

# **I N E F**

## **Report**

Institut für Entwicklung und Frieden der  
Gerhard-Mercator-Universität GH Duisburg  
zur wissenschaftlichen Begleitung der  
Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden

### **Gross Human Rights Violations in 1994**

Brigitte Hamm

in Cooperation with  
Panagiotis Alexandridis  
Michael Birr  
Katja Exner  
Stefan Gronewold  
Trine Koch Jakobsen  
Natascha Kunath  
Bernd Nilles  
Birgit Ophei  
Elisabeth Wollefs

**Heft 18 / 1996**

**Gerhard-Mercator-Universität  
Gesamthochschule Duisburg**



## Table of Contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Preliminary Remarks.....</b>   | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>1. The Measurement of Human Rights Violations<br/>as an Instrument of Political Conditionality .....</b> | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>2. Available Data .....</b>  | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>3. Instruments to Measure Human Rights Violations .....</b>  | <b>7</b>  |
| 3.1 The Human Development Index (HDI) .....   | 7         |
| 3.2 Der Humana-Index.....   | 7         |
| 3.3 The Freedom-Index of Freedom House .....  | 8         |
| <b>4. The Political Terror Scale (PTS) .....</b>  | <b>9</b>  |
| 4.1 Description of the Political Terror Scale .....   | 9         |
| 4.2 Coder Training .....  | 10        |
| <b>5. The Coding of the "Country Reports on<br/>Human Rights Practices for 1994" .....</b>                  | <b>12</b> |
| 5.1 Preparation of the Coding .....   | 12        |
| 5.2 Testing the Reliability of the Coding.....  | 13        |
| 5.3 Recommendations for Future Codings .....  | 13        |
| <b>6. Discussion of the Human Rights Situation in 1994.....</b>   | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Literature .....</b>   | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Appendix: Tables of the Measurement of Human Rights Violations.....</b>                                  | <b>21</b> |



## **Preliminary Remarks**

Since the early 80's a group of scientists at Purdue University in Indiana, U.S.A. and members of PIOOM (the Dutch abbreviation for "Interdisciplinary Program of Research on Root Causes of Human Rights Violations") at the University of Leiden in the Netherlands, have evaluated annually the performance of the states of the world in their respect for political human rights. In Germany, these data were used, for example in the biannual book "Global Trends", but there were no efforts made to process the data here. As the coding process for such rankings requires much time, the measurement results were sometimes published quite late and no actual data were available.

During the winter semester 1994/95 a group of students in my seminar on methodologies of measuring human rights violations was interested in measuring international human rights. For the first time the "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1994" of the U.S. State Department was on Internet. Thus the data source necessary for the coding was available in early 1995. The students coded with great enthusiasm the human rights situation of 193 states. I also would like to thank Hilary Landorf, New York University, for her assistance translating this article and for critical comments.

This INEF-Report documents the research process and also the results of the measurement. Hopefully the measurement of human rights violations will continue in Duisburg on a yearly basis. Cooperation with the scientists at Purdue and Leiden could improve the reliability of these internationally used data.

Brigitte Hamm

November 1995

## **1. The Measurement of Human Rights Violations as an Instrument of Political Conditionality**

Leaving theoretical questions aside, the measurement of human rights is often considered to be appropriate in evaluating a country's human rights situation. Such data are used as an auxiliary tool of exogenous pressure, which is known as political conditionality whereby aid is related to specific political practices. Often human rights organizations of the South ask for the instrument of political conditionality against repressive regimes. However, exogenous pressure directed mainly towards elections and the respect for political human rights may be criticized as a kind of imperialistic attitude, trying to implement Western values in Non-Western societies.

In the U.S.A. it was mainly the Congress in the early 70's who made an effort to include an active human rights policy as part of its foreign policy (Buergenthal 1989: 153). It was also through the initiative of the Congress that the Bureau for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs was established within the Department of State in 1976 (Shestack 1989: 22). Two bills from this time - §116, the Harkin Amendment, and §502B(2), amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 - established that U.S. economic and military aid was to be denied to those states who committed gross human rights violations. Only aid directed to the population in need should be excluded from these regulations. Henry Kissinger, Secretary of State under Nixon and Ford, rejected human rights as a fundamental aspect of foreign policy, claiming it to be a moral exaggeration (Shestack 1989: 21). Jimmy Carter, whose strong commitment to human rights in the American foreign policy is sometimes considered as programmatic, supported the efforts of the Congress in this respect. In concrete policy however, the Carter administration often ignored the demands of Congress to consider the human rights performance of states receiving U.S. aid (de Neufville 1986: 683; Forsythe 1987: 387).

In the Federal Republic of Germany one may speak of an active human rights policy only since the beginning of the 90's. In 1991 the Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development, Mr. Carl-Dieter Spranger, caused quite some attention with the following five "criteria of German development cooperation" that he declared to be the precondition of German development aid (Bulletin Nr. 113, 16.10.1991):

### **1) Respect for Human Rights**

Indicators: freedom from torture, respect for basic rights upon arrest and while on trial, general rule "no punishment without law", freedom of religion, and protection of minorities.

## **2) Participation of the Population in the Political Process**

Indicators: democratic elections, freedom of assembly, freedom of expression, freedom of press and information.

## **3) Secure Rule of Law**

Indicators: independent judiciary, principle of "equal law for all", transparency and calculability of the actions of the state.

## **4) Establishing a "Market Oriented" Economic Order**

Indicators: Respect for property, type of property of land, prices as a matter of markets, realistic exchange rates, freedom of trade and of branches, competition in all economic sectors.

## **5) Actions of the State Oriented towards Development**

Indicators: Orientation towards the improvement of the economic and social situation of the poorer sectors of society, expenditures for military purposes relative to overall expenditures, encouragement of measures observing ecology and demographic considerations.

The instrument of political conditionality is disputed because Western industrial countries do not use it in a consequent and unanimous manner. Too often economic, strategic, and political interests interfere with the necessities of an active human rights policy. As with all statistics the data on human rights violations may also be misused for political purposes. One piece of data in itself can never describe the human rights situation of a country in a sufficient manner. Moreover states who are gross human rights violators will try to hide these crimes as no state wants to be denounced for a bad human rights performance, neither within its own population, nor with regard to international public opinion. Therefore such states will try to hide information of the human rights situation in their countries; consequently, available data may not be reliable. Measurements of human rights violations may be useful as a first overall view on a country's and on the global human rights situation. Such measurements allow for international comparisons of the human rights situation and its development and they are used in statistical analysis. To evaluate the human rights performance of a specific country, the qualitative case study is to be preferred. Statistical data should be used only as one kind of information among others.

## 2. Available Data

There are various sources that inform on the human rights situation in single states. In addition to detailed individual reports, the nongovernmental organizations **Amnesty International** and **Human Rights Watch** publish annual reports on the international human rights situation.

Presumably the biggest human rights organization, Amnesty International, was founded in 1961 with its headquarters in London. The "Amnesty International Report" is published in the middle of a year, giving information about the human rights performance of all states of the world for the preceding year. The report concentrates on gross human rights violations (GHRV), i.e. torture, extralegal executions, disappearance, and denial of a fair public trial. In accordance with the mandate of Amnesty International, the country reports also deal with the fate of prisoners committed to nonviolence and the implementation of the death penalty.

