4.00%  |
| Serbia                 | 48 | 49  | 52 | 5   | 1.97%  |
|                        |    |     |    |     |        |

|                          |    |    |    |     |        |
|--------------------------|----|----|----|-----|--------|
| Montenegro               | 39 | 27 | 73 | 1   | -1.70% |
| Slovak Republic          | 80 | 62 | 30 | 14  | 4.06%  |
| Slovenia                 | 81 | 27 | 36 | 65  | 1.12%  |
| Ukraine                  | 41 | 11 | 57 | N/A | 3.68%  |
| Africa                   |    |    |    |     |        |
| Algeria                  | 57 | 18 | 96 | 7   | 4.55%  |
| Angola                   | 49 | 1  | 97 | N/A | 7.05%  |
| Benin                    | 19 | 91 | 20 | N/A | 3.22%  |
| Botswana                 | 68 | 58 | 76 | N/A | 6.33%  |
| Burkina Faso             | 16 | 91 | 13 | N/A | 4.41%  |
| Burundi                  | 2  | 91 | 6  | N/A | 3.85%  |
| Cameroon                 | 26 | 91 | 91 | N/A | 2.58%  |
| Cape Verde               | 52 | 87 | 4  | N/A | 4.96%  |
| Central African Republic | 9  | 91 | 32 | N/A | 3.18%  |
| Chad                     | 22 | 91 | 89 | N/A | 4.42%  |
| Congo                    | 52 | 87 | 87 | N/A | 12.13% |
| Côte d'Ivoire            | 25 | 91 | 82 | 28  | 2.98%  |
| Dem. Republic            |    |    |    |     |        |

|                   |    |    |    |     |        |
|-------------------|----|----|----|-----|--------|
| Congo             | 4  | 91 | 47 | N/A | 5.44%  |
| Djibouti          | 31 | 76 | 50 | N/A | 4.47%  |
| Egypt             | 37 | 20 | 24 | 69  | 5.01%  |
| Equatorial Guinea | 82 | 91 | 85 | N/A | 0.94%  |
| Eritrea           | 1  | 3  | 1  | 18  | 1.81%  |
| Ethiopia          | 6  | 45 | 8  | N/A | 6.96%  |
| Gabon             | 64 | 91 | 96 | N/A | 5.36%  |
| Gambia            | 8  | 48 | 86 | N/A | 4.82%  |
| Ghana             | 9  | 11 | 69 | N/A | 4.50%  |
| Guinea            | 10 | 7  | 91 | N/A | 3.03%  |
| Guinea-Bissau     | 5  | 91 | 46 | N/A | 3.47%  |
| Kenya             | 20 | 41 | 59 | N/A | 4.11%  |
| Lesotho           | 13 | 40 | 12 | N/A | 2.98%  |
| Liberia           | 12 | 73 | 74 | N/A | 5.92%  |
| Libya             | 73 | 2  | 94 | N/A | 5.22%  |
| Madagascar        | 4  | 22 | 24 | N/A | -1.02% |
| Malawi            | 7  | 25 | 55 | N/A | 5.96%  |
| Mali              | 20 | 91 | 82 | N/A | 5.12%  |

|                     |    |    |     |     |       |
|---------------------|----|----|-----|-----|-------|
| Mauritania          | 15 | 13 | 93  | N/A | 4.58% |
| Mauritius           | 65 | 52 | 56  | 55  | 4.10% |
| Morocco             | 37 | 72 | 48  | 26  | 3.23% |
| Mozambique          | 12 | 23 | 71  | N/A | 6.45% |
| Namibia             | 40 | 39 | 62  | N/A | 1.70% |
| Niger               | 10 | 91 | 21  | N/A | 4.41% |
| Nigeria             | 30 | 6  | 61  | N/A | 6.98% |
| Rwanda              | 21 | 40 | 68  | N/A | 5.39% |
| Sao Tome & Principe | 1  | 61 | 100 | N/A | 3.40% |
| Senegal             | 24 | 91 | 63  | N/A | 3.44% |
| Seychelles          | 60 | 67 | 97  | N/A | 4.01% |
| Sierra Leone        | 5  | 10 | 39  | N/A | 4.77% |
| Somalia             | 2  | 38 | 59  | N/A | 3.19% |
| South Africa        | 61 | 37 | 70  | N/A | 2.59% |
| Sudan               | 16 | 5  | 73  | N/A | 5.52% |
| Swaziland           | 32 | 44 | 79  | N/A | 1.09% |
| Tanzania            | 15 | 45 | 32  | N/A | 6.17% |
| Togo                | 8  | 91 | 92  | N/A | 2.56% |

|                                      |    |    |    |     |       |
|--------------------------------------|----|----|----|-----|-------|
| Tunisia                              | 50 | 61 | 44 | 39  | 4.00% |
| Uganda                               | 11 | 17 | 54 | N/A | 5.59% |
| Zambia                               | 29 | 20 | 49 | N/A | 5.84% |
| Zimbabwe                             | 0  | 8  | 16 | N/A | 2.24% |
| <b>South and<br/>Central America</b> |    |    |    |     |       |
| Argentina                            | 66 | 3  | 80 | 36  | 3.50% |
| Belize                               | 47 | 76 | 80 | N/A | 1.00% |
| Bolivia                              | 32 | 51 | 61 | 81  | 3.99% |
| Brazil                               | 71 | 47 | 78 | 11  | 5.50% |
| Chile                                | 78 | 25 | 92 | 73  | 4.72% |
| Columbia                             | 47 | 52 | 34 | 47  | 2.25% |
| Costa Rica                           | 60 | 42 | 39 | 57  | 3.45% |
| Ecuador                              | 43 | 76 | 75 | 64  | 2.51% |
| El Salvador                          | 35 | 76 | 67 | N/A | 1.04% |
| Guatemala                            | 46 | 59 | 58 | N/A | 2.52% |
| Honduras                             | 27 | 47 | 58 | N/A | 2.00% |
| Mexico                               | 69 | 42 | 52 | 61  | 4.07% |
| Nicaragua                            | 23 | 49 | 42 | N/A | 1.75% |

|                    |     |     |     |     |        |
|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|
| Panama             | 66  | 76  | 72  | 45  | 5.00%  |
| Paraguay           | 35  | 46  | 66  | 16  | 5.27%  |
| Peru               | 59  | 66  | 75  | 22  | 6.33%  |
| Suriname           | 58  | 26  | 81  | 59  | 4.02%  |
| Uruguay            | 70  | 26  | 27  | N/A | 5.71%  |
| Venezuela          | 55  | 1   | 28  | 13  | -2.63% |
| <b>Caribbean</b>   |     |     |     |     |        |
| Antigua & Barbuda  | 72  | 76  | 15  | N/A | -2.01% |
| Bahamas            | 74  | 76  | 45  | 87  | -0.50% |
| Barbados           | 67  | 76  | 33  | 15  | -0.50% |
| Bermuda            | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A    |
| Cuba               | 45  | 76  | 18  | 95  | 0.25%  |
| Dominica           | 53  | 76  | 65  | N/A | 1.40%  |
| Dominican Republic | 54  | 39  | 43  | 4   | 3.50%  |
| Grenada            | 63  | 76  | 48  | N/A | 0.80%  |
| Guyana             | 28  | 56  | 17  | N/A | 4.36%  |
| Haiti              | 11  | 27  | 89  | N/A | -8.50% |
| Jamaica            | 42  | 9   | 85  | 19  | -0.28% |

|                         |    |    |    |     |        |
|-------------------------|----|----|----|-----|--------|
| St Lucia                | 55 | 76 | 67 | N/A | 1.14%  |
| St Vincent & Grenadines | 49 | 76 | 95 | N/A | 0.50%  |
| Trinidad & Tobago       | 82 | 37 | 77 | 72  | 2.13%  |
| <b>Middle East</b>      |    |    |    |     |        |
| Bahrain                 | 84 | 76 | 62 | 91  | 3.48%  |
| Iran                    | 51 | 19 | 40 | 58  | 3.01%  |
| Iraq                    | 48 | 9  | 8  | N/A | 7.27%  |
| Israel                  | 87 | 62 | 12 | 48  | 3.20%  |
| Jordan                  | 41 | 51 | 3  | N/A | 4.10%  |
| Kuwait                  | 96 | 4  | 99 | N/A | 3.10%  |
| Lebanon                 | 63 | 54 | 2  | N/A | 6.00%  |
| Oman                    | 76 | 16 | 88 | N/A | 4.71%  |
| Qatar                   | 99 | 16 | 83 | N/A | 18.54% |
| Saudi Arabia            | 76 | 8  | 98 | N/A | 3.70%  |
| Syria                   | 61 | 24 | 40 | N/A | 5.00%  |
| Turkey                  | 75 | 23 | 27 | 60  | 5.20%  |
| United Arab Emirates    | 96 | 24 | 98 | 94  | 1.29%  |

|                 |    |    |    |     |        |
|-----------------|----|----|----|-----|--------|
| Yemen           | 28 | 2  | 78 | N/A | 7.78%  |
| <b>Asia</b>     |    |    |    |     |        |
| Afghanistan     | 17 | 70 | 74 | N/A | 8.64%  |
| Bangladesh      | 13 | 43 | 25 | N/A | 5.38%  |
| Bhutan          | 24 | 55 | 5  | N/A | 6.85%  |
| Brunei          | 78 | 19 | 99 | 75  | 0.48%  |
| Cambodia        | 18 | 67 | 42 | N/A | 4.77%  |
| China           | 54 | 90 | 19 | 68  | 11.03% |
| Hong Kong       | 89 | 76 | 14 | 82  | 5.02%  |
| India           | 31 | 38 | 34 | 35  | 8.78%  |
| Indonesia       | 42 | 46 | 37 | 31  | 6.00%  |
| Japan           | 88 | 89 | 6  | 71  | 1.90%  |
| Kazakhstan      | 62 | 13 | 76 | 42  | 2.40%  |
| Korea North     | 18 | 65 | 23 | N/A | 1.50%  |
| Korea South     | 83 | 63 | 22 | 85  | 4.44%  |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 24 | 15 | 84 | 88  | 4.61%  |
| Laos            | 17 | 54 | 7  | N/A | 7.22%  |
| Macao           | 91 | 76 | 14 | 82  | 3.00%  |



|                  |    |    |    |     |        |
|------------------|----|----|----|-----|--------|
| Malaysia         | 68 | 65 | 44 | 90  | 4.72%  |
| Maldives         | 44 | 55 | 17 | N/A | 3.45%  |
| Mongolia         | 33 | 5  | 77 | 93  | 7.22%  |
| Myanmar          | 3  | 41 | 72 | N/A | 5.26%  |
| Nepal            | 3  | 14 | 25 | N/A | 2.97%  |
| Pakistan         | 19 | 15 | 31 | 41  | 3.00%  |
| Papua New Guinea | 75 | 50 | 11 | N/A | 7.96%  |
| Philippines      | 30 | 48 | 53 | 43  | 3.63%  |
| Singapore        | 93 | 75 | 63 | 40  | 5.68%  |
| Sri Lanka        | 38 | 22 | 10 | N/A | 5.50%  |
| Taiwan           | 84 | 88 | 35 | 89  | 6.50%  |
| Tajikistan       | 6  | 6  | 60 | 97  | 4.00%  |
| Thailand         | 56 | 64 | 90 | 96  | 5.46%  |
| Turkmenistan     | 51 | 53 | 68 | N/A | 12.00% |
| Uzbekistan       | 40 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 8.00%  |
| Vietnam          | 25 | 12 | 20 | N/A | 6.04%  |
| <b>Pacific</b>   |    |    |    |     |        |
| Australia        | 96 | 63 | 31 | 46  | 2.96%  |

|                          |     |     |     |     |        |
|--------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|
| Fiji                     | 46  | 53  | 3   | N/A | 2.06%  |
| Marshall Islands         | 27  | 76  | 46  | N/A | 1.08%  |
| Micronesia (Fed. States) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A    |
| New Caledonia            | 96  | 73  | 51  | 52  | 2.00%  |
| New Zealand              | 98  | 73  | 51  | 52  | 2.00%  |
| Samoa                    | 34  | 88  | 64  | N/A | -2.77% |
| Solomon Islands          | 14  | 71  | 1   | N/A | 3.36%  |
| Tonga                    | 26  | 57  | 38  | N/A | 0.60%  |
| Vanuatu                  | 33  | 58  | 47  | N/A | 3.80%  |

Source:

CountryWatch Inc. [www.countrywatch.com](http://www.countrywatch.com)

Updated:

This material was produced in 2010; it is subject to updating in 2012.

div style='margin-top:40%;padding-top:40%>

# **Chapter 4**

## **Investment Overview**

---

## Foreign Investment Climate

### Background

Landlocked Malawi ranks among the world's least developed countries. The economy is predominately agricultural, with about 90 percent of the population living in rural areas. The performance of the tobacco sector is vital to short-term growth as tobacco accounts for over 50 percent of exports. The economy depends on substantial inflows of economic assistance from the IMF, the World Bank, and individual donor nations. In late 2000, Malawi was approved for relief under the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) program. The government faces strong challenges, including developing a market economy, improving educational facilities, facing up to environmental problems, dealing with the rapidly growing problem of HIV/AIDS, and satisfying foreign donors that fiscal discipline is being tightened. The anti-corruption campaign championed by President Mutharika was anticipated to possibly help encourage investment and economic growth.

### Foreign Investment Assessment

#### Openness to Foreign Investment

The government encourages both domestic and foreign investment in most sectors of the economy, without restrictions on ownership, size of investment, source of funds, and destination of final product. The Competition And Fair Trading Act - passed by Parliament in November 1998 but made operational in April 2000 - aims to regulate and monitor monopolies and the concentration of economic power, protect consumer welfare, and strengthen the efficient production and distribution of goods and services. The act calls for the formation of a commission that will authorize only acquisitions, mergers and takeovers that increase employment and net exports, and lower prices for consumers. During the first half of 2000 the U.S.-based FCA Investment Company, together with the two local companies, acquired about 63 percent shares in the national insurance company of Malawi (NICO) through a cash takeover. As of July 2000 the Ministry of Commerce and Industry was forming a secretariat to oversee implementation of the Competition and Fair Trading Act.

There is no government screening of foreign investment in Malawi. Apart from the Privatization Program, the government's overall economic and industrial policy does not have discriminatory effects on foreign investors. Since industrial licensing in Malawi applies to both domestic and foreign investment, and is only restricted to a short list of products, it does not impede investment, limit competition, protect domestic interests, or discriminate against foreign investors at any stage

of investment. Restrictions are based on environmental, health, and national security concerns. Affected items are firearms; ammunition, chemical and biological weapons; explosives; and manufacturing involving hazardous waste treatment/disposal or radioactive material. All regulations affecting trade (foreign exchange, taxes, etc.) Apply equally to domestic and foreign investors.

All investors, irrespective of ethnic group or source of capital (foreign or local) may participate in the Privatization Program. However, the Malawi Stock Exchange regulations limit participation of an individual foreign portfolio investor to a maximum of 10 percent of any class or category of security under the program; and limit maximum total foreign investment in any portfolio to 49 percent. The Privatization Act also prohibits members of the cabinet, or employees of the commission, or its consultants to participate in any divestiture except where an offer is made to the general public. Malawi nationals are offered preferential treatment, including discounted share prices and subsidized credit. As of July 2000, the maximum subsidized credit amount had been increased from 20,000 Malawi kwacha (Mk) (about US\$357.1) to Mk50,000 (about US\$892.86) and the minimum income threshold of Mk10,000 per month (about US\$178.6) was removed. Subsidized credit carries a precondition that the shares or assets be retained for at least two years. As of July 2000, Malawi had privatized nearly half of an approximate 80 state-owned enterprises targeted for privatization, generating about Mk1.0 billion (about US\$17.86 million).

#### Transparency of Regulatory System

Malawi's industrial and trade reform program - including rationalization of the tax system, liberalization of the foreign exchange regime, and elimination of trade and industrial licenses on several items and businesses - has produced written guidelines intended to increase government use of transparent and effective policies to foster competition. No tax, labor, environment, health and safety or other laws distort or impede investment. However, procedural delays, red tape, and corrupt practices continue to impede the business and investment approval process. These include decision making, which is often neither transparent nor based purely on merit, and required land-access approvals. While market prices for goods are generally not controlled, prices of certain other goods - sugar (not well enforced), maize, petroleum products, and state-provided utilities - are regulated.

Recent positive steps towards increasing regulatory transparency and improving the foreign investment environment include the establishment of the National Electricity Council in October 1998; the establishment of the Malawi Communication Regulatory Authority (MACRA) in May 1999; the licensing and operation of a second cellular phone service provider in 1999; and the splitting of the former Malawi Posts and Telecommunication Corporation (MPTC) into the Malawi Posts Corporation (MPC) and Malawi Telecommunications Limited (MTL) as separate businesses in May 2000. The state-owned Petroleum Control Commission (PCC) relinquished its monopoly on petroleum imports in May 2000, allowing the private sector to import 80 percent of Malawi's fuel. PCC now plays a primarily regulatory function within the petroleum sector.

## **Labor Force**

Total: 4.5 million

By occupation: agriculture 90%

## **Agriculture and Industry**

Agriculture products: tobacco, sugarcane, cotton, tea, corn, potatoes, cassava (tapioca), sorghum, pulses; groundnuts, Macadamia nuts; cattle, goats

Industries: tobacco, tea, sugar, sawmill products, cement, consumer goods

## **Import Commodities and Partners**

Commodities: food, petroleum products, semi-manufactures, consumer goods, transportation equipment

Partners: South Africa 53.1%, India 6.3%, Tanzania 3.8%

## **Export Commodities and Partners**

Commodities: tobacco 60%, tea, sugar, cotton, coffee, peanuts, wood products, apparel

Partners: South Africa 23.2%, US 13.4%, Germany 11.2%, Egypt 5.6%, Portugal 4.7%, Japan 4.5%, Netherlands 4.3%

## **Telephone System**

Telephones- main lines in use: 85,000

Telephones- mobile cellular: 135,100

*General Assessment:* N/A

*Domestic:* system employs open-wire lines, microwave radio relay links, and radiotelephone communications stations

*International:* country code - 265; satellite earth stations - 2 Intelsat (1 Indian Ocean and 1 Atlantic Ocean)

## **Internet**

Internet Hosts: 18

Internet users: 36,000

### **Roads, Airports, Ports and Harbors**

Railways: 797 km

Highways: 28,400 km

Ports and harbors: Chipoka, Monkey Bay, Nkhata Bay, Nkhotakota, Chilumba

Airports: 42; w/paved runways: 6

### **Legal System and Considerations**

Malawi's legal system is based on English common law and customary law. There is judicial review of legislative acts in the Supreme Court of Appeal. The government has not accepted compulsory ICJ jurisdiction.

#### Dispute Settlement

Malawi has an independent but overburdened judiciary, which derives its procedures from English Common Law. There is little government interference in the court system, although there have on occasion been allegations of government involvement—largely through public comments made by politicians on certain cases. There are also frequent allegations of bribery in civil and criminal cases. Administration of the courts is weak, and due process can be very slow. Serious shortcomings in the judicial system include poor record keeping, a lack of attorneys and trained personnel, heavy caseloads, and insufficient financial resources.

The court system in Malawi accepts and enforces foreign court judgments that are registered in accordance with established legal procedure. There are, however, reciprocal agreements among commonwealth countries to enforce judgments without this registration obligation.

Malawi has legislation that offers adequate protection for property and contractual rights. Malawi has written commercial laws, which codify Common Law. The Sale-Of-Goods Act, the Hire-Purchase Act, and the Competition and Fair Trading Act cover commercial practices. The first two acts have been consistently applied, and there is a track record of cases involving commercial law. There is also a written and consistently applied Bankruptcy Law based on Common Law. Under Bankruptcy Law, secured creditors - ranked-ordered based upon investment registration dates - have first priority in recovering money. Monetary judgments are usually made in the investor's currency. However, the immediate availability of foreign exchange is dependent upon supply, which varies on a seasonal basis.

Malawi is a member of the International Center for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID), and accepts binding international arbitration of investment disputes between foreign investors and the state if specified in a written contract.

### **Corruption Perception Ranking**

See Corruption Perception index reported by Transparency International elsewhere in this report, from least to most corrupt countries.

### **Cultural Considerations**

Guests in Malawi should remember that it is still a developing country so patience is required. Telephone services, banking services and transportation may run slowly. Getting upset over delays and lines will only be a poor reflection on you. In general, locals will help assist however they can, so a friendly attitude will go a long way.

### **For more information see:**

United States' State Department Commercial Guide

---

## **Foreign Investment Index**

### Foreign Investment Index

**The Foreign Investment Index** is a proprietary index measuring attractiveness to international investment flows. The Foreign Investment Index is calculated using an established methodology by CountryWatch's Editor-in-Chief and is based on a given country's economic stability (sustained economic growth, monetary stability, current account deficits, budget surplus), economic risk (risk of non-servicing of payments for goods or services, loans and trade-related finance, risk of sovereign default), business and investment climate (property rights, labor force and laws, regulatory transparency, openness to foreign investment, market conditions, and stability of government). Scores are assigned from 0-10 using the aforementioned criteria. A score of 0 marks the lowest level of foreign investment viability, while a score of 10 marks the highest level of foreign investment viability, according to this proprietary index.



| Country     | Assessment |
|-------------|------------|
|             |            |
| Afghanistan | 2          |
| Albania     | 4.5        |
| Algeria     | 6          |
| Andorra     | 9          |
| Angola      | 4.5-5      |
| Antigua     | 8.5        |
| Argentina   | 5          |
| Armenia     | 5          |
| Australia   | 9.5        |
| Austria     | 9-9.5      |
| Azerbaijan  | 5          |
| Bahamas     | 9          |
| Bahrain     | 7.5        |
| Bangladesh  | 4.5        |
| Barbados    | 9          |
| Belarus     | 4          |
|             |            |

|                          |       |
|--------------------------|-------|
| Belgium                  | 9     |
| Belize                   | 7.5   |
| Benin                    | 5.5   |
| Bhutan                   | 4.5   |
| Bolivia                  | 4.5   |
| Bosnia-Herzegovina       | 5     |
| Botswana                 | 7.5-8 |
| Brazil                   | 8     |
| Brunei                   | 7     |
| Bulgaria                 | 5.5   |
| Burkina Faso             | 4     |
| Burma (Myanmar)          | 4.5   |
| Burundi                  | 4     |
| Cambodia                 | 4.5   |
| Cameroon                 | 5     |
| Canada                   | 9.5   |
| Cape Verde               | 6     |
| Central African Republic | 3     |

|                  |     |
|------------------|-----|
| Chad             | 4   |
| Chile            | 9   |
| China            | 7.5 |
| China: Hong Kong | 8.5 |
| China: Taiwan    | 8.5 |
| Colombia         | 7   |
| Comoros          | 4   |
| Congo DRC        | 4   |
| Congo RC         | 5   |
| Costa Rica       | 8   |
| Cote d'Ivoire    | 4.5 |
| Croatia          | 7   |
| Cuba             | 4.5 |
| Cyprus           | 7   |
| Czech Republic   | 8.5 |
| Denmark          | 9.5 |
| Djibouti         | 4.5 |
| Dominica         | 6   |

|                                   |       |
|-----------------------------------|-------|
| Dominican Republic                | 6.5   |
| East Timor                        | 4.5   |
| Ecuador                           | 5.5   |
| Egypt                             | 4.5-5 |
| El Salvador                       | 6     |
| Equatorial Guinea                 | 4.5   |
| Eritrea                           | 3.5   |
| Estonia                           | 8     |
| Ethiopia                          | 4.5   |
| Fiji                              | 5     |
| Finland                           | 9     |
| Former Yugoslav Rep. of Macedonia | 5     |
| France                            | 9-9.5 |
| Gabon                             | 5.5   |
| Gambia                            | 5     |
| Georgia                           | 5     |
| Germany                           | 9-9.5 |
| Ghana                             | 5.5   |

|                    |       |
|--------------------|-------|
| Greece             | 5     |
| Grenada            | 7.5   |
| Guatemala          | 5.5   |
| Guinea             | 3.5   |
| Guinea-Bissau      | 3.5   |
| Guyana             | 4.5   |
| Haiti              | 4     |
| Holy See (Vatican) | n/a   |
| Hong Kong (China)  | 8.5   |
| Honduras           | 5.5   |
| Hungary            | 8     |
| Iceland            | 8-8.5 |
| India              | 8     |
| Indonesia          | 5.5   |
| Iran               | 4     |
| Iraq               | 3     |
| Ireland            | 8     |
| Israel             | 8.5   |

|              |     |
|--------------|-----|
| Italy        | 8   |
| Jamaica      | 5.5 |
| Japan        | 9.5 |
| Jordan       | 6   |
| Kazakhstan   | 6   |
| Kenya        | 5   |
| Kiribati     | 5.5 |
| Korea, North | 1   |
| Korea, South | 9   |
| Kosovo       | 4.5 |
| Kuwait       | 8.5 |
| Kyrgyzstan   | 4.5 |
| Laos         | 4   |
| Latvia       | 7   |
| Lebanon      | 5   |
| Lesotho      | 5.5 |
| Liberia      | 3.5 |
| Libya        | 3   |

|                  |       |
|------------------|-------|
| Liechtenstein    | 9     |
| Lithuania        | 7.5   |
| Luxembourg       | 9-9.5 |
| Madagascar       | 4.5   |
| Malawi           | 4.5   |
| Malaysia         | 8.5   |
| Maldives         | 6.5   |
| Mali             | 5     |
| Malta            | 9     |
| Marshall Islands | 5     |
| Mauritania       | 4.5   |
| Mauritius        | 7.5-8 |
| Mexico           | 6.5-7 |
| Micronesia       | 5     |
| Moldova          | 4.5-5 |
| Monaco           | 9     |
| Mongolia         | 5     |
| Montenegro       | 5.5   |

|                  |       |
|------------------|-------|
| Morocco          | 7.5   |
| Mozambique       | 5     |
| Namibia          | 7.5   |
| Nauru            | 4.5   |
| Nepal            | 4     |
| Netherlands      | 9-9.5 |
| New Zealand      | 9.5   |
| Nicaragua        | 5     |
| Niger            | 4.5   |
| Nigeria          | 4.5   |
| Norway           | 9-9.5 |
| Oman             | 8     |
| Pakistan         | 4     |
| Palau            | 4.5-5 |
| Panama           | 7     |
| Papua New Guinea | 5     |
| Paraguay         | 6     |
| Peru             | 6     |



---

|                              |       |
|------------------------------|-------|
| Philippines                  | 6     |
| Poland                       | 8     |
| Portugal                     | 7.5-8 |
| Qatar                        | 9     |
| Romania                      | 6-6.5 |
| Russia                       | 6     |
| Rwanda                       | 4     |
| Saint Kitts and Nevis        | 8     |
| Saint Lucia                  | 8     |
| Saint Vincent and Grenadines | 7     |
| Samoa                        | 7     |
| San Marino                   | 8.5   |
| Sao Tome and Principe        | 4.5-5 |
| Saudi Arabia                 | 7     |
| Senegal                      | 6     |
| Serbia                       | 6     |
| Seychelles                   | 5     |
| Sierra Leone                 | 4     |

---

|                            |       |
|----------------------------|-------|
| Singapore                  | 9.5   |
| Slovak Republic (Slovakia) | 8.5   |
| Slovenia                   | 8.5-9 |
| Solomon Islands            | 5     |
| Somalia                    | 2     |
| South Africa               | 8     |
| Spain                      | 7.5-8 |
| Sri Lanka                  | 5.5   |
| Sudan                      | 4     |
| Suriname                   | 5     |
| Swaziland                  | 4.5   |
| Sweden                     | 9.5   |
| Switzerland                | 9.5   |
| Syria                      | 2.5   |
| Tajikistan                 | 4     |
| Taiwan (China)             | 8.5   |
| Tanzania                   | 5     |
| Thailand                   | 7.5-8 |

|                      |       |
|----------------------|-------|
| Togo                 | 4.5-5 |
| Tonga                | 5.5-6 |
| Trinidad and Tobago  | 8-8.5 |
| Tunisia              | 6     |
| Turkey               | 6.5-7 |
| Turkmenistan         | 4     |
| Tuvalu               | 7     |
| Uganda               | 5     |
| Ukraine              | 4.5-5 |
| United Arab Emirates | 8.5   |
| United Kingdom       | 9     |
| United States        | 9     |
| Uruguay              | 6.5-7 |
| Uzbekistan           | 4     |
| Vanuatu              | 6     |
| Venezuela            | 5     |
| Vietnam              | 5.5   |
| Yemen                | 3     |

|          |       |
|----------|-------|
| Zambia   | 4.5-5 |
| Zimbabwe | 3.5   |

Editor's Note:

As of 2015, the global economic crisis (emerging in 2008) had affected many countries across the world, resulting in changes to their rankings. Among those countries affected were top tier economies, such as the [United Kingdom](#), [Iceland](#), [Switzerland](#) and [Austria](#). However, in all these cases, their rankings have moved back upward in the last couple of years as anxieties have eased. Other top tier countries, such as [Spain](#), [Portugal](#), [Ireland](#), and [Italy](#), suffered some effects due to debt woes and the concomitant effect on the euro zone. Greece, another euro zone nation, was also downgraded due to its sovereign debt crisis; however, Greece's position on the precipice of default incurred a sharper downgrade than the other four euro zone countries mentioned above. Cyprus' exposure to Greek bank yielded a downgrade in its case. Slovenia and [Latvia](#) have been slightly downgraded due to a mix of economic and political concerns but could easily be upgraded in a future assessment, should these concerns abate. Meanwhile, the crisis in eastern [Ukraine](#) fueled downgrades in that country and neighboring [Russia](#).

Despite the "trifecta of tragedy" in [Japan](#) in 2011 -- the earthquake, the ensuing tsunami, and the resulting nuclear crisis -- and the appreciable destabilization of the economic and political terrain therein, this country has only slightly been downgraded. Japan's challenges have been assessed to be transient, the government remains accountable, and there is little risk of default. Both [India](#) and China retain their rankings; [India](#) holds a slightly higher ranking than [China](#) due to its record of democratic representation and accountability.

There were shifts in opposite directions for [Mali](#) and [Nigeria](#) versus the [Central African Republic](#), [Burkina Faso](#), and [Burundi](#). [Mali](#) was slightly upgraded due to its efforts to return to constitutional order following the 2012 coup and to neutralize the threat of separatists and Islamists. Likewise, a new government in [Nigeria](#) generated a slight upgrade as the country attempts to confront corruption, crime, and terrorism. But the [Central African Republic](#) was downgraded due to the takeover of the government by Seleka rebels and the continued decline into lawlessness in that country. Likewise, the attempts by the leaders of [Burundi](#) and [Burkina Faso](#) to hold onto power by by-passing the constitution raised eyebrows and resulted in downgrades.

Political unrest in [Libya](#) and [Algeria](#) have contributed to a decision to marginally downgrade these countries as well. [Syria](#) incurred a sharper downgrade due to the devolution into de facto civil war and the dire security threat posed by Islamist terrorists. [Iraq](#) saw a similar downgrade as a result of

the takeover of wide swaths of territory and the threat of genocide at the hands of Islamist terrorists. [Yemen](#), likewise, has been downgraded due to political instability at the hands of secessionists, terrorists, Houthi rebels, and the intervention of external parties. Conversely, [Egypt](#) and [Tunisia](#) saw slight upgrades as their political environments stabilize.

At the low end of the spectrum, devolving security conditions and/or economic crisis have resulted in countries like [Pakistan](#), [Afghanistan](#), [Somalia](#), and [Zimbabwe](#) maintaining their low ratings.

The [United States](#) continues to retain its previous slight downgrade due to the enduring threat of default surrounding the debt ceiling in that country, matched by a conflict-ridden political climate. In the case of [Mexico](#), there is limited concern about default, but increasing alarm over the security situation in that country and the government's ability to contain it. In [Argentina](#), a default to bond holders resulted in a downgrade to that country. Finally, a small but significant upgrade was attributed to [Cuba](#) due to its recent pro-business reforms and its normalization of ties with the United States.

