ECONOMIC FREEDOM OF THE WORLD

2011

SOUTH AFRICAN EDITION

James Gwartney
Florida State University

Robert Lawson
Southern Methodist University

Joshua Hall
Beloit College

with

Jean-Pierre Chauffour
World Bank

Michael D. Stroup
Stephen F. Austin State University

Published in cooperation with the Economic Freedom Network

Editing, design, and typesetting by Lindsey Thomas Martin

Data available to researchers

The full data set, including all of the data published in this report as well as data omitted due to limited space, can be downloaded for free at <http://www.freetheworld.com>. The data file available there contains the most up-to-date and accurate data for the Economic Freedom of the World index. Some variable names and data sources have evolved over the years since the first publication in 1996; users should consult earlier editions of the Economic Freedom of the World annual reports for details regarding sources and descriptions for those years. All editions of the report are available in PDF and can be downloaded for free from <http://www.freetheworld.com/datasets_efw.html>. However, users are always strongly encouraged to use the data from this most recent data file as updates and corrections, even to earlier years' data, do occur. Users doing long-term or longitudinal studies are encouraged to use the chain-linked index as it is the most consistent through time. If you have problems downloading the data, please contact Jean-François Minardi via e-mail to <freetheworld@fraserinstitute.org> or via telephone +1.514.281.9550 ext. 306. If you have technical questions about the data itself, please contact Robert Lawson via e-mail to <rlawson@smu.edu>. Please cite the data set as:

Authors: James Gwartney, Robert Lawson, and Joshua Hall
Title: 2011 Economic Freedom Dataset, published in *Economic Freedom of the World: 2011 Annual Report*
Publisher: Fraser Institute Year: 2011
URL: <http://www.freetheworld.com/datasets_efw.html>

Cite this publication

Authors: James Gwartney, Robert Lawson, and Joshua Hall
Title: *Economic Freedom of the World: 2011 Annual Report*
Publisher: Fraser Institute
Date of publication: 2011
Digital copy available from <www.fraserinstitute.org> and <www.freetheworld.com>

Cataloguing information

Gwartney, James D.
Economic freedom of the world … annual report / James D. Gwartney.

Annual.
Description based on: 1997
2011 issue by James Gwartney, Robert Lawson, and Joshua Hall,
with Jean-Pierre Chauffour and Michael D. Stroup.
Issued also online.
ISSN 1482-471X; ISBN 978-0-88975-252-8 (2011 edition).

1. Economic history—1990- —Periodicals.
2. Economic indicators—Periodicals. I. Fraser Institute (Vancouver, B.C.) II. Title

---

South African edition

Printed in 2011 by the **Free Market Foundation** (co-publisher)
www.freemarketfoundation.com | +27 11 884 0270

ISBN: 978-1-874930-89-1

Cover design by **BrandInc**
Printed and bound by **4 Colour Print**

Table of Contents

About the Sponsors of the South African Edition

The Friedrich Naumann Foundation for Liberty is an independent, nonprofit, nongovernmental organisation committed to promoting liberal policy and politics.

Friedrich Naumann STIFTUNG FÜR DIE FREIHEIT

Lephatsi Investments (Pty) Ltd is an investment company looking at opportunities across all sectors of the South African economy.

Lephatsi INVESTMENTS (Pty) Ltd

Preface to the South African Edition

As the cry goes out for "Economic freedom in our lifetime", it is crucially important we share a common understanding of the idea. This is not an easy task. Commentators across the ideological spectrum claim the term as their own, or attribute different meanings to the words.

Isaiah Berlin, for example, framed the debate in terms of 'positive' and 'negative' freedoms. Positive liberty expressed the idea of being free to accomplish the goals one sets for oneself, or the degree to which that is possible. Negative liberty, on the other hand, he defined as freedom from restriction or coercion by other people. It is a more restricted form of freedom, and includes don't steal, don't commit fraud, don't harm others and so on.