Human Rights Watch began its work with the founding of Helsinki Watch in 1978. The organization consists of regional divisions (Human Rights Watch/Africa etc.). The organization also has thematic projects (eg. on human rights of women and children). The regional divisions of Human Rights Watch document the human rights situation of the respective regions in the Human Rights Watch World Report, focusing on those states where the organization is very active and/or where human rights are especially endangered. In contrast to the Amnesty International reports not all states of the world are documented.<sup>1</sup> An important concern of the organization is the right to monitor the human rights violations in a country and the protection of human rights activists. Each country report deals with the international and U.S. human rights policy towards the respective state.

Obliged by law "to transmit ..., by January 31 of each year, a full and complete report regarding the status of internationally recognized human rights," the U.S. Department of State has published the so-called Country Reports on Human Rights Practices since 1978.<sup>2</sup> The corresponding amendment §116(d) to the Foreign Assistance Act established that country reports on the human rights situation of those states that receive military or economic aid from the U.S.A. or are members of the United Nations be submitted to Congress every year. Today these "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices" report on all states. As the reports are an instrument of the U.S. foreign policy, the human rights situation in the U.S.A. itself is not reported.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Human Rights Watch World Report 1995 gives information on the human rights situation in 64 states.

<sup>2</sup> In the following written as Country Reports.

<sup>3</sup> To evaluate the human rights performance of the U.S.A. one has to draw on information of Human Rights Watch or Amnesty International.



Producing and editing the Country Reports is the responsibility of the Bureau for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs within the Department of State, which is now called the Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor. In the 70's, these reports were quite unsystematic and covered only a relatively small number of states. Especially during the Reagan administration nongovernmental organizations like the Lawyers' Committee criticized the reports because of their political and ideological bias towards socialist and leftist countries like Cuba and Nicaragua. Today, however, these reports are considered to be a largely valid data basis for the evaluation of the international human rights situation. However, critics deplore that the information contained in these reports influence the human rights policy of the U.S.A. too little.

The collection of information on the human rights situation for the Country Reports is the responsibility of the American embassies in the respective states. For this task, the embassies sometimes have special human rights officers. Writing the reports, the embassies rely on a standardized outline developed by the Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor. Besides official sources, information from journalists, NGOs, and victims and their families is used as well. The human rights situation of states without official U.S. representatives like North Korea, Libya or Iraq is evaluated from neighboring countries. Each autumn the embassies deliver a first draft to the Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor. Within the Department of State not only the members of this bureau check the drafts but regional experts from the various geographic bureaus check the first versions as well. Changes made within the Department of State are brought to the respective embassies for comment. The final decision on the content of the reports lies within the Department of State.

In addition to information on gross human rights violations, the Country Reports document the observance of political rights and civil liberties as well as the rights of workers in a standardized manner. Since 1993 the realization of women's rights has been considered to a broader extent, too. The standard format of the Country Reports has changed little over the years. For this reason they can be used as a data basis for evaluating the international development of the human rights situation in the world.

**Standardized Structure of the Country Reports on Human Rights Practices of the U.S. Department of State according to the Report Published in 1995:**

|  |
|--|
| <b>Respect For Human Rights</b>  |
| <b>Section 1. Respect for the Integrity of the Person, Including Freedom From:</b><br>a) Political and Other Extrajudicial Killing<br>b) Disappearance<br>c) Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment<br>d) Arbitrary Arrest, Detention, or Exile<br>e) Denial of Fair Public Trial<br>f) Arbitrary Interference With Privacy, Family, Home, or Correspondence |
| <b>Section 2. Respect for Civil Liberties, Including:</b><br>a) Freedom of Speech and Press<br>b) Freedom of Peaceful Assembly and Association<br>c) Freedom of Religion<br>d) Freedom of Movement Within the Country, Foreign Travel, Emigration, and Repatriation  |
| <b>Section 3. Respect for Political Rights: The Right of Citizens to Change Their Government</b>   |
| <b>Section 4. Governmental Attitude Regarding International and Non-governmental Investigation of Alleged Violations of Human Rights</b>   |
| <b>Section 5. Discrimination Based on Race, Sex, Religion, Disability, Language, or Social Status</b><br>Women<br>Children<br>National/Racial/Ethnic Minorities<br>People with Disabilities  |
| <b>Section 6. Worker Rights</b><br>a) The Right of Association<br>b) The Right to Organize and Bargain Collectively<br>c) Prohibition of Forced or Compulsory Labor<br>d) Minimum Age for Employment of Children<br>e) Acceptable Conditions of Work   |

### 3. Instruments to Measure Human Rights Violations

The measurements of human rights violations may be differentiated according to the human rights considered.

#### 3.1 The Human Development Index (HDI)

The **Human Development Index (HDI)** is a well known scale measuring social human rights. It has been published since the early 90's by UNDP in the yearly **Human Development Report**. The HDI measures human development by indicators for education, health, and standard of living. The level of education is expressed as the average years of schooling of adults and by the rate of literacy.<sup>4</sup> The indicator for health is life expectancy at birth. Finally the standard of living is represented by personal purchasing power (PPP\$). These indicators carry differing weights and are standardized by the range of each indicator.<sup>5</sup> "The HDI is a simple average of the life expectancy index, educational attainment index and the adjusted real GDP per capita (PPP\$) index."(HDR 1995: 135) Another scale for recording the realization of social human rights is the **Physical Quality of Life Index (PQLI)** presented by Morris David Morris in 1979. It considers infant mortality, literacy and life expectancy. The PQLI was not disseminated as highly as the HDI (Cain/Claude/Jabine 1991).

#### 3.2 The Humana-Index

A well known concept for measuring political human rights is the index of Charles Humana.<sup>6</sup> In his index, Charles Humana ranked 40 human rights, coding them as YES = 3, yes = 2, no = 1, NO = 0. In order to stress their importance he weighted seven rights (like freedom from torture) with the factor 3. In statistical tests this weighting was criticized as arbitrary and other weights statistically generated through discriminant analysis were proposed (Gupta/Jongman/Schmid 1994). Moreover Michael Haas (1990) showed that such different human rights as freedom to travel and freedom from torture should not be combined in one index because they represented vastly different dimensions of human rights.

---

<sup>4</sup> Since 1994 the average years of schooling are indicated by the enrollment ratios for the primary, secondary and tertiary level.

<sup>5</sup> Since 1994 the minimum and maximum values for these ranges are no longer empirically but theoretically determined (HDR 1994: 125; HDR 1995: 134).

<sup>6</sup> The **Human Freedom Index (HFI)**, published by UNDP only in the Human Development Report of 1991, used the data of Charles Humana. UNDP had to stop the publication of such a freedom index mainly because of political critique from some Southeast Asian governments, who considered such an evaluation as an undue interference in the inner affairs of their countries and criticized the evaluation as having a Western bias. UNDP also referred to methodological problems in respect to the **Human Freedom Index**.

### 3.3 The Freedom-Index of Freedom House

Like the HDI, the measurement of Freedom House has the advantage of annual appearance. Freedom House was founded in 1941 as a non-profit organization and is seated in New York. Having its roots in the American Civil Rights Movement, the organization is committed to the defence of political rights and civil liberties. As a consequence of the end of the Cold War, Freedom House is at present in a stage of reorientation and restructuring.

Freedom House started out documenting cases of racism in the United States. In the 60's the organization extended its reporting to countries beyond the United States. The "Comparative Survey of Freedom," a ranking of countries in respect to their performance of political rights and civil liberties, was first published in 1973 in the Freedom House's publication "Freedom at Issue" (today "Freedom Review"). Since 1978 this survey has been published as a yearbook.