Source:

CountryWatch Inc. [www.countrywatch.com](http://www.countrywatch.com)

Updated:

2015

---

## **Corruption Perceptions Index**

Corruption Perceptions Index

**Transparency International: [Corruption Perceptions Index](#)**

Editor's Note:

Transparency International's [Corruption Perceptions Index](#) is a composite index which ranks countries in terms of the degree to which corruption is perceived to exist among public officials. This index indicates the views of national and international business people and analysts about the levels of corruption in each country. The highest (and best) level of transparency is indicated by the number, 10. The lower (and worse) levels of transparency are indicated by lower numbers.

| Rank | Country/Territory | CPI 2009 Score | Surveys Used | Confidence Range |
|------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|
| 1    | New Zealand       | 9.4            | 6            | 9.1 - 9.5        |
| 2    | Denmark           | 9.3            | 6            | 9.1 - 9.5        |
| 3    | Singapore         | 9.2            | 9            | 9.0 - 9.4        |
| 3    | Sweden            | 9.2            | 6            | 9.0 - 9.3        |
| 5    | Switzerland       | 9.0            | 6            | 8.9 - 9.1        |
| 6    | Finland           | 8.9            | 6            | 8.4 - 9.4        |
| 6    | Netherlands       | 8.9            | 6            | 8.7 - 9.0        |
| 8    | Australia         | 8.7            | 8            | 8.3 - 9.0        |
| 8    | Canada            | 8.7            | 6            | 8.5 - 9.0        |
| 8    | Iceland           | 8.7            | 4            | 7.5 - 9.4        |
| 11   | Norway            | 8.6            | 6            | 8.2 - 9.1        |
| 12   | Hong Kong         | 8.2            | 8            | 7.9 - 8.5        |
| 12   | Luxembourg        | 8.2            | 6            | 7.6 - 8.8        |
| 14   | Germany           | 8.0            | 6            | 7.7 - 8.3        |
| 14   | Ireland           | 8.0            | 6            | 7.8 - 8.4        |
| 16   | Austria           | 7.9            | 6            | 7.4 - 8.3        |
|      |                   |                |              |                  |

|    |                                  |     |   |           |
|----|----------------------------------|-----|---|-----------|
| 17 | Japan                            | 7.7 | 8 | 7.4 - 8.0 |
| 17 | United Kingdom                   | 7.7 | 6 | 7.3 - 8.2 |
| 19 | United States                    | 7.5 | 8 | 6.9 - 8.0 |
| 20 | Barbados                         | 7.4 | 4 | 6.6 - 8.2 |
| 21 | Belgium                          | 7.1 | 6 | 6.9 - 7.3 |
| 22 | Qatar                            | 7.0 | 6 | 5.8 - 8.1 |
| 22 | Saint Lucia                      | 7.0 | 3 | 6.7 - 7.5 |
| 24 | France                           | 6.9 | 6 | 6.5 - 7.3 |
| 25 | Chile                            | 6.7 | 7 | 6.5 - 6.9 |
| 25 | Uruguay                          | 6.7 | 5 | 6.4 - 7.1 |
| 27 | Cyprus                           | 6.6 | 4 | 6.1 - 7.1 |
| 27 | Estonia                          | 6.6 | 8 | 6.1 - 6.9 |
| 27 | Slovenia                         | 6.6 | 8 | 6.3 - 6.9 |
| 30 | United Arab Emirates             | 6.5 | 5 | 5.5 - 7.5 |
| 31 | Saint Vincent and the Grenadines | 6.4 | 3 | 4.9 - 7.5 |
| 32 | Israel                           | 6.1 | 6 | 5.4 - 6.7 |
| 32 | Spain                            | 6.1 | 6 | 5.5 - 6.6 |
| 34 | Dominica                         | 5.9 | 3 | 4.9 - 6.7 |

|    |                   |     |   |           |
|----|-------------------|-----|---|-----------|
| 35 | Portugal          | 5.8 | 6 | 5.5 - 6.2 |
| 35 | Puerto Rico       | 5.8 | 4 | 5.2 - 6.3 |
| 37 | Botswana          | 5.6 | 6 | 5.1 - 6.3 |
| 37 | Taiwan            | 5.6 | 9 | 5.4 - 5.9 |
| 39 | Brunei Darussalam | 5.5 | 4 | 4.7 - 6.4 |
| 39 | Oman              | 5.5 | 5 | 4.4 - 6.5 |
| 39 | Korea (South)     | 5.5 | 9 | 5.3 - 5.7 |
| 42 | Mauritius         | 5.4 | 6 | 5.0 - 5.9 |
| 43 | Costa Rica        | 5.3 | 5 | 4.7 - 5.9 |
| 43 | Macau             | 5.3 | 3 | 3.3 - 6.9 |
| 45 | Malta             | 5.2 | 4 | 4.0 - 6.2 |
| 46 | Bahrain           | 5.1 | 5 | 4.2 - 5.8 |
| 46 | Cape Verde        | 5.1 | 3 | 3.3 - 7.0 |
| 46 | Hungary           | 5.1 | 8 | 4.6 - 5.7 |
| 49 | Bhutan            | 5.0 | 4 | 4.3 - 5.6 |
| 49 | Jordan            | 5.0 | 7 | 3.9 - 6.1 |
| 49 | Poland            | 5.0 | 8 | 4.5 - 5.5 |
| 52 | Czech Republic    | 4.9 | 8 | 4.3 - 5.6 |



|    |              |     |   |           |
|----|--------------|-----|---|-----------|
| 52 | Lithuania    | 4.9 | 8 | 4.4 - 5.4 |
| 54 | Seychelles   | 4.8 | 3 | 3.0 - 6.7 |
| 55 | South Africa | 4.7 | 8 | 4.3 - 4.9 |
| 56 | Latvia       | 4.5 | 6 | 4.1 - 4.9 |
| 56 | Malaysia     | 4.5 | 9 | 4.0 - 5.1 |
| 56 | Namibia      | 4.5 | 6 | 3.9 - 5.1 |
| 56 | Samoa        | 4.5 | 3 | 3.3 - 5.3 |
| 56 | Slovakia     | 4.5 | 8 | 4.1 - 4.9 |
| 61 | Cuba         | 4.4 | 3 | 3.5 - 5.1 |
| 61 | Turkey       | 4.4 | 7 | 3.9 - 4.9 |
| 63 | Italy        | 4.3 | 6 | 3.8 - 4.9 |
| 63 | Saudi Arabia | 4.3 | 5 | 3.1 - 5.3 |
| 65 | Tunisia      | 4.2 | 6 | 3.0 - 5.5 |
| 66 | Croatia      | 4.1 | 8 | 3.7 - 4.5 |
| 66 | Georgia      | 4.1 | 7 | 3.4 - 4.7 |
| 66 | Kuwait       | 4.1 | 5 | 3.2 - 5.1 |
| 69 | Ghana        | 3.9 | 7 | 3.2 - 4.6 |
| 69 | Montenegro   | 3.9 | 5 | 3.5 - 4.4 |

|    |                     |     |    |           |
|----|---------------------|-----|----|-----------|
| 71 | Bulgaria            | 3.8 | 8  | 3.2 - 4.5 |
| 71 | FYR Macedonia       | 3.8 | 6  | 3.4 - 4.2 |
| 71 | Greece              | 3.8 | 6  | 3.2 - 4.3 |
| 71 | Romania             | 3.8 | 8  | 3.2 - 4.3 |
| 75 | Brazil              | 3.7 | 7  | 3.3 - 4.3 |
| 75 | Colombia            | 3.7 | 7  | 3.1 - 4.3 |
| 75 | Peru                | 3.7 | 7  | 3.4 - 4.1 |
| 75 | Suriname            | 3.7 | 3  | 3.0 - 4.7 |
| 79 | Burkina Faso        | 3.6 | 7  | 2.8 - 4.4 |
| 79 | China               | 3.6 | 9  | 3.0 - 4.2 |
| 79 | Swaziland           | 3.6 | 3  | 3.0 - 4.7 |
| 79 | Trinidad and Tobago | 3.6 | 4  | 3.0 - 4.3 |
| 83 | Serbia              | 3.5 | 6  | 3.3 - 3.9 |
| 84 | El Salvador         | 3.4 | 5  | 3.0 - 3.8 |
| 84 | Guatemala           | 3.4 | 5  | 3.0 - 3.9 |
| 84 | India               | 3.4 | 10 | 3.2 - 3.6 |
| 84 | Panama              | 3.4 | 5  | 3.1 - 3.7 |
| 84 | Thailand            | 3.4 | 9  | 3.0 - 3.8 |

|     |                        |     |   |           |
|-----|------------------------|-----|---|-----------|
| 89  | Lesotho                | 3.3 | 6 | 2.8 - 3.8 |
| 89  | Malawi                 | 3.3 | 7 | 2.7 - 3.9 |
| 89  | Mexico                 | 3.3 | 7 | 3.2 - 3.5 |
| 89  | Moldova                | 3.3 | 6 | 2.7 - 4.0 |
| 89  | Morocco                | 3.3 | 6 | 2.8 - 3.9 |
| 89  | Rwanda                 | 3.3 | 4 | 2.9 - 3.7 |
| 95  | Albania                | 3.2 | 6 | 3.0 - 3.3 |
| 95  | Vanuatu                | 3.2 | 3 | 2.3 - 4.7 |
| 97  | Liberia                | 3.1 | 3 | 1.9 - 3.8 |
| 97  | Sri Lanka              | 3.1 | 7 | 2.8 - 3.4 |
| 99  | Bosnia and Herzegovina | 3.0 | 7 | 2.6 - 3.4 |
| 99  | Dominican Republic     | 3.0 | 5 | 2.9 - 3.2 |
| 99  | Jamaica                | 3.0 | 5 | 2.8 - 3.3 |
| 99  | Madagascar             | 3.0 | 7 | 2.8 - 3.2 |
| 99  | Senegal                | 3.0 | 7 | 2.5 - 3.6 |
| 99  | Tonga                  | 3.0 | 3 | 2.6 - 3.3 |
| 99  | Zambia                 | 3.0 | 7 | 2.8 - 3.2 |
| 106 | Argentina              | 2.9 | 7 | 2.6 - 3.1 |

|     |                       |     |   |           |
|-----|-----------------------|-----|---|-----------|
| 106 | Benin                 | 2.9 | 6 | 2.3 - 3.4 |
| 106 | Gabon                 | 2.9 | 3 | 2.6 - 3.1 |
| 106 | Gambia                | 2.9 | 5 | 1.6 - 4.0 |
| 106 | Niger                 | 2.9 | 5 | 2.7 - 3.0 |
| 111 | Algeria               | 2.8 | 6 | 2.5 - 3.1 |
| 111 | Djibouti              | 2.8 | 4 | 2.3 - 3.2 |
| 111 | Egypt                 | 2.8 | 6 | 2.6 - 3.1 |
| 111 | Indonesia             | 2.8 | 9 | 2.4 - 3.2 |
| 111 | Kiribati              | 2.8 | 3 | 2.3 - 3.3 |
| 111 | Mali                  | 2.8 | 6 | 2.4 - 3.2 |
| 111 | Sao Tome and Principe | 2.8 | 3 | 2.4 - 3.3 |
| 111 | Solomon Islands       | 2.8 | 3 | 2.3 - 3.3 |
| 111 | Togo                  | 2.8 | 5 | 1.9 - 3.9 |
| 120 | Armenia               | 2.7 | 7 | 2.6 - 2.8 |
| 120 | Bolivia               | 2.7 | 6 | 2.4 - 3.1 |
| 120 | Ethiopia              | 2.7 | 7 | 2.4 - 2.9 |
| 120 | Kazakhstan            | 2.7 | 7 | 2.1 - 3.3 |
| 120 | Mongolia              | 2.7 | 7 | 2.4 - 3.0 |

|     |             |     |   |           |
|-----|-------------|-----|---|-----------|
| 120 | Vietnam     | 2.7 | 9 | 2.4 - 3.1 |
| 126 | Eritrea     | 2.6 | 4 | 1.6 - 3.8 |
| 126 | Guyana      | 2.6 | 4 | 2.5 - 2.7 |
| 126 | Syria       | 2.6 | 5 | 2.2 - 2.9 |
| 126 | Tanzania    | 2.6 | 7 | 2.4 - 2.9 |
| 130 | Honduras    | 2.5 | 6 | 2.2 - 2.8 |
| 130 | Lebanon     | 2.5 | 3 | 1.9 - 3.1 |
| 130 | Libya       | 2.5 | 6 | 2.2 - 2.8 |
| 130 | Maldives    | 2.5 | 4 | 1.8 - 3.2 |
| 130 | Mauritania  | 2.5 | 7 | 2.0 - 3.3 |
| 130 | Mozambique  | 2.5 | 7 | 2.3 - 2.8 |
| 130 | Nicaragua   | 2.5 | 6 | 2.3 - 2.7 |
| 130 | Nigeria     | 2.5 | 7 | 2.2 - 2.7 |
| 130 | Uganda      | 2.5 | 7 | 2.1 - 2.8 |
| 139 | Bangladesh  | 2.4 | 7 | 2.0 - 2.8 |
| 139 | Belarus     | 2.4 | 4 | 2.0 - 2.8 |
| 139 | Pakistan    | 2.4 | 7 | 2.1 - 2.7 |
| 139 | Philippines | 2.4 | 9 | 2.1 - 2.7 |

|     |                          |     |   |           |
|-----|--------------------------|-----|---|-----------|
| 143 | Azerbaijan               | 2.3 | 7 | 2.0 - 2.6 |
| 143 | Comoros                  | 2.3 | 3 | 1.6 - 3.3 |
| 143 | Nepal                    | 2.3 | 6 | 2.0 - 2.6 |
| 146 | Cameroon                 | 2.2 | 7 | 1.9 - 2.6 |
| 146 | Ecuador                  | 2.2 | 5 | 2.0 - 2.5 |
| 146 | Kenya                    | 2.2 | 7 | 1.9 - 2.5 |
| 146 | Russia                   | 2.2 | 8 | 1.9 - 2.4 |
| 146 | Sierra Leone             | 2.2 | 5 | 1.9 - 2.4 |
| 146 | Timor-Leste              | 2.2 | 5 | 1.8 - 2.6 |
| 146 | Ukraine                  | 2.2 | 8 | 2.0 - 2.6 |
| 146 | Zimbabwe                 | 2.2 | 7 | 1.7 - 2.8 |
| 154 | Côte d'Ivoire            | 2.1 | 7 | 1.8 - 2.4 |
| 154 | Papua New Guinea         | 2.1 | 5 | 1.7 - 2.5 |
| 154 | Paraguay                 | 2.1 | 5 | 1.7 - 2.5 |
| 154 | Yemen                    | 2.1 | 4 | 1.6 - 2.5 |
| 158 | Cambodia                 | 2.0 | 8 | 1.8 - 2.2 |
| 158 | Central African Republic | 2.0 | 4 | 1.9 - 2.2 |
| 158 | Laos                     | 2.0 | 4 | 1.6 - 2.6 |

|     |                              |     |   |           |
|-----|------------------------------|-----|---|-----------|
| 158 | Tajikistan                   | 2.0 | 8 | 1.6 - 2.5 |
| 162 | Angola                       | 1.9 | 5 | 1.8 - 1.9 |
| 162 | Congo Brazzaville            | 1.9 | 5 | 1.6 - 2.1 |
| 162 | Democratic Republic of Congo | 1.9 | 5 | 1.7 - 2.1 |
| 162 | Guinea-Bissau                | 1.9 | 3 | 1.8 - 2.0 |
| 162 | Kyrgyzstan                   | 1.9 | 7 | 1.8 - 2.1 |
| 162 | Venezuela                    | 1.9 | 7 | 1.8 - 2.0 |
| 168 | Burundi                      | 1.8 | 6 | 1.6 - 2.0 |
| 168 | Equatorial Guinea            | 1.8 | 3 | 1.6 - 1.9 |
| 168 | Guinea                       | 1.8 | 5 | 1.7 - 1.8 |
| 168 | Haiti                        | 1.8 | 3 | 1.4 - 2.3 |
| 168 | Iran                         | 1.8 | 3 | 1.7 - 1.9 |
| 168 | Turkmenistan                 | 1.8 | 4 | 1.7 - 1.9 |
| 174 | Uzbekistan                   | 1.7 | 6 | 1.5 - 1.8 |
| 175 | Chad                         | 1.6 | 6 | 1.5 - 1.7 |
| 176 | Iraq                         | 1.5 | 3 | 1.2 - 1.8 |
| 176 | Sudan                        | 1.5 | 5 | 1.4 - 1.7 |
| 178 | Myanmar                      | 1.4 | 3 | 0.9 - 1.8 |

|     |             |     |   |           |
|-----|-------------|-----|---|-----------|
| 179 | Afghanistan | 1.3 | 4 | 1.0 - 1.5 |
| 180 | Somalia     | 1.1 | 3 | 0.9 - 1.4 |

### Methodology:

As noted above, the highest (and best) level of transparency with the least perceived corruption is indicated by the number, 10. The lower (and worse) levels of transparency are indicated by lower numbers.

According to Transparency International, the [Corruption Perceptions Index](#) (CPI) table shows a country's ranking and score, the number of surveys used to determine the score, and the confidence range of the scoring.

The rank shows how one country compares to others included in the index. The CPI score indicates the perceived level of public-sector corruption in a country/territory.

The CPI is based on 13 independent surveys. However, not all surveys include all countries. The surveys used column indicates how many surveys were relied upon to determine the score for that country.

The confidence range indicates the reliability of the CPI scores and tells us that allowing for a margin of error, we can be 90% confident that the true score for this country lies within this range.

### Note:

Kosovo, which separated from the Yugoslav successor state of [Serbia](#), is not listed above. No calculation is available for [Kosovo](#) at this time, however, a future corruption index by Transparency International may include the world's newest country in its tally. Taiwan has been listed above despite its contested status; while Taiwan claims sovereign status, [China](#) claims ultimate jurisdiction over Taiwan. Hong Kong, which is also under the rubric of Chinese sovereignty, is listed above. Note as well that Puerto Rico, which is a [United States](#) domain, is also included in the list above. These inclusions likely have to do with the size and fairly autonomous status of their economies.

### Source:

Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index; available at URL:



<http://www.transparency.org>

Updated:

Uploaded in 2011 using most recent ranking available; reviewed in 2015.

---

## Competitiveness Ranking

### Competitiveness Ranking

Editor's Note:

The Global Competitiveness Report's competitiveness ranking is based on the Global Competitiveness Index (GCI), which was developed for the World Economic Forum. The GCI is based on a number of competitiveness considerations, and provides a comprehensive picture of the competitiveness landscape in countries around the world. The competitiveness considerations are: institutions, infrastructure, macroeconomic environment, health and primary education, higher education and training, goods market efficiency, labour market efficiency, financial market development, technological readiness, market size, business sophistication, and innovation. The rankings are calculated from both publicly available data and the Executive Opinion Survey.

| Country/Economy | GCI 2010 Rank | GCI 2010 Score | GCI 2009 Rank | Change 2009-2010 |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
| Switzerland     | 1             | 5.63           | 1             | 0                |
| Sweden          | 2             | 5.56           | 4             | 2                |
| Singapore       | 3             | 5.48           | 3             | 0                |
| United States   | 4             | 5.43           | 2             | -2               |
| Germany         | 5             | 5.39           | 7             | 2                |
|                 |               |                |               |                  |

|                |    |      |    |    |
|----------------|----|------|----|----|
| Japan          | 6  | 5.37 | 8  | 2  |
| Finland        | 7  | 5.37 | 6  | -1 |
| Netherlands    | 8  | 5.33 | 10 | 2  |
| Denmark        | 9  | 5.32 | 5  | -4 |
| Canada         | 10 | 5.30 | 9  | -1 |
| Hong Kong SAR  | 11 | 5.30 | 11 | 0  |
| United Kingdom | 12 | 5.25 | 13 | 1  |
| Taiwan, China  | 13 | 5.21 | 12 | -1 |
| Norway         | 14 | 5.14 | 14 | 0  |
| France         | 15 | 5.13 | 16 | 1  |
| Australia      | 16 | 5.11 | 15 | -1 |
| Qatar          | 17 | 5.10 | 22 | 5  |
| Austria        | 18 | 5.09 | 17 | -1 |
| Belgium        | 19 | 5.07 | 18 | -1 |
| Luxembourg     | 20 | 5.05 | 21 | 1  |
| Saudi Arabia   | 21 | 4.95 | 28 | 7  |
| Korea, Rep.    | 22 | 4.93 | 19 | -3 |
| New Zealand    | 23 | 4.92 | 20 | -3 |

|                      |    |      |    |    |
|----------------------|----|------|----|----|
| Israel               | 24 | 4.91 | 27 | 3  |
| United Arab Emirates | 25 | 4.89 | 23 | -2 |
| Malaysia             | 26 | 4.88 | 24 | -2 |
| China                | 27 | 4.84 | 29 | 2  |
| Brunei Darussalam    | 28 | 4.75 | 32 | 4  |
| Ireland              | 29 | 4.74 | 25 | -4 |
| Chile                | 30 | 4.69 | 30 | 0  |
| Iceland              | 31 | 4.68 | 26 | -5 |
| Tunisia              | 32 | 4.65 | 40 | 8  |
| Estonia              | 33 | 4.61 | 35 | 2  |
| Oman                 | 34 | 4.61 | 41 | 7  |
| Kuwait               | 35 | 4.59 | 39 | 4  |
| Czech Republic       | 36 | 4.57 | 31 | -5 |
| Bahrain              | 37 | 4.54 | 38 | 1  |
| Thailand             | 38 | 4.51 | 36 | -2 |
| Poland               | 39 | 4.51 | 46 | 7  |
| Cyprus               | 40 | 4.50 | 34 | -6 |
| Puerto Rico          | 41 | 4.49 | 42 | 1  |

|              |    |      |    |    |
|--------------|----|------|----|----|
| Spain        | 42 | 4.49 | 33 | -9 |
| Barbados     | 43 | 4.45 | 44 | 1  |
| Indonesia    | 44 | 4.43 | 54 | 10 |
| Slovenia     | 45 | 4.42 | 37 | -8 |
| Portugal     | 46 | 4.38 | 43 | -3 |
| Lithuania    | 47 | 4.38 | 53 | 6  |
| Italy        | 48 | 4.37 | 48 | 0  |
| Montenegro   | 49 | 4.36 | 62 | 13 |
| Malta        | 50 | 4.34 | 52 | 2  |
| India        | 51 | 4.33 | 49 | -2 |
| Hungary      | 52 | 4.33 | 58 | 6  |
| Panama       | 53 | 4.33 | 59 | 6  |
| South Africa | 54 | 4.32 | 45 | -9 |
| Mauritius    | 55 | 4.32 | 57 | 2  |
| Costa Rica   | 56 | 4.31 | 55 | -1 |
| Azerbaijan   | 57 | 4.29 | 51 | -6 |
| Brazil       | 58 | 4.28 | 56 | -2 |
| Vietnam      | 59 | 4.27 | 75 | 16 |

|                    |    |      |     |     |
|--------------------|----|------|-----|-----|
| Slovak Republic    | 60 | 4.25 | 47  | -13 |
| Turkey             | 61 | 4.25 | 61  | 0   |
| Sri Lanka          | 62 | 4.25 | 79  | 17  |
| Russian Federation | 63 | 4.24 | 63  | 0   |
| Uruguay            | 64 | 4.23 | 65  | 1   |
| Jordan             | 65 | 4.21 | 50  | -15 |
| Mexico             | 66 | 4.19 | 60  | -6  |
| Romania            | 67 | 4.16 | 64  | -3  |
| Colombia           | 68 | 4.14 | 69  | 1   |
| Iran               | 69 | 4.14 | n/a | n/a |
| Latvia             | 70 | 4.14 | 68  | -2  |
| Bulgaria           | 71 | 4.13 | 76  | 5   |
| Kazakhstan         | 72 | 4.12 | 67  | -5  |
| Peru               | 73 | 4.11 | 78  | 5   |
| Namibia            | 74 | 4.09 | 74  | 0   |
| Morocco            | 75 | 4.08 | 73  | -2  |
| Botswana           | 76 | 4.05 | 66  | -10 |
| Croatia            | 77 | 4.04 | 72  | -5  |

|                     |    |      |     |     |
|---------------------|----|------|-----|-----|
| Guatemala           | 78 | 4.04 | 80  | 2   |
| Macedonia, FYR      | 79 | 4.02 | 84  | 5   |
| Rwanda              | 80 | 4.00 | n/a | n/a |
| Egypt               | 81 | 4.00 | 70  | -11 |
| El Salvador         | 82 | 3.99 | 77  | -5  |
| Greece              | 83 | 3.99 | 71  | -12 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 84 | 3.97 | 86  | 2   |
| Philippines         | 85 | 3.96 | 87  | 2   |
| Algeria             | 86 | 3.96 | 83  | -3  |
| Argentina           | 87 | 3.95 | 85  | -2  |
| Albania             | 88 | 3.94 | 96  | 8   |
| Ukraine             | 89 | 3.90 | 82  | -7  |
| Gambia, The         | 90 | 3.90 | 81  | -9  |
| Honduras            | 91 | 3.89 | 89  | -2  |
| Lebanon             | 92 | 3.89 | n/a | n/a |
| Georgia             | 93 | 3.86 | 90  | -3  |
| Moldova             | 94 | 3.86 | n/a | n/a |
| Jamaica             | 95 | 3.85 | 91  | -4  |

|                        |     |      |     |     |
|------------------------|-----|------|-----|-----|
| Serbia                 | 96  | 3.84 | 93  | -3  |
| Syria                  | 97  | 3.79 | 94  | -3  |
| Armenia                | 98  | 3.76 | 97  | -1  |
| Mongolia               | 99  | 3.75 | 117 | 18  |
| Libya                  | 100 | 3.74 | 88  | -12 |
| Dominican Republic     | 101 | 3.72 | 95  | -6  |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 102 | 3.70 | 109 | 7   |
| Benin                  | 103 | 3.69 | 103 | 0   |
| Senegal                | 104 | 3.67 | 92  | -12 |
| Ecuador                | 105 | 3.65 | 105 | 0   |
| Kenya                  | 106 | 3.65 | 98  | -8  |
| Bangladesh             | 107 | 3.64 | 106 | -1  |
| Bolivia                | 108 | 3.64 | 120 | 12  |
| Cambodia               | 109 | 3.63 | 110 | 1   |
| Guyana                 | 110 | 3.62 | 104 | -6  |
| Cameroon               | 111 | 3.58 | 111 | 0   |
| Nicaragua              | 112 | 3.57 | 115 | 3   |
| Tanzania               | 113 | 3.56 | 100 | -13 |

|                 |     |      |     |     |
|-----------------|-----|------|-----|-----|
| Ghana           | 114 | 3.56 | 114 | 0   |
| Zambia          | 115 | 3.55 | 112 | -3  |
| Tajikistan      | 116 | 3.53 | 122 | 6   |
| Cape Verde      | 117 | 3.51 | n/a | n/a |
| Uganda          | 118 | 3.51 | 108 | -10 |
| Ethiopia        | 119 | 3.51 | 118 | -1  |
| Paraguay        | 120 | 3.49 | 124 | 4   |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 121 | 3.49 | 123 | 2   |
| Venezuela       | 122 | 3.48 | 113 | -9  |
| Pakistan        | 123 | 3.48 | 101 | -22 |
| Madagascar      | 124 | 3.46 | 121 | -3  |
| Malawi          | 125 | 3.45 | 119 | -6  |
| Swaziland       | 126 | 3.40 | n/a | n/a |
| Nigeria         | 127 | 3.38 | 99  | -28 |
| Lesotho         | 128 | 3.36 | 107 | -21 |
| Côte d'Ivoire   | 129 | 3.35 | 116 | -13 |
| Nepal           | 130 | 3.34 | 125 | -5  |
| Mozambique      | 131 | 3.32 | 129 | -2  |



|              |     |      |     |     |
|--------------|-----|------|-----|-----|
| Mali         | 132 | 3.28 | 130 | -2  |
| Timor-Leste  | 133 | 3.23 | 126 | -7  |
| Burkina Faso | 134 | 3.20 | 128 | -6  |
| Mauritania   | 135 | 3.14 | 127 | -8  |
| Zimbabwe     | 136 | 3.03 | 132 | -4  |
| Burundi      | 137 | 2.96 | 133 | -4  |
| Angola       | 138 | 2.93 | n/a | n/a |
| Chad         | 139 | 2.73 | 131 | -8  |

### Methodology:

The competitiveness rankings are calculated from both publicly available data and the Executive Opinion Survey, a comprehensive annual survey conducted by the World Economic Forum together with its network of Partner Institutes (leading research institutes and business organizations) in the countries covered by the Report.

Highlights according to WEF --

- The [United States](#) falls two places to fourth position, overtaken by [Sweden](#) and [Singapore](#) in the rankings of the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Report 2010-2011
- The People's Republic of [China](#) continues to move up the rankings, with marked improvements in several other Asian countries
- [Germany](#) moves up two places to fifth place, leading the Eurozone countries
- [Switzerland](#) tops the rankings

### Source:

World Economic Forum; available at URL: <http://www.weforum.org>

### Updated:

2011 using most recent ranking available; reviewed in 2015.

---

## Taxation

A 38 percent tax rate applies to corporate income and capital gains derived from activities in Malawi. An additional five percent tax rate applies to the net income of non-resident companies.

Domestic protection through tariffs is gradually diminishing as the government continues to shift sources of revenue collection from customs duties to consumption and direct taxes. Import duties vary according to product and country of origin. As a member of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and the Common Market For Eastern And Southern Africa (COMESA), Malawi grants reciprocal preferences to member states of these organizations. Malawi has bilateral trade agreements with South Africa and Zimbabwe, both of which allow duty-free entrance of Malawi products. In 1998, the government eliminated export taxes on tobacco, sugar, tea and coffee. The maximum import tariff rate is 25 percent. In June 2000 the government reduced tariff rates on intermediate goods and raw materials from 15 to 10 percent, but extended a 20 percent surtax to commercial transport fees. COMESA members plan to eliminate duties for member-states in October 2000. A ten- percent reduction in duties under the SADC Trade Protocol is planned to come into effect in January 2001.

Malawi offers the following incentives, which apply equally to domestic and foreign investors:

Tax allowances:

- 40 percent for new buildings and machinery; up to 20 percent for used buildings and machinery;
- 100 percent deduction for manufacturing company operating expenses in two years;
- no import duty on heavy goods vehicles with capacity of 10 tons or more;
- no withholding tax on dividends;
- no import duty on raw materials for manufacturing industry;
- tax holidays or reduced corporate tax for new investments;
- a maximum import tariff rate of 35 percent.

Malawi offers the following special incentives for exporters:

For exporters in export processing zones:

- no corporate tax, value added tax;
- no import duty on capital equipment and raw materials;
- no excise taxes on local purchases of raw materials and packaging.

For industries manufacturing in bond:

- an allowance of 12 percent of export revenues for products other than tobacco, tea, sugar and coffee;
- transport allowance of 25 percent of all international transport costs;
- no import duties on capital equipment;
- no import duties or surtaxes on raw materials;
- no excise tax on local purchases of raw materials and packaging material.

---

## Stock Market

The Malawi Stock Exchange, opened in 1996. Foreign investment is allowed, but is limited to 5 percent of issued share capital per foreign investor and 49 percent of issued share capital in total. Bonds, shares, equities, and government securities are traded. The Exchange is supervised by a committee, which includes representatives from the Central Bank and the government. The Exchange is a member of the African Stock Exchange Association.

For more information on the Malawi Stock Exchange, see URL: <http://www.mse.co.mw/>.

---

## Partner Links

Partner Links



# **Chapter 5**

## **Social Overview**

---

## People

### Background and Origins

Hominid and stone remains dating back more than one million years have been identified in Malawi. Archaeological evidence also indicates early humans inhabited the area 50,000 to 60,000 years ago. Human remains recovered from a site dating back 10,000 years show physical characteristics similar to people living in the Horn of Africa. At another site, dated 1500 before the common era, or B.C.E., the remains possessed features resembling Bushman people.

