

World ranking of life-friendly countries

Luís Botelho Ribeiro, University of Minho, telef. +351.253.510.378 / 190, Portugal
botelho.ribeiro@dei.uminho.pt

Abstract

This paper proposes an economic index for the life-friendliness of countries, based on internationally available data regarding abortion rate, women fertility rate, mother mortality rate and abortion-restrictive legislation. Main objective is to provide a political management instrument with a clear and assumed pro-life focus, capable of ranking and benchmarking countries with respect to the life-friendliness of adopted policies and legislation. Preliminary results of work in progress are briefly discussed.

1. Introduction

Philosopher Agostinho da Silva [1] proposed a metaphoric idea (cf. Appendix 1) which inspired us to propose a value-weighted index of the life-friendliness of countries. This index aims to quantify a criteria function of “the choice of a country to be born at”, for a supposed rational soul in ways to incarnate and obviously interested in survive to the gestation period and with her mother also alive. Such an index can lead to a ranking of life-friendly countries which can help political leaders as well as the citizens to take informed decisions that might have an impact on their life-friendliness world rank. This paper presents preliminary results of a work in progress.

2. Structure of the index

The index should be based on credible and publicly scrutinable data, available for most countries. As a first approach, we chose to use data periodically published by the United Nations [2], punctually complemented with data regarding the portuguese situation [3][4] in view of a first application to a legislation referendum regarding abortion “on request”. The proposed index is set up in order to avoid risk of systematic unbias, and according to best effort for neutrality and linearity. As said above, we adopted the perspective and criteria of a child’s imaginary choice of a country to be born at, according to Agostinho’s suggestion. On a more pragmatic and realistic basis, yet less poetic, this index can well represent the family’s perspective and willingness to generate new children, according to their national reality and constraints. Our index G_c is a simple weighted sum expressed by the general rule;

$$G_c = \sum_i W_i \cdot P_{c,i}$$

The weights W_i are applied to two different types of parameters P per country c (P_c): i) statistical data and ii) legal framework. Considering its availability, the considered statistical parameters were: abortion rate per 1000 women in the age range 15-44 (weighting factor $W=-2,0$); total fertility rate, or the number born-alive children per woman, normalised to the interval $[0, 1]$ (weighting factor $W=+0,5$); mother mortality rate, normalised to the interval $[0, 1]$ (weighting factor $W=-3,0$). We decided not to take into account any data on contraceptive use because it was not clear from the UN report if these could include abortive or non-abortive techniques. The reported classification into *modern* and *other* methods is clearly insufficient for this purpose and interpretation might be highly non-uniform across countries.

Parameters and Weights are always highly arguable aspects of any ranking. We tried to represent as fairly as possible the child-mother common interest. Positive weights reflect favourable factors. Mother mortality was considered highly negative (minus 3) as this was one of the two assumed objectives of the child – surviving with the mother also alive. Abortion rate gets a slightly lighter weight (minus 2) because other parameters will also address this aspect, namely through specialised abortion-legislation aspects.

On the other hand, countries whose data is missing in any parameter get the worse possible classification, which prevents an eventual premium in the ranking for no-answering. Of course, this might penalize some smaller countries possibly much more life-friendly than its calculated position suggests, e.g. Luxembourg and the Holy See. We encourage these countries administrations to update their data for the UN and make sure future reports will include all their parameters.

The “legal framework” parameters were considered in view of the new baby’s willingness to survive gestation and providing the most penalization to the more voluntary or socially preventable abortion conditions. Thus a country that is more permissive to abortion will appear more “dangerous” to the baby and get negative points in the index. We have considered and weighted differently the following legislation allowances for abortion: to save the mother/woman’s life

(weighting factor -0,1); to preserve physical health (weighting factor -0,2); to preserve mental health (weighting factor -0,2), rape or incest (weighting factor -0,1); foetal impairment (weighting factor -0,2); economic or social reasons (weighting factor -0,5); on request (weighting factor -1). We decided to adopt a binary scale of zero (0) or one (1) – zero if the indication is not allowed in the legislation and one if it is.

It is clear for us that cultural and religious factors can strongly influence the way legislation and courts are respected, abused or even irrelevant in some countries as behaviour inducers. Similar international driving rules, for example, result in very different behaviours across northern and southern Europe cultures.