There are two separate checklists for political rights and civil liberties. The nine items for political rights focus on free and secret elections. The 13 items on the checklist for civil liberties record the classical liberal freedoms - like freedom of expression and assembly, equality of opportunity, freedom from social inequality and freedom from extreme government indifference and corruption. In 1994, a country was given a mark from 0 to 4 for each of these items (Ryan 1995: 12).<sup>7</sup> For political rights the highest possible number of points is 36, and 52 points is the highest number for civil liberties. The higher the number of points, the better the human rights situation is. In a second step Freedom House ranks each country on an ordinal scale of seven levels, level 1 representing the "best" level with countries considered free, while level 7 includes those countries considered not free by Freedom House. In a third step, the two scales for political rights and civil liberties are integrated into an additive weighted index of three levels. The three levels are "free" (1 to 2.5), "partly free" (3 to 5.5) and "not free" (5.5 to 7). This aggregation is necessarily very rough. As Freedom House is predominantly interested in the democratic situation of a country, it might be more informative to use only the scale for political rights as a measurement for democracy rather than the 3-level index of freedom.

---

<sup>7</sup>

Earlier surveys had only a range of 0 to 2 at their disposal. The range of 0 to 4 is supposed to allow for a more differentiated view on the realization of the rights in question.

#### **4. The Political Terror Scale (PTS)**

The Political Terror Scale (PTS) which will be emphasized in the following evaluation, was first presented by Raymond Gastil in the 1980 yearbook of Freedom House. David Carleton and Michael Stohl from Purdue University used this scale to compare the human rights rhetoric of President Jimmy Carter with his actual human rights policy (Carleton/Stohl 1985: 212).<sup>8</sup> In their analysis they found that the rhetoric of Jimmy Carter concerning his commitment to human rights had no impact on his respective policy. Rather, for Jimmy Carter as for other American presidents, economic and security interests predominated over a consequent human rights policy.

At Purdue University the measurement of human rights violations using the Political Terror Scale as an instrument has been carried out since the early 80's. Researchers of Purdue code annually the reports of Amnesty International and the Country Reports of the U.S. Department of State (Carleton/Stohl 1985; Gibney/Dalton in press; McCann/Gibney in press). Given the differences between Amnesty International and the U.S. State Department, the coding results of these two yearbooks do not diverge very much. The relative consistency of the coding results may be considered as proof of the reliability of the data.

Finally, for some years researchers of PIOOM at the University of Leiden in the Netherlands have been generating data on human rights violations using the Political Terror Scale as a measurement instrument and the Country Reports of the U.S. State Department as a data source. Purdue and Leiden exchange their data regularly to test the intercoder reliability.

##### **4.1 Description of the Political Terror Scale**

The Political Terror Scale ranks countries according to their performance in human rights on an ordinal level, thereby concentrating on gross human rights violations, i.e. mainly state terrorism that threatens the integrity of the individual by the following dimensions:

- \* lack of a secure rule of law
- \* torture
- \* political murders
- \* disappearances

Michael Stohl (1992) puts the emphasis on the multidimensionality of the measurement of human rights violations with the dimensions of scope, range and intensity. The five levels of the Political Terror Scale may be distinguished according to range, i.e. size of the population

---

<sup>8</sup> That is why the Political Terror Scale is known in Germany also as Carleton/Stohl scale or concept.

targeted and in respect to intensity, i.e. frequency of gross human rights violations. The levels are not distinguished in scope as the same kind of human rights are always considered.

**Table 1: The Political Terror Scale (PTS)**

| Level |   |
|-------|---|
| 1     | Countries ... under a secure rule of law, people are not imprisoned for their views, and torture is rare or exceptional. ... Political murders are extraordinarily rare.  |
| 2     | There is a limited amount of imprisonment for nonviolent political activity. However, few are affected, torture and beatings are exceptional. ... Political murder is rare.   |
| 3     | There is extensive political imprisonment, or a recent history of such imprisonment. Execution or other political murders and brutality may be common. Unlimited detention, with or without trial, for political views is accepted. ...               |
| 4     | The practices of Level 3 are expanded to larger numbers. Murders, disappearances, and torture are a common part of life. ... In spite of its generality, on this level violence affects primarily those who interest themselves in politics or ideas. |
| 5     | The violence of Level 4 has been extended to the whole population. ... The leaders of these societies place no limits on the means or thoroughness with which they pursue personal or ideological goals.  |

Within more than 10 years the scale has not been further elaborated. This means that longitudinal analyses over many years should be reliable at least in respect to the measurement instrument.

#### 4.2 Coder Training

With the help of the training of the coders their measurements should become as reliable and as valid as possible. For this purpose the coders have to become familiar with the measurement instrument itself and with the meaning of the various levels of the scale. Through practice and through discussions within the coding team, they should be able to learn the coding rules. In this way the requirements for an interpersonal, invariate and adequate coding are created.

At Purdue University in addition to the Political Terror Scale, the coders are provided with the following additional instructions that they should keep in mind when ranking the states into the various levels of the Political Terror Scale (Gibney/Dalton in press)<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>9</sup>

As there is only a manuscript of the article available, it is impossible to give page references.

"- Ignore Own Biases. Coders should make every attempt to keep their own biases out of their work. Thus, coders are instructed to ignore their preconceptions of a country, and to limit their coding to the information provided in the country report.

- Give Countries the Benefit of the Doubt. Coders .. are instructed to give the benefit of the doubt in favour of the countries they are coding. Thus, if a coder thinks that a country could be scored as either a level 2 or a level 3, the country is to receive the lower score. Sometimes coders will not feel comfortable making a choice between two levels. In those instances, coders will oftentimes score a country using both numbers, such as 2/3. If the other coder has either of these numbers, we use the level where there is agreement.

One of the more difficult problems is how to deal with the situation where a country's human rights situation changes dramatically during the course of the year. It is not out of the ordinary for a newly installed regime to pursue policies that are diametrically opposed to that which preceded it. In these instances we instruct the coders to consider when the regime change occurred. For example, if a repressive regime was ousted late in the calendar year, the score probably should reflect the human rights situation that existed for most of the year. On the other hand, if the change occurred anywhere near the middle of the year or before then, the score should reflect this change.

- Consider the Size of the Country Being Coded. Coders are instructed to be sensitive to the size of the countries they are coding. For example, six hundred political prisoners in a small country represents a much different phenomenon than the same number in a much larger country, and thus, should be coded differently.

- View the Various Levels as Part of a Continuum. The PTS provides us with ordinal rankings of levels of human rights abuses. Countries with higher scores should experience higher numbers of deaths, torture, and political imprisonment than those ranked below them. In addition, countries with the same score should experience approximately the same level of political terror (but also reflecting the size of the countries), although it might not occur in the same manner. For example, one country might have a large number of political prisoners, but very few summary executions or disappearances. Another country might have the exact opposite scenario. Still, it is quite possible for both countries to have the same score. Coders are instructed to be sensitive to these kinds of trade-offs, and to attempt to reflect the relative level of human rights abuses in the countries they are coding.

- Try to Measure Government Terror, But Ultimately Be Sensitive to all Forms of Terror. The PTS attempts to measure government terror. However, the coders also are instructed not to ignore other forms of terror from non-governmental actors. The aim is to reflect the human rights violations that exist in a country more generally.