Bantu-speaking peoples, ancestors of the Malawians, migrated from the north, the southern region of present-day Democratic Republic of the Congo, about 1400 in the common era or C.E. By 1500 C.E., two divisions of Bantu peoples had established a centralized kingdom stretching beyond today's national borders. This pre-colonial Empire of Malawi covered much more than the current area of the country and included Chewa, Tumbuka and Tonga peoples.

### Population

Reflecting the anthropological origins noted above, almost all Malawians are Africans descended from Bantu peoples. Indeed, Malawi derives its name from "Maravi," the term used for an ancient Bantu culture. Chichewa and English are the official languages. Most of the population is Christian, and about 20 percent are Muslim. Of the Christian population, the majority is Protestant, while the rest are Roman Catholics. Many Malawians combine Christian or Muslim beliefs with traditional religious practices.

The current ethnic composition of the country is mixed. The largest group is the Chewa, found mostly in the central region. Smaller groups include the Ngoni, whose roots are in Northern Natal; the Lomwe, Nyanja and Sena, primarily in the southern region in the country; the largely Muslim Yao; and the Tumbuka and Tonga, disproportionately located in the northern region. The latter were some of the primary beneficiaries of missionary education efforts, which explains the disproportionate numbers of northerners in the colonial administration and later in the nationalist movement. Small and prosperous Asian and European communities also exist.

The salience of ethnic identity among the African population should not be overstated. Although individuals retain group affiliations by virtue of language and home area, members of the various groups interact considerably. Intermarriages are relatively common, especially in urban areas. Political identifications have revolved more around regional than ethnic lines.

The population is about 13.6 million, according to recent estimates. Until 1994, Mozambican refugees alone numbered more than one million. Malawi is one of the most densely populated countries in Africa, at 84.7 per square kilometers, yet with only 10 percent living in towns, it is one of the least urbanized. Half the population lives in the southern region; only 11 percent in the north. The average annual population growth rate at 2.39 percent in recent years.

### Health and Welfare

Between 14 and 15 percent of Malawi citizens are estimated to be HIV-positive. Relevant statistics indicate that HIV/AIDS has caused over tens of thousands of deaths per year and has created 500,000 orphans in Malawi since the first case was noted in 1984. Up to 900,000 people are believed to be living with the virus. The virus also affects 40,000 children, and a further 390,000 have lost their mother or both parents as a result of the virus. Adding a further blight on Malawi's children is that 30 percent of them suffer from malnutrition. In fact, the quality of health and welfare in Malawi was among the lowest in Africa, and indeed, the world for a long time. That said, the infant mortality rate in recent years is 90.55 deaths per 1,000 births -- a reduction from previous years. Life expectancy for Malawi, according to recently released figures, is 43.45 years of age on average.

The average literacy rate in Malawi is 62.7 percent for the total population. This shows a relatively high average rate of literacy for the population in comparison with other less developed countries. That said, it should be noted that the average rate belies a vast disparity between males and females. Whereas literacy among men is 76.1 percent, among women it is 49.8 percent.

About 4.8 percent of GDP in this country is spent on health expenditures; about 4.2 percent of GDP is spent on educational expenditures.

### Human Development

As such, Malawi ranks low in the human development category of the Human Development Index (HDI). This index is a notable measure of human development, which is formulated by the United Nations Development Program. The HDI is a composite of several indicators, which measure a country's achievements in three main areas of human development: longevity, knowledge and education, as well as economic standard of living. In a ranking of 169 countries, the HDI places

Malawi in the low human development category, at 153rd place. Although the concept of human development is complicated and cannot be properly captured by values and indices, the HDI, which is calculated and updated annually, offers a wide-ranging assessment of human development in certain countries, not based solely upon traditional economic and financial indicators.

Written by Dr. Denise Youngblood Coleman, Editor in Chief at [www.countrywatch.com](http://www.countrywatch.com). See Bibliography for list of research sources.

### Human Development Index

Human Development Index

#### Human Development Index (Ranked Numerically)

The [Human Development Index](#) (HDI) is used to measure quality of life in countries across the world. The HDI has been compiled since 1990 by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) on a regular basis. The HDI is a composite of several indicators, which measure a country's achievements in three main arenas of human development: longevity, education, and economic standard of living. Although the concept of human development is complicated and cannot be properly captured by values and indices, the HDI offers a wide-ranging assessment of human development in certain countries, not based solely upon traditional economic and financial indicators. For more information about the methodology used to calculate the HDI, please see the "Source Materials" in the appendices of this review.

| <b>Very High Human Development</b> | <b>High Human Development</b> | <b>Medium Human Development</b> | <b>Low Human Development</b> |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Norway                          | 43. Bahamas                   | 86. Fiji                        | 128. Kenya                   |
| 2. Australia                       | 44. Lithuania                 | 87. Turkmenistan                | 129. Bangladesh              |
|                                    |                               | 88. Dominican                   |                              |



|                  |                         |                 |                          |
|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| 3. New Zealand   | 45. Chile               | Republic        | 130. Ghana               |
| 4. United States | 46. Argentina           | 89. China       | 131. Cameroon            |
| 5. Ireland       | 47. Kuwait              | 90. El Salvador | 132. Myanmar<br>(Burma)  |
| 6. Liechtenstein | 48. Latvia              | 91. Sri Lanka   | 133. Yemen               |
| 7. Netherlands   | 49. Montenegro          | 92. Thailand    | 134. Benin               |
| 8. Canada        | 50. Romania             | 93. Gabon       | 135.<br>Madagascar       |
| 9. Sweden        | 51. Croatia             | 94. Suriname    | 136. Mauritania          |
| 10. Germany      | 52. Uruguay             | 95. Bolivia     | 137. Papua<br>New Guinea |
| 11. Japan        | 53. Libya               | 96. Paraguay    | 138. Nepal               |
| 12. South Korea  | 54. Panama              | 97. Philippines | 139. Togo                |
| 13. Switzerland  | 55. Saudi Arabia        | 98. Botswana    | 140. Comoros             |
| 14. France       | 56. Mexico              | 99. Moldova     | 141. Lesotho             |
| 15. Israel       | 57. Malaysia            | 100. Mongolia   | 142. Nigeria             |
| 16. Finland      | 58. Bulgaria            | 101. Egypt      | 143. Uganda              |
| 17. Iceland      | 59. Trinidad and Tobago | 102. Uzbekistan | 144. Senegal             |
| 18. Belgium      | 60. Serbia              | 103. Micronesia | 145. Haiti               |
| 19. Denmark      | 61. Belarus             | 104. Guyana     | 146. Angola              |

|                          |   |                        |                               |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 20. Spain                | 62. Costa Rica                                | 105. Namibia           | 147. Djibouti                 |
| 21. Hong King            | 63. Peru                                      | 106. Honduras          | 148. Tanzania                 |
| 22. Greece               | 64. Albania                                   | 107. Maldives          | 149. Cote d'Ivoire            |
| 23. Italy                | 65. Russian Federation                        | 108. Indonesia         | 150. Zambia                   |
| 24. Luxembourg           | 66. Kazakhstan                                | 109. Kyrgyzstan        | 151. Gambia                   |
| 25. Austria              | 67. Azerbaijan                                | 110. South Africa      | 152. Rwanda                   |
| 26. United Kingdom       | 68. Bosnia and Herzegovina                    | 111. Syria             | 153. Malawi                   |
| 27. Singapore            | 69. Ukraine                                   | 112. Tajikistan        | 154. Sudan                    |
| 28. Czech Republic       | 70. Iran                                      | 113. Vietnam           | 155. Afghanistan              |
| 29. Slovenia             | 71. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia | 114. Morocco           | 156. Guinea                   |
| 30. Andorra              | 72. Mauritius                                 | 115. Nicaragua         | 157. Ethiopia                 |
| 31. Slovakia             | 73. Brazil                                    | 116. Guatemala         | 158. Sierra Leone             |
| 32. United Arab Emirates | 74. Georgia                                   | 117. Equatorial Guinea | 159. Central African Republic |
| 33. Malta                | 75. Venezuela                                 | 118. Cape Verde        | 160. Mali                     |
| 34. Estonia              | 76. Armenia                                   | 119. India             | 161. Burkina Faso             |

|              |              |                            |                    |
|--------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| 35. Cyprus   | 77. Ecuador  | 120. East Timor            | 162. Liberia       |
| 36. Hungary  | 78. Belize   | 121. Swaziland             | 163. Chad          |
| 37. Brunei   | 79. Colombia | 122. Laos                  | 164. Guinea-Bissau |
| 38. Qatar    | 80. Jamaica  | 123. Solomon Islands       | 165. Mozambique    |
| 39. Bahrain  | 81. Tunisia  | 124. Cambodia              | 166. Burundi       |
| 40. Portugal | 82. Jordan   | 125. Pakistan              | 167. Niger         |
| 41. Poland   | 83. Turkey   | 126. Congo RC              | 168. Congo DRC     |
| 42. Barbados | 84. Algeria  | 127. Sao Tome and Principe | 169. Zimbabwe      |
|              | 85. Tonga    |                            |                    |

Methodology:

For more information about the methodology used to calculate the HDI, please see the "Source Materials" in the appendices of this Country Review.

Reference:

As published in United Nations Development Programme's Human Development Report 2010.

Source:

United Nations Development Programme's [Human Development Index](http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/) available at URL: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/>

Updated:

Uploaded in 2011 using ranking available; reviewed in 2015

---

## Life Satisfaction Index

### Life Satisfaction Index

#### Life Satisfaction Index

Created by Adrian G. White, an Analytic Social Psychologist at the University of Leicester, the "Satisfaction with Life Index" measures subjective life satisfaction across various countries. The data was taken from a metastudy (see below for source) and associates the notion of subjective happiness or life satisfaction with qualitative parameters such as health, wealth, and access to basic education. This assessment serves as an alternative to other measures of happiness that tend to rely on traditional and quantitative measures of policy on quality of life, such as GNP and GDP. The methodology involved the responses of 80,000 people across the globe.

| Rank | Country     | Score  |
|------|-------------|--------|
| 1    | Denmark     | 273.4  |
| 2    | Switzerland | 273.33 |
| 3    | Austria     | 260    |
| 4    | Iceland     | 260    |
| 5    | The Bahamas | 256.67 |
| 6    | Finland     | 256.67 |
| 7    | Sweden      | 256.67 |

|    |                       |        |
|----|-----------------------|--------|
| 8  | Iran                  | 253.33 |
| 9  | Brunei                | 253.33 |
| 10 | Canada                | 253.33 |
| 11 | Ireland               | 253.33 |
| 12 | Luxembourg            | 253.33 |
| 13 | Costa Rica            | 250    |
| 14 | Malta                 | 250    |
| 15 | Netherlands           | 250    |
| 16 | Antiguaand Barbuda    | 246.67 |
| 17 | Malaysia              | 246.67 |
| 18 | New Zealand           | 246.67 |
| 19 | Norway                | 246.67 |
| 20 | Seychelles            | 246.67 |
| 21 | Saint Kitts and Nevis | 246.67 |
| 22 | United Arab Emirates  | 246.67 |
| 23 | United States         | 246.67 |
| 24 | Vanuatu               | 246.67 |
| 25 | Venezuela             | 246.67 |

|    |                                  |        |
|----|----------------------------------|--------|
| 26 | Australia                        | 243.33 |
| 27 | Barbados                         | 243.33 |
| 28 | Belgium                          | 243.33 |
| 29 | Dominica                         | 243.33 |
| 30 | Oman                             | 243.33 |
| 31 | Saudi Arabia                     | 243.33 |
| 32 | Suriname                         | 243.33 |
| 33 | Bahrain                          | 240    |
| 34 | Colombia                         | 240    |
| 35 | Germany                          | 240    |
| 36 | Guyana                           | 240    |
| 37 | Honduras                         | 240    |
| 38 | Kuwait                           | 240    |
| 39 | Panama                           | 240    |
| 40 | Saint Vincent and the Grenadines | 240    |
| 41 | United Kingdom                   | 236.67 |
| 42 | Dominican Republic               | 233.33 |
| 43 | Guatemala                        | 233.33 |
|    |                                  |        |

|    |                       |        |
|----|-----------------------|--------|
| 44 | Jamaica               | 233.33 |
| 45 | Qatar                 | 233.33 |
| 46 | Spain                 | 233.33 |
| 47 | Saint Lucia           | 233.33 |
| 48 | Belize                | 230    |
| 49 | Cyprus                | 230    |
| 50 | Italy                 | 230    |
| 51 | Mexico                | 230    |
| 52 | Samoa                 | 230    |
| 53 | Singapore             | 230    |
| 54 | Solomon Islands       | 230    |
| 55 | Trinidad and Tobago   | 230    |
| 56 | Argentina             | 226.67 |
| 57 | Fiji                  | 223.33 |
| 58 | Israel                | 223.33 |
| 59 | Mongolia              | 223.33 |
| 60 | São Tomé and Príncipe | 223.33 |
| 61 | El Salvador           | 220    |

|    |                |        |
|----|----------------|--------|
| 62 | France         | 220    |
| 63 | Hong Kong      | 220    |
| 64 | Indonesia      | 220    |
| 65 | Kyrgyzstan     | 220    |
| 66 | Maldives       | 220    |
| 67 | Slovenia       | 220    |
| 68 | Taiwan         | 220    |
| 69 | East Timor     | 220    |
| 70 | Tonga          | 220    |
| 71 | Chile          | 216.67 |
| 72 | Grenada        | 216.67 |
| 73 | Mauritius      | 216.67 |
| 74 | Namibia        | 216.67 |
| 75 | Paraguay       | 216.67 |
| 76 | Thailand       | 216.67 |
| 77 | Czech Republic | 213.33 |
| 78 | Philippines    | 213.33 |
| 79 | Tunisia        | 213.33 |
|    |                |        |



|    |                  |        |
|----|------------------|--------|
| 80 | Uzbekistan       | 213.33 |
| 81 | Brazil           | 210    |
| 82 | China            | 210    |
| 83 | Cuba             | 210    |
| 84 | Greece           | 210    |
| 85 | Nicaragua        | 210    |
| 86 | Papua New Guinea | 210    |
| 87 | Uruguay          | 210    |
| 88 | Gabon            | 206.67 |
| 89 | Ghana            | 206.67 |
| 90 | Japan            | 206.67 |
| 91 | Yemen            | 206.67 |
| 92 | Portugal         | 203.33 |
| 93 | Sri Lanka        | 203.33 |
| 94 | Tajikistan       | 203.33 |
| 95 | Vietnam          | 203.33 |
| 96 | Bhutan           | 200    |
| 97 | Comoros          | 196.67 |
|    |                  |        |

|     |                       |        |
|-----|-----------------------|--------|
| 98  | Croatia               | 196.67 |
| 99  | Poland                | 196.67 |
| 100 | Cape Verde            | 193.33 |
| 101 | Kazakhstan            | 193.33 |
| 102 | South Korea           | 193.33 |
| 103 | Madagascar            | 193.33 |
| 104 | Bangladesh            | 190    |
| 105 | Republic of the Congo | 190    |
| 106 | The Gambia            | 190    |
| 107 | Hungary               | 190    |
| 108 | Libya                 | 190    |
| 109 | South Africa          | 190    |
| 110 | Cambodia              | 186.67 |
| 111 | Ecuador               | 186.67 |
| 112 | Kenya                 | 186.67 |
| 113 | Lebanon               | 186.67 |
| 114 | Morocco               | 186.67 |
| 115 | Peru                  | 186.67 |

|     |                       |        |
|-----|-----------------------|--------|
| 116 | Senegal               | 186.67 |
| 117 | Bolivia               | 183.33 |
| 118 | Haiti                 | 183.33 |
| 119 | Nepal                 | 183.33 |
| 120 | Nigeria               | 183.33 |
| 121 | Tanzania              | 183.33 |
| 122 | Benin                 | 180    |
| 123 | Botswana              | 180    |
| 124 | Guinea-Bissau         | 180    |
| 125 | India                 | 180    |
| 126 | Laos                  | 180    |
| 127 | Mozambique            | 180    |
| 128 | Palestinian Authority | 180    |
| 129 | Slovakia              | 180    |
| 130 | Myanmar               | 176.67 |
| 131 | Mali                  | 176.67 |
| 132 | Mauritania            | 176.67 |
| 133 | Turkey                | 176.67 |

|     |                          |        |
|-----|--------------------------|--------|
| 134 | Algeria                  | 173.33 |
| 135 | Equatorial Guinea        | 173.33 |
| 136 | Romania                  | 173.33 |
| 137 | Bosnia and Herzegovina   | 170    |
| 138 | Cameroon                 | 170    |
| 139 | Estonia                  | 170    |
| 140 | Guinea                   | 170    |
| 141 | Jordan                   | 170    |
| 142 | Syria                    | 170    |
| 143 | Sierra Leone             | 166.67 |
| 144 | Azerbaijan               | 163.33 |
| 145 | Central African Republic | 163.33 |
| 146 | Republic of Macedonia    | 163.33 |
| 147 | Togo                     | 163.33 |
| 148 | Zambia                   | 163.33 |
| 149 | Angola                   | 160    |
| 150 | Djibouti                 | 160    |
| 151 | Egypt                    | 160    |

|     |               |        |
|-----|---------------|--------|
| 152 | Burkina Faso  | 156.67 |
| 153 | Ethiopia      | 156.67 |
| 154 | Latvia        | 156.67 |
| 155 | Lithuania     | 156.67 |
| 156 | Uganda        | 156.67 |
| 157 | Albania       | 153.33 |
| 158 | Malawi        | 153.33 |
| 159 | Chad          | 150    |
| 160 | Côte d'Ivoire | 150    |
| 161 | Niger         | 150    |
| 162 | Eritrea       | 146.67 |
| 163 | Rwanda        | 146.67 |
| 164 | Bulgaria      | 143.33 |
| 165 | Lesotho       | 143.33 |
| 166 | Pakistan      | 143.33 |
| 167 | Russia        | 143.33 |
| 168 | Swaziland     | 140    |
| 169 | Georgia       | 136.67 |

|     |                                  |        |
|-----|----------------------------------|--------|
| 170 | Belarus                          | 133.33 |
| 171 | Turkmenistan                     | 133.33 |
| 172 | Armenia                          | 123.33 |
| 173 | Sudan                            | 120    |
| 174 | Ukraine                          | 120    |
| 175 | Moldova                          | 116.67 |
| 176 | Democratic Republic of the Congo | 110    |
| 177 | Zimbabwe                         | 110    |
| 178 | Burundi                          | 100    |

Commentary:

European countries, such as [Denmark](#), [Iceland](#), [Finland](#), [Sweden](#), [Switzerland](#), [Austria](#) resided at the top of the ranking with highest levels of self-reported life satisfaction. Conversely, European countries such as [Latvia](#), [Lithuania](#), [Moldova](#), [Belarus](#) and [Ukraine](#) ranked low on the index. African countries such as Democratic Republic of Congo, [Zimbabwe](#) and [Burundi](#) found themselves at the very bottom of the ranking, and indeed, very few African countries could be found in the top 100. [Japan](#) was at the mid-way point in the ranking, however, other Asian countries such as [Brunei](#) and [Malaysia](#) were in the top tier, while [Pakistan](#) was close to the bottom with a low level of self-identified life satisfaction. As a region, the Middle East presented a mixed bag with Saudi Arabians reporting healthy levels of life satisfaction and Egyptians near the bottom of the ranking. As a region, Caribbean countries were ranked highly, consistently demonstrating high levels of life satisfaction. The findings showed that health was the most crucial determining factor in life satisfaction, followed by prosperity and education.

Source:

White, A. (2007). A Global Projection of Subjective Well-being: A Challenge To Positive

Psychology? Psychtalk 56, 17-20. The data was extracted from a meta-analysis by Marks, Abdallah, Simms & Thompson (2006).

Uploaded:

Based on study noted above in "Source" ; reviewed in 2015

---

## Happy Planet Index

### Happy Planet Index

The Happy Planet Index (HPI) is used to measure human well-being in conjunction with environmental impact. The HPI has been compiled since 2006 by the New Economics Foundation. The index is a composite of several indicators including subjective life satisfaction, life expectancy at birth, and ecological footprint per capita.

As noted by NEFA, the HPI "reveals the ecological efficiency with which human well-being is delivered." Indeed, the index combines environmental impact with human well-being to measure the environmental efficiency with which, country by country, people live long and happy lives. The countries ranked highest by the HPI are not necessarily the ones with the happiest people overall, but the ones that allow their citizens to live long and fulfilling lives, without negatively impacting this opportunity for either future generations or citizens of other countries. Accordingly, a country like the [United States](#) will rank low on this list due to its large per capital ecological footprint, which uses more than its fair share of resources, and will likely cause planetary damage.

It should be noted that the HPI was designed to be a counterpoint to other well-established indices of countries' development, such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP), which measures overall national wealth and economic development, but often obfuscates the realities of countries with stark variances between the rich and the poor. Moreover, the objective of most of the world's people is not to be wealthy but to be happy. The HPI also differs from the [Human Development Index](#) (HDI), which measures quality of life but not ecology, since it [HPI] also includes sustainability as a key indicator.

| Rank | Country            | HPI  |
|------|--------------------|------|
| 1    | Costa Rica         | 76.1 |
| 2    | Dominican Republic | 71.8 |
| 3    | Jamaica            | 70.1 |
| 4    | Guatemala          | 68.4 |
| 5    | Vietnam            | 66.5 |
| 6    | Colombia           | 66.1 |
| 7    | Cuba               | 65.7 |
| 8    | El Salvador        | 61.5 |
| 9    | Brazil             | 61.0 |
| 10   | Honduras           | 61.0 |
| 11   | Nicaragua          | 60.5 |
| 12   | Egypt              | 60.3 |
| 13   | Saudi Arabia       | 59.7 |
| 14   | Philippines        | 59.0 |
| 15   | Argentina          | 59.0 |
| 16   | Indonesia          | 58.9 |
| 17   | Bhutan             | 58.5 |



|    |                     |      |
|----|---------------------|------|
| 18 | Panama              | 57.4 |
| 19 | Laos                | 57.3 |
| 20 | China               | 57.1 |
| 21 | Morocco             | 56.8 |
| 22 | Sri Lanka           | 56.5 |
| 23 | Mexico              | 55.6 |
| 24 | Pakistan            | 55.6 |
| 25 | Ecuador             | 55.5 |
| 26 | Jordan              | 54.6 |
| 27 | Belize              | 54.5 |
| 28 | Peru                | 54.4 |
| 29 | Tunisia             | 54.3 |
| 30 | Trinidad and Tobago | 54.2 |
| 31 | Bangladesh          | 54.1 |
| 32 | Moldova             | 54.1 |
| 33 | Malaysia            | 54.0 |
| 34 | Tajikistan          | 53.5 |
| 35 | India               | 53.0 |

|    |             |      |
|----|-------------|------|
| 36 | Venezuela   | 52.5 |
| 37 | Nepal       | 51.9 |
| 38 | Syria       | 51.3 |
| 39 | Burma       | 51.2 |
| 40 | Algeria     | 51.2 |
| 41 | Thailand    | 50.9 |
| 42 | Haiti       | 50.8 |
| 43 | Netherlands | 50.6 |
| 44 | Malta       | 50.4 |
| 45 | Uzbekistan  | 50.1 |
| 46 | Chile       | 49.7 |
| 47 | Bolivia     | 49.3 |
| 48 | Armenia     | 48.3 |
| 49 | Singapore   | 48.2 |
| 50 | Yemen       | 48.1 |
| 51 | Germany     | 48.1 |
| 52 | Switzerland | 48.1 |
| 53 | Sweden      | 48.0 |

|    |                        |      |
|----|------------------------|------|
| 54 | Albania                | 47.9 |
| 55 | Paraguay               | 47.8 |
| 56 | Palestinian Authority  | 47.7 |
| 57 | Austria                | 47.7 |
| 58 | Serbia                 | 47.6 |
| 59 | Finland                | 47.2 |
| 60 | Croatia                | 47.2 |
| 61 | Kyrgyzstan             | 47.1 |
| 62 | Cyprus                 | 46.2 |
| 63 | Guyana                 | 45.6 |
| 64 | Belgium                | 45.4 |
| 65 | Bosnia and Herzegovina | 45.0 |
| 66 | Slovenia               | 44.5 |
| 67 | Israel                 | 44.5 |
| 68 | South Korea            | 44.4 |
| 69 | Italy                  | 44.0 |
| 70 | Romania                | 43.9 |
| 71 | France                 | 43.9 |

|    |                |      |
|----|----------------|------|
| 72 | Georgia        | 43.6 |
| 73 | Slovakia       | 43.5 |
| 74 | United Kingdom | 43.3 |
| 75 | Japan          | 43.3 |
| 76 | Spain          | 43.2 |
| 77 | Poland         | 42.8 |
| 78 | Ireland        | 42.6 |
| 79 | Iraq           | 42.6 |
| 80 | Cambodia       | 42.3 |
| 81 | Iran           | 42.1 |
| 82 | Bulgaria       | 42.0 |
| 83 | Turkey         | 41.7 |
| 84 | Hong Kong      | 41.6 |
| 85 | Azerbaijan     | 41.2 |
| 86 | Lithuania      | 40.9 |
| 87 | Djibouti       | 40.4 |
| 88 | Norway         | 40.4 |
| 89 | Canada         | 39.4 |

|     |                |      |
|-----|----------------|------|
| 90  | Hungary        | 38.9 |
| 91  | Kazakhstan     | 38.5 |
| 92  | Czech Republic | 38.3 |
| 93  | Mauritania     | 38.2 |
| 94  | Iceland        | 38.1 |
| 95  | Ukraine        | 38.1 |
| 96  | Senegal        | 38.0 |
| 97  | Greece         | 37.6 |
| 98  | Portugal       | 37.5 |
| 99  | Uruguay        | 37.2 |
| 100 | Ghana          | 37.1 |
| 101 | Latvia         | 36.7 |
| 102 | Australia      | 36.6 |
| 103 | New Zealand    | 36.2 |
| 104 | Belarus        | 35.7 |
| 105 | Denmark        | 35.5 |
| 106 | Mongolia       | 35.0 |
| 107 | Malawi         | 34.5 |

|     |                                  |      |
|-----|----------------------------------|------|
| 108 | Russia                           | 34.5 |
| 109 | Chad                             | 34.3 |
| 110 | Lebanon                          | 33.6 |
| 111 | Macedonia                        | 32.7 |
| 112 | Republic of the Congo            | 32.4 |
| 113 | Madagascar                       | 31.5 |
| 114 | United States                    | 30.7 |
| 115 | Nigeria                          | 30.3 |
| 116 | Guinea                           | 30.3 |
| 117 | Uganda                           | 30.2 |
| 118 | South Africa                     | 29.7 |
| 119 | Rwanda                           | 29.6 |
| 120 | Democratic Republic of the Congo | 29.0 |
| 121 | Sudan                            | 28.5 |
| 122 | Luxembourg                       | 28.5 |
| 123 | United Arab Emirates             | 28.2 |
| 124 | Ethiopia                         | 28.1 |
| 125 | Kenya                            | 27.8 |

---

|     |                          |      |
|-----|--------------------------|------|
| 126 | Cameroon                 | 27.2 |
| 127 | Zambia                   | 27.2 |
| 128 | Kuwait                   | 27.0 |
| 129 | Niger                    | 26.9 |
| 130 | Angola                   | 26.8 |
| 131 | Estonia                  | 26.4 |
| 132 | Mali                     | 25.8 |
| 133 | Mozambique               | 24.6 |
| 134 | Benin                    | 24.6 |
| 135 | Togo                     | 23.3 |
| 136 | Sierra Leone             | 23.1 |
| 137 | Central African Republic | 22.9 |
| 138 | Burkina Faso             | 22.4 |
| 139 | Burundi                  | 21.8 |
| 140 | Namibia                  | 21.1 |
| 141 | Botswana                 | 20.9 |
| 142 | Tanzania                 | 17.8 |
| 143 | Zimbabwe                 | 16.6 |

---

*Source: This material is derived from the Happy Planet Index issued by the New Economics Foundation (NEF).*

*Methodology: The methodology for the calculations can be found at URL: <http://www.happyplanetindex.org/>*

---

## **Status of Women**

### **Gender Related Development Index (GDI) Rank:**

129th out of 140

### **Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) Rank:**

Not Ranked

### **Female Population:**

6.4 million

### **Female Life Expectancy at birth:**

43.5 years

### **Total Fertility Rate:**

6.6

### **Maternal Mortality Ratio (2000):**

1,800

### **Total Number of Women Living with HIV/AIDS:**



220,000-800,000

**Ever Married Women, Ages 15-19 (%):**

37%

**Mean Age at Time of Marriage:**

19

**Contraceptive Use Among Married Women, Any Method (%):**

31%

**Female Adult Literacy Rate:**

49.8%

**Combined Female Gross enrollment ratio for Primary, Secondary and Tertiary schools:**

69%

**Female-Headed Households (%):**

27%

**Economically Active Females (%):**

77.5%

**Female Contributing Family Workers (%):**

N/A

**Female Estimated Earned Income:**

\$486

**Seats in Parliament held by women (%):**

*Lower or Single House:* 14.0%

*Upper House or Senate:* N/A

**Year Women Received the Right to Vote:**

1961

**Year Women Received the Right to Stand for Election:**

1961

\*The Gender Development Index (GDI) is a composite index which measures the average achievement in a country. While very similar to the Human Development Index in its use of the same variables, the GDI adjusts the average achievement of each country in terms of life expectancy, enrollment in schools, income, and literacy in accordance to the disparities between males and females.

\*The Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) is a composite index measuring gender inequality in three of the basic dimensions of empowerment; economic participation and decision-making, political participation and decision-making, and power over economic resources.

\*Total Fertility Rate (TFR) is defined as the average number of babies born to women during their reproductive years. A TFR of 2.1 is considered the replacement rate; once a TFR of a population reaches 2.1 the population will remain stable assuming no immigration or emigration takes place. When the TFR is greater than 2.1 a population will increase and when it is less than 2.1 a population will eventually decrease, although due to the age structure of a population it will take years before a low TFR is translated into lower population.

\*Maternal Mortality Rate is the number of deaths to women per 100,000 live births that resulted from conditions related to pregnancy and or delivery related complications.

\*Economically Active Females are the share of the female population, ages 15 and above, whom supply, or are able to supply, labor for the production of goods and services.

\*Female Contributing Family Workers are those females who work without pay in an economic enterprise operated by a relative living in the same household.

\*Estimated Earned Income is measured according to Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) in US dollars.