Positive liberty can lead to claims for social rights such as housing, education and health care. Social rights that a government can provide only because they are paid for by other members of society. If you have the right to a house, someone has to pay to provide the materials and time required to build that house. Similarly, with health-care, education, or the growing number of other claims laid against the state. If you believe that these claims are valid, it's difficult to know how far government would go before there would be no more taxes it could impose.

The classical liberal view of economic freedom is narrower. It takes the long-standing, human tradition of private property and argues for its incorporation in political institutions. Under the classical view, individuals are free to trade their private resources with other similarly free agents, without restriction from third-parties.

These two definitions of economic freedom are miles apart, and are the two extremes that fuel contemporary political debate. To inform this debate, it's important to understand what each definition of economic freedom would have as its result. It was this question that inspired the development and continued publication of the *Economic Freedom of the World* report.

It is two decades since Michael Walker of the Fraser Institute in Vancouver debated this idea with the great economist Milton Friedman and agreed that a formal definition – suitable for academic analyses – was required. Today this definition finds expression in a report that draws its data from credible and public reports – such as the World Bank Development Indicators and the Global Competitiveness Report – and incorporates this data into a useable index with five important categories.

The categories answer a simple question: To what degree does the individual decide (or to put it another way, to what degree does the state intervene) in certain economic decisions? The category headings are (a) Size of Government (b) Judicial Systems (c) Sound Money (d) Freedom to Trade with Foreigners, and (e) Regulation of Credit, Labour and Business. All these categories analyze, from slightly different angles, the degree to which we are allowed to hold property and trade it with others.

In 2011, South Africa continues its trend toward higher levels of government intervention and slips four places further down the Economic Freedom rankings to 87th. Top of the freedom list is Hong Kong, Singapore, New Zealand, Switzerland and Australia. Significantly, the United States drops two places to 10th. At the bottom of the list we find Democratic Republic of Congo, Angola, Venezuela, Myanmar and Zimbabwe.

The 2008/2009 period was particularly dramatic in economic terms as governments transferred massive financial debts to their own books and attempted interventions on an unprecedented scale. These actions may be viewed harshly by future generations as the sovereign debt crisis plays itself out. The increased level of intervention shows up in lower scores across the board in this year's report. The

World score for 'Size of Government' has fallen from 6.4 to 6.3. More importantly, 'Freedom to Trade with Foreigners' fell from 6.7 to 6.5 – a portent of protectionism, tried and failed during the last great depression.

Unfortunately, South Africa continues its 50 year-old tradition of heavy-handed state intervention. We rank 113th in terms of Size of Government. The large involvement in the economy by our parastatals and relatively high tax rates contribute to our poor ranking in this category.

South Africa drops an incredible 55 places to 107th in the regulation of private credit — a function of our National Credit Act. We also remain poor performers relative to the rest of the world in terms of labour law. In the Hiring and Firing category, we rank 123rd. For Collective Bargaining, we're 119th, and Bureacracy Costs leaves us at 103rd. If nothing else, these results show that the entire country is being harmed by the amount of red-tape imposed on its entrepreneurs.

The FMF makes its own contribution to the *Economic Freedom of the World* project in the form of a software program, included in disk form with this report. The program is also available from the web site www.freetheworld.com.

All the data available from the report is present in the software version. For the last two years it has also included the entire set of data from the World Bank Development Indicators. This software makes it easy for researchers to test the economic freedom variables against real-life outcomes. For example: Does more economic freedom create longer, healthier lives and higher levels of income? (The answer – by the way – is yes to both.) Using statistical correlation, we can learn from those countries that have implemented successful policies, rather than those that continue to increase the role of their governments to the detriment of their citizens.

The *Economic Freedom of the World* report plays an important part in the on-going debate about our political institutions and the role government should play in our economic lives. South Africa should carefully monitor its policy options in light of the devastating poverty and unemployment so prevalent in our society. Though history plays a role, it cannot be perpetually blamed for disappointing policy.