- Try to Read What the Reports Are Trying to Say. ... The point is that it is important to discern what the reports are trying to say. One key is the adjectives employed. For example, "systematic" torture represents a more serious human rights violation than the mention that torture commonly occurs."

For the coding it is important to understand what the levels of the Political Terror Scale really mean. Here Gibney and Dalton write: "..., the essence of what differentiates Level 4 from

Level 5 countries is that in the former certain sectors of the population are singled out for widespread terror, while in the latter terror afflicts nearly the entire population. Despite this theoretical distinction, however, sometimes the level of political terror in a country will be so great -- although it is only aimed at certain segments of the population -- that it still warrants a level 5. To use an illustration, even if Hitler had only singled out one group, Jews, for persecution, the level of terror in Nazi Germany still would have been a level 5."

At Purdue at least two persons code one country, using the whole country report of Amnesty International and the "Introduction" and "Section I" of the Country Reports of the U.S. State Department as data basis. The coders give a specific value for a country and give a short justification for their decision. In cases of dispute another person (most often Mark Gibney) tries to find a solution through a third coding. Often the coders are asked to reread the reports. But if doubts remain, the lower value will be given to a country.

## **5. The Coding of the "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1994"**

1994 was the first time that a group of students coded the "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices" in Duisburg.

### **5.1 Preparation of the Coding**

For the coding, three groups of two and one of three students came together. The methodological basis for the coding was a German book on content analysis (Früh 1991). In two preparatory sessions the Political Terror Scale itself as well as the coding instructions of Gibney and Dalton, cited above were discussed. Coding was practiced with selected countries. With the help of these concrete examples signal words for the various levels of the scale were singled out.

Finally, each coding group was assigned about the same number of states that should be judged in respect to their performance of human rights. The assignment required each group to code countries from all regions of the world. Based on the ranking of the year before, each coding group measured states from all levels of the Political Terror Scale.

In addition, two students judged the human rights situation of the U.S.A. using a report of Amnesty International (1995). Amnesty International reports that in 1994 several prisoners died because of the extreme brutality within American prisons. According to Amnesty corruption and racism are widespread within the American police and courts. That is why the coders scored the U.S.A. as level 2.



## 5.2 Testing the Reliability of the Coding

After the actual coding process was finished and discussions were held within the coder groups, two tests of reliability were carried out. One considered the homogeneity of the countries within one level (intra-level consistency). This test asks whether the states in one level of the Political Terror Scale are relatively homogenous in respect to their human rights situation. Especially with countries in dispute this test helped to make a decision on a final common coding. Some countries were recoded after this test. In the case that a coder group could not agree on a common evaluation of a country, another person was asked to code the country.

Another test of reliability was to consider the development of a country's human rights situation compared to the year before. For this purpose specific remarks in the Country Reports in respect to positive or negative changes were kept in mind. While the test on intra-level consistency turned out to be very helpful and should be retained, the consideration of results of the coding from the year before might influence the coders in their actual efforts.

For an intercoder reliability test the country scores were sent to Mark Gibney at Purdue University in order to compare the Duisburg results with his own measurements. Of the 193 states he disagreed with the evaluation of 22 cases. The proposals of Mark Gibney were considered in most of the coder groups, followed by a discussion in the plenum. Finally the Duisburg group agreed to 14 of his judgments, while he joined the Duisburg arguments for five more states. The contested countries that remained were Tunisia, Turkmenistan and Venezuela. But in a further discussion an agreement on the ranking of all states was reached, as is documented in the appendix.<sup>10</sup>

## 5.3 Recommendations for Future Codings

For future codings the following recommendations derived from the Duisburg experiences are proposed:

Two plenum sessions to prepare the coding turned out to be too few for coders without experience. Above all the coding of countries should be practiced more often, in three to four sessions.

If there were enough persons for the coding, groups of three are preferred to groups of two. The addition of another opinion might make the measurement more precise. Furthermore, there seems to be less pressure of conformity concerning country coding in a group of three.

---

<sup>10</sup> For the purpose of comparison we show the development of the human rights situation since 1990. In the appendix a ranking of all countries according to their human rights performance in 1994 is included as well.

Two coders reported that they felt influenced by the sequence of the states they coded. After the report of a country with a very bad human rights situation, they tended to judge the following country better than they would have done without the "baggage" of the preceding country in their minds. In order to avoid such effects, the coders within a group should rank the states in different orders and this order should be prescribed.

One problem in regard to content was whether the underlying meaning of "secure rule of law" as independence of the judiciary was not too molded by Western thought. Taking the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as an orientation (especially in the articles 9 and 14, in which procedures under a "secure rule of law" are described), one might succumb to a Western bias. In order to avoid this, island states without an independent judiciary, but rendering their inhabitants within a traditional system security of law were ranked in this respect in level 1. A similar coding problem arose in respect to states where the shari'a is rule of law, like Saudi Arabia. Evaluating Islamic states with the shari'a as law, some coders were inclined to judge the mere existence of the shari'a as negative, even when no information that it was practiced was given in the Country Reports. For future codings one should be aware of this problem of Western bias and discuss with the coders in advance the understanding of a "secure rule of law" in societies that still have paternalistic responsibilities of a traditional ruler. As an example the United Arab Emirates, where both paternalism and the shari'a exist, might be chosen to train the coders in a concrete manner.

The coding of China turned out to be a more specific problem, which was not to be solved on the basis of the coding instructions of Gibney and Dalton: Gibney and Dalton's instructions of considering the size of a country was of course a plus for the Chinese regime. Furthermore the Country Reports were unable to render secure information of the human rights situation in China. With the four criteria "Ignore Own Biases," "Consider the Size of a Country," "Give Countries the Benefit of the Doubt," and "Take the Reports as Valid Data Basis" the coders arrived at an overly positive evaluation of China's human rights performance. This result does not agree with information from human rights organizations and oppositional groups within the country. It shows the general necessity of coding not only the Country Reports but other reports like the Amnesty International Yearbook. On the basis of the Country Reports China was in level 3, on the basis of the Amnesty International Yearbook China was given a 4 by the Gibney coders.

Although the simplicity of the Political Terror Scale is impressive, a scale of only five levels is very undifferentiated to grasp the global human rights situation adequately. But just adding more levels might only lead to a shifting of the problem lying underneath the measurement of human rights violations. Especially the transitions between level 2 to 3 and 4 to 5 caused

difficulties during the coding process. For suggestions to improve the Political Terror Scale, one should analyze such difficulties in detail.

Furthermore, since 1993 respect for the human rights of women has received more attention in the Country Reports. The human rights of women are discussed in the introduction of the Country Reports to some extent, but they are not to be considered coding the countries with the Political Terror Scale. However, in reading the introduction, it seems that the information on the rights of women indirectly influences the evaluation of a country. One should consider whether the violations of human rights of women and children should be included as specific dimensions in the Political Terror Scale. This implies that the development of the human rights concept as it has been discussed especially since the World Conference on Human Rights 1993 in Vienna, should be reflected in the measurement instrument as well.