## Global Gender Gap Index

### Global Gender Gap Index

#### Editor's Note:

The Global Gender Gap Index by the World Economic Forum ranks most of the world's countries in terms of the division of resources and opportunities among males and females. Specifically, the ranking assesses the gender inequality gap in these four arenas:

1. Economic participation and opportunity (salaries and high skilled employment participation levels)
2. Educational attainment (access to basic and higher level education)
3. Political empowerment (representation in decision-making structures)
4. Health and survival (life expectancy and sex ratio)

|             | 2010 rank | 2010 score | 2010 rank among 2009 countries | 2009 rank | 2009 score | 2008 rank | 2008 score | 2007 rank |
|-------------|-----------|------------|--------------------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Country     |           |            |                                |           |            |           |            |           |
| Iceland     | 1         | 0.8496     | 1                              | 1         | 0.8276     | 4         | 0.7999     | 4         |
| Norway      | 2         | 0.8404     | 2                              | 3         | 0.8227     | 1         | 0.8239     | 2         |
| Finland     | 3         | 0.8260     | 3                              | 2         | 0.8252     | 2         | 0.8195     | 3         |
| Sweden      | 4         | 0.8024     | 4                              | 4         | 0.8139     | 3         | 0.8139     | 1         |
| New Zealand | 5         | 0.7808     | 5                              | 5         | 0.7880     | 5         | 0.7859     | 5         |
| Ireland     | 6         | 0.7773     | 6                              | 8         | 0.7597     | 8         | 0.7518     | 9         |

|                     |    |        |    |    |        |    |        |    |
|---------------------|----|--------|----|----|--------|----|--------|----|
| Denmark             | 7  | 0.7719 | 7  | 7  | 0.7628 | 7  | 0.7538 | 8  |
| Lesotho             | 8  | 0.7678 | 8  | 10 | 0.7495 | 16 | 0.7320 | 26 |
| Philippines         | 9  | 0.7654 | 9  | 9  | 0.7579 | 6  | 0.7568 | 6  |
| Switzerland         | 10 | 0.7562 | 10 | 13 | 0.7426 | 14 | 0.7360 | 40 |
| Spain               | 11 | 0.7554 | 11 | 17 | 0.7345 | 17 | 0.7281 | 10 |
| South Africa        | 12 | 0.7535 | 12 | 6  | 0.7709 | 22 | 0.7232 | 20 |
| Germany             | 13 | 0.7530 | 13 | 12 | 0.7449 | 11 | 0.7394 | 7  |
| Belgium             | 14 | 0.7509 | 14 | 33 | 0.7165 | 28 | 0.7163 | 19 |
| United Kingdom      | 15 | 0.7460 | 15 | 15 | 0.7402 | 13 | 0.7366 | 11 |
| Sri Lanka           | 16 | 0.7458 | 16 | 16 | 0.7402 | 12 | 0.7371 | 15 |
| Netherlands         | 17 | 0.7444 | 17 | 11 | 0.7490 | 9  | 0.7399 | 12 |
| Latvia              | 18 | 0.7429 | 18 | 14 | 0.7416 | 10 | 0.7397 | 13 |
| United States       | 19 | 0.7411 | 19 | 31 | 0.7173 | 27 | 0.7179 | 31 |
| Canada              | 20 | 0.7372 | 20 | 25 | 0.7196 | 31 | 0.7136 | 18 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 21 | 0.7353 | 21 | 19 | 0.7298 | 19 | 0.7245 | 46 |
| Mozambique          | 22 | 0.7329 | 22 | 26 | 0.7195 | 18 | 0.7266 | 43 |
| Australia           | 23 | 0.7271 | 23 | 20 | 0.7282 | 21 | 0.7241 | 17 |

|            |    |        |    |    |        |     |        |     |
|------------|----|--------|----|----|--------|-----|--------|-----|
| Cuba       | 24 | 0.7253 | 24 | 29 | 0.7176 | 25  | 0.7195 | 22  |
| Namibia    | 25 | 0.7238 | 25 | 32 | 0.7167 | 30  | 0.7141 | 29  |
| Luxembourg | 26 | 0.7231 | 26 | 63 | 0.6889 | 66  | 0.6802 | 58  |
| Mongolia   | 27 | 0.7194 | 27 | 22 | 0.7221 | 40  | 0.7049 | 62  |
| Costa Rica | 28 | 0.7194 | 28 | 27 | 0.7180 | 32  | 0.7111 | 28  |
| Argentina  | 29 | 0.7187 | 29 | 24 | 0.7211 | 24  | 0.7209 | 33  |
| Nicaragua  | 30 | 0.7176 | 30 | 49 | 0.7002 | 71  | 0.6747 | 90  |
| Barbados   | 31 | 0.7176 | 31 | 21 | 0.7236 | 26  | 0.7188 | n/a |
| Portugal   | 32 | 0.7171 | 32 | 46 | 0.7013 | 39  | 0.7051 | 37  |
| Uganda     | 33 | 0.7169 | 33 | 40 | 0.7067 | 43  | 0.6981 | 50  |
| Moldova    | 34 | 0.7160 | 34 | 36 | 0.7104 | 20  | 0.7244 | 21  |
| Lithuania  | 35 | 0.7132 | 35 | 30 | 0.7175 | 23  | 0.7222 | 14  |
| Bahamas    | 36 | 0.7128 | 36 | 28 | 0.7179 | n/a | n/a    | n/a |
| Austria    | 37 | 0.7091 | 37 | 42 | 0.7031 | 29  | 0.7153 | 27  |
| Guyana     | 38 | 0.7090 | 38 | 35 | 0.7108 | n/a | n/a    | n/a |
| Panama     | 39 | 0.7072 | 39 | 43 | 0.7024 | 34  | 0.7095 | 38  |
| Ecuador    | 40 | 0.7072 | 40 | 23 | 0.7220 | 35  | 0.7091 | 44  |
| Kazakhstan | 41 | 0.7055 | 41 | 47 | 0.7013 | 45  | 0.6976 | 32  |

|                    |    |        |    |    |        |    |        |    |
|--------------------|----|--------|----|----|--------|----|--------|----|
| Slovenia           | 42 | 0.7047 | 42 | 52 | 0.6982 | 51 | 0.6937 | 49 |
| Poland             | 43 | 0.7037 | 43 | 50 | 0.6998 | 49 | 0.6951 | 60 |
| Jamaica            | 44 | 0.7037 | 44 | 48 | 0.7013 | 44 | 0.6980 | 39 |
| Russian Federation | 45 | 0.7036 | 45 | 51 | 0.6987 | 42 | 0.6994 | 45 |
| France             | 46 | 0.7025 | 46 | 18 | 0.7331 | 15 | 0.7341 | 51 |
| Estonia            | 47 | 0.7018 | 47 | 37 | 0.7094 | 37 | 0.7076 | 30 |
| Chile              | 48 | 0.7013 | 48 | 64 | 0.6884 | 65 | 0.6818 | 86 |
| Macedonia, FYR     | 49 | 0.6996 | 49 | 53 | 0.6950 | 53 | 0.6914 | 35 |
| Bulgaria           | 50 | 0.6983 | 50 | 38 | 0.7072 | 36 | 0.7077 | 25 |
| Kyrgyz Republic    | 51 | 0.6973 | 51 | 41 | 0.7058 | 41 | 0.7045 | 70 |
| Israel             | 52 | 0.6957 | 52 | 45 | 0.7019 | 56 | 0.6900 | 36 |
| Croatia            | 53 | 0.6939 | 53 | 54 | 0.6944 | 46 | 0.6967 | 16 |
| Honduras           | 54 | 0.6927 | 54 | 62 | 0.6893 | 47 | 0.6960 | 68 |
| Colombia           | 55 | 0.6927 | 55 | 56 | 0.6939 | 50 | 0.6944 | 24 |
| Singapore          | 56 | 0.6914 | 56 | 84 | 0.6664 | 84 | 0.6625 | 77 |
| Thailand           | 57 | 0.6910 | 57 | 59 | 0.6907 | 52 | 0.6917 | 52 |
| Greece             | 58 | 0.6908 | 58 | 85 | 0.6662 | 75 | 0.6727 | 72 |

|                    |    |        |    |    |        |     |        |    |
|--------------------|----|--------|----|----|--------|-----|--------|----|
| Uruguay            | 59 | 0.6897 | 59 | 57 | 0.6936 | 54  | 0.6907 | 78 |
| Peru               | 60 | 0.6895 | 60 | 44 | 0.7024 | 48  | 0.6959 | 75 |
| China              | 61 | 0.6881 | 61 | 60 | 0.6907 | 57  | 0.6878 | 73 |
| Botswana           | 62 | 0.6876 | 62 | 39 | 0.7071 | 63  | 0.6839 | 53 |
| Ukraine            | 63 | 0.6869 | 63 | 61 | 0.6896 | 62  | 0.6856 | 57 |
| Venezuela          | 64 | 0.6863 | 64 | 69 | 0.6839 | 59  | 0.6875 | 55 |
| Czech Republic     | 65 | 0.6850 | 65 | 74 | 0.6789 | 69  | 0.6770 | 64 |
| Tanzania           | 66 | 0.6829 | 66 | 73 | 0.6797 | 38  | 0.7068 | 34 |
| Romania            | 67 | 0.6826 | 67 | 70 | 0.6805 | 70  | 0.6763 | 47 |
| Malawi             | 68 | 0.6824 | 68 | 76 | 0.6738 | 81  | 0.6664 | 87 |
| Paraguay           | 69 | 0.6804 | 69 | 66 | 0.6868 | 100 | 0.6379 | 69 |
| Ghana              | 70 | 0.6782 | 70 | 80 | 0.6704 | 77  | 0.6679 | 63 |
| Slovak Republic    | 71 | 0.6778 | 71 | 68 | 0.6845 | 64  | 0.6824 | 54 |
| Vietnam            | 72 | 0.6776 | 72 | 71 | 0.6802 | 68  | 0.6778 | 42 |
| Dominican Republic | 73 | 0.6774 | 73 | 67 | 0.6859 | 72  | 0.6744 | 65 |
| Italy              | 74 | 0.6765 | 74 | 72 | 0.6798 | 67  | 0.6788 | 84 |

|                      |    |        |    |     |        |     |        |     |
|----------------------|----|--------|----|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|
| Gambia,<br>The       | 75 | 0.6762 | 75 | 75  | 0.6752 | 85  | 0.6622 | 95  |
| Bolivia              | 76 | 0.6751 | 76 | 82  | 0.6693 | 80  | 0.6667 | 80  |
| Brueni<br>Darussalem | 77 | 0.6748 | 77 | 94  | 0.6524 | 99  | 0.6392 | n/a |
| Albania              | 78 | 0.6726 | 78 | 91  | 0.6601 | 87  | 0.6591 | 66  |
| Hungary              | 79 | 0.6720 | 79 | 65  | 0.6879 | 60  | 0.6867 | 61  |
| Madagascar           | 80 | 0.6713 | 80 | 77  | 0.6732 | 74  | 0.6736 | 89  |
| Angola               | 81 | 0.6712 | 81 | 106 | 0.6353 | 114 | 0.6032 | 110 |
| Bangladesh           | 82 | 0.6702 | 82 | 93  | 0.6526 | 90  | 0.6531 | 100 |
| Malta                | 83 | 0.6695 | 83 | 88  | 0.6635 | 83  | 0.6634 | 76  |
| Armenia              | 84 | 0.6669 | 84 | 90  | 0.6619 | 78  | 0.6677 | 71  |
| Brazil               | 85 | 0.6655 | 85 | 81  | 0.6695 | 73  | 0.6737 | 74  |
| Cyprus               | 86 | 0.6642 | 86 | 79  | 0.6706 | 76  | 0.6694 | 82  |
| Indonesia            | 87 | 0.6615 | 87 | 92  | 0.6580 | 93  | 0.6473 | 81  |
| Georgia              | 88 | 0.6598 | 88 | 83  | 0.6680 | 82  | 0.6654 | 67  |
| Tajikistan           | 89 | 0.6598 | 89 | 86  | 0.6661 | 89  | 0.6541 | 79  |
| El Salvador          | 90 | 0.6596 | 90 | 55  | 0.6939 | 58  | 0.6875 | 48  |
| Mexico               | 91 | 0.6577 | 91 | 98  | 0.6503 | 97  | 0.6441 | 93  |



|                      |     |        |     |     |        |     |        |     |
|----------------------|-----|--------|-----|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|
| Zimbabwe             | 92  | 0.6574 | 92  | 95  | 0.6518 | 92  | 0.6485 | 88  |
| Belize               | 93  | 0.6536 | 93  | 87  | 0.6636 | 86  | 0.6610 | 94  |
| Japan                | 94  | 0.6524 | 94  | 101 | 0.6447 | 98  | 0.6434 | 91  |
| Mauritius            | 95  | 0.6520 | 95  | 96  | 0.6513 | 95  | 0.6466 | 85  |
| Kenya                | 96  | 0.6499 | 96  | 97  | 0.6512 | 88  | 0.6547 | 83  |
| Cambodia             | 97  | 0.6482 | 97  | 104 | 0.6410 | 94  | 0.6469 | 98  |
| Malaysia             | 98  | 0.6479 | 98  | 100 | 0.6467 | 96  | 0.6442 | 92  |
| Maldives             | 99  | 0.6452 | 99  | 99  | 0.6482 | 91  | 0.6501 | 99  |
| Azerbaijan           | 100 | 0.6446 | 100 | 89  | 0.6626 | 61  | 0.6856 | 59  |
| Senegal              | 101 | 0.6414 | 101 | 102 | 0.6427 | n/a | n/a    | n/a |
| Suriname             | 102 | 0.6407 | 102 | 78  | 0.6726 | 79  | 0.6674 | 56  |
| United Arab Emirates | 103 | 0.6397 | 103 | 112 | 0.6198 | 105 | 0.6220 | 105 |
| Korea, Rep.          | 104 | 0.6342 | 104 | 115 | 0.6146 | 108 | 0.6154 | 97  |
| Kuwait               | 105 | 0.6318 | 105 | 105 | 0.6356 | 101 | 0.6358 | 96  |
| Zambia               | 106 | 0.6293 | 106 | 107 | 0.6310 | 106 | 0.6205 | 101 |
| Tunisia              | 107 | 0.6266 | 107 | 109 | 0.6233 | 103 | 0.6295 | 102 |
| Fiji                 | 108 | 0.6256 | 108 | 103 | 0.6414 | n/a | n/a    | n/a |
| Guatemala            | 109 | 0.6238 | 109 | 111 | 0.6209 | 112 | 0.6072 | 106 |

|              |     |        |     |     |        |     |                        |     |
|--------------|-----|--------|-----|-----|--------|-----|------------------------|-----|
| Bahrain      | 110 | 0.6217 | 110 | 116 | 0.6136 | 121 | 0.5927                 | 115 |
| Burkina Faso | 111 | 0.6162 | 111 | 120 | 0.6081 | 115 | 0.6029                 | 117 |
| India        | 112 | 0.6155 | 112 | 114 | 0.6151 | 113 | 0.6060                 | 114 |
| Mauritania   | 113 | 0.6152 | 113 | 119 | 0.6103 | 110 | 0.6117                 | 111 |
| Cameroon     | 114 | 0.6110 | 114 | 118 | 0.6108 | 117 | 0.6017                 | 116 |
| Nepal        | 115 | 0.6084 | 115 | 110 | 0.6213 | 120 | 0.5942                 | 125 |
| Lebanon*     | 116 | 0.6084 | n/a | n/a | n/a    | n/a | n/a                    | n/a |
| Qatar        | 117 | 0.6059 | 116 | 125 | 0.5907 | 119 | 0.5948                 | 109 |
| Nigeria      | 118 | 0.6055 | 117 | 108 | 0.6280 | 102 | 0.6339                 | 107 |
| Algeria      | 119 | 0.6052 | 118 | 117 | 0.6119 | 111 | 0.6111                 | 108 |
| Jordan       | 120 | 0.6048 | 119 | 113 | 0.6182 | 104 | 0.6275                 | 104 |
| Ethiopia     | 121 | 0.6019 | 120 | 122 | 0.5948 | 122 | 0.5867                 | 113 |
| Oman         | 122 | 0.5950 | 121 | 123 | 0.5938 | 118 | <a href="#">0.5960</a> | 119 |
| Iran         | 123 | 0.5933 | 122 | 128 | 0.5839 | 116 | 0.6021                 | 118 |
| Syria        | 124 | 0.5926 | 123 | 121 | 0.6072 | 107 | 0.6181                 | 103 |
| Egypt        | 125 | 0.5899 | 124 | 126 | 0.5862 | 124 | 0.5832                 | 120 |
| Turkey       | 126 | 0.5876 | 125 | 129 | 0.5828 | 123 | 0.5853                 | 121 |
| Morocco      | 127 | 0.5767 | 126 | 124 | 0.5926 | 125 | 0.5757                 | 122 |

|                |     |        |     |     |        |     |        |     |
|----------------|-----|--------|-----|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|
| Benin          | 128 | 0.5719 | 127 | 131 | 0.5643 | 126 | 0.5582 | 123 |
| Saudi Arabia   | 129 | 0.5713 | 128 | 130 | 0.5651 | 128 | 0.5537 | 124 |
| Côte d'Ivoire* | 130 | 0.5691 | n/a | n/a | n/a    | n/a | n/a    | n/a |
| Mali           | 131 | 0.5680 | 129 | 127 | 0.5860 | 109 | 0.6117 | 112 |
| Pakistan       | 132 | 0.5465 | 130 | 132 | 0.5458 | 127 | 0.5549 | 126 |
| Chad           | 133 | 0.5330 | 131 | 133 | 0.5417 | 129 | 0.5290 | 127 |
| Yemen          | 134 | 0.4603 | 132 | 134 | 0.4609 | 130 | 0.4664 | 128 |
| Belarus        | n/a | n/a    | n/a | 34  | 0.7141 | 33  | 0.7099 | 23  |
| Uzbekistan     | n/a | n/a    | n/a | 58  | 0.6913 | 55  | 0.6906 | 41  |
|                |     |        |     |     |        |     |        |     |

\*new country 2010

#### Commentary:

According to the report's index, Nordic countries, such as [Iceland](#), [Norway](#), [Finland](#), and [Sweden](#) have continued to dominate at the top of the ranking for gender equality. Meanwhile, [France](#) has seen a notable decline in the ranking, largely as a result of decreased number of women holding ministerial portfolios in that country. In the Americas, the [United States](#) has risen in the ranking to top the region, predominantly as a result of a decreasing wage gap, as well as higher number of women holding key positions in the current Obama administration. [Canada](#) has continued to remain as one of the top ranking countries of the Americas, followed by the small Caribbean island nation of Trinidad and Tobago, which has the distinction of being among the top three countries of the Americans in the realm of gender equality. [Lesotho](#) and South African ranked highly in the

index, leading not only among African countries but also in global context. Despite [Lesotho](#) still lagging in the area of life expectancy, its high ranking was attributed to high levels of female participation in the labor force and female literacy. The [Philippines](#) and [Sri Lanka](#) were the top ranking countries for gender equality for Asia, ranking highly also in global context. The [Philippines](#) has continued to show strong performance in all strong performance on all four dimensions (detailed above) of the index. Finally, in the Arab world, the [United Arab Emirates](#) held the highest-rank within that region of the world; however, its placement near the bottom of the global list highlights the fact that Arab countries are generally poor performers when it comes to the matter of gender equality in global scope.

Source:

This data is derived from the latest edition of The Global Gender Gap Report by the World Economic Forum.

Available at URL:

<http://www.weforum.org/en/Communities/Women%20Leaders%20and%20Gender%20Parity/Gende>

Updated:

Based on latest available data as set forth in chart; reviewed in 2014

---

## Culture and Arts

Content coming soon.

---

## Etiquette

### Cultural Dos and Taboos

1. The handshake is an acceptable form of greeting.

2. Modest dress is appreciated. It is especially important to dress modestly in the villages.
3. The elderly should always be given the utmost respect.
4. The visitor should remember Malawi is still a developing country so patience is required. Telephone services, banking services and transportation may run slowly. Getting upset over delays and lines will only be a poor reflection on you. In general, locals will help assist however they can, so a friendly attitude will go a long way.
5. Expect to haggle in the market place.

---

## Travel Information

### Please Note

**This is a generalized travel guide and it is intended to coalesce several resources, which a traveler might find useful, regardless of a particular destination. As such, it does not include travel warnings for specific "hot spot" destinations.**

**For travel alerts and warnings, please see the United States Department of State's listings available at URL:**

**<http://travel.state.gov/content/passports/english/alertswarnings.html>**

**Please note that travel to the following countries, based on these warnings, is ill-advised, or should be undertaken with the utmost precaution:**

**Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea, Honduras, Iraq, Iran, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, North Korea, Pakistan, Palestinian Territories of West Bank and Gaza, Philippines areas of Sulu Archipelago, Mindanao, and southern Sulu Sea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria, Ukraine, Venezuela, and Yemen.**

## **International Travel Guide**

### **Checklist for Travelers**

1. Take out travel insurance to cover hospital treatment or medical evacuation. Overseas medical costs are expensive to most international travelers, where one's domestic, nationalized or even private health insurance plans will not provide coverage outside one's home country. Learn about "reciprocal insurance plans" that some international health care companies might offer.
2. Make sure that one's travel insurance is appropriate. If one intends to indulge in adventurous activities, such as parasailing, one should be sure that one is fully insured in such cases. Many traditional insurance policies do not provide coverage in cases of extreme circumstances.
3. Take time to learn about one's destination country and culture. Read and learn about the place one is traveling. Also check political, economic and socio-cultural developments at the destination by reading country-specific travel reports and fact sheets noted below.
4. Get the necessary visas for the country (or countries) one intends to visit - but be aware that a visa does not guarantee entry. A number of useful sites regarding visa and other entry requirements are noted below.
5. Keep in regular contact with friends and relatives back at home by phone or email, and be sure to leave a travel itinerary.
6. Protect one's personal information by making copies of one's passport details, insurance policy, travelers checks and credit card numbers. Taking copies of such documents with you, while leaving another collection copies with someone at home is also good practice for travelers. Taking copies of one's passport photograph is also recommended.
7. Stay healthy by taking all possible precautions against illness. Also, be sure to take extra supplies of prescription drugs along for the trip, while also taking time to pack general pharmaceutical supplies, such as aspirin and other such painkillers, bandages, stomach ailment medication, anti-inflammatory medication and anti-bacterial medication.
8. Do not carry illicit drugs. Understand that the punishment for possession or use of illegal drugs in some countries may be capital punishment. Make sure your prescription drugs are legal in the countries you plan to visit.
9. Know the laws of one's destination country and culture; be sure to understand the repercussions

of breaking those laws and regulations. Often the transparency and freedoms of the juridical system at home is not consistent with that of one's destination country. Become aware of these complexities and subtleties before you travel.

**10.** For longer stays in a country, or where the security situation is volatile, one should register one's self and traveling companions at the local embassy or consulate of one's country of citizenship.

**11.** Women should take care to be prepared both culturally and practically for traveling in a different country and culture. One should be sure to take sufficient supplies of personal feminine products and prescription drugs. One should also learn about local cultural standards for women, including norms of dressing. Be aware that it is simply inappropriate and unsafe for women to travel alone in some countries, and take the necessary precautions to avoid risk-filled situations.

**12.** If one is traveling with small children, one should pack extra supplies, make arrangements with the travel carrier for proper seating that would adequately accommodate children, infants or toddlers. Note also that whether one is male or female, traveling with children means that one's hands are thus not free to carry luggage and bags. Be especially aware that this makes one vulnerable to pickpockets, thieves and other sorts of crime.

**13.** Make proper arrangements for accommodations, well in advance of one's arrival at a destination. Some countries have limited accommodation, while others may have culturally distinctive facilities. Learning about these practicalities before one travels will greatly aid the enjoyment of one's trip.

**14.** Travel with different forms of currency and money (cash, traveler's checks and credit cards) in anticipation that venues may not accept one or another form of money. Also, ensuring that one's financial resources are not contained in one location, or by one person (if one is traveling with others) can be a useful measure, in the event that one loses a wallet or purse.

**15.** Find out about transportation in the destination country. In some places, it might be advisable to hire a local driver or taxi guide for safety reasons, while in other countries, enjoying one's travel experience may well be enhanced by renting a vehicle and seeing the local sights and culture independently. Costs may also be prohibitive for either of these choices, so again, prior planning is suggested.

### **Tips for Travelers**

- Arrange comprehensive travel insurance and carry the details with you.
- Check with your embassy, consulate, or appropriate government institution related to travel before traveling.
- Visitors should carry identity documents at all times. Keep a photocopy of your passport with you separate from the original.

- Enter next of kin details into the back of your passport.
- Bring enough money. Credit cards are not widely accepted in Malawi. You should carry travelers checks or cash.
- Be alert to muggers, bag-snatchers and con men. Be cautious of over-friendly people who offer to act as tour-guides. On public transport, do not accept food or drink from fellow passengers as it may be drugged: the victim falls unconscious and is then robbed.
- Malawi is an extremely dangerous place in which to drive. Drive very carefully. Avoid travel out of town at night, when main roads are dangerous: hazards such as potholes and abandoned unlit vehicles often cause serious accidents.
- Armed carjacking (especially of 4x4 vehicles) is fairly commonplace. If an attack takes place, hand over car keys and anything else demanded; it is extremely dangerous to resist.
- There is a very high prevalence of AIDS/HIV in Malawi. Malaria is also highly prevalent and visitors should take anti-malarial prophylactics. Care should be taken to ensure that drinking water is safe, especially in rural areas. Bilharzia (a disease caused by infestation with blood flukes) exists in some lakeshore areas and rivers.
- Possession of even small amounts of drugs can lead to arrest and imprisonment. Visitors should avoid any involvement with drugs. Avoid buying uncut precious stones, which is illegal. Although the dress code in Malawi is now more relaxed than in the past, visitors should take care not to offend local sensitivities, some of which reflect pre-1994 standards.
- The land route between Malawi and Zimbabwe along the Tete Corridor in Mozambique can be dangerous. Exercise caution: do not leave the main road and complete travel during daylight hours.

Note: This information is directly quoted from the United Kingdom Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

Sources: *United Kingdom Foreign and Commonwealth Office*

### **Business Culture: Information for Business Travelers**

Malawians are characteristically helpful in both personal and business dealings.

English, the official language of Malawi, generally suffices for business communication, although few rural Malawians speak it. The most common vernacular languages include Chichewa (spoken



throughout the country), Chitumbuka (spoken primarily in the North), and Chiyao (spoken primarily in the South).

Sources: *United States Department of State Commercial Guides*

### **Online Resources Regarding Entry Requirements and Visas**

Foreign Entry Requirements for Americans from the United States Department of State

[http://travel.state.gov/travel/cis\\_pa\\_tw/cis/cis\\_1765.html](http://travel.state.gov/travel/cis_pa_tw/cis/cis_1765.html)

Visa Services for Non-Americans from the United States Department of State

[http://travel.state.gov/visa/visa\\_1750.html](http://travel.state.gov/visa/visa_1750.html)

Visa Bulletins from the United States Department of State

[http://travel.state.gov/visa/frvi/bulletin/bulletin\\_1360.html](http://travel.state.gov/visa/frvi/bulletin/bulletin_1360.html)

Visa Waivers from the United States Department of State

[http://travel.state.gov/visa/temp/without/without\\_1990.html](http://travel.state.gov/visa/temp/without/without_1990.html) - new

Passport and Visa Information from the Government of the United Kingdom

<http://www.bia.homeoffice.gov.uk/>

Visa Information from the Government of Australia

<http://www.dfat.gov.au/visas/index.html>

Passport Information from the Government of Australia

<https://www.passports.gov.au/Web/index.aspx>

Passport Information from the Government of Canada

[http://www.voyage.gc.ca/preparation\\_information/passport\\_passeport-eng.asp](http://www.voyage.gc.ca/preparation_information/passport_passeport-eng.asp)

Visa Information from the Government of Canada

[http://www.voyage.gc.ca/preparation\\_information/visas-eng.asp](http://www.voyage.gc.ca/preparation_information/visas-eng.asp)

Online Visa Processing by Immigration Experts by VisaPro

<http://www.visapro.com>

Sources: United States Department of State, United Kingdom Foreign and Commonwealth Office,

---

Government of Australia: Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Government of Canada  
Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade

Useful Online Resources for Travelers

Country-Specific Travel Information from United States

[http://travel.state.gov/travel/cis\\_pa\\_tw/cis/cis\\_1765.html](http://travel.state.gov/travel/cis_pa_tw/cis/cis_1765.html)

Travel Advice by Country from Government of United Kingdom

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travelling-and-living-overseas/travel-advice-by-country/>

General Travel Advice from Government of Australia

<http://www.smartraveller.gov.au/zw-cgi/view/Advice/General>

Travel Bulletins from the Government of Australia

<http://www.smartraveller.gov.au/zw-cgi/view/TravelBulletins/>

Travel Tips from Government of Australia

<http://www.smartraveller.gov.au/tips/index.html>

Travel Checklist by Government of Canada

[http://www.voyage.gc.ca/preparation\\_information/checklist\\_sommaire-eng.asp](http://www.voyage.gc.ca/preparation_information/checklist_sommaire-eng.asp)

Travel Checklist from Government of United Kingdom

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travelling-and-living-overseas/staying-safe/checklist>

Your trip abroad from United States Department of State

[http://travel.state.gov/travel/tips/brochures/brochures\\_1225.html](http://travel.state.gov/travel/tips/brochures/brochures_1225.html)

A safe trip abroad from United States Department of State

[http://travel.state.gov/travel/tips/safety/safety\\_1747.html](http://travel.state.gov/travel/tips/safety/safety_1747.html)

Tips for expatriates abroad from United States Department of State

[http://travel.state.gov/travel/living/residing/residing\\_1235.html](http://travel.state.gov/travel/living/residing/residing_1235.html)

Tips for students from United States Department of State

[http://travel.state.gov/travel/living/studying/studying\\_1238.html](http://travel.state.gov/travel/living/studying/studying_1238.html) [http://travel.state.gov/travel/tips/brochures/brochures\\_1225.html](http://travel.state.gov/travel/tips/brochures/brochures_1225.html)

Medical information for travelers from United States Department of State

[http://travel.state.gov/travel/tips/health/health\\_1185.html](http://travel.state.gov/travel/tips/health/health_1185.html)

#### US Customs Travel information

<http://www.customs.gov/xp/cgov/travel/>

Sources: United States Department of State; United States Customs Department, United Kingdom Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Government of Australia; Government of Canada: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade

#### Other Practical Online Resources for Travelers

##### Foreign Language Phrases for Travelers

<http://www.travlang.com/languages/>

<http://www.omniglot.com/language/phrases/index.htm>

##### World Weather Forecasts

<http://www.intellicast.com/>

<http://www.wunderground.com/>

<http://www.worldweather.org/>

##### Worldwide Time Zones, Map, World Clock

<http://www.timeanddate.com/>

<http://www.worldtimezone.com/>

##### International Airport Codes

<http://www.world-airport-codes.com/>

##### International Dialing Codes

<http://www.kropla.com/dialcode.htm>

<http://www.countrycallingcodes.com/>

##### International Phone Guide

<http://www.kropla.com/phones.htm>

##### International Mobile Phone Guide

<http://www.kropla.com/mobilephones.htm>

##### International Internet Café Search Engine

<http://cybercaptive.com/>

##### Global Internet Roaming

<http://www.kropla.com/roaming.htm>

World Electric Power Guide

<http://www.kropla.com/electric.htm>

<http://www.kropla.com/electric2.htm>

World Television Standards and Codes

<http://www.kropla.com/tv.htm>

International Currency Exchange Rates

<http://www.xe.com/ucc/>

Banking and Financial Institutions Across the World

<http://www.123world.com/banks/index.html>

International Credit Card or Automated Teller Machine (ATM) Locator

<http://visa.via.infonow.net/locator/global/>

<http://www.mastercard.com/us/personal/en/cardholderservices/atmlocations/index.html>

International Chambers of Commerce

<http://www.123world.com/chambers/index.html>

World Tourism Websites

<http://123world.com/tourism/>

Diplomatic and Consular Information

United States Diplomatic Posts Around the World

<http://www.usembassy.gov/>

United Kingdom Diplomatic Posts Around the World

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/about-the-fco/embassies-and-posts/find-an-embassy-overseas/>

Australia's Diplomatic Posts Around the World

<http://www.dfat.gov.au/missions/>

<http://www.dfat.gov.au/embassies.html>

Canada's Embassies and High Commissions

<http://www.international.gc.ca/ciw-cdm/embassies-ambassades.aspx>

Resources for Finding Embassies and other Diplomatic Posts Across the World

---

<http://www.escapeartist.com/embassy1/embassy1.htm>

## Safety and Security

Travel Warnings by Country from Government of Australia

<http://www.smarttraveller.gov.au/zw-cgi/view/Advice/>

Travel Warnings and Alerts from United States Department of State

[http://travel.state.gov/travel/cis\\_pa\\_tw/tw/tw\\_1764.html](http://travel.state.gov/travel/cis_pa_tw/tw/tw_1764.html)

[http://travel.state.gov/travel/cis\\_pa\\_tw/pa/pa\\_1766.html](http://travel.state.gov/travel/cis_pa_tw/pa/pa_1766.html)

Travel Reports and Warnings by Government of Canada

[http://www.voyage.gc.ca/countries\\_pays/menu-eng.asp](http://www.voyage.gc.ca/countries_pays/menu-eng.asp)

[http://www.voyage.gc.ca/countries\\_pays/updates\\_mise-a-jour-eng.asp](http://www.voyage.gc.ca/countries_pays/updates_mise-a-jour-eng.asp)

Travel Warnings from Government of United Kingdom

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travelling-and-living-overseas/travel-advice-by-country/>

[http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travelling-and-living-overseas/travel-advice-by-country/?](http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travelling-and-living-overseas/travel-advice-by-country/?action=noTravelAll#noTravelAll)

[action=noTravelAll#noTravelAll](http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travelling-and-living-overseas/travel-advice-by-country/?action=noTravelAll#noTravelAll)

Sources: United Kingdom Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the United States Department of State, the Government of Canada: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Government of Australia: Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

## Other Safety and Security Online Resources for Travelers

United States Department of State Information on Terrorism

<http://www.state.gov/s/ct/>

Government of the United Kingdom Resource on the Risk of Terrorism

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/servlet/Front?>

[pagename=OpenMarket/Xcelerate/ShowPage&c=Page&cid=1044011304926](http://www.fco.gov.uk/servlet/Front?pagename=OpenMarket/Xcelerate/ShowPage&c=Page&cid=1044011304926)

Government of Canada Terrorism Guide

<http://www.international.gc.ca/crime/terrorism-terrorisme.aspx?lang=eng>

Information on Terrorism by Government of Australia

<http://www.dfat.gov.au/icat/index.html>

## FAA Resource on Aviation Safety

<http://www.faasafety.gov/>

In-Flight Safety Information for Air Travel (by British Airways crew trainer, Anna Warman)

<http://www.warman.demon.co.uk/anna/inflight.html>

Hot Spots: Travel Safety and Risk Information

<http://www.airsecurity.com/hotspots/HotSpots.asp>

Information on Human Rights

<http://www.state.gov/g/drl/hr/>

Sources: The United States Department of State, the United States Customs Department, the Government of Canada, the Government of United Kingdom, the Government of Australia, the Federal Aviation Authority, Anna Warman's In-flight Website, Hot Spots Travel and Risk Information

---

## **Diseases/Health Data**

**Please Note: Most of the entry below constitutes a generalized health advisory, which a traveler might find useful, regardless of a particular destination.**

**As a supplement, however, the reader will also find below a list of countries flagged with current health notices and alerts issued by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Please note that travel to the following countries, based on these 3 levels of warnings, is ill-advised, or should be undertaken with the utmost precaution:**

**Level 3 (highest level of concern; avoid non-essential travel) --**

**Guinea - Ebola**

**Liberia - Ebola**

**Nepal - Earthquake zone**  
**Sierra Leone - Ebola**

**Level 2 (intermediate level of concern; use utmost caution during travel) --**

**Cameroon - Polio**  
**Somalia - Polio**  
**Vanuatu - Tropical Cyclone zone**  
**Throughout Middle East and Arabia Peninsula - MERS ((Middle East Respiratory Syndrome)**

**Level 1 (standard level of concern; use practical caution during travel) -**

**Australia - Ross River disease**  
**Bosnia-Herzegovina - Measles**  
**Brazil - Dengue Fever**  
**Brazil - Malaria**  
**Brazil - Zika**  
**China - H7N9 Avian flu**  
**Cuba - Cholera**  
**Egypt - H5N1 Bird flu**  
**Ethiopia - Measles**  
**Germany - Measles**  
**Japan - Hand, foot, and mouth disease (HFMD)**  
**Kyrgyzstan - Measles**  
**Malaysia -Dengue Fever**  
**Mexico - Chikungunya**  
**Mexico - Hepatitis A**  
**Nigeria - Meningitis**  
**Philippines - Measles**  
**Scotland - Mumps**  
**Singapore - Hand, foot, and mouth disease (HFMD)**  
**South Korea - MERS ((Middle East Respiratory Syndrome)**  
**Throughout Caribbean - Chikungunya**  
**Throughout Central America - Chikungunya**  
**Throughout South America - Chikungunya**  
**Throughout Pacific Islands - Chikungunya**

**For specific information related to these health notices and alerts please see the CDC's listing available at URL:  
<http://wwwnc.cdc.gov/travel/notices>**

\*\*\*

## Health Information for Travelers to Malawi

Several cases of African trypanosomiasis (African sleeping sickness) have been reported from this region recently, including cases among tourists visiting game parks. For more information and recommendations on trypanosomiasis, see Travelers' Health Information on African Trypanosomiasis (<http://www.cdc.gov/travel/diseases/aftrypano.htm>).