Neil Emerick
Council Member
Free Market Foundation

The South African Economy in a Nutshell

The South African economy in a nutshell

Immediately prior to the commencement of the financial crisis in June 2007, the South African economy was expanding strongly, having achieved growth rates of 5.1% and 5.7% respectively for the third and fourth quarters of the year. The crisis had a lagged impact on the growth of the economy, the effect only becoming apparent in the final quarter of 2008 and the first two quarters of 2009, well after most other economies reported slowdowns. The economy contracted sharply from an annual growth rate of 3.7% in 2008 to a decline of 1.7% in 2009. A recovery appeared in the offing in 2010 when the economy grew at an annual rate of 2.8% but growth in quarter two of 2011declined to 1.3% after expanding at 4.5% in the first quarter.

Estimates for GDP growth in 2011 have mostly been lowered by analysts, especially after the downgrade of US debt and the subsequent market reactions. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) estimates that growth for 2011 will vary between 3% and just below 4% with a probable outcome of approximately 3.5%.

Performance of certain sectors:

The mining and quarrying sector contributes about 6% to South Africa's GDP. Although constituting a relatively small proportion of overall GDP it is a significant foreign exchange earner but has been in decline in recent years. It contracted by 5.4% and 4.5% on an annual basis during 2008 and 2009 but bounced back to a 5.8% increase in 2010. In the first quarter of 2011 mining activity decreased by 4% followed by a 4.2% decrease in the second quarter despite record prices in certain locally produced commodities.

The weak performance in mining can be attributed to increased costs, particularly as a result of escalating labour and electricity prices, and to dwindling gold ore qualities, which combined to bring about a slowdown in mining related investments in recent years. Continuous talk about nationalisation probably exacerbated the situation.

The agricultural sector is notoriously volatile. Recent increases in the prices of "soft commodities" are likely to be very beneficial to South African producers although international competition and a relatively strong currency do present them with challenges. Despite still being a significant employer, the agricultural sector reduced its workforce by approximately 25% between 2008 and the second quarter of 2011 due to more restrictive labour laws. Proposed legislation to limit property rights may further reduce agriculture's contribution to GDP, currently at 2.5% compared to the 3.5% achieved in 1994. In 2007, for the first time, South Africa became a net food importer.

Construction performed surprisingly well throughout 2008 as a result of the award of some major contracts, including some relating to the Soccer World Cup. They included the award of the contracts for power station construction (Medupi and Kusile) and the commencement of the Gauteng Freeway Improvement Project. The construction sector lost momentum during the course of 2009 as World Cup stadia and related auxiliary infrastructure was completed. This is an obvious sector for increased state expenditure. The country's infrastructural needs are huge yet state expenditure on capital fell from 3% of total expenditure in 1990 to 0.8% in 2009.

Consumption was the main driving force in economic growth until the end of the financial crisis in late 2008; reflected in the performance in **Wholesale and Retail trade sales, Hotels and Restaurants**. Job losses mounted and consumer debt increased significantly from just above 50% of disposable income in 2003 to more than 80% in 2008 and, which eroded consumer confidence and led to lower spending. Sales contracted from the second quarter of 2008 until the fourth quarter of 2009. Some tentative signs of recovery, albeit fragile, were evident during 2010. An increase of 4.4% in spending was experienced in the first quarter of 2011 followed by another increase of 4.1% in the second quarter. Walmart's recent acquisition of Massmart indicates that South Africa's wholesale and retail trade has become more attractive to foreign investors.

Finance, Real estate and Business services constitutes more than 23% of GDP and reacted in line with international trends during 2008 when it contracted by a significant 7.9% (-0.4% in 2009). This sector benefited from lower local short term interest rates and expansionary international policies that supported significant inflows into the SA financial markets. However, it remains hamstrung by property prices that, in nominal terms, are little changed from what they were just before the onset of the financial crisis. The momentum of expansion of 1.9% during 2010 was carried over into 2011 as an increase of 4.8% in the first quarter was followed by another of 2.9% in the second quarter.