This is just another fact advising great care about interpretation and generalization of this and any other quantitative or qualitative economic aggregated indicator. Numbers can not describe completely people's behaviours and motivations. Indicators just provide general indications, based on incomplete and sometimes inaccurate data that should be analysed carefully.

The complete results for the countries listed on the mentioned United Nations report can be found at appendix 2. In the future, we'd like to include in the index some parameters on the public social policies with impact on the life-friendliness. These could include direct subsidies to maternity, nurturing, clothing, housing and maybe education. These new aspects should be calibrated against some context variable like the average life-cost or minimum wage. Certainly this improved index will guarantee a better position in the ranking to countries like France and mainly Germany, that have recently adopted decisive action pro-maternity, pressed by "demographic clock-bomb" [5],[6].

Such policies somehow rely on the assumption that "not only a community choose and accept new members but also new members (having its future interest represented by families) choose and decide to accept or not this membership". Part of the work in progress will consist on how to access this type of data for a representative set of countries and how to normalise and incorporate it in the index. It is however very important as one of the index main objectives is to act as an inducer of best-practice adoption in the generality of countries. And time is increasingly showing that social policies can be an effective (and exclusive) alternative to abortion permissiveness. Countries should face their responsibility to provide the necessary social, cultural and legal conditions for Human Life to break-through in a happy, responsible and sustainable way.

We now justify the name proposed for the index. We propose it should be called the "Guimarães index" as a reference to this UNESCO world-heritage city known as nest-town ("*cidade-berço*") due to its central role in the independence of Portugal. It was also in this city university that the idea of this index and ranking came to light.

3. Application on two different scenarios after the portuguese referendum on abortion

As stated above, the main use of this ranking might be as an aid to decision. By this reason, it was tested in the context of the next Portuguese referendum about abortion on request. Eventual legislation modifications after that might turn out in a change of column "on request" from zero (0) to one (1), in the case "*sim*" wins. The two possible outcomes yield two different scenarios that may be taken into consideration by the decision-maker – the portuguese electorate, in this case.

For this exercise, missing data in the United Nations 1999 report, relative to Portugal, was fulfilled with data updated to 2005. The estimated abortion rate was calculated on 2,60. Updating this data doesn't distort the index result, as many values from that report actually are dated back to the eighties and even the seventies. This also means that countries might get here additional motivation to update their statistics within UN.

We now present the result of the top10 ranking in the two possible scenarios coming out of the Portuguese referendum. Table 1 highlights the portuguese present day situation, also maintained if "*não*" wins. It should be kept in mind that the first three columns were normalised into the [0, 1] interval. That is why Spain "Total fertility rate" appears as zero. That means only that Spain is in the very lower extreme of the actual distribution range.

WORLD RANKING OF LIFE-FRIENDLY COUNTRIES	Abortion rate	Total fertility rate	Maternal mortality ratio	To save the woman's life	To preserve physical health	To preserve mental health	Rape or incest	Foetal impairment	Economic or social reasons	On request	GUIMARÃES INDEX
	WEIGHT -2,00	0,5	-3	-0,1	-0,2	-0,2	-0,1	-0,2	-0,5	-1	
Ireland	-0,13	0,06	-0,01	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0,18
Switzerland	-0,19	0,03	0,00	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-0,66
Portugal	-0,05	0,02	0,00	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-0,83
Spain	-0,13	0,00	0,00	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-0,93
Israel	-0,34	0,12	0,00	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-1,02
New Zealand	-0,39	0,07	-0,03	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-1,15
Japan	-0,31	0,02	-0,02	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-1,21
Republic of Korea	-0,46	0,04	-0,21	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-1,23
Bangladesh	-0,08	0,15	-1,41	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-1,44
Finland	-0,23	0,05	-0,01	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	-1,49

Table 1. Normalised statistical data for the countries ranked in the top10 of life-friendliness, at present and in the scenario of an eventual victory of the “NO” to abortion on request at the referendum in Portugal.

Table 2 highlights the result of an eventual victory of the “yes” to de-penalization of abortion. Portugal will then fall to 10th because of the change in the last column (on request) of the index. This parameter is definitely not overvalued, as it is still below the weight of the abortion rate column (weight -2) and maternal mortality ratio (weight -3).