Also, please check the Outbreaks section for important updates on this region, including information on the Epidemic of Meningococcal Disease in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (<http://www.cdc.gov/travel/outbreaks.htm>).

Food and waterborne diseases are the number one cause of illness in travelers. Travelers' diarrhea can be caused by viruses, bacteria, or parasites, which are found throughout the region and can contaminate food or water. Infections may cause diarrhea and vomiting (*E. coli*, *Salmonella*, cholera, and parasites), fever (typhoid fever and toxoplasmosis), or liver damage (hepatitis). Make sure your food and drinking water are safe. (See below.)

Malaria is a preventable infection that can be fatal if left untreated. Prevent infection by taking prescription antimalarial drugs and protecting yourself against mosquito bites (see below). Most travelers to malaria risk areas in this region should take mefloquine to prevent malaria. You can be infected with malaria in all areas of this region except the cities of Addis Ababa, Ismara, and Nairobi, the islands of Reunion and Seychelles, and in highland areas above 2,500 meters. For more detailed information about the risk in specific locations, see Malaria in East Africa (<http://www.cdc.gov/travel/regionalmalaria/eafrica.htm>).

A certificate of yellow fever vaccine may be required for entry into certain of these countries. For detailed information, see Comprehensive Yellow Fever Vaccination Requirements (<http://www.cdc.gov/travel/yelfever.htm>).

Dengue, filariasis, leishmaniasis, onchocerciasis, trypanosomiasis (sleeping sickness), and Rift Valley fever are diseases carried by insects that also occur in this region. Protecting yourself against insect bites will help to prevent these diseases.

Schistosomiasis, a parasitic infection, is found in fresh water in the region, including Lake Malawi. Do not swim in fresh water (except in well-chlorinated swimming pools) in these countries. (For more information, please see the Swimming Precautions on the Making Travel



Safe page at URL <http://www.cdc.gov/travel/safety.htm>.)

Because motor vehicle crashes are a leading cause of injury among travelers, walk and drive defensively. Avoid nighttime travel if possible and always use seat belts.

### **CDC Recommends the Following Vaccines (as Appropriate for Age):**

See your doctor at least 4-6 weeks before your trip to allow time for shots to take effect.

- Hepatitis A or immune globulin (IG).
- Hepatitis B, if you might be exposed to blood (for example, health-care workers), have sexual contact with the local population, stay longer than 6 months, or be exposed through medical treatment.
- Meningococcal (meningitis) vaccine, if you plan to visit the western half of Ethiopia (see meningitis map at URL <http://www.cdc.gov/travel/meninmap.htm>) from December through June.
- Rabies, if you might be exposed to wild or domestic animals through your work or recreation.
- Typhoid, particularly if you are visiting developing countries in this region.
- Yellow fever, if you travel anywhere outside urban areas.
- As needed, booster doses for tetanus-diphtheria, measles, and a one-time dose of polio vaccine for adults. Hepatitis B vaccine is now recommended for all infants and for children ages 11-12 years who did not receive the series as infants.

### **To Stay Healthy, Do:**

- Wash hands often with soap and water.
- Drink only bottled or boiled water, or carbonated (bubbly) drinks in cans or bottles. Avoid tap water, fountain drinks, and ice cubes. If this is not possible, make water safer by BOTH filtering through an "absolute 1-micron or less" filter AND adding iodine tablets to the filtered water. "Absolute 1-micron filter" are found in camping/outdoor supply stores.
- Eat only thoroughly cooked food or fruits and vegetables you have peeled yourself. Remember: boil it, cook it, peel it, or forget it.
- If you travel to an area where there is risk for malaria, take your malaria prevention medication before, during, and after travel, as directed. (See your doctor for a prescription.)
- Protect yourself from insects by remaining in well-screened areas, using repellents (applied sparingly at 4-hour intervals) and permethrin-impregnated mosquito nets, and wearing long-sleeved shirts and long pants from dusk through dawn.
- To prevent fungal and parasitic infections, keep feet clean and dry, and do not go barefoot.
- Always use latex condoms to reduce the risk of HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases.

### **To Avoid Getting Sick:**

- Don't eat food purchased from street vendors.
- Don't drink beverages with ice.
- Don't eat dairy products unless you know they have been pasteurized.
- Don't share needles with anyone.
- Don't handle animals (especially monkeys, dogs, and cats), to avoid bites and serious diseases (including rabies and plague). (For more information, please see the Animal-Associated Hazards on the Making Travel Safe page.)
- Don't swim in fresh water, including Lake Malawi. Salt water is usually safer. (For more information, please see the Swimming Precautions on the Making Travel Safe page.)

### **What You Need To Bring with You:**

- Long-sleeved shirt and long pants to wear while outside whenever possible, to prevent illnesses carried by insects (e.g., malaria, dengue, filariasis, leishmaniasis, and onchocerciasis).
- Insect repellent containing DEET (diethylmethyltoluamide), in 30%-35% strength for adults and 6%-10% for children. Unless you are staying in air-conditioned or well-screened housing, purchase a bed net impregnated with the insecticide permethrin. (Bed nets can be purchased in camping or military supply stores.)
- Over-the-counter antidiarrheal medicine to take if you have diarrhea.
- Iodine tablets and water filters to purify water if bottled water is not available. See Do's above for more detailed information about water filters.
- Sunblock, sunglasses, hat.
- Prescription medications: make sure you have enough to last during your trip, as well as a copy of the prescription(s).

### **After You Return Home:**

If you have visited an area where there is risk for malaria, continue taking your malaria medication weekly for 4 weeks after you leave the area.

If you become ill after your trip-even as long as a year after you return-tell your doctor where you have traveled.

### **For More Information:**

Ask your doctor or check the CDC web sites for more information about how to protect yourself against diseases that occur in East Africa, such as:

### **For information about diseases-**

Carried by Insects

Dengue, Malaria, Yellow Fever

Carried in Food or Water

Cholera, *Escherichia coli*, diarrhea, Hepatitis A, Schistosomiasis, Typhoid Fever

Person-to-Person Contact

Hepatitis B, HIV/AIDS

For more information about these and other diseases, please check the Diseases (<http://www.cdc.gov/travel/diseases.htm>) section and the Health Topics A - Z (<http://www.cdc.gov/health/diseases.htm>).

*Note:*

*Malawi is located in the East Africa health region.*

*Sources:*

*The Center for Disease Control Destinations Website:*

<http://www.cdc.gov/travel/indianrg.htm>

# **Chapter 6**

## **Environmental Overview**

---

## **Environmental Issues**

### **General Overview:**

Malawi has an ecologically rich environment with abundant water and fertile soil resources. Nevertheless, the country faces several environmental challenges and threats to its natural resources.

### **Current Issues:**

- deforestation and poor land usage
- land degradation
- water pollution from agricultural runoff, as well as contamination from sewage and industrial wastes
- The endangerment of fish populations by the siltation of spawning grounds

### **Total Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Mtc):**

1.8

### **Country Rank (GHG output):**

142nd

### **Natural Hazards:**

N/A

---

## Environmental Policy

### Regulation and Jurisdiction:

The regulation and protection of the environment in Malawi is under the jurisdiction of the following:

- Ministry of Research and Environmental Affairs

### Major Non-Governmental Organizations:

N/A

### International Environmental Accords:

*Party to:*

- Biodiversity
- Climate Change
- Climate Change-Kyoto Protocol
- Desertification
- Endangered Species
- Environmental Modification
- Hazardous Wastes
- Marine Life Conservation
- Nuclear Test Ban
- Ozone Layer Protection
- Ship Pollution
- Wetlands

*Signed but not ratified:*

- Law of the Sea

*Kyoto Protocol Status (year ratified):*

2001

---

## Greenhouse Gas Ranking

Greenhouse Gas Ranking

## GHG Emissions Rankings

| <b>Country Rank</b> | <b>Country</b> |
|---------------------|----------------|
| 1                   | United States  |
| 2                   | China          |
| 4                   | Russia         |
| 5                   | Japan          |
| 6                   | India          |
| 7                   | Germany        |
| 8                   | United Kingdom |

---

|    |              |
|----|--------------|
| 9  | Canada       |
| 10 | Korea, South |
| 11 | Italy        |
| 12 | Mexico       |
| 13 | France       |
| 14 | South Africa |
| 15 | Iran         |
| 16 | Indonesia    |
| 17 | Australia    |
| 18 | Spain        |
| 19 | Brazil       |
| 20 | Saudi Arabia |
| 21 | Ukraine      |
| 22 | Poland       |
| 23 | Taiwan       |
| 24 | Turkey       |
| 25 | Thailand     |
| 26 | Netherlands  |

---



---

|    |                      |
|----|----------------------|
| 27 | Kazakhstan           |
| 28 | Malaysia             |
| 29 | Egypt                |
| 30 | Venezuela            |
| 31 | Argentina            |
| 32 | Uzbekistan           |
| 33 | Czech Republic       |
| 34 | Belgium              |
| 35 | Pakistan             |
| 36 | Romania              |
| 37 | Greece               |
| 38 | United Arab Emirates |
| 39 | Algeria              |
| 40 | Nigeria              |
| 41 | Austria              |
| 42 | Iraq                 |
| 43 | Finland              |
| 44 | Philippines          |
|    |                      |

---

---

|    |                     |
|----|---------------------|
| 45 | Vietnam             |
| 46 | Korea, North        |
| 47 | Israel              |
| 48 | Portugal            |
| 49 | Colombia            |
| 50 | Belarus             |
| 51 | Kuwait              |
| 52 | Hungary             |
| 53 | Chile               |
| 54 | Denmark             |
| 55 | Serbia & Montenegro |
| 56 | Sweden              |
| 57 | Syria               |
| 58 | Libya               |
| 59 | Bulgaria            |
| 60 | Singapore           |
| 61 | Switzerland         |
| 62 | Ireland             |
|    |                     |

---

---

|    |                    |
|----|--------------------|
| 63 | Turkmenistan       |
| 64 | Slovakia           |
| 65 | Bangladesh         |
| 66 | Morocco            |
| 67 | New Zealand        |
| 68 | Oman               |
| 69 | Qatar              |
| 70 | Azerbaijan         |
| 71 | Norway             |
| 72 | Peru               |
| 73 | Cuba               |
| 74 | Ecuador            |
| 75 | Trinidad & Tobago  |
| 76 | Croatia            |
| 77 | Tunisia            |
| 78 | Dominican Republic |
| 79 | Lebanon            |
| 80 | Estonia            |
|    |                    |

---

---

|    |                      |
|----|----------------------|
| 81 | Yemen                |
| 82 | Jordan               |
| 83 | Slovenia             |
| 84 | Bahrain              |
| 85 | Angola               |
| 86 | Bosnia & Herzegovina |
| 87 | Lithuania            |
| 88 | Sri Lanka            |
| 89 | Zimbabwe             |
| 90 | Bolivia              |
| 91 | Jamaica              |
| 92 | Guatemala            |
| 93 | Luxembourg           |
| 94 | Myanmar              |
| 95 | Sudan                |
| 96 | Kenya                |
| 97 | Macedonia            |
| 98 | Mongolia             |
|    |                      |

---

---

|     |               |
|-----|---------------|
| 99  | Ghana         |
| 100 | Cyprus        |
| 101 | Moldova       |
| 102 | Latvia        |
| 103 | El Salvador   |
| 104 | Brunei        |
| 105 | Honduras      |
| 106 | Cameroon      |
| 107 | Panama        |
| 108 | Costa Rica    |
| 109 | Cote d'Ivoire |
| 110 | Kyrgyzstan    |
| 111 | Tajikistan    |
| 112 | Ethiopia      |
| 113 | Senegal       |
| 114 | Uruguay       |
| 115 | Gabon         |
| 116 | Albania       |
|     |               |

---

---

|     |                  |
|-----|------------------|
| 117 | Nicaragua        |
| 118 | Botswana         |
| 119 | Paraguay         |
| 120 | Tanzania         |
| 121 | Georgia          |
| 122 | Armenia          |
| 123 | Congo, RC        |
| 124 | Mauritius        |
| 125 | Nepal            |
| 126 | Mauritius        |
| 127 | Nepal            |
| 128 | Mauritania       |
| 129 | Malta            |
| 130 | Papua New Guinea |
| 131 | Zambia           |
| 132 | Suriname         |
| 133 | Iceland          |
| 134 | Togo             |
|     |                  |

---

---

|     |                   |
|-----|-------------------|
| 135 | Benin             |
| 136 | Uganda            |
| 137 | Bahamas           |
| 138 | Haiti             |
| 139 | Congo, DRC        |
| 140 | Guyana            |
| 141 | Mozambique        |
| 142 | Guinea            |
| 143 | Equatorial Guinea |
| 144 | Laos              |
| 145 | Barbados          |
| 146 | Niger             |
| 147 | Fiji              |
| 148 | Burkina Faso      |
| 149 | Malawi            |
| 150 | Swaziland         |
| 151 | Belize            |
| 152 | Afghanistan       |
|     |                   |

---

---

|     |                          |
|-----|--------------------------|
| 153 | Sierra Leone             |
| 154 | Eritrea                  |
| 155 | Rwanda                   |
| 156 | Mali                     |
| 157 | Seychelles               |
| 158 | Cambodia                 |
| 159 | Liberia                  |
| 160 | Bhutan                   |
| 161 | Maldives                 |
| 162 | Antigua & Barbuda        |
| 163 | Djibouti                 |
| 164 | Saint Lucia              |
| 165 | Gambia                   |
| 166 | Guinea-Bissau            |
| 167 | Central African Republic |
| 168 | Palau                    |
| 169 | Burundi                  |
| 170 | Grenada                  |
|     |                          |

---



|            |                                |
|------------|--------------------------------|
| 171        | Lesotho                        |
| 172        | Saint Vincent & the Grenadines |
| 173        | Solomon Islands                |
| 174        | Samoa                          |
| 175        | Cape Verde                     |
| 176        | Nauru                          |
| 177        | Dominica                       |
| 178        | Saint Kitts & Nevis            |
| 179        | Chad                           |
| 180        | Tonga                          |
| 181        | Sao Tome & Principe            |
| 182        | Comoros                        |
| 183        | Vanuatu                        |
| 185        | Kiribati                       |
| Not Ranked | Andorra                        |
| Not Ranked | East Timor                     |
| Not Ranked | Holy See                       |
| Not Ranked | Hong Kong                      |

|            |                  |
|------------|------------------|
| Not Ranked | Liechtenstein    |
| Not Ranked | Marshall Islands |
| Not Ranked | Micronesia       |
| Not Ranked | Monaco           |
| Not Ranked | San Marino       |
| Not Ranked | Somalia          |
| Not Ranked | Tuvalu           |

\* European Union is ranked 3rd

Cook Islands are ranked 184th

Niue is ranked 186th

---

## Global Environmental Snapshot

### **Introduction**

The countries of the world face many environmental challenges in common. Nevertheless, the nature and intensity of problem vary from region to region, as do various countries' respective capacities, in terms of affluence and infrastructure, to remediate threats to environmental quality.

Consciousness of perils affecting the global environment came to the fore in the last third or so of the 20<sup>th</sup> century has continued to intensify well into the new millennium. According to the United Nations Environment Programme, considerable environmental progress has been made at the level of institutional developments, international cooperation accords, and public participation. Approximately two-dozen international environmental protection accords with global implications have been promulgated since the late 1970s under auspices of the United Nations and other international organizations, together with many additional regional agreements. Attempts to address and rectify environmental problems take the form of legal frameworks, economic instruments,

environmentally sound technologies and cleaner production processes as well as conservation efforts. Environmental impact assessments have increasingly been applied across the globe.

Environmental degradation affects the quality, or aesthetics, of human life, but it also displays potential to undermine conditions necessary for the sustainability of human life. Attitudes toward the importance of environmental protection measures reflect ambivalence derived from this bifurcation. On one hand, steps such as cleaning up pollution, dedicating parkland, and suchlike, are seen as embellishments undertaken by wealthy societies already assured they can successfully perform those functions deemed, ostensibly, more essential-for instance, public health and education, employment and economic development. On the other hand, in poorer countries, activities causing environmental damage-for instance the land degradation effects of unregulated logging, slash-and-burn agriculture, overgrazing, and mining-can seem justified insofar as such activities provide incomes and livelihoods.

Rapid rates of resource depletion are associated with poverty and high population growth, themselves correlated, whereas consumption per capita is much higher in the most developed countries, despite these nations' recent progress in energy efficiency and conservation. It is impossible to sequester the global environmental challenge from related economic, social and political challenges.

First-tier industrialized countries have recently achieved measurable decreases in environmental pollution and the rate of resource depletion, a success not matched in middle income and developing countries. It is believed that the discrepancy is due to the fact that industrialized countries have more developed infrastructures to accommodate changes in environmental policy, to apply environmental technologies, and to invest in public education. The advanced industrialized countries incur relatively lower costs in alleviating environmental problems, in comparison to developing countries, since in the former even extensive environmental programs represent a rather minuscule percentage of total expenditures. Conversely, budget constraints, lagged provision of basic services to the population, and other factors such as debt service and militarization may preclude institution of minimal environmental protection measures in the poorest countries.

A synopsis for the current situation facing each region of the world follows:

### **Regional Synopsis: Africa**

The African continent, the world's second-largest landmass, encompasses many of the world's least developed countries. By global standards, urbanization is comparatively low but rising at a rapid rate. More heavily industrialized areas at the northern and southern ends of the continent experience the major share of industrial pollution. In other regions the most serious environmental problems typically stem from inefficient subsistence farming methods and other forms of land

degradation, which have affected an increasingly extensive area under pressure of a widely impoverished, fast-growing population. Africa's distribution of natural resources is very uneven. It is the continent at greatest risk of desertification, especially in the Sahel region at the edge of the Sahara but also in other dry-range areas. Yet at the same time, Africa also harbors some of the earth's richest and most diverse biological zones.

Key Points:

Up to half a billion hectares of African land are moderately to severely degraded, an occurrence reflecting short-fallow shifting cultivation and overgrazing as well as a climatic pattern of recurrent droughts.

Soil degradation is severe along the expanse directly south of the Sahara, from the west to the east coasts. Parts of southern Africa, central-eastern Africa, and the neighboring island of Madagascar suffer from serious soil degradation as well.

Africa contains about 17 percent of the world's forest cover, concentrated in the tropical belt of the continent. Many of the forests, however, are severely depleted, with an estimated 70 percent showing some degree of degradation.

Population growth has resulted in continuing loss of arable land, as inefficient subsistence farming techniques affect increasingly extensive areas. Efforts to implement settled, sustainable agriculture have met with some recent success, but much further progress in this direction is needed. Especially in previously uninhabited forestlands, concern over deforestation is intensifying.

By contrast, the African savanna remains the richest grassland in the world, supporting a substantial concentration of animal and plant life. Wildlife parks are sub-Saharan Africa's greatest tourist attraction, and with proper management-giving local people a stake in conservation and controlling the pace of development-could greatly enhance African economies.

Significant numbers of mammal species in parts of northern, southern and eastern Africa are currently threatened, while the biological diversity in Mauritania and Madagascar is even further compromised with over 20 percent of the mammal species in these two countries currently under threat.

With marine catch trends increasing from 500,000 metric tons in the 1950s to over 3,000,000 metric tons by 2000, there was increasing concern about the reduction in fisheries and marine life, should this trend continue unabated.

Water resource vulnerability is a major concern in northeastern Africa, and a moderate concern across the rest of the continent. An exception is central Africa, which has plentiful water supplies.

Many Africans lack adequate access to resources, not just (if at all) because the resources are unevenly distributed geographically, but also through institutional failures such as faulty land tenure systems or political upheaval. The quality of Africa's natural resources, despite their spotty distribution, is in fact extraordinarily rich. The infrastructure needed to protect and benefit from this natural legacy, however, is largely lacking.

### **Regional Synopsis: Asia and the Pacific**

Asia-earth's largest landmass-and the many large and nearly innumerable small islands lying off its Pacific shore display extraordinarily contrasting landscapes, levels of development, and degrees of environmental stress. In the classification used here, the world's smallest continent, Australia, is also included in the Asia-Pacific region.

The Asia-Pacific region is home to 9 of the world's 14 largest urban areas, and as energy use for utilities, industry and transport increases in developing economies, urban centers are subject to worsening air quality. Intense population density in places such as Bangladesh or Hong Kong is the quintessential image many people have of Asia, yet vast desert areas such as the Gobi and the world's highest mountain range, the Himalayas, span the continent as well. Forested areas in Southeast Asia and the islands of Indonesia and the Philippines were historically prized for their tropical hardwood, but in many places this resource is now severely depleted. Low-lying small island states are extremely vulnerable to the effects of global warming, both rising sea levels and an anticipated increase in cyclones.

#### **Key Points:**

Asian timber reserves are forecast to be depleted in the next 40 years. Loss of natural forest is irreversible in some areas, but plantation programs to restore tree cover may ameliorate a portion of the resulting land degradation.

Increased usage of fossil fuels in China and other parts of southern Asia is projected to result in a marked increase in emissions, especially in regard to carbon dioxide. The increased usage of energy has led to a marked upsurge in air pollution across the region.

Acidification is an emerging problem regionally, with sulfur dioxide emissions expected to triple by 2010 if the current growth rate is sustained. China, Thailand, India, and Korea seem to be suffering from particularly high rates of acid deposition. By contrast, Asia's most highly developed economy, Japan, has effected substantial improvements in its environmental indicators.

Water pollution in the Pacific is an urgent concern since up to 70 percent of the water discharged

into the region's waters receives no treatment. Additionally, the disposal of solid wastes, in like manner, poses a major threat in a region with many areas of high population density.

The Asia-Pacific region is the largest expanse of the world's land that is adversely affected by soil degradation.

The region around Australia reportedly suffers the largest degree of ozone depletion.

The microstates of the Pacific suffer land loss due to global warming, and the consequent rise in the levels of ocean waters. A high-emissions scenario and anthropogenic climate impact at the upper end of the currently predicted range would probably force complete evacuation of the lowest-elevation islands sometime in this century.

The species-rich reefs surrounding Southeast Asia are highly vulnerable to the deleterious effects of coastal development, land-based pollution, over-fishing and exploitative fishing methods, as well as marine pollution from oil spills and other activities.

With marine catch trends increasing from 5,000,000 metric tons in the 1950s to over 20,000,000 metric tons by 2000, there was increasing concern about the reduction in fisheries and marine life, should this trend continue unabated.

Significant numbers of mammal species in parts of China and south-east Asia are currently threatened, while the biological diversity in India, Japan, Australia, the Philippines, Indonesia and parts of Malaysia is even further compromised with over 20 percent of the mammal species in these countries currently under threat.

Water resource vulnerability is a serious concern in areas surrounding the Indian subcontinent.

### **Regional Synopsis: Central Asia**

The Central Asian republics, formerly in the Soviet Union, experience a range of environmental problems as the result of poorly executed agricultural, industrial, and nuclear programs during the Soviet era. Relatively low population densities are the norm, especially since upon the breakup of the U.S.S.R. many ethnic Russians migrated back to European Russia. In this largely semi-arid region, drought, water shortages, and soil salinization pose major challenges.

#### **Key Points:**

The use of agricultural pesticides, such as DDT and other chemicals, has contributed to the contamination of soil and groundwater throughout the region.

Land and soil degradation, and in particular, increased salinization, is mostly attributable to faulty irrigation practices.

Significant desertification is also a problem in the region.

Air pollution is prevalent, mostly due to use of low octane automobile fuel.

Industrial pollution of the Caspian Sea and the Aral Sea, as a result of industrial effluents as well as mining and metal production, presents a challenge to the countries bordering these bodies of water.

One of the most severe environmental problems in the region is attributable to the several billion tons of hazardous materials stored in landfills across Central Asia.

Uzbekistan's particular problem involves the contraction of the Aral Sea, which has decreased in size by a third, as a consequence of river diversions and poor irrigation practices. The effect has been the near-total biological destruction of that body of water.

Kazakhstan, as a consequence of being the heartland of the former Soviet Union's nuclear program, has incurred a high of cancerous malignancies, biogenetic abnormalities and radioactive contamination.

While part of the Soviet Union, the republics in the region experienced very high levels of greenhouse gas emissions, as a consequence of rapid industrialization using cheap but dirty energy sources, especially coal.

By contrast, however, there have recently been substantial reductions in the level of greenhouse gas emissions, especially those attributable to coal burning, with further decreases anticipated over the next decade. These changes are partially due to the use of cleaner energy technologies, such as natural gas, augmented by governmental commitment to improving environmental standards.

### **Regional Synopsis: Europe**

Western Europe underwent dramatic transformation of its landscape, virtually eliminating large-scale natural areas, during an era of rapid industrialization, which intensified upon its recovery from World War II. In Eastern Europe and European Russia, intensive land development has been less prevalent, so that some native forests and other natural areas remain. Air and water pollution from use of dirty fuels and industrial effluents, however, are more serious environmental problems in Eastern than in Western Europe, though recent trends show improvement in many indicators. Acid rain has inflicted heavy environmental damage across much of Europe, particularly on forests.

Europe and North America are the only regions in which water usage for industry exceeds that for agriculture, although in Mediterranean nations agriculture is the largest water consumer.

Key Points:

Europe contributes 36 percent of the world's chlorofluorocarbon emissions, 30 percent of carbon dioxide emissions, and 25 percent of sulfur dioxide emissions.

Sulfur and nitrogen oxide emissions are the cause of 30 to 50 percent of Central and Eastern Europe's deforestation.

Acid rain has been an environmental concern for decades and continues to be a challenge in parts of Western Europe.

Overexploitation of up to 60 percent of Europe's groundwater presents a problem in industrial and urban areas.

With marine catch trends increasing from 5,000,000 metric tons in the 1950s to over 20,000,000 metric tons by 2000, there was increasing concern about the reduction in fisheries and marine life, should this trend continue unabated.

Significant numbers of mammal species in parts of western Europe, Eastern Europe and Russia are currently threatened, while the biological diversity on the Iberian Peninsula is even further compromised with over 40 percent of the mammal species in this region currently under threat. As a result, there has been a 10 percent increase in protected areas of Europe.

A major environmental issue for Europe involves the depletion of various already endangered or threatened species, and most significantly, the decline of fish stocks. Some estimates suggest that up to 50 percent of the continent's fish species may be considered endangered species. Coastal fisheries have been over-harvested, resulting in catch limits or moratoriums on many commercially important fish species.

Fortunately, in the last few years, these policies have started to yield measurable results with decreasing trends in marine fish catch.

Recently, most European countries have adopted cleaner production technologies, and alternative methods of waste disposal, including recycling.

The countries of Eastern Europe have made air quality a major environmental priority. This is exemplified by the Russian Federation's addition to the 1995 "Berlin Mandate" (transnational legislation based on resolutions of the Rio Earth Summit) compelling nations to promote "carbon



sinks" to absorb greenhouse gases.

On a relative basis, when compared with the degree of industrial emissions emitted by many Eastern European countries until the late 1980s, there has been some marked increase in air quality in the region, as obsolete plants are closed and a transition to cleaner fuels and more efficient energy use takes place.

### **Regional Synopsis: The Middle and Near East**

Quite possibly, the Middle East will exemplify the adage that, as the 20<sup>th</sup> century was a century fixated on oil, the 21<sup>st</sup> century will be devoted to critical decisions about water. Many (though far from all) nations in the Middle East rank among those countries with the largest oil and gas reserves, but water resources are relatively scarce throughout this predominantly dry region. Effects of global warming may cause moderately high elevation areas that now typically receive winter "snowpack" to experience mainly rain instead, which would further constrain dry-season water availability. The antiquities and religious shrines of the region render it a great magnet for tourism, which entails considerable economic growth potential but also intensifies stresses on the environment.

#### **Key Points:**

Water resource vulnerability is a serious concern across the entire region. The increased usage of, and further demand for water, has exacerbated long-standing water scarcity in the region. For instance, river diversions and industrial salt works have caused the Dead Sea to shrink by one-third from its original surface area, with further declines expected.

The oil industry in the region contributes to water pollution in the Persian Gulf, as a result of oil spills, which have averaged 1.2 million barrels of oil spilt per year (some sources suggest that this figure is understated). The consequences are severe because even after oil spills have been cleaned up, environmental damage to the food webs and ecosystems of marine life will persist for a prolonged period.

