



ADVANCING FREEDOM FOR 73 YEARS

PRESS FREEDOM IN 2011: BREAKTHROUGHS AND PUSHBACK IN THE MIDDLE EAST

by Karin Deutsch Karlekar and Jennifer Dunham

The year 2011 featured precarious but potentially far-reaching gains for media freedom in the Middle East and North Africa. Major steps forward were recorded in Egypt, Libya, and Tunisia, where longtime dictators were removed after successful popular uprisings. While trends in these countries were not uniformly positive, with important setbacks to democratic prospects in both Egypt and Libya toward year's end, the magnitude of the improvements—especially in Tunisia and Libya—represented major breakthroughs in a region that has a long history of media control by autocratic leaders. The gains more than offset declines in several other countries in the Middle East. And even the greatest declines, in Bahrain and Syria, reflected the regimes' alarmed and violent reactions to tenacious protest movements, whose bold demands for greater freedom included calls for a more open media environment.

The improvements in the Arab world were the most significant findings of *Freedom of the Press 2012: A Global Survey of Media Independence*, the latest edition of an annual index published by Freedom House since 1980. The gains came on the heels of eight consecutive years of decline in the global average press freedom score, a phenomenon that has affected practically every region in the world. Furthermore, they were accompanied by positive changes in several key countries outside the Middle East and North Africa: Burma, Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Zambia. Other countries that registered progress include Georgia, Nepal, Niger, Sierra Leone, and Togo.

Three of the countries with major gains—Burma, Libya, and Tunisia—had for many years endured media environments that were among the world's most oppressive. Both Libya and

Tunisia made single-year leaps of a size practically unheard of in the 32-year history of the report.

At the same time, press freedom continued to face obstacles and reversals in many parts of the world. China, which boasts the world's most sophisticated system of media repression, stepped up its drive to control both old and new sources of news and information through arrests and censorship. Other authoritarian powers—such as Russia, Iran, and Venezuela—resorted to a variety of techniques to maintain a tight grip on the media, detaining some press critics, closing down media outlets and blogs, and

bringing libel or defamation suits against journalists.

Another disturbing development in 2011 was a decline in press freedom

in several well-established democracies, most notably Chile and Hungary. As a result of status downgrades in a number of previously Free countries over the past few years, the proportion of the global population that enjoys a Free press has fallen to its lowest level in over a decade. The report found that only 14.5 percent of the world's people—or roughly one in six—live in countries where coverage of political news is robust, the safety of journalists is guaranteed, state intrusion in media affairs is minimal, and the press is not subject to onerous legal or economic pressures. Deterioration was also seen in a number of Partly Free media environments, such as Ecuador, Macedonia, Malawi, Uganda, and Ukraine.

Key Trends in 2011

- **New Media—Promise and Limits:** New media and citizen journalism made major contributions to both the Egyptian and Tunisian uprisings and were crucial to the

In 2011, Libya, Tunisia, and Egypt improved to Partly Free as media freedom expanded with the fall of longtime dictators.

creation of a new and potentially more democratic political dynamic in Russia. Even in Syria, where the foreign media, including the influential Qatar-based satellite network Al-Jazeera, were refused entry, ordinary citizens were able to use mobile-telephone cameras to record regime atrocities and prevent the government from escaping global scrutiny. Nevertheless, events in countries such as Egypt and Russia demonstrated that while new media—particularly when amplified by traditional mass media—can be quite effective at disseminating news of government abuses and mobilizing civic action against illiberal regimes, they play a much less significant role in the construction of democratic institutions, especially in societies where most of the population still gets its information from state-controlled broadcast outlets.

- **Repression in Wake of Arab Spring:** Authoritarian regimes around the world, fearing domestic unrest, censored news of the Arab uprisings. They employed techniques ranging from information blackouts in the state media, as in Zimbabwe and Ethiopia, to sophisticated internet and text-message filtering, as in China. However, some people in these countries were able to follow events in the Middle East via satellite television networks and the internet, or in China's case by using circumvention tools to evade online censors. And in nations where antigovernment protests did take hold, such as Uganda, Angola, and Djibouti, the authorities cracked down, sometimes violently, on journalists covering the demonstrations.
- **Television Wars:** While a dramatic growth in cable and satellite channels has broadened media diversity in a number of countries over the previous decade or more, state control of domestic broadcast media remains the norm in many societies and is a key method of restricting critical content. In the aftermath of mass demonstrations in Russia to protest the presidential candidacy of Prime Minister Vladimir Putin, members of

the opposition included in a list of demands the creation of a public television station that would be free of Kremlin control. Since first taking power in 2000, Putin has made control of national television the foundation of his authoritarian system, transforming a medium that had been diverse and critical into a conduit for both propaganda and frivolous distraction. Other authoritarian-minded leaders—Hugo Chávez in Venezuela, Robert Mugabe in Zimbabwe, the presidents of most Eurasian states, the Communist leaders of China and Vietnam—have similarly retained or extended their control of television news.

- **Need for Vigilance in Democracies:** Various pressures impinged on press freedom in democratic countries as diverse as India, Israel, Italy, South Africa, and South Korea. Heightened harassment of journalists trying to cover protest movements contributed to a decline in Chile's status, from Free to Partly Free. And following a sharp numerical slide in 2010, Hungary was downgraded to Partly Free due to concerted efforts by the conservative government of Prime Minister Viktor Orbán to seize control over the legal and regulatory framework for media. This two-year drop of 13 points in what had long been a Free country is extremely unusual in the history of the index, but it demonstrates that media freedom cannot be taken for granted even in seemingly well-established democracies.
- **Fragile Freedoms in Latin America:** Chile's decline to Partly Free and major setbacks in Ecuador are the latest in a series of negative developments in the region over the past decade. Whether due to violence by criminal groups, as in Mexico and Honduras, or government hostility to media criticism, as in Venezuela, Argentina, and Bolivia, media freedom is on the defensive in much of Central and South America.

What the Index Measures

The *Freedom of the Press* index assesses the degree of print, broadcast, and internet freedom in every country in the world, analyzing the events and developments of each calendar year. Ratings are determined through an examination of three broad categories: the legal environment in which media operate; political influences on reporting and access to information; and economic pressures on content and the dissemination of news.

Under the **legal** category, the index assesses the laws and regulations that could influence media content as well as the extent to which the government uses these tools to restrict the media's ability to function.

The **political** category encompasses a variety of issues, including editorial pressure by the government or other actors, censorship and self-censorship, the ability of reporters to cover the news, and the extralegal intimidation of and violence against journalists.

Finally, under the **economic** category, the index examines issues such as the structure, transparency, and concentration of media ownership; costs of production and distribution; and the impact of advertising, subsidies, and bribery on content.


Ratings reflect not just government actions and policies, but the behavior of the press itself in testing boundaries, even in more restrictive environments, as well as the impact of nonstate actors. Each country receives a numerical rating from 0 (the most free) to 100 (the least free), which serves as the basis for a press-freedom status designation of Free, Partly Free, or Not Free.