WORLD RANKING OF LIFE-FRIENDLY COUNTRIES	Abortion rate	Total fertility rate	Maternal mortality ratio	To save the woman's life	To preserve physical health	To preserve mental health	Rape or incest	Foetal impairment	Economic or social reasons	On request	GUIMARÃES INDEX
	WEIGHT -2,00	0,5	-3	-0,1	-0,2	-0,2	-0,1	-0,2	-0,5	-1	
Ireland	-0,13	0,06	-0,01	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0,18
Switzerland	-0,19	0,03	0,00	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-0,66
Spain	-0,13	0,00	0,00	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-0,93
Israel	-0,34	0,12	0,00	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-1,02
New Zealand	-0,39	0,07	-0,03	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-1,15
Japan	-0,31	0,02	-0,02	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-1,21
Republic of Korea	-0,46	0,04	-0,21	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-1,23
Bangladesh	-0,08	0,15	-1,41	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-1,44
Finland	-0,23	0,05	-0,01	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	-1,49
Portugal	-0,05	0,02	0,00	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	-1,83

Table 2. Normalised statistical data for the countries ranked in the top10 of life-friendliness, in the scenario of a possible victory of the “yes” to abortion on request at the referendum in Portugal.

4. Conclusions

It is possible to identify a set of public available parameters with acceptable accuracy can be used to build a quantitative index of countries “life-friendliness”. Defining fair weights, based on the relative importance – positive or negative - attributed to these parameters, a weighted index was determined. Then it will be possible to establish a ranking between countries and benchmark pro-life practices, assessing the impact of political decisions on the proposed index. This assessment can be equally used for internal benchmarking between different states of a federation (e.g. U.S.A.), and even regions of a country (e.g. Belgium). To make it possible, we’ll only need to meet one of these two conditions: i) available statistical data resolves the different regions/states to compare; ii) autonomy statute guarantees the possibility to legislate differently from state to state.

Applying the index to real-world data, interesting results emerged. United Nations data shows that Ireland, Switzerland and Portugal, by this order, are presently the most life-friendly of the world. On the other hand, if Portugal approves abortion on demand, it will fall from 3rd to 10th or even 31st if economic and social reasons are also explicitly accepted or implicitly included at the “on demand” UN classification. Thus, voters will not only decide on abortion de-penalization but also if they’d rather stay ahead of Spain or consciously fall below Bangladesh life-friendliness levels.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank valuable comments and suggestions of Prof. João César das Neves, from the Faculty of Entrepreneurial and Economic Sciences of Catholic University in Lisbon – Portugal – and Prof. Vítor Pereira from the Universidade Lusíada in Famalicão - Portugal.

References

- [1] Agostinho da Silva, *in* “vida conversável”, ed. Assírio e Alvim, 2nd edition, 1998, pp. 16 (in portuguese)
- [2] <http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/abt/fabttoc.htm>
- [3] http://www.apf.pt/activ/aborto_portugal.pdf (in portuguese)
- [4] <http://www.ics.ul.pt/investiga/projectos/sitsoc/cap/0208.htm> (in portuguese)
- [5] http://www.portugaldiario.iol.pt/noticia.php?div_id=291&id=755795 (in portuguese)
- [6] http://www.portugaldiario.iol.pt/noticia.php?id=759443&div_id=291 (in portuguese)

Appendix 1

«In that short biography I'd been writing by my friend's request, I've put *this idea that when came the moment for me to be born in the heaven of ideas, I was staired at the world spinning in front of me, searching for a land that might please me. And, just like me, there was a bunch of others: I mean, everybody (somehow) chooses the land where he/she would like to be born at.* Being born can not be a fatality but a pré-conscious choice, a decision from that conscience you lose when you fly from heaven to earth, as Plato put it...»

Citation from "vida conversável" (in portuguese), Agostinho da Silva, ed. Assírio e Alvim, 2nd edition, 1998, pp. 16 (our translation)

Appendix 2 – Table of results of the indicator calculated with data published by the United Nations