The region's coastal zone is considered one of the most fragile and endangered ecosystems of the world. Land reclamation, shoreline construction, discharge of industrial effluents, and tourism (such as diving in the Red Sea) contribute to widespread coastal damage.

Significant numbers of mammal species in parts of the Middle East are currently threatened.

Since the 1980s, 11 percent of the region's natural forest has been depleted.

## **Regional Synopsis: Latin America and the Caribbean**

The Latin American and Caribbean region is characterized by exceedingly diverse landforms that have generally seen high rates of population growth and economic development in recent decades. The percentage of inhabitants residing in urban areas is quite high at 73.4 percent; the region includes the megacities of Mexico City, Sao Paulo, and Rio de Janeiro. The region also includes the world's second-highest mountain range, the Andes; significant expanses of desert and grassland; the coral reefs of the Caribbean Sea; and the world's largest contiguous tropical forest in the Amazon basin. Threats to the latter from subsistence and commercial farming, mineral exploitation and timbering are well publicized. Nevertheless, of eight countries worldwide that still retain at least 70 percent of their original forest cover, six are in Latin America. The region accounts for nearly half (48.3 percent) of the world's greenhouse gas emissions derived from land clearing, but as yet a comparatively minuscule share (4.3 percent) of such gases from industrial sources.

### **Key Points:**

Although Latin America is one of the most biologically diverse regions of the world, this biodiversity is highly threatened, as exemplified by the projected extinction of up to 100,000 species in the next few decades. Much of this loss will be concentrated in the Amazon area, although the western coastline of South America will also suffer significant depletion of biological diversity. The inventory of rainforest species with potentially useful commercial or medical applications is incomplete, but presumed to include significant numbers of such species that may become extinct before they are discovered and identified.

Up to 50 percent of the region's grazing land has lost its soil fertility as a result of soil erosion, salinization, alkalinization and overgrazing.

The Caribbean Sea, the Atlantic Ocean, and the Pacific Ocean have all been contaminated by agricultural wastes, which are discharged into streams that flow into these major waters. Water pollution derived from phosphorous, nitrates and pesticides adversely affects fish stocks, contributes to oxygen depletion and fosters overgrowth of aquatic vegetation. Marine life will continue to be severely compromised as a result of these conditions.

Due to industrial development in the region, many beaches of eastern Latin America and the Caribbean suffer from tar deposits.

Most cities in the region lack adequate sewage treatment facilities, and rapid migration of the rural poor into the cities is widening the gap between current infrastructure capacity and the much greater level needed to provide satisfactory basic services.

The rainforest region of the Amazon Basin suffers from dangerously high levels of deforestation, which may be a significant contributory factor to global warming or "the greenhouse effect." In the late 1990s and into the new millennium, the rate of deforestation was around 20 million acres of rainforest being destroyed annually.

Deforestation on the steep rainforest slopes of Caribbean islands contributes to soil erosion and landslides, both of which then result in heavy sedimentation of nearby river systems. When these sedimented rivers drain into the sea and coral reefs, they poison the coral tissues, which are vital to the maintenance of the reef ecosystem. The result is marine degradation and nutrient depletion. Jamaica's coral reefs have never quite recovered from the effects of marine degradation.

The Southern Cone of Latin America (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, and Uruguay) suffers the effects of greatly increased ultraviolet-B radiation, as a consequence of more intense ozone depletion in the southern hemisphere.

Water resource vulnerability is an increasingly major concern in the northwestern portion of South America.

### **Regional Synopsis: North America**

North American nations, in particular the United States and Canada, rank among the world's most highly developed industrial economies—a fact which has generated significant pollution problems, but also financial resources and skills that have enabled many problems to be corrected. Although efforts to promote energy efficiency, recycling, and suchlike have helped ease strains on the environment in a part of the world where per capita consumption levels are high, sprawling land development patterns and recent preferences many households have demonstrated for larger vehicles have offset these advances.

Meanwhile, a large portion of North America's original forest cover has been lost, though in many cases replaced by productive second-growth woodland. In recent years, attitudes toward best use of the region's remaining natural or scenic areas seem to be shifting toward recreation and preservation and away from resource extraction. With increasing attention on the energy scarcity in the United States, however, there is speculation that this shift may be short-lived. Indeed, the energy shortage on the west coast of the United States and associated calls for energy exploration, indicate a possible retrenchment toward resource extraction. At the same time, however, it has also served to highlight the need for energy conservation as well as alternative energy sources.

Despite generally successful anti-pollution efforts, various parts of the region continue to suffer significant air, water and land degradation from industrial, vehicular, and agricultural emissions and

runoff. Mexico, as a middle-income country, displays environmental problems characteristic of a developing economy, including forest depletion, pollution from inefficient industrial processes and dirty fuels, and lack of sufficient waste-treatment infrastructure.

Key Points:

Because of significantly greater motor vehicle usage in the United States (U.S.) than in the rest of the world, the U.S. contribution of urban air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, especially carbon dioxide, is disproportionately high in relation to its population.

Acid rain is an enduring issue of contention in the northeastern part of the United States, on the border with Canada.

Mexico's urban areas suffer extreme air pollution from carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxide, and other toxic air pollutants. Emissions controls on vehicles are in their infancy, compared to analogous regulations in the U.S.

The cities of Mexico, including those on the U.S. border, also discharge large quantities of untreated or poorly treated sewage, though officials are currently planning infrastructure upgrades.

Deforestation is noteworthy in various regions of the U.S., especially along the northwest coastline. Old growth forests have been largely removed, but in the northeastern and upper midwestern sections of the United States, evidence suggests that the current extent of tree cover probably surpasses the figure for the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Extreme weather conditions in the last few years have resulted in a high level of soil erosion along the north coast of California; in addition, the coastline itself has shifted substantially due to soil erosion and concomitant landslides.

Agricultural pollution-including nitrate contamination of well water, nutrient runoff to waterways, and pesticide exposure-is significant in various areas. Noteworthy among affected places are California's Central Valley, extensive stretches of the Midwest, and land in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

Inland waterways, especially around the Great Lakes, have substantially improved their water quality, due to concentrated efforts at reducing water pollution by governmental, commercial and community representatives. Strict curbs on industrial effluents and near-universal implementation of sewage treatment are the chief factors responsible for this improvement.

A major environmental issue for Canada and the United States involves the depletion of various

already endangered or threatened species, and most significantly, the decline of fish stocks. Coastal fisheries have been over-harvested, resulting in catch limits or moratoriums on many commercially important fish species. In the last few years, these policies have started to yield measurable results with decreasing trends in marine fish catch.

Due to the decay of neighboring ecosystems in Central America and the Caribbean, the sea surrounding Florida has become increasingly sedimented, contributing to marine degradation, nutrient depletion of the ecosystem, depletion of fish stocks, and diseases to coral species in particular.

## **Polar Regions**

### **Key Points:**

The significant rise in sea level, amounting 10 to 25 centimeters in the last 100 years, is due to the melting of the Arctic ice sheets, and is attributed to global warming.

The Antarctic suffers from a significant ozone hole, first detected in 1976. By 1985, a British scientific team reported a 40 percent decrease in usual regeneration rates of the ozone. Because a sustained increase in the amount of ultraviolet-B radiation would have adverse consequences upon all planetary life, recent environmental measures have been put into effect, aimed at reversing ozone depletion. These measures are projected to garner significant results by 2050.

Due to air and ocean currents, the Arctic is a sink for toxic releases originally discharged thousands of miles away. Arctic wildlife and Canada's Inuit population have higher bodily levels of contaminants such as PCB and dioxin than those found in people and animals in much of the rest of the world.

---

## **Global Environmental Concepts**

### **1. Global Warming and Greenhouse Gases**

#### **The Greenhouse Effect:**

In the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, the French physicist, Jean Fourier, contended that the earth's atmosphere functions in much the same way as the glass of a greenhouse, thus describing what is now understood as the "greenhouse effect." Put simply, the "greenhouse effect" confines some of the sun's energy to the earth, preserving some of the planet's warmth, rather than allowing it to flow back into space. In so doing, all kinds of life forms can flourish on earth. Thus, the "greenhouse effect" is necessary to sustain and preserve life forms and ecosystems on earth.

In the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, a Swedish chemist, Svante Arrhenius, noticed that human activities, such as the burning of coal and other fossil fuels for heat, and the removal of forested lands for urban development, led to higher concentrations of greenhouse gases, like carbon dioxide and methane, in the atmosphere. This increase in the levels of greenhouse gases was believed to advance the "greenhouse effect" exponentially, and might be related to the trend in global warming.

In the wake of the Industrial Revolution, after industrial development took place on a large scale and the total human population burgeoned simultaneously with industrialization, the resulting increase in greenhouse gas emissions could, many scientists believe, be significant enough to have some bearing on climate. Indeed, many studies in recent years support the idea that there is a linkage between human activities and global warming, although there is less consensus on the extent to which this linkage may be relevant to environmental concerns.

That said, some scientists have argued that temperature fluctuations have existed throughout the evolution of the planet. Indeed, Dr. S. Fred Singer, the president of the Science and Environment Policy Project has noted that 3,000-year-old geological records of ocean sediment reveal changes in the surface temperature of the ocean. Hence, it is possible that climate variability is merely a normal fact of the planet's evolution. Yet even skeptics as to anthropogenic factors concur that any substantial changes in global temperatures would likely have an effect upon the earth's ecosystems, as well as the life forms that inhabit them.

### **The Relationship Between Global Warming and Greenhouse Gases:**

A large number of climatologists believe that the increase in atmospheric concentrations of "greenhouse gas emissions," mostly a consequence of human activities such as the burning of fossil fuels, are contributing to global warming. The cause notwithstanding, the planet has reportedly warmed 0.3°C to 0.6°C over the last century. Indeed, each year during the 1990s was one of the very warmest in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, with the mean surface temperature for 1999 being the fifth warmest on record since 1880.

In early 2000, a panel of atmospheric scientists for the National Research Council concluded in a report that global warming was, indeed, a reality. While the panel, headed by Chairman John Wallace, a professor of atmospheric sciences at the University of Washington, stated that it

remained unclear whether human activities have contributed to the earth's increasing temperatures, it was apparent that global warming exists.

In 2001, following a request for further study by the incoming Bush administration in the [United States](#), the National Academy of Sciences again confirmed that global warming had been in existence for the last 20 years. The study also projected an increase in temperature between 2.5 degrees and 10.4 degrees Fahrenheit by the year 2100. Furthermore, the study found the leading cause of global warming to be emissions of carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels, and it noted that greenhouse gas accumulations in the earth's atmosphere was a result of human activities.

Within the scientific community, the controversy regarding has centered on the difference between surface air and upper air temperatures. Information collected since 1979 suggests that while the earth's surface temperature has increased by about a degree in the past century, the atmospheric temperature five miles above the earth's surface has indicated very little increase. Nevertheless, the panel stated that this discrepancy in temperature between surface and upper air does not invalidate the conclusion that global warming is taking place. Further, the panel noted that natural events, such as volcanic eruptions, can decrease the temperature in the upper atmosphere.

The major consequences of global warming potentially include the melting of the polar ice caps, which, in turn, contribute to the rise in sea levels. Many islands across the globe have already experienced a measurable loss of land as a result. Because global warming may increase the rate of evaporation, increased precipitation, in the form of stronger and more frequent storm systems, is another potential outcome. Other consequences of global warming may include the introduction and proliferation of new infectious diseases, loss of arable land (referred to as "desertification"), destructive changes to existing ecosystems, loss of biodiversity and the isolation of species, and concomitant adverse changes in the quality of human life.

### **International Policy Development in Regard to Global Warming:**

Regardless of what the precise nature of the relationship between greenhouse gas emissions and global warming may be, it seems that there is some degree of a connection between the phenomena. Any substantial reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and global warming trends will likely involve systematic changes in industrial operations, the use of advanced energy sources and technologies, as well as global cooperation in implementing and regulating these transformations.

In this regard, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) stipulated the following objectives:

1. To stabilize "greenhouse gas" concentrations within the atmosphere, in such a manner that would preclude hazardous anthropogenic intervention into the existing biosphere and ecosystems of the world. This stabilization process would facilitate the natural adaptation of ecosystems to



changes in climate.

2. To ensure and enable sustainable development and food production on a global scale.

\*\*\* See section on "International Environmental Agreements and Associations" for information related to international policies related to limiting greenhouse gases and controlling climate change emanating from historic summits at Kyoto, Copenhagen, Doha, and Paris. \*\*\*

## **2. Air Pollution**

Long before global warming reared its head as a significant issue, those concerned about the environment and public health noted the deleterious effects of human-initiated combustion upon the atmosphere. Killer smogs from coal burning triggered acute health emergencies in London and other places. At a lower level of intensity motor vehicle, power plant, and industrial emissions impaired long-range visibility and probably had some chronic adverse consequences on the respiratory systems of persons breathing such air.

In time, scientists began associating the sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides released from coal burning with significant acid deposition in the atmosphere, eventually falling as "acid rain." This phenomenon has severely degraded forestlands, especially in Europe and a few parts of the [United States](#). It has also impaired some aquatic ecosystems and eaten away the surface of some human artifacts, such as marble monuments. Scrubber technology and conversion to cleaner fuels have enabled the level of industrial production to remain at least constant while significantly reducing acid deposition. Technologies aimed at cleaning the air and curtailing acid rain, soot, and smog may, nonetheless, boomerang as the perils of global warming become increasingly serious. In brief, these particulates act as sort of a sun shade -- comparable to the effect of volcanic eruptions on the upper atmosphere whereby periods of active volcanism correlate with temporarily cooler weather conditions. Thus, while the carbon dioxide releases that are an inevitable byproduct of combustion continue, by scrubbing the atmosphere of pollutants, an industrial society opens itself to greater insolation (penetration of the sun's rays and consequent heating), and consequently, it is likely to experience a correspondingly greater rise in ambient temperatures.

The health benefits of removing the sources of acid rain and smog are indisputable, and no one would recommend a return to previous conditions. Nevertheless, the problematic climatic effects of continually increasing emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases pose a major global environmental challenge, not as yet addressed adequately.



### **3. Ozone Depletion**

The stratospheric ozone layer functions to prevent ultraviolet radiation from reaching the earth. Normally, stratospheric ozone is systematically disintegrated and regenerated through natural photochemical processes. The stratospheric ozone layer, however, has been depleted unnaturally as a result of anthropogenic (man-made) chemicals, most especially chlorine and bromide compounds such as chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), halons, and various industrial chemicals in the form of solvents, refrigerants, foaming agents, aerosol propellants, fire retardants, and fumigants. Ozone depletion is of concern because it permits a greater degree of ultraviolet-B radiation to reach the earth, which then increases the incidences of cancerous malignancies, cataracts, and human immune deficiencies. In addition, even in small doses, ozone depletion affects the ecosystem by disturbing food chains, agriculture, fisheries and other forms of biological diversity.

Transnational policies enacted to respond to the dangers of ozone depletion include the 1985 Vienna Convention on the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the 1987 Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. The Montreal Protocol was subsequently amended in London in 1990, Copenhagen in 1992 and Vienna in 1995. By 1996, 155 countries had ratified the Montreal Protocol, which sets out a time schedule for the reduction (and eventual elimination) of ozone depleting substances (OPS), and bans exports and imports of ODS from and to non-participant countries.

In general, the Protocol stipulates that developed countries must eliminate halon consumption by 1994 and CFC consumption by 1996, while developing countries must eliminate these substances by 2010. Consumption of methyl bromide, which is used as a fumigant, was to be frozen at the 1995 in developed countries, and fully eliminated in 2010, while developing countries are to freeze consumption by 2002, based on average 1995-1998 consumption levels. Methyl chloroform is to be phased out by 2005. Under the Montreal Protocol, most ODS will be completely eliminated from use by 2010.

### **4. Land Degradation**

In recent decades, land degradation in more arid regions of the world has become a serious concern. The problem, manifest as both "desertification" and "devegetation," is caused primarily by climate variability and human activities, such as "deforestation," excessive cultivation, overgrazing, and other forms of land resource exploitation. It is also exacerbated by inadequate irrigation practices. Although the effects of droughts on drylands have been temporary in the past, today, the productivity and sustainability of these lands have been severely compromised for the long term. Indeed, in every region of the world, land degradation has become an acute issue.

**Desertification and Devegetation:**

"Desertification" is a process of land degradation causing the soil to deteriorate, thus losing its nutrients and fertility, and eventually resulting in the loss of vegetation, known as "devegetation." As aforementioned, "desertification" and "devegetation" are caused by human activities, yet human beings are also the greatest casualties. Because these forms of land degradation affect the ability of the soil to produce crops, they concomitantly contribute to poverty. As population increases and demographic concentrations shift, the extent of land subject to stresses by those seeking to wrest subsistence from it has inexorably risen.

In response, the United Nations has formed the Convention to Combat Desertification-aimed at implementing programs to address the underlying causes of desertification, as well as measures to prevent and minimize its effects. Of particular significance is the formulation of policies on transboundary resources, such as areas around lakes and rivers. At a broader level, the Convention has established a Conference of Parties (COP), which includes all ratifying governments, for directing and advancing international action.

To ensure more efficacious use of funding, the Convention intends to reconfigure international aid to utilize a consultative and coordinated approach in the disbursement and expenditure of donor funds. In this way, local communities that are affected by desertification will be active participants in the solution-generation process. In-depth community education projects are envisioned as part of this new international aid program, and private donor financing is encouraged. Meanwhile, as new technologies are developed to deal with the problem of desertification, they need to be distributed for application across the world. Hence, the Convention calls for international cooperation in scientific research in this regard.

Desertification is a problem of sustainable development. It is directly connected to human challenges such as poverty, social and economic well-being and environmental protection as well. Broader environmental issues, such as climate change, biological diversity, and freshwater supplies, are indirectly related, so any effort to resolve this environmental challenge must entail coordinated research efforts and joint action.

**Deforestation:**

Deforestation is not a recent phenomenon. For centuries, human beings have cut down trees to clear space for land cultivation, or in order to use the wood for fuel. Over the last 200 years, and most especially after World War II, deforestation increased because the logging industry became a globally profitable endeavor, and so the clearing of forested areas was accelerated for the purposes of industrial development. In the long term, this intensified level of deforestation is considered problematic because the forest is unable to regenerate itself quickly. The deforestation that has

occurred in tropical rainforests is seen as an especially serious concern, due to the perceived adverse effects of this process upon the entire global ecosystem.

The most immediate consequence of deforestation is soil degradation. Soil, which is necessary for the growth of vegetation, can be a fragile and vital property. Organically, an extensive evolution process must take place before soil can produce vegetation, yet at the same time, the effects of natural elements, such as wind and rain, can easily and quickly degrade this resource. This phenomenon is known as soil erosion. In addition, natural elements like wind and rain reduce the amount of fertile soil on the ground, making soil scarcity a genuine problem. When fertile topsoil that already exists is removed from the landscape in the process of deforestation, soil scarcity is further exacerbated. Equally significant is the fact that once land has been cleared so that the topsoil can be cultivated for crop production, not only are the nutrient reserves in the soil depleted, thus producing crops of inferior quality, but the soil structure itself becomes stressed and deteriorates further.

Another direct result of deforestation is flooding. When forests are cleared, removing the cover of vegetation, and rainfall occurs, the flow of water increases across the surface of land. When extensive water runoff takes place, the frequency and intensity of flooding increases. Other adverse effects of deforestation include the loss of wildlife and biodiversity within the ecosystem that supports such life forms.

At a broader level, tropical rainforests play a vital role in maintaining the global environmental system. Specifically, destruction of tropical rainforests affects the carbon dioxide cycle. When forests are destroyed by burning (or rotting), carbon dioxide is released into the air, thus contributing to an intensified "greenhouse effect." The increase in greenhouse gas emissions like carbon dioxide is a major contributor to global warming, according to many environmental scientists. Indeed, trees themselves absorb carbon dioxide in the process of photosynthesis, so their loss also reduces the absorption of greenhouse gases.

Tropical rainforest destruction also adversely affects the nitrogen cycle. Nitrogen is a key nutrient for both plants and animals. Plants derive nitrogen from soil, while animals obtain it via nitrogen-enriched vegetation. This element is essential for the formation of amino acids, and thereby for proteins and biochemicals that all living things need for metabolism and growth. In the nitrogen cycle, vegetation acquires these essential proteins and biochemicals, and then cyclically returns them to the atmosphere and global ecosystem. Accordingly, when tropical rainforest ecosystems are compromised, not only is vegetation removed; the atmosphere is also affected and climates are altered. At a more immediate level, the biodiversity within tropical rainforests, including wildlife and insect species and a wealth of plant varieties, is depleted. Loss of rare plants is of particular concern because certain species as yet unknown and unused could likely yield many practical benefits, for instance as medicines.

As a result of the many challenges associated with deforestation, many environmental groups and agencies have argued for government policies on the sustainable development of forests by governments across the globe. While many countries have instituted national policies and programs aimed at reducing deforestation, and substantial research has been advanced in regard to sustainable and regenerative forestry development, there has been very little progress on an international level. Generally speaking, most tropical rainforests are located in developing and less developed countries, where economic growth is often dependent upon the exploitation of tropical rainforests. Timber resources as well as wildlife hunting tend to be particularly lucrative arenas.

In places such as the Amazon, where deforestation takes place for the construction of energy plants aimed at industrialization and economic development, there is an exacerbated effect on the environment. After forests are cleared in order to construct such projects, massive flooding usually ensues. The remaining trees then rot and decay in the wake of the flooding. As the trees deteriorate, their biochemical makeup becomes more acidic, producing poisonous substances such as hydrogen sulphide and methane gases. Acidified water subsequently corrodes the mechanical equipment and operations of the plants, which are already clogged by rotting wood after the floodwaters rise.

Deforestation generally arises from an economically plausible short-term motivation, but nonetheless poses a serious global concern because the effects go beyond national boundaries. The United Nations has established the World Commission on Forest and Sustainable Development. This body's task is to determine the optimal means of dealing with the issue of deforestation, without unduly affecting normal economic development, while emphasizing the global significance of protecting tropical forest ecosystems.

## **5. Water Resources**

For all terrestrial fauna, including humans, water is the most immediate necessity to sustain life. As the population has increased and altered an ever-greater portion of the landscape from its natural condition, demand on water resources has intensified, especially with the development of industrialization and large-scale irrigation. The supply of freshwater is inherently limited, and moreover distributed unevenly across the earth's landmasses. Moreover, not just demand for freshwater but activities certain to degrade it are becoming more pervasive. By contrast, the oceans form a sort of "last wilderness," still little explored and in large part not seriously affected by human activity. However, coastal environments - the biologically richest part of the marine ecosystem-are experiencing major depletion due to human encroachment and over-exploitation.

### **Freshwater:**

In various regions, for instance the Colorado River in the western [United States](#), current withdrawals of river water for irrigation, domestic, and industrial use consume the entire streamflow so that almost no water flows into the sea at the river's mouth. Yet development is ongoing in many such places, implying continually rising demand for water. In some areas reliant on groundwater, aquifers are being depleted at a markedly faster rate than they are being replenished. An example is the San Joaquin Valley in California, where decades of high water withdrawals for agriculture have caused land subsidence of ten meters or more in some spots. Naturally, the uncertainty of future water supplies is particularly acute in arid and semi-arid regions. Speculation that the phenomenon of global warming will alter geographic and seasonal rainfall patterns adds further uncertainty.

Water conservation measures have great potential to alleviate supply shortages. Some city water systems are so old and beset with leaking pipes that they lose as much water as they meter. Broad-scale irrigation could be replaced by drip-type irrigation, actually enhancing the sustainability of agriculture. In many areas where heavy irrigation has been used for decades, the result is deposition of salts and other chemicals in the soil such that the land becomes unproductive for farming and must be abandoned.

Farming is a major source of water pollution. Whereas restrictions on industrial effluents and other "point sources" are relatively easy to implement, comparable measures to reform hydraulic practices at farms and other "nonpoint sources" pose a significantly knottier challenge. Farm-caused water pollution takes the following main forms:

- Nitrate pollution found in wells in intensive farming areas as a consequence of heavy fertilizer use is a threat to human health. The most serious danger is to infants, who by ingesting high-nitrate water can contract methemoglobinemia, sometimes called "blue baby syndrome," a potentially fatal condition.
- Fertilizer runoff into rivers and lakes imparts unwanted nutrients that cause algae growth and eventual loss of oxygen in the body of water, degrading its ability to support fish and other desirable aquatic life.
- Toxic agricultural chemicals - insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides - are detectable in some aquifers and waterways.

In general, it is much easier to get a pollutant into water than to retrieve it out. Gasoline additives, dry cleaning chemicals, other industrial toxins, and in a few areas radionuclides have all been found in water sources intended for human use. The complexity and long time scale of subterranean hydrological movements essentially assures that pollutants already deposited in aquifers will continue to turn up for decades to come. Sophisticated water treatment processes are available, albeit expensive, to reclaim degraded water and render it fit for human consumption. Yet

source protection is unquestionably a more desirable alternative.

In much of the developing world, and even some low-income rural enclaves of the developed world, the population lacks ready access to safe water. Surface water and shallow groundwater supplies are susceptible to contamination from untreated wastewater and failing septic tanks, as well as chemical hazards. The occurrence of waterborne disease is almost certainly greatly underreported.

### **Marine Resources:**

Coastal areas have always been desirable places for human habitation, and population pressure on them continues to increase. Many types of water degradation that affect lakes and rivers also affect coastal zones: industrial effluents, untreated or partially treated sewage, nutrient load from agriculture figure prominently in both cases. Prospects for more extreme storms as a result of global warming, as well as the pervasiveness of poorly planned development in many coastal areas, forebode that catastrophic hurricanes and landslides may increase in frequency in the future. Ongoing rise in sea levels will force remedial measures and in some cases abandonment of currently valuable coastal property.

Fisheries over much of the globe have been overharvested, and immediate conservation measures are required to preserve stocks of many species. Many governments subsidized factory-scale fishing fleets in the 1970s and 1980s, and the resultant catch increase evidently surpassed a sustainable level. It is uncertain how much of the current decline in fish stocks stems from overharvesting and how much from environmental pollution. The deep ocean remains relatively unaffected by human activity, but continental shelves near coastlines are frequently seriously polluted, and these close-to-shore areas are the major biological nurseries for food fish and the smaller organisms they feed on.

## **6. Environmental Toxins**

Toxic chemical pollution exploded on the public consciousness with disclosure of spectacularly polluted industrial areas such as Love Canal near Buffalo, New York. There is no question that pollutants such as organophosphates or radionuclides can be highly deleterious to health, but evidence to date suggests that seriously affected areas are a localized rather than universal problem.

While some explore the possibilities for a lifestyle that fully eschews use of modern industrial chemicals, the most prevalent remediative approach is to focus on more judicious use. The most efficient chemical plants are now able to contain nearly all toxic byproducts of their production processes within the premises, minimizing the release of such substances into the environment.



Techniques such as Integrated Pest Management (IPM) dictate limited rather than broadcast use of pesticides: application only when needed using the safest available chemical, supplemented as much as possible with nontoxic controls.

While heightened public awareness and growing technical sophistication suggest a hopeful outlook on limiting the damage from manmade environmental toxins, one must grant that previous incidents of their misuse and mishandling have already caused environmental damage that will have to be dealt with for many years to come. In the case of the most hazardous radioactive substances, the time scale for successful remediation actually extends beyond that of the recorded history of civilization. Moreover, in this era of high population density and rapid economic growth, quotidian activities such as the transport of chemicals will occasionally, seemingly inevitably result in accidents with adverse environmental consequences.

## **7. "Islandization" and Biodiversity**

With increased awareness regarding the adverse effects of unregulated hunting and habitat depletion upon wildlife species and other aspects of biodiversity, large-scale efforts across the globe have been initiated to reduce and even reverse this trend.

In every region of the world, many species of wildlife and areas of biodiversity have been saved from extinction. Nationally, many countries have adopted policies aimed at preservation and conservation of species, and one of the most tangible measures has been the proliferation of protected habitats. Such habitats exist in the form of wildlife reserves, marine life reserves, and other such areas where biodiversity can be protected from external encroachment and exploitation.

Despite these advances in wildlife and biodiversity protection, further and perhaps more intractable challenges linger. Designated reserves, while intended to prevent further species decline, exist as closed territories, fragmented from other such enclaves and disconnected from the larger ecosystem. This environmental scenario is referred to as "islandization." Habitat reserves often serve as oversized zoos or game farms, with landscapes and wildlife that have effectively been "tamed" to suit. Meanwhile, the larger surrounding ecosystem continues to be seriously degraded and transformed, while within the islandized habitat, species that are the focus of conservation efforts may not have sufficient range and may not be able to maintain healthy genetic variability.

As a consequence, many conservationists and preservationists have demanded that substantially larger portions of land be withheld as habitat reserves, and a network of biological corridors to connect continental reserves be established. While such efforts to combat islandization have considerable support in the [United States](#), how precisely such a program would be instituted, especially across national boundaries, remains a matter of debate. International conservationists and preservationists say without a network of reserves a massive loss of biodiversity will result.

The concept of islandization illustrates why conservation and preservation of wildlife and biodiversity must consider and adopt new, broader strategies. In the past, conservation and preservation efforts have been aimed at specific species, such as the spotted owl and grizzly bear in North America, the Bengal tiger in Southeast Asia, the panda in [China](#), elephants in Africa. Instead, the new approach is to simultaneously protect many and varied species that inhabit the same ecosystem. This method, referred to as "bio-regional conservation," may more efficaciously generate longer-term and more far-reaching results precisely because it is aimed at preserving entire ecosystems, and all the living things within.

### **More About Biodiversity Issues:**

This section is directly taken from the United Nations Environmental Program: "[Biodiversity Assessment](#)"

The Global Biodiversity Assessment, completed by 1500 scientists under the auspices of United Nations Environmental Program in 1995, updated what is known (or unknown) about global biological diversity at the ecosystem, species and genetic levels. The assessment was uncertain of the total number of species on Earth within an order of magnitude. Of its working figure of 13 million species, only 13 percent are scientifically described. Ecological community diversity is also poorly known, as is its relationship to biological diversity, and genetic diversity has been studied for only a small number of species. The effects of human activities on biodiversity have increased so greatly that the rate of species extinctions is rising to hundreds or thousands of times the background level. These losses are driven by increasing demands on species and their habitats, and by the failure of current market systems to value biodiversity adequately. The Assessment calls for urgent action to reverse these trends.

There has been a new recognition of the importance of protecting marine and aquatic biodiversity. The first quantitative estimates of species losses due to growing coral reef destruction predict that almost 200,000 species, or one in five presently contributing to coral reef biodiversity, could die out in the next 40 years if human pressures on reefs continue to increase.

Since Rio, many countries have improved their understanding of the status and importance of their biodiversity, particularly through biodiversity country studies such as those prepared under the auspices of UNEP/GEF. The [United Kingdom](#) identified 1250 species needing monitoring, of which 400 require action plans to ensure their survival. Protective measures for biodiversity, such as legislation to protect species, can prove effective. In the USA, almost 40 percent of the plants and animals protected under the Endangered Species Act are now stable or improving as a direct result of recovery efforts. Some African countries have joined efforts to protect threatened species through the 1994 Lusaka Agreement, and more highly migratory species are being protected by



specialized cooperative agreements among range states under the Bonn Agreement.

There is an emerging realization that a major part of conservation of biological diversity must take place outside of protected areas and involve local communities. The extensive agricultural areas occupied by small farmers contain much biodiversity that is important for sustainable food production. Indigenous agricultural practices have been and continue to be important elements in the maintenance of biodiversity, but these are being displaced and lost. There is a new focus on the interrelationship between agrobiodiversity conservation and sustainable use and development practices in smallholder agriculture, with emphasis on use of farmers' knowledge and skills as a source of information for sustainable farming.

Perhaps even more important than the loss of biodiversity is the transformation of global biogeochemical cycles, the reduction in the total world biomass, and the decrease in the biological productivity of the planet. While quantitative measurements are not available, the eventual economic and social consequences may be so significant that the issue requires further attention.

\*\*\*\*\*

Specific sources used for this section:

Bendall, Roger. 1996. "Biodiversity: the follow up to Rio". *The Globe* 30:4-5, April 1996.