The Global Picture in 2011

Of the 197 countries and territories assessed during 2011, including the new country of South Sudan, a total of 66 (33.5 percent) were rated Free, 72 (36.5 percent) were rated Partly Free, and 59 (30 percent) were rated Not Free. This balance marks a shift toward the Partly Free category compared with the edition covering 2010, which featured 68 Free, 65 Partly Free, and 63 Not Free countries and territories.

The analysis found that only 14.5 percent of the world's inhabitants lived in countries with a Free press, while 45 percent had a Partly Free press and 40.5 percent lived in Not Free environments. The population figures are significantly affected by two countries—China, with a Not Free status, and India, with a Partly Free status—that together account for over a third of the world's nearly seven billion people. The percentage of those enjoying Free media in 2011 declined by a half point to the lowest level since 1996, when Freedom House began incorporating population data into the findings of the survey. Meanwhile, the share living in Partly Free countries jumped by three percentage points, reflecting the move by populous states such as Egypt and Thailand into this category.

After eight years of decline in the global average score, including particularly steep drops in 2007, 2008, and 2009 [see Graph 1], there was a slight improvement of 0.14 points for 2011. This break from the negative trend was driven by a significant net improvement in the Middle East and North Africa, coupled with a more modest improvement in the Asia-Pacific region. The positive openings were nearly balanced by negative movements in the regional averages for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia, the Americas, and to a lesser extent sub-Saharan Africa. The regional average score for Western Europe remained largely unchanged. In terms of thematic categories, the global average score improvement appears to stem from gains primarily in the legal category, and secondarily in the economic category. The political category showed a global decline when compared with the previous year.



Graph 1

There were a total of 10 status changes, four negative and six positive, with most representing improvements from Not Free to Partly Free. In terms of significant numerical shifts of three or more points, the ratio was identical to that for 2010, with declines (12 countries) almost evenly balanced by gains (11 countries).

Worst of the Worst

The world's eight worst-rated countries, with scores of between 90 and 100 points, are Belarus, Cuba, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Iran, North Korea, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. In these states, independent media are either nonexistent or barely able to operate, the press acts as a mouthpiece for the regime, citizens' access to unbiased information is severely limited, and dissent is crushed through imprisonment, torture, and other forms of repression. During 2011, significant improvements in Burma and Libya allowed them to emerge from this cohort, reducing the number of states where free media remain overwhelmingly circumscribed to its lowest point in the past five years. However, conditions worsened in Iran, which earned the dubious distinction of having the most journalists behind bars in the world (42) as measured by the Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ). And in Uzbekistan, the authorities shut down one of the country's last independent newspapers. Meanwhile, the Syrian government's crackdown on independent

reporting by citizen journalists and foreign reporters moved that country to the brink of the 90–100 range.

Regional Findings


Americas: In the Americas, 15 countries (43 percent) were rated Free, 16 (46 percent) were rated Partly Free, and 4 (11 percent) were rated Not Free for 2011. In terms of the region's population, 39 percent lived in Free countries and 44 could be found in Partly Free media environments, with the remaining 17 percent living in Not Free countries. These figures are significantly influenced by the open media environments of North America and much of the Caribbean, which tend to offset the less rosy picture in Central and South America. In Hispanic America, meaning the Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking parts of the region, only 15 percent of the countries were rated Free, and just 1.5 percent of the population lived in Free media environments. There were two negative status changes in the Americas, with Chile and Guyana moving from Free to Partly Free, as well as a significant numerical decline in Ecuador. The regional average score worsened, with gains in the legal category, such as the passage of freedom of information laws and the decriminalization of libel, overshadowed by declines in the political and economic categories.

Press freedom remained extremely restricted in **Cuba**, which has one of the most repressive media environments worldwide, and in **Venezuela**, where the Chávez government continued its efforts to control the press. In 2011, journalists in the country began to feel the effects of a new law that extended existing controls on broadcast media to the internet.

After falling to Not Free status in 2010, **Mexico** continued to suffer from high levels of criminal violence in 2011, especially against journalists and communicators who used social media to bypass self-censorship in the traditional press. Eight media workers were killed in 2011, and journalists reported receiving threats from drug cartels as well as the police and politicians. **Honduras** also stayed in the Not Free category because of continued harassment and intimidation of journalists. Although fewer

journalists were killed than in 2010, self-censorship and a lack of access to information were still problems.

Chile's score worsened from 29 to 31, pushing it into the Partly Free category, due to the obstacles faced by journalists covering protests on education and environmental issues that took place throughout the year. Several journalists were harassed or detained in connection with their reporting. Meanwhile, Chile's commercial press remained concentrated in the hands of two media conglomerates that have advertising interests and control distribution channels across the country.



Graph 2

Guyana also declined to Partly Free, falling from 30 to 33 points, because of the heightened political polarization of the media and verbal intimidation of journalists by members of the ruling party. There were several ongoing libel cases, and a restrictive Broadcasting Act dramatically increased fines for broadcasting without a license. The distribution of licenses appeared to be politically motivated.

The region's largest numerical downgrade took place in **Ecuador**, which fell by six points as President Rafael Correa persisted in his attacks on critical news outlets. The country's score has dropped by 17 points since 2008, one of the most dramatic declines in the world. A controversial law passed in 2011 bars the media from disseminating any promotion of presidential candidates, making it difficult for them to cover political campaigns and inform

citizens about the candidates and their points of view. In Correa's high-profile libel case against the newspaper *El Universo*, the Supreme Court ruled quickly in favor of the president, but reduced the fines against the paper to \$40 million. Media outlets practiced self-censorship to avoid becoming the targets of similar cases. Journalists and press freedom organizations continued to face harassment and intimidation, and an antimonopoly law threatened to further weaken media organizations.


The **United States** remains one of the stronger performers in the index, but it faces several challenges, including a threat to media diversity stemming from poor economic conditions for the news industry, and a lack of protection-of-sources legislation at the federal level. The overall score declined by one point due to detentions, rough police tactics, and other difficulties encountered by journalists while covering protests associated with the Occupy movement. On a positive note, in 2011 the federal judiciary showed signs of resisting government demands for reporters' notes and the names of their sources in cases involving leaks of classified information.

Asia-Pacific: The Asia-Pacific region as a whole exhibited a relatively high level of press freedom in 2011, with 15 countries and territories (37.5 percent) rated Free, 13 (32.5 percent) rated Partly Free, and 12 (30 percent) rated Not Free. Yet the regionwide figures disguise considerable subregional diversity. For example, the Pacific Islands, Australasia, and parts of East Asia have some of the best-ranked media environments in the world, while conditions in South Asia, Southeast Asia, and other parts of East Asia are significantly worse. The country breakdown also obscures the fact that only 5 percent of the region's population had access to Free media, while 49 percent lived in Partly Free and 46 percent in Not Free media environments. A modest improvement in the average score for the Asia-Pacific region was caused by positive change in both the legal and political categories in 2011.

Asia includes the world's worst-rated country, North Korea, as well as several other restrictive media environments, such as China,

Laos, and Vietnam. All of these feature extensive state and party control of the press.