WORLD RANKING OF LIFE-FRIENDLY COUNTRIES	abortion rate (AR)	AR (norm. & weighted)	Total fertility rate (TFR)	TFR (norm. & weighted)	Maternal mortality ratio (MMR)	MMR (norm. & weighted)	To save the woman's life	To preserve physical health	To preserve mental health	Rape or incest	Foetal impairment	Economic or social reasons	On request	GUIMARÃES INDEX	RANK
WEIGHT		-2,00		0,5		-3									
Region and Country							-0,1	-0,2	-0,2	-0,1	-0,2	-0,5	-1		
Eastern Africa															
Burundi		-2,00	6,3	0,40	1300	-2,16	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-4,26	131
Comoros		-2,00	4,8	0,28	950	-1,58	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-3,79	120
Djibouti		-2,00	5,3	0,32	570	-0,94	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,72	67
Eritrea		-2,00	5,7	0,35	..	-3,00	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-5,15	164
Ethiopia		-2,00	6,3	0,40	1400	-2,33	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-4,43	141
Kenya		-2,00	4,4	0,25	650	-1,08	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-3,32	102
Madagascar		-2,00	5,4	0,33	490	-0,81	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,58	50
Malawi		-2,00	6,8	0,44	560	-0,93	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,59	52
Mauritius		-2,00	1,9	0,06	120	-0,19	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,23	25
Mozambique		-2,00	6,3	0,40	1500	-2,50	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-4,60	144
Rwanda		-2,00	6,2	0,39	1300	-2,16	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-4,27	132
Seychelles		-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-5,80	178
Somalia		-2,00	7,3	0,48	1600	-2,67	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-4,29	135
Uganda		-2,00	7,1	0,46	1200	-2,00	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-4,04	126
United Republic of Tanzania		-2,00	5,5	0,34	770	-1,28	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-3,44	110
Zambia	0,40	0,00	5,6	0,35	940	-1,56	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	-2,42	36
Zimbabwe		-2,00	3,8	0,21	570	-0,94	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	-3,34	105
Middle Africa															
Angola		-2,00	6,8	0,44	1500	-2,50	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-4,16	128
Cameroon		-2,00	5,3	0,32	550	-0,91	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-3,19	98
Central African Republic		-2,00	4,9	0,29	700	-1,16	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,97	85
Chad		-2,00	6,1	0,38	1500	-2,50	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-4,21	129
Congo		-2,00	6,1	0,38	890	-1,48	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-3,19	99
Dem. Rep. Of Congo		-2,00	6,4	0,41	870	-1,45	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-3,14	93
Equatorial Guinea		-2,00	5,6	0,35	820	-1,36	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-3,52	112
Gabon		-2,00	5,4	0,33	500	-0,83	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,60	53
Sao Tome and Principe		-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-5,10	151
Northern Africa															
Algeria		-2,00	3,8	0,21	160	-0,26	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-2,55	46
Egypt		-2,00	3,4	0,18	170	-0,28	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,20	23
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		-2,00	3,8	0,21	220	-0,36	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,25	28
Morocco		-2,00	3,1	0,15	610	-1,01	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-3,36	106
Sudan		-2,00	4,6	0,27	660	-1,09	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-3,03	88
Tunisia	8,60	-0,20	2,5	0,11	170	-0,28	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,67	63
Southern Africa															
Botswana		-2,00	4,3	0,25	250	-0,41	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-2,96	84
Lesotho		-2,00	4,8	0,28	610	-1,01	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,83	79