Global Environmental Change: Human and Policy Implications. 1995. Special issue on "People, Land Management and Environmental Change", Vol. 3, No. 4, September 1995.

Golubev, Genady N. (Moscow University) In litt. 29 June 1996.

Heywood, V.H. (ed.). 1995. *Global Biodiversity Assessment*. United Nations Environment Programme. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Heywood, V.H. 1996. "The Global Biodiversity Assessment". *The Globe*, 30:2-4, April 1996.

---

Reaka-Kudla, Marjorie. 1996. Paper presented at American Association for Advancement of Science, February 1996. Quoted in Pain, Stephanie. "Treasures lost in reef madness". New Scientist, 17 February 1996.

Uitto, Juha I., and Akiko Ono (eds). 1996. Population, Land Management and Environmental Change. The United Nations University, Tokyo.

USFWS. 1994. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service report to Congress, cited in news release 21 July 1994.

Online resources used generally in the Environmental Overview:

Environmental Protection Agency Global Warming Site. URL: <http://www.epa.gov/globalwarming>

Food and Agriculture Organization of United Nations: Forestry. URL: <http://www.fao.org/forestry/site/sofo/en/>

Global Warming Information Page. URL: <http://globalwarming.org>

U n i t e d N a t i o n s E n v i r o n m e n t a l P r o g r a m . U R L : [http://www.unep.org/GEO/GEO\\_Products/Assessment\\_Reports/](http://www.unep.org/GEO/GEO_Products/Assessment_Reports/)

United Nations Global Environmental Outlook. URL: <http://www.unep.org/geo/geo4/media/>

Note on Edition Dates:

The edition dates for textual resources are noted above because they were used to formulate the original content. We also have used online resources (cited above) to update coverage as needed.

Information Resources

For more information about environmental concepts, CountryWatch recommends the following resources:

The United Nations Environmental Program Network (with country profiles)

[<http://www.unep.net/>](http://www.unep.net/)

The United Nations Environment Program on Climate Change

[<http://climatechange.unep.net/>](http://climatechange.unep.net/)

The United Nations Environmental Program on Waters and Oceans

[<http://www.unep.ch/earthw/Pdepwat.htm>](http://www.unep.ch/earthw/Pdepwat.htm)

The United Nations Environmental Program on Forestry: "Forests in Flux"

[<http://www.unep-wcmc.org/forest/flux/homepage.htm>](http://www.unep-wcmc.org/forest/flux/homepage.htm)

FAO "State of the World's Forests"

[<http://www.fao.org/forestry/FO/SOFO/SOFO99/sofo99-e.stm>](http://www.fao.org/forestry/FO/SOFO/SOFO99/sofo99-e.stm)

World Resources Institute.

[<http://www.wri.org/>](http://www.wri.org/)

Harvard University Center for Health and the Global Environment

[<http://www.med.harvard.edu/chge/the-review.html>](http://www.med.harvard.edu/chge/the-review.html)

The University of Wisconsin Center for Sustainability and the Global Environment

<http://sage.aos.wisc.edu/>

---

## **International Environmental Agreements and Associations**

## **International Policy Development in Regard to Global Warming:**

### **Introduction**

Regardless of what the precise nature of the relationship between greenhouse gas emissions and global warming may be, it seems that there is some degree of a connection between the phenomena. Any substantial reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and global warming trends will likely involve systematic changes in industrial operations, the use of advanced energy sources and technologies, as well as global cooperation in implementing and regulating these transformations.

In this regard, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) stipulated the following objectives:

1. To stabilize "greenhouse gas" concentrations within the atmosphere, in such a manner that would preclude hazardous anthropogenic intervention into the existing biosphere and ecosystems of the world. This stabilization process would facilitate the natural adaptation of ecosystems to changes in climate.
2. To ensure and enable sustainable development and food production on a global scale.

Following are two discussions regarding international policies on the environment, followed by listings of international accords.

### ***Special Entry: The Kyoto Protocol***

The UNFCCC was adopted at the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, and entered into force in 1994. Over 175 parties were official participants.

Meanwhile, however, many of the larger, more industrialized nations failed to reach the emissions' reduction targets, and many UNFCCC members agreed that the voluntary approach to reducing emissions had not been successful. As such, UNFCCC members reached a consensus that legally binding limits were necessitated, and agreed to discuss such a legal paradigm at a meeting in Kyoto, [Japan](#) in 1997. At that meeting, the UNFCCC forged the Kyoto Protocol. This concord is the first legally binding international agreement that places limits on emissions from industrialized countries. The major greenhouse gas emissions addressed in the Kyoto Protocol include carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, sulfur hexafluoride, and methane.

The provisions of the Kyoto Protocol stipulate that economically advanced nations must reduce their combined emissions of greenhouse gases, by approximately five percent from their 1990

levels, before the 2008-2010 deadline. Countries with the highest carbon dioxide emissions, such as the [United States](#) (U.S.), many of the European Union (EU) countries, and [Japan](#), are to reduce emissions by a scale of 6 to 8 percent. All economically advanced nations must show "demonstrable progress" by 2005. In contrast, no binding limits or timetable have been set on developing countries. Presumably, this distinction is due to the fact that most developing countries - - with the obvious exceptions of [India](#) and [China](#) -- simply do not emit as many greenhouse gases as do more industrially advanced countries. Meanwhile, these countries are entrenched in the process of economic development.

Regardless of the aforementioned reasoning, there has been strong opposition against the asymmetrical treatment assigned to emissions limits among developed and developing countries. Although this distinction might be regarded as unfair in principle, associations such as the Alliance of Small Island States have been vocal in expressing how global warming -- a result of greenhouse gas emissions - has contributed to the rise in sea level, and thus deleteriously affected their very existence as island nation states. For this reason, some parties have suggested that economically advanced nations, upon returning to their 1990 levels, should be required to further reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by a deadline of 2005. In response, interested parties have observed that even if such reductions were undertaken by economically advanced nations, they would not be enough to completely control global warming. Indeed, a reduction in the rate of fossil fuel usage by developing nations would also be necessary to have substantial ameliorative effect on global warming. Indeed, a reduction in the rate of fossil fuel usage by developing nations would also be necessary to have substantial ameliorative effect on global warming.

As such, the Protocol established a "Clean Development Mechanism" which permits developed countries to invest in projects aimed at reducing emissions within developing countries in return for credit for the reductions. Ostensibly, the objective of this mechanism is to curtail emissions in developing countries without unduly penalizing them for their economic development. Under this model, the countries with more potential emissions credits could sell them to other signatories of the Kyoto Protocol, whose emissions are forecast to significantly rise in the next few years. Should this trading of emissions credits take place, it is estimated that the Kyoto Protocol's emissions targets could still be met.

In 1999, the International Energy Outlook projected that Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union and Newly Independent States, as well as parts of Asia, are all expected to show a marked decrease in their level of energy-related carbon emissions in 2010. Nations with the highest emissions, specifically, the U.S., the EU and [Japan](#), are anticipated to reduce their emissions by up to 8 percent by 2012. By 2000, however, the emissions targets were not on schedule for achievement. Indeed, the U.S. Department of Energy estimates forecast that by 2010, there will be a 34 percent increase in carbon emissions from the 1990 levels, in the absence of major shifts in policy, economic growth, energy prices, and consumer trends. Despite this assessment in the U.S., international support for the Kyoto Protocol remained strong, especially among European countries

and island states, who view the pact as one step in the direction away from reliance on fossil fuels and other sources of greenhouse gases.

In 2001, U.S. President, George W. Bush, rejected his country's participation in the Kyoto Protocol, saying that the costs imposed on the global economic system, and especially, on the US, overshadowed the benefits of the Protocol. He also cited the unfair burden on developed nations to reduce emissions, as another primary reasons for withdrawal from the international pact, as well as insufficient evidence regarding the science of global warming. Faced with impassioned international disapproval for his position, the U.S. president stated that his administration remained interested in dealing with the matter of global warming, but would endorse alternative measures to combat the problem, such as voluntary initiatives limiting emissions. Critics of Bush's position, however, have noted that it was the failure of voluntary initiatives to reduce emissions following the Rio Summit that led to the establishment of the Kyoto Protocol in the first place.

In the wake of the Bush administration's decision, many participant countries resigned themselves to the reality that the goals of the Kyoto Protocol might not be achieved without U.S. involvement. Nevertheless, in Bonn, [Germany](#), in July 2001, the remaining participant countries struck a political compromise on some of the key issues and sticking points, and planned to move forward with the Protocol, irrespective of the absence of the U.S. The key compromise points included the provision for countries to offset their targets with carbon sinks (these are areas of forest and farmland which can absorb carbon through the process of photosynthesis). Another compromise point within the broader Bonn Agreement was the reduction of emissions cuts of six gases from over 5 percent to a more achievable 2 percent. A third key change was the provision of funding for less wealthy countries to adopt more progressive technologies.

In late October and early November 2001, the UNFCCC's 7<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties met in Marrakesh, [Morocco](#), to finalize the measures needed to make the Kyoto Protocol operational. Although the UNFCCC projected that ratification of the Protocol would make it legally binding within a year, many critics noted that the process had fallen short of implementing significant changes in policy that would be necessary to actually stop or even slow climate change. They also maintained that the absence of U.S. participation effectively rendered the Protocol into being a political exercise without any substance, either in terms of transnational policy or in terms of environmental concerns.

The adoption of the compromises ensconced within the Bonn Agreement had been intended to make the provisions of the Kyoto Protocol more palatable to the U.S. In this regard, it failed to achieve its objective as the Bush administration continued to eschew participation in the international accord. Still, however, the Bonn Agreement did manage to render a number of other positive outcomes. Specifically, in 2002, key countries, such as [Russia](#), [Japan](#) and [Canada](#) agreed to ratify the protocol, bringing the number of signatories to 178. The decision by key countries to

ratify the protocol was regarded as "the kiss of life" by observers.

By 2005, on the eve of a climate change conference in London, British Prime Minister Tony Blair was hoping to deal with the problems of climate change beyond the provisions set forth in the Kyoto Protocol. Acknowledging that the Kyoto Protocol could not work in its current form, Blair wanted to open the discussion for a new climate change plan.

Blair said that although most of the world had signed on to Kyoto, the protocol could not meet any of its practical goals of cutting greenhouse gas emissions without the participation of the United States, the world's largest polluter. He also noted that any new agreement would have to include India and China -- significant producers of greenhouse gas emissions, but exempt from Kyoto because they have been classified as developing countries. Still, he said that progress on dealing with climate change had been stymied by "a reluctance to face up to reality and the practical action needed to tackle problem."

Blair also touted the "huge opportunities" in technology and pointed toward the possibilities offered by wind, solar and nuclear power, along with fuel cell technology, eco-friendly biofuels, and carbon capture and storage which could generate low carbon power. Blair also asserted that his government was committed to achieving its domestic goal of reducing carbon dioxide emissions by 20 percent by 2010.

In the United States, President George W. Bush has said that global warming remained a debatable issue and despite conclusions reached by his own Environmental Protection Agency, he has not agreed with the conclusion that global warming and climate change are linked with human activities. Bush has also refused to ratify Kyoto on the basis of its economic costs.

Australia, an ally of the United States, has taken a similarly dim view of the Kyoto Protocol. Ahead of the November 2005 climate change meeting in Canada in which new goals for the protocol were to be discussed, Australia's Environment Minister, Ian Campbell, said that negotiating new greenhouse gas emission levels for the Kyoto Protocol would be a waste of time. Campbell said, "There is a consensus that the caps, targets and timetables approach is flawed. If we spend the next five years arguing about that, we'll be fiddling and negotiating while Rome burns." Campbell, like the Bush administration, has also advocated a system of voluntary action in which industry takes up new technologies rather than as a result of compelling the reduction of emissions. But the Australian Conservation Foundation (ACF) has called on its government to ratify the Kyoto Protocol, to establish a system of emissions trading, and to set binding limits on emissions. Interestingly, although it did not sign on to Kyoto, Australia was expected to meet its emissions target by 2012 (an 8 percent increase in 1990 levels in keeping with the country's reliance on coal). But this success has nothing to do with new technologies and is due to state-based regulations on land clearing.



Note: The Kyoto Protocol calls for developed nations to cut greenhouse emissions by 5.2 percent of 1990 levels by 2012.

***Special Entry: Climate Change Summit in Copenhagen (2009) --***

In December 2009, the United Nations Climate Change Summit opened in the Danish capital of Copenhagen. The summit was scheduled to last from Dec. 7-18, 2009. Delegates from more than 190 countries were in attendance, and approximately 100 world leaders, including British Prime Minister Gordon Brown and [United States](#) President Barack Obama, were expected to participate. At issue was the matter of new reductions targets on greenhouse gas emissions by 2020.

Despite earlier fears that little concurrence would come from the conference, effectively pushing significant actions forward to a 2010 conference in [Mexico](#) City, negotiators were now reporting that the talks were productive and several key countries, such as [South Africa](#), had pledged to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The two main issues that could still lead to cleavages were questions of agreement between the industrialized countries and the developing countries of the world, as well as the overall effectiveness of proposals in seriously addressing the perils of climate change.

On Dec. 9, 2009, four countries -- the [United Kingdom](#), [Australia](#), [Mexico](#) and [Norway](#) -- presented a document outlining ideas for raising and managing billions of dollars, which would be intended to help vulnerable countries dealing with the perils of climate change. Described as a "green fund," the concept could potentially help small island states at risk because of the rise in sea level. [Bangladesh](#) identified itself as a potential recipient of an assistance fund, noting that as a country plagued by devastating floods, it was particularly hard-hit by climate change. The "green fund" would fall under the rubric of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, for which developed countries have been committed to quantifying their emission reduction targets, and also to providing financial and technical support to developing countries.

The [United Kingdom](#), [Australia](#), [Mexico](#) and [Norway](#) also called for the creation of a new legal treaty that would replace the Kyoto Protocol. This new treaty, which could go into force in 2012, would focus largely on the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 2020. But [Australia](#) went even further in saying that the successor treaty to the Kyoto Protocol, should be one with provisions covering all countries. Such a move would be a departure from the structure of the Kyoto Protocol, which contained emissions targets for industrialized countries due to the prevailing view that developed countries had a particular historic responsibility to be accountable for climate change. More recently, it has become apparent that substantial reductions in greenhouse gas emissions demanded by scientists would only come to pass with the participation also of significant developing nation states, such as [China](#) and [India](#). Indeed, one of the most pressing critiques of the Kyoto Protocol was that it was a "paper tiger" that failed to address the impact of the actions of



emerging economies like [China](#) and [India](#), with its focus on the developed economies.

Now, in 2009, [China](#) -- as the world's biggest greenhouse gas emitter -- was responding this dubious distinction by vocalizing its criticism of the current scenario and foregrounding its new commitments. Ahead of the Copenhagen summit, [China](#) had announced it would reduce the intensity of its carbon emissions per unit of its GDP in 2020 by 40 to 45 percent against 2005 levels. With that new commitment at hand, [China](#) was now accusing the [United States](#) and the European Union of shirking their own responsibilities by setting weak targets for greenhouse gas emissions cuts. Senior Chinese negotiator, Su Wei, characterized the goals of the world's second largest greenhouse gas emitter -- the [United States](#) -- as "not notable," and the European Union's target as "not enough." Su Wei also took issue with [Japan](#) for setting implausible preconditions.

On Dec. 11, 2009, [China](#) demanded that developed and wealthy countries in Copenhagen should help deliver a real agreement on climate change by delivering on their promises to reduce carbon emissions and provide financial support for developing countries to adapt to global warming. In so doing, China's Vice Foreign Minister He Yafei said his country was hoping that a "balanced outcome" would emerge from the discussions at the summit. Echoing the position of the Australian government, He Yafei spoke of a draft agreement as follows: "The final document we're going to adopt needs to be taking into account the needs and aspirations of all countries, particularly the most vulnerable ones."

China's Vice Foreign Minister emphasized the fact that climate change was "a matter of survival" for developing countries, and accordingly, such countries need wealthier and more developed countries to accentuate not only their pledges of emissions reduction targets, but also their financial commitments under the aforementioned United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. To that end, scientists and leaders of small island states in the Indian Ocean, the Pacific Ocean and the Caribbean Sea, have highlighted the existential threat posed by global warming and the concomitant rise in sea level.

China aside, attention was also on [India](#) -- another major player in the developing world and a country with an industrializing economy that was impacting the environment. At issue was the Indian government's decision to set a carbon intensity target, which would slow emissions growth by up to 25 percent by the 2020 deadline. This strong position was resisted by some elements in [India](#), who argued that their country should not be taking such a strong position when developed wealthy countries were yet to show accountability for their previous commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The matter grew so heated that the members of the opposition stormed out of the parliament in protest as Indian Environment Minister Jairam Ramesh defended the policy. But the political pressure at home in [India](#) was leaving the Indian delegation in Copenhagen in a state of chaos as well. In fact, India's top environmental negotiator refused to travel to Copenhagen in protest of the government's newly-announced stance.

China and [India](#) were joined by [Brazil](#) and [South Africa](#) in the crafting of a draft document calling

for a new global climate treaty to be completed by June 2010. Of concern has been the realization that there was insufficient time to find concurrence on a full legal treaty, which would leave countries only with a politically-binding text by the time the summit at Copenhagen closed. But Guyana's leader, President Bharrat Jagdeo, warned that the summit in [Denmark](#) would be classified as a failure unless a binding document was agreed upon instead of just political consensus. He urged his cohorts to act with purpose saying, "Never before have science, economics, geo-strategic self-interest and politics intersected in such a way on an issue that impacts everyone on the planet."

Likewise, [Tuvalu](#) demanded that legally binding agreements emerge from Copenhagen. Its proposal was supported by many of the vulnerable countries, from small island states and sub-Saharan Africa, all of whom warned of the catastrophic impact of climate change on their citizens. [Tuvalu](#) also called for more aggressive action, such as an amendment to the 1992 agreement, which would focus on sharp greenhouse gas emissions and the accepted rise in temperatures, due to the impact the rise in seas. The delegation from [Kiribati](#) joined the call by drawing attention to the fact that one village had to be abandoned due to waist-high water, and more such effects were likely to follow. Kiribati's Foreign Secretary, Tessie Lambourne, warned that the people of [Kiribati](#) could well be faced with no homeland in the future saying, "Nobody in this room would want to leave their homeland." But despite such impassioned pleas and irrespective of warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change that the rise in sea level from melting polar ice caps would deleteriously affect low-lying atolls such as [Tuvalu](#) and [Kiribati](#) in the Pacific, and the [Maldives](#) in the Indian Ocean, the oil-giant [Saudi Arabia](#) was able to block this move.

Meanwhile, within the developed countries, yet another power struggle was brewing. The European Union warned it would only agree to raise its target of 20 percent greenhouse gas emissions reductions to 30 percent if the [United States](#) demonstrated that it would do more to reduce its own emissions. It was unknown if such pressure would yield results. [United States](#) President Barack Obama offered a "provisional" 2020 target of 17 percent reductions, noting that he could not offer greater concessions at Copenhagen due to resistance within the [United States](#) Congress, which was already trying to pass a highly controversial "cap and trade" emissions legislation. However, should that emissions trading bill fail in the Senate, the [United States](#) Environment Protection Agency's declaration that greenhouse gases pose a danger to human health and the environment was expected to facilitate further regulations and limits on power plants and factories at the national level. These moves could potentially strengthen the Obama administration's offering at Copenhagen. As well, President Obama also signaled that he would be willing to consider the inclusion of international forestry credits.

Such moves indicated willingness by the Obama administration to play a more constructive role on the international environmental scene than its predecessor, the Bush administration. Indeed, ahead of his arrival at the Copenhagen summit, President Barack Obama's top environmental advisors

promised to work on a substantial climate change agreement. To that end, [United States](#) Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Lisa Jackson said at a press conference, "We are seeking robust engagement with all of our partners around the world." But would this pro-engagement assertion yield actual results?

By Dec. 12, 2009, details related to a draft document prepared by Michael Zammit Cutajar, the head of the Ad-hoc Working Group on Long-Term Cooperative Action, were released at the Copenhagen climate conference. Included in the document were calls for countries to make major reductions in carbon emissions over the course of the next decade. According to the Washington Post, industrialized countries were called on to make cuts of between 25 percent and 40 percent below 1990 levels -- reductions that were far more draconian than the [United States](#) was likely to accept. As discussed above, President Obama had offered a provisional reduction target of 17 percent. The wide gap between the released draft and the United States' actual stated position suggested there was much more negotiating in the offing if a binding agreement could be forged, despite the Obama administration's claims that it was seeking greater engagement on this issue.

In other developments, the aforementioned call for financial support of developing countries to deal with the perils of climate change was partly answered by the European Union on Dec. 11, 2009. The European bloc pledged an amount of 2.4 billion euros (US\$3.5 billion) annually from 2010 to 2012. Environment Minister Andreas Carlgren of [Sweden](#) -- the country that holds the rotating presidency of the European Union at the time of the summit -- put his weight behind the notion of a "legally binding deal." Meanwhile, Yvo de Boer, a top United Nations climate change official, focused less on the essence of the agreement and more on tangible action and effects saying, "Copenhagen will only be a success if it delivers significant and immediate action that begins the day the conference ends."

The division between developed and developing countries in Copenhagen reached new heights on Dec. 14, 2009, when some of the poor and less developed countries launched a boycott at the summit. The move, which was spurred by African countries but backed by [China](#) and [India](#), appeared to be geared toward redirecting attention and primary responsibility to the wealthier and more industrialized countries. The impasse was resolved after the wealthier and more industrialized countries offered assurances that they did not intend on shirking from their commitments to reducing greenhouse gases. As a result, the participating countries ceased the boycott.

Outside the actual summit, thousands of protestors had gathered to demand crucial global warming, leading to clashes between police and demonstrators elsewhere in the Danish capital city. There were reports of scattered violence across Copenhagen and more than 1,000 people were arrested.

Nevertheless, by the second week of the climate change summit, hopes of forging a strong deal were eroding as developed and developing nations remained deadlocked on sharing cuts in

greenhouse gases, and particularly on the matters of financing and temperature goals. In a bid to shore up support for a new climate change, [United States](#) President Barack Obama joined other world leaders in Copenhagen. On Dec. 14, 2009, there was a standoff brewing between the [United States](#) and [China](#). At issue was China's refusal to accept international monitoring of its expressed targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The [United States](#) argued that China's opposition to verification could be a deal-breaker.

By the close of the summit, the difficult process eventually resulted in some consensus being cultivated. A draft text called for \$100 billion a year by 2020 to assist poor nations cope with climate change, while aiming to limit global warming to two degrees Celsius compared with pre-industrial levels. The deal also included specific targets for developed countries to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and called for reductions by developing countries as a share of their economies. Also included in the agreement was a mechanism to verify compliance. The details of the agreement were supported by President Barack Obama, Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao, Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and Brazilian President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva.

This draft would stand as an interim agreement, with a legally-binding international pact unlikely to materialize until 2010. In this way, the summit in Copenhagen failed to achieve its central objective, which was to negotiate a successor to the Kyoto Protocol on greenhouse gas emissions.

#### Editor's Note

In the background of these developments was the growing global consciousness related to global warming and climate change. Indeed, as the Copenhagen summit was ongoing, it was clear there was enormous concurrence on the significance of the stakes with an editorial on the matter of climate change being published in 56 newspapers in 45 countries. That editorial warned that without global action, climate change would "ravage our planet." Meanwhile, a global survey taken by Globescan showed that concern over global warming had exponentially increased from 1998 -- when only 20 percent of respondents believed it to be a serious problem -- to 64 percent in 2009. Such survey data, however, was generated ahead of the accusations by climate change skeptics that some climate scientists may have overstated the case for global warming, based on emails derived in an illicit manner from a British University.

#### ***Special Entry: Climate change talks in Doha in [Qatar](#) extend life of Kyoto Protocol (2012)***

December 2012 saw climate talks ensue in the Qatari city of Doha as representatives from countries across the world gathered to discuss the fate of the Kyoto Protocol, which seeks to minimize greenhouse gas emissions. The summit yielded results with decisions made (1) to extend the Kyoto Protocol until 2020, and (2) for wealthier countries to compensate poorer countries for the losses and damage incurred as a result of climate change.

In regards to the second matter, Malia Talakai of [Nauru](#), a leading negotiator for the Alliance of Small Island States, explained the necessity of the compensation package as follows: “We are trying to say that if you pollute you must help us.”

This measure was being dubbed the "Loss and Damage" mechanism, and was being linked with [United States](#) President Barack Obama's request for \$60 billion from Congress to deal with the devastation caused by Hurricane Sandy months before. The sight of a hurricane bearing down on the northern Atlantic seaboard, along with the reality of the scope of reconstruction, appeared to have illustrated the economic costs of climate change -- not so much as a distant environmental issue -- but as a danger to the quotidian lives of people. Still, there was blame to be placed on the [United States](#) and European countries -- some of world's largest emitters -- for failing to do more to reduce emissions.

To that latter end, there was in fact little progress made on the central issue of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Had those emissions been reduced, there would have been less of a need to financially deal with the devastation caused by climate change. One interpretation was that the global community was accepting the fact that industrialization was contributing to global warming, which had deleterious effects on the polar ice caps and concomitantly on the rise of sea level, with devastating effects for small island nations. Thus, wealthier countries were willing to pay around \$10 billion a year through 2020, effectively in "damages," to the poor countries that could be viewed as the "collateral damage" of industrial progress. But damages today could potentially be destruction tomorrow, leaving in place the existential challenges and burdens to be born by some of the world's smallest and least wealthy island countries.

Perhaps not surprisingly, the representative for the small island nation states at the Doha summit responded with ire, characterizing the lack of progress on reducing emissions as follows: "We see the package before us as deeply deficient in mitigation (carbon cuts) and finance. It's likely to lock us on the trajectory to a 3,4,5C rise in global temperatures, even though we agreed to keep the global average temperature rise of 1.5C to ensure survival of all islands. There is no new finance (for adapting to climate change and getting clean energy) -- only promises that something might materialize in the future. Those who are obstructive need to talk not about how their people will live, but whether our people will live."

Indeed, in most small island countries not just in the Pacific, but also the Caribbean and Indian Ocean, ecological concerns and the climate crisis have been dominant themes with dire life and death consequences looming in the background for their people. Small island nations in these region are already at risk from the rise of sea-level, tropical cyclones, floods. But their very livelihoods of fishing and subsistence farming were also at risk as a result of ecological and environmental changes. Increasingly high storm surges can wipe out entire villages and contaminate water supplies. Accordingly, the very existence of island nations, such as [Kiribati](#) and [Tuvalu](#), are

at severe risk of being obliterated from the map. Yet even with the existential threat of being wiped off the map in the offing, the international community has been either slow or restrictive in its efforts to deal with global warming, climate change, economic and ecological damage, as well as the emerging global challenge of environmental refugees.

A 2012 report from the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and the Pacific Regional Environment Program underlined the concerns of small island nations and their people as it concluded that the livelihoods of approximately 10 million people in Pacific island communities were increasingly vulnerable to climate change. In fact, low-lying islands in that region would likely confront losses of up to 18 percent of gross domestic product due to climate change, according to the report. The report covers 21 countries and territories, including [Fiji](#), [Kiribati](#), [Samoa](#) and [Tonga](#), and recommended environmental legislation intended to deal with the climate crisis facing the small island countries particularly. As noted by David Sheppard, the director general of the Pacific Regional Environment Program that co-sponsored this study: "The findings... emphasize the need more than ever to raise the bar through collective actions that address the region's environmental needs at all levels."

Regardless of the failures of the summit in [Qatar](#) (discussed above), the meeting did facilitate a process starting in 2015, which would bind both wealthy and poor countries together in the mission of forging a new binding treaty that would replace the Kyoto Protocol and tackle the central causes of climate change.

For more information on the threats faced in small island nations by climate change and the measures being undertaken to lobby for international action, please see the Alliance for Small Island States available online at the URL: <http://aosis.org/>

### *Special Report*

#### ***COP 21 summit in Paris ends with historic agreement to tackle climate change; rare international consensus formed on environmental crisis facing the planet (2015) --***

In mid-December 2015, the highly-anticipated United Nations climate conference of parties (COP) in Paris, [France](#), ended with a historic agreement. In fact, it would very likely be understood as the most significant international agreement signed by all the recognized countries of the world since the Cold War. Accordingly, the Paris Agreement was being distinguished as the first multilateral pact that would compel all countries across the world to cut its carbon emissions -- one of the major causes of increasing greenhouse gas emissions, which contribute to global warming, and its deleterious effects ranging from the dangerous rise in sea level to catastrophic climate change.



The accord, which was dubbed to be the "Paris Agreement," was the work of rigorous diplomacy and fervent environmental advocacy, and it aimed to address the climate change crisis facing the planet. As many as 195 countries were represented in the negotiations that led to the landmark climate deal. Indeed, it was only after weeks of passionate debate that international concurrence was reached in addressing the environmental challenges confronting the world, with particular attention to moving beyond fossil fuels and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

The success of the COP 21 summit in Paris and the emergence of the landmark Paris Agreement was, to some extent, attributed to the efforts of France's Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius who presided over the negotiations. The French foreign minister's experience and credentials as a seasoned diplomat and respected statesman paid dividends. He skillfully guided the delegates from almost 200 countries and interest groups along the negotiations process, with ostensibly productive results and a reasonably robust deal to show for it.

On Dec. 12, 2015, French Foreign Minister Fabius officially adopted the agreement, declaring: "I now invite the COP to adopt the decision entitled Paris Agreement outlined in the document. Looking out to the room I see that the reaction is positive, I see no objections. The Paris agreement is adopted." Once Foreign Minister Fabius' gavel was struck, symbolically inaugurating the Paris Agreement into force, the COP delegate rushed to their feet with loud and bouyant cheers as well as thunderous applause.

In general, the Paris Agreement was being hailed as a victory for enviromental activists and a triumph for international diplomats, while at the same time being understood as simply an initial -- and imperfect -- move in the direction of a sustainable future. China's chief negotiator, Xie Zhenhua, issued this message, saying that while the accord was not ideal, it should "not prevent us from marching historical steps forward."

United States President Barack Obama lauded the deal as both "ambitious" and "historic," and the work of strenuous multilateral negotiations as he declared, "Together, we've shown what's possible when the world stands as one." The [United States](#) leader acknowledged that the accord was not "perfect," but he reminded the critics that it was "the best chance to save the one planet we have."

Former [United States](#) Vice President Al Gore, one of the world's most well known environmental advocates, issued a lengthy statement on the accomplishments ensconced in the Paris Agreement. He highlighted the fact that the Paris Agreement was a first step towards a future with a reduced carbon footprint on Planet Earth as he said, "The components of this agreement -- including a strong review mechanism to enhance existing commitments and a long-term goal to eliminate global-warming pollution this century -- are essential to unlocking the necessary investments in our future. No agreement is perfect, and this one must be strengthened over time, but groups across every sector of society will now begin to reduce dangerous carbon pollution through the framework of this agreement."

The central provisions of the Paris Agreement included the following items:

- Greenhouse gas emissions should peak as quickly as possible, with a move towards balancing energy sources, and ultimately the decrease of greenhouse gases in the second half of this century
- Global temperature increase would be limited to 1.5 degrees Centigrade above pre-industrial levels and would be held "well below" the two degrees Centigrade threshold
- Progress on these goals would be reviewed every five years beginning in 2020 with new greenhouse gas reduction targets issued every five years
- \$100 billion would be expended each year in climate finance for developing countries to move forward with green technologies, with further climate financing to be advanced in the years beyond

It should be noted that there both legally binding and voluntary elements contained within the Paris Agreement. Specifically, the submission of an emissions reduction target and the regular review of that goal would be legally mandatory for all countries. Stated differently, there would be a system in place by which experts would be able to track the carbon-cutting progress of each country. At the same time, the specific targets to be set by countries would be determined at the discretion of the countries, and would not be binding. While there was some criticism over this non-binding element, the fact of the matter was that the imposition of emissions targets was believed to be a major factor in the failure of climate change talks in Copenhagen, [Denmark](#), in 2009.