In **China**, the world's largest poor performer, the authorities sharply curbed coverage of the popular uprisings in the Middle East and North Africa, retained blocks on foreign social media platforms like Twitter, and tightened controls on investigative reporting and entertainment programming in advance of a sensitive leadership change scheduled for 2012. Detailed party directives—which can arrive daily at editors' desks—also restricted coverage related to public health, environmental accidents, deaths in police custody, and foreign policy, among other issues. Dozens of writers and activists with significant internet followings were forcibly disappeared, abused in custody, and in some cases sentenced to long prison terms after anonymous messages that circulated online in February called for a Tunisian-style revolution in China. Despite the robust censorship apparatus, Chinese journalists and millions of internet users continued to test the limits of permissible expression by drawing attention to incipient scandals or launching campaigns via domestic microblogging platforms. Most notably in 2011, journalists defied censorship orders pertaining to coverage of a fatal high-speed train crash in July, while internet users shared real-time updates of both the incident and official attempts to cover up its cause.



Graph 3

On a positive note, the region's second-worst performer in 2010 experienced a significant opening in 2011. The press freedom score for **Burma** improved from 94 to 85 points as the regime tentatively implemented political reforms. Positive developments included the release of imprisoned bloggers, a softening of official censorship, fewer reports of harassment and attacks against journalists, and an increase in the number of private media outlets, which led to somewhat more diversity of content and less self-censorship. In addition, a number of exiled journalists were able to return to the country.

The region featured two positive status changes in 2011. **Thailand**, which in 2010 had been downgraded to Not Free, moved back into the Partly Free range due to a calmer political situation that enabled expanded reporting on elections, greater space for dissent and coverage of sensitive topics, and a significant decrease in violence against journalists. Following the end of a state of emergency in late 2010, journalists were better able to cover the news across the country, though access to the restive southern provinces remained restricted. Despite Thailand's overall upgrade, the judicial environment deteriorated toward the end of 2011, with increasingly frequent and harsh applications of the *lèse-majesté* law and the creation of a new internet security agency that can implement shutdowns more quickly and with less oversight.

The South Pacific island kingdom of **Tonga** was the only country to earn a status upgrade to Free, a result of the new government's commitment to strengthening press freedoms and a general reduction in the harassment and intimidation of journalists.

A number of significant numerical improvements were also seen in Asia during the year. **Indonesia** moved from 53 to 49 points as a result of reduced restrictions on the broadcasting authority and press council, less official censorship, and journalists' greater ability to cover news events freely in most of the country. The **Philippines** continued to make gains—moving from 46 to 42 points after a major decline in 2009—due to a reduction in violence against journalists, attempts by the government to address impunity, and expanded diversity of


media ownership. And in **Nepal**, the score improved from 59 to 55 points thanks in part to better access to information and a decline in censorship. There were no journalists killed during the year, and fewer restrictions on the production and distribution of news.

India suffered a two-point decline in 2011 because of a worrying attempt to extend content controls over the internet and the murder of a senior newspaper editor in Mumbai, among other problems. The score for **Pakistan** also declined by two points, as threats against the press from a variety of actors reached unprecedented levels. CPJ now considers Pakistan to be the deadliest country in the world for reporters. As a result of this danger, self-censorship has increased, particularly on sensitive topics like blasphemy laws and the role and reach of the security forces.

Central and Eastern Europe/Eurasia: In the CEE/Eurasia region, 7 countries (24 percent) remained classified as Free, 13 (45 percent) were rated Partly Free, and 9 (31 percent) were rated Not Free. However, a majority of the people in this region (56 percent) lived in Not Free media environments, while 29 percent lived in Partly Free countries and only 15 percent had access to Free media—the smallest share since 2003. In 2011, the regional average score underwent a significant decline, with negative movement in all three thematic (legal, political, and economic) categories. While the average for the Eurasia subregion was almost completely static, deterioration in the typically better-performing subregion of Central and Eastern Europe was marked, driven by significant numerical declines in Hungary and Macedonia in particular.

It is notable that three of the eight worst press freedom abusers in the entire survey—Belarus, Uzbekistan, and Turkmenistan—are found in Eurasia. Other countries of special concern include Russia, Azerbaijan, and Kazakhstan. The media environment in **Russia** is characterized by the use of a pliant judiciary to prosecute independent journalists, impunity for the physical harassment and murder of journalists, and continued state control or influence over almost all traditional media outlets. This was mitigated somewhat by an

increase in use of the internet, social media, and satellite television to disseminate and access news and information, especially during the December parliamentary elections and subsequent protests. However, new media users have yet to achieve a real breakthrough in reaching the general public in Russia, and face an uphill battle against a range of political, economic, legal, and extralegal tools at the disposal of the authorities.



Graph 4

Several countries in the region suffered continued and significant declines. **Hungary**, whose score deteriorated sharply in 2010, was downgraded to Partly Free to reflect the ongoing erosion of press freedom under Prime Minister Viktor Orbán. This was seen in the establishment of the National Agency for Data Protection, which will restrict access to information; evidence of a politically motivated licensing procedure that resulted in a critical radio station losing its frequencies; increased reports of censorship and self-censorship, especially at the public broadcasters; and worsening economic conditions for independent media entrepreneurship.

Ukraine's score fell from 56 to 59 points as a result of growing government control over the media. Many national media council members are loyal to government official and media tycoon Valery Khoroshkovsky, and media owners increasingly face political pressure regarding content. In **Macedonia**, the score


moved from 48 to 54 points due to the declining legal environment, including politicized decisions by regulatory bodies and the lengthy pretrial detention of a leading opposition-oriented media owner in a politically fraught tax case. As part of that case, the country’s most popular television station and three affiliated newspapers were forced out of business in 2011.

The only significant numerical improvement in the region occurred in Partly Free **Georgia**, which moved from 55 to 52 points. The change reflected the establishment of a number of new publications, the issuing of a broadcast license to a media group that is critical of the government, and the enforcement of new requirements on transparency of ownership. More modest improvements were also noted in **Montenegro**, which decriminalized defamation and libel, and in **Kosovo**, which benefited from a continuing trend of fewer attacks on journalists and greater ownership transparency.

Middle East and North Africa: The Middle East and North Africa region continued to have the world’s poorest ratings in 2011, with a single country (5 percent) rated Free, 5 (26 percent) rated Partly Free, and 13 (69 percent) rated Not Free. Similarly, in terms of the breakdown by population, only 2 percent of the region’s people lived in Free media environments, 27 percent lived in Partly Free countries, and the vast majority, 71 percent, lived in countries or territories designated as Not Free. Although transnational satellite television and internet-based information platforms have had a positive impact, the media in much of the region remained constrained by emergency rule, state ownership and editorial directives, harsh blasphemy legislation, and laws against insulting monarchs and public figures.

However, in 2011, thanks to extraordinary openings in some formerly closed media environments, the regional average score underwent a dramatic improvement, particularly in the legal and political categories. There were three positive status changes, as a series of uprisings that started in late 2010 overthrew entrenched leaders and either disrupted or demolished their systems of media control. While the gains are remarkable, it is important to

note that many are not yet supported by new institutional, legal, and regulatory structures. Vigilance will be required as these countries seek to consolidate their transitions and begin adopting new laws and constitutions.