Namibia		-2,00	4,9	0,29	370	-0,61	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-3,12	91
South Africa	2,70	-0,06	3,3	0,17	230	-0,38	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,56	48
Swaziland		-2,00	4,7	0,28	560	-0,93	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,75	69
Western Africa															
Benin		-2,00	5,8	0,36	990	-1,65	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-3,38	107
Burkina Faso		-2,00	6,6	0,42	930	-1,55	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-3,92	122
Cape Verde		-2,00	3,6	0,19	..	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-7,11	190
Cote d'Ivoire		-2,00	5,1	0,31	810	-1,35	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-3,14	92
Gambia		-2,00	5,2	0,32	1100	-1,83	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-4,01	125
Ghana		-2,00	5,2	0,32	740	-1,23	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-3,71	117
Guinea		-2,00	5,5	0,34	1600	-2,67	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-4,83	146
Guinea-Bissau		-2,00	5,8	0,36	910	-1,51	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-3,25	100
Liberia		-2,00	6,3	0,40	560	-0,93	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-3,33	103
Mali		-2,00	6,6	0,42	1200	-2,00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-3,67	116
Mauritania		-2,00	5,5	0,34	930	-1,55	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-3,31	101
Niger		-2,00	6,8	0,44	1200	-2,00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-3,66	115
Nigeria		-2,00	5,2	0,32	1000	-1,66	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-3,85	121
Senegal		-2,00	5,6	0,35	1200	-2,00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-3,75	118
Sierra Leone		-2,00	6,1	0,38	1800	-3,00	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-5,12	163
Togo		-2,00	6,1	0,38	640	-1,06	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,78	71
Caribbean															
Antigua and Barbuda		-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-5,10	151
Bahamas		-2,00	2,6	0,12	100	-0,16	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-2,54	45
Barbados		-2,00	1,5	0,03	43	-0,06	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-3,33	104
Cuba	77,70	-1,86	1,5	0,03	95	-0,15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-4,28	133
Dominica		-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-5,10	151
Dominican Republic		-2,00	2,8	0,13	110	-0,18	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,14	18
Grenada		-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-5,50	165
Haiti		-2,00	4,4	0,25	1000	-1,66	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-3,51	111
Jamaica		-2,00	2,5	0,11	120	-0,19	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-2,58	51
Saint Kitts and Nevis		-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-5,50	165
Saint Lucia		-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-5,50	165
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-6,30	188
Trinidad and Tobago		-2,00	1,6	0,04	90	-0,14	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-2,60	55
Central America															
Belize		-2,00	3,7	0,20	..	-3,00	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	-6,00	181
Costa Rica		-2,00	2,8	0,13	55	-0,08	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-2,45	40
El Salvador		-2,00	3,2	0,16	300	-0,49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,33	32
Guatemala		-2,00	4,9	0,29	200	-0,33	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,13	17
Honduras		-2,00	4,3	0,25	220	-0,36	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,21	24
Mexico		-2,00	2,8	0,13	110	-0,18	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-2,24	26
Nicaragua		-2,00	4,4	0,25	160	-0,26	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,11	14
Panama		-2,00	2,6	0,12	55	-0,08	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-2,37	35