Table 2: Human Rights in Separate Regions in 1994\*

| PTS-Level          | Europe | States that succeeded the SU | North America | South-/ Middle America | Caribbean | Asia  | Pacific Region | Near East and North Africa | Africa | Total |
|--------------------|--------|------------------------------|---------------|------------------------|-----------|-------|----------------|----------------------------|--------|-------|
| 1                  | 25     | 2                            | 1             | 1                      | 8         | 4     | 12             | 2                          | 6      | 61    |
| Row                | 40,98  | 3,28                         | 1,64          | 1,64                   | 13,11     | 6,56  | 19,67          | 3,28                       | 9,84   | 100   |
| Column             | 69,44  | 13,33                        | 50            | 5                      | 61,54     | 15,38 | 100            | 9,52                       | 12,50  | 31,61 |
| 2                  | 8      | 7                            | 1             | 7                      | 2         | 6     | 0              | 6                          | 13     | 50    |
| Row                | 16,00  | 14                           | 2,00          | 14,00                  | 4,00      | 12,00 | 0              | 12,00                      | 26,00  | 100   |
| Column             | 22,22  | 46,67                        | 50            | 35                     | 15,38     | 23,08 | 0              | 28,57                      | 27,08  | 25,91 |
| 3                  | 0      | 2                            | 0             | 5                      | 2         | 7     | 0              | 4                          | 13     | 33    |
| Row                | 0      | 6,06                         | 0             | 15,15                  | 6,06      | 21,21 | 0              | 12,12                      | 39,39  | 100   |
| Column             | 0      | 13,33                        | 0             | 25                     | 15,38     | 26,92 | 0              | 19,05                      | 27,08  | 17,10 |
| 4                  | 0      | 4                            | 0             | 6                      | 1         | 6     | 0              | 6                          | 8      | 31    |
| Row                | 0      | 12,90                        | 0             | 19,35                  | 3,23      | 19,35 | 0              | 19,35                      | 25,18  | 100   |
| Column             | 0      | 26,67                        | 0             | 30                     | 7,69      | 23,08 | 0              | 28,57                      | 16,67  | 16,06 |
| 5                  | 3      | 0                            | 0             | 1                      | 0         | 3     | 0              | 3                          | 8      | 18    |
| Row                | 16,67  | 0                            | 0             | 5,56                   | 0         | 16,67 | 0              | 16,67                      | 44,44  | 100   |
| Column absolute    | 8,33   | 0                            | 0             | 5                      | 0         | 11,54 | 0              | 14,29                      | 16,67  | 9,33  |
| %-column           | 36     | 15                           | 2             | 20                     | 13        | 26    | 12             | 21                         | 48     | 193   |
| %-total            | 18,65  | 7,77                         | 1,04          | 10,36                  | 6,74      | 13,47 | 6,22           | 10,88                      | 24,87  | 100   |
| Countries in total | 100    | 100                          | 100           | 100                    | 100       | 100   | 100            | 100                        | 100    | 193   |

\* For analytic purposes the Caribbean islands are separated from Latin America and the Pacific islands from Asia.

## **6. Discussion of the Human Rights Situation in 1994**

The table on the preceding page shows that in 1994, 61 states, or roughly 30% of all 193 states were in level 1 of the Political Terror Scale, which means that their human rights performance is good. However, this does not mean that there were no human rights violations at all in these states, as this ranking is relative to the other states considered. Roughly 43% of these 61 states are developed Western industrialized countries. Leaving Australia and New Zealand aside, 18 of the 20 states in the Caribbean and the Pacific in level 1 are small island states. Including the island states offshore Africa and in the South Asian Sea, then roughly 35% of the states in level 1 are island states. This means that - relatively speaking - human rights is best in states with established democracies and a long tradition of the human rights idea, as in Europe. The situation of small island states might be favourable for human rights because of relatively homogenous populations and relatively integrated (sometimes even traditional) social structures as in the Pacific.

Eighteen states were in level 5, most of them involved in wars, civil wars and armed conflicts. War always implies gross human rights violations. The three European states in level 5 are all within the boundaries of former Yugoslavia. Eight states, or almost 45% of all states in level 5, are in Africa. This means that gross human rights violations - as measured through the Political Terror Scale - occur most frequently in Africa. However, uniting level 5 and level 4, where the human rights situation is disastrous as well, then 49 states (or one quarter of all 193 states) are the most severe gross human rights violators. Except for Europe, North America and the island states, no region of the world is excluded from these extensive humanitarian crises and catastrophies: Of 21 states in the Near East/North Africa nine (or roughly 43%) are in level 4 and 5 of the Political Terror Scale. One third of the 48 African states are included in these levels. The situation in Asia and Latin America is bad as well with 35% and more than one third of the states respectively in levels 4 and 5.

Nine of the 15 states having succeeded the former Soviet Union are in level 1 or 2. But the other states are in level 3 and 4, which means that human rights is considered to be critical. Russia is not in level 5 because the war in Chechenia broke out only in the end of 1994, which had to be considered in the measurement.

**Table 3: Human Rights Situation Since 1990**

| Level<br>PTS | 1990* |      | 1991 |      | 1992 |      | 1993 |       | 1994 |      |
|--------------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|
|              | n     | %    | n    | %    | n    | %    | n    | %     | n    | %    |
| 1            | 7     | 7,9  | 53   | 32,5 | 64   | 34,4 | 68   | 36,6  | 61   | 31,6 |
| 2            | 23    | 25,8 | 43   | 26,4 | 36   | 19,4 | 37   | 19,9  | 50   | 25,9 |
| 3            | 34    | 38,2 | 35   | 21,5 | 40   | 21,5 | 32   | 17,2  | 33   | 17,1 |
| 4            | 19    | 21,3 | 24   | 14,7 | 33   | 17,7 | 29   | 15,6  | 31   | 16,1 |
| 5            | 6     | 6,7  | 8    | 4,9  | 13   | 7,0  | 20   | 10,8  | 18   | 9,3  |
|              | 89    | 99,9 | 163  | 100  | 186  | 100  | 186  | 100,1 | 193  | 100  |

\* In 1990 many countries were not coded at all, among them many Western industrialized countries (see tables in appendix).

Leaving the human rights situation in 1990 aside because of the few states considered, then the proportionate distribution of states into the various levels of the Political Terror Scale since 1991 does not show any fundamental improvement of the international human rights situation. Approximately one third of the states are scored level 1 over the years. There is a slight variation in levels 2 and 3 that might be interpreted as a tendency of improvement of the human rights situation of states in level 3, but this would have to be confirmed by looking into the individual country codings in more detail. Looking at level 5, since the early 90's proportionately (from roughly 5% in 1991 to 9.3% in 1994) and absolutely more states (because of the absolute increase in number) have to be considered as severe gross human rights violators. The ratios of level 4 and level 5 together have stayed at roughly 25%. Because of wars, civil wars and armed conflicts, the international human rights situation has remained bad, in spite of the end of the Cold War.

The data presented here give an overall view on the global human rights situation. The individual scores as listed in the appendix allow for such a view in respect to the individual states. However, as stated in the beginning of this INEF-Report, for political purposes, eg. for decisions in the refugee and asylum policy of Western industrialized countries, or in respect to grants and economic aid to countries in the South, the evaluation of the human rights performance of states should be based on qualitative and profound case studies. A measurement instrument with only five levels of ranking, such as the Political Terror Scale, cannot depict the differentiated and comprehensive picture of a country's human rights situation. In spite of all attempts to assure the reliability and validity of such measurements, they necessarily remain rough and highly aggregated. Where the lives of people are concerned, the measurement of human rights violations should be used as one of many tools to judge the human rights situation of a country in a realistic manner.