Manufacturing contracted by 2.7% in 2008 and by 10.3% in 2009 following the financial crisis, which resulted in a decline in international demand. Ironically, manufacturing performed rather well despite dire predictions related to the increase in the rand exchange rate. Stronger demand for South African goods, largely from the East, especially China, contributed to a 14.5% increase in output during the first quarter of 2011. However, a slowdown in international demand, mounting uncertainty and particularly costly labour union strike action during the second quarter contributed to a contraction of 7.0% during the second quarter of 2011. A contraction in the manufacturing sector is of particular importance because of its potential labour absorption capabilities. Uncertainty caused by the strikes affected international demand and output from the manufacturing sector contracted again during the second quarter of 2011. The decrease in manufacturing was the main reason why the South African economy hardly grew during this time.

Overall growth in international demand boosted export volumes while import levels remained relatively low due to dampened domestic demand. The result of higher exports coupled with lower imports meant that South Africa realised a trade balance surplus from the second quarter of 2009 to the first quarter of 2011.

This trade balance surplus helped to contain the balance on the current account. The current account balance, as a percentage to GDP, improved from -4.1% in 2009 to -2.9% in 2010; a slightly larger deficit is envisaged for 2011.

This smaller current account deficit was easily funded by large capital inflows from abroad. In fact, large inflows, which supported the local financial markets, resulted in a stronger local currency despite attempts by the South African Reserve Bank (SARB) to prevent a significant appreciation. During 2010, the rand in real terms appreciated by 12.3% against a basket of currencies. During the same time South Africa's official net reserves increased by $4.4bn.

Inevitably the international financial crisis and its aftermath affected employment in the country. But unlike most other countries, South Africa's unemployment levels were already very high at 24.1% (narrow definition) in 2007 which increased by nearly a million to 25.7% in quarter two of 2011. Yet despite this the economy lost 14.6 million work days during 2010 due to strikes and 17.8 million in 2011 thus far. Wage costs increased by 13.4% in nominal terms which translates into 5.1% in real terms during 2010. Labour legislation remains restrictive. A proposed wage subsidy is strongly opposed by organised labour and is in any event unlikely to significantly reduce unemployment. Should the economy grow at between 3% and 5% for the next few years, it will be insufficient to contribute to a fall in unemployment.

The SARB responded to rising inflation by gradually increasing interest rates since the middle of 2006. Consumer inflation peaked at 12.3% in September 2008 with the repo rate at 12.0%. This pattern was suddenly reversed in the wake of the financial crisis in 2007 and its aftermath. Consumer demand fell sharply in 2008 and price increases became less apparent. Inflation fell to a low of 3.2% in September 2010 with the repo rate at 5.5%, a reduction of 650 basis points in 24 months! The last rate cut was in November 2010 which brought the repo rate to its lowest level in more than 30 years.

A slowdown in economic growth in the second quarter of 2011 was mostly due to strike actions and renewed international uncertainty, driven primarily by growth and debt concerns in both Europe and the US while Japan suffered a devastating natural disaster and a nuclear fallout problem. During these events, consumer demand in South Africa showed signs of revival while inflation started increasing; mostly as a result of electricity, food and fuel price increases. Consumer inflation for July 2011 was 5.3% and is expected to breach 6%, the upper level of the 3%-6% inflation targeted range, by early 2012.

Producer Price Inflation (PPI) is showing a similar pattern. It was 8.9% for July 2011 and this may mean higher consumer prices next year.

Despite the worsening outlook for inflation the SARB is unlikely to tighten monetary policy before mid-2012. Demand for credit on average increased by 4.3% from May 2010 to July 2011 with 5.7% reported for July 2011, indicating a gradual increase in the demand for credit. This is substantially lower than the 30% that was at times experienced during 2005 and early 2008.

A contributing reason for rising consumer debt levels before 2008 was because the SARB did little to stem the massive demand for credit, and as happened in many other countries, local house prices increased sharply before the onset of the financial crisis. Demand for mortgage finance increased annually by 27% on average during 2005 to mid-2008 but declined rapidly to an average increase of 3.8% in 2010/2011. Year-on-year growth in mortgage finance for July 2011 is 2.9% and house prices are relatively stagnant and in some cases even declining in real terms.