Graph 5

Especially striking was **Libya**, which had long ranked as one of the world’s worst violators of press freedom, but ended the year in the Partly Free category after a numerical improvement from 94 to 60 points. The media environment in Libya changed drastically in 2011 in all three thematic categories. The transitional constitutional charter drafted after the ouster of Mu’ammar al-Qadhafi guaranteed several fundamental human rights and offered a broad definition of freedom of expression, though these provisions fell short of international standards, and institutions to implement them had yet to be established. The Libyan media began to experience unprecedentedly free working conditions in practice. While censorship was not explicitly

banned, there were no longer laws against libeling officials in Libya, and journalists were able to report critically as al-Qadhafi's rule broke down. Five journalists were killed in 2011, mainly while covering the conflict between rebel and Qadhafi forces. Roughly 800 new media outlets had registered by the time the new transitional government officially took control in October, creating a far more diverse and unfettered media environment than had ever existed under the old regime.

The score for **Tunisia**, where conditions in 2010 had also been highly repressive, rose from 85 to 51 points after the overthrow of President Zine el-Abidine Ben Ali, bringing Tunisia well into the Partly Free range. The draft constitution as well as a transitional press code provided major new protections for the media. Imprisoned bloggers and freedom of expression activists were released after Ben Ali fled into exile, and journalists now have the ability to work without fear of detention or official censorship. Threats and intimidation against media workers by extremist Islamist groups were problems, but they paled in comparison to the constraints of previous years. Also during 2011, the number of independent media outlets increased significantly, and social media platforms added further pluralism to the media landscape.

Egypt, which had been downgraded in 2010 due to a crackdown surrounding the November parliamentary elections, also improved to Partly Free after a popular protest movement forced the resignation of President Hosni Mubarak. However, the country's score change, from 65 to 57 points, was less dramatic than in Libya or Tunisia, reflecting Egypt's less dismal starting point as well as the survival of many features of the old system. The political upheaval led to a flourishing of new media outlets, a reduction in self-censorship, and some loosening of the centralized editorial control over state media that had been in place during the three decades of Mubarak's rule. Journalists and media outlets covered controversial stories and produced critical and investigative reports, despite intimidation by the transitional military regime. Two journalists were killed in 2011, and there were several reports of violence and harassment as reporters attempted to cover the uprising and its aftermath. There were also


multiple reports of interference in broadcast media content by the military authorities. Among other lingering problems, the Emergency Law was still in effect at year's end, and nearly 30 restrictive legal articles that allow journalists to be prosecuted for their reporting remain on the books.

Antigovernment protests in several other countries led to increased restrictions on the press. The largest numerical decline globally occurred in **Bahrain**, which fell from 72 to 84 points as journalists faced defamation cases and the government frequently invoked restrictive press laws to deter media criticism. Journalists and bloggers were also subjected to severe harassment, arrests, and torture as a result of their reporting on the ongoing demonstrations, and several fled into exile. Though the government does not own newspapers, the Ministry of Culture and Information maintains control over private publications, imposing fines on those that carry information it finds objectionable.

Syria also suffered a significant decline, from 84 to 89 points, due to the increased attacks, intimidation, and detentions faced by local and foreign journalists. The government revoked the press passes of foreign reporters, and several media workers were arrested as a result of a press law passed in August. The few existing media outlets with a degree of independence were forced to close, leaving only those controlled by the government and ruling party. Citizen journalists and activists worked to get information out of the country, but the authorities made every effort to hunt them down. These conditions, combined with mounting state-led violence in many areas, made the collection and dissemination of accurate news nearly impossible in the country.

Sub-Saharan Africa: Out of a new total of 49 countries—with South Sudan assessed separately for the first time—5 countries (10 percent) were rated Free, 23 (47 percent) were rated Partly Free, and 21 (43 percent) remained Not Free in sub-Saharan Africa. In terms of population, 5 percent lived in Free media environments, while a majority (54 percent) lived with Partly Free media and 41 percent lived in Not Free environments. The regional

average score suffered a marginal decline, with improvements in the legal and economic categories balanced by a deterioration in the political category. Press freedom conditions remained dire in Equatorial Guinea and Eritrea, two of the world's eight worst performers. Their authoritarian governments continued to use legal pressure, imprisonment, and other forms of harassment to suppress independent reporting.



Graph 6

A number of key countries experienced decline and backsliding in 2011. **Guinea**, which had been upgraded to Partly Free in 2010 following efforts by the transitional government to open the legal and political environment for the press, slipped backward to the Not Free category, as the government of newly elected president Alpha Condé failed to implement those reforms. Moreover, the state regulatory body imposed a brief media blackout after a July attempt to assassinate Condé, and several media workers were detained, suspended, and threatened by the government and security forces during the year.

Uganda dropped from 54 to 57 points as a result of biased election coverage by the state-controlled media prior to February balloting, as well as physical attacks on journalists attempting to report on postelection protests. **Malawi** declined from 55 to 60 points due to alleged bias in the issuing of broadcast licenses, and a ban preventing media outlets from addressing key political events such as July antigovernment demonstrations. Reporters, particularly those

who attempted to cover the protests, faced a substantial increase in attacks and harassment, which in turn led to a rise in self-censorship.

In **Angola**, which dropped from 64 to 67 points, the 32-year-old regime of President José Eduardo dos Santos stepped up its repression of the press by imposing disproportionate punishments in legal cases against journalists; increasing its attacks and harassment of reporters, especially those covering anti-government demonstrations; and making it more difficult for foreign journalists to enter and work in the country. The highly repressive environment in **Ethiopia** worsened even further, from 78 to 81 points, with the government employing a 2009 antiterrorism law to silence nearly all dissenting voices. Many journalists have fled the country to avoid prosecution. Ethiopia is the only nation in sub-Saharan Africa with a nationwide internet-filtering system, and the apparatus appeared to grow more sophisticated in 2011.

The passage of the Protection of Information Bill, which allows government officials and state agencies to withhold a wide range of information in the national interest or on national security grounds, in **South Africa**'s lower house of parliament represented yet another troubling development in a country that has been looked to for leadership on press freedom in Africa.

A few countries in the region registered improvements in 2011, in some cases building on gains from 2010. **Zambia** was upgraded to Partly Free due to reform of the public media initiated by the new government after the September 2011 elections, which led to greater professionalism and independence, less self-censorship, and a decrease in the overtly partisan character of these outlets.

The largest numerical improvement outside the Middle East and North Africa occurred in **Niger**, which rose from 59 to 49 points. Newly elected president Mahamadou Issoufou became the first African leader to sign the Table Mountain Declaration, which calls for the repeal of criminal defamation and insult laws. The legal environment also benefited from the passage of an access to information law and the prosecution of journalists under civil rather than criminal law for media offenses, including libel.

There were no reported cases of official censorship, extrajudicial harassment, or attacks directed against media workers during the year.


Elsewhere in West Africa, the press freedom climate continued to improve in **Sierra Leone** under President Ernest Bai Koroma, with increased space for opposition viewpoints and criticism of the government. Moreover, no cases of intimidation or harassment of journalists were reported in 2011. **Togo** made gains due to a decrease in restrictions on opening media outlets and a reduction in attacks on journalists, among other changes. And **Nigeria** passed freedom of information legislation after more than a decade of advocacy by civil society groups and media practitioners.