## Literature

- Amnesty International* (1995): Jahresbericht 1995. Frankfurt/M.
- Buergenthal*, Thomas (1989): Entwicklungen in der Menschenrechtspolitik der USA. In: Europäische Grundrechtezeitschrift, 16 (7), pp. 149-157.
- Cain*, Michael / *Claude*, Richard P. / *Jabine*, Thomas B. (1991): A Guide to Human Rights Data Sources. In: *Jabine*, Thomas B. & *Claude*, Richard P. (eds.): Human Rights and Statistics (pp. 392-442). Philadelphia.
- Carleton*, David / *Stohl*, Michael (1985): The Foreign Policy of Human Rights: Rhetoric and Reality from Jimmy Carter to Ronald Reagan. In: *Human Rights Quarterly*, 7, pp. 205-229.
- Forsythe*, David P. (1987): Congress and Human Rights in U.S. Foreign Policy: The Fate of General Legislation. In: *Human Rights Quarterly*, 9 (3), pp. 382-404.
- Freedom House* (1991): Freedom in the World. Political Rights and Civil Liberties 1990-1991. New York: Freedom House.
- Früh*, Werner (1991): Inhaltsanalyse (3rd ed.). München.
- Gibney*, Mark / *Dalton*, Matthew (in press): The Political Terror Scale. In: *Cingranelli*, David L. (ed.), *Human Rights and Developing Countries*.
- Gupta*, Dipak K. / *Jongman*, Albert / *Schmid*, Alex P. (1994): Creating a Composite Index for Assessing Country Performance in the Field of Human Rights: Proposal for a New Methodology. In: *Human Rights Quarterly*, 16, pp.131-162.
- Haas*, Michael (1990): Human rights. Mapping Empirical Dimensions onto Analytical Categories. Paper prepared for presentation at the Biennial Conference of the International Peace Research Association, Groningen, July 6. Groningen.
- Hauchler*, Ingomar / *Kennedy*, Paul (eds.) (1994): Global Trends. The World Almanac of Development and Peace. New York.
- Hauchler*, Ingomar (ed.) (1995): Globale Trends 1996. Fakten, Analysen, Prognosen. Frankfurt/M.
- Human Rights Watch* (1995): Human Rights Watch World Report 1995. New York.
- McCann*, James / *Gibney*, Mark (in press): An Overview of Political Terror in the Developing World, 1980-1991. In: *Cingranelli*, David L. (ed.): *Human Rights and Developing Countries*.
- Neufville de*, Judith Innes (1986): Human Rights Reporting as a Policy Tool: An Examination of the State Department Country Reports. In: *Human Rights Quarterly*, 8 (4), pp. 681-699.
- Ryan*, Joseph E. (1995): Survey Methodology. In: *Freedom Review*, 26 (1), pp. 10-14.
- Shestack*, Jerome J. (1989): Human Rights, the National Interest and U.S. Foreign Policy. In: *The Annals*, 506, pp.17-29.

- Stohl, Michael (1992): Towards a New Framework for Monitoring Human Rights Violations.*  
In: Schmid, Alex P. & Jongman, Albert J. (eds.): *Monitoring Human Rights Violations*  
(pp. 63-71). Leiden: Center for the Study of Social Conflicts, Faculty of Social Science.  
Leiden University.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (1994): Human Development Report 1994.*  
New York.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (1995): Human Development Report 1995.*  
New York.
- U.S. Department of State (1995): Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1994.*  
Washington.

## Appendix

**TABLES A to F:** Human Rights Situation in the Regions of the World

**TABLE G:** Ranking of Countries According to their Human Rights Performance in 1994



**Table A: Human Rights in Africa South of the Sahara**

| Country         | 1990*        | 1991          | 1992  | 1993  | 1994           |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|-------|-------|----------------|
| Angola          | 4            | 3             | 5     | 5     | 5              |
| Benin           | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Botswana        | -            | 1             | 1     | 2     | 2              |
| Burkina Faso    | -            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Burundi         | 2            | 4             | 4     | 5     | 5              |
| Cameroon        | -            | 3             | 4     | 3     | 4              |
| Cape Verde      | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| C. African Rep. | -            | 2             | 3     | 2     | 2              |
| Chad            | 4            | 4             | 4     | 4     | 4              |
| Comoros         | -            | 1             | 2     | 1     | 2              |
| Congo           | -            | 2             | 1     | 4     | 3              |
| Djibouti        | -            | 3             | 3     | 4     | 3              |
| Equat. Guinea   | -            | 3             | 3     | 4     | 4              |
| Eritrea         | -            | -             | -     | -     | 1              |
| Ethiopia        | 4            | 5             | 4     | 4     | 4              |
| Gabon           | -            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 3              |
| Gambia          | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 3              |
| Ghana           | 2            | 2             | 2     | 1     | 2              |
| Guinea          | 2            | 3             | 3     | 3     | 3              |
| Guinea-Bissau   | -            | 2             | 3     | 3     | 3              |
| Ivory Coast     | -            | 2             | 3     | 2     | 3              |
| Kenya           | 3            | 3             | 4     | 4     | 4              |
| Lesotho         | 2            | 2             | 3     | 3     | 3              |
| Liberia         | 5            | 5             | 5     | 5     | 5              |
| Madagascar      | -            | 3             | 3     | 2     | 2              |
| Malawi          | -            | 2             | 3     | 2     | 2              |
| Mali            | 3            | 3             | 4     | 1     | 3              |
| Mauretania      | -            | 3             | 4     | 3     | 2              |
| Mauritius       | -            | 1             | -     | -     | 1              |
| Mozambique      | 4            | 4             | 5     | 4     | 3              |
| Namibia         | 2            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Niger           | 3            | 2             | 3     | 3     | 3              |
| Nigeria         | 3            | 3             | 3     | 4     | 4              |
| Rwanda          | -            | 4             | 4     | 4     | 5              |
| Sao Tomé-Princ. | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Senegal         | 3            | 3             | 3     | 3     | 2              |
| Seychelles      | 2            | 2             | 2     | 1     | 1              |
| Sierra Leone    | -            | 3             | 4     | 4     | 5              |
| Somalia         | 5            | 5             | 5     | 5     | 5              |
| South Africa    | 4            | 4             | 4     | 5     | 4              |
| Sudan           | 4            | 5             | 5     | 5     | 5              |
| Swaziland       | -            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Tanzania        | 3            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Togo            | -            | 3             | 3     | 3     | 4              |
| Uganda          | 4            | 4             | 3     | 3     | 3              |
| Zaire           | 3            | 3             | 4     | 5     | 5              |
| Zambia          | 3            | 2             | 2     | 3     | 3              |
| Zimbabwe        | 3            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Sources         | Purdue Univ. | Global Trends | PIOOM | PIOOM | Duisburg Univ. |

\* In 1990 not all countries were coded.