In 2015, the talks faced challenges as several countries, such as [China](#) and [India](#), objected to conditions that would stymie economic and development. In order to avoid that kind of landmine, a system Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) was developed and formed the basis of the accord. As such, the Paris Agreement would, in fact, facilitate economic growth and development, as well as technological progress, but with the goal of long-term ecological sustainability based on low carbon sources. In fact, the agreement heralded as "the beginning of the end of the fossil fuel era." As noted by Nick Mabey, the head of the climate diplomacy organization E3G, said, "Paris means governments will go further and faster to tackle climate change than ever before. The transition to a low carbon economy is now unstoppable, ensuring the end of the fossil fuel age."

A particular sticking point in the agreement was the \$100 billion earmarked for climate financing for developing countries to transition from traditional fossil fuels to green energy technologies and a low carbon future. In 2014, a report by the International Energy Agency indicated that the cost of that transition would actually be around \$44 trillion by the mid-century -- an amount that would render the \$100 billion being promised to be a drop in the proverbial bucket. However, the general expectation was that the Republican-controlled Senate in the [United States](#), which would have to ratify the deal in that country, was not interested in contributing significant funds for the cause of climate change.



A key strength of the Paris Agreement was the ubiquitous application of measures to all countries. Of note was the frequently utilized concept of "flexibility" with regard to the Paris Agreement. Specifically, the varying capacities of the various countries in meeting their obligations would be anticipated and accorded flexibility. This aspect presented something of a departure from the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, which drew a sharp distinction between developed and developing countries, and mandated a different set of obligations for those categories of countries. Thus, under Kyoto, [China](#) and [India](#) were not held to the same standards as the [United States](#) and European countries. In the Paris Agreement, there would be commitments from all countries across the globe.

Another notable strength of the Paris Agreement was the fact that the countries of the world were finally able to reach consensus on the vital necessity to limit global temperature increases to 1.5 degrees Centigrade. Ahead of the global consensus on the deal, and as controversy continued to surface over the targeted global temperature limits, the leaders of island countries were sounding the alarm about the melting of the Polar ice caps and the associated rise in sea level. Prime Minister Enele Sopoaga of [Tuvalu](#) issued this dismal reminder: "Tuvalu's future ... is already bleak and any further temperature increase will spell the total demise of [Tuvalu](#). No leader in this room carries such a level of worry and responsibility. Just imagine you are in my shoes, what would you do?" It was thus something of a victory for environmental advocates that the countries of the world could find consensus on the lower number -- 1.5 degrees rather than 2 degrees.

A significant weak point with regard to the Paris deal was a "loss and damage" provision, which anticipates that even with all the new undertakings intended to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and move to a low carbon future, there would nonetheless be unavoidable climate change consequences. Those consequences ranged from the loss of arable land for farmers as well as soil erosion and contamination of potable water by sea water, to the decimation of territory in coastal zones and on small islands, due to the rise in sea level, with entire small island countries being rendered entirely uninhabitable. The reality was that peoples' homes across the world would be destroyed along with their way of life.

With that latter catastrophic effect being a clear and present danger for small island countries, the Association of Small Island States (AOSIS) demanded that the developed world acknowledge its responsibility for this irreversible damage.. Despite the fact that greenhouse gas emissions and the ensuing plague of global warming was, indeed, the consequence of development in the West (the [United States](#) and Europe) and the large power house countries, such as [Russia](#), [China](#) and [India](#), there was no appetite by those countries to sign on to unlimited liability. Under the Paris Agreement, there was a call for research on insurance mechanisms that would address loss and damage issues, with recommendations to come in the future.

The call for research was being regarded as an evasion of sorts and constituted the weakest aspect

---

of the Paris Agreement. Not surprisingly, a coalition of small island nations demanded a "Marshall Plan" for the Pacific. Borrowing the term "Marshall Plan" from the post-World War II reconstruction effort, the coalition of Pacific island nation, which included [Kiribati](#), [Tuvalu](#), [Fiji](#), and the [Marshall Islands](#), called for an initiative that would include investment in renewable energy and shoreline protection, cultural preservation, economic assistance for economies in transition, and a plan for migration and resettlement for these countries as they confront the catastrophic effects of the melting of the Polar ice caps and the concomitant rise in sea level. The precise contours of the initiative remained unknown, unspecified, and a mere exercise in theory at the time of writing. Yet such an initiative would, at some point, have to be addressed, given the realities of climate change and the slow motion calamity unfolding each day for low-lying island nations across the world.

As noted by Vice President Greg Stone of Conservation International, who also functions as an adviser to the government of [Kiribati](#), "Imagine living in a place where you know it's going to go away someday, but you don't know what day that wave's going to come over and wash your home away." He added, "It's a disaster we know is going to happen." Meanwhile, the intervening years promised to be filled with hardship for small island nations, such as [Kiribati](#). Stone explained, "For every inch of sea-level rise, these islands lose 10 feet of their freshwater table to saltwater intrusion," Stone explained. "So it's not just about the day the water finally goes over the island; it's also about the day that there's just not enough water left and everyone has to move off the island." Presaging the future for island nations that could face submersion, Stone said, "If you look ahead 50 years, a country like [Kiribati](#) could become the first aqueous nation. possibility of migration. That is, they own this big patch of ocean, and they administer it from elsewhere."

Foreign Minister Minister Tony Debrum of the [Marshall Islands](#) emerged as the champion advocating on behalf of small island nation states and a loose coalition of concerned countries from the Pacific to the Caribbean, but with support from the [United States](#). He addressed the comprehensive concerns of small island nations regarding the weaknesses of the deal, while simultaneously making clear that the Paris Agreement signified hope for the countries most at risk. In a formal statement, Debrum declared: "We have made history today. Emissions targets are still way off track, but this agreement has the tools to ramp up ambition, and brings a spirit of hope that we can rise to this challenge. I can go back home to my people and say we now have a pathway to survival." Debrum highlighted the imperatives of Pacific island nations, saying, "Our High Ambition Coalition was the lightning rod we needed to lift our sights and expectations for a strong agreement here in Paris. We were joined by countries representing more than half the world. We said loud and clear that a bare-bones, minimalist agreement would not fly. We instead demanded an agreement to mark a turning point in history, and the beginning of our journey to the post-carbon era."

Debrum of the [Marshall Islands](#) espoused the quintessential synopsis of the accord and its effects

---

for those most likely to be affected by climate change as he noted, “Climate change won’t stop overnight, and my country is not out of the firing line just yet, but today we all feel a little safer.”

Editor's Entry on [Environmental Policy](#):

The low-lying Pacific island nations of the world, including [Kiribati](#), [Tuvalu](#), the [Marshall Islands](#), [Fiji](#), among others, are vulnerable to the threats posed by global warming and climate change, derived from carbon emissions, and resulting in the rise in sea level. Other island nations in the Caribbean, as well as poor countries with coastal zones, were also at particular risk of suffering the deleterious effects of climate change.

Political policy in these countries are often connected to ecological issues, which have over time morphed into an existential crisis of sorts. Indeed, ecological concerns and the climate crisis have also been dominant themes with life and death consequences for the people of island nations in the Pacific. Indeed, the very livelihoods of fishing and subsistence farming remain at risk as a result of ecological and environmental changes. Yet even so, these countries are threatened by increasingly high storm surges, which could wipe out entire villages and contaminate water supplies. Moreover, because these are low lying island nations, the sustained rise in sea level can potentially lead to the terrain of these countries being uninhabitable at best, and submerged at worst. Stated in plain terms, these countries are at severe risk of being obliterated from the map and their plight illuminates the emerging global challenge of environmental refugees. In these manifold senses, climate change is the existential crisis of the contemporary era.

Since the time of the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, there have been efforts aimed at extending the life of that agreement, with an eye on minimizing greenhouse gas emissions, and thus minimizing the effects of climate change. Those endeavors have largely ended in failure, as exemplified by the unsuccessful Copenhagen talks in 2009 and the fruitless Doha talks in 2012 respectively. The success of the COP 21 talks in [France](#), with the adoption of the landmark Paris Agreement in 2015, was regarded as the first glimmer of hope. Not only did the Paris Agreement signify the triumph of international diplomacy and global consensus, but it also marked the start of the end of the fossil fuel era, with the path forward toward a low carbon future reliant on greener technologies. Most crucially, the Paris Agreement stood as the first significant response in recent times to the central challenge of climate change and its quotidian effects on the lives of real human beings across the world.

## **1. Major International Environmental Accords:**

### **General Environmental Concerns**

Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context, Espoo, 1991.

### **Accords Regarding Atmosphere**

Annex 16, vol. II (Environmental Protection: Aircraft Engine Emissions) to the 1044 Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation, Montreal, 1981

Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (LRTAP), Geneva, 1979

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), New York, 1992

Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, Vienna, 1985 including the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Depleted the Ozone Layer, Montreal, 1987

### **Accords Regarding Hazardous Substances**

Convention on the Ban of the Import into Africa and the Control of Transboundary Movements and Management of Hazardous Wastes within Africa, Bamako, 1991

Convention on Civil Liability for Damage Caused during Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road, Rail and Inland Navigation Vessels (CRTD), Geneva, 1989

Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal (Basel Convention), Basel, 1989

Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents, Helsinki, 1992

Convention to Ban the Importation into Forum Island Countries of Hazardous and Radioactive Wastes and to Control the Transboundary Movement and Management of Hazardous Wastes within the South Pacific Region (Waigani Convention), Waigani, 1995

European Agreement Concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), Geneva 1957

FAO International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides, Rome, 1985

## **2. Major International Marine Accords:**

## **Global Conventions**

Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter (London Convention 1972), London, 1972

International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, as modified by Protocol of 1978 relation thereto (MARPOL 73/78), London, 1973 and 1978

International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage 1969 (1969 CLC), Brussels, 1969, 1976, and 1984

International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for Compensation for Oil Pollution Damage 1971 (1971 Fund Convention), Brussels, 1971

Convention on Liability and Compensation for Damage in Connection with the Carriage of Hazardous and Noxious Substances by Sea (HNS), London 1996

International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response, and Co-operation (OPRC), London, 1990

International Convention Relation to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties (Intervention Convention), Brussels, 1969

United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), Montego Bay, 1982

## **Regional Conventions**

Convention for the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping from Ships and Aircraft (Oslo Convention), Oslo, 1972

Convention for the Prevention of Marine Pollution from Land-based Sources (Paris Convention), Paris, 1974

Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North East Atlantic (OSPAR Convention), Paris, 1992

Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (1974 Helsinki Convention), Helsinki 1974

Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (1992 Helsinki

---

Convention), Helsinki 1992

Conventions within the UNEP Regional Seas Programme

Convention on the Protection of the Black Sea against Pollution, Bucharest, 1992

Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region, Cartagena de Indias, 1983

Convention for the Protection, Management, and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region, Nairobi, 1985

Kuwait Regional Convention for Co-operation on the Protection of the Marine Environment from Pollution, [Kuwait](#), 1978

Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment and Coastal Region of the Mediterranean Sea (Barcelona Convention), Barcelona, 1976

Regional Convention for the Conservation of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Environment, Jeddah, 1982

Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region, Noumea, 1986

Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Coastal Area of the South-East Pacific, Lima, 1981

Convention for Co-operation in the Protection and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the West and Central African Region, Abidjan, 1981

### **3. Major Conventions Regarding Living Resources:**

#### **Marine Living Resources**

Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), Canberra, 1980

International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), Rio de Janeiro, 1966

International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (ICRW), Washington, 1946

---

## **Nature Conservation and Terrestrial Living Resources**

Antarctic Treaty, Washington, D.C., 1959

Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Convention), Paris, 1972

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Nairobi, 1992

Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), Bonn, 1979

Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), Washington, D.C., 1973

Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention), Ramsar, 1971

Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD), Paris 1994

FAO International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources, Rome, 1983

International Tropical Timber Agreement, 1994 (ITTA, 1994), Geneva, 1994

## **Freshwater Resources**

Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes, Helsinki, 1992

## **4. Major Conventions Regarding Nuclear Safety:**

Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency (Assistance Convention), Vienna, 1986

Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident (Notification Convention), Vienna, 1986

Convention on Nuclear Safety, Vienna, 1994

Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage, Vienna, 1963

## **5. Major Intergovernmental Organizations**

Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD)

European Union (EU): Environment

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

Global Environment Facility (GEF)

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

International Labour Organization (ILO)

International Maritime Organization (IMO)

International Monetary Fund (IMF)

International Oil Pollution Compensation Funds (IOPC Funds)

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Environment Policy Committee (EPOC)

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)



World Bank

World Food Programme (WFP)

World Health Organization (WHO)

World Meteorological Organization (WMO)

World Trade Organization (WTO)

## **6. Major Non-Governmental Organizations**

Atmosphere Action Network East Asia (AANE)

Climate Action Network (CAN)

Consumers International (CI)

Earth Council

Earthwatch Institute

Environmental Liaison Centre International (ELCI)

European Environmental Bureau (EEB)

Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)

Friends of the Earth International (FoEI)

Greenpeace International

International Chamber of Commerce (ICC)

International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU)

International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF)

International Solar Energy Society (ISES)

IUCN-The World Conservation Union

Pesticide Action Network (PAN)

Sierra Club

Society for International Development (SID)

Third World Network (TWN)

Water Environment Federation (WEF)

Women's Environment and Development Organization (WEDO)

World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)

World Federalist Movement (WFM)

World Resources Institute (WRI)

World Wide Fund For Nature (WWF)

## **7. Other Networking Instruments**

Arab Network for Environment and Development (RAED)

Global Legislators for a Balanced Environment (GLOBE)

Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe (REC)

United Nations Non-Governmental Liaison Service (UN-NGLS)



# Appendices

---

## **Bibliography**

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

#### **Sources: Key Data**

Altapedia. URL: [http://www.atlapedia.com/online/country\\_index.htm](http://www.atlapedia.com/online/country_index.htm)

Ethnologue. URL: <http://www.ethnologue.com>

Geobase Global Statistics. URL: <http://www.geoba.se>

Infoplease. URL: <http://www.infoplease.com>

The Statesman's Year Book 2006. Barry Turner, ed. London: St. Martin's Press.

[United States](http://www.state.gov/www/background_notes/index.htm) Department of State, Background Notes. URL: [http://www.state.gov/www/background\\_notes/index.htm](http://www.state.gov/www/background_notes/index.htm)

[United States](http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html) Central Intelligence Agency, World Factbook. Washington, D.C.: Printing and Photography Group. URL: <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html>

World Bank. URL: <http://www.worldbank.org/>

World Climate Data Online. URL: <http://www.worldclimate.com>

#### **Methodology Note for Demographic Data:**

The demographic numbers for cities and national populations listed in CountryWatch content are derived from the Geoba.se website, which analyzes data from the World Bank. The current demographic numbers displayed on the Countrywatch website are reflective of the latest available estimates.

The demographic information for language, ethnicity and religion listed in CountryWatch content is

derived from a mix of sources including the Altapedia, Central Intelligence Agency Factbook, Infoplease, and State Department Background Notes.

**Sources: Political Overview**

Agence [France](http://www.afp.com/en/) Presse. URL: <http://www.afp.com/en/>

BBC International News. URL: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/> (Various editions and dates as cited in particular reviews)

Britannica Book of the Year. 1998-present. David Calhoun, ed. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc.

Britannica Online URL :<http://www.eb.com>

Britannica Year in Review. URL: <http://www.britannica.com/browse/year>

Chiefs of State and Cabinet Members of Foreign Governments. URL: <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/chiefs/index.html>

Christian Science Monitor. URL: <http://www.csmonitor.com/> (Various editions and dates as cited in particular reviews)

CNN International News. URL:<http://www.cnn.com/WORLD/> (Various editions and dates as cited in particular reviews)

Current Leaders of Nations. 1997. Jennifer Mossman, ed. Detroit: Gale Research

The Economist Magazine. (Various editions and dates as cited in particular reviews)

The Economist Country Briefings. URL: <http://www.economist.com/countries/>

Eldis Country Profiles. URL: <http://www.eldis.org/country/index.htm>

Elections Around the World. URL: <http://www.electionworld.org/>

Election Resources. URL: <http://electionresources.org/>

Europa World Yearbook 1999. Vols. I & II. 1999. London: Europa Publications Ltd.

Europe World Online. URL: <http://www.europaworld.com/pub/>

Financial Times. URL: <http://www.financialtimes.com>

Foreign Government Resources. URL: <http://www.lib.umich.edu/govdocs/foreign.html>

[Human Rights](http://www.hrw.org) Watch. URL: <http://www.hrw.org>

IFES Election Guide. URL: <http://www.electionguide.org>

International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. URL: <http://www.idea.int/>

International Who's Who 1997-1998, 61st Edition. 1997. London: Europa Publications Ltd.

Leadership Views, Chiefs of State Online. URL : <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/chiefs/index.html>

Library of Congress Country Studies. URL: <http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/cshome.html>

New Encyclopedia Britannica. 1998. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica Inc.

New York Times. URL: <http://www.nytimes.com> (Various editions and dates as cited in particular reviews)

Patterns of Global Terrorism. n.d. [United States](http://www.state.gov) Department of State. Washington D.C.: [United States](http://www.state.gov) Department of State Publications.

Political Handbook of the World. n.d. Arthur S. Banks, Thomas C. Muller, ed. Binghamton, New York: CSA Publications.

Political Reference Almanac Online. URL: <http://www.polisci.com/almanac/nations.htm>

Reuters News. URL: <http://www.reuters.com/>

Rulers. URL: <http://rulers.org/>

The Guardian Online. URL: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/> (Various editions and dates as cited in particular reviews)

The Statesman's Year-Book 2006. Barry Turner, ed. London: St. Martin's Press.

United Nations Development Programme. URL: <http://hdr.undp.org>

United Nations Refugee Agency. URL: <http://www.unhcr.org>

[United States](#) Central Intelligence Agency, World Factbook. Washington, D.C.: Printing and Photography Group. URL: <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html>

[United States](#) Department of State, World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers (WMEAT) URL : [http://www.state.gov/www/global/arms/bureau\\_ac/reports\\_ac.html](http://www.state.gov/www/global/arms/bureau_ac/reports_ac.html)

United States Department of State, Country Reports on [Human Rights](#) Practices. URL: <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2002/18245.htm>

[United States](#) Department of State, Background Notes. URL : [http://www.state.gov/www/background\\_notes/index.html](http://www.state.gov/www/background_notes/index.html)

Virtual Library: International Relations Resources. URL: <http://www.etown.edu/vl/countgen.html>

World Bank: Governance Indicators. URL: <http://info.worldbank.org/governance>

-- See also list of News Wires services below, which are also used for research purposes. --

#### Note on Edition Dates:

The earlier edition dates are noted above because they were used to formulate the original Country Reviews and serve as the baseline for some of the information covered. Later editions have been used in some cases, and are cited as such, while other more recent online resources (cited above) contain recent and ever-updated data sets used for research.

#### **Sources: [Economic Overview](#)**

BP Statistical Review of World Energy. URL: <http://www.bp.com/genericsection.do?categoryId=92&contentId=7005893>

BP Statistical Review of World Energy, June 1998. 1998 to present. Page 1.C. London: The British Petroleum Company.

International Monetary Fund, Direction of Trade Statistics Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund Publication Services.



International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics. 1998 to present. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund Publication Services.

International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics Yearbook. 1999 to present. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund Publication Services.

International Monetary Fund, World Economic Outlook, May 1999. 1999 to present. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund Publication Services.

International Labour Office, World Employment Report, 1998-99. 1998 to present. Geneva: International Labour Office.

United Nations Statistical Division Online. URL: <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/default.htm>

United Nations Statistics Division, Monthly Bulletin of Statistics (MBS On Line), November 1999 Edition. 1999 to present. New York: United Nations.

United Nations, Statistical Yearbook, 43rd Issue. 1999. 1999 to present New York: United Nations.

United Nations, Food & Agricultural Organization, FAOSTAT Database. URL : <http://apps.fao.org/>  
United Nations, Comtrade Data Base, <http://comtrade.un.org/>

United States Department of Energy, Country Analysis Briefs. URL:<http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cabs/contents.html>

United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics Database

United States Geological Service, Mineral Information

United States Department of State, Country Commercial Guides. Washington, D.C. [United States of America](http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/business/com_guides/index.html). URL:[http://www.state.gov/www/about\\_state/business/com\\_guides/index.html](http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/business/com_guides/index.html)

The World Bank, Global Development Finance, Country Tables. 1999 to present. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

The World Bank Group, World Development Indicators. 1999 to present. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Yearbook of Tourism Statistics, World Tourism Organization. 1998 to present. Madrid: The World Tourism Organization.

#### Note on Edition Dates:

The earlier edition dates are noted above because they were used to formulate the original country reviews and serve as the baseline for some of the information covered. Later editions have been used in some cases, and are cited as such, while other more recent online resources (cited above) contain recent and ever-updated data sets used for research.

#### Methodology Notes for Economic Data:

Estimates by CountryWatch.com of GDP in dollars in most countries are made by converting local currency GDP data from the International Monetary Fund World Economic Outlook to US dollars by market exchange rates estimated from the International Monetary Fund International Financial Statistics and projected out by the CountryWatch Macroeconomic Forecast. Real GDP was estimated by deflating current dollar values by the US GDP Implicit Price Deflator.

Exceptions to this method were used for:

- Bosnia-Herzegovina
- Nauru
- Cuba
- Palau
- Holy See
- San Marino
- Korea, North
- [Serbia](#) & Montenegro
- Liberia
- Somalia
- Liechtenstein
- Tonga
- Monaco
- Tuvalu

In these cases, other data and/or estimates by CountryWatch.com were utilized.

#### **Investment Overview**

C o r r u p t i o n   a n d   T r a n s p a r e n c y   I n d e x .   U R L :  
<http://www.transparency.org/documents/cpi/2001/cpi2001.html#cpi>  
<<http://www.transparency.org/documents/>

Deloitte Tax Guides. URL: <http://www.deloittetaxguides.com>

---

Trade Policy Reviews by the World Trade Organization . URL: [http://www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_e/tpr\\_e/tp\\_rep\\_e.htm#bycountry](http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/tpr_e/tp_rep_e.htm#bycountry)

United States Department of Energy, Country Analysis Briefs. URL: <http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cabs/contents.html>

United States Department of State, Background Notes. URL: [http://www.state.gov/www/background\\_notes/index.html](http://www.state.gov/www/background_notes/index.html)

United States Department of State, Country Commercial Guides. 1996-2006. Washington, D.C. U n i t e d S t a t e s o f A m e r i c a . U R L : [http://www.state.gov/www/about\\_state/business/com\\_guides/index.html](http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/business/com_guides/index.html)

World Bank: Doing Business. URL: <http://www.doingbusiness.org>

World Bank: Governance Indicators. URL: <http://info.worldbank.org/governance>

### **Social Overview**

Borden, G.A., Conaway, W.A., Morrison, T. 1994. *Kiss, Bow, or Shake Hands: How to do Business in Sixty Countries*. Holbrook, Massachusetts, 1994.

Center for Disease Control. URL: <http://www.cdc.gov>

Eldis Country Profiles. URL: <http://www.eldis.org/country/index.htm>

Ethnologue. URL: <http://www.ethnologue.com/>

Government of Australia Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. URL: <http://www.dfat.gov.au/geo>

Government of Canada Foreign Affairs and International Trade. URL: [http://www.voyage.gc.ca/consular\\_home-e.htm](http://www.voyage.gc.ca/consular_home-e.htm)

Library of Congress Country Studies. URL: <http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/cshome.html>

Lonely Planet. URL: <http://www.lonelyplanet.com/worldguide/>

Steve Kropla's Online Help For World Travelers. URL: <http://www.kropla.com/>

[United Kingdom](http://www.fco.gov.uk/) Ministry of Foreign and Commonwealth Office. URL: <http://www.fco.gov.uk/>

United Nations Human Development Report. URL: <http://www.undp.org/hdro>

UNICEF Statistical Database Online. URL: <http://www.unicef.org/statis/atoz.html>

[United States](http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html) Central Intelligence Agency, World Factbook. 2001. Washington, D.C.: Printing and Photography Group. URL: <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html>

United States Department of State, Background Notes. URL: [http://www.state.gov/www/background\\_notes/index.html](http://www.state.gov/www/background_notes/index.html)

United States Department of State, Commercial and Business Affairs: Travel Tips. URL: [http://www.state.gov/www/about\\_state/business/cba\\_travel.html](http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/business/cba_travel.html)

United States Department of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs. URL: <http://travel.state.gov/>

World Health Organization. URL: <http://www.who.int/home-page/>

World News Connection, National Technical Information Service. Springfield, Virginia, USA.

Internet News Service, Xinhua News Agency (U.S.) Inc. Woodside, New York. URL: <http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/>

#### Note on Edition Dates:

The earlier edition dates are noted above because they were used to formulate the original country reviews and serve as the baseline for some of the information covered. Later editions have been used in some cases, and are cited as such, while other more recent online resources (cited above) contain recent and ever-updated data sets used for research.

#### Methodology Notes for the HDI:

Since 1990, the United Nations Development Programme, in concert with organizations across the globe, has produced the [Human Development Index](#) (or HDI). According to the UNDP, the index measures average achievement in basic human development in one simple composite index, and produces from this index a ranking of countries. The HDI is a composite of three basic components of human development: longevity, knowledge and standard of living. Longevity is measured by life expectancy. Knowledge is measured by combination of adult literacy and mean

years of schooling. Standard of living is measured by purchasing power, based on real GDP per capita (in constant US\$) adjusted for differences in international living costs (or, purchasing power parity, PPP). While the index uses these social indicators to measure national performance with regard to human welfare and development, not all countries provide the same level of information for each component needed to compute the index; therefore, as in any composite indicator, the final index is predicated on projections, predictions and weighting schemes. The index is a static measure, and thus, an incomplete measure of human welfare. In fact, the UNDP says itself the concept of human development focuses on the ends rather than the means of development and progress, examining in this manner, the average condition of all people in a given country.

Specifically, the index is calculated by determining the maximum and minimum for each of the three components (as listed above) and then measuring where each country stands in relation to these scales-expressed as a value between 0 and 1. For example, the minimum adult literary rate is zero percent, the maximum is 100 percent, and the reading skills component of knowledge in the HDI for a country where the literacy rate is 75 percent would be 0.75. The scores of all indicators are then averaged into the overall index.

For a more extensive examination of human development, as well as the ranking tables for each participating country, please visit: <http://www.undp.org>

#### Note on [History](#) sections

In some CountryWatch Country Reviews, open source content from the State Department Background Notes and Country Guides have been used.

### **Environmental Overview**

Environmental Profiles: A Global Guide to Projects and People. 1993. Linda Sobel Katz, Sarah Orrick, and Robert Honig. New York: Garland Publishing.

The Environment Encyclopedia and Directory, 2nd Edition. 1998. London: Europa.

Environmental Protection Agency Global Warming Site. URL: <http://www.epa.gov/globalwarming>

Food and Agriculture Organization of United Nations: Forestry. URL: <http://www.fao.org/forestry/site/sofo/en/>

Global Warming Information Page. URL: <http://globalwarming.org>

Introduction to Global [Environmental Issues](#), 2nd Edition. 1997. Kevin Pickering and Lewis Owen.

London: Routledge.

Trends: Compendium of Data on Global Change. URL: [http://cdiac.esd.ornl.gov/trends/emis/em\\_cont.htm](http://cdiac.esd.ornl.gov/trends/emis/em_cont.htm)

United Nations Environmental Program. URL: [http://www.unep.org/GEO/GEO\\_Products/Assessment\\_Reports/](http://www.unep.org/GEO/GEO_Products/Assessment_Reports/)

United Nations Global Environmental Outlook. URL: <http://www.unep.org/geo/geo4/media/>

United States Department of Energy, Country Analysis Briefs. URL: <http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cabs/contents.html>

World Climate Data Online. URL: <http://www.worldclimate.com>

World Directory of Country Environmental Studies. 1996. The World Resource Institute.

World Factbook. US Central Intelligence Agency. Washington, D.C.: Printing and Photography Group.

1998-1999 World Resources Guide to the Global Environment by the World Resources Institute. May, 1998.

1998/1999 Yearbook of International Cooperation on Environment and Development. 1998. London: Earthscan Publications.

#### Note on Edition Dates:

The earlier edition dates are noted above because they were used to formulate the original country reviews and serve as the baseline for some of the information covered. Later editions have been used in some cases, and are cited as such, while other more recent online resources (cited above) contain recent and ever-updated data sets used for research.

#### **Other Sources:**

General information has also been used in the compilation of this review, with the courtesy of governmental agencies from this country.

#### **News Services:**

CANA Daily Bulletin. Caribbean Media Agency Ltd., St. Michael, [Barbados](#).

Central and Eastern Africa Report, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs - Integrated Regional Information Network for Central and Eastern Africa.

Daily News, Panafrican News Agency. Dakar, [Senegal](#).

PACNEWS, Pacific Islands Broadcasting Association. Suva, [Fiji](#).

Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty. Washington D.C. USA.

Reuters News. Thomson Reuters. New York, New York. USA.

Southern Africa Report, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs - Integrated Regional Information Network for Southern Africa.

Voice of America, English Service. Washington D.C.

West Africa Report, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs - Integrated Regional Information Network for West Africa. 1998-1999

Note: Some or all these news services have been used to research various sections of this Country Review.

## **USING COUNTRYWATCH.COM AS AN ELECTRONIC SOURCE:**

### *MLA STYLE OF CITATION*

#### **Commentary**

For items in a "Works Cited" list, CountryWatch.com suggests that users follow recommended patterns for indentation given in the *MLA Handbook*, 4th edition.

#### **Individual Works**

**Basic form, using an Internet protocol:**

Author/editor. *Title of Print Version of Work*. Edition statement (if given). Publication information (Place of publication: publisher, date), if given. *Title of Electronic Work*. Medium. Available Protocol (if applicable):Site/Path/File. Access date.

**Examples:**

Youngblood-Coleman, Denise. *Country Review: France*. 2003. Houston, Texas: CountryWatch Publications, 2003. *Country Review:France*. Online. Available URL : [http://www.countrywatch.com/cw\\_country.asp?vCOUNTRY=61](http://www.countrywatch.com/cw_country.asp?vCOUNTRY=61) October, 12, 2003.

Note:

This is the citation format used when the print version is not used in the reference.

**Parts of Works**

**Basic form, using an Internet protocol:**

Author/editor. "Part title." *Title of Print Version of Work*. Edition statement (if given). Publication information (Place of publication: publisher, date), if given. *Title of Electronic Work*. Medium. AvailableProtocol (if applicable): Site/Path/File. Access date.

**Examples:**

Youngblood-Coleman, Denise. "People." *CountryWatch.com: France*. 2003. Houston, Texas: CountryWatch Publications, 2003. *CountryWatch.com: France*. Online. Available URL : [http://www.countrywatch.com/cw\\_topic.asp?vCOUNTRY=61&SECTION=SOCIAL&TOPIC=CLPEO&TYPE=TEXT](http://www.countrywatch.com/cw_topic.asp?vCOUNTRY=61&SECTION=SOCIAL&TOPIC=CLPEO&TYPE=TEXT). October 12, 2003.

Note:

This is the citation format used when the print version is not used in the reference.

***For further source citation information, please email:*** editor@countrywatch.com or education@countrywatch.com.



# CountryWatch

CountryWatch is an information provider for public and private sector organizations that operate globally. The management of CountryWatch has extensive international experience and has utilized this experience to provide a concise and useful set of political, economic, and business information for its clients in the form of Country Reviews, the Country Wire, CountryWatch Data, Elections Central, CountryWatch Videos and CountryWatch Forecast.

This Country Review is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information on the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publication is not intended to provide legal, accounting, investment, or other professional advice.

CountryWatch believes that the information and opinions contained here in are reliable, but does not make any warranties, express or implied, and assumes no liability for reliance on or use of the information or opinions contained herein.

The offices of CountryWatch are located at:

CountryWatch, Inc.  
5005 Riverway Suite 220  
Houston, Texas 77056 U.S.A.  
Tel: 800-879-3885  
Fax: 713-355-3770  
Web address: <http://www.countrywatch.com>  
Email: [support@countrywatch.com](mailto:support@countrywatch.com)

ISBN: 1- 60523- 720-5

Malawi Country Review

2016

ISSN: 1- 60523- 893-5

Printed in the United States of America