South Sudan, which became independent from Sudan on July 9, 2011, began with a rating of Partly Free, as the ruling Sudan People’s Liberation Movement attempted to build government institutions that protect political rights and civil liberties. Press freedom is guaranteed in the new constitution, but laws enforcing this principle have yet to be passed. There were reports of extralegal intimidation and attacks on journalists by security agents during the year, resulting in self-censorship. Journalists were also caught up in an ongoing border conflict with Sudan.

Western Europe: Western Europe has consistently boasted the highest level of press freedom worldwide. In 2010, 23 countries (92 percent) were rated Free, and 2 (8 percent) were rated Partly Free. In terms of population, 72 percent of the region’s residents enjoyed a Free press, while 28 percent lived in Partly Free media environments. The regional average score was largely stable in 2011, with no major change noted. Norway and Sweden joined Finland as the world’s top-performing countries, with scores of 10.

The region’s largest numerical changes in 2011 were declines in Iceland and the United Kingdom. The score for **Iceland**, previously one of the world’s top performers, moved from 12 to 14 points because of an increase in libel cases and the passage of a controversial new law that could restrain the media. The **United Kingdom**’s score fell from 19 to 21 points due to the use of super injunctions—which prevent

the media from reporting both the targeted information and the very existence of an injunction—by celebrities and wealthy individuals, as well as attacks on journalists covering riots. In addition, the police and government used the 1984 Police and Criminal Evidence Act to force a number of media organizations to hand over unedited footage of rioting in London and Northern Ireland.



Graph 7

Italy remained a regional outlier with its Partly Free status, but registered a one-point gain in 2011 due to Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi’s resignation in November, which significantly decreased media concentration in the country. Berlusconi is a major private media owner, and his political position had also given him control of the state media, including influence over the appointment of directors and key journalists.

In **Turkey**, which is also Partly Free, the score declined by one point as the government continued to crack down on unfavorable press coverage in 2011. Constitutional guarantees of freedom of the press and expression are only partially upheld in practice, undermined by restrictive provisions in the criminal code and Anti-Terrorism Act. Due to detentions stemming from investigations into the alleged Ergenekon conspiracy to overthrow the government, as well as a case involving suspected ties to an alleged Kurdish militant group, Turkey now has one of the highest numbers of imprisoned journalists in the world.

Acknowledgements

Karin Deutsch Karlekar served as the project director of Freedom of the Press 2012. Overall guidance for the project was provided by Arch Puddington, vice president for research, and Christopher Walker, vice president for strategy and analysis. Extensive research, editorial, analytical, and administrative assistance was provided by Jennifer Dunham, Bret Nelson, and Valerie Popper, as well as by Tyler Roylance, Nicholas Bowen, Holiday Dmitri Kumar, and Michael Larkin. We would also like to thank our consultant writers and advisers and other members of the survey team for their contributions.

The extensive work undertaken to produce Freedom of the Press 2012 was made possible by leadership contributions from the Leon Levy Foundation, the Hurford Foundation, and the Jyllands-Posten Foundation. Additional generous support has been provided by the Nicholas B. Ottaway Foundation, Google, and Free Press Unlimited, as well as the F.M. Kirby Foundation, The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, Lilly Endowment Inc., The Freedom Forum, and Walter Schloss.

GLOBAL PRESS FREEDOM RANKINGS

Rank 2012	Country	Rating	Status
1	Finland	10	Free
	Norway	10	Free
	Sweden	10	Free
4	Belgium	11	Free
5	Denmark	12	Free
	Luxembourg	12	Free
	Netherlands	12	Free
	Switzerland	12	Free
9	Andorra	13	Free
10	Iceland	14	Free
	Liechtenstein	14	Free
12	St. Lucia	15	Free
13	Ireland	16	Free
	Monaco	16	Free
	Palau	16	Free
16	Germany	17	Free
	Marshall Islands	17	Free
	New Zealand	17	Free
	Portugal	17	Free
	San Marino	17	Free
	St. Vincent and Grenadines	17	Free
22	Estonia	18	Free
	Jamaica	18	Free
	United States of America	18	Free
25	Barbados	19	Free
	Canada	19	Free
	Costa Rica	19	Free
	Czech Republic	19	Free
29	Bahamas	20	Free
	St. Kitts and Nevis	20	Free
31	Australia	21	Free
	Austria	21	Free
	Belize	21	Free
	Micronesia	21	Free
	Slovakia	21	Free
	United Kingdom	21	Free

Rank 2012	Country	Rating	Status
37	Cyprus	22	Free
	Japan	22	Free
	Malta	22	Free
40	Dominica	23	Free
	Lithuania	23	Free
	Suriname	23	Free
43	France	24	Free
	Grenada	24	Free
	Mali	24	Free
	Spain	24	Free
47	Poland	25	Free
	Slovenia	25	Free
	Taiwan	25	Free
	Trinidad and Tobago	25	Free
51	Tuvalu	26	Free
	Uruguay	26	Free
	Vanuatu	26	Free
54	Cape Verde	27	Free
	Kiribati	27	Free
	Latvia	27	Free
	Papua New Guinea	27	Free
58	Ghana	28	Free
	Nauru	28	Free
	Solomon Islands	28	Free
61	Mauritius	29	Free
	Samoa	29	Free
	São Tomé and Príncipe	29	Free
	Tonga	29	Free
65	Greece	30	Free
	Israel	30	Free
67	Chile	31	Partly Free
68	Namibia	32	Partly Free
	South Korea	32	Partly Free
70	Guyana	33	Partly Free
	Hong Kong	33	Partly Free
	Italy	33	Partly Free
73	Benin	34	Partly Free
	South Africa	34	Partly Free
75	East Timor	35	Partly Free

Rank 2012	Country	Rating	Status
	Montenegro	35	Partly Free
	Serbia	35	Partly Free
78	Bulgaria	36	Partly Free
	Hungary	36	Partly Free
80	India	37	Partly Free
	Mongolia	37	Partly Free
82	Antigua and Barbuda	38	Partly Free
83	Botswana	40	Partly Free
	Croatia	40	Partly Free
	El Salvador	40	Partly Free
86	Dominican Republic	41	Partly Free
	Romania	41	Partly Free
88	Burkina Faso	42	Partly Free
	Philippines	42	Partly Free
90	Mozambique	43	Partly Free
91	Brazil	44	Partly Free
	Peru	44	Partly Free
93	Panama	46	Partly Free
94	Bolivia	47	Partly Free
95	Bosnia and Herzegovina	48	Partly Free
	Comoros	48	Partly Free
97	Indonesia	49	Partly Free
	Kosovo	49	Partly Free
	Lesotho	49	Partly Free
	Nicaragua	49	Partly Free
	Niger	49	Partly Free
	Sierra Leone	49	Partly Free
	Tanzania	49	Partly Free
104	Argentina	50	Partly Free
	Haiti	50	Partly Free
	Nigeria	50	Partly Free
107	Albania	51	Partly Free
	Lebanon	51	Partly Free
	Maldives	51	Partly Free
	Tunisia	51	Partly Free
111	Bangladesh	52	Partly Free
	Georgia	52	Partly Free
	Kenya	52	Partly Free
	Mauritania	52	Partly Free