**Table B: Human Rights on the American Continent and in the Caribbean**

| Country            | 1990*        | 1991          | 1992  | 1993  | 1994           |
|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------|-------|----------------|
| Antigua/Barbu.     | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Argentina          | 2            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Bahamas            | -            | 2             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Barbados           | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Belize             | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 2              |
| Bolivia            | 3            | 2             | 2     | 3     | 3              |
| Brazil             | 4            | 4             | 4     | 4     | 4              |
| Canada             | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Chile              | 3            | 3             | 3     | 2     | 2              |
| Colombia           | 5            | 4             | 4     | 5     | 5              |
| Costa Rica         | 1            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Cuba               | 3            | 3             | 3     | 3     | 3              |
| Dominica           | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Dominican Rep.     | 2            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Ecuador            | 3            | 2             | 3     | 3     | 3              |
| El Salvador        | 4            | 4             | 4     | 3     | 3              |
| Grenada            | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Guatemala          | 5            | 4             | 4     | 4     | 4              |
| Guyana             | 2            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Haiti              | 4            | 4             | 4     | 4     | 4              |
| Honduras           | 3            | 3             | 3     | 3     | 3              |
| Jamaica            | 2            | 3             | 3     | 3     | 3              |
| Mexico             | 3            | 3             | 3     | 4     | 4              |
| Nicaragua          | 3            | 3             | 4     | 4     | 4              |
| Panama             | 2            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Paraguay           | 2            | 3             | 3     | 3     | 3              |
| Peru               | 5            | 4             | 5     | 4     | 4              |
| St. Kitts / -Nevis | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| St. Lucia          | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| St. Vincent        | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Surinam            | 3            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Trinidad/Tobago    | -            | 1             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Uruguay            | 2            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| U.S.A.             | -            | -             | -     | -     | 2**            |
| Venezuela          | 3            | 3             | 3     | 3     | 4              |
| Sources            | Purdue Univ. | Global Trends | PIOOM | PIOOM | Duisburg Univ. |

\* In 1990 not all countries were coded.

\*\* Data base is a report of Amnesty International (1995).

**Table C: Human Rights in Asia and the Pacific Region**

| Country          | 1990*        | 1991          | 1992  | 1993  | 1994           |
|------------------|--------------|---------------|-------|-------|----------------|
| Afghanistan      | 4            | 5             | 5     | 5     | 5              |
| Australia        | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Bangladesh       | 4            | 4             | 3     | 3     | 3              |
| Bhutan           | -            | 3             | 4     | 4     | 4              |
| Brunei           | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 2              |
| Cambodia         | 4            | 4             | 3     | 4     | 4              |
| China            | 4            | 3             | 3     | 3     | 3              |
| Fiji             | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Hong Kong        | -            | -             | 2     | 1     | 1              |
| India            | 4            | 4             | 4     | 5     | 5              |
| Indonesia        | 3            | 4             | 3     | 4     | 4              |
| Japan            | 1            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Kiribati         | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Korea, North     | -            | 3             | 4     | 4     | 4              |
| Korea, South     | 3            | 3             | 3     | 2     | 2              |
| Laos             | 3            | 2             | 3     | 3     | 2              |
| Malaysia         | 2            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Maldives         | -            | 2             | 2     | 1     | 1              |
| Marshall Islands | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Micronesia       | -            | 1             | -     | -     | 1              |
| Mongolia         | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Myanmar (Burma)  | 4            | 4             | 5     | 5     | 5              |
| Nauru            | -            | -             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Nepal            | -            | 2             | 3     | 3     | 3              |
| New Zealand      | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Pakistan         | 3            | 3             | 4     | 4     | 4              |
| Papua-N.Guinea   | -            | 3             | 3     | 3     | 4              |
| Philippines      | 4            | 4             | 4     | 4     | 3              |
| Singapore        | 2            | 1             | 1     | 2     | 2              |
| Solomon Islands  | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Sri Lanka        | -            | 4             | 4     | 4     | 3              |
| Taiwan           | 2            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Thailand         | 2            | 2             | 3     | 3     | 3              |
| Tonga            | -            | -             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Tuvalu           | -            | -             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Vanuatu          | -            | -             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Vietnam          | 3            | 3             | 3     | 3     | 3              |
| Western-Samoa    | -            | -             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Sources          | Purdue Univ. | Global Trends | PIOOM | PIOOM | Duisburg Univ. |

\* In 1990 not all countries were coded.

**Table D:**  
**Human Rights in Europe** (Excluding the States which Succeeded the Soviet Union)

| Country          | 1990*        | 1991          | 1992  | 1993  | 1994           |
|------------------|--------------|---------------|-------|-------|----------------|
| Albania          | 3            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Andorra          | -            | -             | -     | -     | 1              |
| Austria          | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Belgium          | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Bosnia Herzeg.   | -            | -             | 5     | 5     | 5              |
| Bulgaria         | 2            | 1             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Croatia          | -            | -             | 5     | 5     | 5              |
| Cyprus (Greek)   | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Czech Republic   | -            | -             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Denmark          | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Eire (Rep. of)   | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Finland          | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| France           | 1            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Germany          | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Great Britain    | -            | 2             | 1**   | 1**   | 2              |
| Greece           | 1            | 1             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Hungary          | 1            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Iceland          | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Italy            | 1            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 2              |
| Liechtenstein    | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Luxembourg       | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Macedonia        | -            | -             | 1     | 1     | 2              |
| Malta            | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Monaco           | -            | -             | -     | -     | 1              |
| Netherlands      | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Norway           | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Poland           | 2            | 2             | 2     | 1     | 1              |
| Portugal         | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Romania          | 2            | 2             | 1     | 2     | 2              |
| San Marino       | -            | -             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Serbia / Monten. | -            | -             | 5     | 5     | 5              |
| Slovak Republic  | -            | -             | -     | -     | 1              |
| Slovenia         | -            | -             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Spain            | -            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Sweden           | -            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Switzerland      | -            | 1             | 2     | 1     | 1              |
| Yugoslavia       | 3            | 5             | -     | -     | -              |
| Sources          | Purdue Univ. | Global Trends | PIOOM | PIOOM | Duisburg Univ. |

\* In 1990 not all countries were coded.

\*\* PIOOM coded the Situation in Northern Ireland seperately.

**Table E: Human Rights in the Middle East and North Africa**

| Country                       | 1990*        | 1991          | 1992  | 1993  | 1994           |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|-------|-------|----------------|
| Algeria                       | -            | 4             | 4     | 5     | 5              |
| Bahrain                       | 3            | 2             | 1     | 2     | 2              |
| Egypt                         | 3            | 3             | 3     | 4     | 4              |
| Iran                          | 4            | 4             | 4     | 4     | 4              |
| Iraq                          | 5            | 5             | 5     | 5     | 5              |
| Israel                        | 2            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Israel (occupied territories) | 3            | 4             | 4     | 4     | 4              |
| Jordan                        | 2            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Kuwait                        | -            | 5             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Lebanon                       | 3            | 4             | 3     | 4     | 4              |
| Libya                         | 3            | 3             | 4     | 4     | 3              |
| Morocco                       | 3            | 3             | 3     | 3     | 3              |
| Oman                          | 1            | 1             | 1     | 1     | 2              |
| Qatar                         | -            | 2             | 2     | 2     | 1              |
| Saudi Arabia                  | 2            | 2             | 3     | 3     | 2              |
| Syria                         | 4            | 3             | 4     | 4     | 4              |
| Tunesia                       | 3            | 3             | 3     | 3     | 3              |
| Turkey                        | 3            | 4             | 4     | 5     | 5              |
| United Arab E.                | -            | 1             | 2     | 1     | 1              |
| Western Sahara                | -            | -             | 3     | 3     | 3              |
| Yemen                         | 3            | 3             | 3     | 3     | 4              |
| Sources                       | Purdue Univ. | Global Trends | PIOOM | PIOOM | Duisburg Univ. |

\* In 1990 not all countries were coded.