Fiscal policy became significantly more accommodative during the crisis years and currently remains so. The efficiency of the "automatic stabilisers" was clearly illustrated during the economic contraction of 2008 and 2009.

A slowdown in economic activity reduced corporate earnings and corporate tax collections. Although other tax collections were similarly affected, lower corporate tax collections were mostly responsible for a sharp deterioration in fiscal balances. During the 2007/08 financial year there was a fiscal surplus of 0.9% of GDP and in 2008/09 a deficit of -5.5%. Relatively high deficits are expected to continue and the deficit of -4.6% of GDP budgeted for financial year 2011/12 is likely to be a realistic estimate.

SA was fortunate in that, despite a rising tax burden and increases in state expenditure, fiscal rectitude was maintained before 2008. The result was a sharp drop in government debt to 49.7% of GDP in 1994 to 23.9% in 2008. This allowed the fiscal authorities to "support" the economy during the crisis. However, maintaining the current deficit to GDP ratio is not sustainable. A fiscal consolidation will have to be considered within a year or two.

Apart from the stimulatory effect of the "automatic stabilisers" government has in any event been on a fiscal expansion drive during the past few years. This is clear from the increase in state expenditure during the 2007/08, 2008/09 and 2009/10 fiscal years. During these years budgeted state expenditure increased, respectively, by 15.1%, 17.4% and 17.5%. During the same time budgeted revenue declined due to job losses, falling company earnings and less VAT receipts as a result of the economic downturn. Growth in budgeted revenue in the corresponding period grew less rapidly. Growth in budgeted revenue for 2007/08, 2008/09, 2009/10 and 2010/11 was 13.6%, 9.7%, -5.8% and 10.9% respectively.

Budgeted state expenditure thus increased proportionally more than revenue during the economic downturn. The counter-cyclical policy was further evident in the way in which the budget deficit as a percentage of GDP (deficit ratio) increased during these years. The deficit as a percentage of GDP was quite small and even positive in the years preceding the economic downturn. There were budget surpluses of 0.7% and 0.9% of GDP during the 2006/07 and 2007/08 fiscal years. This ratio turned negative in 2008/09 an in 2009/10 it dipped further into the red to -5.5% of GDP. The budgeted deficit for the 2010/11 fiscal year was -4.6% of GDP.

The counter cyclical nature of the fiscal policy could also be seen in the government sector as contained in GDP calculations. General government services increased constantly from 2007 through to 2010. Growth in the general government services sector from 2007 to 2010 was recorded at 4.0%, 4.2% and 4.4% respectively. Growth in this sector even climbed further in the second quarter of 2011 with a recorded growth of 5.7%. This increase in general government services was the main driving force behind the 1.3% economic growth recorded during the second quarter of 2011.

Even as the general government services sector and broad counter-cyclical measures had some well-intended effects on the economy, the government needs to be cautious, a view that is shared by the IMF.

A matter of concern is the rate at which the state's salary bill increased over the last few of years. The salary bill as percentage of GDP increased from 9.5% in 2007/08 to 11.5% in 2010/11, a much higher rate of increase than that experienced by the other G20 emerging countries, which averaged 8.75%. Salary increases in the government sector must be contained at levels that are matched by higher levels of productivity. South Africa should consider increasing capital expenditure, particularly on investment in infrastructure which amounts to a meagre 2.25% of GDP.

The IMF maintained in their annual personnel report that South Africa should act against persistent real wage increases (wage increases in excess of inflation). They further maintained that more attention should be given to global product competitiveness if the country is to remain relevant in the global trade arena.

Clearly, employment creation remains worrisome given the uncertainty arising from yet another policy amendment to reclassify temporary work. Given the already high unemployment in South Africa, measures which will eventually support employment creation must be handled with greater urgency as the workforce as a percentage of total available labour decreased from 45% in 2008 to 40% in 2011.

The South African economy remains fragile and vulnerable to international developments. Economic growth at 1.3% slowed markedly in the second quarter of 2011 as the manufacturing sector came under pressure.