Rank 2012	Country	Rating	Status
115	Macedonia	54	Partly Free
	Moldova	54	Partly Free
117	Colombia	55	Partly Free
	Congo (Brazzaville)	55	Partly Free
	Nepal	55	Partly Free
	Senegal	55	Partly Free
	Turkey	55	Partly Free
122	Seychelles	56	Partly Free
123	Egypt	57	Partly Free
	Guinea-Bissau	57	Partly Free
	Kuwait	57	Partly Free
	Uganda	57	Partly Free
127	Bhutan	58	Partly Free
	Ecuador	58	Partly Free
	Fiji	58	Partly Free
130	South Sudan	59	Partly Free
	Ukraine	59	Partly Free
132	Guatemala	60	Partly Free
	Liberia	60	Partly Free
	Libya	60	Partly Free
	Malawi	60	Partly Free
	Paraguay	60	Partly Free
	Thailand	60	Partly Free
	Zambia	60	Partly Free
139	Algeria	62	Not Free
	Central African Republic	62	Not Free
	Guinea	62	Not Free
	Honduras	62	Not Free
	Mexico	62	Not Free
144	Cambodia	63	Not Free
	Jordan	63	Not Free
	Madagascar	63	Not Free
	Malaysia	63	Not Free
	Pakistan	63	Not Free
149	Armenia	65	Not Free
150	Angola	67	Not Free
	Qatar	67	Not Free
	Singapore	67	Not Free
153	Cameroon	68	Not Free

Rank 2012	Country	Rating	Status
	Morocco	68	Not Free
155	Iraq	69	Not Free
	Kyrgyzstan	69	Not Free
	Togo	69	Not Free
	Côte d'Ivoire	70	Not Free
158	Gabon	70	Not Free
	Oman	71	Not Free
161	Burundi	72	Not Free
	Sri Lanka	72	Not Free
	United Arab Emirates	72	Not Free
164	Afghanistan	74	Not Free
	Djibouti	74	Not Free
166	Brunei	75	Not Free
	Chad	75	Not Free
168	Swaziland	76	Not Free
	Venezuela	76	Not Free
170	Sudan	78	Not Free
171	Tajikistan	79	Not Free
172	Azerbaijan	80	Not Free
	Russia	80	Not Free
	Zimbabwe	80	Not Free
175	Ethiopia	81	Not Free
	Kazakhstan	81	Not Free
	The Gambia	81	Not Free
178	Rwanda	82	Not Free
179	Congo (Kinshasa)	83	Not Free
	West Bank and Gaza Strip	83	Not Free
	Yemen	83	Not Free
182	Bahrain	84	Not Free
	Laos	84	Not Free
	Saudi Arabia	84	Not Free
	Somalia	84	Not Free
	Vietnam	84	Not Free
187	Burma	85	Not Free
	China	85	Not Free
189	Syria	89	Not Free
190	Cuba	91	Not Free
	Equatorial Guinea	91	Not Free
192	Iran	92	Not Free

Rank 2012	Country	Rating	Status
193	Belarus	93	Not Free
194	Eritrea	94	Not Free
195	Uzbekistan	95	Not Free
196	Turkmenistan	96	Not Free
197	North Korea	97	Not Free

Status	Number of Countries	Percentage of Total
Free	66	33.5
Partly Free	72	36.5
Not Free	59	30
TOTAL	197	100

ASIA-PACIFIC

Rank 2012	Country	Rating	Status
1	Palau	16	Free
2	Marshall Islands	17	Free
	New Zealand	17	Free
4	Australia	21	Free
	Micronesia	21	Free
6	Japan	22	Free
7	Taiwan	25	Free
8	Tuvalu	26	Free
	Vanuatu	26	Free
10	Kiribati	27	Free
	Papua New Guinea	27	Free
12	Nauru	28	Free
	Solomon Islands	28	Free
14	Samoa	29	Free
	Tonga	29	Free
16	South Korea	32	Partly Free
17	Hong Kong	33	Partly Free
18	East Timor	35	Partly Free
19	India	37	Partly Free
	Mongolia	37	Partly Free
21	Philippines	42	Partly Free
22	Indonesia	49	Partly Free
23	Maldives	51	Partly Free
24	Bangladesh	52	Partly Free
25	Nepal	55	Partly Free
26	Bhutan	58	Partly Free
	Fiji	58	Partly Free
28	Thailand	60	Partly Free
29	Cambodia	63	Not Free
	Malaysia	63	Not Free
	Pakistan	63	Not Free
32	Singapore	67	Not Free
33	Sri Lanka	72	Not Free
34	Afghanistan	74	Not Free
35	Brunei	75	Not Free
36	Laos	84	Not Free

Rank 2012	Country	Rating	Status
	Vietnam	84	Not Free
38	Burma	85	Not Free
	China	85	Not Free
40	North Korea	97	Not Free

Status	Number of Countries	Percentage of Total
Free	15	37.5
Partly Free	13	32.5
Not Free	12	30
TOTAL	40	100

**Subregion Comparison
Asia-Pacific**

Region and Subregions	Number of Countries	Average Press Freedom Score
Asia-Pacific	40	46.8
Asia Proper	26	57.7
Pacific Islands	14	26.4

AMERICAS

Rank 2012	Country	Rating	Status
1	St. Lucia	15	Free
2	St. Vincent and Grenadines	17	Free
3	Jamaica	18	Free
	United States of America	18	Free
5	Barbados	19	Free
	Canada	19	Free
	Costa Rica	19	Free
8	Bahamas	20	Free
	St. Kitts and Nevis	20	Free
10	Belize	21	Free
11	Dominica	23	Free
	Suriname	23	Free
13	Grenada	24	Free
14	Trinidad and Tobago	25	Free
15	Uruguay	26	Free
16	Chile	31	Partly Free
17	Guyana	33	Partly Free
18	Antigua and Barbuda	38	Partly Free
19	El Salvador	40	Partly Free
20	Dominican Republic	41	Partly Free
21	Brazil	44	Partly Free
	Peru	44	Partly Free
23	Panama	46	Partly Free
24	Bolivia	47	Partly Free
25	Nicaragua	49	Partly Free
26	Argentina	50	Partly Free
	Haiti	50	Partly Free
28	Colombia	55	Partly Free
29	Ecuador	58	Partly Free
30	Guatemala	60	Partly Free
	Paraguay	60	Partly Free
32	Honduras	62	Not Free
	Mexico	62	Not Free
34	Venezuela	76	Not Free
35	Cuba	91	Not Free

Status	Number of Countries	Percentage of Total
Free	15	43
Partly Free	16	46
Not Free	4	11
TOTAL	35	100

**Subregion Comparison
Americas**

Region and Subregions	Number of Countries	Average Press Freedom Score
Americas	35	38.4
Hispanic America	20	49.1
Non-Hispanic America	15	24.1

CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE / EURASIA

Rank 2012	Country	Rating	Status
1	Estonia	18	Free
2	Czech Republic	19	Free
3	Slovakia	21	Free
4	Lithuania	23	Free
5	Poland	25	Free
	Slovenia	25	Free
7	Latvia	27	Free
8	Montenegro	35	Partly Free
	Serbia	35	Partly Free
10	Bulgaria	36	Partly Free
	Hungary	36	Partly Free
12	Croatia	40	Partly Free
13	Romania	41	Partly Free
14	Bosnia and Herzegovina	48	Partly Free
15	Kosovo	49	Partly Free
16	Albania	51	Partly Free
17	Georgia	52	Partly Free
18	Macedonia	54	Partly Free
	Moldova	54	Partly Free
20	Ukraine	59	Partly Free
21	Armenia	65	Not Free
22	Kyrgyzstan	69	Not Free
23	Tajikistan	79	Not Free
24	Azerbaijan	80	Not Free
	Russia	80	Not Free
26	Kazakhstan	81	Not Free
27	Belarus	93	Not Free
28	Uzbekistan	95	Not Free
29	Turkmenistan	96	Not Free

Status	Number of Countries	Percentage of Total
Free	7	24
Partly Free	13	45
Not Free	9	31
TOTAL	29	100

**Subregion Comparison
Central and Eastern Europe/Eurasia**

Region and Subregions	Number of Countries	Average Press Freedom Score
CEE/Eurasia	29	51.2
Central and Eastern Europe	17	34.3
Eurasia	12	75.3

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Rank 2012	Country	Rating	Status
1	Mali	24	Free
2	Cape Verde	27	Free
3	Ghana	28	Free
4	Mauritius	29	Free
	São Tomé and Príncipe	29	Free
6	Namibia	32	Partly Free
7	Benin	34	Partly Free
	South Africa	34	Partly Free
9	Botswana	40	Partly Free
10	Burkina Faso	42	Partly Free
11	Mozambique	43	Partly Free
12	Comoros	48	Partly Free
13	Lesotho	49	Partly Free
	Niger	49	Partly Free
	Sierra Leone	49	Partly Free
	Tanzania	49	Partly Free
17	Nigeria	50	Partly Free
18	Kenya	52	Partly Free
	Mauritania	52	Partly Free
20	Congo (Brazzaville)	55	Partly Free
	Senegal	55	Partly Free
22	Seychelles	56	Partly Free
23	Guinea-Bissau	57	Partly Free
	Uganda	57	Partly Free
25	South Sudan	59	Partly Free
26	Liberia	60	Partly Free
	Malawi	60	Partly Free
	Zambia	60	Partly Free
29	Central African Republic	62	Not Free
	Guinea	62	Not Free
31	Madagascar	63	Not Free
32	Angola	67	Not Free
33	Cameroon	68	Not Free
34	Togo	69	Not Free
35	Côte d'Ivoire	70	Not Free
	Gabon	70	Not Free

Rank 2012	Country	Rating	Status
37	Burundi	72	Not Free
38	Djibouti	74	Not Free
39	Chad	75	Not Free
40	Swaziland	76	Not Free
41	Sudan	78	Not Free
42	Zimbabwe	80	Not Free
43	Ethiopia	81	Not Free
	The Gambia	81	Not Free
45	Rwanda	82	Not Free
46	Congo (Kinshasa)	83	Not Free
47	Somalia	84	Not Free
48	Equatorial Guinea	91	Not Free
49	Eritrea	94	Not Free

Status	Number of Countries	Percentage of Total
Free	5	10
Partly Free	23	47
Not Free	21	43
TOTAL	49	100

MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA

Rank 2012	Country	Rating	Status
1	Israel	30	Free
2	Lebanon	51	Partly Free
	Tunisia	51	Partly Free
4	Egypt	57	Partly Free
	Kuwait	57	Partly Free
6	Libya	60	Partly Free
7	Algeria	62	Not Free
8	Jordan	63	Not Free
9	Qatar	67	Not Free
10	Morocco	68	Not Free
11	Iraq	69	Not Free
12	Oman	71	Not Free
13	United Arab Emirates	72	Not Free
14	West Bank and Gaza Strip	83	Not Free
	Yemen	83	Not Free
16	Bahrain	84	Not Free
	Saudi Arabia	84	Not Free
18	Syria	89	Not Free
19	Iran	92	Not Free

Status	Number of Countries	Percentage of Total
Free	1	5
Partly Free	5	26
Not Free	13	69
TOTAL	19	100


WESTERN EUROPE

Rank 2012	Country	Rating	Status
1	Finland	10	Free
	Norway	10	Free
	Sweden	10	Free
4	Belgium	11	Free
5	Denmark	12	Free
	Luxembourg	12	Free
	Netherlands	12	Free
	Switzerland	12	Free
9	Andorra	13	Free
10	Iceland	14	Free
	Liechtenstein	14	Free
12	Ireland	16	Free
	Monaco	16	Free
14	Germany	17	Free
	Portugal	17	Free
	San Marino	17	Free
17	Austria	21	Free
	United Kingdom	21	Free
19	Cyprus	22	Free
	Malta	22	Free
21	France	24	Free
	Spain	24	Free
23	Greece	30	Free
24	Italy	33	Partly Free
25	Turkey	55	Partly Free


Status	Number of Countries	Percentage of Total
Free	23	92
Partly Free	2	8
Not Free	0	0
TOTAL	25	100

Global Data

Status Breakdown by Country



Status Breakdown by Population




Global Trends in Press Freedom


Year Under Review	Free Countries		Partly Free Countries		Not Free Countries	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
2011	66	33.5	72	36.5	59	30
2001	75	40	50	27	61	33
1991	67	41	49	30	46	28
1981	36	23	34	22	86	55

Regional Data


Americas




Asia-Pacific




Central and Eastern Europe/Eurasia




Middle East and North Africa




Sub-Saharan Africa



Western Europe




World Population in 2011 According to Total Press Freedom Score




Key to Press Freedom Scoring and Status Designation

Total Score	Country Status
0-30	Free
31-60	Partly Free
61-100	Not Free

Countries with a Net Annual Change of 3 or More Points





Freedom of the Press 2011–2012

Middle East and North Africa



Net Change in Total Score, 2011-2012

- 3+ point improvement
- No change
- 3+ point decline
- 1-2 point decline
- 1-2 point improvement



Methodology

The 2012 index, which provides analytical reports and numerical ratings for 197 countries and territories, continues a process conducted since 1980 by Freedom House. The findings are widely used by governments, international organizations, academics, and the news media in many countries. Countries are given a total score from 0 (best) to 100 (worst) on the basis of a set of 23 methodology questions divided into three subcategories. Assigning numerical points allows for comparative analysis among the countries surveyed and facilitates an examination of trends over time. The degree to which each country permits the free flow of news and information determines the classification of its media as “Free,” “Partly Free,” or “Not Free.” Countries scoring 0 to 30 are regarded as having “Free” media; 31 to 60, “Partly Free” media; and 61 to 100, “Not Free” media. The criteria for such judgments and the arithmetic scheme for displaying the judgments are described in the following section. The ratings and reports included in *Freedom of the Press 2012* cover events that took place between January 1, 2011, and December 31, 2011.

Criteria

This study is based on universal criteria. The starting point is the smallest, most universal unit of concern: the individual. We recognize cultural differences, diverse national interests, and varying levels of economic development. Yet Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states:

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media regardless of frontiers.