**Table F: Human Rights in the States that Succeeded the Soviet Union**

| Country      | 1990*        | 1991          | 1992  | 1993  | 1994           |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------|-------|----------------|
| Armenia      | -            | -             | 4     | 3     | 2              |
| Azerbaijan   | -            | -             | 4     | 5     | 4              |
| Belarus      | -            | -             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Estonia      | -            | 1             | 1     | 2     | 2              |
| Georgia      | -            | -             | 4     | 5     | 4              |
| Kazakhstan   | -            | -             | 1     | 1     | 3              |
| Kyrgyzstan   | -            | -             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Latvia       | -            | 2             | 1     | 1     | 2              |
| Lithuania    | -            | 2             | 1     | 1     | 1              |
| Moldova      | -            | -             | 4     | 2     | 2              |
| Russia       | -            | -             | 3     | 3     | 4              |
| Tajikistan   | -            | -             | 5     | 5     | 4              |
| Turkmenistan | -            | -             | 2     | 1     | 2              |
| Ukraine      | -            | -             | 1     | 1     | 3              |
| Uzbekistan   | -            | -             | 2     | 2     | 2              |
| Sources      | Purdue Univ. | Global Trends | PIOOM | PIOOM | Duisburg Univ. |

\* In 1990 not all countries were coded.

**Table G: Ranking of Countries According to their Human Rights Performance in 1994**

| Länder            | 1994 |
|-------------------|------|
| Andorra           | 1    |
| Antigua & Barbuda | 1    |
| Australia         | 1    |
| Austria           | 1    |
| Bahamas           | 1    |
| Barbados          | 1    |
| Belgium           | 1    |
| Benin             | 1    |
| Canada            | 1    |
| Cape Verde        | 1    |
| Costa Rica        | 1    |
| Cyprus            | 1    |
| Czech Republic    | 1    |
| Denmark           | 1    |
| Dominica          | 1    |
| Eire, Republic of | 1    |
| Eritrea           | 1    |
| Fiji              | 1    |
| Finland           | 1    |
| France            | 1    |
| Germany           | 1    |
| Grenada           | 1    |
| Hong Kong         | 1    |
| Hungary           | 1    |
| Iceland           | 1    |
| Japan             | 1    |
| Kiribati          | 1    |
| Kyrgyzstan        | 1    |
| Liechtenstein     | 1    |
| Lithuania         | 1    |
| Luxembourg        | 1    |
| Maledives         | 1    |
| Malta             | 1    |
| Marshall Islands  | 1    |
| Mauritius         | 1    |
| Micronesia        | 1    |

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Monaco                   | 1 |
| Mongolia                 | 1 |
| Nauru                    | 1 |
| Netherlands              | 1 |
| New Zealand              | 1 |
| Norway                   | 1 |
| Poland                   | 1 |
| Portugal                 | 1 |
| Quatar                   | 1 |
| San Marino               | 1 |
| Sao Tome & Principe      | 1 |
| Seychelles               | 1 |
| Slovak Republic          | 1 |
| Slovenia                 | 1 |
| Solomon Islands          | 1 |
| St. Kitts & Nevis        | 1 |
| St. Lucia                | 1 |
| St. Vincent              | 1 |
| Sweden                   | 1 |
| Switzerland              | 1 |
| Tonga                    | 1 |
| Tuvalu                   | 1 |
| United Arab Emirates     | 1 |
| Vanuatu                  | 1 |
| Western-Samoa            | 1 |
| Albania                  | 2 |
| Argentina                | 2 |
| Armenia                  | 2 |
| Bahrain                  | 2 |
| Belarus                  | 2 |
| Belize                   | 2 |
| Botswana                 | 2 |
| Brunei                   | 2 |
| Bulgaria                 | 2 |
| Burkina Faso             | 2 |
| Central African Republic | 2 |
| Chile                    | 2 |
| Comoros                  | 2 |
| Dominican Republic       | 2 |
| Estonia                  | 2 |
| Ghana                    | 2 |



|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Great Britain            | 2 |
| Greece                   | 2 |
| Guyana                   | 2 |
| Israel                   | 2 |
| Italy                    | 2 |
| Jordan                   | 2 |
| Korea, South             | 2 |
| Kuwait                   | 2 |
| Laos                     | 2 |
| Latvia                   | 2 |
| Macedonia                | 2 |
| Madagascar               | 2 |
| Malawi                   | 2 |
| Malaysia                 | 2 |
| Mauretania               | 2 |
| Moldova                  | 2 |
| Namibia                  | 2 |
| Oman                     | 2 |
| Panama                   | 2 |
| Romania                  | 2 |
| Saudi Arabia             | 2 |
| Senegal                  | 2 |
| Singapore                | 2 |
| Spain                    | 2 |
| Surinam                  | 2 |
| Swaziland                | 2 |
| Taiwan                   | 2 |
| Tanzania                 | 2 |
| Trinidad & Tobago        | 2 |
| Turkmenistan             | 2 |
| United States of America | 2 |
| Uruguay                  | 2 |
| Uzbekistan               | 2 |
| Zimbabwe                 | 2 |
| Bangladesh               | 3 |
| Bolivia                  | 3 |
| China                    | 3 |
| Congo                    | 3 |
| Cuba                     | 3 |
| Djibouti                 | 3 |
| Ecuador                  | 3 |

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| El Salvador                   | 3 |
| Gabon                         | 3 |
| Gambia                        | 3 |
| Guinea                        | 3 |
| Guinea Bissau                 | 3 |
| Honduras                      | 3 |
| Ivory Coast                   | 3 |
| Jamaica                       | 3 |
| Kazakhstan                    | 3 |
| Lesotho                       | 3 |
| Libya                         | 3 |
| Mali                          | 3 |
| Morocco                       | 3 |
| Mozambique                    | 3 |
| Nepal                         | 3 |
| Niger                         | 3 |
| Paraguay                      | 3 |
| Philippines                   | 3 |
| Sri Lanka                     | 3 |
| Thailand                      | 3 |
| Tunesia                       | 3 |
| Uganda                        | 3 |
| Ukraine                       | 3 |
| Vietnam                       | 3 |
| Western Sahara                | 3 |
| Zambia                        | 3 |
| Azerbaijan                    | 4 |
| Bhutan                        | 4 |
| Brazil                        | 4 |
| Cambodia                      | 4 |
| Cameroon                      | 4 |
| Chad                          | 4 |
| Egypt                         | 4 |
| Equatorial Guinea             | 4 |
| Ethiopia                      | 4 |
| Georgia                       | 4 |
| Guatemala                     | 4 |
| Haiti                         | 4 |
| Indonesia                     | 4 |
| Iran                          | 4 |
| Israel (occupied territories) | 4 |

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| Kenya              | 4 |
| Korea, North       | 4 |
| Lebanon            | 4 |
| Mexico             | 4 |
| Nicaragua          | 4 |
| Nigeria            | 4 |
| Pakistan           | 4 |
| Papua New Guinea   | 4 |
| Peru               | 4 |
| Russia             | 4 |
| South Africa       | 4 |
| Syria              | 4 |
| Tajikistan         | 4 |
| Togo               | 4 |
| Venezuela          | 4 |
| Yemen              | 4 |
| Afghanistan        | 5 |
| Algeria            | 5 |
| Angola             | 5 |
| Bosnia Herzegovina | 5 |
| Burundi            | 5 |
| Columbia           | 5 |
| Croatia            | 5 |
| India              | 5 |
| Iraq               | 5 |
| Liberia            | 5 |
| Myanmar (Burma)    | 5 |
| Rwanda             | 5 |
| Serbia-Montenegro  | 5 |
| Sierra Leone       | 5 |
| Somalia            | 5 |
| Sudan              | 5 |
| Turkey             | 5 |
| Zaire              | 5 |