WORLD RANKING OF LIFE-FRIENDLY COUNTRIES	abortion rate (AR)	AR (norm. & weighted)	Total fertility rate (TFR)	TFR (norm. & weighted)	Maternal mortality ratio (MMR)	MMR (norm. & weighted)	To save the woman's life	To preserve physical health	To preserve mental health	Rape or incest	Foetal impairment	Economic or social reasons	On request	GUIMARÃES INDEX	RANK
WEIGHT		-2,00		0,5		-3		-0,1	-0,2	-0,2	-0,1	-0,2	-0,5	-1	
Region and Country															
South America															
Argentina	..	-2,00	2,6	0,12	100	-0,16	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-2,64	62
Bolivia	..	-2,00	4,4	0,25	650	-1,08	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-3,42	109
Brazil	..	-2,00	2,3	0,09	220	-0,36	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-2,47	42
Chile	..	-2,00	2,4	0,10	65	-0,10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,00	11
Colombia	..	-2,00	2,8	0,13	100	-0,16	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,13	16
Ecuador	..	-2,00	3,1	0,15	150	-0,24	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-2,69	64
Guyana	..	-2,00	2,3	0,09	..	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-7,21	192
Paraguay	..	-2,00	4,2	0,24	160	-0,26	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,12	15
Peru	..	-2,00	3	0,15	280	-0,46	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-2,81	77
Suriname	..	-2,00	2,2	0,08	..	-3,00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-5,02	150
Uruguay	..	-2,00	2,4	0,10	85	-0,13	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-2,63	58
Venezuela	..	-2,00	3	0,15	120	-0,19	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,15	20
Eastern Europe															
Belarus	67,50	-1,62	1,4	0,02	37	-0,05	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-3,95	124
Bulgaria	51,30	-1,23	1,2	0,01	27	-0,04	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-3,56	113
Czech Republic	20,70	-0,49	1,2	0,01	15	-0,02	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,80	75
Hungary	34,70	-0,83	1,4	0,02	30	-0,04	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-3,15	94
Poland	..	-2,00	1,5	0,03	19	-0,02	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-2,79	74
Moldova	38,80	-0,93	1,8	0,05	..	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-6,17	182
Romania	78,00	-1,87	1,2	0,01	130	-0,21	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-4,37	139
Russian federation	68,40	-1,64	1,3	0,02	75	-0,12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-4,04	127
Slovakia	19,70	-0,47	1,4	0,02	..	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-5,74	177
Ukraine	11,80	-0,28	1,4	0,02	50	-0,08	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,63	57
Northern Europe															
Denmark	16,10	-0,38	1,7	0,05	9	-0,01	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,64	61
Estonia	53,80	-1,29	1,3	0,02	41	-0,06	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-3,63	114
Finland	9,90	-0,23	1,7	0,05	11	-0,01	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-1,49	9
Iceland	..	-2,00	2,1	0,08	-	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-6,22	184
Ireland	5,90	-0,13	1,9	0,06	10	-0,01	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0,18	1
Latvia	44,10	-1,05	1,3	0,02	40	-0,06	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-3,40	108
Lithuania	34,40	-0,82	1,4	0,02	36	-0,05	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-3,15	95
Norway	15,60	-0,37	1,9	0,06	6	0,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,61	56
Sweden	18,70	-0,44	1,6	0,04	7	0,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,71	65
United Kingdom	..	-2,00	1,7	0,05	9	-0,01	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	-3,16	96
Southern Europe															
Albania	27,20	-0,65	2,5	0,11	65	-0,10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,94	82
Andorra	..	-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-5,10	151
Bosnia and Herzegovina	..	-2,00	1,4	0,02	..	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-7,28	193
Croatia	12,90	-0,30	1,6	0,04	..	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-5,56	174
Greece	..	-2,00	1,3	0,02	10	-0,01	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-4,29	136
Holy See	..	-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-5,00	149
Italy	11,40	-0,27	1,2	0,01	12	-0,01	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,57	49
Malta	..	-2,00	1,9	0,06	..	-3,00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-4,94	147
Portugal	2,60	-0,05	1,4	0,02	5,3	0,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,33	31
San Marino	..	-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-5,10	151
Slovenia	22,80	-0,54	1,3	0,02	..	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-5,83	179
Spain	5,70	-0,13	1,1	0,00	7	0,00	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-0,93	3
Macedonia	28,50	-0,68	2,1	0,08	..	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-5,90	180
Yugoslavia	54,60	-1,31	1,8	0,05	..	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-6,55	189
Western Europe															
Austria	..	-2,00	1,4	0,02	10	-0,01	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-4,29	134
Belgium	6,80	-0,15	1,5	0,03	10	-0,01	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,43	38
France	12,40	-0,29	1,7	0,05	15	-0,02	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,56	47
Germany	7,60	-0,17	1,3	0,02	22	-0,03	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,49	44
Liechtenstein	..	-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-5,50	165
Luxembourg	..	-2,00	1,7	0,05	..	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-6,25	186
Monaco	..	-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-5,10	151
Netherlands	6,50	-0,15	1,5	0,03	12	-0,01	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,43	37
Switzerland	8,40	-0,19	1,5	0,03	6	0,00	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-0,66	2
North America															
Canada	15,50	-0,36	1,5	0,03	6	0,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,64	59
United States of America	22,90	-0,54	2	0,07	12	-0,01	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,79	73
Australia/New Zealand															
Australia	22,20	-0,53	1,8	0,05	9	-0,01	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,78	72
New Zealand	16,40	-0,39	2	0,07	25	-0,03	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-1,15	5
Melanesia															
Fiji	..	-2,00	2,7	0,12	90	-0,14	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	-3,02	87
Papua New Guinea	..	-2,00	4,6	0,27	930	-1,55	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-3,78	119
Solomon Islands	..	-2,00	4,8	0,28	..	-3,00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-4,82	145
Vanuatu	..	-2,00	4,3	0,25	280	-0,46	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-2,71	66
Micronesia															
Kiribati	..	-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-5,10	151
Marshall Islands	..	-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-5,10	151
Micronesia	..	-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-5,10	151
Nauru	..	-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-5,50	165
Palau	..	-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-5,10	151
Polynesia															
Cook Islands	..	-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-5,50	165
Niue	..	-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-5,50	165
Samoa	..	-2,00	4,2	0,24	35	-0,05	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-2,31	30
Tonga	..	-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-5,10	151
Tuvalu	..	-2,00	..	0,00	..	-3,00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-5,10	151