It is difficult to say what is going to happen next both locally and internationally. What is certain about the local economy is that inflation is currently showing signs of increasing while unemployment is rising, economic growth is slowing, persistent high levels of household debt is still evident and domestic demand is gradually returning. The negative economic data and trends will pose difficult policy questions to the authorities in the coming months.

Dawie Roodt
Chief Economist, Efficient Group
with **Freddie Mitchell**
Economist, Efficient Group

Executive Summary

Economic Freedom of the World

The index published in *Economic Freedom of the World* measures the degree to which the policies and institutions of countries are supportive of economic freedom. The cornerstones of economic freedom are personal choice, voluntary exchange, freedom to compete, and security of privately owned property. Forty-two data points are used to construct a summary index and to measure the degree of economic freedom in five broad areas:

1 Size of Government: Expenditures, Taxes, and Enterprises;
2 Legal Structure and Security of Property Rights;
3 Access to Sound Money;
4 Freedom to Trade Internationally;
5 Regulation of Credit, Labor, and Business.

Economic freedom has suffered another setback

- The chain-linked summary index (exhibit 1.4) permits comparisons over time. The average economic freedom score rose from 5.53 (out of 10) in 1980 to 6.74 in 2007, but fell back to 6.67 in 2008, and to 6.64 in 2009, the most recent year for which data are available. (See chapter 1 for a discussion.)

- In this year's index, Hong Kong retains the highest rating for economic freedom, 9.01 out of 10. The other nations among the top 10 are: Singapore (8.68); New Zealand (8.20); Switzerland (8.03); Australia (7.98); Canada (7.81); Chile (7.77); United Kingdom (7.71); Mauritius (7.67); and the United States (7.60).

- The rankings (and scores) of other large economies are Germany, 21 (7.45); Japan, 22 (7.44); France, 42 (7.16); Italy, 70 (6.81); Mexico, 75 (6.74); Russia, 81 (6.55); China, 92 (6.43); India, 94 (6.40); and Brazil, 102 (6.19).

- The bottom 10 nations are: Zimbabwe (4.08); Myanmar (4.16); Venezuela (4.28); Angola (4.76); Democratic Republic of Congo (4.84); Central African Republic (4.88); Guinea-Bissau (5.03); Republic of Congo (5.04); Burundi (5.12); and Chad (5.32).

The world's largest economy, the United States, has suffered one of the largest declines in economic freedom over the last 10 years, pushing it into tenth place. Much of this decline is a result of higher government spending and borrowing and lower scores for the legal structure and property rights components. Over the longer term, the summary chain-linked ratings of Venezuela, Zimbabwe, United States, and Malaysia fell by eight-tenths of a point or more between 1990 and 2009, causing their rankings to slip.

The chain-linked summary ratings of Uganda, Zambia, Nicaragua, Albania, and Peru have increased by three or more points since 1990. The summary ratings of eight other countries—Bulgaria, Poland, El Salvador, Romania, Ghana, Nigeria, Hungary, and Guinea-Bissau—increased by between two and three points during this same period.

Nations that are economically free out-perform non-free nations in indicators of well-being

- Nations in the top quartile of economic freedom had an average per-capita GDP of $31,501 in 2009, compared to $4,545 for those nations in the bottom quartile, in constant 2005 international dollars (exhibit 1.9).
- Nations in the top quartile of economic freedom had an average growth in per-capita GDP between 1990 and 2009 of 3.07%, compared to 1.18% for those nations in the bottom quartile, in constant 2005 international dollars (exhibit 1.10).
- In the top quartile, the average income of the poorest 10% of the population was $8,735, compared to $1,061 for those in the bottom quartile, in constant 2005 international dollars (exhibit 1.12). Interestingly, the average income of the poorest 10% in the top quartile is almost double the overall income per capita in the bottom quartile ($4,545, exhibit 1.9): the poorest people in the most economically free countries are nearly twice as rich as the average people in the least free countries.
- Life expectancy is 79.4 years in the top quartile compared to 60.7 years in the bottom quartile (exhibit 1.13).
- The $1.25-per-day poverty rate is 2.7% in the top quartile compared to 41.5% in the bottom quartile (exhibit 1.17).