The operative word for this index is “everyone.” All states, from the most democratic to the most authoritarian, are committed to this doctrine through the UN system. To deny that doctrine is to deny the universality of information freedom—a basic human right. We recognize that cultural distinctions or economic underdevelopment may limit the volume of news flows within a country, but these and other arguments are not acceptable explanations for outright centralized control of the content of news and information. Some poor countries allow for the exchange of diverse views, while some economically developed countries restrict content diversity. We seek to recognize press freedom wherever it exists, in poor and rich countries as well as in countries of various ethnic, religious, and cultural backgrounds.

Research and Ratings Review Process

The findings are reached after a multilayered process of analysis and evaluation by a team of regional experts and scholars. Although there is an element of subjectivity inherent in the index findings, the ratings process emphasizes intellectual rigor and balanced and unbiased judgments.

The research and ratings process involved several dozen analysts—including members of the core research team headquartered in New York, along with outside consultants—who prepared the draft ratings and country reports. Their conclusions are reached after gathering information from professional contacts in a variety of countries, staff and consultant travel, international visitors, the findings of human rights and press freedom organizations, specialists in geographic and geopolitical areas, the reports of governments and multilateral bodies, and a variety of domestic and international news media. We would particularly like to thank the other

members of the International Freedom of Expression Exchange (IFEX) network for providing detailed and timely analyses of press freedom violations in a variety of countries worldwide on which we rely to make our judgments.

The ratings were reviewed individually and on a comparative basis in a global meeting involving analysts and Freedom House staff. The ratings are compared with the previous year's findings, and any major proposed numerical shifts or category changes are subjected to more intensive scrutiny. These reviews are followed by cross-regional assessments in which efforts are made to ensure comparability and consistency in the findings.

Methodology

Through the years, we have refined and expanded our methodology. Recent changes are intended to simplify the presentation of information without altering the comparability of data for a given country over the 32-year span or the comparative ratings of all countries over that period.

Our examination of the level of press freedom in each country currently comprises 23 methodology questions and 109 indicators divided into three broad categories: the legal environment, the political environment, and the economic environment. For each methodology question, a lower number of points is allotted for a more free situation, while a higher number of points is allotted for a less free environment. Each country is rated in these three categories, with the higher numbers indicating less freedom. A country's final score is based on the total of the three categories: A score of 0 to 30 places the country in the Free press group; 31 to 60 in the Partly Free press group; and 61 to 100 in the Not Free press group.

The diverse nature of the methodology questions seeks to encompass the varied ways in which pressure can be placed upon the flow of information and the ability of print, broadcast, and internet-based media to operate freely and without fear of repercussions: In short, we seek to provide a picture of the entire "enabling environment" in which the media in each country operate. We also seek to assess the degree of news and information diversity available to the public in any given country, from either local or transnational sources.

The **legal environment** category encompasses an examination of both the laws and regulations that could influence media content and the government's inclination to use these laws and legal institutions to restrict the media's ability to operate. We assess the positive impact of legal and constitutional guarantees for freedom of expression; the potentially negative aspects of security legislation, the penal code, and other criminal statutes; penalties for libel and defamation; the existence of and ability to use freedom of information legislation; the independence of the judiciary and of official media regulatory bodies; registration requirements for both media outlets and journalists; and the ability of journalists' groups to operate freely.

Under the **political environment** category, we evaluate the degree of political control over the content of news media. Issues examined include the editorial independence of both state-owned and privately owned media; access to information and sources; official censorship and self-censorship; the vibrancy of the media and the diversity of news available within each country; the ability of both foreign and local reporters to cover the news freely and without harassment; and the intimidation of journalists by the state or other actors, including arbitrary detention and imprisonment, violent assaults, and other threats.

Our third category examines the **economic environment** for the media. This includes the structure of media ownership; transparency and concentration of ownership; the costs of establishing media as well as of production and distribution; the selective withholding of advertising or subsidies by the state or other actors; the impact of corruption and bribery on content; and the extent to which the economic situation in a country impacts the development and sustainability of the media.

CHECKLIST OF METHODOLOGY QUESTIONS 2012

A. LEGAL ENVIRONMENT (0–30 POINTS)

1. Do the constitution or other basic laws contain provisions designed to protect freedom of the press and of expression, and are they enforced? (0–6 points)
2. Do the penal code, security laws, or any other laws restrict reporting and are journalists or bloggers punished under these laws? (0–6 points)
3. Are there penalties for libeling officials or the state and are they enforced? (0–3 points)
4. Is the judiciary independent and do courts judge cases concerning the media impartially? (0–3 points)
5. Is freedom of information legislation in place, and are journalists able to make use of it? (0–2 points)
6. Can individuals or business entities legally establish and operate private media outlets without undue interference? (0–4 points)
7. Are media regulatory bodies, such as a broadcasting authority or national press or communications council, able to operate freely and independently? (0–2 points)
8. Is there freedom to become a journalist and to practice journalism, and can professional groups freely support journalists' rights and interests? (0–4 points)

B. POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT (0–40 POINTS)

1. To what extent are media outlets' news and information content determined by the government or a particular partisan interest? (0–10 points)
2. Is access to official or unofficial sources generally controlled? (0–2 points)
3. Is there official or unofficial censorship? (0–4 points)
4. Do journalists practice self-censorship? (0–4 points)
5. Do people have access to media coverage and a range of news and information that is robust and reflects a diversity of viewpoints? (0–4 points)
6. Are both local and foreign journalists able to cover the news freely in terms of harassment and physical access? (0–6 points)
7. Are journalists, bloggers, or media outlets subject to extralegal intimidation or physical violence by state authorities or any other actor? (0–10 points)

C. ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT (0–30 POINTS)

1. To what extent are media owned or controlled by the government and does this influence their diversity of views? (0–6 points)
2. Is media ownership transparent, thus allowing consumers to judge the impartiality of the news? (0–3 points)
3. Is media ownership highly concentrated, and does it influence diversity of content? (0–3 points)
4. Are there restrictions on the means of news production and distribution? (0–4 points)
5. Are there high costs associated with the establishment and operation of media outlets? (0–4 points)
6. Do the state or other actors try to control the media through allocation of advertising or subsidies? (0–3 points)
7. Do journalists, bloggers, or media outlets receive payment from private or public sources whose design is to influence their journalistic content? (0–3 points)
8. Does the overall economic situation negatively impact media outlets' financial sustainability? (0–4 points)

Note: Under each question, a lower number of points is allotted for a more free situation, while a higher number of points is allotted for a less free environment. A complete list of the indicators used to make the assessments can be found online at www.freedomhouse.org.



Freedom House supports global freedom through comprehensive analysis, dedicated advocacy, and concrete assistance for democratic activists around the world.

Founded in 1941, Freedom House has long been a vigorous proponent of the right of all individuals to be free. Eleanor Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie served as Freedom House's first honorary co-chairpersons.

William H. Taft IV
Chair
Freedom House Board of Trustees

David J. Kramer
President

Arch Puddington
Vice President for Research

www.freedomhouse.org

**Support the right of every individual to be free.
Donate now.**