WORLD RANKING OF LIFE-FRIENDLY COUNTRIES	abortion rate (AR)	AR (norm. & weighted)	Total fertility rate (TFR)	TFR (norm. & weighted)	Maternal mortality ratio (MMR)	MMR (norm. & weighted)	To save the woman's life	To preserve physical health	To preserve mental health	Rape or incest	Foetal impairment	Economic or social reasons	On request	GUIMARÃES INDEX	RANK
WEIGHT		-2,00		0,5		-3		-0,1	-0,2	-0,2	-0,1	-0,2	-0,5	-1	
Region and Country															
Eastern Asia		-2,00		0,00		-3,00									
China	26,10	-0,62	1,8	0,05	95	-0,15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-3,02	86
DPR (North) Korea	"	-2,00	2	0,07	70	-0,11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-4,34	137
Japan	13,40	-0,31	1,4	0,02	18	-0,02	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-1,21	6
Mongolia	25,90	-0,62	2,6	0,12	65	-0,10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,90	81
Republic of Korea	19,60	-0,46	1,6	0,04	130	-0,21	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-1,23	7
South-eastern Asia		-2,00		0,00		-3,00									
Brunei Darussalam	"	-2,00	2,8	0,13	60	-0,09	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,06	13
Cambodia	"	-2,00	4,6	0,27	900	-1,50	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-5,53	173
Indonesia	"	-2,00	2,6	0,12	650	-1,08	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-3,06	89
Lao PDR	"	-2,00	5,8	0,36	650	-1,08	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,82	78
Malaysia	"	-2,00	3,2	0,16	80	-0,13	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-2,46	41
Myanmar	"	-2,00	2,4	0,10	580	-0,96	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,96	83
Philippines	"	-2,00	3,6	0,19	280	-0,46	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,37	34
Singapore	15,90	-0,37	1,7	0,05	10	-0,01	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,64	60
Thailand	"	-2,00	1,7	0,05	200	-0,33	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-2,88	80
Viet Nam	83,30	-2,00	2,6	0,12	160	-0,26	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-4,44	142
South Central Asia		-2,00		0,00		-3,00									
Afghanistan	"	-2,00	6,9	0,45	1700	-2,83	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-4,49	143
Bangladesh	3,80	-0,08	3,1	0,15	850	-1,41	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-1,44	8
Bhutan	"	-2,00	5,5	0,34	1600	-2,67	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-4,43	140
India	2,70	-0,06	3,1	0,15	570	-0,94	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,15	19
Iran	"	-2,00	2,8	0,13	120	-0,19	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,16	21
Kazakhstan	43,90	-1,05	2,3	0,09	"	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-6,26	187
Kyrgyzstan	22,40	-0,53	3,2	0,16	"	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-5,67	176
Maldives	"	-2,00	5,4	0,33	"	-3,00	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-4,97	148
Nepal	"	-2,00	4,4	0,25	1500	-2,50	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-4,34	138
Pakistan	"	-2,00	5	0,30	340	-0,56	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-2,76	70
Sri Lanka	"	-2,00	2,1	0,08	140	-0,23	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,25	27
Tajikistan	49,10	-1,17	4,2	0,24	"	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-6,24	185
Turkmenistan	44,90	-1,07	3,6	0,19	"	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-6,18	183
Uzbekistan	83,30	-2,00	3,4	0,18	"	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-7,12	191
Western Asia		-2,00		0,00		-3,00									
Armenia	35,40	-0,84	1,7	0,05	50	-0,08	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-3,17	97
Azerbaijan	16,00	-0,38	2	0,07	"	-3,00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-5,61	175
Bahrain	"	-2,00	2,9	0,14	60	-0,09	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-4,25	130
Cyprus	"	-2,00	2	0,07	5	0,00	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-2,73	68
Georgia	21,90	-0,52	1,9	0,06	33	-0,05	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2,80	76
Iraq	"	-2,00	5,3	0,32	310	-0,51	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,29	29
Israel	14,30	-0,34	2,7	0,12	7	0,00	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-1,02	4
Jordan	"	-2,00	4,9	0,29	150	-0,24	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-2,45	39
Kuwait	"	-2,00	2,9	0,14	29	-0,04	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-2,60	54
Lebanon	"	-2,00	2,7	0,12	300	-0,49	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,47	43
Oman	"	-2,00	5,8	0,36	190	-0,31	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,05	12
Qatar	"	-2,00	3,7	0,20	"	-3,00	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-5,50	165
Saudi Arabia	"	-2,00	5,8	0,36	130	-0,21	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-2,35	33
Syrian Arab Republic	"	-2,00	4	0,22	180	-0,29	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2,17	22
Turkey	25,00	-0,59	2,5	0,11	180	-0,29	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-3,08	90
United Arab Emirates	"	-2,00	3,4	0,18	26	-0,04	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-1,96	10
Yemen	"	-2,00	7,6	0,50	1400	-2,33	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-3,93	123