Chapter 1: Economic Freedom of the World

The principal authors of the report, James Gwartney (Florida State University), Robert Lawson (Southern Methodist University), and Joshua Hall (Beloit College), provide an overview of the report and discuss why economic freedom is important.

Chapter 2: Country Data Tables

Detailed historical data is provided for each of the 141 countries and territories in the index. For many countries, this covers years 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995, 2000, 2005, 2008, and 2009.

Chapter 3: What Matters for Development: Freedom or Entitlement?

Jean-Pierre Chauffour, Lead Economist, Middle East and North Africa Region, World Bank, examines policies that promote "freedom" compared to "entitlement" in relation to economic development. He notes that, depending on the balance between free choices and more coerced decisions, individual opportunities to learn, own, work, save, invest, trade, protect, and so forth could vary greatly across countries and over time. Chauffour's empirical findings suggest that fundamental freedoms are paramount in explaining long-term economic growth. For a given set of exogenous conditions, countries that favor free choice—economic freedom and civil and political liberties—over entitlement rights are likely to achieve higher sustainable economic growth and to achieve many of the distinctive proximate characteristics of success identified by the Commission on Growth and Development (World Bank, 2008). In contrast, pursuing entitlement rights through greater coercion by the state is likely to be self-defeating in the long run.

These findings provide potentially important policy lessons for all countries. For developed countries, they suggest that prioritizing economic freedom over social entitlements could be an effective way to reform the welfare state and make it more sustainable and equitable in the long run. For middle-income countries (such as countries in the midst of the Arab Spring and countries in Asia and Latin America), they indicate that the quest for civil and political rights and for economic freedom could create the conditions for new social contracts. For low-income countries, they provide an opportunity to reflect on the achievements under the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) and the potential role that economic freedom and other fundamental freedoms that could play in a post-2015 MDG development agenda.

Chapter 4: Does Economic Freedom Promote Women's Wellbeing?

Michael D. Stroup, Stephen F. Austin State University, examined the impact of economic freedom on women's well-being based on a recent United Nations Development Project (UNDP) report. He finds that a one-point increase in the average EFW index, controlling for other relevant factors, was found to be associated with:

- a decline in the UNDP Gender Inequality (GI) index of 0.03 with the sample average at 0.53;
- a decline in the maternal death rate by 131 women per 100,000 births with the sample average at 300;
- a reduction of over six births per 1,000 births to females age 15–19 when the sample average is 53;
- an increase of almost five percentage points in the percentage of women with a secondary education when the sample average is 52%;
- an increase of two percentage points in the number of women holding seats in parliament in the legislative branch of a national government when the sample average is 18%.

Data available to researchers

The full data set, including all of the data published in this report as well as data omitted due to limited space, can be downloaded for free at <http://www.freetheworld.com>. The data file available there contains the most up-to-date and accurate data for the Economic Freedom of the World index. Some variable names and data sources have evolved over the years since the first publication in 1996; users should consult earlier editions of the *Economic Freedom of the World* annual reports for details regarding sources and descriptions for those years. All editions of the report are available in PDF and can be downloaded for free from <http://www.freetheworld.com/datasets_efw.html>. However, users are always strongly encouraged to use the data from this most recent data file as updates and corrections, even to earlier years' data, do occur. Users doing long-term or longitudinal studies are encouraged to use the chain-linked index as it is the most consistent through time. If you have problems downloading the data, please contact Jean-François Minardi via e-mail to <freetheworld@fraserinstitute.org> or via telephone +1.514.281.9550 ext. 306. If you have technical questions about the data itself, please contact Robert Lawson via e-mail to <rlawson@smu.edu>. Please cite the data set as:

Authors: James Gwartney, Robert Lawson, and Joshua Hall
Title: 2011 Economic Freedom Dataset, published in *Economic Freedom of the World: 2011 Annual Report*
Publisher: Fraser Institute
Year: 2011
URL: <http://www.freetheworld.com/datasets_efw.html>